

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT (ESSA)



ETHIOPIA CLIMATE ACTION THROUGH LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT (CALM) PROGRAM FOR RESULTS (P170384)

May 2019
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Executive Summary

Land degradation affects millions of rural Ethiopians and reduces their resilience to climate change and undermines livelihood security. Sustainable land management practices offer an opportunity to build resilience, mitigate climate change, and boost local livelihoods. Ethiopia has made significant progress over the past 10 years in restoring degraded watersheds, but challenges remain. Successful remediation has been achieved through improved natural resource management and resource rights, livelihood diversification, and gender outreach in targeted degraded watersheds. Restoration and improved management of land at the watershed level also yields climate co-benefits. In the government's Growth and Transformation Plan II (GTP-II), Ethiopia has been trying to curb land degradation and provision of land use certificates to encourage greater farmer-level investment in sustainable land management practices.

Ethiopia Strategic Investment Framework (ESIF)-3 is expected to deliver durable watershed management in five thousand community watersheds with an estimated area of 3.75 million hectares (or nearly 14% of the 27 million hectares estimated to be degraded), and strengthen rural land tenure security in 287 woredas. The government program will facilitate through extension services the establishment of Watershed User Associations (WUAs), the preparation and regular update of Participatory Watershed Management Plans (WMPs), and support to ensure these WUAs are effective, their plans implemented, and their efforts monitored. The government will also scale up its support for land titling, through the provision of Second-Level Landholding Certificates (SLLCs), and the establishment of a digital land registry, the National Rural Land Administration Information System (NRLAIS) to ensure security of land records and facilitate provision of land title information services.

The CALM PforR Program consists of two major result areas: Participatory Watershed Management and Land administration and management in non-rangeland areas having a total of six disbursement linked indicators. The World Bank has proposed the CALM Program with a PforR financing which aims at strengthening the government's systems in place and institutional capacity for implementation, with a shift from inputs to result approach with defined accountability.

As part of the preparation and appraisal of the CALM program, this environmental and social systems assessment (ESSA) has been prepared and consulted by the World Bank. The ESSA has been conducted with the objective to assess the capacity of the implementing agency, i.e., Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), particularly Natural Resource Management and Land Administration and Use Directorates' environmental, social, and safety management systems in sustainable natural resources management. Specifically, the ESSA was conducted to (i) identify potential environmental and social risks/impacts associated with the Program; (ii) assess the strengths and weaknesses of the legal, institutional, and implementation frameworks; and (iii) recommend measures to strengthen national and regional systems and capacity to deliver the PforR in a sustainable manner.

The ESSA was conducted within the framework of the six Core Guiding Principles of PforR financing: (i) General Principle of Environmental and Social Management; (ii) Natural Habitats and Physical Cultural Resources (PCR); (iii) Public and Workers Safety; (iv) Land Acquisition and Loss of Access to Natural Resources; (v) Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups; and (vi) Social Conflict. The ESSA was prepared using desk review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, community consultations and institutional analysis.

The draft ESSA will be disclosed in country and at the World Bank's external website for garnering feedback, consulted in a stakeholders workshop, incorporate the feedback from the public disclosure and the stakeholders workshop and disclose the revised version before appraisal.

Applicable Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework aspects: The Government of Ethiopia (GoE) has the necessary legal frameworks for environmental and social management and institutions to ensure consistency with the six Core Principles of the Program for Results Financing. The environmental and social legal frameworks of Ethiopia are found adequate. The primary legislations that support environmental and social management in Ethiopia are the FDRE Constitution, Environmental Policy of Ethiopia, Environmental Impact Assessment Proclamation No. 299/2002, Solid Waste Management Proclamation No. 513/2007; Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage Proclamation No. 209/2000; the Labor Proclamation No. 377/2003, Environmental Impact Assessment Procedural Guideline (2003); Environmental and Social Management Plan Preparation Guideline (2004); National Social Protection Policy; Cultural Policy; National Policy on Ethiopian Women; and other Laws, Strategies, and Guidelines Enforcing Special Support for Developing Regions and Vulnerable Groups.

Summary of Key Findings

The ESSA analysis indicates that all the six core principles of PforR financing are applicable to CALM Program for reasons described in the following sections.

Core Principle 1: General Principle of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management

Findings: The overall purpose of the landscape development practices is to rehabilitate and conserve the degraded natural resources with expected positive outcome for the environment. Communities and local authorities are accumulating experiences from their practices in planning, selection, and prioritizing the treatment works of watersheds involved. However, there is still need to confirm that these experiences are carried forward and strengthened further during the CALM program by ensuring that comprehensive watershed management plans that address potential environmental and social risks are prepared and implemented. This will require Watershed Management Plans to be screened, reviewed and cleared (approved) by the competent Environment protection authorities prior to its implementation. Some of the risks include inequitable and delayed benefits from watershed, inadequate participation, low empowerment of women and forced labor and fatigue in the watershed development.

The CALM program component on improving the robustness and quality of service delivery in land administration is to expand the coverage of second level land certification. The main issue from the perspective of potential environmental and social risks could be related to the disposal of IT facilities and surveying equipment, female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers and boundary related conflicts. The potential environmental and social risks of program activities related to these aspects will need to be addressed and hence trigger Core Principle-1

Core Principle 2: Environmental Considerations – Natural Habitats and Physical Cultural Resources

Findings: The applicability of Core principle 2 is generally related to the reasons given for applicability of Core principle 1 in the preceding sections. The current practices of site selection for watershed development largely focuses on prioritizing degraded lands without due attention given to other aspects like conservation of physical cultural resources in the watersheds. The potential environmental risks of program activities related to these aspects will need to be addressed and hence applies Core Principle-2.

Core Principle 3: Environmental Considerations – Public and Worker Safety

Findings: Core Principle 3 is applicable to the CALM Program in the sense that individual worker safety issues are of concern during participatory watershed development works. Depending on the nature of the

watershed sites communities may be engaged on digging with hand tools, carrying materials and work on sloppy grounds which can expose them to safety hazards. Hence, core principle 3 of the PforR financing will remain applicable to ensure that watershed management works supported by the CALM program observe applicable safety procedures.

Core Principle 4: Social Considerations: Land Acquisition and Access Restriction to Natural Resources

Findings: Watershed development on communal land may result in loss of access to natural resources/assets, for example, restriction towards free grazing on the communal land. Area closures also affect negatively the livelihood of farmers by denying open and immediate access to grazing land. However, the same area closure benefits the farmer by allowing the area to grow feed and become beneficiaries of it. Therefore, the compensation for the change in livelihood is to assure farmers' benefits from the feed grown in the area closure in the form of cut and carry. Moreover, there could be land acquisition related to Program interventions that might be induced by infrastructural development (including facilities for WUAs). Further, land use planning may potentially induce land use change and subsequent land take. For such instances the kebele or woreda administration will grant land for land replacement with equal productivity. If replacement land is not available, it can be treated under the country's proclamation No.455/2005 article 1(1) that states landholding expropriation for public purposes is compensated and a payment is supposed to be paid either in cash or in kind to the owner of a property that is located in the expropriated landholding. Because of this, the ESSA found that Core Principle 4 is applicable.

Core Principle 5: Social Considerations – Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups

Findings: In relation to participatory watershed management and SLLCs, there are vulnerable sections of the community that needs attention such as the elderly and female-headed households who could rent out land that they can't utilize for a better return than they have been forced to accept before. This allows for more efficient use of land plots and gives landless youth a chance to access land through renting. Although the SLLCs manual has been progressively revised including changes to better address the tenure rights of women and the vulnerable, these changes have not yet been fully implemented at the local level. It is important to consider gender equity, equality and social inclusion dimensions that require further work starting with more effective monitoring of the impact of interventions on vulnerable women, and close follow up of adaptive mitigation measures that would benefit women over the long term, including in the process of WUAs. Participatory watershed management may be susceptible to coercion of labor and so it is important to provide room to resist participation to avoid increasing the burden of women. In addition, even though stakeholders during ESSA consultations could not inform the presence of Gender Based Violence (GBV), the DHS (2016) study in the four regions consulted for this assessment revealed the existence of GBV and requires awareness creation during Program implementation. Thus, core principle 5 is applicable to the analysis of CALMP.

Core Principle 6: Social Considerations – Social Conflict

Findings: The program yields significant social benefits to the local community members or farmers, particularly those living in the watershed considering equitable share of vulnerable groups to get support in their farmland during participatory watershed management. Moreover, it strengthens the social bond of the local community as they get together during the start and end of participatory watershed management. The program can also advance their sense of ownership towards watershed and in turn help rehabilitate degraded landscapes in addition to the tenure security they could get in SLLCs. However, there can be complaints and/or conflict from local communities participating in the watershed management and receiving SLLCs related to basic resource sharing and absence of meeting the needs of vulnerable groups. Rural communities' livelihood in Ethiopia is mostly derived from land and related conflicts over use right

title and use as well as boundary disputes (mainly during adjunction process such as problems arising from replacement and wrong spell of names, incorrect land measurement and sometimes problem of locating the right landholding) have prevailed and undermine productive activities. Moreover, there are conflicts due to inequitable benefit sharing, forced labor, inability to enforce bylaws and damage of soil and water conservation structures. More to the point, there has not been well established GRM structure for participatory watershed management. The issue of social tension in some areas can also significantly affect the capacity of the program to deliver services, particularly in regions with the highest social tensions such as parts of Oromia, Amhara and SNNP. This is related to the current political instability in the country that cause difficulty to move from place to place for experts to effect their duties, particularly travelling to woredas and kebeles mainly working on sensitive issues, which is related to land. Such disturbances are not directly related to the program but affect its implementation. Thus, core principle 6 is applicable.

Analysis of ESMS of implementing agencies: The MoA is one of the delegated institutions by the EFCCC to review and approve ESIA reports prepared for development projects in the agriculture sector. Though it appears that the MoA lacks an organized unit/department that run environmental and social management systems at the Ministry level, the presence of environmental and social staffs in the Natural Resource Management and Food Security Directorate coupled with existence of project such as PSNP has contributed towards developing its exposure and experiences on World Bank safeguard policies and procedures through ESMF implementation practices in the past few years. Thus, there are opportunities for the current CALM program to build upon the existing experiences of the Directorate to implement its safeguard instruments during the program periods.

At regional level, the Bureaus of Agriculture and Natural Resource also have environment focal persons designated/employed to support and supervise implementation of PSNP, SLMP, and AGP's ESMFs. The woreda agriculture and natural resource offices generally lack dedicated environmental and social development focal persons. Implementation of ESMF is generally handled by the natural resource experts in the woreda and kebele offices. In the context of the CALM Program, where most subprojects are to be carried in rural kebeles, the zonal and woreda environment protection offices are going to play a major role during the implementation of the ESSA and its associated guidelines. For that reason, it will be more important to focus on building the capacities, performances and challenges of these zonal and woreda level environment protection institutions which will be directly involved in the daily review and approval of the environmental and social assessment instruments for sub-projects. In this respect there are ongoing efforts carried by the ESPES program (Enhanced Shared Prosperity through Equitable Service) to build their capacity by providing training on ESMS, as noted in Amhara and Tigray regions in the discussions held with the respective REPA during ESSA field assessment.

The overall implementation of CALM program will be carried out using existing government systems, structures, and mandates. The proposed PforR will use government system for Program implementation, oversight, safeguards, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and reporting arrangements. The Program is implemented by MoA that will have the overall responsibility for policy guidance and oversight for Program implementation and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC) is responsible for CALM financial coordination. The Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute will be involved to support the program by carrying out relevant research in broader CALM boundary.

Environmental and Social Benefits and Risks of the CALM Program: The proposed Program is expected to be environmentally friendly and socially acceptable. It is to provide benefits to the nation in general and to the beneficiaries of the proposed Program in particular. The implementation of CALM Program is anticipated to enhance the community based watershed management works in a more organized manner with strong participation and growing sense of ownership by the communities. The CALM Program will encourage the establishment of WUAs and support the issuance of SLLCs to the farmers, both of which target in enhancing the organizational capacity and sense of ownership of the

communities in watershed management. The CALM Program will therefore strengthen further the positive environmental and social impacts gained through the on-going participatory watershed management and will contribute towards its long term sustainability. In the majority of the sub-watershed areas where soil and water conservation activities were carried, the environment has benefited through improvement in vegetation cover, soil, water and biodiversity regeneration. Implementation of the PforR CALM Program will ensure the sustainability of these beneficial environmental and social impacts through preparation and execution of better watershed development plans with the participation of WUAs, fostering equity benefit sharing, and enhancing the sense of ownership. The development of watershed has also brought important off-farm and non-farm opportunities for the households, particularly for the youth and women. The watershed development creates an opportunity for women and youths by providing different IGAs such as to grow grasses to be available for both their own cattle and also for sale. The biological stabilizers have also made possible to exercise apiculture and fattening of small ruminants and oxen as off-farm livelihood activities. Besides, it increases capacity of households for natural resources management as well strengthens the social bonds of the local community and women right for landholding.

However, the findings of the ESSA showed that there are substantial, moderate and low risks anticipated to occur during the implementation of the CALM Program. The substantial risks identified include weak ESMS in implementing agencies, risk of exposure to occupational hazard of workers and community safety, weak consideration of Physical Cultural Resources (PCR) as well as risk related to boundary and benefit sharing conflicts. The moderate risks anticipated to occur during the Program are related to developing adequate watershed development plans and prioritization of works, access restriction towards communal grazing land during area closure, inequitable share from the benefits of the program for vulnerable groups, inadequate participation and forced labor in some cases towards participatory watershed management activities and the perception of low rewards in return from the many years of participation in the activity. The ESSA has also identified other low risk issues which need to be addressed as part of the Program. The overall risk for the proposed CALM Program on the environmental and social safeguard and safety management perspective is found to be ‘Substantial’.

Moreover, main issues from the perspective of potential social risks could be related to lack of controlling free grazing, difficulty to enforce bylaws, low support for vulnerable groups in watershed development and SLLCs-women, elderly and unemployed and landless youths and inequitable and delayed benefits from watershed, inadequate participation in participatory watershed management, low empowerment of women in the watershed development, risk of female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers as well as workers and community safety risks and in some cases forced labor and fatigue towards participatory watershed management. Besides, participatory consultation, planning, management and monitoring, resource use and management were not well established.

Findings of the ESSA show that the institutional capacity for effective implementation of CALM and the management of safeguard issues in particular have the following gaps: the absence of dedicated safeguard units or specialists not being put in place at all levels with the mandate to address environmental and social safeguard issues; technical staff turnover, lack of incentives and motivation, and the tendency to regard safeguard implementation as secondary to regular job assignments in regional BoA except in Amhara regional state; inadequate capacity (awareness, knowledge and skills) and failure to deliver trainings by MoA and BoA on safeguards for watershed development and SLLCs implementing agencies from federal down to Kebele levels.

Regarding grievance redress mechanism, the ESSA findings in the participatory watershed management activities and SLLC processes was found weak. For example, in the GRM systems identified it was learned nonexistence of recorded and compiled data showing the type, volume, frequency and handling of the complaints made, absence of in-built and independent GRM structure established for the purpose of

responding to complaints and grievances arising in the implementation of participatory watershed management activities and during SLLCs. There are also low awareness and knowledge on the part of regional, woreda and kebele implementing agencies in relation to the requirements and relevance of having a working GRM system. Besides, low attention to the side of MoA to make sure that a functional GRM structure is in place to effectively address the complaints and grievances of affected groups in the process of watershed development and provision of SLLCs as well as lack of social development specialists assigned as a focal person at the regional and woreda levels to coordinate and monitor the proper addressing of social issues including complaints and grievances. There has not been a strong environmental and social safeguard team established to follow and redress grievances except land related GRM in Amhara regional states. Some of the grievances and complaints manifested during watershed development and SLLCs have been treated through the general Ethiopian grievance redress systems as part of robust risk mitigation measures and uses local institutions as relevant. It was not passing through organized and structured system operated for that purpose. Thus, it is necessary to establish structured grievance redress mechanism by MoA from the federal down to the woreda levels in collaboration with World Bank and could also be possible to strengthen and use the GRM of ESPES Program.

Recommended Program Action Plans: The proposed action plan will strengthen the MoA's capacity and fill the identified gaps for managing the environmental and social issues with regard to implementation of the Program. The recommendations and actions of the ESSA target to ensure that risks identified in the assessment are properly addressed to meet the PforR financing core principles through strengthening the environmental, social and safety management capacity and performance of implementing agencies at all levels. The proposed and agreed action will be implemented by MoA and other key implementing entities. Based on the analysis, the ESSA identified the following main action to ensure that the Program interventions are consistent with the requirements of the Core Principles for improved environmental and social due diligence at MoA, implementing entities and its counterparts at regional and woreda levels.

In the absence of a section or unit for environmental and social management that serves across the Ministry of Agriculture and its regional BoANRs, and noting that the available environmental and social safeguard specialists are deployed to coordinate and support implementation of specific project/program ESMFs/ESMSGs, it warrants the recommendation that an environmental and social safeguard specialists should be hired at federal and regional levels to join as members of the program implementation unit. These safeguard specialists will be hired to coordinate and support the implementation of the CALM Program Action Plan and associated ESMSG.

Capacity Building Activities: owing to the scale of CALM Program, there will be a need to recruit environmental and social development experts at the MoA that serve both program implementing directorates and in the regional Agriculture and NRM bureaus. These focal persons will be responsible for providing coordination, guidance and technical support to the Woreda and kebele level agriculture and natural resource offices. They will also be responsible for supervising the compliance of the Woreda and kebele CALM program sub-projects with the environmental and social management requirements. It is also important to recruit an environment and social experts at woreda Agriculture and NRM office levels who interface with the kebele DAs in preparing the E&S screening reports and with woreda environment protection offices in getting environmental clearance for sub-projects. Moreover, there is a need to develop technical guidelines (ESMSG) that provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program that includes detailed procedures and precautionary advises on occupational and community health and safety aspects appropriate to the context of participatory watershed management. It is important to include topics on PCRs and its identification, conservation and chance find procedures in the ESMSG. There is also a need to encourage the participation of communities during watershed subproject screening to benefit from their local indigenous knowledge on PCR identification. The ESMSG to be developed will build upon the general environmental and social management principles and ESMS procedures outlined in the ESPES

operational manual for ESMS. Besides, coordinate prior arrangement and planning for environmental and social risk screening, review and approval of watershed development plans by the competent environment and social protection authority.

It is relevant to provide logistic and financial support to strengthen the first aid service delivery by the health post medics, provision of standby traditional ambulance (using mule or horses and carts), and temporary tent shelter for child care during participatory watershed management campaign as appropriate and practical options in context.

Strengthening GRM committee at all levels to receive, review, address complaints in a timely manner associated with dissatisfaction with CALM activities/services, negative impacts, etc. In addition, GRM guidelines will be developed and awareness raising orientation on the GRM will be conducted for implementers, project affected persons, and the broader community members.

The ESPES PforR financed by the World Bank has supported the establishment of a national GRM, and all regional governments have established their respective GRM structures down to woreda level with focal points located in the Kebeles. Operation of this GRM is based on a manual approved by the Ethiopian Institution of the Ombudsman (EIO - which is accountable to the Parliament of Ethiopia), which provides capacity building for regional and woreda GRM offices with continued support from the ESPES PforR. At the woreda level, assigned GRM officers report to the woreda administrator, who in turn provides regular consolidated reports to the GRM office at the regional level. The head of the regional GRM office is accountable to the chief administrator, and also provides regionally consolidated reports to the EIO. While the rollout and functionality of the GRM mechanism is variable, it is a robust and functional mechanism setting procedures for the receipt, registration, response and documentation of complaints. The Program will draw on and strengthen this mechanism by using it to provide data on Program-related complaints in regional reports to the MoA, and in the MoA's regular reporting of Program implementation to the World Bank. While relying on this GRM system, (i) there are regional variations in using the public grievance hearing office (For example, Amhara regional state has a separate GRM for land related grievances), (ii) the ESPES supported GRMs cover a range of issues and the support through CALM is to enable the public grievance hearing system report on CALM related complains.

The CALM Program will reinforce and extend the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing ESPES Program at woreda level that are designed to strengthen woreda capacity for management of environmental and social risks. These include:

- The appointment, training and performance assessment of environmental and social management specialists at woreda level;
- Citizen engagement through: (i) training in financial transparency and accountability, and Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM); (ii) appointment of woreda-level GRM officers; and (iii) engagement at woreda-level of Social Accountability Implementing Partners (SAIPs) from civil society;
- An Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) Operational Manual to help woreda staff screen local development initiatives for their environmental and social effects and monitor the implementation of any mitigation measures.

Program Benefit Sharing and Equitable Access for vulnerable groups, vulnerable groups should be given due attention. As a result, the proposed program is required to support these categories of the population particularly the women, elderly, female-headed household head, landless youths and people with disability. Thus, it needs to put in place the ways to enable these segments of the population benefit from the program. This can be realized participating vulnerable groups in WUAs in the communal landholding and arranging incentive mechanisms as well as creating income generating activities and benefit them from rehabilitated watersheds. In addition, participating in leadership or advisory roles in watershed level institutions could create empowerment.

The Local universities and ATVETs may take action to provide training and build capacity to help fill the gaps with respect to legal competence and services as well as in the development process of watershed and second level landholding certificates participating EIAR and MoA. They should strengthen implementation of livestock breed improvement with adequate input supply and fodder development using different options, creating adaptive management and regulation of communal grazing systems to the extent of developing policy actions on communal land tenure, and building technical capacity that should be considered as important elements to increase adaptive capacity and enhance future livestock production system.

Table 1: Showing part of the Program Action Plan in brief (For detailed PAP see table 7 under section 12.4)

Action Description	Source	DLI#	Responsibility	Timing		Completion Measurement
Ensure establishment of strong Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) and strengthening its functionality including GRM	Environmental and Social Systems	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	MoA and BoANRs Woredas	Within six month of program effectiveness	Continuous	ESMS established and functional, ESMSG document produced, Safeguards staff in place
Agreement and implementation of an MoU between MoA and BoAs requiring the operationalization in each CALM Program woreda of an ESMS in accordance with the action plan on environmental and social management defined in the ESSA	Environmental and Social Systems	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	MoA	Recurrent	Continuous	MoUs signed between MoA and BoAs, and ESMS functional in CALM Program woredas, as reported by MoA and monitored by World Bank implementation support.
In woredas with WUAs: (i) training in financial transparency, accountability, and GRMs; (ii) ensure functioning GRM with assigned woreda-level GRM officer including reporting of CALM related grievances; (iii) engagement at woreda-level of civil society SAIPs, and (iv) train DAs on the application of the CDP interface screening tool in areas where there is interface with WUAs	Environmental and Social Systems		MoA, BoAs, WoANRs	Recurrent	Continuous	In woredas with WUAs: (i) WUAs and WoANRs trained in financial transparency, accountability, and GRMs, (ii) GRM officers appointed, (iii) civil society SAIPs engaged. In woredas with active CDP and WUAs, CDP screening tool applied by WoANRs and DAs
Incorporation into guideline for WUA bylaws of Occupational Health and Safety provisions and standards of non-discrimination and prevention of gender-based violence.	Environmental and Social Systems	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	MoA, BoAs	Due Date	30-Jun-2020	Guideline for WUA bylaws incorporates Occupational Health and Safety provisions and standards of non-discrimination and prevention of gender-based violence.
Inclusion in the CBPWD Guidelines of (i) agreed principles for voluntary, participatory community labor, and (ii) procedures for the environmental and social screening of WMPs.	Environmental and Social Systems		MoA	Due Date	30-Sep-2019	Updated CBPWD Guidelines include principles for voluntary, participatory community labor.
Conduct rapid conflict analysis in Benishangul Gumuz and	Environment		MoA,		Recurr	SLLCs issuance coverage

Draft Environmental and Social Systems Assessment for CALM Program: Ethiopia

Gambella regions to manage the potential of SLLCs issuance induced conflict	al and Social Systems		RLAUB, Woreda LAUO, and an independent consultant		ent	informed by the rapid conflict analysis
Undertake environment and social audit (ESA) with independent firm to undertake environmental and social audit in sample CALM woredas annually.	Environment al and Social Systems	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	MoF, ESAP Steering Committee		annua lly.	Annual ESA

Table of Content

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY II

LIST OF TABLESXIII

LIST OF ANNEXESXIII

LISTS OF ACRONYMS.....XIV

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

 1.1 BACKGROUND.....1

 1.2 RATIONALE FOR ESSA2

 1.3 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ESSA2

 1.4 SCOPE OF THE ESSA3

2 PFORR CALM PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 4

 2.1 ETHIOPIA STRATEGIC INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK4

 2.2 CALM PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND KEY RESULTS.....4

 2.3 CALM PROGRAM SCOPE5

 2.4 CALM PROGRAM COMPONENTS6

 2.5 CALM CAPACITY BUILDING AND INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING8

 2.6 CALM PROGRAM DLIS AND VERIFICATION PROTOCOLS.....9

3 ESSA METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS..... 10

 3.1 DESK REVIEW11

 3.2 KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.....11

 3.3 FIELD VISITS.....11

4. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTATION SUMMARY 12

5. RELEVANT POLICY, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF ETHIOPIA’S ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS..... 14

6. INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT 15

 6.1 *The Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC)15*

 6.2 *Regional Environment Protection Forest and Climate Change Authority (REPFCCA).....16*

 6.3 *Zonal and Woreda level Environment, Forest, Land Utilization, and Climate Change Offices.17*

 6.4 *Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs/Regional Labor and Social Affairs Bureaus17*

7. FINDINGS OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AGAINST THE WORLD BANK PFORR CORE PRINCIPLES 18

 7.1 INTRODUCTION18

 7.2 PFORR CORE PRINCIPLES.....19

 7.3 ANALYSIS OF THE ESSA AGAINST THE CORE PRINCIPLES21

Core Principle 1: General Principle of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management.....21

Core Principle 2: Environmental Considerations – Natural Habitats and Physical Cultural Resources28

Core Principle 3: Environmental Considerations – Public and Worker Safety30

Core Principle 4: Social Considerations – Land Acquisition and Access Restriction of Resources32

Core Principle 5: Social Considerations – Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups34

Core Principle 6: Social Considerations – Social Conflict36

8. CAPACITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF KEY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES	39
8.1 MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	39
8.2 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND FUNCTIONS OF WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT ...	40
8.3 ETHIOPIAN AGRICULTURE RESEARCH INSTITUTE (EARI)	41
8.4 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR CALM PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.....	42
9. ANALYSIS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES.....	42
9.1 STAFF CAPACITY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT IN MOA AND REGIONAL BOAS	42
9.2 PERFORMANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AT REGIONAL AND WOREDA LEVEL	43
9.3 CALM PROGRAM GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM	45
9.4 PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS IMPLEMENTATION OF CALM PROGRAM.....	48
10. ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACTS AND RISKS OF THE PROGRAM	48
10.1 BACKGROUND TO PARTICIPATORY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	48
10.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF EXISTING PARTICIPATORY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	49
10.3 SOCIAL IMPACTS OF EXISTING PARTICIPATORY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AND SLLCs	50
10.3.1 <i>Positive and Negative/Challenges in the Process of Participatory Watershed Management</i>	50
10.3.2 <i>Second Level Landholding Certificates related Issues</i>	50
10.3.3 <i>Gender in relation to Watershed Development and SLLCs</i>	52
10.3.4 <i>Gender-Based Violence/Sexual Abuse Incidents</i>	53
11. PFORR PROPOSED CALM PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS, IMPACTS AND RISKS	54
11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS OF CALMP.....	54
11.1.1 <i>Potential Beneficial Environmental Impacts of CALMP</i>	54
11.1.2 <i>Potential Beneficial Social Impacts of CALMP</i>	55
11.2 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL ADVERSE IMPACTS AND RISKS OF CALMP	56
11.2.1 <i>Potential Environmental Adverse Impacts and Risks of the Program</i>	56
11.2.2 <i>Potential Social Adverse Impacts and Risks</i>	57
12. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND RISK RATING OF CALM PROGRAM	59
12.1 PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS OF CALMP (CORE PRINCIPLE 1-3).....	59
12.2 PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS OF CALMP (CORE PRINCIPLE 4- 6).....	61
12.3 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISK RATING OF PROPOSED FOR CALM PROGRAM	63
12.4 RECOMMENDED ACTION PLAN TO STRENGTHEN SYSTEM PERFORMANCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT	68
13. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTATION AND DISCLOSURE.....	74
13.1 CONSULTATIONS.....	74
13.2 DISCLOSURE.....	74
REFERENCES	75

List of Tables

Table 1: ESIF program elements supported by the CALM Program

Table 2: Disbursement-Linked Indicators

Table 3: Areas Covered and Number of stakeholders Consulted for this ESSA

Table 4: Relevant MoEFCC (EFCCC) and other guidelines and standards

Table 5: Summary of existing institutions and critical legislations for Environmental and Social Management at regional level.

Table 6: Environmental and Social Risk Rating for Proposed CALM Program

Table 7: Recommended Program Action Plan (PAP) on Environment and Social Management

List of Annexes

Annex-1 Stakeholders consultation summary

Annex-2 Participatory watershed management History in case of Amhara, Tigray, SNNP and Oromia

Annex-3 Exclusion List

Annex-4 Relevant Policy Legal and Institutional Framework of Ethiopia

Annex -5 ESSA Checklists

Annex-6: Sample Lists of Participants in the Community Consultation

Annex 7: Minutes of the ESSA Stakeholder Consultation Workshop

Lists of Acronyms

AGP	Agricultural Growth Program
ARCCH	Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage
ATVETC	Agricultural Technical and Vocational Education Training College
BoA	Bureau of Agriculture
BLAU	Bureau of Land Administration and Use
BP	Bank Policy
CALM	Climate Action through Landscape Management
CALMP	Climate Action through Landscape Management Program
CBPWDG	Community Based Participatory Watershed Development Guidelines
CDP	Commune Development Program
CRGE	Climate Resilient Green Economy
CRI	Corporate Results Indicator
CWMU	Community Watershed Management and Utilization
CWT	Community Watershed Team
DA	Development Agent
DRDIP	Development Response to Displacement Impacts
DLI	Disbursement-Linked Indicator
EARO	Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
EARI	Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute
EFCCC	Environment, Forest, and Climate Change Commission
EFWPDA	Environment, Forest, Wildlife Protection and Development Authority
EP	Environmental Protection
EPE	Environment Policy of Ethiopia
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMG	Environment and Social Management Guideline
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
ELEAP	Ethiopia Electrification Program
ESPES	Enhancing Shared Prosperity through Equitable Services
ESIF	Ethiopia Strategic Investment Framework

ESLMIS	Ethiopian Sustainable Land Management Information System
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
ESMS	Environmental and Social Management System
ESPES	Enhancing Shared Prosperity through Equitable Services project
ESSA	Environmental and Social System Assessment
E&S	Environmental and Social
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FTC	Farmer Training Center
FY	Fiscal Year
GBV	Gender-based violence
GEQIP-E	General Education Quality Improvement Program for Equity
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
GTP-II	Second Growth and Transformation Plan
IAs	Implementing Agencies
IGA	Income Generating Activity
IPF	Investment Project Financing
IT	Information Technology
KLAUC	Kebele Land Administration and Use Committee
KWT	Kebele Watershed Team
LFSDP	Livestock and Fisheries Sector Development Project
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoEFCC	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
MoLSA	Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NRLAIS	National Rural Land Administration Information System
NRMD	Natural Resource Management Directorate
OP	Operational Policy
OHS	Occupational Health Safety
PAD	Program Appraisal Document

PAPs	Project Affected Peoples
PAP	Program Action Plan
PCR	Physical Cultural Resources
PforR	Program-for-Results
PIA	Public Information and Administration
PDO	Project Development Objective
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Program
RARI	Regional Agricultural Research Institutes
PWD	People With Disabilities
RED&FS	Rural Economic Development and Food Security Platform
REPA	Regional Environmental Protection Authorities
RLAS	Rural land Administration System
RLAU	Rural Land Administration and Use
RLAUD	Rural Land Administration and Use Directorate
SLLC	Second Level Landholding Certification
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SLMP-II	Sustainable Land Management Project Phase-II
SNNP	Southern Nation Nationalities and People
SWOT	Strength, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats
ULGDP	Urban Local Governance and Development Project
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WB	World Bank
WMP	Watershed Management Plan
WoANR	Woreda Office of Agriculture and Natural Resources
WUA	Watershed User Association

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Land degradation has been the major problem in most developing countries of the world. Ethiopia is one of the Sub-Saharan African countries that are seriously affected by land degradation, which accounts for 8% of the global total (Habtamu, 2010). Notably, land degradation in the form of soil erosion and declining fertility is a serious challenge to agricultural productivity and economic growth in Ethiopia (Mulugeta, 2004). Indeed, land degradation in Ethiopia is largely an outcome of the existing ‘resource-poor’ agricultural production system, which is characterized by uncertain rainfall, low inherent land productivity, lack of capital, inadequate support services and poverty. Consequently, the problem has been severe to the extent that it affected lives and livelihoods in particular and development in general. To change the situation of land degradation, the concept of watershed management was implemented in Ethiopia in 1980s as a way of redressing the degradation of the natural resource base and increasing land productivity. Although attempts to reverse land degradation following watershed approaches dated back to 1980s in Ethiopia (Lakew et al., 2005; Gete 2006; Tongul and Hobson, 2013), many programs were unsuccessful, and the technologies and practices were often abandoned by farmers as soon as they stopped being forced or paid to adopt them. The major limitation of the past attempt was the dominant view that labeled watershed problems as engineering problems, and technical solutions for controlling erosion, reducing runoff and flooding, and enhancing groundwater recharge were often designed and implemented with little regard for their impacts on people’s livelihoods, on farm profitability, or on social equity. Thus, the watershed development was applied in a rigid and conventional manner without community participation and with little attention to farmer objectives and farmer knowledge as important reasons for these failures.

Aware of these limitations, the government of Ethiopia has launched a massive community based participatory watershed development programs since 2010/11 in four regional states: Southern Nation, Nationalities and Peoples, Oromia, Amhara and Tigray as part of strategy to protect the environment while achieving food security. The farming communities in the rural areas were highly mobilized to implement both physical and biological soil and water conservation measures on private farm and communal lands. The proponents of this participatory watershed management, i.e. the government of Ethiopia, have claimed that significant social, economic and environmental benefits have been achieved.

Another issue that CALMP will take into account is second level landholding certificate. Ethiopia is the second populous country in Africa with an estimated human population of 94 million and about 82.5% of the population lives in rural areas (UNIDO 2014). According to UNDP (2015), agriculture remains the largest contributor of the country’s economy having a share of about 40% of the GDP. In addition, agriculture covers about 90% of the exports, uses 80% of the labor force, and provides 70% of the raw materials to local industries (UNIDO 2014). Based on the above figures, it could be inferred that most of the economic activities in the country directly or indirectly depend on the ultimate resource, i.e. land. Thus, land is the basic resource which supports majority of the rural lives in developing countries. About 70% of African population secures their livelihoods from land and utilization of the natural resources (ECA 2004). It is a means to achieve food security and sustainable development. In addition, land has significant contribution to the economy of the region and comprises the major share of the GDP and employment opportunity (UNDP 2015).

In Ethiopia all land is state-owned. There have been periodic redistributions of households’ rights to farmland. The 1995 Constitution and the 1997 Federal Land Law allow leasing, sharecropping and inheritance of land rights; practices which used to be illegal.

Ethiopia has implemented one of the least expensive land registration and certification reform in Africa using simple land measurement techniques and a participatory registration process. It is believed that first

level landholding certificate improved tenure security. The country has now begun piloting and introducing a second level land registration and certification in selected districts. The new registration and certification system involves recording the precise geographical locations and sizes of individual farm plots using technologies such as GPS, satellite imagery or Ortho-photo. Farmers receive plot-level certificates with maps rather than a household-level certificate. According to the Ministry of Agriculture, the second level land registration and certification effort will enhance tenure security, the maintenance and updating of records, and land management. This second level land registration and certification will likely be substantially more costly than the first level certification and will also require much longer time to complete (Bezu, et al, 2014).

Women in Ethiopia are essentially protected by the country's law, not only in political, civil and economic terms, but also with regard to access to natural resources, including land. Rural Land Use and Administration Regulations No 4/2011 and the Land Proclamation Act (draft) that pay attention to the issue of gender equality and provide specific provisions for women pastoralist and access to communal land. In addition to policies and regulations, women's access to land has been mainly guaranteed by the registration and certification process that issued land certificates in the name of women, if head of household, and husband and wife for married couples, including their pictures in the book of holding. In order to address the aforementioned issues related participatory watershed management and SLLCs, the World Bank will implement PforR CALM program.

1.2 Rationale for ESSA

In line with the PforR financing, the World Bank is required to conduct ESSA to assess the institutional arrangements and its capacity within the proposed program, for managing environmental and social impacts and risks in a manner consistent with Operational Policy of Program for Results (PforR) financing. This policy sets out core principles and key planning elements intended to ensure that PforR operations are designed and implemented in a manner that maximizes potential environmental and social benefits, while avoiding, minimizing, or otherwise mitigating environmental or social harms. In terms of environmental and social management, PforR employs a risk management approach, in which process requirements are adapted to the Program context. For the proposed PforR operation, the Bank assesses—at the Program level—the borrower's authority and organizational capacity to achieve environmental and social objectives against the range of environmental and social impacts and risks that may be associated with the Program.

Hence, the World Bank has prepared this ESSA for the proposed PforR using the existing information from the CALMP papers and a field-based assessment. The assessment targets, based on the scope of the proposed Program boundary, to review the robustness of government's system, as it relates to the program, in terms of their capacity to plan and implement effective measures for environmental and social impact management at federal, regional and woreda levels. Specifically, this ESSA considers the six core principles of Program for Results (PforR) financing.

1.3 Purpose and Objective of the ESSA

a. Purpose of ESSA

This ESSA was conducted by the World Bank with the overall aim to assess the key implementing agency Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) (under the MoA, the Natural Resource Management Directorate (NRMD) and Rural Land Administration and Use Directorate (RLAUD) are addressed) organizational capacities and performance to achieve environmental and social objectives against the range of environmental and social risks and impacts that may be associated with the proposed program; as well as conduct a comprehensive review of relevant government systems and procedures that address environmental and social issues related to the Program. Besides, it describes the extent to which the applicable government environmental and social policies, legislations, program procedures and

institutional systems are consistent with the six ‘core principles’ and recommends actions to address the gaps and enhance performance during the Program implementation.

b. Objectives of ESSA

The general objective of ESSA is to ensure environmental, social, safety impacts and risks are properly addressed from an early stage of formulating the environmental and social policy and guidelines for the CALMP PforR implementation in line with the Bank’s PforR financing. Specific objectives of ESSA are to:

- i) Assess the program system performance with respect to the core principles of the PforR financing and identify gaps in the Program’s performance;
- ii) Identify the potential environmental and social impacts/risks applicable to the CALM interventions;
- iii) Evaluate the institutional capacity arrangements of implementing agency (MoA) and its regional counterpart to manage and monitor the likely environmental and social effects in accordance with the country’s own requirements under the proposed program;
- iv) Explore environmental and social impacts and/or risks on vulnerable groups, social conflict and women participation;
- v) Assess the consistency of the borrower’s systems with core principles and attributes defined in the PforR
- vi) Establish institutional arrangements for the identification, planning, design, preparation and implementation of activities under the proposed program to adequately address environmental and social sustainability issues;
- vii) Specify appropriate roles and responsibilities, and outline the necessary reporting procedures for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to the proposed program;
- viii) Design enhanced stakeholders’ consultation and participation approaches including stakeholder mapping to mitigate negative impacts and enhance benefits identified;
- ix) Establish clear procedures and methodologies for environmental and social planning, review, approval and implementation of the proposed program;
- x) Recommend specific actions for improving counterpart capacity during implementation to ensure that they are able to adequately perform their mandate;
- xi) Determine the training, capacity building and technical assistance needed to successfully implement the provisions of the ESSA developing; and
- xii) Describe actions to fill the gaps that will be put in place during the Operation of Action Plan in order to strengthen the Program’s performance with respect to the core principles of the PforR instrument;

1.4 Scope of the ESSA

The PforR operations requires, early in Program preparation, the World Bank task team to conduct a comprehensive ESSA of the country systems in place for managing potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with the proposed PforR.

This ESSA covers review of the environment and social regulatory, institutional and legal policy frameworks of the Country. The review includes all relevant proclamations and regulations concerning environment, cultural heritage, and social policies. In addition, the ESSA examines and assesses the country’s systems currently in place for environmental and social management in line with the proposed PforR activities both at national and regional levels. For each activity, the following were carried out:

- Review of the systems and procedures currently in use against the PforR Core Principles. This review is situated within the broader government systems and procedures, as required.

- Review of capacity of the concerned implementing agency (MoA and its regional counterparts) to implement the systems and procedures in terms of staff capacity, among others.
- Review of the performance of existing systems and procedures under MoA. This includes a review of the actual operational experience of MoA and its regional counterparts to implement the Program Action Plan activities identified in CALMP ESSA, including the extent to which the monitoring and evaluation systems for the activities are able to report on the potential environmental and social impacts, and whether such information has been acted upon by management.

Based on the findings of the reviews and fieldwork, the ESSA has made recommendations for actions required to improve the capacity and the system of implementing agencies to meet the requirements of the PforR financing Core Principles for managing any social and environmental impacts and risks. These recommendations are incorporated as a Program Action Plan. The findings of the ESSA informed the preparation of the Program Action Plan that the Government has to apply to bridge any significant gaps in the existing environmental and social management system with respect to the sustainability principles of the PforR financing. The Bank will provide technical support during implementation as warranted for the successful implementation of the agreed Program Action Plan and meet PforR core principles.

2 PforR CALM Program Description

2.1 Ethiopia Strategic Investment Framework

The overarching goal of ESIF is to provide: “a national level strategic planning framework that is used to guide the prioritisation, planning and implementation, by both the public and private sector, of current and future investments in SLM with the aim of addressing the interlinked problems of poverty, vulnerability, land degradation and declining productivity of agricultural lands at the rural community level.”. More specifically, the program seeks to:

- Reduce poverty and vulnerability to climatic shocks of Ethiopia’s rural population,
- Reduce the area of land affected by land degradation and the protective functions of ecosystem resources,
- Remove land tenure insecurity that has hindered field level adoption of SLM practices,
- Address institutional, knowledge and capacity constraints for effective planning, financing and implementation of SLM at local, regional and national levels.

ESIF includes one development and one environmental objective, focused on improving livelihoods and on protecting, restoring and enhancing natural capital and ecosystem resources, respectively. It provides economic, social and environmental criteria for prioritizing investments in SLM and sets-out six broad component areas covering:

- (i) Investments to scale-up SLM adoption,
- (ii) Land administration and land tenure strengthening,
- (iii) Capacity-building,
- (iv) Policy, regulatory, institutional and financial reforms,
- (v) Knowledge management; and
- (vi) Overall program management and implementation support.

2.2 CALM Program Development Objectives and Key Results

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to increase adoption of sustainable land management practices and expand access to secure land titles in non-rangeland rural areas. The PDO-level results indicators are as follows:

- PDO 1: Land area under sustainable landscape management practices¹ (DLI3) (CRI) (ha)
- PDO 2: Project area showing an increase in the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)² correcting for short-term weather effects (Percent)
- PDO 3: Area of landholdings³ in targeted areas that are securely registered (ha)
- PDO 4: Share of securely registered landholdings held by a woman either individually or jointly with a man (Percent)

The Corporate Results Indicator (CRI) relevant for the adoption of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices is “Land area under sustainable landscape management practices”. Bank guidance indicates that this refers to a combination of at least two technologies and approaches to increase land quality and restore degraded land. MoA’s CBPWD Guideline for the preparation and implementation of WMPs includes the following practices; which are aligned with Bank guidance:

- Physical soil and water conservation practices;
- Flood control and drainage practices;
- Water harvesting and run-off management for multiple use practices;
- Soil fertility management and biological soil conservation practices;
- Agro-forestry, forage development and forestry practices;
- Gully control practices.

2.3 CALM Program Scope

The Climate Action through Landscape Management (CALM) Program will deliver performance-based financing for selected elements of the ESIF program, as identified in Table 1. Support will be provided over a 5-year period (FY20 - FY24) contiguous with the third phase of ESIF (ESIF-3), and to an amount equivalent to nineteen percent of GoE’s expenditures on the CALM Program after exclusions. The enhanced Program will enable SLM support to be delivered to a higher quality and at national scale.

There are three parts of the government program that will be excluded from the CALM Program: Firstly, GoE has requested that Bank to avoid triggering the provisions of OP7.50 regarding projects on international waterways and for this reason, the Bank will not include support for small-scale irrigation. Secondly, the Program will exclude activities in the predominantly-pastoral Afar and Somali regions because watersheds are less suitable as planning units for pastoral lands-given the physical and social characteristics of these rangelands. In these areas, provisions for issuance of communal land rights are at an earlier stage of development and are being addressed through other projects. Finally, the Program will exclude support provided for aspects of the MoA’s rural land management and administration program supported by other development partners and World Bank IPF operations and by the Enhancing Shared Prosperity through Equitable Services (ESPES) *P for R* operation.

¹ Sustainable landscape management practices are the same as sustainable land management practices. This Corporate Results Indicator (CRI) will be measured as the area managed in a participatory manner according to an approved Watershed Management Plan (WMP), which will be determined on the basis of participatory implementation of the annual work plans developed by WUAs to achieve the goals of WMPs.

² The NDVI uses the visible and near-infrared bands of the electromagnetic spectrum to analyze remote sensing measurements to determine the extent to which a target contains live green vegetation. Increase in NDVI should be at least 4% for the area to count against this indicator.

³ A landholding is an administrative term used in the RLAS to refer to a collection of land parcels within a single kebele held by an individual, or jointly with a spouse. SLLCs are issued at the parcel level, so a landholding may include more than one SLLC. An individual may also have landholdings in other kebeles, or more than one landholding within a single kebele if these are held differently.

2.4 CALM Program Components

The CALM Program is divided into two Results Areas, and consists of the following:

Results Area 1 - Participatory watershed management: the CALM Program will provide results-based support to incentivize field-based interventions to scale up participatory watershed management activities to reduce land degradation. The CALM Program will also support: (i) development of capacity at the federal, regional and woreda levels for participatory watershed management; (ii) SLM-related research at the federal and regional levels; (iii) strengthening of the policy, institutional and regulatory framework for SLM; (iv) building the SLM knowledge base; and (v) management, monitoring and reporting of ESIF interventions for watershed management;

Results Area 2 - Rural land administration: the CALM Program will provide results-based support for improved rural land tenure security by incentivizing: (i) the preparation of SLLCs and their authentication (which includes quality assurance, verification against first level land holding certificates, and legal issuance); and (ii) the installation and operation of the NRLAIS at the federal, regional and woreda levels. The CALM Program will also support: (i) development of capacity at the federal, regional and woreda levels for rural land administration; (ii) the strengthening of the policy, institutional and regulatory framework for rural land administration; and (iii) management, monitoring and reporting of ESIF interventions for improved rural land tenure security.

The Program will support the third phase of the Ethiopia Strategic Investment Framework (ESIF-3). The ESIF program components and specific elements supported by the proposed CALM Program are shown in Table-1. The ESIF is structured over three phases of five years each, starting in 2010, with the third phase scheduled to start in 2019, running to 2024. ESIF-3 provides the operational program for meeting the GTP-II targets for SLM. Since 2010, ESIF has guided GoE's large-scale efforts to address land degradation, reduce vulnerability to climate shocks, provide land tenure security and address institutional, knowledge and capacity constraints for effective planning, financing and implementation of SLM at local, regional and national levels.

ESIF has made impressive progress over the last 10 years through both development partner-financed projects and mainstream GoE programs. Over the first two phases of ESIF, development partner support for SLM has covered 209 woredas with financing from the World Bank, Canada, Germany, Sweden, the European Union and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. At the same time, mainstream GoE programs have supported SLM interventions in some 500 woredas, primarily through Participatory watershed management (an annual initiative led by the MoA to organize voluntary community labor during the agricultural low season), and through the public works supported by the Productive Safety Nets Program (PSNP). Despite this progress, the MoA is concerned that the scale and quality of the achievements so far do not match the ambitious targets of GTP-II. At design, ESIF envisaged funding requirements to be nearly US\$6.7 billion over the fifteen year program period - or approximately \$446 million per annum. The program has been successful in helping GoE to mobilize domestic and international financing, but less than the amounts originally envisaged. This partly explains why the ESIF has fallen short of reaching its ambitious targets. In response, MoA is requesting programmatic support for the third phase of the ESIF that will build on the lessons and methodological approaches developed during the first two phases, apply them at scale through the mainstream GoE initiatives for SLM, while strengthening the regulatory framework to provide durable institutions for watershed management and rural land tenure security.

ESIF-3 is expected to deliver durable watershed management in five thousand community watersheds with an estimated area of 3.75 million hectares (or nearly 14% of the 27 million hectares estimated to be degraded), and strengthen rural land tenure security in 287 woredas. To achieve this, the government program will facilitate through extension services the establishment of Watershed User Associations

(WUAs), the preparation and regular update of Participatory Watershed Management Plans (WMPs), and support to ensure these WUAs are effective, their plans implemented, and their efforts monitored. Under the program, the government will also scale up its support for land titling, through the provision of Second-Level Landholding Certificates (SLLCs), and the establishment of a digital land registry, the National Rural Land Administration Information System (NRLAIS) to ensure security of land records and facilitate provision of land title information services.

To provide a sound regulatory foundation for ESIF-3, in 2019 MoA will introduce two proclamations supporting its enhanced efforts for SLM. The Community Watershed Management and Utilization (CWMU) Proclamation will provide the regulatory basis for establishment and operation of WUAs at community level, while the Rural Lands Administration and Use (RLAU) Proclamation will provide the legal foundation for the introduction and operation of the NRLAIS. These regulatory initiatives will be accompanied by an enhanced policy framework, including updates to the existing Community-Based Participatory Watershed Development Guideline (CBPWDG), and a guideline for the establishment and operation of WUAs. To help ensure the quality of SLM activities under ESIF-3, MoA also proposes measures to increase emphasis on natural resource management in Agricultural Technical and Vocational Education Training Colleges (ATVETCs), and to reinforce a multi-disciplinary approach to natural resource management research through the national system of agricultural research institutes, with an enhanced focus on SLM.

ESIF-3 also introduces a significant and progressive change of course in the way in which labour is mobilized to achieve SLM objectives. It notes that community labor is essential for watershed development and management, and the MoA has therefore agreed that it intends to replace the current program of Participatory watershed management with participatory community planning and implementation for watershed development and management. It will ensure that community labour for SLM activities is provided on a voluntary basis in a participatory manner, meeting the following requirements:

- Provision of labor will be based on watershed development and management plans prepared with and agreed by WUAs;
- Labor incentives will be provided in the form of investments by the woreda in community infrastructure, to be identified in the watershed development and management plans through a community-driven development approach;
- Un-paid labor for implementation of watershed development and management plans will only be provided by members of the respective WUA;
- Provision of labor for watershed development and management activities should not negatively affect anyone’s ability to sustain their immediate or long-term livelihood, and should lead to direct or indirect benefits for the participating households;
- The voluntary nature of the provision of labor will be documented; and
- The voluntary nature of the provision of labor will be verified through the Social Accountability Program at the woreda level.

Table 1: ESIF program elements supported by the CALM Program

Component No.	ESIF Components	Sub-components of ESIF supported by CALM Program
C1	Investments in field based projects and programs for promoting and scaling up SLM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community-based participatory watershed management in high potential areas - Community-based watershed management in food in-secure areas.

		- Community-based participatory communal forest/woodland resource
C 2	Improving the administration and tenure of Ethiopia's land resources.	- Registering traditional use and property rights and responsibilities for the use and management of communal land resources. - Development and initiation of the second stage land certification process - Building the capacity of the Federal, Regional and Woreda level land Institutions - Development of public information and administration (PIA) programs - Improving legal recourse for tenure security and dispute resolution
C 3	Building the capacity of public and private sector SLM planning, advisory, and other support service providers.	- Building the capacity of advisory (extension) service providers - Building the capacity of research support services providers
C 4	Improving the enabling policy, institutional, and financial environment for SLM	- Review, improvement and support the implementation of the policy environment for SLM - Review and improvement of the institutional environment for SLM - Review and improvement of the legislative environment including enforcement of policies for SLM
C 5	Building the SLM knowledge base	- Establish Ethiopian SLM information system (ESLMIS) - Monitoring and assessment of land degradation within Ethiopia
C 6	Management and Implementation of ESIF	- Building the federal, regional and woreda SLM Platforms - Management support to the coordination and implementation of the ESIF - Monitoring and evaluation of the ESIF

2.5 CALM Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening

Building climate resilience is a central consideration for the proposed PforR operation, but is a term that is often loosely interpreted. In general, “resilience” refers to a heightened system capacity to anticipate, respond to, and recover from hazards. Resilience-building involves strengthening three specific capacities:

- Absorptive capacity: The ability of people, assets, and systems to prepare for, mitigate, or prevent negative impacts of hazards so as to preserve and restore essential basic structures and functions, for example through protection, robustness, preparedness, and/or recovery.
- Adaptive capacity: The ability of people, assets, and systems to adjust, modify or change characteristics and actions to moderate potential future impacts from hazards so as to continue to function without major qualitative changes, for example through diversity, redundancy, integration, connectedness, and/or flexibility.
- Transformative capacity: The ability to create a fundamentally new system so as to avoid negative impacts from hazards.

The proposed PforR operation seeks to strengthen these capacities in a number of ways, including: (i)

absorptive capacity, through watershed development and management interventions; (ii) adaptive capacity, through the establishment of WUAs and participatory planning processes; and (iii) transformative capacity, through land certification and improved land administration services, providing a basis for more fundamental socioeconomic change.

2.6 CALM Program DLIs and Verification Protocols

The Disbursement-Linked Indicators (DLIs) are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Disbursement-Linked Indicators

DLI	Rationale for Selection of DLIs
Result Area 1: Participatory Watershed Management	
DLI#1: Community Watershed Management and Utilization (CWMU) Proclamation approved by Council of Ministers (Yes/No)	The CWMU proclamation is a necessary step to provide the regulatory basis for establishment and operation of WUAs at community level.
DLI#2: Area of program watersheds with Watershed User Associations (WUAs) registered, with approved Watershed Management Plans (WMPs) prepared in a participatory manner (ha)	To incentivize and reward progress to expand registration of WUAs with approved WMPs prepared in a participatory manner.
DLI#3: Land area under sustainable landscape management practices (ha)	Main outcome of the project and also measuring the PDO. Through this DLI, the participatory implementation of agreed annual work plans for the operationalization of approved WMPs is incentivized.
Result Areas 2: Land administration and management in non-rangeland areas	
DLI#4: Rural Land Administration and Use (RLAU) Proclamation approved by Council of Ministers (Yes/No)	The RLAU proclamation is a necessary step as this provides the legal foundation for the introduction and operation of the NRLAIS.
DLI#5: Second Level Land Holding Certificates (SLLCs) authenticated (number)	To incentivize and reward progress towards expanding the area of degraded watersheds covered by land titles.
DLI#6: Woredas covered by operational National Rural Land Administration (NRLAIS) in Program watersheds with Second Level Land Holding Certificates (SLLCs) digitized (number)	To incentivize and reward progress towards expanding the area of degraded watersheds covered by land titles secured through NRLAIS.

Verification protocols: The DLIs selected are measurable to enable reliable verification. In addition to a detailed definition of the DLIs, Annex 2 of the PAD provides a description of the associated verification protocols and the basis for the determination of disbursements. DLI#2 requires that WMPs are prepared in a participatory manner. The criteria for adequate participation in these processes are based on the requirements for voluntary provision of community labor set out above, which will be included in the revised CBPWD Guideline. To streamline the verification process, the Central Statistical Agency (CSA) will act as the Independent Verification Agency (IVA) for DLIs #2, #3, #5 and #6. CSA has experience as the IVA for other Bank-supported PforR Programs in Ethiopia, which will be reinforced with targeted technical assistance and training for field verification agents based on the verification protocols and associated manuals to be developed for these DLIs. Based on the approach adopted for verification of the approval of regulatory instruments in other Bank-financed PforR operations in Ethiopia, the National Planning and Development Commission (NPDC) will act as the IVA for DLIs #1 and #4. Terms of reference incorporating detailed verification processes and procedures will be developed for both IVAs.

3 ESSA Methodology and Process

The ESSA is undertaken to ensure consistency with a set of core principles and key planning elements for environmental and social management outlined in the World Bank's PforR financing in order to effectively manage program risks and promote sustainable development. The gaps identified through the ESSA and subsequent actions to fill those gaps will directly contribute to the Program's anticipated results to enhance the effectiveness and performance of MoA's institutional structures and related implementing agencies (IAs) for CALMP. In order to achieve the stated objectives of the ESSA, the following selection methods were used to generate a wide range of the required data. Sample selection of woredas/districts in each regional state was done using: performance and experience of woredas in terms of public mobilization or public works and watershed management activities as well as woredas experiences in terms of Bank financed projects. The selected districts were communicated to the regional state focal persons for their suggestions and accordingly contacts at district level were established. Finally, the distance of the districts should also be conducive to the proposed travel time. Watershed management and mass mobilization or public works were selected in consultation with district and kebele level officials and selected representatives to ensure that there was diversity in the sample in terms of performance and agro-ecological context based on severity and the extent of the watershed development interventions. The following table shows regions, woredas, and watershed/city name, number of people consulted and date of data collection.

Table 3: Areas Covered and Number of stakeholders Consulted for this ESSA

S.No	Region	Woreda	Watershed/city name	Number of people consulted			Date-data collection
				Female	Male	Total	
1	Tigray	Enda Mehoni	Shinkomayo/Gereb Sale watershed	10	12	22	Feb.22,2019
		Kiltie Awelalo		8	18	26	Feb.21,2019
		Regional office	Mekele	0	2	2	Feb.20,2019
Sub-Total				18	32	50	
2	SNNPR	Durame	Sheshera-Dudoye	7	19	26	Feb.28,2019
		Boditi	Ade ofa	4	23	27	Feb. 27,2019
		Regional Office	Hawasa	0	11	11	Feb.26,2019
Sub Total				11	53	64	
3	Amhara	Meket	Aribit (032)	0	16	16	Feb.19,2019
		Lay Gayint/Nifas Mewecha	Arore watershed	4	8	12	Feb.18,2019
		Semen Mecha	Birakit-Koga	3	7	10	Feb.14,2019
		Regional Office	Bahirdar	2	14	16	Feb.13,15&16,2019
Sub Total				9	45	54	
4	Oromia	Dugda	Chari golba chalalak	1	17	18	Mar.4,2019
		Dodola	Denba	5	21	26	Mar.1,2019
		Regional Office	Addis Ababa	3	2	5	Mar.11,2019
Sub-Total				9	40	49	
5	Addis		MoA and EARI	0	6	6	March 12,2019

	Ababa					
Sub-Total			0	6	6	
Grand Total			47	176	223	

3.1 Desk Review

In order to review and assess the existing environmental and social management systems (ESMSs) as well as analyze how these systems are applied in practice, the ESSA preparation process has drawn on a wide range of relevant laws, policies and guidelines, Program documents and other reports on the implementation of the previous and current World Bank financed environmental and natural resource management projects and programs. The review also includes the national and regional states proclamations and legal requirements related to environment and social management. Moreover, the review examined Program concept note papers, mission reports, draft PAD, and other ESSA documents prepared by the World Bank for similar programs carried elsewhere such as Enhancing Shared Prosperity through Equitable Services (ESPES), Ethiopia Electrification Program (ELEAP), and General Education Quality Improvement Program for Equity (GEQIP). Secondary information was also used in order to appreciate good practices and lessons of related previous interventions, identify existing gaps and plan for effectively dealing with the limitations. With these aims, an extensive review of the most pertinent literature was undertaken.

3.2 Key Informant Interviews

The ESSA team conducted interviews and consultations with the GoE's relevant ministries and authorities, including those at the national, regional, woreda, kebele and community level as well as technical experts involved with environmental and social management issues. Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) was consulted on Watershed management and mass mobilization or Public work, Land Administration and Use representatives on land use or tenure as well as administration, labor and working condition issues. Staffs have been consulted on the environmental and social management issues. Focus group discussions were also held with various groups to discuss about the resources contributed and invested, and the impacts so far due to the sub-watershed development and how the developed watersheds is utilized and managed. FGDs were held in the selected sub-watershed with separate groups of community elders, women and youth. Both formal and informal interviews and discussions were made with experts and administrators in charge of the watershed development about the process, the resources used, the challenges, and performance of the watershed development in the regions.

3.3 Field Visits

To assess the situations of the existing systems and practices related to watershed development and management as well as mass mobilization and land use and administration system, field visits were carried out in four regional states of Ethiopia, namely: Amhara, Tigray, Oromia, and SNNP. A range of relevant institutions under the MoA that mainly include Land administration and Utilization, Natural resource and environmental related offices at federal, regional, zonal, woreda, and Kebele levels were visited to conduct consultation and interviews with key personnel in these organizations. A targeted field visit was made to Amahara, Tigray, Oromia, and SNNP Regional States to conduct consultations and interviews with management and professional staff at the concerned directorates of regional, woreda, and kebele levels and community consultations at watershed development sites. The potential environmental and social impacts/risks associated with the proposed CALMP were assessed at various levels to determine the significance level of anticipated impacts and risks and to recommend the corresponding mitigation measures to ensure the implementation of the Program in an environmentally friendly and socially acceptable manner.

3.4. Stakeholders Consultation

Consultation is one of the crucial tasks of Environment and Social System Assessment that ensure active participation of communities and stakeholders. Involving local communities in consultation process informs decisions about local priorities and needs and be considered in determining the overall concept and design of a program. In addition to the community, implementing agency, MoA, and its regional counterparts-Amhara, Tigray, SNNP and Oromia agricultural offices and environmental protection and climate change authority of sampled woredas in selected four regions, kebeles watershed committee as well as Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute (EARI) were consulted.

In collaboration with administrators of the Woredas, Kebeles and sub-watersheds were selected for community consultation. Participants for the public consultation in each selected Kebeles were pre-informed. They were from all walks of life that include elders, women, men, youths, household heads, and the like.

4. Stakeholders Consultation Summary

For Ethiopia Climate Action Through Landscape Management program ESSA, public consultations were conducted with key segments of the community in nine sub-watersheds (from nine kebele) of Nine Woredas in the four regions (Amhara, Tigray, SNNPR and Oromia). The consultation was intended to know priority development interests, desires, concerns as well as potential risks, opportunities and challenges during the implementation of the program that focuses on participatory watershed management as well as second level landholding certification.

The consultation has focused on informing stakeholders about the program objectives, create a sense of ownership on CALM Program activities, captures the views and perceptions of people who may be affected or have an interest in a development program, deal with complaint redress mechanisms on the program; women participation and vulnerable groups and understand existence of gender-based violence.

In each of the watersheds consulted, briefing and awareness creation were made for the community members about the CALM objectives and components. During the exhaustive open discussions, communities' provided feedbacks and comments. Participants were allowed to reflect their view, concerns and recommendation on the likely social, environmental, and economic impacts or risks of the program.

Regional BoA's informants indicated their concern regarding participatory watershed development and management system of watershed development and management as it is very strong and effective. Scholars also confirm this during conference related to watershed management and assessments. Assessment also conducted to know the effect of participatory watershed management.

The community consulted during participatory watershed management in the four regions confirmed that participation in participatory watershed management has done on voluntary basis. The ESSA team observed that there was significant number of women participants in the watershed development. Participants also mentioned that women are highly energetic and motivated. During community consultation, number of days for free labour contribution in the watershed development is varying that depends upon the availability of rehabilitated lands. However, in some visited sites, particularly in Oromia region, participatory watershed management activities, have not given a due attention. In all consulted regions, the informant noted that the local communities have well experienced and motivated to do watershed development. But still, it requires more attention to be effective.

In Oromia region in visited woreda BoA informants noted that, participatory watershed management is not contextualized. To avoid such confusion, consulted stakeholders recommended the need to have more training and consultation.

In consulted regions, regarding grievance there is resolving mechanism that starting from kebele watershed committee up to regional level. However, it is not in well organized and structured manner. The community has bylaws about watershed development and management, but these bylaws can't oblige all member of the community. Besides, the consulted community did not inform the presence of Gender Based Violence in the mass mobilization work as mostly females' move with their husband and other relatives and as many of them are known each other. However, study shows that there is prevalence of GBV in the four consulted regions.

Second level landholding certificate: Federal Rural Land Administrative and Use Directorate informants point out their opinion, landholding registration was started in 2012/13. SLLC's is useful in way to (a) tenure security that increase productivity; (b) improved water and soil conservation; (c) improved tree planting; (d) decreasing boundary conflict and (e) takeover of land from vulnerable groups reduced and return their land taken by others.

In all consulted regions, the consulted communities explained that, they were very pleased to have second level landholding certificate. The process of SLLCs is liable in which before the certificate is issued, kebele NRM office are expected to post the lists of landholders with parcel area in hectare in a public place and commented by the communities. DAs and other concerned expert provide technical support for verifying the parcels of the landholders.

Key informants from land administration and use revealed that there has been conflicts related to second level land certification process, especially during adjudication time. This is related to problems arising from replacement and wrong spell of their names, incorrect land measurement and sometimes problem of locating the right landholding. To overcome such problem, it was suggested the need to provide more training and logistic.

Consulted zonal and woreda RLAU offices indicate their concern to processed SLLC, there was political instability in some area of the region. This political instability cause vandalizes (e.g. breaking of vehicles) and hinders the movement of experts to enter woredas. In such situation, taking about secondary land holding certificates become sensitive issues. The current political instabilities create difficulties to work on SLLC.

On the other hand, Federal RLAUD informants stated the concern that, land administration and use proclamation 456/2005 doesn't have provisions for enforcing land use plan which is essential for land conservation. In addition to that urban peripheral is encroached by illegal settlers' expecting legalization in the near future due to urbanization. Hence, it became difficulties to implement land use plan, of course the policy didn't enforce land use except the practice in Amhara region.

Overall there were several Concerns identified during consultation, but not limited to:

- Lack of control on free grazing
- Lack of legalized bylaw
- Improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed to watershed user associations
- Absence of land use planning
- Turnover of staffs, particularly development agents and capacity related problem
- Lack of hand tools and logistics
- Political instability

For detail description of stakeholders consultation summary, refer Annex-1.

4.1. Stakeholders consultation workshop

The World Bank organized the Environment and Social System Assessment (ESSA) public consultation workshop in Addis Ababa on April 22, 2019. During the consultation, 79 (75 male and 4 female) people representing from key stakeholders of the Environmental and Social System management of the CALM program was actively participated. The participant's representatives were from MoA (NRMD and RLAUD at Federal and regional office heads and experts, by regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoAs), Land Administration and Use (BLAUs) zonal and woreda experts), World Bank team and EFCCC (including regional Environmental Authorities) drawn from seven regions (Amhara, Oromia, Tigray, SNNPR, Gambella, Benshagul Gumuz and Harari) and Dire Dawa city administration.

Public consultation workshop, presentations was covered (i) Program briefing; (ii) ESSA Process and World Bank PforR Programs Financing Policy and (iii) draft CALM-ESSA (Objective, Methods, Institutional Assessment, Environment and Social Findings, Risks and Program Action Plan). After the presentation, group discussions on the major findings, program action plan, and the risks were held in four groups. The groups presented their views on the key findings, program action plan, and the risks of the ESSA. During the discussion the participants agree on the most social and environmental risks and program action plan identified by suggesting minor modifications to the risk ratings. The inputs, comments, and concerns of workshop participants have contributed for the improvement of the draft ESSA. The details of public consultation summary including issues raised are discussed under annex 7.

5. Relevant Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework of Ethiopia's Environmental and Social Management Systems

This section discusses relevant national and regional environmental and social Policies, Strategies and Legislation applicable to CALM program that needs to be considered during program implementation. These include:

The constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

- It had been issued in August 1995 and there are applicable Articles (40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 92)
- Regional states also have their respective constitutions.

Applicable Polices, Proclamations, Regulations and Procedural Guidelines forming the National Environmental Management System

- National Policy and strategy on Occupational Safety and Health (endorsed by the FDRE Council of Ministers in July 2014);
- Environment Policy of Ethiopia (approved by the Council of Ministers in April 1997);
- Food Security Strategy;
- The Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE, 2011);
- EIA Proclamation (Proclamation No. 299/2002);
- Environmental Impact Assessment Procedural Guidelines Series (Series 1 and 2);
- Directive No.2/2014 (2006 EC);
- Guideline for Environmental Management Plan (draft), May 2004;
- EIA Procedural Guideline (draft), November 2003;
- EIA Guideline, July 2000;
- Waste Handling and Disposal Guideline, 1997;
- Environmental Pollution Control Proclamation (Proclamation No. 300/2002);
- Solid Waste Proclamation (Proclamation 513/2007);

- Proclamation to Provide for the Establishment of Environmental Protection Organs (Proclamation No. 295/2002);
- Water Resources Management Proclamation (197/2000);
- Proclamations on public and workers safety- Labor Proclamation No. 377/2003 and
- The 2005 Occupational Health and Safety Directive.

National Policies, Regulations, and Guidelines for Social Impact Assessment and Management

- The Agriculture Sector Policy and Strategy;
- The National Social Protection Strategy of Ethiopia;
- The National Policy on Ethiopian Women (1993);
- Gender mainstreaming strategy and guideline (2010);
- The Development and Change Package (2007);
- The Federal rural land administration proclamation No.89/1997;
- National Rural Land Administration and Use (Proclamation No. 456/2005);
- Proclamation No. 568/2008 Rights to Employment for Persons with Disabilities and
- Building Proclamation No. 624/2009 and Regulation 243/2011.

Applicable International Conventions Endorsed by Ethiopia

- UN Framework Convention on Climate Change;
- The United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification;
- Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Cartagena Protocol on Bio-Safety to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage Paris, 23 November 1972; and
- Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

For more detailed discussions on each of the above relevant policy, legal and institutional framework of Ethiopia's Environmental and Social Management Systems, see Annex-4.

6. Institutional Roles and Responsibilities for Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management

The discussions hereunder summarize the roles and responsibilities of institutions involved in environment and social management in Ethiopia. Identification of institutional roles and responsibilities takes into account potential environmental and social implications of supported activities and the requirements of OP/BP 9.00.

6.1 The Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC)

As per proclamation 916/2015, the former Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC) have bestowed among others with the powers and duties listed below. Despite its devolvement from the level of Ministry headed by a Minister to a Commission headed by a Commissioner during the recent restructuring of the GoE introduced by the incumbent Prime Minister in 2018, the powers and duties of the former MoEFCC remains the same and it is made to be directly accountable to the Prime Minister. The powers and duties include:

- Coordinate activities to ensure that the environmental objectives provided under the Constitution and the basic principles set out in the Environmental Policy of the Country are realized;
- Establish a system for evaluating and decision making, in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Proclamation, the impacts of implementation of investment programs and

projects on environment prior to approvals of their implementation by the concerned sectoral licensing organ or the concerned regional organ;

- Coordinate actions on soliciting the resources required for building a climate resilient green economy in all sectors and at all Regional levels; as well as provide capacity building support and advisory services;
- Establish an environmental information system that promotes efficiency in environmental data collection, management and use;
- Enforcing and ensuring compliance to the EIA proclamation which currently is being implemented through delegated authority provided to sector ministries;
- Reviewing EIAs and monitoring the implementation of EIA recommendations which is also in part being implemented through delegated authority provided to sector ministries;
- Regulating environmental compliance and developing legal instruments that ensure the protection of the environment;
- Ensuring that environmental concerns are mainstreamed into sector activities; and
- Coordinating, advising, assessing, monitoring and reporting on environment-related aspects and activities

Sector environment units: The other environmental organs stipulated in the Environmental Protection Organs Establishment Proclamation (295/2002) are ‘Sector Environmental Units’ which have been established in some of the line Ministries including the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources. These Sector Environment Units have the responsibility of coordinating and implementing activities in line with environmental protection laws and requirements (Article 14, Proclamation 295/2002).

Article 13 of the EIA Proclamation 299/2002 requires that public instruments undertake EIA. To this end, Sector Environmental Units play an important role in ensuring that EIA is carried out on projects initiated by their respective sector institution. However, capacity of these units is limited.

Delegated authority: The EFCCC has delegated its authority to sector institutions to ensure implementation of EIA laws and requirements in their sector and to undertake EIA reviews. For instance, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, Mining as well as Water, Energy and Irrigation are responsible for ensuring that an EIA is undertaken on their sectoral projects and to review the EIA. This delegation has been communicated to the sector ministries through an official letter sent by the former MoEFCC (i.e. EFCCC).

6.2 Regional Environment Protection Forest and Climate Change Authority (REPFCCA)

At regional level, there are environmental bureaus to implement environment management systems within their respective jurisdictions. Proclamation 295/2002 requires regional states to establish or designate their own regional environmental agencies. The regional environmental agencies are responsible for coordination, formulation, implementation, review and revision of regional conservation strategies as well as environmental protection, regulation and monitoring. Relating to EIA specifically, Proclamation 299/2002 gives regional environmental agencies the responsibility to evaluate EIA reports of projects that are licensed, executed or supervised by regional states and that are not likely to generate inter-regional impacts. Regional environmental agencies are also responsible for monitoring, auditing and regulating implementation of such projects. The institutional standing of regional environmental agencies varies among regions. In many of the six regions of focus for the CALM program, they are established as separate institutions in the form of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authorities (e.g., SNNPR, Oromia, Amhara, and Gambella regions) while in others they are joined with Land use administration and utilization agencies as EPLAUA (e.g., Tigray and Benishangul).

6.3 Zonal and Woreda level Environment, Forest, Land Utilization, and Climate Change Offices.

The ESSA team identified that institutional structures for environmental management in the regions of focus for the current CALM program at zonal and woreda level are varied from region to region. Whereas the Environment Authorities of SNNPR, Oromia, Amhara, Tigray and Benishangul Regions have parallel offices at woreda level, the Gambella Region lacks parallel offices at woreda level. However, the Gambella regional environment bureau has delegated the Natural Resource Conservation section in the woreda office of Agriculture to carry environmental management related activities on its behalf. Almost all of the six regional environment authorities have zonal environment offices except for Tigray region which has deployed two of its staff in its southern and north western zone administrations to serve as zonal environment focal persons.

Except in Amhara region, the roles and responsibilities of the woreda level environmental organs are almost identical. Their main areas of responsibility falls in carrying environmental performance monitoring and follow up of development projects for which ESMPs and screening reports are approved and the review and approval of Schedule III (category C) environmental and social screening reports. In Amhara region, the Authority has prepared and transmitted a list of the type of projects that can be reviewed and approved at woreda and zone levels. The SNNPR environment authority has generally given the mandate to review and approve all types of projects (Schedule I to III) at its zonal level offices, but it allows them to seek assistance of the regional head office when faced with challenging ESIA reviews. Among others, the responsibilities of zonal and woreda level Environmental organs include:

- Enforcing and ensuring compliance to the EIA proclamation which currently is being implemented
- Reviewing EIAs and monitoring the implementation of ESMP recommendations;
- Regulating environmental compliance that ensure the protection of the environment;
- Ensuring that environmental concerns are mainstreamed into sector activities; and
- Coordinating, advising, assessing, monitoring and reporting on environment-related aspects and activities

The existing capacity and staffing at woreda environment office level is very limited and requires further support for capacity development. As per their organizational structure, the woreda environment offices in Oromia region are supposed to be staffed with more than 20 experts representing the highest staffed woreda level environment offices in the Country. But in practice, the Woreda environment offices across the six CALMP target regions are found to be staffed with 2 to 5 employees including in the Oromia region.

6.4 Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs/Regional Labor and Social Affairs Bureaus

The Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (MoLSA) is responsible to ensure industrial peace, maintain employee's health and safety at workplace, improve working condition and environment, promote efficient and equitable employment services; and maintain developmental social welfare of citizens. Implementing Occupational Safety & Health, Public Safety and Social welfare protection activities, prevention of child labor are also among the mandates, roles and responsibilities of their Ministry. Overall the ministry shall have the following powers and duties to:

- With a view to ensuring the maintenance of industrial peace(a) Encourage and support workers and employers to exercise their rights to organize and collective bargaining;(b)Encourage the practice of participating in bilateral forums between workers and employers and tri-partite forums including the government; and (c) Establish efficient labour dispute settlement mechanisms;
- Issue and follow up the implementation of occupational health and safety standards
- Create conducive conditions for the provision of efficient and equitable employment services; determine conditions for the issuance of work permit to foreigners, issue such permits and

incorporation with the relevance bodies, supervise compliance there with; regulate the provision of foreigners employment service to Ethiopians;

- Undertake studies on manpower employed in the formal and informal sectors, unemployed manpower and occupational classifications in the country collect, compile and employers' unions established at national level;
- Register workers' and employers' unions established at national level;
- Register workers' unions and collective agreement relating to federal public enterprise situated in cities accountable to the federal government, and carry out labour inspection services in such enterprise; provide conciliation services to amicably settle labour disputes arising between employers and employees;
- In corporation with the concerned stakeholders, undertake and facilitate the implementation of studies on ensuring and improving social well-being of citizens in particular on; (a)The creation of enabling condition for persons with disabilities to benefit from equal opportunities and full participation; (b)The provision of care to the elderly and the encouragement of their participation and (c)The prevention of social problems and provision of rehabilitation services to the affected.

Regional governments have established bureau/agency responsible to implement the national vision and set mission of the Ministry. Woreda and town administrations have offices whose responsibility is investigation and supervision of establishment (manufacturing plants) to ensure that all stakeholders are adhering to Proclamation 377/2003. Ensuring rights and interest of persons with disabilities and the elderly is included in policies and laws of federal and regional governments and are mainly the duty of the Ministry. By the same token even though the implementation of the National Social Protection strategy is a consorted effort of all government organs, the responsibility mainly falls on the Ministry.

In addition to Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Construction is responsible to ensure public and workers safety at construction sites. Regional governments have adopted different approach to establish a body responsible for the construction sector, as a department within the bureau of urban development, housing and construction (Amhara region) or an independent bureau of construction (Oromia region).

7. Findings of Environmental and Social Management Systems against the World Bank PforR Core Principles

7.1 Introduction

In this section, discussion is made on each proposed PforR financing core principles that are intended to guide comprehensive assessment of existing borrower Program Level systems as well as the borrower's authority and organizational capacity to plan and implement effective measures for environmental and social impact/risk management.

Based on a review of the documentation, field observations, detailed analysis of the environmental and social effects of the Program and consultations and discussions with stakeholders, the analysis is organized by the six Core Principles outlined in *Program for Results Financing* and synthesizes the main findings using the SWOT (Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats) applied to the PforR context in the following way:

- **Strengths** of the system, or where it functions effectively and efficiently and is consistent with *Program for Results financing core principles*.
- Inconsistencies and gaps ("**weaknesses**") between the principles adopted in *Program for Results Financing* and capacity constraints.
- **Opportunities** to strengthen the existing system.
- Risks ("**threats**") to the proposed actions designed to strengthen the system.

The data collection and analysis of the existing institutional capacity is mainly focused on the main implementer-MoA and its regional counterparts of the proposed program. The World Bank team had also assessed the inter-agency coordination practice and existing capacity of relevant organizations on environmental and social management including Land Administration and Use and Environmental authorities at national, regional, woreda and local levels, who participate in the implementation of environmental and social safeguards of the proposed program.

7.2 PforR Core Principles

The core principles and key planning elements incorporated establish the policy and planning elements generally necessary to achieve outcomes consistent with PforR objectives. These principles and elements are intended to guide assessment of existing borrower Program systems as well as their capacity to plan and implement effective measures for environmental and social risk management. They also serve as a basis for provision of Bank implementation support. The core principles and key planning elements are summarized as follows:

Core Principle 1: General Principle of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management

<p>Environmental and social management procedures and processes are designed to (a) promote environmental and social sustainability in Program design (b) avoid, minimize or mitigate against adverse impacts and (c) promote informed decision-making relating to a program’s environmental and social effects.</p>
<p>Program procedures will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operate within an adequate legal and regulatory framework to guide environmental and social impact assessments at the program level ▪ Incorporate recognized elements of environmental and social assessment good practice, including (a) early screening of potential effects; (b) consideration of strategic, technical, and site alternatives (including the “no action” alternative); (c) explicit assessment of potential induced, cumulative, and trans-boundary impacts; (d) identification of measures to mitigate adverse environmental or social impacts that cannot be otherwise avoided or minimized; (e) clear articulation of institutional responsibilities and resources to support implementation of plans; and (f) responsiveness and accountability through stakeholder consultation, timely dissemination of program information, and responsive grievance redress measures.

Core Principle 2: Environmental Considerations – Natural Habitats and Physical Cultural Resources

<p>Environmental and social management procedures and processes are designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate against adverse effects on natural habitats and physical cultural resources resulting from program.</p>
<p>As relevant, the program to be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes appropriate measures for early identification and screening of potentially important biodiversity and cultural resource areas. ▪ Supports and promotes the conservation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of natural habitats; avoids the significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, and if avoiding the significant conversion of natural habitats is not technically feasible, includes measures to mitigate or offset impacts or program activities ▪ Takes into account potential adverse effects on physical cultural property and, as warranted, provides adequate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate such effects.

Core Principle 3: Environmental Considerations – Public and Worker Safety

Environmental and social management procedures and processes are designed to protect public and worker safety against the potential risks associated with (a) construction and/or operations of facilities or other operational practices developed or promoted under the program; (b) exposure to toxic chemicals, hazardous wastes, and otherwise dangerous materials; and (c) reconstruction or rehabilitation of infrastructure located in areas prone to natural hazards.

As required, the program to be supported has to:

- Promote community, individual, and worker safety through the safe design, construction, operation, and maintenance of physical infrastructure, or in carrying out activities that may be dependent on such infrastructure with safety measures, inspections, or remedial works incorporated as needed
- Promote use of recognized good practice in the production, management, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials generated through program construction or operations; and promotes use of integrated pest management practices to manage or reduce pests or disease vectors; and provides training for workers involved in the production, procurement, storage, transport, use, and disposal of hazardous chemicals in accordance with international guidelines and conventions.
- Include measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate community, individual, and worker risks when program activities are located within areas prone to natural hazards such as floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or other severe weather or climate events.

Core Principle 4: Social Considerations – Land Acquisition and Loss of Access to Natural Resources

Land acquisition and loss of access to natural resources are managed in a way that avoids or minimizes displacement, and affected people are assisted in improving, or at least restoring, their livelihoods and living standards.

Key Planning Elements:

As relevant, the Program to be supported:

- Avoids or minimizes land acquisition and related adverse impacts;
- Identifies and addresses economic and social impacts caused by land acquisition or loss of access to natural resources, including those affecting people who may lack full legal rights to assets or resources they use or occupy;
- Provides compensation sufficient to purchase replacement assets of equivalent value and to meet any necessary transitional expenses, paid prior to taking of land or restricting access;
- Provides supplemental livelihood improvement or restoration measures if taking of land causes loss of income-generating opportunity (e.g., loss of crop production or employment); and
- Restores or replaces public infrastructure and community services that may be adversely affected.

Core Principle 5: Social Considerations – Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups

Due consideration is given to cultural appropriateness of, and equitable access to, program benefits giving special attention to rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples and to the needs or concerns of vulnerable groups.

- Undertakes free, prior, and informed consultations if Indigenous Peoples are potentially affected

<p>(positively or negatively) to determine whether there is broad community support for the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensures that Indigenous/underserved Peoples can participate in devising opportunities to benefit from exploitation of customary resources or indigenous knowledge, the latter (indigenous knowledge) to include the consent of the Indigenous Peoples. ▪ Gives attention to groups vulnerable to hardship or disadvantage, including as relevant the poor, the disabled, women and children, the elderly, or marginalized ethnic groups. If necessary, special measures are taken to promote equitable access to program benefits.
--

Core Principle 6: Social Considerations – Social Conflict

<p>Avoid exacerbating social conflict, especially in fragile states, post-conflict areas, or areas subject to territorial disputes.</p>
<p>Key Planning Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considers conflict risks, including distributional equity and cultural sensitivities.

7.3 Analysis of the ESSA against the Core Principles

Based on the key findings of the assessment, this section presents an analysis of the consistency of government’s environmental and social management systems with the World Bank core principles of PforR financing. System consistency is analyzed against each core principle by adopting Strength, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats/Risks (SWOT) analysis approach.

Core Principle 1: General Principle of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management

a. Applicability:

One of the focus areas of the Program is increasing the total area under restoration in selected watersheds, which implies that expanding the sustainable landscape management practices in the watersheds. The overall purpose of the landscape development practices is to rehabilitate and conserve the degraded natural resources with expected positive outcome for the environment. Risks derive from watershed development activities being not well planned; with unintended and unpredicted adverse impacts on farmlands, natural habitats, wetlands, physical cultural resources, etc. Current practices in the woredas of all visited regions show that the process of site selection and prioritization for watershed development follows similar patterns as stipulated in the Community Based Participatory Watershed Development Guideline issued by the MoA (2005). During the selection and prioritization of the watersheds criteria, like existing severity of land degradation and potential beneficial use of the watershed after treatment, are considered. The appropriate conservation technologies required for treatment of the prioritized watersheds are also determined by NRM professionals in the woreda. From the ESSA field assessment, it was observed that generally the prioritized micro-watersheds conservation activities are selected based on the level of high degradation of natural resources. This implies that communities and local authorities are accumulating experiences from their practices in planning, selection, and prioritizing the treatment works of watersheds involved. However, there is still need to confirm that these experiences are carried forward and strengthened further during the CALM program by ensuring that comprehensive watershed management plans that also address potential environmental and social risks/impacts which may occur during the watershed development works are prepared and implemented. This will require Watershed Development Plans to be screened, reviewed and cleared (approved) by the competent Environment protection authorities prior to its implementation. Thus, Core principle-1 on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management will be required to ensure that watershed development activities are well planned and supported and guided by adequate watershed development plans that address environmental and social impact considerations.

In addition, main issues from the perspective of potential environmental and social risks/impacts could be related to lack of controlling free grazing, difficulty to enforce bylaws, low support for vulnerable groups in watershed development and SLLCs-women, elderly and unemployed and landless youths and inequitable and delayed benefits from watershed, inadequate participation in participatory watershed management, low empowerment of women in the watershed development, risk of female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers as well as workers and community safety risks and in some cases forced labor and fatigue towards participatory watershed management. Besides, participatory consultation, planning, management and monitoring, resource use and management were not well established. Moreover, the CALM program component on improving the robustness and quality of service delivery in land administration is to expand the coverage of second level land certification. The establishment of National Rural Land Administration Information System (NRLAIS) and its connection with the regional land use administration offices is likely to require additional IT facilities. The main issue from the perspective of potential environmental and social risks/impacts could be related to the disposal of used IT facilities (e.g., computers, laptops, printers, etc.), surveying equipment (e.g., GPS), lack of enforcing land use plan, political instability and conflicts (due to replacement and wrong spell of names, incorrect land measurement and sometimes problem of locating the right landholding). The potential environmental and social risks of program activities related to these aspects will need to be addressed and hence applies Core Principle-1.

a) Strengths

- The Country has adopted the key principles of environmental and social management and sustainable development at different levels of its main legislations and policies including in the FDRE Constitution and Environment Policy of Ethiopia. The EPE (1997) is aimed at guiding sustainable social and economic development of the country through the conservation and sustainable utilization of the natural, man-made and cultural resources and the environment at large.
- The Country has put in place EIA Proclamation No.299/2002 which defines the fundamental requirements and procedures for environmental and social impact assessment. The EIA proclamation provides the legal and regulatory framework that guide environmental and social impact assessments applicable at National level. This Federal EIA law has been in force for nearly two decades and hence its systemic enforcement was growing and expanding over the years. Furthermore, whereas some of the regional states involved in the implementation of the proposed CALM Program apply the Federal EIA law as it is in their regions (e.g., SNNPR, Gambella and Benishangul regions) the other regions such as Amhara, Oromia and Tigray states have already enacted their own customized version of EIA regulations based on the Federal EIA law to further contextualize and strengthen the EIA system in their respective jurisdictions.
- Article 4(1) of the Federal EIA proclamation and relevant sections of the subsequent regional EIA regulations highlights some of the main aspects for consideration while carrying impact assessments. These include site location, nature of project, cumulative effects, duration, reversibility or irreversibility of the effects of the project, etc. There are also other provisions in the Federal EIA proclamation such as article 8(1&2) which require to provide sufficient information in EIA reports and outlining the minimum information requirement EIA reports should contain that are essential for informed decision making during EIA review and approval. The Federal EIA procedural guidelines and Amhara Region EFWPDA EIA guideline also elaborates further on the level of information requirement for acceptable EIA report. Consideration of these aspects by the EIA law would confirm with the principles and key planning elements of Core principle 1 on environmental and social risk management.

- The Inclusion of concerns and opinions of affected communities in the EIA study process is also considered as one important issue in preparing an acceptable EIA both at Federal and Regional levels. The Federal EIA law has also made it clear in article 15(1) (and relevant sections of subsequent regional EIA regulations) by stating that the Authority (i.e., EFCCC) or the relevant regional environmental agency shall ensure that the comments made by the public and in particular by the communities likely to be affected by the implementation of a project are incorporated into the environmental impact study report as well as in its evaluation. In a similar move with the Federal EFCCC, the Amhara, Oromia, Tigray, SNNPR, Gambella and Benishangul Gumuz regional EPAs does not consider an EIA report not consisting of evidences for community consultation as acceptable one for clearance or approval.
- The implementation of the Federal EIA proclamation by the EFCCC is also supported by EIA procedural guideline (2003) and ESMP preparation guideline (2004) which provides the essential procedural steps for carrying out EIA and the required minimum contents of an ESMP. The EIA procedural guideline requires that prior to the commencement of EIA studies, pre-screening consultations, screening and scoping exercises needs to be done in order to Categorize the proposed project into one of the three schedule of activities (Schedule I, II or III). The EIA procedural guideline has consisted in its annexes the list of project types that are categorized under the schedules I to III. On the other side, the ESMP preparation guideline requires ESMPs to consist of summary of identified impacts, proposed mitigation and enhancement measures, institutional arrangements for implementation of the mitigation and monitoring measures, and preliminary cost estimates to ensure mitigation and monitoring measures are adequately funded for implementation. These guidelines are widely applied not only by the EFCCC at Federal level, but more or less by all regional EPAs including the proposed CALM program target regions (i.e. Oromia, SNNPR, Tigray, Gambella and Benishangul Gumuz Regional states). The Amhara Region EFWPDA have published its own version of an EIA guideline (Directive no.01/2010) which more or less is similar but more elaborate than the Federal EIA guidelines and have distributed it for use by its zonal and woreda branch offices in the region.
- The Country has environment protection institutions at Federal and Regional levels mandated to enforce the EIA Proclamation and other environmental management related policies and legislations. EFCCC is the Federal environment institution responsible to enforce the EIA law at National level. There are also Regional Environment institutions in the proposed CALM Program target regions responsible for enforcing the EIA system. Most of these Regional Environment Protection Authorities have organizational structures that go down to the Zone and Woreda levels (e.g: Amhara, Oromia, SNNPR, Tigray and Benshangul Gumuz regions). Whereas the Fedral EFCCC is responsible for enforcing the EIA law on development projects licensed by the Federal Government and on those that will have trans-regional impacts, the regional environment protection bureaus are generally responsible for enforcing the EIA law on development projects licensed by their respective regional authorities. Within the regional environment protection authorities, though some variation exist between regions, the woreda level offices are usually mainly responsible for carrying out environmental performance monitoring of approved project ESMPs and for review and approval of Schedule III (Category C) sub projects.
- All of the Regional head offices, and many of the zone and woreda level environment protection offices are getting increasingly involved in enforcing the environmental management system in general and in the review and approval process of EIAs, EMPs and E&S screening reports from World Bank financed projects which is helping them gain more experiences on handling environmental and social safeguard instruments.

b. Gaps

The analysis identified significant gaps in how the system functions or operates in actual practice, which constrains the ability of the EIA process to be a meaningful tool for utilization in sector-specific

development programs/projects such as the proposed CALM program. What follows is an analysis that focuses on performance gaps in the application of the national system for environmental management in the context of proposed CALM program.

- There is a gap in systemic functionality in environmental and social management due to absence of an environmental management system in the Ministry of Agriculture that oversees the compliance of all public or donor financed projects and programs implemented by the Ministry.
- The Natural Resource Management and Food Security Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture have three permanent environmental and social experts. However, there is a gap in the implementation support given by these staff for fulfilling environmental and social assessment requirements which are limited to World Bank financed projects such as PSNP and SLMP. Environmental and social assessment requirements were not implemented in other public financed projects including the participatory watershed management sub-projects.
- In a similar pattern, at regional level, the Bureaus of Agriculture and Natural Resources have focal environment persons for the Bank financed projects such as PSNP, AGP and SLMP. However, the implementation support and supervision provided by these staff were only limited to the Bank financed projects.
- At woreda level, with the exception of Amhara Region, the environmental and social screening activities conducted by the Agriculture and natural resource offices were being carried for World Bank financed projects such as PSNP and AGP. Other public financed projects were not included in the E&S screening. There is a general trend that representatives of the woreda environment protection office are made to be members of the woreda steering and technical committees for Participatory watershed management planning of the woreda, but there appears to be a gap in fully enforcing the environment and social assessment requirements on these participatory watershed management subprojects.
- There is a general lack of awareness in the regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices in recognizing the importance of carrying environmental and social screening for all types of sub-projects, and in submitting it to the appropriate regional or woreda level environment protection offices for review and approval. It was observed in many cases that even World Bank financed sub-projects for which E&S screening was prepared were not sent to the woreda environment protection offices to obtain environmental clearances.
- There is a gap in capacity for environmental and social safeguard management in the Land Administration and Use Directorate of the MoA, and in those regions and woredas where the land administration and utilization offices are separated from the environment protection authorities (e.g., Oromia, SNNPR, and Gambella).
- In most cases, the experiences gained from implementation practices of environmental and social safeguard instruments at regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices is generally weak. There is a gap in fully acknowledging the regulatory role of the Regional and Woreda environment protection offices by the regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource management offices.
- In some cases, there are gaps in implementing the recommendations of ESMPs as per the approval given by the competent authorities.
- Gaps in awareness at regional and woreda implementing agency leadership levels on ESMS which often deter the fulfillment of environmental and social requirements.
- Shortage of budget resources for carrying out site level verification of screening reports and environmental performance monitoring and enforcements by the regional, zonal and woreda environment protection offices. According to the consultation and discussions held with representatives of SNNP REPA and Woreda Environment Protection Offices in Amhara Region, this shortage of budget resources are sometimes exacerbated by not channeling the budgets allocated for such purposes to the environment protection authorities by the program implementing agencies of Bank financed projects such as PSNP and AGP

- There are shortages of basic office logistics in the woreda environment offices such as desktop computers, laptops, printers, cameras and transport facilities which heavily constrain them to carry their routine regulatory activities.
- There is still a gap in the level of awareness on ESMGs and screening procedures in some of the woreda environment offices and hence need to provide continued capacity building training on environmental management focused on ESIA methodologies, safeguard instruments such as ESMGs to ensure presence of adequate capacities in the regions and woreda environment offices which are affected by high staff turn-over.
- Overall, there is a shortage of environmental and social experts within the woreda environment sector offices. Though the woreda environment offices are structurally expected to be staffed well, they are generally found staffed with 1 to 3 employees in most woredas. Thus, there are insufficient numbers of experts in the woreda environment offices who tend to be easily overwhelmed with small tasks.
- Budget resources dedicated for environmental and social issues management are a serious problem with respect to on time environmental management. Despite the requirement of some donors for the inclusion of budgets for the environmental management of development activities in Ethiopia, this remains to be far adequate in terms of implementation.
- There is a wide confusion among the DAs between annex 9 of the Community Based Participatory Watershed Development guideline and E&S screening report formats. Many DAs take it for granted that by filling/completing annex 9 physical and socioeconomic information used for planning the specific watershed development, they feel that they also did the E&S screening for it, though it is not in practice.

c. Opportunities

- The Country has put in place various environmental and social management policies, legislations and guidelines that support the development of broader environmental protection and management systems in Ethiopia. It has also been exercising the implementation and enforcement of these environmental protection and management laws through the environment protection institutions it established at federal, regional and woreda levels. Though implementation and enforcement of the environmental protection and management systems in the country has been going for nearly two decades spearheaded by these environment protection institutions, more needs to be done to strengthen the performance capacity of the system especially at woreda levels. This is important in the context of CALM program, because since the Watershed development works are planned and implemented at kebele and woreda levels, strengthening the woreda environment protection offices provides conducive opportunities for adequately addressing the environmental and social management requirements of the CALM program.
- The rolling out of the ESPES program to build the environmental and social management capacities of the five public sector offices (Agriculture, Health, Water, Education and Road Construction) at regional and woreda levels by providing training on ESMS and its operational manual in collaboration with the regional environment protection offices offers an opportunity for CALM Program to build upon in the woredas covered by the ESPES.
- The presence of development agents that include a natural resource expert at each kebele level and the ongoing limited E&S screening practices for the World Bank financed subprojects at that level provides an opportunity to build upon and scale up the ESMS implementation experiences to all woreda covered by the CALM program.
- The involvement of Ethiopian institute of agricultural research in CALM program provides an opportunity to understand through research the cumulative positive and negative impacts of implementing watershed development plans in the regions and propose research based enhancement and mitigation measures.

- The presence of environment protection staff along with the land administration and utilization offices in some regions and woredas (e.g. Tigray, Benshangul Gumuz, Amhara regions) provides an opportunity to implement ESMS requirements in relation to CALM program component sub-projects.

There are opportunities to strengthen the capacity of the regional and woreda environment protection institutions, agriculture and natural resource offices, and the land administration and utilization institutions by:

- Provision of continuous training on the preparation, review and approval producers of ESIA and other environmental and social safeguard instruments for zonal and woreda environment protection institutions not covered by ESPES Program and build upon the already delivered capacity building trainings on ESPES covered woredas to ensure capacity development and overcome high staff turnover induced weaknesses.
- Strengthening the coordination among national, regional, zonal and woreda level environmental institutions as regulators and the offices of Agriculture and natural resources, land administration and utilization offices as program implementers;
- Provide continuous training on environmental, social and safety management instruments preparation and implementation for woreda agriculture and natural resource office staffs (including the development agents in the rural kebeles) not covered by ESPES Program and build upon the already delivered capacity building trainings on ESPES covered woredas.
- Enhance and share good practices and experiences gained from SLMP, PSNP and AGP implementation in environmental and social management practices, ESMS applications including E&S screening and approval procedures in the regions and woredas.
- development of technical guidelines for environmental screening and preparation of ESMP
- Development of E-wastes recycling and disposal management guideline that applies for the E-waste stream to be generated during operation of NRLAIS at all levels of the Land administration and utilization offices, as per the national standards and guidelines.
- Putting in place updated written procedure, timely, appropriate and responsive GRM guideline and procedures for grievances. As applicable, strengthen awareness raising for project affected people and customers on different issues including GRM, safety measures using easily accessible media and considering the local context of the targets. Develop GRM Procedure and guideline as well as set intake location. The rolling out of the ESPES program to build GRM capacities at regional and woreda levels by providing training on GRM and its operational manual offers an opportunity for CALM Program to build upon in the woredas covered by the ESPES.

d. Risks

Overall, the risk of not complying with the principles and key planning elements of Core principle 1 of environmental and social risk management for the proposed CALM program is that participatory watershed management and SLM works will be carried without ensuring that it is guided by watershed development plans that address adverse environmental and social effects. This in turn will risk for the occurrence of unintended and unpredicted environmental and social risks that will undermine the program effectiveness. Moreover, the E-waste and related hazardous waste generation associated with the operational phases of the NRLAIS will go unchecked for its environmental and social effects and may risk environmental degradation through improper disposal.

Generally, the risk of not addressing the identified gaps above and not capitalizing on the opportunities will potentially result in the proposed CALM program not being able to operate in a system-based approach which would allow it to effectively manage environmental and social impacts. Thus, there will be no mechanism for addressing the limited potential impacts of the subprojects which will be inconsistent with the principles of PforR financing. Specific risks to the proposed program will be:

- Potential environmental and social impacts of the main components of CALM program including Watershed development works will not be identified, mitigated, and monitored.
- Activities under the watershed development component of the program will be designed and operated without adequate attention to existing environmental settings, related ecological and social risks and impacts.
- No mechanism will be in place for safe and environmentally sound disposal of used IT equipment and related hazardous wastes.
- Community and stakeholder concerns will not be consistently taken into account in environmental, social and safety issues identification and mitigation.
- Inadequate or no budget will be allocated for environmental, social and safety management and no environmental and social issues management and precaution will be applied.
- Risks are deemed **substantial** and should be mitigated through a combination of dedicated enforcement of national legislation and ESSA/ESMSG guideline instruments at all levels.

e. Actions

- Owing to the scale of sub-projects in the CALM program, there will be a need to recruit environmental and social development specialist in the project management unit in the MoA that serve both program implementing directorates and in the regional Agriculture and NRM offices. These focal persons will be responsible for providing coordination, guidance and technical support to the Woreda and kebele level Agriculture and Natural resource offices. They will also be responsible for supervising the compliance of the Woreda and kebele CALM program subprojects with the environmental and social management requirements.
- Recruit an environment and social experts at woreda Agriculture and NRM office levels who interface with the kebele DAs in preparing the E&S screening reports and with woreda environment protection offices in getting environmental clearance for sub-projects.
- Develop technical ESMS guidelines that provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program that includes detailed procedures and precautionary advises on occupational and community health and safety aspects appropriate to the context of participatory watershed management works in watersheds. The ESMSG to be developed will build upon the general environmental and social management principles and ESMS procedures outlined in the ESPES operational manual for ESMS.
- Develop E-waste recycling and disposal management guideline that applies for safe disposal of the E-waste stream to be generated during operation of ESLMIS/NRALIS at all levels of the Land administration and utilization offices.
- Strengthen the coordination among the national, regional, zonal and woreda level Agriculture and natural resources, land administration and utilization offices as program implementers and the environmental institutions as regulators.
- Strengthen the environmental and social management system at woreda level by reinforcing and extending the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing ESPES Program at woreda level that are designed to strengthen woreda capacity for management of environmental and social risks which include the appointment, training and performance assessment of environmental and social management specialists at woreda level. All participating woredas need a system that will outline specific roles and responsibilities for environmental and social risk screening to enforce regulatory requirements.
- Provide awareness raising training on ESMS to the management and relevant staff of the Regional, zonal and woreda level agriculture offices and land administration and utilization offices.
- Provide continuous technical training on the preparation, review and approval procedures of E&S screening, EMP and ESIA reports and other environmental and social safeguard instruments (i.e. ESMS, ESMG) including safety management instruments to the relevant zonal, woreda and kebele level staff of agriculture offices, land administration and utilization offices as well as staff of the environment protection offices in zone and woreda level not covered by ESPES Program and build

upon the already delivered capacity building trainings on ESPES covered woredas to ensure capacity development and overcome high staff turnover induced weaknesses.

- Provide financial support for the regional, zonal and specially woreda environment protection offices to address their shortage of basic office logistics such as desktops, laptops, printers as well as transport facilities that constrain them to carry their regulatory role. .
- Encourage EIAR to undertake research to quantify cumulative and long term impacts (both beneficial and adverse) of watershed development projects in the regions.
- Coordination for prior arrangement and planning for environmental and social risk screening. This may include a process for woredas and communities to prepare a watershed management/development plan and budget to allow timely environment and social risk-screening and monitoring.

Core Principle 2: Environmental Considerations – Natural Habitats and Physical Cultural Resources

Applicability

The applicability of Core principle 2 is generally related to the reasons given for applicability of Core principle 1 in the preceding sections. Most often, watershed sites are situated deep in the rural areas and away from the rural villages where farm fields, open communal lands, and other territories that may adjoin natural habitats, wetlands, places of unknown physical cultural resources could be present. The current practices of site selection for watershed development largely focuses on prioritizing degraded lands without due attention given to other aspects like conservation of physical cultural resources in the watersheds. The potential environmental risks of program activities related to these aspects will need to be addressed and hence applies Core Principle-2.

a. Strengths

The EIA Proclamation (2002) and the EIA procedural guideline (2003) are consistent with Core Principle 2. Specifically, under article 7(1), the Federal ESIA proclamation (and subsequent regional regulations) states that a project proponent shall undertake an environmental impact assessment to identify the likely adverse impacts of projects and incorporate the means of their prevention or containment and submit the environmental impact study report to the Authority (i.e., EFCCC) or the relevant regional environmental agency. Moreover, the kind of adverse impacts a project proponent is required to assess includes any change to the environment or to its component that may affect flora, fauna, natural or cultural heritage, or in general, subsequently alter environmental, social, economic or cultural conditions. Thus, the Federal proclamation on ESIA has provisions by which it considers the issues of conserving natural habitats and physical cultural resources which are the main concerns of Core principle 2 of the environmental and social risk management. Areas where Ethiopia's environmental management system functions well include the following strengths:

- The ESIA proclamation is clear in the objectives of an ESIA to protect the environment (natural systems);
- Annex I of the ESIA procedural guideline (2003) list environmentally sensitive ecosystems that include National parks, forest reserves, wildlife reserves and sanctuaries, wildlife corridors, and areas containing endangered flora and fauna as additional criteria for screening.
- Annex II of the ESIA procedural guideline (2003) list the potential adverse impacts of concern during the screening process which include consideration of effects on cultural, religious, historic, archaeological and scientific resources.
- An Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (ARCCCH) was established by Proclamation No. 209/2000, and one of its major responsibilities is the protection of cultural heritage against man-made and natural disasters.
- The country has well-defined legal/regulatory systems for safeguarding environment and ecologically significant areas from pollution, for excluding activities that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on eco-sensitive areas, forest and hilly areas and wetlands.

- Overall, the analysis confirmed that there are no significant inconsistencies between OP/BP 9.00 and Ethiopia's policies, laws, and regulations related to natural habitats.

b. Gaps

- There is a general gap in awareness and recognizing what PCRs constitute and the need for preserving it by the practitioners of watershed development works. The Community Based Participatory Watershed Management Guideline (MoA, 2005) which is the main planning tool for watershed development is short of consisting environmental and social considerations including PCRs, wetlands and etc during site selection and prioritization.
- There is a gap in capacity to assess the potential impacts of watershed development works on physical cultural resources and natural habitats by the zone and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices.
- Physical cultural heritages are not well documented or exhaustively listed at regional and woreda levels.
- There is a gap in planning and coordination to use available indigenous knowledge of the communities to identify and protect the PCRs in their watershed areas.
- No or very limited knowledge and experience in considering PCRs during the review of E&S screening reports at the woreda level environment protection offices, and implementation of the recommended measures as stated in the EMP to safeguard both terrestrial and aquatic habitats.
- Although there are well defined environmental regulations, guidelines and procedures that are already in place, the MoA and its regional and woreda counterpart offices experience in the implementation of these legal frameworks to ensure no impacts to occur on the natural habitats and PCRs is very limited.
- There is an overlap in responsibilities for safeguarding PCR between the EFCCC and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and coordination between them is weak. Because the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is often left out of the EIA loop, there is a lack of cultural heritage specialists in the EIA domain, and PCR is typically inadequately covered in the EIA process.
- No awareness and unavailability of resources to implement the chance find procedures, when applicable, by the watershed development committee, kebele and woreda agriculture offices.

c. Opportunities

The opportunities identified for core principle one are also applicable to this Core Principle. Besides environmental and social screenings to be conducted for watershed development sites will have to consider the potential adverse impacts on existing natural habitats and PCRs found within and around the watershed sites and devise mechanisms to avoid those impacts. The program can exclude parts of watersheds that would disturb natural habitat and affect physical cultural resources.

The CALM Program provides an opportunity to develop and strengthen appropriate guidance through manuals and checklists for improved managements of biodiversity areas, natural habitats and PCRs. Suitable guidelines for management and conservation of natural habitats and physical cultural resources can also be developed for implementing in the proposed program.

Strengthening the capacity of the regional and woreda level offices for agriculture and natural resources as well as the environmental protection offices will help to ensure overall conservation of the bio-physical, environmental and social resources in the watersheds.

d. Risks

Practically speaking, the watershed development activities to be supported under the CALM program covers hugely extensive rural areas in the country where natural habitats, biodiversity and known or unknown physical cultural resources would be present. Thus, Watershed development works can have a

potential adverse impact (unpredicted and/or unintended) on these resources if carried without proper watershed development plan that address environmental and social concerns.

- Physical cultural heritages are not well understood or exhaustively listed and could be lost unintentionally
- Lack of awareness among implementing agencies on existing environmental regulations or poor capacities of implementing agencies at the local level.
- The overall risks are deemed to be **moderate**

e. Actions

- Encourage the inclusion of considerations for environmental and social aspects in general and PCRs in particular in the watershed development planning and site selection tool of the MoA applied Country wide. (i.e., Community Based Participatory Watershed Management Guideline)
- Include topics on PCRs and its identification, conservation and chance find procedures in the technical trainings on ESMS to be provided to relevant staff of zonal, woreda and kebele level agriculture offices as well as environment protection offices as recommended in the actions for core principle 1.
- Encourage the woreda culture and tourism office to register and document all known PCRs in the woreda and establish a coordination mechanism with the woreda office of Agriculture for exchange of information on PCRs present.
- Encourage the participation of communities during watershed subproject screening to benefit from their local indigenous knowledge on PCR identification.
- Include guidance on chance find procedures in the ESMSG guidelines to be prepared to provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program as recommended under Core principle 1.

Core Principle 3: Environmental Considerations – Public and Worker Safety

Applicability

Core Principle 3 is applicable to the CALM Program in the sense that individual worker safety issues are of concern during participatory watershed management activities. Depending on the nature of the watershed sites communities that may be engaged on activities such as digging with hand tools, carrying materials, and working on sloppy grounds can expose them to safety hazards. There is a potential for occurrence of injuries and accidents (non-fatal and/or fatal) while at work during the participatory watershed management activities. Temporary facilities like tents and first aid kits are also supposed to be availed voluntarily by the local kebele authorities to provide temporary shelter for babies whose moms are working in the watershed. However, during the field assessment in all the regions, no such first aid kits and tents were seen availed during the work at the watersheds. Participatory watershed management may be susceptible to coercion of labor and place a double burden on women in which they carry out participatory watershed management activities in addition to house chores and hence core principle 3 of the PforR financing will remain applicable to ensure that Watershed Development works supported by the CALM program observe applicable safety procedures.

a. Strengths

- Public and Workers safety issues are addressed in conformity with P for R financing, through Labour and Social Affairs sector proclamations and guidelines, namely the Labour Proclamation (No. 377/2003) and Occupational Health and Safety Directive (2008).
- Proclamation 377/2003 is the prevailing law that is applicable in all the regions where CALM program will be implemented. The Federal, Regional, Zone and Woreda Labor and Social Affairs offices are responsible to ensure the health and safety of workers and the public is protected.

- Building Proclamation no.624/2009 and regulation no. 243/2011 serves to protect the safety of the public and workers in the construction sector. These laws and guidelines are enforced by the Federal Ministry of Construction and the Urban Development and Construction Bureaus in the regions.
- The EIA proclamation and its regulations contain several provisions for public and worker safety, which are consistent with and aligned with core principles 3.

b. Weaknesses/Gaps

Public and worker safety aspects are adequately covered through the aforementioned proclamations and directives. However,

- There is a gap in the formal application of the national health and safety rules in the participatory watershed management works due to the nature and place of work involved which are based on voluntary work and carried in remote rural areas where labor and social affairs offices are generally absent.
- Lack of guideline on health and safety that is appropriate for the purpose and tallied with the basic safety risks likely to be encountered during participatory watershed management works in the sites and that assist to comply with basic features of national health and safety rules.
- Members of the local authorities, communities and watershed development committee appear to have a certain level of understanding on the need for availing first aid services during participatory watershed management works. Traditional ambulances like horses and carts are also supposed to be on a standby reserve to carry the injured to health posts/centers. First aid services are supposed to be provided by the medics of kebele health posts who are made to join the participatory watershed management campaign with their first aid service kits. However, though this looks appropriate and practical approach to address work related accidents and emergency, its practical application appears to be lenient. Thus, there is a need to strengthen the first aid service delivery during participatory watershed management campaign.
- There is a general gap in providing appropriate safety orientation and briefing to the community members during participatory watershed management that enables them to take precaution when lifting and carrying materials, working on sloppy and inclined grounds, working in crowded group, etc.
- No or limited capacities are in place in the woreda labor and social affairs offices to address the risks to the safety of members of the community participating in participatory watershed management campaigns.
- Other gaps identified in Core Principle 1 are also applicable to Core Principle 3

c. Opportunities

The analysis identified several Program level opportunities to be considered and treated in the ESSA Action Plan through the ESMSG guidance and capacity building elements, including:

- Incorporate aspects of occupational health and public safety into the proposed CALM program environmental and social management framework.
- Develop procedures for providing safety orientation and briefings to be given to members of the community participating in participatory watershed management at the start of work season.
- Develop an appropriate guideline on occupational health and public safety procedures relevant to the nature and place of the participatory watershed management works and ensure that it is integrated within the program manuals.
- Provide training of trainers in appropriate health and safety procedures for participatory watershed management works to regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices.

d. Risks

If the gaps and opportunities identified are not addressed, there will not be a program based approach for addressing the OHS issues nor would it be consistent with the guiding principles of PforR financing. In addition, the following specific risks will be highlighted during program implementation period:

- No or limited availability of Safety protection procedures at work site
- No or limited awareness on safety precautions and management among the community members participating in participatory watershed management

Inability to ensure public and worker safety can result in injuries and loss of life. In addition, the risks identified for strengthening the system for Core Principle 1 are applicable to Core Principle 3. The overall risks are deemed to be **‘moderate’**.

e. Actions

- Develop an appropriate guideline on occupational health and public safety procedures relevant to the nature and work place of participatory watershed management works and for providing safety orientation and briefings to members of the community participating in participatory watershed management at the start of the public work seasons. The guideline should be prepared in a manner that is appropriate for the participatory watershed management work contextual purpose and tailored to the basic safety risks likely to be encountered during participatory watershed management works in the sites which lead towards complying with basic features of national health and safety rules. The guideline can be incorporated with the proposed CALM program ESMSG guidelines or developed as separate guideline on health and safety if deemed suitable.
- Provide training of trainers in appropriate health and safety procedures for participatory watershed management works to regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices.
- Provide logistical and financial support to strengthen the first aid service delivery by the health post medics, provision of standby traditional ambulance, and temporary tent shelter for child care during participatory watershed management campaign as appropriate and practical options in context.

Core Principle 4: Social Considerations – Land Acquisition and Access Restriction of Resources

Applicability

Watershed development on communal land may result in loss of access to natural resources/assets, for example, restriction towards free grazing on the communal land. For example, area closures affect negatively the livelihood of farmers by denying open and immediate access to grazing land. However, the same area closure benefits the farmer by allowing the area to grow feed and become beneficiaries of it. Therefore, the compensation for the change in livelihood is to assure farmers benefits from the feed grown in the area closure in the form of cut and carry.

Moreover, there could be land acquisition related to Program interventions that might be induced by infrastructural development (including facilities for WUAs). Further, land use planning may potentially induce land use change and subsequent land take. For such instances, the kebele or woreda administration will grant land for land with equal productivity replacement land. If replacement land is not available, it can be treated under the country’s proclamation No.455/2005 article 1(1) that states landholding expropriation for public purposes is compensated and a payment is supposed to be paid either in cash or in kind to the owner of a property that is in the expropriated landholding. In addition, there might be investments by the woredas in community infrastructure as an incentive for labor contribution for participatory watershed management which is to be identified in the watershed development and management plans through a community-driven development approach. During this process, there may be land acquisition from individual use right holders farmland that could in turn require compensation or replacement from the communal land. Because of this, the ESSA found that Core Principle 4 is applicable.

a. Strengths

- Integrated watershed management involves protecting and rehabilitating watersheds in a way that increases production, generating both short-term and long-term benefits for people living in the watershed area.
- Watershed development ensures that downstream communities are not adversely affected by land-use practices in the watersheds.
- SLLC have benefits for the land owners in terms of land transactions and access to financing (provide precise information for renters and rentees on the exact size, owners, and location of the plot thereby allowing the parties to enter into a formal or informal contract), land disputes and conflict resolution; land management and soil conservation; agricultural investment and productivity outcomes.

b. Opportunities

- In support of integrating watershed management and land tenure, the four regional governments of Ethiopia have made use of the powers vested in them in the constitution and Proclamation 89/1997 (amended by Proclamation No. 446/2005) to formulate their land policies. These are: Tigray Region (Proclamation No. 23/1997, amended by 239/2013/14), Amhara Region (Proclamation No. 46/2000, amended by 133/2006), Oromia Region (Proclamation No. 56/2002, amended by 130/2007), and SNNPR (Proclamation No. 53/2003, amended by 110/2007) have their own land policies.
- The attention given to the rehabilitation of degraded lands by policy makers has remarkably increased with a lot of success stories achieved in terms of rehabilitation of degraded land and at the same time the commitment of communities and government has attracted many of the international donors to support sustainable land management.
- All regional policies validate state ownership of land and land users only receive usufruct rights to plots of land. The rural land administration and use policy and regulations obligates the land users to maintain the quality of land it owns with proper management. Moreover, the government launched Land administration program i.e., land registration and certification program in 2003. Following the proclamation, regional states issued guidelines for the implementation of land registration and certification.
- Participatory watershed management have also become source of income for an integrated package of many homesteads engaging in poultry and fattening as well as in the production of Gesho (*Rehmannus prinoides*), potato, and maize.

c. Weaknesses/Gaps

- Institutional capacity strengthening of MoA as key implementing entity in participatory watershed management and SLLCs as well as staffing and relevant trainings need to be in place in order to meet the requirements of Core Principle 4 (staffing, watershed development guideline and systematic procedure on voluntary land or land based asset donations protocol). There is a staffing gap at MoA and its counterparts at all levels on social and environmental safeguards; and especially there are no Social Development Officer at various levels of the land administration and use as well as agricultural offices and in the environmental protection authorities except environmentalist. The related specialists where available especially at regional level are not trained or qualified to handle tasks in social and environmental safeguards management because the assignment and focus of such staff differ from safeguards. To address any legacy issues related to land acquisition and access restriction of watershed development that may benefit from existing or supported by the CALMP, a social and environmental due diligence assessment is required to ensure whether the acquired land if any follows World Bank PforR financing Core Principle 4-Land Acquisition and Loss of Access to Natural Resources. The due diligence assessment will identify proportional gap filling actions.

- The watershed development program lacks integration of homestead development, introduction of technologies that increase productivity, a clear strategy on forage development and other off-farm activities.
- Public mobilization withdraws local community from livelihoods and affects their time from social networking, labor rent and collection of wood for fuel.
- Lack of a clear understanding of the return of soil and water conservation measures and at the same time they have a long term return which is derived from the rehabilitated lands. But the Ethiopian subsistence farmers need some form of livelihood option in a short period of time that can support their current needs.

a. Risks/Threats

In relative terms, risks related to land acquisition is minimal but the idea of voluntary individual land donation for roads that connect two watersheds may affect individual livelihoods and whenever it passes through area closure may again affect rehabilitated areas. Inability to consult with, rehabilitate and adequately compensate affected people while acquiring land for the project activities will adversely affect livelihoods and living standards of displaced people. The overall risks are deemed to be **‘moderate’**.

b. Actions

- Improve community mobilization, sensitization and involvement and in the meantime strengthening the community members that they should not be regarded as beneficiaries of a government program, but rather as key stakeholders and partners in the conservation of their land in a manner that also has significant positive impacts on their livelihoods.
- There is a need to look at the administrative capacity of land administrations to ensure that they are able to handle the new tasks that are put on their shoulders with the most recent land proclamations emphasizing land use planning, formal registration of all land rental transactions, and monitoring and enforcing sustainable land use.
- The Local universities and ATVETs may take action to provide training and build capacity to help fill the gaps with respect to legal competence and services as well as in the development process of watershed and second level landholding certificates participating EIAR and MoA. They should strengthen implementation of livestock breed improvement with adequate input supply and fodder development using different options, creating adaptive management and regulation of communal grazing systems to the extent of developing policy actions on communal land tenure, and building technical capacity that should be considered as important elements to increase adaptive capacity and enhance future livestock production system. It should be linked to the LFSDP project, as the main focus here is on sustainable land management practices, land use and certification systems. Thus, appropriate livestock management practices will reduce the pressure of free grazing, consequently minimizing the destruction of rehabilitated lands as a result of participatory watershed management activities on soil and water conservation and ensure its sustainability.

Core Principle 5: Social Considerations – Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups

Applicability

In Ethiopia, there are people who are vulnerable and underserved that need special attention. In the 1997 Cultural Policy of Ethiopia and the 2014 Social Protection Policy, vulnerable groups are identified as children, women, older people, people with disabilities, and the chronically ill people.

In relation to watershed development and SLLCs, there are vulnerable sections of the community that needs attention. For example, SLLCs provide land rights including vulnerable groups such as the elderly

and female-headed households who could rent out land that they can't utilize for a better return than they have been forced to accept before. This allows for more efficient use of land plots and gives landless youth a chance to access land through renting. Although the SLLC manual has been progressively revised including changes to better address the tenure rights of women and the vulnerable, these changes have not yet been fully implemented at the local level. It is important to consider gender equity, equality and social inclusion dimensions that require further work starting with more effective monitoring of the impact of interventions on vulnerable women, and close follow up of adaptive mitigation measures that women would benefit from over the long term, including in the process of WUAs. Participatory watershed management is somehow a forced kind of labour in which it does not give room to resist participation and it increases the burden of women. In addition, even though stakeholders during ESSA consultations could not inform the presence of Gender Based Violence (GVB), the DHS (2016) study in the four regions consulted for this assessment revealed the existence of GVB. Thus, core principle 5 is applicable to the analysis of CALMP.

a. Strengths

- There have been experiences participating women and youth to reflect their concerns during problem identification, planning, implementation, decision making and equal sharing of benefits in the course of watershed development and management.
- In line with the government's decentralization policy, decision making powers in the agricultural and natural resource sector have been delegated from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) down to regional and woreda offices and in some cases up to Kebele level. Unlike other regions, in Amhara region, DAs are assigned up to the kebele government structure.

b. Weaknesses/Gaps:

- Women have been working at least half of the workload men have been doing. However, there was no village-level capacity building.
- Landless youth populations are surging in rural Ethiopia, but their concerns are not well addressed except some allocation of communal lands for apiculture and cut and carry purposes where the actions have not satisfying the youths as the result they are migrating than ever before in search of jobs to other places although they have been participating in the watershed process.
- Poor planning and lack of sustained commitment to address inclusive participation of women, mainly in the visited woredas of Oromia region.
- Though there is a commitment from MoA, there is weak and inconsistent documentation of Watershed data resulted into lack of information about what has worked so far in a documented manner.
- Lack of commitment on the part of implementing agencies to address safeguard issues at all levels. This is manifested in the failure to assign social safeguard experts at regional, zonal and woredas.
- Low participation of women in the leadership positions particularly at watershed community committee although the bylaws in the guideline of community based participatory watershed development granted 50% of watershed committee would be women referring from GTP III. In some institutions, there is a lack of commitment to establish gender units. Meanwhile, in institutions where units have been established, their role in promoting women's leadership in watershed development is often compromised by lack of qualified personnel and inadequate budget allocation and their participation is low in decision-making. The CALM Program will reinforce and extend the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing Social Accountability Implementing Partners (SAIPs) at woreda-level from civil society to strengthen the participation of women.
- There are a number of challenges related to coordination among stakeholders working on women in watershed development and SLLCs that is not consistent in its practical sense when it is seen from national direction; lack of sustainability of interventions; and duplication of efforts, which can lead to inefficiencies.
- There is gender imbalance in the process of decision making of sharing benefits from the rehabilitated land from watershed management.

c. Risks/Threats

- Failure to address male capture of community institutions and decision making at the various committee established at local levels particularly at the watershed and kebele development committee levels. Even though there is a claim that 50% of the committee members in the watershed are women, the ESSA found that in some watershed committee even no women in the committee and whenever they are included their number is 2 or 3.
- There is a risk of little consideration of vulnerable groups during participatory watershed management and SLLCs in consultation, participation, awareness creation and benefit sharing.

d. Actions

- Serious consideration of the legal frameworks that are in place to support vulnerable groups and make use of procedures for equitable and fair treatment.
- Provide training and capacity building for vulnerable groups in wide-ranging consultations in order to benefit them from the program and to make clear application of procedures for equitable access in the program in understanding policies and guidelines to ensure equitable treatment of vulnerable groups that may be affected by activities of watershed development as well as SLLCs. The trainings should also ensure that they are in compliance on inclusion, community consultations, gender, land acquisition, benefit sharing, and provision of services to vulnerable groups and households.
- Strengthening of engagement with landholders particularly women in male-headed households and vulnerable groups, enhanced public awareness on gender equality and social inclusion as well as building facilitation and communication skills of staff to ensure effective participation of women and vulnerable groups are some additional proposals to address the challenges the program will face during implementation.
- Facilitate community consultations targeting vulnerable groups to effectively use community organizations such as women groups, youth groups and other community forums and ensure whether they are adequately represented in the arrangements for the provision of compensation or other aspects in the program.
- Prioritize the training of women and community members on the need for and benefit of vulnerable groups involvement in compensation and livelihood restoration process as deemed necessary.
- Create awareness on grievance redress mechanism to the community about the procedures for accessing GRM, understanding how the GRM functions, timelines, etc.
- Participation of women in the committee should be strengthened to reflect their concerns in watershed benefit sharing and during SLLC planning and implementation.
- Benefits to the elderly, people with disability, the poor during participatory watershed management activities, which can be realized by making consultation and participation to be inclusive in the design of the program that help consider their needs
- Better coordination and communications between implementers (MoA) and Offices of Land administrations and Use, Offices of Labor and Social Affairs as well as Women and Children Affairs in order to help in identifying vulnerable groups and underserved people in potential project areas.

Core Principle 6: Social Considerations – Social Conflict

Applicability

The program yields significant social benefits to the local community members or farmers, particularly those living in the watershed considering equitable share of vulnerable groups to get support in their land during participatory watershed management in their farmland. Moreover, it strengthens the social bond of the local community as they get together during the period of participatory watershed management during

start and end of public mobilization works. The program can also advance their sense of ownership towards watershed and in turn help rehabilitate degraded landscapes in addition to the tenure security they could get in SLLCs. However, there can be complaints and/or conflict from local communities participating in the watershed management and receiving SLLCs related to basic resource sharing and absence of meeting the needs of vulnerable groups.

Rural communities' livelihood in Ethiopia is mostly derived from land. Considering this, it is argued that land-related conflicts over use right title and use as well as boundary disputes (mainly during adjunction process such as problems arising from replacement and wrong spell of names, incorrect land measurement and sometimes problem of locating the right landholding) have prevailed and undermine productive activities. Moreover, there are conflicts due to inequitable benefit sharing, forced labor mobilization, inability to enforce bylaws and damage of soil and water conservation structures. More to the point, there has not been well established GRM structure for participatory watershed management.

The issue of social tension in some areas can also significantly affect the capacity of the program to deliver services, particularly in regions with the highest social tensions such as parts of Oromia, Amhara and SNNP. This is related to the current political instability in the country that cause difficulty to move from place to place for experts to effect their duties , particularly travelling to woredas and kebeles mainly working on sensitive issues, which is related to land. Such disturbances are not directly related to the program, but affect its implementation. Thus, core principle 6 is applicable.

a. Strengths

- The National proclamations are applicable in all regional states of Ethiopia. The existence of the legal frameworks is an opportunity that can serve as a basis to address complaints and conflicts related to program implementation.
- In connection with conflict resolution and grievance redress mechanisms, if misunderstandings and disputes arise (e.g. implementing agencies and affected parties) during CALMP implementation or impact of the program, the preferred means of settling disputes is through Social courts at the local level. If the complainer is not satisfied with the decision of the arbitration committee, the case may be referred to woreda and to the High Court. Customary institutions have traditionally played an important role in the settlement of disputes involving rural land in the catchment areas. The designation and composition of these customary/informal conflict mediation institutions may slightly vary between regions/catchments. Community trust and respect are crucial requirements that mediators must meet to be effective in land dispute settlement process. As the result, elders, family councils/trusted relatives, religious leaders, *idirs*, *etc.* have won increased community acceptance and recognition in the settlement of land-related disputes. In fact, courts-regular as well as quasi-formal refer disputants to these institutions to seek resolution for their disagreements in the first instance.
- In some areas participation of households in the implementation of watershed development activities has been considered as a must to do work and has been facilitated through local community organizations, development groups and 1 to 5 work forces. This has indirectly considered as an enforcement mechanism to engage households for common actions.
- The ones listed with respect to Core Principle 5 will also be applied.

b. Weaknesses/Gaps

- There is lack of well-established and actively functioning GRM system under MoA.
- CALMP ESSA found out absence of especially social safeguard experts at MoA and its counterpart regional bureaus that are fully committed to safeguard issues during program implementation as a responsible person at least at regional level.

- Capacity limitations include human resources, equipment, communications, machinery, furniture and other facilities in various organizations, particularly related to SLLCs and watershed management. Absence of central coordination and/or focal person of sectors who creates perception and team spirit to capitalize group knowledge and common practices towards community watershed development are observed in almost all Woreda of the study watersheds.
- Institutions are not fully functional and are less effective in practicing community bylaws, awareness creation, coordination, convincing the community for action, and implementation of zero grazing. Some local institutions perceive communal lands are protected by government or recruited paid guards and no surveillance is made by the general public.
- Level of participation in the watershed management vary depending on the capacity of local institutions where there are passive local leaders and whenever people living in the area are relatively reluctant to engage in voluntary activities, there has been low record of participatory watershed activities.

c. Opportunities

- Strong legal framework, policies and institutional framework for land management, decentralized planning and social inclusion provides opportunities to create formal and informal mechanisms at the grassroots to ensure that processes for demand responsive planning, community participation, rights of the vulnerable, accountability and transparency are facilitated.
- MoA has a good experience from the federal to the local level through which disputes can be solved, particularly focusing on land administration and watershed management. Disputes that cannot be resolved through local negotiation should be resolved based on regional land administration laws. This means if it is not resolved at local social court, then appeal to the woreda court, and if the two first decisions are different it is possible to appeal to the higher court. This procedure of appealing complaints or grievances could also serve as a mechanism to redress any issues related to CALMP.

d. Risks/Threats

- Whenever there will be unfair benefits sharing from watershed development, there would be possibility of compliant and conflict during CALMP implementation and become obstacle for sustainability;
- A plot of land registered by names of more than one land users by only changing the boundary in the certificate but in real grounds which leads them into conflicts.
- There is also a risk of putting wrong names in the certificate due to encoders inability of the local language, mainly this issue was raised in Wolita zone, Boditi Woreda
- Social court judges typically make decisions based on traditions rather than the law that may make it difficult for women to get support according to the law and may also be difficult for them to take their case to the woreda court due to social pressures and consequently they many give up appealing cases.
- There is a risk of boundary disputes over communal lands. This has been increasing interest of the landholders to takeover communal land and uses it as a private land. Moreover, the land transaction process (renting, donation, inheritance, and buying use right) and the high demand for arable land are the main causes of land related conflict and land tenure insecurity.

e. Actions

The following actions are required to be implemented:

- Strengthening the GRM established under the MoA that will also address any conflict or complaints related to the proposed CALMP; awareness rising on GRM to the community to create awareness about the procedures for accessing GRM, understanding how the GRM functions, timelines, etc; with the rolling out of the GRM operational manual of the ESPES program can be customized during the implementation of CALMP.

- Affected communities should be properly consulted and the consultations need to be documented;
- Mutual agreements and local elders can be used to resolve watershed and land certification related conflicts.
- Vulnerable groups such as women, elderly, and disabled people should receive special support;
- Training program on social aspects to inform Program implementing organizations about key social issues such as equity, benefit sharing; social inclusion processes and procedures; roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.
- There have been local grievances regarding broad governance issues, land use and land conversions in some areas of the country. The current political situations/tensions can significantly affect the capacity of the program to deliver services in particular in the regions with the highest social tensions. So, the program should consider consolidating grassroots institutions such as rural land dispute adjudication and grievance redress structures. Strengthening such establishments also plays an important role in making sure that women who lease their land in sharecropping arrangements will not unfairly lose their landholding rights because of the breach of agreements in the land registration and certification process.
- The ones listed with respect to distributional equity under Core Principle 5 will also apply.

8. Capacity and Performance Assessment of Key Program Implementing Agencies

8.1 Ministry of Agriculture

The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for a broad array of agricultural production and research, food security, poverty reduction, natural resource management and rural development programs and activities. The regional Bureaus of Agriculture are directly involved in delivery of programs with Woredas, in keeping with the decentralization strategy and the government's Growth and Transformation Plan. The following are duties and responsibilities according to Proclamation number 916/2015 Definition of Powers and Duties of the Executive Organs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Proclamation, article 19, December 2015.

- promote sustainable natural resources development and protection and, expansion of agro-forestry;
- design mechanisms for the improvement of soil fertility, soil health protection and for establishing national soil database;
- follow up and provide support in the establishment of a system involving rural land administration and use, and organize a national database;
- establish and direct training centers that contribute to the enhancement of agricultural development and the improvement of rural technologies;
- ensure the proper execution of functions relating to agricultural research and agricultural investment;
- coordinate activities relating to food security and job creation in the rural setting; and
- promote the expansion of extension and training services provided to farmers, pastoralists, private investors and urban communities engaged in urban agriculture to improve the production and productivity of crops;
- establish a system to ensure that any crop product supplied to the market maintains its quality standard; and follow up the implementation of same;
- conduct quarantine on plants and seeds brought into or taken out of the country;
- establish a system to control the outbreak of plant diseases and migratory pests;
- build capacity for supplying, distributing and marketing of crop production inputs to ensure the reliability of their supply; establish and follow up the implementation of a system for quality control;
- ensure the proper administration and control of pesticides;

- promote the expansion of effective technologies to ensure crop productivity and quality; facilitate to expand horticulture development;
- ensure the proper execution of functions relating to coffee and tea development and marketing activities;
- promote the expansion of cooperative societies;
- facilitate enabling environment for the provision of rural credit facilities and the accessibility of same to farmers;
- establish a system whereby stakeholders of crop research coordinate their activities and work in collaboration;
- expand small-scale irrigation schemes development;

The powers and duties given to the Ministry of Agriculture by the provisions of other laws, currently in force, with respect to matters relating to crop and natural resource are also given to the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources by the present proclamation.

8.2 Institutional arrangements and functions of Watershed Development and management

The institutional arrangement has a paramount importance in implementing developmental works especially for watershed development program. Institutional arrangement characterizes the process of sub-watershed development from preparation to implementation to post implementation. These institutional arrangements are watershed committee, one to five group, *ye limat budin* (Development group), youth associations, women association, and Kebele administration. Regarding the overall arrangement and the interaction among them, one to five arrangements is comprised of 6 members and one is the leader. *Ye limat budin* is comprised of a group of one to five arrangements consisting of 5 to 6 members.

i. Watershed Committee

Watershed committee is a group of people comprised of different representatives from the community. There are different watershed committees at different levels. These are woreda watershed committee, Kebele watershed committee and sub-watershed committee at village level. The watershed committee at woreda level consists of woreda officials representing the various sector woreda offices having different disciplines. These include: experts from soil and water conservation, agro-forestry, crops, livestock, irrigation, and agronomy, gender expert from office of agriculture, public work coordinator and experts from office of cooperatives. Whereas, Kebele watershed committee is comprised of (a) DA especially that of the natural resources sectors, (b) chairperson of the Kebele, (c) youth representative, (d) women representative, (e) woreda expert, (f) religious leaders, and (g) selected elders. Furthermore, sub-watershed committee at village level is comprised of DAs, youth representatives, women representatives, selected elders, religious leaders and Kebele cabinet.

Role and responsibilities: Major responsibilities of the WC involves creating a development army by identifying the active labor force; strengthening organizational arrangements; organization of awareness creation trainings that fill attitudinal gaps for top 5 and 10 farmers, model farmers and the community at village level; mobilizing the organized active labor force; monitoring, supporting, evaluating activities and supervise to ensure that the watershed resources and soil conservation measures are utilized and function according to the agreed bylaws.

ii. Development group (Ye limat budin)

This institutional arrangement is comprised of a group of one to five teams. One development group (*ye limat budin*) is formed by five to seven teams of one to five. In general, one development group (*ye limat budin*) is comprised of 30 to 42 individuals. **Role and responsibilities:** The identification of active labor

force; handover and takeover of daily share of work to and from the 1:5 work teams; reporting and evaluating of the daily work; and participate in the quality control activities. Community mobilization, awareness creation, evaluation of daily work performance and provision of feedbacks are the tasks of the development group which are complemented by the kebele command post and kebele administration.

iii. One to five team

It is the lowest level institutional arrangement. It is a team of five to six individuals that is organized based on neighborhood, i.e., geographical proximity. It is established for carrying out various social and economic tasks. The social tasks undertaken by this group include maintaining peace and security in their area. Among the economic tasks, they involve in infrastructural and social services construction, sub-watershed development, undertaking agricultural activities and so on. The **role and responsibilities include:** 1:5 team formations and enhanced effective labor mobilization and control, information flow, equal share of work among the members, easily introduce quality control mechanisms, facilitate competitive motivation, build sense of individual responsibility, and reinforce effective collective action towards achieving common goals. Here there are **Youth association** at kebele level are engaged in implementation of the sub-watershed development activities. For the youth association, a parcel of land allocated to develop both physical and biological structures. The same is true for **Women association** participating in the implementation phase. The sub-watershed committee in each kebele assigns a particular area of land for the women association to develop both physical and biological SWC structures.

8.3 Ethiopian Agriculture Research Institute (EARI)

The Ethiopian Agricultural Research is one of the oldest and largest agricultural research systems in Africa. Ethiopian Agricultural Research System (EARS) has evolved through several stages since its first initiation during the late 1940s, following the establishment of agricultural and technical schools at Ambo and Jimma. In 1955, a full-fledged agricultural experiment station was established at Debre Zeit (now named Debre Zeit Agricultural Research Center) under the then Imperial College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts (now called Haramaya University) and had been continued as the major research entity until the mid-1960s. In 1966, Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR) was established as the first nationally coordinated agricultural research system in Ethiopia. Institute of Agricultural Research (IAR) was established with a mission to formulate national agricultural research guidelines, coordinate National Agricultural Research System, and undertake research in its centers and sub-centers located in various agro-ecological zones of Ethiopia.

In Ethiopia, agricultural research underwent significant reform in the early 1990s following the declaration of a decentralized political system of Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. The National Agricultural Research System has prearranged as including the Federal Research Institute, the Regional Agricultural Research Institutes (RARIs) and research undertakings of Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs). In 1993, numbers of IAR centers were transferred to the regional governments and become independent research centers. During this time, Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization (EARO) has established with new set up in 1997 by Proclamation number 79/1997 and later it is renamed as the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR) on 25th October 2005.

As per this Proclamation, its objectives are (1) to generate, develop and adapt agricultural technologies that focus on the needs of the overall agricultural development and its beneficiaries; (2) to coordinate technically the research activities of Ethiopian Agricultural Research System; (3) build up a research capacity and establish a system that will make agricultural research efficient, effective and based on development needs; and (4) popularize agricultural research results. Research directorates are answerable

to the Deputy Director General for Research (DDG-R) guide, coordinate and oversee research in their respective directorates.

8.4 Institutional Arrangements for CALM Program Implementation

Institutional responsibility for leading and coordinating action on SLM is the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA). Under the MoA, the Natural Resource Management and Food Security Directorate (NRMFSD) and Rural Land Administration and Use Directorate (RLAUD) are instrumental. At regional and local level, support is channeled and delivered by regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoAs) and Bureaus of Land Administration and Use (BLAUs), and land administration and utilization offices at the woreda level (equivalent to district).

At the federal level, the existing institutional mechanisms already established to provide oversight and policy direction on SLM will be continued. These are the Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) Platform, the National SLM Steering Committee and the National SLM Technical Committee, all hosted by MoA. The National SLM Steering Committee, chaired by the State Minister for Natural Resources Management in MoA, is responsible for the following tasks: (a) providing policy guidance, oversight and overall supervision for program implementation; (b) reviewing and approving annual work plans and budgets; (c) reviewing and approving annual performance reports, and overseeing the execution of any corrective actions that may be designed.

At the regional and zonal levels, implementation of the ESIF is supported by regional SLM steering and technical committees, which oversee execution of annual regional work plans and achievement of results. The regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoAs) and Bureaus of Land Administration and Use (BLAU) serve as the link between the federal, zonal and woreda institutions, reviewing and consolidating annual work plans and budgets submitted by the woredas. BoAs and BLAUs also review and approve implementation progress reports originating from the woredas.

At the woreda and kebele levels, planning and execution of activities under the Program is undertaken jointly by the woreda offices of agriculture and land administration, Development Agents (DAs) and communities. With the implementation of the RLAS, the effectiveness of the land administration process will be enhanced based on the principle of kebele land administration offices providing front-office functions, and the woreda land administration office fulfilling a back-office role. A woreda-level SLM core team is responsible for, among others: (i) participating in the selection and prioritization of community watersheds in the woreda; (ii) organizing orientation and training of DAs in watershed planning and implementation; and (iii) assisting DAs in the establishment of WUAs, preparation of watershed management plans, and in the review of their implementation.

At the community level, Community Watershed Teams (CWTs) are responsible for the implementation of watershed management plans developed in a participatory manner by the community, DAs and the Woreda SLM core team. Once the CWMU Proclamation is issued, it is anticipated that the CWTs will be replaced by duly constituted WUAs, with a greater role in the design and implementation arrangements for WMPs, helping ensure that these are more participatory in nature, better reflecting local priorities, rather than the current process through which targets are established through a top-down process.

9. Analysis of the Environmental and Social Systems Management of Implementing Agencies

9.1 Staff Capacity for Environmental and Social Management in MoA and Regional BoAs

The MoA is one of the delegated institutions by the EFCCC to review and approve ESIA reports prepared for development projects in the agriculture sector. Though it is used to have a department that review and

approve ESIA reports for agriculture investment projects, the current organizational structure of the Ministry does not consist of a section or unit for environmental and social management. The Ministry has a dedicated directorate for CRGE but appears to be engaged more on running CRGE related programs and projects. However, some directorates of MoA have environment and social development specialists who are permanent employees. For example, the Natural Resource Management and Food Security Directorate of MoA, which is one of the responsible directorates for implementation of the CALM Program component related to Watersheds, have three permanent environmentalist and social development specialist staffs who coordinate and supervise the implementation of ESMF for the PSNP and the phased out SLMP-II projects. Public financed projects such as the Watershed development works carried by participatory watershed management are not covered neither by the ESMFs nor the national requirements for environmental assessment and hence not supervised by the staffs.

Regarding Land administration and use directorate of the MoA, which is the other directorate responsible for implementation of the CALM Program component related to SLLCs and NRLAIS, appears to have no dedicated staff for carrying environmental and social management systems for projects run by the directorate.

Though it appears that the MoA lacks an organized unit/department that run environmental and social management systems at the Ministry level, the presence of environmental and social staffs in the Natural Resource Management and Food Security Directorate coupled with existence of project such as PSNP has contributed towards developing its exposure and experiences on World Bank safeguard policies and procedures through ESMF implementation practices in the past few years. Thus, there are opportunities for the current CALM program to build upon the existing experiences of the Directorate to implement its safeguard instruments during the program periods.

At regional level, the Bureaus of Agriculture and Natural Resource also have environment focal persons designated/employed to support and supervise implementation of PSNP and AGP ESMFs. The woreda agriculture and natural resource offices generally lack dedicated environmental and social development focal persons and implementation of ESMF is generally handled by the natural resource experts present in the woreda and kebele offices.

9.2 Performance of Environmental and Social Management System at Regional and Woreda Level

In the context of the CALM Program, where most subprojects are to be carried in rural kebeles, the regional, zonal and woreda environment protection offices are going to play a major role during the implementation of the ESSA and its associated guidelines. For that reason, it will be more important to focus on the capacities, performances and challenges of these regional, zonal and woreda level environment protection institutions which will be directly involved in the daily review and approval of the environmental and social assessment instruments for sub-projects.

Overall, the regional environmental agencies, to which the woreda environment offices are horizontally accountable, are responsible for coordination, implementation, review and revision of regional EIA systems as well as environmental monitoring, protection and regulation. Specifically, Proclamation 299/2002 gives regional environmental agencies the responsibility to evaluate ESIA reports of projects that are licensed, executed or supervised by regional states and that are not likely to generate inter-regional impacts. Regional environmental agencies are also responsible for monitoring, auditing and regulating implementation of such projects. The institutional standing of regional environmental agencies varies among regions. In some regions, they are established as separate Environment forest and climate change institutions; while in others they are within Regional Sector Bureaus (e.g., Bureau of Land Use Administration).

It was observed during the ESSA assessment that all the six regional states under consideration have established their own Environment Protection Authorities (REPA) since long time. In particular the REPA's in five of the six regional states have expanded their structures down to the woreda level, which creates conducive situation for implementation of the proposed CALM program ESSA on the ground at woreda levels (see table 5). Though the woreda environment protection offices are vertically accountable to their respective woreda administrator, they are also horizontally accountable to the zone and regional REPAs and hence report to them. The Gambella regions REPA exists at regional bureau level only and have delegated the woreda office of agriculture and natural resources to act on its behalf.

Table 5: Summary of Existing Institutions and Critical Legislations for Environmental and Social Management at Regional Level.

Region	Responsible Regional Environment Bureau/Agency	EIA Regulations enacted at regional level	Other Environmental Key Management Legislations/guidelines			Remarks
			Pollution Control	Solid Waste Management	Regional guideline for EIA	
Oromia	Oromia EFCCA	Yes	Yes	No	No	-It has zonal and woreda level Environment Offices
Tigray	Tigray EPLAUA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Draft	-Apply Federal EIA procedural guideline - Has woreda level Environment Offices
Amhara	Amhara EFWPPDA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-EIA guideline Directive 01/2010 - It has zonal and woreda level Environment Offices
SNNPR	SNNPR EFCCA	No (Draft level)	No (Draft level)	No	No	-Apply Federal EIA law & guideline. - It has zonal and woreda level Environment Offices
Benishangul Gumuz	Benshangul Gumuz EPLAIB	No (Draft level)	No	No	No	-Apply Federal EIA law & guideline -It has zonal and woreda level Environment Offices
Gambella	Gambella EPFCC	No (Draft level)	No	No	No	-Apply Federal EIA law & guideline. -It has no zonal and woreda level Environment Offices

Regarding existing experiences, at regional levels, the activities of the six target REPAs and the zonal and woreda environment offices under them in enforcing the environmental and social management systems in their respective jurisdictions are increasingly growing over the years. The implementation of multiple World Bank financed programs such as PSNP, SLMP, ULGDP, DRDIP, AGP, One Wash programs, etc. in the regions have already created practical experiences in the review and approval of E&S screening reports and environmental performance monitoring of ESIA/ESMPs. The awareness and application of ESMF, ESSA, ESMSG requirements from the past and present World Bank financed programs in the head offices and zonal branches of REPAs has comparatively increased. To some extent, the REPAs also conduct environmental monitoring of sub-projects based on the approved ESMPs. With the rolling out of the ESMS operational manual of the ESPES program, some of the REPAs of the above listed six regions are also continuing their efforts to expand the EIA enforcement practices to the public sector investment projects. For example, the Amhara region EFWPPDA stated that with the support of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development it has already given training to representatives and relevant staff of the five sectors (i.e. Bureaus of Agriculture, Health, Education, Water resources and Road development) to help them start implement the ESMS operational manual. The same trainings are reported to have been delivered in Tigray to the specified public sectors by the regional EPLAUA.

The involvement and implementation practices of the environmental and social management systems at woreda level environment protection offices vary among the CALM program regions. The woreda environment protection offices in Amhara region appears to have advanced experiences by undertaking the review and approval of World Bank and government financed sub-projects and issue environmental clearance certificates. Such sub-projects for which environmental clearance certificates are issued by the woreda environment offices include Watershed Development Projects done by participatory watershed management. In Tigray, Oromia and SNNPR the woreda environment protection offices undertake the review and approval of schedule-III (Category-C) subproject E&S screening reports (e.g. review of AGP, SLMP and DRDIP sub-projects) and also carry environmental performance monitoring. Similar woreda environment protection offices in Benishangul region do not play any active role in the review, approval and follow up monitoring processes. Except in Amhara Region, the PSNP sub-project E&S screening reports are generally not submitted to the woreda environment protection offices for review and approval.

Role in the Implementation of the CALM program: The woreda and zonal environment protection offices under the REPAs will be responsible to discharge their regulatory services to the proposed CALM program sub-projects through the review, approval and implementation monitoring of E&S screening reports and ensuing EMPs as appropriate. Following the E&S screening of watershed development plans and other related sub-projects of the CALM program, the woreda and zonal environment protection offices will review and approve it and will issue an environmental permit/clearance where applicable. The woreda and zonal environment protection offices in collaboration with REPA head offices will undertake environmental monitoring and audits where required to ensure that the implementing agencies are complying with their Environmental Management Plans (EMPs). Table 3 shows the existing competent environment authorities at regional and woreda levels and the status of regional environmental regulations that define the applicable environmental and social management systems in the regions.

9.3 CALM Program Grievance Redress Mechanism

According to the findings of CALMP ESSA, the grievance redress mechanisms in the watershed development of participatory watershed management activities and second level land certificate processes has been found weak. Some of the main weaknesses of the GRM system identified are as follows:

- Nonexistence of recorded and compiled data showing the type, volume, frequency and handling of the complaints made,

- Absence of in-built and independent GRM structure established for the purpose of responding to complaints and grievances arising in the implementation of participatory watershed management and SLLCs,
- Low awareness and knowledge on the part of regional, woreda and kebele implementing agencies in relation to the requirements and relevance of having a working GRM system,
- Low attention to the side of MoA to make sure that a functional GRM structure is in place to effectively address the complaints and grievances of affected groups in the process of participatory watershed management and provision of SLLCs.
- Lack of social development specialists assigned as a focal person at the regional and woreda levels to coordinate and monitor the proper addressing of social issues including complaints and grievances even at the MoA, there has not been a strong social safeguard team established to follow and redress grievances.

Some of the grievances and complaints manifested during watershed development and SLLCs have been treated through the general Ethiopian grievance redress systems as part of robust risk mitigation measures and uses local institutions as relevant. It was not passing through organized and structured system operated for that purpose. Thus, it is necessary to establish structured grievance redress mechanism by MoA from the Federal down to the *Woreda* levels in collaboration with World Bank.

Communities in the study regions confirmed that their participation in the participatory watershed management activities has passed through problem identification, preparation, work plan, implementation, monitoring, operation and maintenance. The planning process has followed a bottom-up approach to lay foundation for all the interventions and to ensure sustainability. Since the whole process has been participatory and transparent, the occurrence of complaint is very rare. Even though the existence of complaints has been minimal, a functional GRM system which serves as a guideline should be prepared as discussed with participants from regional, zonal, woreda and kebele levels natural resources, land administration, and experts. Thus, a clear GRM with plausible process should be put in place to address unpredicted events in all watersheds and SLLCs. Thus, the GRM guideline should include the procedures, focal persons and timeframe at each level of the administrative hierarchy.

Awareness creation training should be given to responsible woreda experts of relevant stakeholder offices and development agents (DA). Communities should be aware of the mechanism how and where to apply whenever they have complaints in relation to participatory watershed management activities of the program during preparation, implementation and operation phases. They should have access to the mechanism and get responses. Some of the complaints that need to be addressed by GRM include but not limited to be targeting for IGA and/or benefit sharing, targeting for SWC activities on communal land, boundary related issues, free grazing, etc. It is therefore necessary to use the grievance redress mechanism to address all complaints arising from CALMP activity implementations. Any person within CALMP targeted watershed and users of SLLCs that has complaints regarding the activities of the CALMP during preparation, implementation and operation phases shall have access to the Mechanism.

The MoA/CALMP in collaboration with concerned regional and woreda (Bureau of Agriculture, and Woreda Agricultural Office, Woreda Land Administration and Use) will make the public aware of the GRM through awareness creation forums, training and capacity building. Any person who has complaints regarding the activities of the CALM program during preparation, implementation and operation phases shall have access to the mechanism. Contact details in support of the mechanism will be publicly disclosed and posted in the offices of concerned woreda offices, kebele administration, kebele development centers/agriculture office and Farmers Training Centers (FTC). These will also be incorporated in the CALMP environment and social safeguard information materials such as reports, brochures, flyers and posters.

Complaints can be communicated in written form using the standard complaint form to participatory watershed management team. All received complaints and responses given should be documented and copies sent to kebele watershed team. At community watershed team level unresolved complaints (if the complainant is not satisfied) will be brought to traditional grievance redress institution (depending on specific locality) and investigated and resolved. All received complaints and responses should be documented and copies sent to kebele watershed team, kebele administration and woreda Agriculture office. Complaints unresolved at traditional grievance redress institution level (if the complainant is not satisfied) will be brought to kebele watershed team and investigated and resolved. All received complaints and responses should be documented and copies sent to community watershed team and woreda Agriculture Office. Complaints unresolved at kebele watershed team level (if the complainant is not satisfied) will be brought to woreda Agriculture Office. At woreda level, all received complaints, which are unresolved at kebele watershed team level will be reviewed by the woreda Agriculture office and sent to woreda steering committee for investigation and final decision.

Generally, the process of grievance redress will start with registration of the grievance to be addressed, for reference purposes, and to enable progress updates of the cases. The Register should contain a record of the person responsible for an individual complaint, and records of date for the complaint reported; date the Grievance Logged; date information on proposed corrective action sent to complainant (if appropriate), the date the complaint was closed out and the date response was sent to complainant. The Kebele, *Woreda* and regions should compliant lodger keep a journal with recording all grievances, date and results of the closure with all supporting documents available (completed compliant logging forms, decision minutes, emails, etc.) and ensure that each complaint has an individual reference number, and is appropriately tracked and recorded actions are completed. To this effect, a GRM with clear timeline and responsibility is required at different levels to be transparent, accountable and responsive.

GRM at Community Watershed Level: First Complaint Form will be completed by any interested person or complainant and submitted to the community watershed team. Second, the community watershed team will review, investigate and discuss on the issue and resolve the matter within three to five days from the date of application is received. The decision will be provided in written form to the complainant. All meetings/discussions will be recorded, documented and copies of the minutes will be sent to Kebele watershed team. Third, up on the decision made, the community watershed team will act accordingly to the appeal or compliant. All meetings will be recorded and filed. At the same time copies of the minutes of meetings will be provided to Kebele Agriculture Office (Development Agent), Kebele administration and other concerned stakeholders. Finally, if the complainant is not satisfied by the response given by traditional grievance redress institution or if no response is received within ten days, the affected persons can appeal to the Kebele watershed committee.

GRM at the Kebele Watershed Team Level: The first step is completing appeal form by any interested person or complainant and submits to watershed team. Second, the kebele watershed team up on the appeal or complaint received from complainant and document which is transferred from traditional grievance redress institution will review and further investigate. If the decision given at traditional grievance redress institution level is appropriate, the KWT will approve it; otherwise if the appeal is valid, the team will resolve the issue within seven days from the date the application is received. The decision will be provided in written form to the applicants and copies will be sent to CWT and to Woreda agriculture office. All meetings will be recorded and filed. Finally, if the complainant is not satisfied by the response given by Kebele watershed team or if no response is received from the Kebele watershed team within seven days after the registration of complaint, the complainant can appeal to the Woreda Agriculture office.

GRM at the Woreda Level: The first step is completing appeal form by any interested persons or complainant and submits to Climate Resilient Landscape Management Program (CALMP) focal person at

Woreda Agricultural Office. Second, up on the appeal or complaint received from complainant, the CALMP focal person at Woreda Office Agriculture records the issues in the registry, assess the appeal or the grievance and will organize meeting(s) for a Woreda steering committee. The Woreda steering committee will review the decision given at Kebele watershed committee level and endorse it if it is appropriate otherwise if the appeal is valid, the Woreda steering committee will resolve the issue and give final decision within 15 days of receiving the appeal or compliant. The decision should be provided to the applicant in written form. All meetings will be recorded, and copies of the minutes will be provided to all concerned stakeholders. Anyone who is not satisfied with the aforementioned steps could follow the formal legal procedures

Given the aforementioned findings on the GRM, it can be noted that the CALM Program will reinforce and extend the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing ESPES Program, which has been using ‘standardized manual for regional public grievance redress offices in Ethiopia’. The ESMSG to be developed will build upon the general regional public grievance redress principles and GRM procedures outlined in the ESPES operational manual for ESMS.

9.4 Proposed Institutional Arrangement for Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation of CALM Program

In the absence of a section or unit for environmental and social management that serves across all the programs and projects of the Ministry of Agriculture and its regional BoANRs, and noting that the available environmental and social safeguard specialists are deployed to coordinate and support implementation of specific projects/programs ESMFs/ESMSGs. This warrants the recommendation that environmental and social safeguard specialists should be hired at federal and regional levels to join as members of the program. These safeguard specialists will be hired to coordinate and support the implementation of the ESSA during CALM program implementation and ensure compliance of the program activities with the PforR core principles.

Moreover, owing to the number of participatory watershed management subprojects that will be implemented in each woreda and the prevailing low capacity for coordinating, supporting, implementing and supervising environmental and social management system requirements in the woreda agriculture and natural resource offices, it is recommended that an environmental and social focal person shall be assigned to interface with the development agents, community watershed committee and other stakeholders involved at kebele level for E&S screening of subprojects. The woreda environment and social focal person will also interface with the woreda environment protection offices to facilitate the verification, review and approval of the E&S screening reports/EMPs and its follow up monitoring. The CALM Program will reinforce and extend the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing ESPES Program at woreda level that are designed to strengthen woreda capacity for management of environmental and social risks which include the appointment, training and performance assessment of environmental and social management specialists at woreda level.

10. Assessment of Existing Environmental and Social Impacts and Risks of the Program

10.1 Background to participatory watershed management

The concept of watershed management was implemented in Ethiopia since 1980s as a way of redressing land degradation following watershed approaches. The major limitation of the past watershed approaches were related to engineering problems, technical solutions for controlling erosion, reducing runoff and flooding, and enhancing groundwater recharge that gave little regard for their impacts on people’s livelihoods, on farm profitability, or on social equity. Thus, the watershed development was applied in a rigid and conventional manner without community participation and with little attention to farmer objectives and farmer knowledge as important reasons for failures. Given these limitations into account, the government of Ethiopia launched a massive community based participatory watershed development

programs since 2010/11 in four regional states: Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples, Oromia, Amhara and Tigray as part of strategy to protect the environment while achieving food security. The farming communities in the rural areas were highly mobilized to implement both physical and biological soil and water conservation measures on farm and communal lands.

As part of the green economy strategy of the country, watershed development was devised as one of the strategy to mitigate climate change in the country. A general direction is also given by the government and accordingly each of the woredas have identified the environmental problems and set priority for action. As opposed to previous watershed development involvements, the existing watershed development has involved various stakeholders. Regarding this, farmers at their watershed levels have been active participant from planning to operational and maintenance stages. Participatory watershed management activities have been implemented in the four regions visited, on the one hand, under the auspices of the government without the provision of any incentive for the farmers but they have been benefiting from rehabilitated farm and communal land with agreed bylaws drafted and approved by the watershed residents. While on the other hand, watershed development campaign works that have been done by projects of World Bank and others have incentivized the farmers who involve in the watershed development activities. The following section discusses about the various phases in undertaking watershed development activities.

Phases of watershed development: preliminary, implementation, operational and maintenance

In carrying out watershed development activities, more or less in the four consulted regions, they have used similar phases that include preliminary, implementation, operational and maintenance as well as evaluation and monitoring stages. During preliminary phase, participants in the discussion described major activities as a prerequisite to be taken into account implementation of watershed development activities such as resource identification, materials for the activities, trainings, and forming institutional arrangements in order to facilitate the activities that mainly relied on establishing and providing responsibility for watershed committee composed of various sections of the community including youths, elderly, both sexes, and the like. During implementation stage, activities undertaken embraces mobilizing the community, define, design layout, construct the physical structures and make use of physical structures with biological stabilizers, handing over and maintenance of the developed physical and biological soil and water conservation structures on the communal as well as private lands. Regarding monitoring and evaluation, there is no clear post monitoring and evaluation strategies recognized at planning stage that ensure efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of watershed development although there has been continuous and intensive monitoring and evaluation watershed development by DAs, kebele and woreda administration officials and experts working in agriculture bureau of natural resource management office.

10.2 Environmental Impacts of Existing Participatory Watershed Management

The overall environmental impacts of the participatory watershed management activities are positive. The positive environmental impacts of the participatory watershed management activities include the following aspects:

- Improvement in vegetation cover of the environment
- Improvement in reducing soil erosion and enhancing soil fertility
- Improvements in reducing surface run off and flooding
- Increase in surface and ground water recharging capacity
- Increasing ground and surface water availability and
- Improvements in biodiversity regeneration.

Communities appear to have realized that the positive environmental impacts attained by the participatory watershed management far outweigh the negative impacts, if any. The improvements in soil and its fertility were reported to be due to increase in vegetation cover and moisture availability. The vegetation cover improvement is also associated with reduced soil erosion, increased infiltration and soil moisture

which support vegetation growth. The physical and biological soil and water conservation structures have contributed in reducing runoff, increasing infiltrations and enriching the springs and smaller tributaries that supply water to rivers. The reduced runoff has also contributed for reduced flooding and siltation. In the watershed development through community mobilization, afforestation was implemented in three ways, i) planting seedlings of exotic and indigenous plants on degraded lands, homesteads and farm borders, ii) closing degraded bare lands for natural rehabilitation from soil seed bank iii) combination of the two. As a result of these reforestation interventions made on the watersheds, improvements in both plant and animal biodiversity are reported to be among the positive environmental outcomes. The observations revealed that it is not only the growth in biomass but also the areas have become green. The changes in vegetation cover have positive impact on climate change by lowering the atmospheric temperature.

10.3 Social Impacts of Existing participatory watershed management and SLLCs

In this section, discussion will be made on the major positive and negative impacts or challenges in relation to existing participatory watershed management and second level landholding certificates.

10.3.1 Positive and Negative/Challenges in the Process of Participatory Watershed Management

The ESSA team discussed with various stakeholders from federal up to watershed committee about social impacts of watershed development during public mobilization. Participatory watershed management approaches integrating soil and water conservation, natural resource use, and livelihood activities were implemented in several micro-watersheds in the visited woredas. The watershed works have also provided positive social impacts through production of economically important goods that are used for livelihood diversification. These include the growing of perennial trees such as hop plant and fruit trees as well as through planting variety of grass species (Sespania, elephant grass, Rodes, etc.). The biological stabilizers have made possible grasses to be available. The availability of grass has lessened the fodder problem of the farmers. The increased production of grasses also helped to increase the productivity of their livestock. Production of the grasses has become important sources of income for the youth as they are sold in the market. The assessment team has also found the increasing achievements of public mobilization in the efforts to carry out physical and biological soil and water conservation activities by establishing more or less effective organizational arrangements from bottom-up structures. It has also developed sense of ownership and increased social bond as the work brings various sections of the community together. This is accompanied by ceremonies during the beginning and end of mass mobilization works. In spite of the many positive efforts that have been achieved in the watershed development and management activities in the past years since its start, there have been major challenges observed in the four regions during the CALM ESSA assessment which are discussed as follows.

In relation to watershed development and management, informants have described several challenges that they encountered during planning, implementation as well as operation and maintenance stages. Some of the challenges encountered in the process of undertaking watershed development and management include: free grazing, lack of legalized bylaw, improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed to watershed user associations, inadequate application of watershed guideline, absence of land use planning, missing to consider the connectivity of two kebeles watersheds, turnover of staffs, particularly development agents, overlap of various rural development activities, as well as poor documentation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation system. For detailed discussions of the challenges in the participatory watershed management listed above, see **Annex-2**.

10.3.2 Second Level Landholding Certificates related Issues

Land administration and management are carried out in the form of private, group, communal and state form of holdings. Private refers that individual landholders are the beneficiaries for the benefits generated out of it; communal holdings represents both controlled or restricted access and open access for collective use of the benefits to identified communities in a village; group use is representing a restricted use of

benefits to a certain group particularly landless and unemployed youths upon the decision made by the Kebele Land Administration Committee in consultation with the Kebele Administration and the community; and state holding represents property rights to government like forest lands and sanctuaries. Regarding the SLLC, in the four regions, informants at different levels from the federal to the woreda stated various advantages of SLLCs, for example, transfer of land in terms of gift, exchange, inheritance, leasing, and using land as collateral to access loans. They further stated that household could get the certificate that recognize the precise geographical locations and sizes of individual farm plots using technologies such as GPS, satellite imagery or orthography.

Informants also described the various negative social impacts or challenges in relation to SLLCs that includes all households to get the chance to have the certificate as it requires a huge budget that left those communities who could not get the chance of the certificate. There were also complaints about the inequality of access to land from some landholders and landless households. Some of the land holders, especially in Amhara region, criticized that family size was not well considered while certifying land. Besides, landless households who were not considered in the land distribution feel neglected by the regional governments in terms of securing access to land in the region through developing different strategies and mechanisms. Furthermore, landless youths have been competing on the available land resources in the form of land rent and sharecropping which in turn affects the share of economic benefits per household and overall livelihood improvement and environmental protection in watersheds. These changes in the study watersheds are explicitly observed and can be explained by the expansion of crop lands to grazing lands and the competition on land rentals and sharecropping. Because of the growing pressure of landless, the local authorities in some Woredas are compelled to redistribute the existing communal lands mainly included in the micro-watershed development to landless youths.

The other issue is related to land disputes. In the case study watersheds, land certification was found important in reducing most of the conflicts over boundaries and land titles between family members and relatives, and gradually reducing risk of encroachment of communal lands by neighboring communities as it is reported by Kebele officials and land administration committee members. However, land disputes have been increasing in a situation when there is lack of appropriate implementation of the laws and low capacity to practice the land administration process. In some circumstances, disputes may arise from the breaking of agreements on customary land transaction/leasing, for example, at Lay Gaint and other areas of watershed land claims arise from landless family members to their parents.

One aspect of tenure security is related to the sense of ownership and security to land use right. In the study watersheds, the provisions laid out in the land registration and certification constitute a significant improvement in securing access to land and tenure use right. Farmers during our discussion indicated that access to land use right gave them the impetus to voluntarily participate in the watershed management activities in general and devote their time and labor as far as they afford, in their farmlands in particular. They further stated that the land certification system have provided and enhanced tenure security through ensuring usufruct rights over land especially on private croplands and homestead lands.

Vulnerable Groups: The program is planned to be implemented in watershed development and on SLLCs, in some of participating woredas there are underserved groups including vulnerable groups: the very poor, women, and children/youth, the elderly, landless youth and persons with disability (PWD) that require special attention in the implementation of the CALM. The Program aims to provide regionally tailored approaches that ensure distributional equality, gender balanced, and culturally appropriate access to the benefits provided by CALM participating women in the watershed and being prioritized them in the SLLCs.

Vulnerable Women: Women play a significant role in agricultural productivity (carrying out an estimated 40-60% of all agricultural labor) but have unequal access to resources and capacity-building opportunities. Female-headed households are more vulnerable to shocks and face multiple challenges that hinder their productivity. Women in polygamous marriages are also vulnerable and disadvantaged as

limited resources need to be shared among different households. This is mainly related to second level landholding certificate in which usufruct right appear only with the husband and first wife. Women participation in participatory watershed management is considered as forced labor and created fatigue on them. Moreover, some women claimed as participatory watershed management activity has been a double burden upon them in addition to the challenges they have been encountering in the house chores.

Vulnerable Children: Vulnerable groups of children include children who lost their parents and have not received their rights of land inherited properly from their parents which sometimes their relatives and other people may have the chance to take their rights. They are found in critical problem. Besides, mothers left their little children at home and participate in participatory watershed management activities in the watershed development and as a result the children lost treatment of their mothers. Moreover, whenever mothers take their breast feed children with them in the field for watershed development activity through participatory watershed management, sheds and other services are not well equipped. As a result, children are exposed to sunlight, cold, etc. and at the same time mothers could not feed them properly. From this, participatory watershed management activity is a forced labor, mainly for such moms.

People with Disability: Over 6 million people in Ethiopia—7.6 percent of the total population—are disabled. These groups of people are often the least considered in the planning and provision of basic services. It is important to consult these sections of the community during planning, implementation and benefit sharing of watershed development in order for them to prefer the way they can be benefited. This idea can also apply for elderly and chronically ill people as mentioned below.

The Elderly: Elderly peoples accumulated knowledge and experience is recognized and is treated with respect in Ethiopia. In times of need, the elderly receives strong support and assistance from their families and communities. However, when families or communities themselves face problems, it is difficult for older persons to get the support and assistance they need.

Chronically ill people: Chronic illnesses cause labor shortages in resource-poor households, preventing them from diversifying their income activities. These people endure extended periods of pain and suffering and face high costs for treatment and medication, which may erode savings and make them dependent on family and friends. The chronic illness leads to the loss of their ability to earn a livelihood and support themselves.

10.3.3 Gender in relation to Watershed Development and SLLCs

a. Women in relation to Watershed Development

Women has been participating in all the woredas visited by the ESSA team and found out that considering the burdens women shoulder in domestic activities at home including child care, they are allowed to work in the watershed development activities half of the workload assigned to men. There has been increasing participation of women especially in implementation of the watersheds, promoting a more equitable access, and control and share of natural resource benefits within the social groups although there has been a weak trend. Women have been playing tangible role in the watershed management, especially in implementation stage. Women participated in soil and water conservation implementation, leaving the heavy tasks to men to reduce their workload. They have been involved actively in Tigray and in Amhara region as we observed and discussed in the watersheds. Women in these regions claimed that they got benefits like grass harvest in area closures and have a sense of ownership of watershed development. In spite of this, women's participation in decision making is yet to be improved as it was seen in the assessment watersheds sites.

Moreover, it was rare to see women as a leading figure in most institutional arrangements at Kebele or watershed level despite the fact that in the bylaws women are granted 50% leadership positions in the

watershed committee based on the plan in GTP III. This could be taken into account in order to sustain community-based watershed management. This is because in few assessed watersheds indicated that successful watershed management interventions were resulted in the participation and benefits of women. This in turn requires to explicitly address the needs of both men and women resource users and seek equitable sharing of benefits. Especially, strengthening the capacity of women in order to engage those in decision making at the planning, implementation, evaluation stages will have an immense impact on agricultural production and natural resources management.

b. Women in relation to SLLCs

Second level land certificate emphasizes equal rights for women during adjudication, surveying, demarcation and public display. Despite the government's attempts to ensure full certification of landholding, the process of digitalizing the land registration system is still a lengthy process that will not guarantee immediate benefits to equal rights to land between men and women. One of the reasons might emanate from the high levels and spread of poverty that have been identified as restriction to the full realization of women's rights to land and, particularly, tenure security in Ethiopia. Poverty frequently tramples on the ability of the poor to claim their legal rights to land, especially through formal mechanisms, as the costs associated with legal processes remain too high for the poor, leaving them generally uneducated and uninformed about how to navigate formal institutions. So, women, especially those living in rural locations where patriarchal traditions are particularly strong will lack access to economic and social resources that would enable them to access and participate in land institutions at the local and national levels. This makes these institutions to be seen incapable of providing fair remedies to men and women regarding access to land. Combined with the absence of laws protecting women living in polygamous families, perpetuates gender inequalities related to land, its use and the decisions around it. According to GTP III, although Ethiopia has established a 30% quota of women in land administration committees on all levels, the finding showed that the participation of women in committee has still been insignificant mainly because of the fact women are engaged in various house chores. The other points raised by informants were low awareness of women about their rights to land and how to claim them as they are excluded from spaces where they can access relevant information about their rights.

10.3.4 Gender-Based Violence/Sexual Abuse Incidents

Gender-based violence (GBV) is an umbrella term for any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person's will and that is based on socially ascribed (i.e., gender) differences between males and females, which includes acts that inflict physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion, and other deprivations of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life. The ESSA team has discussed about gender based violence with various sections of the community engaged in the watershed development as well as issues related to Second Level Landholding Certificates. Accordingly, it was found out that almost all the participants responded the nonexistence of gender based violence in relation to public mobilization activities as many of them are known to one another and work as a family in their 1 to 5 team, development groups (30-40 people in one group) and in general as a watershed team where they have their own committee that follows each and every steps. Thus, the informants reported that they could not encounter a serious case of GBV. Despite this finding from the field, according to the DHS (2016) data, a significant percentage of GBV (particularly between husband and wife) was recorded in the four regions (Tigray-33%, Amhara-35%, SNNP-29% and Oromia-38%) where the assessment was carried out. Given this understanding, during the CALM program implementation, the necessary precaution regarding GBV should be taken into account including awareness creation.

11. PforR Proposed CALM Program Environmental and Social Benefits, Impacts and Risks

This section presents the environmental and social benefits and impacts/risks of the Program. The proposed Program is expected to be environmentally friendly and socially acceptable. It is to provide benefits to the nation in general and to the beneficiaries of the proposed Program in particular. The proposed program being a national development agenda in the natural resource management sector particularly focusing on watershed development and land administration and use sectors, it will have immense benefits and could help the country in terms of soil and water conservation and in general reducing land degradation. Given the nature and scale of the proposed program, both positive and negative impacts could emanate from the participatory watershed management and land administration and use program activities, particularly SLLCs that ultimately benefit the community and affect the nearby biophysical and social environment. The environmental and social benefits will be derived from participatory watershed management program and provision of second level landholding certificate.

The potential adverse environmental and social impacts of the Program are likely to be associated with program activities, including sustainable management and equitable use of watershed resources; participatory and equitable processes for planning and implementing interventions for watershed development and management; provision of SLLCs to rural landholders; and functioning of the NRLAIS for the registration and management of SLLCs. The potential adverse social impacts are likely to be associated with land related issues in the development of watershed development and during the provision of second level landholding certificates.

The risks have been identified by looking at existing and possible vulnerabilities in the environmental and social context, the Program strategy and sustainability, the institutional complexity and capacity. The risks associated can be mitigated through capacity building of implementing partners to enhance inclusion, participation, and strengthening mechanisms on accountability and grievance redress mechanisms.

Overall, the anticipated environmental and social impacts are expected to be minimal. These are also not anticipated to be of large scale but could affect individual program-affected persons that lose assets including structures, crops and trees, and the use of portions of their land. It is anticipated that most of the adverse effects will be reversible in nature and there are no impacts that will lead to irreversible negative permanent change. The Program's social benefits are substantial and long-term, and it has also impacts/risks, which are discussed in the following sections.

11.1 Environmental and Social Benefits of CALMP

The proposed CALM program is going to support investments in field based projects and programs for promoting and scaling up SLM which include community based watershed management. The implementation of CALM program is anticipated to enhance the community based watershed development works in a more organized manner with strong participation and growing sense of ownership by the communities. The CALM program will encourage the establishment of WUAs and support the issuance of SLLCs to the farmers, both of which target in enhancing the organizational capacity and sense of ownership of the communities in watershed development works. The CALM program will therefore strengthen further the positive environmental and social impacts gained through the on-going participatory watershed management projects and will contribute towards its long term sustainability.

11.1.1 Potential Beneficial Environmental Impacts of CALMP

In the majority of the sub-watershed areas where soil and water conservation activities were carried, the environment has benefited through improvement in vegetation cover, soil, water and biodiversity regeneration. Implementation of the PforR CALM program will ensure the sustainability of these

beneficial environmental and social impacts through preparation and execution of better watershed development plans with the participation of WUAs, fostering equity benefit sharing, and enhancing the sense of ownership.

Moreover, as the current trends show, expansion of the watershed management activities done on communal lands will have dual potential beneficial impacts. In addition to the environmental rehabilitation and restoration benefits, the transfer of these rehabilitated and reclaimed communal lands for unemployed youth and women groups has become an important dimension in reducing unemployment in many rural kebeles. The unemployed youth and women groups are made to continue maintaining and conserving the communal lands while making benefit from the grasses and perennial fruit trees planted to stabilize the SWC structures. Therefore, implementation of the CALM program will also have additional environmental and social benefits through the support it provides for expansion of watershed management works on communal lands.

11.1.2 Potential Beneficial Social Impacts of CALMP

In this section discussion will be made focusing on the anticipated benefits or positive impacts gained through participatory watershed management and SLLCs programs supported by CALM.

i. Sense of ownership increased

Communal resources in a given watershed used to be considered as every ones' resources. As a result, they used to suffer from the tragedy of the commons. As every ones' property is no one's property, various communal resources in the regions have been dwindling little by little from time to time. However, since the introduction of participatory watershed management activities of watershed management program, the outlook or sense of ownership towards communal land resources has been improved and now the community made soil and water conservation structures as their own resources whether they are in some ones farm or on communal lands.

ii. Create employment opportunity for the youth and women by increasing WUAs

The development of watershed has brought important off-farm and non-farm opportunities for the households, particularly for the youth and women. The watershed development creates an opportunity for women and youths by providing different IGAs such as to grow grasses to be available for both their own cattle and also for sale. The biological stabilizers have also made possible to exercise apiculture and fattening of small ruminants and oxen as off-farm livelihood activities. It has also positive impact for women to get training to produce locally-made, energy-saving stoves for the market and this generated as additional income.

iii. Increased capacity of households for natural resources management

The watershed development intervention is known to involve people with diverse knowledge, skills and capacities from different organizations. This could help the participants to get information and knowledge that in turn help them develop the spirit of competition among the neighbors. They also get training and awareness about the environment and natural resources management. This knowledge and information ultimately changed their perception and consequently built their capacity in different activities at their farm. This is relevant to the rehabilitation of degraded land and at the same time the commitment of communities and government that has also attracted many of the international donors to support sustainable land management.

iv. Strengthened the social bonds of the local community

Strong community participation and a demand-driven approach are among the driving forces of successful watershed management. In most of the successful watersheds, it has been observed that watershed committee, together with the community and the project coordination office staffs are responsible for problem identification and priority setting. It was also observed that the opening and winding of participatory watershed management has become ceremonial and accompanied by blessings where the communities use it as opportunity to exercise their cultural entertainments that integrate their social bonds.

v. Strengthen women right for landholding

Some of the women we met were women landless, who have benefited from a plot given by the “land bank” that allocates land according to the land proclamation: giving priority to women, people with disability and children. Nowadays the issue of landless rather than being a gender issue affecting specifically women is more concerning the youth. It is recommended that additional efforts is made to find and improve alternative income generating activities (IGA) for young people who won't be benefiting directly from land but may be involved in other agricultural related activities. The program could also have social benefits from second level landholding certificates:

- i. Regional states issued guidelines for the implementation of land registration and certification that has significantly improved land management practices of farmers by increasing investments in soil and water conservation structures,
- ii. Joint titling of land provide women equitable rights to their men counterpart,
- iii. Tenure security that help motivate farmers to avoid land degradation, provides opportunity for updating the information, identify landholders and the size of their land, as well help them use
- iv. Land transactions and access to financing (provide precise information for renters and rentees on the exact size, owners, and location of the plot)
- v. Land disputes and conflict resolution mechanism on the bases of the certificate of the landholder

11.2 Environmental and Social Adverse Impacts and Risks of CALMP

11.2.1 Potential Environmental Adverse Impacts and Risks of the Program

i. Risk of weak or absence of environmental and social management capacities

In the absence of a section or unit for environmental and social management that serves across all the programs and projects of the Ministry of Agriculture and noting that the available environmental and social safeguard specialists are deployed to coordinate and support implementation of specific projects/programs ESMFs/ESMSGs, there will be a risk for the CALM program sub-projects to proceed without complying with safeguard requirements. The weak environmental and social management capacities in the program implementing agencies include the regional Bureaus of Agriculture and Natural Resource and its zonal as well as woreda offices on one side and the environment regulatory authorities like REPAs and woreda environment protection offices on the other which will likely expose the proposed CALM program to the risk of implementing program sub-projects without putting in place proper safeguard mitigation measures. Watershed development plans and other sub-projects with adverse environmental and social impacts will not be screened by the program implementing agencies and get reviewed and approved by the regulatory agencies. Thus, there is a need to provide capacity building for environmental and social management in both the implementing agencies and the regulatory bodies to avoid risks to the proposed CALM program.

ii. Risks in developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works

As indicated in the PDO, the main objective of the CALM program is to increase adoption of sustainable land management practices and expand access to secure land titles in non-rangeland rural areas. Sustainable land management practices are in principle planned and carried to rehabilitate and conserve degraded natural resources. Thus, in essence, the implementation of SLM practices of the CALM program by itself will not be anticipated to cause adverse environmental and social impacts. However, certain environmental and social risks can potentially occur due to lack of careful planning and proper prioritization of the watershed development works. Such gaps in planning watershed development can cause risks of creating new flood directions and erosion, damage to downstream SWC structures due to improper prioritization of works, covering farm fields with receding pond water or conversely drying up downstream ponds/irrigation waters because of excessive retention of water upstream, impacts of free grazing on the SWC structures and biological treatments, etc. Watershed treatment and the resulting

changes in land use types can also affect the environment through long term cumulative effects. Planning of sub-watersheds belonging to different administrative boundaries of kebeles, woredas or zones will have to be jointly done to avoid environmental risks arising from poor prioritization of works.

iii. Risk related to weak consideration of PCR and Natural habitats

Community based watershed development projects are going to be carried deep in the rural areas and usually away from the rural villages where farm fields, open communal lands, and other territories that may adjoin natural habitats, wetlands, places of unknown physical cultural resources could be present. Unless proper considerations are made during the watershed development planning including site selection and delineation processes, there will be a risk of affecting critical habitats, destroying valuable physical cultural resources and affecting biodiversity.

iv. Workers and community safety risks

Occupational safety of community workers participating in the participatory watershed management activities are of concern due to the existence of multiple hazard sources which pose risks during the works. Depending on the nature of the watershed sites, communities will be engaged on digging with hand tools, carrying materials and work on inclined grounds which can expose them to safety hazards. In other watersheds community workers can also be exposed to avalanche of denuded rubble stones when working on high slope mountainous areas. There will be a potential for occurrence of injuries and accidents (non-fatal and/or fatal) while at work during the participatory watershed management activities supported by the CALM program.

v. Risks of E-waste generation and disposal

The CALM program component on establishing the Ethiopian SLM information system (ESLMIS/NRLAIS) and improving the robustness and quality of service delivery in land administration to expand the coverage of SLLC to farmers is anticipated to cause a moderate to low potential environmental and social impacts mainly due to the generation of E-waste at various stages of its development and operation. At the initial stage of installation and commissioning the potential environmental and social risks will involve the generation and disposal of IT packaging wastes, whereas improper disposal of used IT facilities (e.g.: computers, laptops, printers, e.t.c) are likely to affect the environment later during operational phases.

11.2.2 Potential Social Adverse Impacts and Risks

The anticipated negative social impacts of the Program are not expected to be significant provided that land acquisition and access restriction to communal lands are conducted in a manner consistent with Core Principle 4. The major social risks/impacts in relation to watershed development and SLLCs include, but not limited to the following:

i. Damages of significant proportion of implemented soil and water conservation measures with in short period of time after completion.

These have been the case due to improper design of cut off drain, layout and poor construction as well as lack of control of free grazing considered as a risk among farmers to invest planting trees, shrubs and fodder strips within their farm plots as well as communal lands. Livestock development was not strategically planned and integrated in the community based watersheds. Farming system based livestock development and the target of production whether it is for subsistence or market is not well designed. Control of free grazing and implementation of zero grazing are among the watershed interventions related to livestock. Apparently, these interventions are not well supported with adequate fodder development and grazing management strategies and plans. In addition to low fodder productivity and continued crop

land expansion, the carrying capacity of available grazing lands is very low. These factors have led to reduction of livestock number in a household and in turn negatively impact future livestock supply. Continuous follow up and maintenance is equally critical to sustain the intervention.

ii. Risk of vulnerable groups inequitable share from the benefits of the program in the watershed development

Women embrace disproportionately large number of poor in most countries due to gender discrimination. The situation limits the women to have access to resources, opportunities, and public services necessary to improve the standard of living for themselves and their families. In majority of rural areas of Ethiopia, women's economic activities are limited to household management and some major farm practices. Female-headed households may be disadvantaged the sharing of the watershed benefits. The same is true for the poor, elderly, or with disability that they may not be able to get support during participatory watershed management.

- There is a risk of participatory watershed management activities in withdrawing the local community, specifically landless youths from livelihoods and affects their time from social networking and labor rent.
- Institutional capacity limitation risks-human resources, equipment, communication, machinery, furniture and other facilities in order to carry out participatory watershed management in the watershed development activities. In this regard there is a possible impact due to weak ability to design and implement Program identified under the CALM. There will also be low rate of disbursement of funds allocated by the CALM.
- Inadequate participation and being fade up towards public mobilization activities and the perception of low rewards in return from the many years participation in the activity.
- Lack of commitment on the part of implementing agencies to address safeguard issues at all levels, particularly assigning social safeguard experts.
- Low participation of women in the leadership positions particularly at watershed committee although there were efforts in the bylaws to participate women.
- There is a risk of practicing soil and water conservation activities without considering variations in ecosystem and cultural diversity as the country has characterized by a great variety of agro-ecology, settlement pattern and regional make up. So, it is relevant to recognize context dependent best experiences while adopting.

There are also social impacts/risks related to second level landholding certificate that include, but not limited to:

- There is the risk of female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers, who can register the plots in their name for certification against the terms of the sharecropping agreements.
- Land certification has resulted in increased costs for sharecropping and created negative influence on access to land for those poor landless households and unemployed rural youths who do not have any other means of livelihood and employment opportunities. Consequently, landless youths have been constantly out-migrating seeking employment leaving behind elderly and women to work on the implementation of soil and water conservation through participatory watershed management. Ultimately, this resulted in low performance of the implementation of watershed management and indirectly affects the sustainability of watershed management.
- Perceived risk of tenure insecurity and demand for land demarcation are still high. Demand is higher for those who believe land certificate provides better protection against encroachment disputes. Tenure risk and demand are hugely associated with parcel-specific properties/attributes.
- Land users limitation to use offered training, established institution from regional to local level and the different committee which established to facilitate the process.
- Inadequate vertical and horizontal collaboration among implementing and regulatory bodies.

12. Recommended Mitigation Measures to Strengthen System Performance and Risk Rating of CALM Program

12.1 Proposed Mitigation Measures for Environmental and Social Risks of CALMP (Core principle 1-3)

The identified environmental and social impacts and risks are likely to occur at different stages of the CALM program life cycle. MoA and the regional, zonal, and woreda level agriculture and natural resource offices as well as the land administration and utilization offices are responsible for environmental and social risk management during the program implementation to ensure the recommended mitigation measures are implemented. The following are recommendations proposed to mitigate the identified risks.

- i. Recommended mitigation measures for avoiding the risk of weak or absence of environmental and Social management capacities**
 - a. Owing to the scale of sub-projects in the CALM program, there will be a need to recruit environmental and social development specialist in the project management unit in the MoA that serve both program implementing directorates and in the regional agriculture and NRM offices. These focal persons will be responsible for providing coordination, guidance and technical support to the woreda and kebele level agriculture and natural resource offices. They will also be responsible for supervising the compliance of the woreda and kebele CALM program subprojects with the environmental and social management requirements.
 - b. Recruit an environment and social experts at woreda Agriculture and NRM office levels who interface with the kebele DAs in preparing the E&S screening reports and with woreda environment protection offices in getting environmental clearance for sub-projects.
 - c. Develop technical guidelines (ESMSG) that provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program that includes detailed procedures and precautionary advises on occupational and community health and safety aspects appropriate to the context of participatory watershed management works in watersheds. The ESMSG to be developed will build upon the general environmental and social management principles and ESMS procedures outlined in the ESPES operational manual for ESMS.
 - d. Strengthen the coordination among the national, regional, zonal and woreda level Agriculture and natural resources, land administration and utilization offices as program implementers and the environmental institutions as regulators.
 - e. Strengthen the environmental and social management system at woreda level by reinforcing and extending the coverage of measures supported by the ongoing ESPES Program at woreda level that are designed to strengthen woreda capacity for management of environmental and social risks which include the appointment, training and performance assessment of environmental and social management specialists at woreda level. All participating woredas need a system that will outline specific roles and responsibilities for environmental and social risk screening to enforce regulatory requirements.
 - f. Provide awareness raising training on ESMS to the management and relevant staff of the Regional, zonal and woreda level agriculture offices and land administration and utilization offices.
 - g. Provide continuous technical training on the preparation, review and approval procedures of E&S screening, EMP and ESIA reports and other environmental and social safeguard instruments (i.e. ESMS, ESMSG) including safety management instruments to the relevant zonal, woreda and kebele level staff of agriculture offices, land administration and utilization offices as well as staff of the environment protection offices in zone and woreda level not covered by ESPES Program and build upon the already delivered capacity building trainings on ESPES covered woredas to ensure capacity development and overcome high staff turnover induced weaknesses.

- h. Provide financial support for the regional, zonal and specially woreda environment protection offices to address their shortage of basic office logistics such as desktops, laptops, printers as well as transport facilities that constrain them to carry their regulatory role.
- ii. Recommended mitigation measures for avoiding and/or minimizing risks in developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works:**
 - a. Coordinate for prior arrangement and planning for environmental and social risk screening, review and approval of watershed development plans by the competent environment protection authority. This may include a process for the woreda and kebele agriculture offices and the WUAs to prepare a watershed management/development plan and sending it timely to the competent woreda environment protection office for review and approval. The woreda environment protection shall plan for site verification and compliance monitoring and follow up visits to be made on the watershed development sites.
 - b. Coordinate for annual performance reviews and audits on environmental and social safeguard managements to ensure the implementation of safeguard instruments to avoid and/or minimize potential negative impacts associated with CALM program.
 - c. Encourage EIAR to undertake research to quantify cumulative and long term impacts (both beneficial and adverse) of watershed development projects in the regions.
 - d. Encourage the inclusion of considerations for environmental and social aspects in general and PCRs in particular in the watershed development planning and site selection tool of the MoA applied country wide (i.e., Community Based Participatory Watershed Management Guideline).
- iii. Recommended mitigation measures for avoiding and/or minimizing risks related to weak consideration of PCR and Natural habitats**
 - a. Include topics on PCRs and its identification, conservation and chance find procedures in the technical trainings on ESMS to be provided to relevant staff of zonal; woreda and kebele level agriculture offices as well as environment protection offices.
 - b. Include guidance on chance find procedures in the technical guidelines (ESMSG) to be prepared to provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program.
 - c. Encourage the woreda office of Agriculture for obtaining information on all known and registered PCRs present from woreda culture and tourism office and establish a coordination mechanism for exchange of information on PCRs.
 - d. Encourage the participation of communities during watershed subproject screening to benefit from their local indigenous knowledge on PCR identification.
- iv. Recommended mitigation measures for avoiding workers and community safety risks**
 - a. Develop an appropriate guideline on occupational health and public safety procedures relevant to the nature and work place of participatory watershed management works and for providing safety orientation and briefings to members of the community participating in participatory watershed management at the start of the public work seasons. The guideline should be prepared in a manner that is appropriate for the participatory watershed management work contextual purpose and tailored to the basic safety risks likely to be encountered during participatory watershed management works in the watershed development sites which lead towards complying with basic features of national health and safety rules. The guideline can be incorporated with the proposed CALM program technical guidelines or developed as separate guideline on health and safety if deemed suitable.
 - b. Provide training of trainers in appropriate health and safety procedures for participatory watershed management works to regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices.
 - c. Provide logistical and financial support to strengthen the first aid service delivery by the health post medics, provision of standby traditional ambulance, and temporary tent shelter for child care during participatory watershed management campaign as appropriate and practical options in context.

v. Recommended mitigation measures for minimizing risks of E-waste generation and disposal

- a. Develop E-waste recycling and disposal management guideline that applies for safe disposal of the E-waste stream to be generated during installation and operation of ESLMIS/NRALIS at all levels of the Land administration and utilization offices.
- b. Encourage the use of good quality recycled paper cards for printing the SLLC cards to be distributed to farmers to minimize the overall impact of the CALM program ESLMIS/NRALIS component on natural resources.

12.2 Proposed Mitigation Measures for Environmental and Social Risks of CALMP (Core principle 4- 6)

i. Crosscutting Social Mitigation Measures

- a. Through awareness creation, the relevance of participatory watershed management and SLLCs for the local community and working in line with the policies, proclamations and guidelines enacted by the national and regional states including bylaws, which help program to assist the vulnerable groups. So, ensuring participation of Program affected people that incorporate vulnerable groups and underserved communities in ongoing consultation throughout the implementation of the program.
- b. Strengthening implementation of livestock breed improvement with adequate input supply and fodder development using different options, creating adaptive management and regulation of communal grazing systems to the extent of developing policy actions on communal land tenure, and building technical capacity that should be considered as important elements to increase adaptive capacity and enhance future livestock production system.
- c. Establishing effective grievance response mechanism may be building up on the standard regional public grievance redress mechanisms established by ESPES GRM Operational manual of the program and provide equitable and fair benefit sharing
- d. Incorporate appropriate capacity building measures and ensure that funding and disbursement targets are realistic. There is also a need for building the capacity of research support service providers by enhancing the technical skills (knowledge) and operational capacity (manpower, budget, equipment and facilities) at the federal and regional agricultural research institutions to undertake adaptive and participatory research with rural land users to identify locally appropriate solutions to problems of land degradation and the need for adaptive research to develop Conservation Agriculture systems suited to the different cropping systems and agro-ecological zones of Ethiopia as an alternative to the traditional reliance on physical soil and water conservation works for tackling land degradation.
- e. The Program should consider consolidating grassroots institutions such as rural land dispute adjudication and grievance redress structures. Strengthening such establishments plays an important role in making sure that women and disabled people who lease their land in sharecropping arrangements will not unfairly lose their landholding rights because of the breach of agreements in the land registration and certification process.
- f. The local universities may take action to help provide training and build capacity to help fill the gaps with respect to legal competence and services as well as in the development process of watershed and second level landholding certificates by participating with EIAR and MoA.

ii. Recommended measures to strengthen the government system to ensure compliance with Core Principle 4: Provision of special support for vulnerable households

- a. Meaningful consultation and documentation
- b. Institutional Capacity (skilled social development staff, training, resource allocation).
- c. Revision of Environment and Social system guidelines and endorsement by implementers
- d. Compensation at replacement cost and assistance to restore livelihoods, including those without titles when land is taken, or livelihoods are affected.

- e. Standardize procedures for land acquisition that can be followed across all the regions
 - f. To realize the benefits from watershed management, co-operation of all resource-users is needed, including downstream communities that are affected by land uses upstream. Their diverse needs can be addressed through combinations of local collective-action arrangements e.g., including representatives from upstream and downstream communities.
- iii. Recommended measures to strengthen the government system to ensure compliance with Core Principle 5**
- a. Awareness on the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups at all levels
 - b. Procedures to identify vulnerable groups and disadvantaged people
 - c. Ensure equitable access to program benefits
 - d. Consultation procedure - free, prior and informed consultation with disadvantaged and vulnerable communities
 - e. Mainstream the interest of vulnerable groups in the preparation of long-term and short term development plans
 - f. Integrate into the watershed development plan the organs responsible for the development and protection of women, children, elderly and People with Disability (PWD) as well as identified disadvantaged groups
 - g. Watershed user associations should be established and strengthened through continuous community consultation participating the community, village leaders and community elders and other key persons to increase ownership, inclusiveness, avoid disappointment and ensure sustainability by making sure broad community support exists.
- iv. Recommended measures to strengthen the government system to ensure compliance with Core Principle 6**
- a. Giving due attention for consultation, communication, participation and enhanced transparency of all stakeholders including local communities in watershed development and SLLCs supported activities
 - b. Participants recommended continuous awareness raising programs on CALM program objectives, watershed development and SLLCs.
 - c. The issue of current political instability in the country and related social tensions in some areas can significantly affect the capacity of the program to deliver services. Such developments are not directly related to the program, but it can affect the program implementation.
 - d. The presentation also included recommendations on the need to address capacity gaps, i.e., gaps in skilled staff assignment (social development and gender) and lack of adequate training for the assigned staffs, shortage of transport facilities and other logistics.

12.3 Environmental and Social Risk Rating of Proposed for CALM Program

The identified environmental and social impacts and risks apply throughout the program life cycle. MoA including regional, zonal, woreda and Kebele level institutions are responsible for environmental and social risk management during proposed program implementation to ensure higher level environmental, social and safety quality in collaboration with other program stakeholders.

The overall risk rating for the purpose of CALM program from environmental and social perspective is estimated as being ‘substantial’. Based on the findings of this ESSA, the risks and proposed mitigation measures discussed above are presented in the following table 6.

Table 6: Environmental and Social Risk Rating for Proposed CALM Program

No	Risk Description	Risk Management	Risk Rating
1	Weak or absent ESMS in implementing agencies (MOA, BoANR and Zone/woreda offices) that would cause inadequate implementation of environmental and social issues and Safety management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Recruit environmental and social development specialist in the project management unit in the MoA that serve both program implementing directorates and recruit same in the regional agriculture and natural resource offices ✚ Assign an environment and social experts at woreda agriculture and natural resource office levels who interface with the kebele DAs in preparing the E&S screening reports and with woreda environment protection offices in getting environmental clearance for sub-projects. ✚ Develop technical guidelines (ESMSG) that provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program that includes detailed procedures and precautionary advises on occupational and community health and safety aspects appropriate to the context of participatory watershed management works in watersheds. ✚ Based on continuing capacity need assessments (human resources, equipment, communication, machinery, furniture and other facilities), the MoA will enhance the capacity of existing and newly recruited experts on environmental and social safeguard issues of the program. ✚ Facilitate the establishment and functionality of CALM ESMS including GRM at MoA and its regional counterparts ✚ Strengthen the environmental and social management system at woreda level. ✚ Provide continuous technical training on environmental and social safeguard instruments including safety management instruments to the relevant zonal, woreda and kebele level staff of agriculture offices, land administration and utilization offices as well as staff of the environment protection offices in zone and wereda level induced weaknesses. ✚ Provide financial support for the regional, zonal and specially woreda environment protection offices as well as MoLSA and the rural livelihood rehabilitation offices to address their shortage of basic office logistics such as desktops, laptops, printers as well as transport facilities that constrain them to carry their regulatory role. ✚ Develop an appropriate guideline on occupational health and public safety procedures relevant to the nature and work place of participatory watershed management works and for providing safety orientation and briefings to members of the community participating in participatory watershed management at the start of the public work seasons. The guideline should be prepared in a manner that is appropriate for the participatory watershed management work contextual purpose and tailored to the basic safety risks likely to be encountered during 	Substantial

No	Risk Description	Risk Management	Risk Rating
	<p>Workers and community safety risks</p>	<p>participatory watershed management works in the watershed development sites which lead towards complying with basic features of national health and safety rules. The guideline can be incorporated with the proposed CALM program technical guidelines or developed as separate guideline on health and safety if deemed suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Provide training of trainers in appropriate health and safety procedures for participatory watershed management works to regional and woreda agriculture and natural resource offices. ✚ Provide logistical and financial support to strengthen the first aid service delivery by the health post medics, provision of standby traditional ambulance, and temporary tent shelter for child care during participatory watershed management campaign as appropriate and practical options in context. ✚ Include topics on PCRs and its identification, conservation and chance find procedures in the technical trainings on ESMS to be provided to relevant staff of zonal, woreda and kebele level agriculture as well as environment protection offices. ✚ Include guidance on chance find procedures in the technical guidelines (ESMSG) to be prepared to provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program. ✚ Encourage the woreda office of Agriculture for obtaining information on all known and registered PCRs present from woreda culture and tourism office and establish a coordination mechanism for exchange of information on PCRs. ✚ Encourage the participation of communities during watershed subproject screening to benefit from their local indigenous knowledge on PCR identification. 	

No	Risk Description	Risk Management	Risk Rating
	Risk related to weak consideration of PCR		
2	<p>Risks in developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works</p> <p>There is also a risk of practicing soil and water conservation activities without considering variations in ecosystem and cultural diversity as the country has characterized by a great variety of agro-ecology, settlement pattern and regional make up.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Coordinate for prior arrangement and planning for environmental and social risk screening, review and approval of watershed development plans by the competent environment and social protection authority. ✚ Coordinate for annual performance reviews and audits on environmental and social safeguard managements to ensure the implementation of safeguard instruments to avoid and/or minimize potential negative impacts associated with CALM program. ✚ Encourage EIAR undertake research to quantify cumulative and long term impacts (both beneficial and adverse) of watershed development projects in the regions. ✚ Encourage the inclusion of considerations for environmental and social aspects in general and PCRs in particular in the watershed development planning and site selection tool of the MoA applied country wide (i.e., Community Based Participatory Watershed Management Guideline). ✚ It is relevant to recognize context dependent best experiences while adopting. 	Moderate
3	Access restriction towards communal lands, particularly control of free grazing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Effective arrangements for protecting and enhancing rights and management responsibilities for the use of communal land resources (grazing lands, forests/woodlands, water resources, etc) ✚ Strengthened rights of the members of a particular community/user group to the use of specific communal land areas ✚ The development of a legal framework for enabling such communities/user groups to formulate and enforce local bylaws that govern the access to, use of, and management responsibilities for these communal resources 	Moderate
4	Low support for vulnerable groups in watershed development and SLLCs (like women, elderly, unemployed and landless youths) and inequitable benefits from watershed There is also the risk of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Establish special support for women having children as well as for landless youths by providing them training and paving ways for creating IGAs ✚ Deliver awareness raising for the community and watershed committee and officials at different levels to consider the issue of the youths and women ✚ Build capacity of social workers and hiring new social workers as required ✚ Increase the participation of youths, particularly landless youths and women in WUAs ✚ Strengthening such establishments to play an important role in making sure that women and disabled people who lease their land in sharecropping arrangements will not unfairly lose their landholding rights because of the 	Moderate

No	Risk Description	Risk Management	Risk Rating
	female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers	breach of agreements in the land registration and certification process.	
5	Inadequate participation and risks of participatory watershed management perceived as forced labor and fatigue and the perception of low rewards in return from the many years participation in the activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Awareness creation on the fact participatory watershed management would offer long term social and environmental benefits. ✚ Create employment opportunity for the youth and women by increasing WUAs 	Substantial
6	Low participation of women in the leadership positions particularly at watershed committee	✚ Improve participation of women in the leadership position by solving double burdens they are in charge of at home and in the participatory watershed management.	Moderate
7	Perceived risk of tenure insecurity and demand for land demarcation	✚ Land certificate provides better protection against encroachment disputes as it is highly associated with parcel-specific properties/attributes	Moderate
8	Land users limitation to use offered training, established institution from regional to local level and the different committee which established to facilitate the process.	✚ Create awareness to the local community to participate in meetings and trainings that are necessary for their land security	Low
9	Risks of E-waste generation and disposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Develop E-waste recycling and disposal management guideline that applies for safe disposal of the E-waste stream to be generated during installation and operation of ESLMIS/NRALIS at all levels of the Land administration and utilization offices. ✚ Encourage the use of recycled papers for printing the SLIC cards to be distributed to farmers to minimize the overall impact of the CALM program ESLMIS/NRALIS component on natural resources. 	Low
10	Risks of conflicts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Requires reducing inter and intra community land use conflicts. ✚ The Program should consider consolidating grassroots institutions such as rural land dispute adjudication mainly 	Substantial

No	Risk Description	Risk Management	Risk Rating
		boundary related and grievance redress structures. ✚ Need to be fair during benefit sharing of rehabilitated communal lands as well as in the process of participating in WUAs	
	Overall Risk		Substantial

12.4 Recommended Action Plan to Strengthen System Performance for Environmental and Social Management

Table 7: Recommended Action Plan on Environment and Social Management

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
1	Ensure establishment of strong Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) and strengthening its functionality including GRM	1. Employment of Environmental and Social Safeguard persons in MoA and the regional BoANRs	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	Percentage (100%) of staffs in place at all levels	At national and regional levels	MoA & BoANRs	Within six (6) months after program Effectiveness	ESMS established Federal & Regional Safeguard staffs in place
		2. Assign safeguard focal persons at woreda levels in all participating regions	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3	Percentage (100%) of focal persons assigned at Woreda levels	Regional and Woreda levels	Regional BoANRs, Zone and Woreda office of Agriculture	Within six (6) months of program effectiveness	Woreda Safeguard focal persons in place
		3. Develop ESMSG to address identified environmental and social risks, including risks related to weak consideration of PCR and Natural habitats ⁴ and workers and community safety risks ⁵ .	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3	Actions taken to prepare the ESMSG	At national level	MOA	Within three months of program effectiveness	-ToR Produced -ESMSG document produced

⁴ 1. Include guidance on chance find procedures in the technical guidelines (ESMSG) to be prepared to provide overall guidance on the requirements and procedures for environmental and social screening of subprojects of the CALM program. 2. Include topics on PCRs its identification, conservation and chance find procedures in the technical trainings on ESMS to be provided to relevant staff of zonal; woreda and kebele level agriculture offices as well as environment protection offices. 3. Encourage the woreda culture and tourism office to register and document all known PCRs in the woreda and establish a coordination mechanism with the woreda office of Agriculture for exchange of information on PCRs present. 4. Encourage the participation of communities during watershed subproject screening to benefit from their local indigenous knowledge on PCR identification.

⁵ Develop an appropriate guideline on occupational health and public safety procedures relevant to the nature and work place of participatory watershed management works and for providing safety orientation and briefings to members of the community participating in participatory watershed management at the start of the public work seasons. Provide logistical and financial support to strengthen the first aid service delivery by the health post medics, provision of standby traditional ambulance, and temporary tent shelter for child care during participatory watershed management campaign as appropriate and practical options in context.

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
		4. Provide continuous technical training on ESMS, ESGM including safety management instruments to the relevant national, regional, zonal, woreda and kebele level agriculture, land administration and utilization offices staff as well as staff of the environment protection offices to ensure institutional capacity development and overcome high staff turnover induced weaknesses.	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	Percentage (100%) staffs trained	Federal, regional, Woreda and kebele levels	MoA and BoANR	Continuous; throughout program period	Safeguard training documents produced Safeguard training delivered.
		5. Provide awareness raising training on ESMS to the management and relevant staff of the regional, zonal and woreda level agriculture offices and land administration and use offices.	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	-Percentage of management staff trained (100%).	Regional, Zonal, Woreda	MoA, BoANR	Within one year of program effectiveness	Awareness training documents produced Awareness training delivered.
2	Support for vulnerable groups (i.e., landless youth, women, and elderly, people with disability as well as chronically ill people.	1. Participate and better benefit landless youth and women in Watershed User Association and give priority as applicable in the provision of SLLCs		Increase WUAs and equipped with the necessary resources and staff	At kebele and watershed levels	Regional and woreda levels	Completed at the end of Year 5 of program period	-Equipped and staffed with the necessary materials and personnel
		2. Participating vulnerable groups in WUAs in the communal landholding and arranging incentive mechanisms as well as creating income generating activities and benefit them from rehabilitated watersheds. In addition, participating in leadership or advisory roles in		Percentage (100%) of landless youths who participate in the watershed development that are not	At kebele level	MoA, regional and woreda levels	Continuous; throughout program period	-landless youths acquired support for their livelihoods -Amount of Incentive or top-up paid

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
		watershed level institutions could create empowerment		included in WUAs				
3	Developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works to prevent unintended environmental and social effects.	1. Coordinate for prior arrangement and planning for environmental and social risk screening, review and approval of watershed development plans by the competent environment protection authority.	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	- Percentage (%) of WSD plan E&S screening reports prepared -Percentage (%) of WSD plan approved by woreda	Woreda level	Woreda Agriculture and Natural Resource Office	Well before commencement of participatory watershed management starts at each woreda.	-Approved WSD Plans that minimize/avoid environmental and social impacts.
		2. Coordinate for annual performance reviews and audits on environmental and social safeguard management systems to ensure the implementation of safeguard instruments, avoid and/or minimize potential negative impacts associated with CALM program.	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	-ToR for environment & social performance audit (ESPA) prepared & consultants hired. -Annual ESPA conducted	Regional and Woreda levels	MoA	End of the first year after program effectiveness.	Compliance of Program sub-projects with national and Bank safeguard requirements
		3. Encourage the inclusion of considerations for environmental and social aspects in general and PCRs in particular in the watershed development planning and site selection tool of the MoA applied Country wide. (i.e. Community Based Participatory Watershed Management Guideline).	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.	-Assign resource to support inclusion of PCR and E&S issues to the guideline	National	MoA	During updating of the CBPWM Guideline.	A comprehensive CBPWD guideline that provides guidance on minimizing environmental and social impacts applied country wide.

Draft Environmental and Social Systems Assessment for CALM Program: Ethiopia

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
4	Minimize risks of E-waste generation and disposal	1. Develop E-waste recycling and disposal management guideline that applies for safe disposal of the E-waste stream to be generated during installation and operation of ESLMIS/NRALIS at all levels of the Land administration and utilization offices.		Actions taken to prepare the E-waste recycling and disposal guideline	At national level	MOA	Within six months of program effectiveness	-ToR Produced -E-waste recycling and disposal guideline document produced
		2. Encourage the use of recycled papers for printing the SLLC cards to be distributed to farmers to minimize the overall impact of the CALM program ESLMIS/NRALIS component on natural resources.		-Actions taken to include options for quality recycled paper supply in the procurement ToR.	National and Regional levels	MoA and BoANR, Land Administration and Utilization bureaus.	Within the first year of program effectiveness	Reduced impact of the program on natural resource.
5.	Agreement an MoU between MoA and BoAs requiring the operationalization in each CALM Program woreda of an ESMS in accordance with the action plan on environmental and social management defined in the ESSA	Agreement and implementation of an MoU between MoA and BoAs requiring the operationalization in each CALM Program woreda of an ESMS in accordance with the action plan on environmental and social management defined in the ESSA	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.		MoA and BoANR	MoA	Recurrent	MoUs signed between MoA and BoAs, and ESMS functional in CALM Program woredas, as reported by MoA and monitored by World Bank implementation support
6	Inclusion in the CBPWD Guidelines	CBPWD Guideline with agreed			Federal and Regional	MoA	30-Sep-2019	Updated CBPWD Guidelines include

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
	of (i) agreed principles for voluntary, participatory community labor, and (ii) procedures for the environmental and social screening of WMPs.	principles for voluntary, participatory community labor, and procedure for environmental and social screening of WMPs						principles for voluntary, participatory community labor.
7	In woredas with WUAs: (i) training in financial transparency, accountability, and GRMs; (ii) appointment of woreda-level GRM officers; and (iii) engagement at woreda-level of civil society SAIPs.		This is linked to DLI#2.		Regional and Woreda levels	MoA, BoAs, WoANRs	Recurrent	In woredas with WUAs: (i) WUAs and WoANRs trained in financial transparency, accountability, and GRMs, (ii) GRM officers appointed, (iii) civil society SAIPs engaged
8	Conduct rapid conflict analysis in Benishangul Gumuz and Gambella regions to manage the potential of SLLCs issuance induced conflict	Conduct rapid conflict analysis	This is linked to DLI#5.		MoA, RLAUB, Woreda LAUO,	MoA, RLAUB, Woreda LAUO, and an independent consultant	Recurrent	SLLCs issuance coverage informed by the rapid conflict analysis

No	Action Items	Activities/Actions	Link to DLI	Progress Indicator	Level of application	Responsibility	Timeline	Output
9	In woredas with active CDP and WUAs, WoANRs and DAs will be trained in the application of the CDP screening tool.	Conduct CDP WUAs interface screening.				MoA, BoAs, WoANRs	Recurrent	
10	Incorporation into guideline for WUA bylaws of Occupational Health and Safety provisions and standards of non-discrimination and prevention of gender-based violence.	Prepare WUAs bylaws of Occupational Health and Safety provisions and standards of non-discrimination and prevention of gender-based violence.	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.		Regional and Woreda and WUAs levels	MoA, BoAs	Due date	Guideline for WUA bylaws incorporates Occupational Health and Safety provisions and standards of non-discrimination and prevention of gender-based violence.
112	Undertake environment and social audit (ESA) with independent firm to undertake environmental and social audit in sample CALM woredas annually.	Undertake environment and social audit (ESA)	This is linked to DLI#2 and DLI#3.		National, Regional, Woreda and WUAs levels	Ministry of Finance	Annual	Environment and social audit (ESA) report that inform CSA verification

13. Stakeholders Consultation and Disclosure

13.1 Consultations

The preparation of this ESSA involves stakeholders' consultations. For the ESSA preparation, the Bank has hired environmental and social consultants. The consultants undertook recurrent meetings and consultations in the four regional states that have a good deal of practice in the watershed management and SLLC's. The meetings and consultations were done with different stakeholders, including implementing agencies (IAs) and relevant institutions at national, regional and woreda levels, DPs involved in Public mobilization and SLLC's and beneficiaries who are familiar with the practice and likely to be impacted or benefited.

The stakeholder consultations were conducted with relevant institutions to ensure the proper identification of environmental and social issues and propose appropriate recommendation measures over the program period. The stakeholder meetings and consultations have been conducted as one to one discussion, group discussion, and meetings at all levels with high level decision makers, experts, communities and discussion was made with experts working in a similar Bank financed projects. The consultation with stakeholders explored the potential environmental and social impacts and risks of the PforR, the capacity of implementing agencies in mitigating the negative environmental and social impacts and risks associated with the proposed program. The consultation also aims at ensuring the priority concerns of stakeholders that are taken full account during program implementation. Consultation with the relevant stakeholders on the draft ESSA will also be made following the guidelines of the Bank Policy on Information Access.

13.2 Disclosure

The draft ESSA was publicly disclosed at the World Bank external website on April 05, 2019 for review by relevant institutions before the stakeholders' consultation. The national ESSA public consultation was held on April 22, 2019, in Addis Ababa; with attendees from MoA (NRMD and RLAUD at Federal and regional office heads and experts, by regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoAs), Land Administration and Use (BLAUs) zonal and woreda experts), World Bank team and EFCCC (including regional Environmental Authorities). The World Bank will re-disclose the final ESSA on the World Bank external website and request MoA for the in-country disclosure.

References

1. Community Based Participatory Watershed development. A Guideline Ministry of Agriculture
2. Ethiopian Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management (ESIF) ,2010
3. Ethiopian Rural Development Policy and strategy, 2002
4. Ethiopian Food Security Strategy
5. 2004 Regional Natural Resource Plan and Report.
6. Amhara Regional State Assessment: Natural resource management through public mobilization, 2012.
7. UNHCR. 2018. Snapshot: Ethiopia's New Way of Working.
8. Evaluation of Government Initiated Participatory Watershed Based Land Resource Management Intervention in Southern Ethiopia: Performance and Sustainability, 2018.
9. Assessing Sustainability of Watersheds Developed through the Community Mobilization In Ethiopia Highlands: Does Land Tenure Play a Role (TECHNICAL REPORT, 2016).
10. Regional land use proclamations (Amhara, SNNP and Tigray)
11. PAD-CALM.
12. World Bank Policies.
13. Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute Website.

Annex 1- Stakeholders Consultation Summary

1. Stakeholders Consultation Summary

Consultation is one of the crucial tasks of Environment and Social System Assessment that ensure active participation of communities and stakeholders. Each community is a unique group of people with different needs, priorities and relations to their natural resources. Bringing together and consulting an inclusive selection of the community from various sections of the community such as male, female, elderly and youth as well as stakeholders working in different area related to watershed management. This helps understand the views and desires of different people. Considering communities' priority areas of development would, therefore, create efficient implementation of program that maximize value and minimize social costs on an intervention, which in turn, would help the sustainability of a program. Involving local communities in consultation process informs decisions about local priorities and needs and be considered in determining the overall concept and design of a program. In addition to the community, implementing agency, MoA, and its regional counterparts-Amhara, Tigray, SNNP and Oromia agricultural offices and environmental protection and climate change authority of sampled woredas in selected four regions, kebeles watershed committee as well as Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute (EARI) were consulted.

In order to conduct community consultation, discussion was conveyed made through phone by ESSA team with focal persons in the MoA and in turn regional focal persons of SNNPR, Oromia, Amhara and Tigray Natural Resource Management directorates were communicated. Regional level focal persons in turn communicated sampled Woredas's administrators and focal persons. In collaboration with administrators of the Woredas, Kebeles and sub-watersheds were selected for community consultation. Participants for the public consultation in each selected Kebeles were pre-informed. They were from all walks of life that include elders, women, men, youths, household heads, and the like.

For Ethiopia Climate Action Through Landscape Management program ESSA, public consultations were conducted with key segments of the community in nine sub-watersheds (from nine kebele) of Nine Woredas in the four regions (Amhara, Tigray, SNNPR and Oromia). The consultation was intended to know priority development interests, desires, concerns as well as potential risks, opportunities and challenges during the implementation of the program that focuses on participatory watershed management on watershed development as well as second level landholding certification.

1.1. Introducing objective of Ethiopia Climate Action Through Landscape Management program for the community

The consultation has focused on achieving the following objectives:

- Inform stakeholders about the program objectives and provide adequate information on the program, its components and result areas in their language and manner that is appropriate for them including using translators;
- Create a sense of ownership on CALM Program activities and consent watershed participatory watershed management participates to give their free, prior and informed views in a transparent and participative ways about the program, which are vital for sustainability and development outcomes to the program;
- Get cooperation and support for the project affected peoples by enabling them understand their rights and responsibilities in relation to CALM Program;
- Captures the views and perceptions of people who may be affected or have an interest in a development program, and provides a means to take their views into account as inputs to improve program design and implementation, thereby avoiding or reducing adverse impacts, and enhancing benefits;
- Deal with complaint redress mechanisms on the program;

- Discuss with the communities about women participation and vulnerable groups to strengthen by the program;
- To understand existence of Gender Based Violence.

1.2. Stakeholders view

In each of the watersheds consulted, briefing and awareness creation were made for the community members about the CALM objectives and components. During the exhaustive open discussion communities' provided feedbacks and comments. Participants were allowed to reflect their view, concerns and recommendation on the likely social, environmental, and economic impacts or risks of the program. The reflections and desires on proposed program are summarized below:

1.2.1. Participatory watershed management

All visited regions, FGD participants described that watershed development through participatory watershed management was started in 2012 except in Tigray, which was started in 1990. In consulted four regions for process of watershed development and management implementation, Community Based Participatory Watershed Development Guideline (CBPWDG) have used as a standard. They have also conducted socio-economic assessment to see the level of the impact. Ethiopian Strategic Investment Framework (ESIF) for sustainable land Management has also been used by the MoA since March 2010 to implement natural resource management but this document (ESIF) is under revision to address some gaps. These gaps are (a) it is not focused on climate aspects and doesn't consider current situation; (b) focused on only 177 watersheds (8500-10,000ha) which is limited watershed, and (c) Environmental issues were not considered. However, this document ensures women participation up to 50% during implementation.

Regional BoA's informants indicated their concern regarding participatory watershed development and management system of watershed development and management is very strong and effective. Scholars also confirm this during conference related to watershed management and assessments. Assessment also conducted to know the effect of participatory watershed management.

The community consulted during participatory watershed management in the four regions confirmed that participation in participatory watershed management has done on voluntary basis. Watershed development works are done both in individual and communal lands that are highly degraded. Hence, it requires more soil and water conservation effort. The physical and biological structures are taking place from upstream to downstream approach based on community based participatory watershed development guideline.

All community members who have fit to work can participate on participatory watershed management activities at the age ranges of 18-60 that exclude students, disabilities and pregnant women. The ESSA team observed that there was significant number of women participants in the watershed development. Participants also mentioned that women are highly energetic and motivated. During community consultation, number of days for free labour contribution in the watershed development is varying that depends upon the availability of rehabilitated lands. In Amhara regional states, the number of days that community spent on participatory watershed management ranges 25-30 days per year. From these, 5 days are reserved for maintenance of damaged physical structures. In SNNP, Oromia and Tigray number of working days for communities' participatory watershed managements ranges from 30-35 days per year. However, in some visited sites, particularly in Oromia region, participatory watershed management activities, have not given a due attention.

Participants during community consultation in the four regions were asked by ESSA team about the process of their participation in the watershed development, and its implementation and benefit sharing, they informed the team that their participation in the process of site selection, planning and implementation stages of watershed development. They also indicated that development agents and

Kebele watershed team were providing support during planning, preparation, implementation and maintenance phases of watershed development. In all consulted regions, the informant noted that community was well experienced and motivated to do watershed development. But still, it requires more attention to be effective. In addition Zonal and woreda DA's, noted that participatory watershed development help the community to generate income from off-farm and non-farm activities (bee-keeping, livestock fattening, dairy). As far as the communities are highly populated and food unsecured, watershed management program is creating alternative source of income and job opportunity.

In Oromia region in visited woreda BoA informants noted that, participatory watershed management is not contextualized. To avoid such confusion, consulted stakeholders recommended more training and consultation.

In consulted regions, regarding grievance there is resolving mechanism that starting from kebele watershed committee up to regional level. Accordingly, if they are not satisfied with the decision they have the right to go to court (Woreda, Zone, Region and Federal) in any steps. The community has bylaws about watershed development and management, but these bylaws can't oblige all member of the community. Bylaws are not acceptable in the courts and don't consider as law, that is way bylaws can't oblige all member of the community. The community recommends relating and to be considered bylaws as regular laws.

Besides, in the consulted community inform Gender Based Violence is not familiar because the work is conducted in mass and females move with their husband and other relatives and as many of them are known each other. Moreover, all consulted stakeholders have good knowledge and experience regarding to watersheds development and management.

1.2.2. Second level landholding certificate

Federal Rural Land Administrative and Use Directorate informants point out their opinion, landholding registration was started in 2012/13. A total of 24,000,000 parcel lands was registered and demarcate from that 14,000,000 parcels acquired Second Level Landholding Certificate. Moreover, SLLC's is useful in way to (a) tenure security that increase productivity; (b) improved water and soil conservation; (c) improved tree planting; (d) decreasing boundary conflict and (e) takeover of land from vulnerable groups reduced and return back their land taken by others.

Moreover, the communities also further noted land certification was found important that reducing most of the conflicts over boundaries and land titles between family members and relatives, and gradually reducing risk of encroachment of communal lands by neighboring communities. They also stated that, the provisions laid out in the land registration and certification constitute a significant improvement in securing access to land and tenure use right. Access to land use right gave them the impetus to voluntarily participate in the watershed management activities in general and devote their time and labor as far as they afford, in their farmlands in particular.

In all consulted region communities explain that, they were very pleased to have second level landholding certificate. The process of SLLC's liable, before the certificate is issued kebele NRM office posted list of land holders with parcel area in hectare in a public place and commented by the communities. DA's and other concerned expert provide technical support for verify their parcels. They further stated that household could get the certificate that recognize the precise geographical locations and sizes of individual farm plots using technologies such as GPS, satellite imagery or orthography.

They further stated that the land certification system have provided and enhanced tenure security through ensuring usufruct rights over land especially on private croplands and homestead lands.

Key informants from land administration and use revealed that there has been conflicts related to second level land certification process, especially during adjudication time. This is related to problems arising

from replacement and wrong spell of their names, incorrect land measurement and sometimes problem of locating the right landholding. To overcome such problem, it was suggested the need to provide more training and logistic.

Consulted zonal and woreda RLAU offices indicate their concern to processed SLLC, there was political instability in some area of the region. This political instability cause vandalizes (e.g. breaking of vehicles) and hinders the movement of experts in the entre woredas. In such situation, taking about secondary land holding certificates become sensitive issues. The current political instabilities create difficulties to work on SLLC. To work on SLLC and to start the program, as rural land administration and use directorate explain, training is required on land demarcation and re-demarcation. In addition, logistics (e.g. vehicles and motors) should be fulfilled to start SLLC. On the other hand, Federal RLAUD informants stated the concern that, land administration and use proclamation 456/2005 doesn't have provisions for enforcing land use plan which is essential for land conservation. In addition to that urban peripheral is encroached by illegal settlers' expecting legalization in the near future due to urbanization. Hence it became difficulties to implement land use plan, of course the policy didn't enforce land use except Amahra region. Only Amhara region gives parcel land use plan other region have only land use right depend on their proclamation. So, action should be taken at country level to prepare land use plan that aligned with certification.

1.3. Concerns and recommendations identified during consultation

Below are concerns and recommendation identified during consultation in all visited regions.

Lack of controlling free grazing: Challenges biological integration and sustainability of the watershed development intervention even if guards are employed in some woredas visited by ESSA team. The regulations within the bylaw mostly states about controlling free grazing particularly in the treated areas, damage to physical structures due to tillage operations but rarely mention the functions and accountability of the authorized body that are responsible to enforce agreed bylaws. There have been experiences of Zero grazing in Semen Mecha (Amhara) and Tigray that they have still working hard to curve the challenges encountering them in this regard. The consulted communities recommended that there have to be law enforcement for the Sustainability's of developed watershed.

Lack of legalized bylaw: In all visited watershed, there is absence of legalized bylaws developed with the participation of the community, as a result, it has been difficult for regulatory and monitoring get ahead in the sustainability of community watersheds without strong and legalized bylaws. It requires strong and legalized bylaws to put in place to control defaulters.

Improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed to watershed user associations: During the consultation the communities explain that their no clear arrangement of benefit sharing mechanism of rehabilitated areas or the areas in the process of being rehabilitated. So that they recommended, when the program is implemented it must give attention for these kinds of issues.

Absence of land use planning: Stakeholders at various levels stated the expansion of eucalyptus plantation to food producing lands. The expansion of eucalyptus needs an immediate policy response before encroaching potential crop production areas and depletes water resources.

Zonal and woreda informants indicate that even if the watershed guideline recommends conducting land use planning prior to watershed implementation, it was not applied and used as a tool for planning other interventions. Moreover, the implementation of land use planning in all land uses was delayed. As a consequence, there has been encroachment of communal grazing lands.

Turnover of staffs, particularly development agents and capacity related problem: There are limited human and physical capacities within institutions responsible to implement watershed development

programs of the regions. Above all, skill and knowledge gaps of newly assigned DAs, shortage of DAs in some kebeles, high turnover and untimely reshuffling of DAs were the major mentioned gaps during the implementation of watershed development. There is also lack of attractive working environment and incentive for woreda and kebele persons comparable to the hardship, work load and qualification including experts working in the natural resource and environment related activities. They recommend incentive must be there to overcome such kind of problem for experts at different level.

Lack of hand tools and logistics: Dearth of hand tools and its low quality has contributed a lot to the lower working efficiency of the mobilized labor. It is thus important to provide quality hand tools and surveying materials based on the gaps observed in the development team.

Participation of women: Women in visited regions claimed that they got benefits like grass harvest in area closures and have a sense of ownership of watershed development. In spite of this, women's participation in decision making is yet to be improved. The participation of women in committee has still been insignificant even though the Participatory watershed guideline give grant up to 50%. The other points raised by informants were low awareness of women about their rights to land and how to claim them as they are excluded from spaces where they can access relevant information about their rights. Therefore, strengthening the capacity of women in order to engage those in decision making at the planning, implementation, evaluation stages will have an immense impact on agricultural production and natural resources management.

Political instability: the communities frustrate to participate on community mobilization and the number of participants is declining.

1.4. Summary of Community consultations

Community consultations were made in four regions: Amhara, SNNPR, Oromia and Tigray. Nine woredas were selected: Meket, Nifas Meweche, Semen Mecha, Durame, Boditi, Dugda, Dodola, Endemehoni and Kiltie Awelalo for the Environment and Social System Assessment. From each woredas one kebeles were selected depending on their ecological represent of watershed management.

In all the four regions, the community consultations were successfully completed without any resistance towards the upcoming CALM. Participants unanimously agreed to support the program during implementation. They accepted the program after they learnt the CALM components, objectives and activities that were made clear by consultants. They reflected their concerns, views and recommendations towards the program.

Annex-2 Participatory watershed management

Public Mobilization: an overview of Amhara, Tigray, SNNP and Oromia Regions

1. Background to public/mass mobilization on watershed development

To change the situation of land degradation, the concept of watershed management was implemented in Ethiopia in 1980s as a way of redressing. Although attempts to reverse land degradation following watershed approaches dated back to 1980s in Ethiopia (Lakew et al., 2005; Gete 2006; Tongul and Hobson, 2013), many programs were unsuccessful, and the technologies and practices were often abandoned by farmers as soon as they stopped being forced or paid to adopt them. The major limitation of the past attempt was the dominant view that labeled watershed problems as engineering problems, and technical solutions for controlling erosion, reducing runoff and flooding, and enhancing groundwater recharge were often designed and implemented with little regard for their impacts on people's livelihoods, on farm profitability, or on social equity. Thus, the watershed development was applied in a rigid and conventional manner without community participation and with little attention to farmer objectives and farmer knowledge as important reasons for these failures.

Aware of these limitations, the government of Ethiopia launched a massive community based participatory watershed development programs since 2010/11 in four regional states: Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples, Oromia, Amhara and Tigray as part of strategy to protect the environment while achieving food security. The farming communities in the rural areas were highly mobilized to implement both physical and biological soil and water conservation measures on farm and communal lands. These activities have been made to alleviate and reverse environmental problems in general and soil erosion and deforestation in particular both on private and communal lands. This practice has in turn increased agricultural productivity, vegetation cover, maintain bio-diversity, and realize the growing fuel wood and construction wood demand of the local communities.

As part of the green economy strategy of the country, watershed development was devised as one of the strategy to mitigate climate change in the country. A general direction is also given by the government and accordingly each of the woredas have identified the environmental problems and set priority for action. As opposed to previous watershed development involvements, the existing watershed development has involved various stakeholders. Regarding this, farmers at their watershed levels have been active participant from planning to operational and maintenance stages. Participatory watershed management activities have been implemented in the four regions visited, on the one hand, under the auspices of the government without the provision of any incentive for the farmers but they have been benefiting from rehabilitated farm and communal land with agreed bylaws drafted and approved by the watershed residents. While on the other hand, watershed development campaign works that have been done by projects of World Bank and others have incentivized the farmers who involve in the watershed development activities. The following section discusses about the various phases in undertaking watershed development activities.

2. Phases of watershed: Preparation and Planning, Implementation, Operational and Maintenance

In carrying out watershed development activities, more or less the four consulted regions have used in one way or the other similar phases that include preliminary, implementation, operational and maintenance as well as evaluation and monitoring stages.

2.1. Preparation and planning phase

During this phase, participants in the discussion described various things as a prerequisite to be taken into account and considered before the implementation of the watershed development activities. The major ones, but not limited to are resource identification, materials for the activities, trainings, and forming institutional arrangements in order to facilitate the activities that mainly relied on establishing and providing responsibility for watershed committee composed of various sections of the community including youths, elderly, both sexes, and the like. In this stage, it is also important to consider the document that is prepared following guideline 9, which is adopted from Ministry of Agriculture and the main issues to be considered in the document, includes the following aspects, but not limited to:

- ✚ Participatory watershed problem identification (watershed with critical problems are identified and then prioritized for development based on the severity of the problems),
- ✚ Watershed development mapping, which are called as sketch map, base map, and watershed development map (watershed with critical problems are identified and then prioritized for development based on the severity of the problems in participatory way by involving watershed committee, the local community and other stakeholders then reviewed and approved by community and posted at the Kebele office),
- ✚ Resources identification for watershed development. These include labor (15 to 60 years old people can participate), farm implements (spade, hoe, pick axe, lever, and the like), local and

industrial construction materials, surveying tools, seeds and seedlings, etc) identification and analysis are addressed.

- ✚ In all the regions visited the development of watershed has been conducted using the existing institutional arrangements: one two five (*andleamist*), Development groups (*ye limat budin*), as well as watershed committee, to mention a few. Watershed committee plays significant role in coordinating community for collective action in all stages of community watershed development. They are commonly composed of nine members from various groups of the Kebele that include chairman of the Kebele and vice chair persons, manager of the Kebele, development agent, health extension worker, women representative, youth representative, public affairs and head of justice. The major roles include: identify watershed problems, resources, planning of watershed activities, outline community by-laws, facilitate community meetings and discussions, assign field surveyors, monitor and evaluate day to day activities of the achievements and successes of the various watershed development in one to five working groups (about 6 members) as well as development group (30-40 members) and reporting the day to day progress to the Kebele council.
- ✚ Sorts of awareness creation mechanisms have been arranged in order for the community to make key decisions for implementation and post implementation in every year at Kebele level. During this time, the actual work and number of man days for each activity and site to be rehabilitated is decided and approved. Regarding this, various groups (selected farmers, kebele council members, development agents (DAs) and experts) from Amhara, Oromia and SNNP made a visit to Tigray in 2011 to learn soil and water conservation lessons and experiences on the process and status of the rehabilitated watershed. Besides, DAs and kebele council members received trainings at zonal and woreda levels on various aspects of the watershed development.
- ✚ Identifying and prioritizing the site in the selected watersheds is made based largely on the severity of the problems that include serious soil erosion, fertility loss, and decline in crop and livestock productivity as well as severe flooding prone area or topography.

2.2 Implementation

There are several things that have been accomplished in the process of implementing watershed development using mass/public mobilization. Some of the activities carried out in implementation stages embraces first and foremost mobilizing the community, define, design layout, construct the physical structures and make use of physical structures with biological stabilizers, handing over and maintenance of the developed physical and biological soil and water conservation structures. In the following sections, discussions will be made on each of the aforementioned accomplishments during the implementation phase of watershed development.

To start with one of the issues to be undertaken during implementation phase is mobilizing the public. It is done to create sense of ownership particularly through conferences, religious institutions, traditional songs, and slogans. Awareness about watershed development has also been created by providing vivid lessons and benefits obtained from it. Besides, the community at this stage has been given awareness about public participation, community by-laws and maintaining watershed of rehabilitated land. The other thing considered during implementation stage is that for top prioritized watershed areas, delineation, design and layout of physical structures are done by surveyors with the involvement of the community. Right away after lay out of the appropriate structures, constructions of various physical structures are made. In this regard, the role of one to five, development group, watershed committee and other stakeholders is immense. What is important in the implementation stage is not only the construction of physical soil and water conservation structures but also the need to stabilize it with biological measures: multi-use trees, shrubs and forage species that start with seedling raisings during the short rainy season and the actual plantation is done in the major rainy season beginning in June. In addition, public mobilization in every watershed development has to be handed over to the community as well as

individual land owners. This allows them to protect and conserve both the physical as well as biological structures on the basis of the agreement and commitment they made and is done every year by watershed committee. Even though watersheds are developed on the private lands and are handed to individuals with commitment to maintain and protect from damage while communal lands are protected and managed by the community.

3. Challenges in Participatory watershed management activities of Watershed Development at all levels

In spite of the many positive efforts that have been achieved in the watershed development and management activities in the past years since its start, the following are some of the major challenges observed in the four regions during the CALM ESSA assessment. In relation to watershed development and management, informants have described several challenges that they encountered during planning, implementation as well as operation and maintenance stages. Some of the challenges encountered in the process of undertaking watershed development and management include: free grazing, lack of legalized bylaw, improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed to watershed user associations, inadequate application of watershed guideline, absence of land use planning, missing to consider the connectivity of two kebeles watersheds, turnover of staffs, particularly development agents, overlap of various rural development activities, as well as poor documentation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation system. These challenges are discussed as follows.

Lack of controlling free grazing

Lack of free grazing challenges biological integration and sustainability of watershed development intervention even if guards are employed in some woredas visited by ESSA team. This was further aggravated in situations where strategic feed development was not in place particularly in areas where the livestock population is high. The regulations within the bylaw mostly states about controlling free grazing particularly in the treated areas, damage to physical structures due to tillage operations but rarely mention the functions and accountability of the authorized body that are responsible to enforce agreed bylaws. There have been experiences of Zero grazing in Semen Mecha (Amhara) and Tigray that they have still working hard to curve the challenges encountering them in this regard.

Lack of legalized bylaw

In all watershed development activities, there is lack of legalized bylaws developed with the participation of the community, as a result, it has been difficult for regulatory and organized committee to succeed in the sustainability of community watersheds without strong and legalized bylaws. This allows wrong doers a room sometimes not to be abided by the bylaws. Thus, it requires strong and legalized bylaws to put in place to control defaulters.

Improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed to watershed user associations

During the field work the youth and landless regardless of their active participation in the implementation and a good intention to accommodate their felt needs there is no well designed and accepted strategy to ensure equity and share benefit from the watershed development program. These indicate a need for clear direction for the benefits that would be gained for youth and landless as well as the management and utilization of the common resources. It is also imperative to make clear that different user groups are responsible in sustaining developed watershed. This also reflects the relevance to select beneficiaries through the participation of the community, organize user groups with certified use right in order to benefit from watershed resources. No clear arrangement of benefit sharing mechanism of rehabilitated areas or the areas in the process of being rehabilitated. Selection of beneficiaries was not done right from the start through community participation and use right of users not certified. Undermining the participation of the community on local decision making on watershed resources benefit sharing will have

negative impact on the sustainability of the watershed development which mainly focused on protective bylaws

Inadequate application of watershed guideline

For the purpose of proper implementation and collaboration of actors of CBPWD, a comprehensive watershed guiding manual was developed in 2005 which is a good opportunity. Watershed development approach includes different levels of intervention from the individual farm, through the community level, the extension system, the regional or national administration to the enabling policy environment. With the exception of some project supported Woreda, the watershed guideline was not completely applied and translated into actions due to technical capacity gaps and shortage of resources. Accordingly, it has been implemented differently under different conditions depending on agro-ecology, farming system, spatial and social scales as well as local socio-economic and political contexts.

Absence of land use planning

Even if the watershed guideline recommends conducting land use planning prior to watershed implementation, it was not applied and used as a tool for planning other interventions. Moreover, the implementation of land use planning in all land uses was delayed. As a consequence, there has been encroachment of communal grazing lands. Stakeholders at various levels stated the expansion of eucalyptus plantation to food producing lands, particularly the case in Semen Mecha and further degradation of mountain areas. The expansion of eucalyptus needs an immediate policy response before encroaching potential crop production areas and depletes water resources. However, all rural land use and administration proclamations of the federal government and regional states have provisions that support the integrated watershed management principles. Among the provisions, the necessity of land use planning that prepared according to the potential of the land; application of watershed approach for land resource management; necessity of equitable water use between upstream and downstream watershed users; buffering water bodies and gullies; implementation of wetland conservation; and harmonizing livestock with soil and water conservation.

Missing to consider the connectivity of two kebeles watersheds

The individual watershed planning often did not consider broader landscapes or the connectivity of different watersheds across two or more Kebele and Woreda boundaries, which rather has to consider a holistic manner of planning focusing on the physical plans of interventions. As work cannot be carried out at the same time in all the sub-watersheds due to manpower and resource constraints, a priority list of watersheds in the landscape taking into account connectivity of nested watersheds must have been set. Mismatch between watershed and administrative boundaries has limited the effectiveness of land management practices in watershed approach, upstream and downstream interactions has not received equal treatment and development in a coordinated manner. In situations where a watershed boundary extend more than one kebele, enforcement of agreed bylaws and harmonize planning and implementation of watershed development based on watershed governing principles was challenging, to the extent that threatens the system sustainability.

Turnover of staffs, particularly development agents and capacity related problem

There are limited human and physical capacities within institutions responsible to implement watershed development programs of the regions. Above all, skill and knowledge gaps of newly assigned DAs, shortage of DAs in some kebeles, high turnover and untimely reshuffling of DAs were the major mentioned gaps during the implementation of watershed development. There is also lack of attractive

working environment and incentive for woreda and kebele persons comparable to the hardship, work load and qualification including experts working in the natural resource and environment related activities.

Overlap of various rural development activities

In most cases the beginning time of SWC implementation overlaps with other peak agricultural activities such as harvesting and threshing, and towards the end with peak irrigation period and primary tillage operation. There is also overlap of different rural development activities that gives little time for critical thinking to maintain continuity and synergy between the different development activities and pose pressure on the lower level implementers. Moreover, the administrators and experts were totally absorbed on seasonal activities rather than targeting holistic approaches in rural development.

Hand tools

Dearth of hand tools and its low quality has contributed a lot to the lower working efficiency of the mobilized labor. It is thus important to provide quality hand tools and surveying materials based on the gaps observed in the development team.

Poor documentation, reporting, monitoring and evaluation system

The assessment of the ESSA found that there is lack of modern and appropriate documentation systems on watershed development that makes knowledge management, learning, decision making process on watershed development difficult. Accordingly, it is very difficult to obtain well organized and reliable reports and plans on watershed interventions. It has been found that the existing Monitoring and evaluation system was inadequate for the monitoring and reporting of the watershed development in the country. It was also noted that NRM intervention data are not easily accessible to end users, of poor quality and not easily manageable. Establishing a robust information management system in the sector will be solution for the problem. The practical strategic scheme observed during the assessment did not build monitoring and evaluation system into the watershed management plan in order to permit periodic appraisal of the watershed development performance and impacts. Monitoring and evaluation are used to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of planning and implementation of the watersheds, provide the institutional arrangements and the community at various levels with reliable and timely information on performance and achievement, and help all people affected by the work to take timely decisions that improve the quality of the work.

There is no clear post monitoring and evaluation strategies recognized at planning stage that ensure efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation

This is particularly the case at kebele level where the watershed development committee is responsible for these tasks, but it lacks capacity and empowerment to implement. In some cases, there were observations that indicate low level of interest and reluctance to conduct daily evaluation of their work by one to five work team and development group. There was insufficient technical support provided by woreda experts to the kebeles and on the other hand, the DAs sometimes showed resistance and defend the support and comments provided by the experts. In cases where the team of woreda experts assigned at one kebele throughout the implementation period restricted them to visualize the performance of other kebeles.

A brief discussion on evaluation and monitoring of watersheds

It has been observed that in all stages of watershed intervention, DAs, kebele and woreda administration officials and experts working in agriculture bureau of natural resource management office have made continuous and intensive monitoring and evaluation. One of the things that they have done in the process of implementing the actual watershed development work is checking the application of the principle of watershed development that starts from the upper stream. During the evaluation process, the evaluation

has taken into account various issues including the selection of tools that are appropriate as per the specific sub-watershed land type/slope or structure as this affects the person per day labor for each structure and the efficiency of the work to be done. They also evaluate the organizational set up, resource availability and its gaps or weakness. Informants also informed that in addition to field evaluation and assessment, written reports are submitted to both woreda administration and agricultural office.

One of the methodologies applied while monitoring the activity includes observing the activities carried out in person having the report at hand. Besides, achievements and challenges are reported every five days to woreda administration and office of agriculture in written form by watershed development committee as a result feedback report is sent to kebele for taking corrective actions. In their evaluation, several stakeholders stated that participatory watershed management, despite its contribution for the development of degraded lands particularly watershed areas, they criticized its wastage of human resource and materials taking into account the high number of people participating in the watershed development as compared to its benefits and drawbacks in sustaining what has been developed. The case in point was observed by the ESSA team in oromia region, Dodola and Dugda woredas where the participatory watershed management activity has faced challenges since 2017 due to political instability.

Sample photos taken during ESSA assesment





Figure 1: Closing ceremony of public/participatory watershed management for watershed development in Koga Watershed, Berkit Kebele, Semen Anchefer- Amhara Regional State



Figure 2: Communities conducting participatory watershed management at Koga watershed, Semen mecha woreda in Amhara Regional State



Figure 3: Conducting FGD and KII at Arore watershed, Nifas Mewecha-Lay Gayiant in Amhara Regional State.



Figure 4: Communities conducting participatory watershed management at Arore watershed, Nifas Mewecha-Lay Gayiant in Amhara Regional State.



Figure 5: Conducting community consultation at Endemehoni and Kilite Awelalo in Tigray Regional State.



Figure 6: Communities conducting participatory watershed management at Endemehoni, Tigray Regional State.



Figure 7: Conducting KII and Community consultation at Ade ofa watershed, Boditi woreda- Wolayita zone in SNNP.



Figure 8: Conducting KII and Community consultation at Sheshera-Dudoye watershed, Durame woreda- Kebata zone in SNNP.



Figure 9: under rehabilitate watershed through community participatory watershed management in Chari golba chalalak and Denba (Dugda and Dodola, respectively), Oromia Regional State.



Figure 10: SLMP-2 Practice in beekeeping and fattening (Robit watershed, Meket woreda in Amhara Regional State)

Annex-3: Exclusion List

The following lists of activities are excluded from CALM Program supported subproject.

1. Small Scale Irrigation

Annex -4. Relevant Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework of Ethiopia's Environmental and Social Management Systems

1. Relevant Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework of Ethiopia's Environmental and Social Management Systems

This section discusses relevant national and regional environmental Policies, strategies and legislations applicable to CALM program that needs to be considered during program implementation phases. The discussion below provides a list of the key relevant environment legislations and key institutions that are in charge of the implementation. The relevance of these requirements to CRLMP is assessed with due consideration of the requirements and guidelines of PforR financing.

1.1. Applicable Policies and Strategies forming the National Environmental and Social Management System

a. The Constitution

The constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia had been issued in August 1995 with several provisions, which provides basic and comprehensive principles and guidelines for environmental protection and management in the country. The concept of sustainable development and environmental rights are presented in Articles 43, 44 and 92 of the Constitution.

Article 43- The Right to Development

- The Peoples of Ethiopia as a whole, and each Nation, Nationality and People in Ethiopia in particular have the right to improved living standards and to sustainable development.
- Nationals have the right to participate in national development and, in particular, to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community.

Article 44- Environmental Rights

- All persons have the right to a clean and healthy environment.
- All persons who have been displaced or whose livelihoods have been adversely affected as a result of State programs have the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation, including relocation with adequate State assistance.

Article 92- Environmental Objectives

- Government shall endeavor to ensure that all Ethiopians live in a clean and healthy environment.
- The design and implementation of programs and projects of development shall not damage or destroy the environment.
- People have the right to full consultation and to the expression of views in the planning and implementations of environmental policies and projects that affect them directly.
- Government and citizens shall have the duty to protect the environment.

Article 40: Land and Natural Resource

In relation to land and natural resources, the Constitution under Article 40 proclaims that land and natural resources are commonly owned by the people of Ethiopia and shall not be subject to sale or other means

of exchange. It stipulates the rights of Ethiopian farmers and pastoralists to obtain land for cultivation and for free grazing without payment and the protection against eviction from their possession.

Article 42: Rights of Labor

Article 42(2) stipulates that ‘workers have the right to a healthy and safe work environment’, obliging an employer (be it government or private) to take all necessary measures to ensure that workplace is safe, healthy and free of any danger to the wellbeing of workers.

Article 41: Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Article 41 of the Constitution states that every Ethiopian has the right to access publicly funded social services. Sub Article 5 of the same article stipulates, the state, within available means, should allocate resource to provide rehabilitation and assistance to physically and mentally disabled, the aged and to children who are left without parents or guardians.

Regional states constitution: Regional states have their own constitution upholding the federal constitution in its entirety and constituting their regional particulars. All the regional state constitutions have addressed land and natural resources management and environmental protection. The regional states constitutions state that:

- The regional governments are entrusted to administer land and natural resources in the name of the people and deploy for the common benefit of the same;
- The regional governments and all citizens of the regions are responsible for the conservation of natural resources and the environment;
- Concerned communities shall be given opportunity to express their opinions in the formulation and implementation of policies in relation to the environment

b. Environment Policy of Ethiopia

The first comprehensive statement of Environmental Policy of Ethiopia was approved by the Council of Ministers in April 1997 that was based on the policy and strategic findings and recommendations of the Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia. The policy is aimed at guiding sustainable social and economic development of the country through the conservation and sustainable utilization of the natural, man-made and cultural resources and the environment at large. The overall policy goal is to improve and enhance the health and quality of life of all Ethiopians and to promote sustainable social and economic development through the sound management and use of natural, human-made and cultural resources and the environment as a whole so as to meet the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Environmental Policy provides a number of guiding principles that require adherence to the general principles of sustainable development. In particular, the need to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessment:

- Considers impacts on human and natural environments
- Provides for early consideration of environmental impacts in project and program design
- Recognizes public consultation processes as essential to effective management
- Includes mitigation and contingency plans
- Provides for auditing and monitoring
- Is a legally binding requirement

The Government of Ethiopia has recently initiated to update the Environmental policy of Ethiopia. The technical committee under the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change was formalized to be in charge of updating the National environmental policy to fulfil the gaps identified in addressing climate change and other environmental issues.

c. Climate Resilient Green Economy

The Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE, 2011) is Ethiopia's overarching framework and a national strategy towards a green economy. The Green Economy Strategy is believed to provide an opportunity to promote sustainable development in Ethiopia. Currently, it builds on an investment plan of over 60 initiatives that are, or can be, turned into financed projects. For this to happen, there is a strong need to reform the economy. The CRGE is envisioned to be the main driver for this transformation. The CRGE has three complementary objectives: i) fostering economic development and growth, ii) ensuring abatement and avoidance of future GHG emissions; and iii) improving resilience to climate change. To achieve these objectives, CRGE sets out to tap into international climate finance, seize opportunities for innovation and new technologies, and create competitive advantages via sustainable resource use and improving productivity.

d. The Agriculture Sector Policy and Strategy

The policy objectives are:

- To substantially enhance the production and productivity of agricultural sector for improvement of the living conditions of the people,
- To conserve and rational utilization of natural resource for sustainable agricultural development,
- Policy elements on crop protection focus on non –migratory and migratory pests.

The policy statements include:

- Importation and handing over of crop protection technologies should be based on testing their effectiveness,
- spraying pesticides considered as effective control of Migratory pests,
- The need for the establishment of plant quarantine system to prevent intrusion of exotic pests or move out of the country,
- Development of pesticide registration and control system, etc.

e. Food Security Strategy

This strategy addresses both the supply and the demand side of the food equation - that is, availability and entitlement respectively from both a national and household level perspective. Within this, particular attention is focused on the diversity of food production zones in Ethiopia (i.e. areas with adequate moisture, moisture deficit and pastoral) to tailor options and strategies accordingly.

The three basic pillars on which the strategy rests are:

- ✚ To increase the availability of food through increased domestic production.
- ✚ To ensure access to food for food deficit households; and
- ✚ To strengthen emergency response capabilities.

f. FDRE National Occupational Safety and Health Policy and Strategy

The National Policy and strategy on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) was endorsed by the FDRE Council of Ministers in July 2014. The OSH policy and strategy was prepared to implement the rights of Labour as stipulated in article 42(2) of the Constitution and also implement the requirements of International Conventions on Occupational Health and Safety (No.155) to which Ethiopia is a signatory. The overall objective of the national OSH Policy and strategy is to avoid, prevent or minimize occupational and health hazards by providing effective OSH services in all working places and thereby contribute to the socioeconomic development of the Country.

The guiding principles of the National OSH policy and strategy are stated as the following:

- c. Occupational Safety and Health Services are basic rights of workers
- d. Occupational Safety and Health Services are necessary in all working places
- e. Occupational accidents and health hazards can be prevented
- f. Tripartite and bipartite cooperation and coordination are key instruments for the national OSH policy and strategy implementation.

The Specific objectives of the National OSH policy and strategy include:

- g. To ensure availability and accessibility of OSH services in all economic activities including in the informal work sectors
- h. To prevent occupational safety and health hazards by establishing a tripartite and bipartite consultation and coordination mechanisms
- i. To establish OSH systems that pays attention to those workers who seek special assistance (e.g: Women, youth, persons with disabilities, HIV patients, etc.).
- j. To prevent the environment, public and workers health by preventing the release of pollutants from the work places.

The strategy of the national OSH policy includes;

- a. Establishment of an effective and accessible work conditions inspection mechanism that is focused on prevention.
- b. Formulating and implementing national regulations and standards on OSH and updating and improving it periodically.
- c. Integrating and implementing OSH protection principles in all national development plans
- d. Establishing control and inspection mechanism that ensure prevention of occupational and health hazards to workers and impacts on the environment from occurring due to import. Use or disposal of machineries, raw materials or chemicals in work places.
- e. Establishing a mechanism to ensure OSH services are provided in the private sector
- f. Establishing a mechanism to ensure provision of advices and technical support on OSH are provided by Organizations.

The national OSH policy and strategy is applicable to all types of work places and economic activities in Ethiopia.

1.2 Applicable Proclamations, Regulations and Procedural Guidelines forming the National Environmental Management System

a. Environmental Impact Assessment Proclamation (Proclamation No. 299/2002)

The EIA Proclamation is used to predict and manage the environmental effects of a proposed development activity as a result of its design, sitting, construction, operation, or an ongoing one as a result of its modification or termination, entails and thus helps to bring about intended development.

The proclamation is an effective means of harmonizing and integrating environmental, economic, cultural and social considerations in to the planning and decision making processes thereby promoting sustainable development. Moreover, it serves as a basic instrument in bringing about administrative transparency and accountability, to involve the public and the communities in particular, in the planning and execution of development programs that may affect them and their environment. The objective of undertaking the assessment study is to ensure the impacts of a development project and the incorporation of mitigating measures for the adverse significant impacts. The EIA law and associated guidelines clearly defines:

- Why there is a need to prepare EIAs

- What procedure is to be followed in order to implement EIA
- The depth of environmental impact studies
- Which projects require full EIA studies
- Which projects need partial or no EIA studies
- To whom the report must be submitted

There are ongoing efforts carried by the former MoEFCC (now Environment, Forest, and Climate Change Commission/EFCCC/) to review the EIA Proclamation in order to update and improve it.

i. Environmental Impact Assessment Procedural Guidelines Series (Series 1 and 2)

In order to facilitate the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessment Proclamation (Proclamation 299/2002), the then MoEFCC (now EFCCC) had formulated four procedural guidelines, namely, Review Guideline Series 1: Guidelines for Review Approach; Review Guideline Series 2- Guidelines for Contents and Scopes of Report; Review Guideline Series 3- Checklist of Environmental Characteristics and Review Guideline Series 4- Review Criteria. These widely applied draft environmental impact assessment guidelines were under review to enhance the documents in light of the experiences gained so far and to publish it for official use after endorsement by the Ministry. The review process is still ongoing and yet to be completed during the current 2018/2019 fiscal year. Review Guideline Series 1 and 2 will be elaborated to a certain extent here and any further updates made to the documents will apply after official publication of the reviewed guidelines.

A) Procedural Guideline Series 1 -Guidelines for Review Approach

This guideline pointed out roles and responsibilities of the former MoEFCC (now called EFCCC) and Regional Environmental Agencies, the proponent, consulting firm, interested and affected parties, and the licensing agency. In the guideline, the EIA processes and requirements, and comprehensive description of the EA process has been stated. It also outlined projects which may have adverse and significant environmental impacts, and may, therefore, require full EIA (Schedule 1), projects whose type, scale or other relevant characteristics have the potential to cause some significant environmental impacts but not likely to warrant an environmental impact study (Schedule 2) and projects which would have no impact and does not require environmental impact assessment (Schedule 3).

B) Procedural Guideline Series 2 - Guidelines for Contents and Scopes of Report

This guideline among others indicates structure and content of the Environmental Impact Study Report and describes the contents including the administrative, legal and policy requirements, assessment and mitigation measures. The guideline indicates the following main types of mitigating measures, which need due considerations:

- Preventing, reducing or minimizing impacts before they occur;
- Eliminating an actual impact over time by incorporating appropriate maintenance measures during the life of the project;
- Rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the affected environment;
- Compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments as well as contingency plans in case of emergencies;
- Maximizing beneficial impacts through specific additional actions

c) Directive No.2/2014 (2006 EC): Directive on issuing “professional competence certificate to consultants and firms providing service in Environmental Impact Assessment, Environmental Audit and Climate Change fields”

The Directive has been issued by the MoEFCC (now called EFCCC) and has been in force for the last four years. It has become an important milestone in the development of the EIA system in Ethiopia. The directive stipulates that EIA and Environment Audits should be conducted by professional consultants and firms that are registered and certified for their competence by the Federal Environment, Forest, and Climate Change Commission. EIAs and Environment Audits prepared by unregistered and certified firms will not be eligible for review and approval. The Regional EPFCCs have also started applying the stated directive of MoEFCC. Directive no.2/2014 is also among the guidelines put under review by the MOEFCC and is being updated.

d) Environmental guideline and management plan

- ***Guideline for Environmental Management Plan (draft), May 2004*** outlines measures for preparation of an Environmental Management Plans (EMP) for proposed developments in Ethiopia and institutional arrangements for implementation of EMPs.

- ***EIA Procedural Guideline (draft), November 2003***: This guideline outlines the screening, review and approval process for development projects in Ethiopia and defines the criteria for undertaking an EIA.

- ***EIA Guideline, July 2000***: The EIA Guideline Document provides essential information covering the following elements:

- Environmental Assessment and Management in Ethiopia
- Environmental Impact Assessment Process
- Standards and Guidelines
- Issues for sector environmental impact assessment in Ethiopia covering agriculture, industry, transport, mining, dams and reservoirs, tanneries, textiles, hydropower generation, irrigation projects and resettlement
- The guideline contains annexes that:
 - Identify activities requiring a full EIA, partial measure or no action
 - Contain sample forms for application
 - Provide standards and guidelines for water and air

ii. Waste Handling and Disposal Guideline, 1997

The Waste Handling and Disposal Guidelines have been in use since 1997. The Guidelines are meant to help industry and local authorities handle medical waste situation at the local level.

iii. Environmental Pollution Control Proclamation (Proclamation No. 300/2002)

This proclamation is aimed at eliminating or, when not possible, to mitigate pollution as an undesirable consequence of social and economic development activities. It has also an objective of protecting the environment and safeguarding of human health, as well as maintaining of the biota and the aesthetic value of the environment. The Proclamation, among others has considered control of pollution; management of hazardous waste, chemical and radioactive substances; management of municipal wastes; the importance and need to respect environmental standards; and punitive and incentive measures.

iv. Solid Waste Proclamation (Proclamation 513/2007)

Solid Waste Management proclamation aims to promote community participation to prevent adverse impacts and enhance benefits resulting from solid waste management. It provides for preparation of solid waste management action plans by urban local governments.

V. Proclamation to Provide for the Establishment of Environmental Protection Organs (Proclamation No. 295/2002)

The first objective of this proclamation is to assign responsibilities to separate organizations for environmental development and management activities on the one hand, and environmental protection,

regulations and monitoring on the other, which is instrumental for the sustainable use of environmental resources. The second objective is to establish a system that fosters coordinated but differentiated responsibilities among environmental protection agencies at federal and regional levels.

Vi. Water Resources Management Proclamation (197/2000)

The purpose of the Proclamation is to ensure that the water resources of the country are protected and utilized for the highest social and economic benefits of the people of Ethiopia, to follow up and supervise that they are duly conserved, ensure that harmful effects of water are prevented, and that the management of water resources is carried out properly.

Vii. Proclamations on public and workers safety- The Labor Law

Ethiopia has issued proclamations in the effort to improve employment relations and outcomes, protect child labor exploitation, and maintain proper occupational health and safety. The transitional government of Ethiopia has issued Labor Proclamation No. 42/1993. This proclamation was amended and replaced with Labor Proclamation No. 377/2003. The Labor Proclamations have had detailed provisions pertaining to workers' suspension and protects their rights. Besides, there are other labor related proclamations such as the provisions of the Employment Exchange Service Proclamation (Proclamation No. 632/2009) and the Right to Employment of Persons with Disability (Proclamation No. 568/2008) enacted to govern the relations between employers and employees.

The Labor Law protects Children against Child Labor abuse. Under the provisions of the Revised Family Code (2000), a child or minor is defined as "a person of either sex who has not attained the full age of eighteen years". Proclamation No. 377/2003, Article 89 prohibited employment of less than 14 years. The proclamations states "It is prohibited to employ persons under 14 years of age". It is also prohibited to employ young workers which on account of its nature or due to the condition in which it is carried out, endangers the life or health of the young workers performing it. "Young worker" means a person who has attained the age of 14 but is not over the age of 18 years (Article 89 Sub-Article 3).

Proclamation 377/2003 is also the prevailing law protecting public and workers safety. The proclamation covers health and safety at work, harmonious industrial relation and minimum workplace standard and addresses workplace vulnerability. Article 92-93 of the proclamation defines obligation of employers and employees in work place including assignment of safety officers and health committee.

The Labor Proclamation mandates employers to protect occupational safety, health and create better working environment for their workers. Article 92 states that "An employer shall take the necessary measure to safeguard adequately the health and safety of the workers..." The proclamations have details about the safety and health of workers. For instance, it forces employers to i) take appropriate steps to ensure that workers are properly instructed and notified concerning the hazards of their respective occupations and the precautions necessary to avoid accident and injury to health; ii) ensure that directives are given and also assign safety officer; establish an occupational, safety and health committee of which the committee's establishment, shall be determined by a directive issued by the Minister; iii) provide workers with protective equipment, clothing and other materials and instruct them of its use; etc.

In addition to enacting its labor codes, Ethiopia is also a signatory to the international UN conventions and has ratified the major international human rights instruments. Ethiopia has also ratified the following ILO conventions:

- Forced Labor Convention No.29 /1930;
- Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, No.87/1948;
- Employment Service Convention, No.88/1948;

- Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, No.98/1949;
- Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, No.105/1957;
- Minimum Age Convention No. 138 /1973;
- Occupational Safety and Health Convention, No.156/1981;
- Termination of Employment Convention, No.158/1982;
- The Rights of the Child Convention (1989); and
- The Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention No.182/1999.

The 2005 Occupational Health and Safety Directive: developed as a follow-up to the labor Proclamation provides guidance on the establishment of occupational health and safety committees in public and private organizations.

Table 4: Relevant EFCCC (MoEFCC) and other guidelines and standards

GUIDELINE/ STANDARD	DESCRIPTION
EIA Procedural Guideline, November 2003	The EIA guideline of 2000 mentioned above was revised in 2003 and issued as draft EIA procedural guideline. The later outlines the screening; review and approval process for development projects in Ethiopia and defines the criteria for undertaking an EIA. Annex-III identifies the schedule of activities for which a full EIA, partial EIA or no action is required. The schedule of activities listed in Annex-III is widely applied by the Federal and Regional competent authorities to classify sub-projects into one of the three Categories.
Directive No.2/2014 (2006 EC): Directive on issuing “professional competence certificate to consultants and firms providing service in Environmental Impact Assessment, Environmental Audit and Climate Change fields”	The Directive has been issued by the EFCCC and brought into force in the last four years. It has become an important milestone in the development of the EIA system in Ethiopia. The directive stipulates that EIA and Environment Audits should be conducted by professional consultants and firms that are registered and certified for their competence by the Ministry of Environment. EIAs and Environment Audits prepared by unregistered and certified firms will not be eligible for review and approval. The Regional EPFCCs have also started applying the stated directive of EFCCC and others preparing their own version of the Directive (e.g. Amhara region)
Draft Guideline for Environmental Management Plan (draft), May 2004	The guideline provides guidance on the necessary elements for preparation of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for proposed development projects in Ethiopia and the institutional arrangements for implementation of EMPs.
The Labor Proclamation 377/2005	The Labor proclamation requires an employer to take the necessary measures to adequately safeguard the health and safety of the workers. It also consists of provisions that address working conditions of women and young workers (14-18 years age). The Federal Labor law is the basic legislation directly applied by all the regional states without further making regional version of it.
Directive No.01/2010 Regional EIA guideline of Amhara Region Environment, Forest, Wildlife Protection and	The EIA guideline provides details for acceptable EIA content, the review and approval process involved, the certification process of ESIA practitioners/consultants/ in the region, and EMP formats which need to be applied during EIA preparation. The Amhara region EFWPDA is testing the preparation and submission of EIA reports in the local Amharic language and

Development Authority (EFPDA).	is starting to collect service charges for reviewing and clearing EIA documents.
--------------------------------	--

1.3 National Policies, Regulations, and Guidelines for Social Impact Assessment and Management

a. The National Social Protection Strategy of Ethiopia

Ethiopia has formulated National Social Protection policy in 2012 with a general objective to create an enabling environment in which citizens (including special need and other vulnerable segments) have equitable access to all social protection services that will enhance their growth, development. Ethiopia's social protection policy is a central public policy component for addressing poverty, vulnerability and inequality. The following are among the objectives of Social Protection Policy of Ethiopia:

2. Protect poor and vulnerable individuals, households, and communities from the adverse effects of shocks and destitution;
3. Increase access to equitable and quality health, education and social welfare services to build human capital thus breaking the intergenerational transmission of poverty;
4. Guarantee a minimum level of employment for the long term unemployed and under-employed;
5. Enhance the social status and progressively realize the social and economic rights of the excluded and marginalized;

The strategy has designed instruments to reach long and short term objectives including conditional and unconditional social transfer, expansion of public works; providing technical support and financial services; mandatory social insurance and community based health insurance; establishment of social work system, services for PWDs, the elderly and mobility constrained persons; enhancing abuse and exploitation prevention communication, provide protective legal and policy environment, support for survivors of abuse and exploitation and drop in centers and hot lines.

b. The National Policy on Ethiopian Women (1993)

It underlines the need to establish equitable and gender sensitive public policies that empower woman, especially in education and property rights, and engaging them in decision making. Improving healthy working conditions, ensuring access to basic services, protecting woman from harmful traditional practices are among the emphasized key issues.

c. Gender mainstreaming strategy and guideline (2010)

This strategy was adopted at policy, program and project level by government and development partners to ensure the outcomes of development to be shared equally between men and women; both men and women enjoy equal opportunities, status and recognition.

The ratification of the Family Law and amendments made to the criminal code significantly support to fight abuses committed against woman and children. Proclamation No, 377/2003 gives special attention to woman and young workers. The proclamation provides protection for woman in general and pregnant woman in particular from hard work and long hours. The law clearly states that women should not be discriminated against as regards to employment and payment on bases of her sex. Gender norms in Ethiopia vary widely depending on geographic location, ethnicity, and religion, especially related to property ownership, inheritance, and the division of assets after divorce. However, the new Family Code has changed all that. Passed in 2000, it gives equal rights to women in marriage and it requires all assets be divided equally among both partners in the case of a divorce. By now, all the states in Ethiopia have

approved this new Code. Ethiopia is one of many developing countries implementing gender policy reforms, especially regarding women's equal access to assets and resources.

d. The Development and Change Package (2007)

It envisions to build democratic society where women are equal participants and beneficiaries of economic, social and political life of the country. Widespread awareness creation of women to actively participate in the development process; organizing and associate women to address challenges they face; capacitate women to solve problems and fight demeaning perceptions & fight for their rights; facilitate linkages and support among created associations and organization; and enable women to benefit economically and socially.

e. The Federal rural land administration proclamation No.89/1997

Federal rural land administration proclamation stated that women, orphans and disabled persons can use hired labor on their land or use other options without compromising their rights. In addition, the legislation has also provided orphans inherited land-use rights through their legal guardians.

Article 6 of part two of the Proclamation (right to hold land) states that: "The working system that gives priority to women, disables and orphan children shall be executed during the time of land distribution". It is also reiterated under article 9 on procedures for land provision that: "where the land to be distributed is not available to all petitioners with equal magnitude of land holding problem it shall priority be caused to be given to orphan children, disables, women and youngsters who join the new life of independence, consecutively".

Article 5 on access to and use of grazing land states that: "Women pastoralists have equal rights with men to access and use grazing lands" and Article 9 on access to rural lands and use right " Women who intend to be engaged in raising animals, crop farming; and natural resource development activities have the right to access to and use farm and grazing lands free of charge and (ii) Rural women whose husbands are away from the locality and are in other places to render government services; or to do other work shall not lose their right of use over the joint/communal holding".

f. National Rural Land Administration and Use (Proclamation No. 456/2005)

The Rural Land Administration and Use Proclamation (Proclamation No. 456/2005) defines the state ownership of rural land and the tenure rights of the land occupant, including rights to "property produced on his land", rights of inter-generational tenure transfer, and rights of exchange land and limited leasing rights. Provisions are made for the registration and certification of tenure rights. Part three of the proclamation presents regulations relating to the use of rural land, particularly as it relates to soil and water conservation and watershed management. The rural land administration and land use laws are to be implemented by the regional states.

Land holding right gives the right to use the land for agricultural purposes as well as to lease it and, while the right remains in effect, bequeath it to family members, as well as the right to acquire property thereon, by labor or capital, and to sell, exchange and bequeath the same. The proclamation also addresses environmental concerns, including non-compliance with directives on environmental protection.

An important feature of this proclamation is that it stipulates rural land use and restrictions based on proper land use planning, providing for the proper use of various types of land, such as slopes, gullies and wetlands, as well as the utilization of rural land for villages and social services. In addition, it is envisaged that the proclamation will create a sense of ownership among the vast majority of the rural population and enable them to take initiatives and collectively engage in environmental management activities.

g. Proclamations on Persons with Disability and Vulnerable groups

Proclamation No. 568/2008 Rights to Employment for Persons with Disabilities: makes null and void any law, practice, custom, attitude and other discriminatory situations that limit equal opportunities for persons with disabilities. It also requires employers to provide appropriate environment for work, training and take affirmative measures particularly when employing women with disabilities.

Building Proclamation No. 624/2009 and Regulation 243/2011: puts as requirement accessibility for the elderly and physically impaired persons in the design and construction of public building.

Various policies and plan of action have been formulated to protect people with disability and the elderly. The most relevant are mentioned below;

- National Plan of Action of Persons with Disabilities (2012-2021) addresses the needs of persons with disabilities for comprehensive rehabilitation services, equal opportunities for education, skills training and work, as well as full participation in the life of their families, communities and the nation.

1.4 Applicable International Conventions Endorsed by Ethiopia

Ethiopia has ratified several international/multilateral environmental conventions and many of the principles and provisions in those conventions have been well addressed in the national environmental policies and regulations. Accordingly, Article 9(4) of the constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia provides that once an international agreement is ratified through the accepted or established procedure, it automatically becomes an integral part of the law of the land. Consequently, the convention and the protocol are the laws of this land. Therefore, the following international conventions and protocols are relevant to the proposed P for R operation;

UN Framework Convention on Climate Change: It provides a framework for international cooperation to combat climate change by limiting average global temperature increases and the resulting climate change and coping with its impacts. The objective of this convention is to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that will prevent dangerous interference with the climate system. Ethiopia ratified this convention through proclamation No. 97/1994 on May 2/1994. This convention takes into account the fact that climate change has trans-boundary impacts.

The United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification: The objective of the convention is to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of droughts in countries experiencing serious drought and desertification, particularly in Africa. Ethiopia has ratified the convention through its proclamation No. 80/1997.

Convention on Biological Diversity: The convention on biological diversity has three goals. These are:

- Conservation of biodiversity;
- Sustainable use of the components of biodiversity; and
- Fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources.

Cartagena Protocol on Bio-Safety to the Convention on Biological Diversity: It aims to ensure the safe handling; transport and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) are resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.

Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage Paris, 23 November 1972

Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: Legally binds developed country Parties to emission reduction targets.

Annex 5: ESSA Checklist

Checklist for ESSA for Community Consultation for CALM PforR

A. Questions related to watershed such as Participatory watershed management, public work, etc

1. What are climate resilience landscape management related intervention activities such as participatory watershed management or public work?
2. What is/are the standard/s for providing non-paid participatory watershed management or public work in the community?
3. Could you tell us the process and nature of climate resilience landscape management such as participatory watershed management in your area?
4. Have you engaged in watershed management?
5. Was there consultation before the commencement of the watershed rehabilitation/public works? If there was community consultation, how the consultation process was carried out and what were the consultation agenda?
6. Do you think Participatory watershed management or public work is useful? If yes
What are the benefits of engaging in Participatory watershed management or public work?
7. How many hours do you work per day/per week? How do you manage/balance your time to participatory watershed management or public works and for your other personal daily activities (livelihoods)? Is there any conflicting issues regarding timing?
8. Do you think the provision of labor for watershed development and management activities should affect anyone's ability to sustain their immediate or long-term livelihood?
9. Do you work in your own/nearby watershed areas or somewhere else far from your residence? If they work in a different watershed, how far is the distance? Who assign them to watershed sites?
10. Do the watershed participatory watershed management work conducted on communal land or individually owned land? If working on individual plots, what are the bases for selection/prioritization?
11. If the proposed project requires some land for subproject activity implementation, how would it acquire? Do you think that community members could voluntarily donate? If so, what procedures would be followed to ensure voluntary donation by landholders?
12. Are there physical cultural resources in the community? If so,
 - i. The name, type, age, ownership, short description of the cultural resource, etc.
 - ii. What is the nature and extent of potential impacts on these resources (this should include locally recognized sacred and religious place.
 - iii. How will it be monitored, and managed? What activities need to done to protect the cultural heritages?
13. At what point they start to work in the watershed? (Is that from the top, middle or bottom of the watershed?) Is there any responsible person who supervises (expertise)?
14. Are there any arrangements for vulnerable groups that inclusiveness of elders, pregnant, people with disability and etc? Is there any special arrangement for those who take care of vulnerable people in their home?
15. Is there any conflict resolution mechanism in the process of participatory watershed management and public works? Do people know where to go for complain? If they have any complain/disagreement? Do you have the right to say "NO"? If they refuse the proposal (offer) what will happen on to them?

16. Is there any incentive or payment for being engaged in public works?
17. Have you ever observed any act of child labor exploitation/abuse or child trafficking in the host community?
Probe: If so, who are the perpetrators? When and how is the act committed? Are there exist NGOs or civic societies that advocate child rights and raise awareness to children and families about child rights protection?
18. Do you have water user association? What are the processes to participate in the association, which office are in charge of organizing or supporting you?
19. How do you think that all community members participate in the Program design and implementation? Do men and women have equal saying and discuss together?
20. What is your future plan?
21. If you have anything to add?

B. Questions related to Land Use and land Administration

1. How do you evaluate land use and administration in your locality?
2. How are the Kebele level committee democrat and capable in making the process of providing second level landholding certificate?
3. Is there joint SLLCs practice in your locality?
4. How do you explain land expropriation and compensation in your area, particularly focusing on women, elderly and disabled persons in relation to ownership and certification process? How their rights are addressed by government and international organizations? Could you suggest how the capacity gaps in this regard be improved?
5. How the land certification procedures and controlling systems are secured and information based?
6. How the owners of the land are protected?
7. What are the gaps of the service providers and how can their capacity be built?
8. Do you have GRM to solve issues related to land?

ESSA for Climate Action through Landscape Management (170384)

Key Informant Interview Questions for BoA for Regional/woreda Offices

First briefing about the project- land certification and system (benefits and drawbacks)

1. What is the role of BoA at regional and woreda level branch office in community?
2. Does all the community participate on participatory watershed management or public work program? What is your organization do to support them?
3. Compared with last years, what is the level of community participation in participatory watershed management in this year?
4. Which sector offices and development partners are involved in SLMP work including DPs? Are there guidelines and standard working procedures related with SLMP?
5. What were the notable roles and achievements SLMP and can you mention the process- the tools used and available evidences?
6. What do you think will be the barriers that hinder participatory watershed management or public work with the conventional/national program?
Probe: Factors like social, cultural, religious, political, legal, economic and others.
7. What mechanisms need to be put in place to solve the barriers?
8. What efforts have you played in participating women in the climate resilience/participatory watershed management projects?
9. Have you received any report of incidents of sexual harassment or gender-based violence in the community?
10. Does your organization have accessible **grievance redress mechanisms**, with established procedures for submission of grievances? Do you have established grievance procedures that accept and process grievances relating to environmental and social management issues? Are there established routines and standards for responding to grievances received?

11. Does your organization have potential environmental and social impacts/risks applicable to involuntary resettlement/voluntary land donation for climate resilience landscape management interventions? Restriction of access and benefit sharing?
12. Are there any mechanisms to check the availability of good and friendly working conditions target community? What about child labor issue?
13. What are the processes of organizing Watershed Users Association and could you mention its benefits?
14. Can you tell us the number of participants in the climate resilience related work/participatory watershed management in your area? Who initiate the process? How are the communities involved in the various activities? And what the selection criteria of sites and participants?
15. Is there any overlap of participatory watershed management/public work of different organization (AGP, SLM and DPs) in your kebele/woreda?
16. What are existing policies in implementing climate resilient landscapes –participatory watershed management, public work and land use and administration, etc
17. What is the advantages of registration of land rights for landholders and how can it be closely linked with watershed development?
18. What are the capacity constraints in BOA at the regional and woreda levels in strengthening and reinforcing watershed management and participatory processes and in expanding coverage of land use certification, and improve land administration service delivery?
19. What are existing social management systems guidelines and procedures across woredas and regions? Are they applicable the same way all across? Are different sector offices efficiently coordinated? Are there resources to run these?
20. Do you have any comments you like to add in order to effort Climate Resilience Landscape Management/participatory watershed management or public?
21. What type of process do you follow when enforcing participatory watershed management work on communal areas?

Annex-6: Sample Lists of Participants in the Community Consultation

Environmental and Social Systems Assessment (ESSA) of Climate Resilience Landscape Management (CRLM) in Ethiopia

Community Consultation Attendance Sheet

Date: SNMP - Wolayita - Sodo - Bedim - 27/2/2019

No	Name	Region	Woreda	Kebele	Sex	Age	Watershed	Signature
1	Yohannes Barsama	SNMP	Dansat Gaje	Adenafa	M	25		
2	Taxile geta	"	"	"	"	30		
3	Bakshamu Daiso	"	"	"	"	32		
4	Yolannes Alebo	"	"	"	"	35		
5	Alena Alaye	"	"	"	"	34		
6	ulmical Meja	"	"	"	"	58		
7	Abraham maia	"	"	"	"	42		
8	Dejene baichaa	"	"	"	"	30		
9	Dejene Kodere	"	"	"	"	32		
10	matihos maia	"	"	"	"	40		
11	ulro Tawabae Tantis	"	"	"	F	30		
12	" Ayinalem Peters	"	"	"	F	31		
13	" wolebe minamo	"	"	"	F	14		
14	" Anashaku Malago	"	"	"	M	35		
15								
16								

Draft Environmental and Social Systems Assessment for CALM Program: Ethiopia

Tigray - Endamachon: 22/02/2019

No	Name	Institution/Organization	Responsibility	Telephone/Mob/email	Signature
1.	ገበየሁ ለገበየሁ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0914692023	[Signature]
2.	ሃይለማርያም	ዘይት	ገበ	0914663232	[Signature]
3.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0949740476	[Signature]
4.	ገበየሁ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0928789524	[Signature]
5.	ሃይለማርያም	ዘይት	ገበ	0983116574	[Signature]
6.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	-	[Signature]
7.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	-	[Signature]
8.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	09446484079	[Signature]
9.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	-	[Signature]
10.	ሃይለማርያም	ዘይት	ገበ	0914384540	[Signature]
11.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	-	[Signature]
12.	ሃይለማርያም	ዘይት	ገበ	0924286001	[Signature]
13.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0914399931	[Signature]
14.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0929501028	[Signature]
15.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0942352932	[Signature]
16.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0932054032	[Signature]
17.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0914399893	[Signature]
18.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	-	[Signature]
19.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0933093314	[Signature]
20.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0914125437	[Signature]
21.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0978380851	[Signature]
22.	አብይ	ገበየሁ	ገበ	0937038112	[Signature]

Preparation of Environmental and Social Systems Assessment for CRLMP Program
Stakeholder and Community Engagement/Consultation Process

Attendance Sheet

Date: 15/02/2019

Amhara Region - Stakeholder institut

No	Name	Institution/Organization	Responsibility	Telephone(Mob)/email	Signature
1	Tsegay Araghe	Land Adm	head	0912390604	[Signature]
2	Dr. Belayneh Agde	EFWPD/A	itead	0904574868	[Signature]
3	Abebe Alemsegn	EFWPD/A	Director	0913132778	[Signature]
4	Melese Damtie	Bureau of Land Admin & Use	D/B/Head	0818302831	[Signature]
5	Yizengizaw Assefaw	L.A.U	inspent	0918217211	[Signature]
6	Tefera Alemsegn	reviser	reviser	0918560814	[Signature]
7	Kolceb Bogale	Natural R.M. Unit	Team leader	0918218064	[Signature]
8	Ayalaw Adane	Oda	PSNP PM&E	0918320681	[Signature]
9	Yitayaw Alene	SLMP	SLMP focal	0913676640	[Signature]
10	Bithan Bejay	RURAL LAND ADMINISTRATION	Head	0913769489	[Signature]
11	Schomaw Wasselaw	Market NRM Expert	SWCC Expert	0948928984	[Signature]
12	Fadesse Gwadhen	Market Agri	PSNP M&E	0912735016	[Signature]
13	Munuseta Darnaw	Market Agri	PSNP NRM	0934578997	[Signature]
14	Mekonen Getachew	Market Agri	PSNP NRM	0913374807	[Signature]
15	Kasla Assen	Market	Team leader	0920189860	[Signature]
16	Berman Kabbie	Market environment	Environment	0920189860	[Signature]
17	Zinabu Mengesha	Market environment	EJA expert	0927389300	[Signature]
18	Isaac Fenta	Market environment	Environment	0933478254	[Signature]

Environmental and Social Systems Assessment (ESSA) of Climate Resilience Landscape Management (CRLM) in Ethiopia

Community Consultation Attendance Sheet

Date: March 3/2019 Oromia - Dadaa

No	Name	Region	Woreda	Kebele	Sex	Age	Watershed	Signature
1	Axirayin Baay Jaar	Oromia	Dadaa	Danneta	M	43		[Signature]
2	Gammadaa Kibanno	>>	>>	>>	F			[Signature]
3	Taaniruu Abraham	>>	>>	>>	M			[Signature]
4	Daagimaa He'ii	>>	>>	>>	M			[Signature]
5	Waariteen Sootee	>>	>>	>>	M			[Signature]
6	Gammashuu Kadit	>>	>>	>>	M	25		[Signature]
7	Shurree Daabato	>>	>>	>>	F	48		[Signature]
8	Muntuwaak Xaasaa	>>	>>	>>	F			[Signature]
9	Anaan Hanfante	>>	>>	>>	M	54		[Signature]
10	Sparda Tonfollu	>>			M	60		[Signature]
11	Taldoo Saqaxuu	>>			M			[Signature]
12	Birke Daqaja	>>			F			[Signature]
13	Birke Nuruu	>>			F	25		[Signature]
14	Cannamed Tolaa	>>			M	25		[Signature]
15	Muhammed Dulleba	>>			M	36		[Signature]
16	Getachoo Reebaa	>>			M	70		[Signature]

Annex 7: Minutes of the ESSA Stakeholder Consultation Workshop

Summary of Minutes of Stakeholders Consultation Workshop on CALM Program, Capital Hotel, April 22, 2019, Addis Ababa

1. Introduction

Stakeholders' consultations with institutions are important in the planning process and preparation of the proposed Ethiopia Climate Action through Landscape Management (CALM). Regular consultations with stakeholders is pertinent to ensure successful assessment and identification of environmental, social and safety impacts, recommendations of appropriate measures and sound implementation of safeguards instruments over the program period. The most important step during ESSA process that helps to identify key issues and to determine how the concerns of all parties will be addressed in proper handling and implementation of stakeholder consultations with relevant institutions, local communities and all other interested parties. In this regard, MoA, under its Natural Resource Management and Rural Land Administration and Use directorates and their regional counterparts are the main responsible implementing institutions and needs to ensure effective participation in stakeholders' consultation for sustainable implementation of the CALM program. This helps participants to learn objectives of the program area of participatory watershed management and second level landholding certificates. Thus, MoA is required to establish a platform for coordination among stakeholders to strengthen and improve the efficiency and transparency of the execution of the program.

The CALM Program-ESSA preparation process involved extensive stakeholder consultations and disclosure of the ESSA report following the guidelines of the World Bank's Access to Information Policy. For the preparation of CALM-ESSA, Bank safeguards specialists (consultants) undertook recurrent meetings and consultations with different stakeholders, including government institutions at National, Regional and Woreda levels, and local communities at watershed level that provide familiarity for the forthcoming program and to make clear the likely impact of the proposed program.

In addition to key stakeholders consultations at the national, regional, zonal, woreda and local communities at watershed level to obtain their views and broad support on the ESSA, stakeholders consultation on the draft ESSA is conducted before appraisal on April 22, 2019 at capital Hotel, Addis Ababa with a large group of stakeholders drawn from national and regional institutions in order to gain additional information and feedback on the draft CALM ESSA. The participants in the workshop were 79, of which 3 of them were females. These inputs and comments are useful in enriching and finalizing the draft ESSA that consequently help advance the Program Action Plan (PAP). The Stakeholders consultation was aimed at the following points, but not limited to:

- improve the draft CALM-ESSA report through gathering concerns and additional information and to incorporate outstanding comments and views presented and forwarded by the participants;
- agree on the risks and the ratings as well as program action plans (PAP) stated in the ESSA;
- inform and discuss about the nature and scale of adverse impacts and to provide remedial measures for the impacts;
- create a sense of concerns, priorities and aspirations of the stakeholders and implementing parties as they implement the proposed measures and actions;
- increase public awareness and understanding of the program and ensure its acceptance.

2. Opening remark and Introductory session

The agenda for the consultation workshop was introduced to the participants by the organizers from the World Bank Ethiopia Office. The first half of the morning session was devoted to the opening session of the program including self-introduction of participants. From World Bank Environmental and Social Safeguards team-Yacob Wondimkun-Senior Environment Specialist took the opportunity to convey a

welcoming remarks and an introduction of the Ethiopia Climate Action through Landscape Management (CALM). He highlighted the purpose of the Workshop taking into account the objectives of the program and ESSA process briefly. He also mentioned about some of the additional benefit of the program to the community through improved participatory watershed management and second level landholding certificates. Moreover, he pinpointed the relevance of contributing views and concerns by the participants on the draft ESSA presentations and adds points to enrich the program to implement proper management of environmental, social and safety aspects to ensure no/minimum impacts to the biophysical and social environment due to the program activities.

3. Presentations

After the official opening of the consultation on the draft ESSA, in the first half of the morning session, six presentations were delivered to the participants with plenary question and answer sessions. The first and second presentations were focused on briefing CALM Program and brief note on ESSA process and World Bank PforR Programs Financing Policy. The subsequent four presentations were focused on the overall content of the draft ESSA and presented by two consultants (Environment and Social Specialists). These include objectives and methods of ESSA, anticipated environmental and social impacts and risks, and respective mitigation and enhancement measures, analysis of institutional performance against six core principles, and key findings and recommendations of the draft ESSA report. For ease of understanding and full deliberation inputs by the participants, the facilitator provided options to the participants about the mode of communication during the workshop to be in Amharic, the national official language, whereas the presentation slides is in English. This arrangement facilitated the participants to express effectively their inputs and comments with no language barriers that could hamper the understanding of the technical terms and ensure successful participations of the stakeholders as required. The presentations are briefly summarized as follows.

3.1 CALM Program briefing

An introductory overview to the CALMP was delivered to the meeting participants by Mr. Paul Martin, who is a Task Team Leader. The presentation briefly outlined the Program Development Objectives and components of the CALM program and its relationship with the umbrella ESIF program run by the GoE. The presenter also described the difference of the current PforR CALM Program from the other project based financing mechanisms that are widely known by the participating members. He emphasized that unlike the project based financing which provide inputs and measure the outputs, the present PforR program will measure the outputs and make financial disbursements based on the achieved outputs. Following that, the presenter outlined the CALM Program result areas and associated Disbursement linked indicators (DLIs) which will be applied to measure performance during implementation of the CALM Program. The presenter finally explained the, proposed means for measuring the DLIs, theory of change of the program and explained the overall expected outcomes of the CALM Program.

3.2 ESSA Process and the PforR Financing Policy

A second presentation was delivered by Ato Yacob Wondimkun, who is a senior environment specialist at the World Bank and coordinator of the ESSA team. In his presentation, he mainly emphasized on outlining the cycle for processing PforR programs and the six safeguard Core Principles involved in the PforR financing mechanism. The presenter explained the steps involved during preparation and implementation stages of the PforR processing cycle and each of the six core principles to the participants and stated that the draft CALMP ESSA report was prepared by carrying out assessment vis-à-vis the six core principles. He explained that unlike in the IPF projects which rely on directly implementing and verifying the fulfillment of the safeguard operational policies (OP/BP) of the Bank for each sub-projects, the PforR financing mechanism applies the six core principles to assess the existing environmental and social management systems and capacities of the Government to determine its adequacy to support and fulfill the safeguard requirements during CALMP implementation. The presenter emphasized that in

PforR financing, the Program is going to use the existing Country environment and social risk management systems in place and the World Bank will verify the extent to which safeguard requirements are fulfilled in the course of CALMP implementation. These are going to be achieved through monitoring of program performance. The presenter also explained that the ESSA will look into provisions of technical support for systems improvements and will monitor implementation of any agreed actions to improve performance.

3.3 Objective and methodologies of ESSA

Following the presentation of the process of PforR financing mechanism, the social development specialist-consultant delivered presentation on the overall and specific objectives and methodologies of the CALM ESSA. He started his presentation by acknowledging the participants for their courage to come from different parts of the country to share their views and concerns on the Program. Following this, he discussed about the objective and ESSA Methodology that focuses on the social and environmental checks and balances existed in the country policy and guidelines, anticipated environmental risks and gaps and the respective mitigation and enhancement measures to strengthen the current capacity of the major implementing institutions. The presenter also highlighted the basic methodologies adopted during the ESSA preparation and these include: desk review comprises of applicable existing institutional policies and legal frameworks, reviewing proclamations and guidelines related to watershed management and second level land certification, previous ESSA documents developed by World Bank such as GEQIP, ELEAP, etc, site visit from February 13 to April 12, 2019 at various levels from the Federal MoA (particularly Natural Resources Management and Rural Land Administration and Use Directorates) to its regional counter parts, zonal, woreda and watershed levels; interviews with staffs and officials from various government authorities, and consultation with the local communities during mass mobilization working at watershed levels. He further stated that the ESSA team consulted 223 officials, experts and the local community working in the mass mobilization at visited watersheds from four regions (Tigray, Amhara, SNNP and Oromia, but Gambella and Benishangul Gumuz were not included due to security problem

3.4 Key findings of the CALMP ESSA

Following the presentation of ESSA objectives and methodologies by Social Development Specialist-Consultant, Environmental Specialist-Consultant, presented consecutively the institutional arrangements and environmental impacts/risks. These will be presented in order as follows.

3.4.1 Institutional Assessment

The consultant presented ESSA finding on institutional capacity assessment outlined in the form of capacity in Program implementing agencies, E&S regulatory agencies and proposed arrangement for strengthening ESMS. Regarding implementing agency, he mentioned that MoA and its directorates of Natural Resource Management and Rural Land Administration and Use is responsible in leading the program. He also listed that BoA and BLAU provides regional and zonal level program implementation support (Oromia, Tigray, Amhara, SNNPR, Gambella & Benshangul Gumuz). Moreover, he presented Woreda Agriculture and Natural Resources office, Woreda Land administration and use office and Kebele DAs, Watershed Communities, etc responsibilities at the lower levels. Besides, the consultant presented the weaknesses and gaps of implementing agencies in the consulted regions and highlighted the exceptions in the regions in terms of organizational arrangements and level of implementations. From capacity of E&S regulatory agencies, the consultant presented the legal framework for environmental and social management, institutional setup and division of responsibilities in E&S management and their exceptions, challenges and gaps. Moreover, he presented workers and community safety management as well as grievance redress mechanism in line with the program. Finally, he presented proposed arrangement for strengthening CALMP ESMS where he suggested the need for environmental and social safeguard specialists hiring at federal and regional levels and assigning environmental and social focal

person at woreda agriculture office. He also recommended ESPES Program at woreda level designed to strengthen woreda capacity for management of environmental and social risks.

3.4.2 Key Environmental and Social Findings

Following the presentation of the institutional assessment, the Environmental Specialist-Consultant continued presenting environmental impacts/risks. In his first section, he presented the overall positive environmental impacts including improvements in vegetation cover of the environment, reducing soil erosion and enhancing soil fertility as well as reducing surface run off and flooding, increase in surface and ground water recharging capacity, increasing ground and surface water availability and Improvements in biodiversity regeneration. In his second section, he highlighted potential environmental adverse impacts/risks of the Program. These include weak or absence of environmental and social management capacities, weaknesses in developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works, weak consideration of physical cultural resources and natural habitats, workers and community safety as well as E-waste generation and disposal.

After the presentation of environmental aspects by environmental specialist-consultant, the social development specialists-consultant presented the social findings that include positive and negative impacts/risks related to participatory watershed management and second level landholding certificates. He started his presentation by highlighting the opinions, views and concerns of stakeholders found out during field visits of community consultations. He further highlighted the main positive impacts of the Program forwarded by consulted community about participatory watershed management (PWM) and SLLCs: tenure security that increases productivity, improve water and soil conservation, improve tree planting, decrease boundary conflict and reduce takeover of land from vulnerable groups. He also listed the main concerns: lack of controlling free grazing, lack of legalized bylaw, improper handing over of rehabilitated watershed, absence of land use planning; turnover of staffs, particularly development agents and capacity related problem, lack of hand tools and logistics and political instability.

Following upon presenting the views and concerns of consulted community, he presented the social impacts related to participatory watershed management and SLLCs. Positively, PWM integrates soil and water conservation, natural resource use, and livelihood activities in several micro-watersheds in the visited woredas, organizational arrangements from bottom-up structures, sense of ownership, increase social bond and area closures contribution as sources of income for the youth and women. He also listed the positive impacts related to SLLCs: transfer of land in terms of gift, exchange, inheritance, leasing, and using land as collateral to access loans, joint titling in the name of husband and wife that provide women equitable rights to their men counterpart, provide precise information for renters and rentees on the exact size, owners, and location of the plot as well as land disputes and conflict resolution mechanism on the bases of the certificate of the landholder.

The consultant also outlined the negative social impacts/risks related to PWM and SLLCs: mass mobilization perceived as having some coercive elements in the mobilization and enforcement of agreements, forced labor even if there is participatory planning, there are social sanctions which indirectly force communities or individuals to take part, participation of women in MM is considered as forced labor and created fatigue on them as they consider it a double burden-in addition to house chores and delayed economic transition of the rehabilitated watersheds, and landless youths competition on communal lands in the micro-watershed development. Land related disputes over boundaries and land titles between family members and relatives, and encroachment of communal lands by neighboring communities. Lastly, he further highlighted land disputes when there is lack of appropriate implementation of the laws and low capacity to practice the land administration process as well as land claims arise from landless family members to their parents.

3.4.3 Risk rating and Program Action Plan

Towards the end of the morning session, the social development specialist-consultant presented Environmental and Social risks and their ratings. He listed eleven risks with ratings from substantial, moderate to low and he presented the overall risk rating as substantial. Some of the risks pointed out include Weak or absent of ESMS in implementing agencies that would cause inadequate implementation of environmental and social issues and Safety management, risks related to workers and community safety as well as physical cultural resources, access restriction towards communal lands, particularly control of free grazing, low support for vulnerable groups in watershed development and SLLCs and PWM perceived as forced labor and fatigue and the perception of delayed economic benefits from rehabilitated watershed to mention a few.

At the beginning of afternoon session, the Environmental Specialist-consultant highlighted the Program Action Plan (PAP). To minimize, avoid or fulfill the identified impacts, risks and gaps, the presenter delivered information on the potential recommendation and Program Action Plan (PAP). These include: 1) Ensure establishment of strong Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) including GRM and strengthening its functionality, 2) Support for vulnerable groups (i.e., landless youth, women, and elderly, people with disability as well as chronically ill people), 3) Social and environmental due diligence assessment, 4) Developing adequate watershed development plan and prioritization of works to prevent unintended environmental and social effects, 5) Minimize risks related to weak consideration of PCR as well workers and community safety risks, and 6) minimize risks of E-waste generation and disposal.

4. Group and plenary discussions

4.1 Summary of Plenary discussions

Plenary discussions were held during the morning and afternoon sessions after the presentations were made. During the morning plenary discussions participants were invited to reflect their views, opinions and queries with regard to the draft ESSA in general and on the presentations delivered in particular. Accordingly, a number of participants aired their opinions and forwarded their questions.

A participant reflected that, based on the P for R financing mechanism, it is stated that the Government is going to get the financial supports scheduled by the program only after it has achieved results as outlined in the DLIs. Thus, he queried, considering the apparent shortage of resources wouldn't it be difficult for the government to start financing the program itself and run it until it achieve some results? Moreover, the participant said, the lion share of the contributions to be made for implementing the CALM program appears to come from the Government as shown in the presentation. The participant asked whether it is possible for the government to provide such huge contribution to the CALM program? In a response given to the queries and concerns, the presenter explained that the GoE has been running the ESIF program for several years now and the CALMP will provide its support to continue this program in selected areas. The contribution of the GoE for the program may not necessarily seek for allocation of new budget by the government, but all in kind contributions made towards the implementation of the program will be considered. The program has been a government program and the World Bank will provide additional support to continue. In addition the presenter explained that through a discussion and agreement with MoFED, the CALM program may arrange for advance payments to be disbursed to kick start the program implementation.

Another participant aired his concern on the coverage given to land use planning issues in the CALMP. The participant asserted that the preparation of watershed development plan should be based on land use plans prepared for the area. In the absence of a land use plan that can inform the preparation of watershed

development plan, the development process may not become sustainable. The CALM program and this ESSA appears to be short of incorporating the need for development and implementation of land use policies, regulations during the program period and asked for explanations on why? In a response to these concerns, the senior environment specialist from the World Bank explained that the current CALM program is proposed to mainly focus on the program components as presented. However, it was stated, the issue of developing land use policy and related legislations is becoming another area of focus for program development. Some discussions are going on with relevant organs in the MoA on the possibilities of addressing the land use policy issues.

A participant from the EPFCCC stated that it is suggested in the ESSA that the overall responsibility to manage the environmental and social risks of the CALMP is given to the Ministry of Agriculture. However, he commented that the role for monitoring the environmental and social risks of the CALM program would have been better handled by the EPFCCC. The participant further expressed that managing the environmental and social risks of the CALM program would create a working relationship both with the MoA and the World Bank that will be further strengthened in the future. In a related concern, another participant stated that the role of environment organs and their responsibilities is not well clarified in the ESSA and asked for further explanation on the subject. In a response to these concerns, it was explained that the MoA being the main program implementing agency, it remains to be its responsibility to ensure that six safeguard core principles of the PforR are fulfilled during the course of program implementation. However, the ESSA has also outlined in detail the roles and responsibilities of the different environmental protection organs found at federal, regional and woreda levels in the CALM program.

In the second round of plenary discussion held at the end of the presentations on ESSA environmental and social findings, participants of the consultation meeting further expressed their queries and concerns on a number of issues. One of the participants stated that the World Bank has important safeguard policies such as OP/BP 4.12 on involuntary resettlement. Even though this policy partly have commendable aspects with regard to compensating formal/legal resettlers, its enforcement including the GRM appears to be lax in covering all such resettlement issues caused by public financed projects. The participant wondered on whether the World Bank can fully enforce this aspect of the policy by supporting it with legal means? On the other hand, the same participant also argued on the appropriateness of the entitlements given to informal settlers (encroachers) by the same OP/BP 4.12 involuntary resettlement policy. This aspect of the resettlement policy, he argued, even contravene the Constitutional rules of the country and asked whether this policy of the World Bank is meant to encourage expansion of informal encroachment? In a response to these queries, it was explained that the Bank Policy OP/BP 4.12 neither have an intention nor a purpose to encourage illegal encroachment of illegal settlers. Under normal circumstances, the issue of squatters should be known to the local authorities before any development interests arise in an area. The World Bank does not consider encroachers as informal settlers when they settle after cut of dates are set for census survey. Moreover, it considers land acquisition legacy issues by verifying project activities during previous two years. With regard to the enforcement of compensation entitlement and GRM, the Bank always advocates to apply the best policy. If the Government Policy and practice is better for Compensation and GRM, then it will be always advisable to apply it and in the contrary, if the Bank Policy is going to be better, then the Bank Policy will supersede over the Government policy.

Another participant of the consultation meeting also reflected on the appropriateness of ESIA and ESSA for the CALM program. The participant explained that, ESIA is recommended for a specific project whose sites are identified but CALM is a program and the site is not specific. Thus, he queried, CALM being a program isn't it appropriate to conduct Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for it instead of ESSA? In a related concern, another participant also reflected his view by stating why ESIA is always referred as "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment", and expressed his worries that this term has

sometimes the tone of undermining the biological aspects of the environment. He further argued by exemplifying with the experiences on the ground by stating that during transfer of communal lands treated by Participatory Watershed Management to unemployed youth groups, there are indications that less focus is given to preserve the existing biological resources, for example by not allowing a buffer zone to exist between the natural biological resource and the transferred communal land. Thus, he queried, isn't it important to leave a buffer area between the communal land to be transferred and natural vegetation areas? And can the ESIA system address this without undermining the biological environment? In the explanations given to the participants by way of responding to their queries, it was stated that the main purpose of this ESSA is to look into the government environmental and social management system and its capacity to meet the six safeguard core principles of the P for R financing mechanism. Once the ESSA assessment is completed successfully, the sub-project level ESIA will be carried in the course of program implementation as determined by the E&S screening report outcomes. Thus the purpose of the ESSA is not to undertake a program level environmental impact assessment but to determine the adequacy of existing environmental and social systems to fulfill safeguard requirements. In addition, it was explained, the issue of leaving buffer area to preserve natural vegetation cover existing in communal lands could be addressed during E&S screening of Watershed development plans.

Some participants also raised their concerns on the methodology adopted to prepare the ESSA by expressing their concern on whether the ESSA team has visited all the target regions of the CALM program including Harar and Diredawa? Other participant argued that the ESSA repeatedly mentions Participatory Watershed Management issues and appears inclined more to addressing watershed management than SLLCs, and he requested if the ESSA team has been able to visit sample woredas that practically implement issuance of Second Level Land Certificates? The ESSA team leader explained that the ESSA team has carried field assessment on four regional states (i.e. Amhara, Tigray, SNNPR and Oromia) and more than two sample woreda and rural kebele from each of the regions. The woredas visited were carefully selected to ensure that both participatory watershed development and issuances of SLLCs were practiced. Thus there is a strong belief that most of the issues which need to be captured from field assessments are collected and used as major inputs in the study. However, the purpose of inviting stakeholders representing all regions and city administrations to this consultation meeting is to disclose the ESSA and provide additional opportunities to participants to express their views and concerns that are not yet addressed. Thus, it was noted, that participants should freely express their views and opinions and make their contribution for enhancement of the ESSA.

Certain participants also raised some general clarification question during the plenary session. These include questions to clarify how issuance of SLLCs can increase the prices of share cropping and also increase conflicts in the communities. Moreover a participant also aired his view and general observation by stating that one of the missions of the World Bank is to Reduce Poverty. However, he stated, in the case of Ethiopia poverty is increasing from day to day in the Country. The participant queried, what is the role of the World Bank in alleviating poverty in Ethiopia? In a response to these clarification questions, it was explained that the ESSA found that the issuance SLLCs will have the impact of decreasing conflicts related to farm field border disputes and actually will facilitate for share cropping especially with the vulnerable members of the community who cannot work their farm by themselves. With regard to the role of the World Bank in reducing poverty in Ethiopia, it was explained by stating that the Bank has already been financing a number of programs and projects that are targeted at reducing poverty in the Country. These include World Bank financed programs such as PSNP, UPSNP, AGP, e.t.c.

4.2 Summary of group discussion and presentation

In the afternoon session, the consultation meeting participants were divided into four groups and made to discuss on the identified environmental and social risks of the CALMP program, its rating as well as to

thoroughly examine the Program Action Plan of the ESSA. The participants deliberated on the group discussions and finally presented their findings which are summarized as follows.

Group I discussed the entire environmental and social risks identified and reached on consensus that almost all the risks identified, and its rating are acceptable. The group only suggested adding a sentence at the end of risk item 3 which reads: “The Plan prepared is not participatory and prioritized”. The group also commented risk item 4 by stating that access restriction towards communal land may not be a big risk in those areas having vast communal land such as Harar, but other regions have already implemented zero grazing. Moreover, the group identified “Access restriction to Investment areas” as other form of risk.

Group II also discussed the entire social and environmental risks identified and reached on consensus by suggesting some modifications to the risk ratings. The group proposed that the risk rating given to item 1 and 4 be lowered to “Moderate” from “Substantial” and the overall risk rating of the program lowered to “Moderate” from “Substantial”. Group II also suggested the addition of a new risk statement i.e. “Absence of land use policy” into item no.4. With this suggestions group II also endorsed the draft ESSA.

Group III endorsed the social and environmental risks identified with some comments. The group proposed that the ratings for risk item 4 and 5 be lowered from “Moderate” to “low” and suggested the addition of one risk item on “Poor integration among sectors” with substantial rating. The reason for the group to suggest for lowering the risk rating of item 5 to low is that it considers the risk of female household heads and disabled persons losing their land that they have leased to sharecroppers is low.

Group IV thoroughly discussed the environmental and social risks identified, its rating and the Program Action Plan. The group comes up with a list of additional risks that are suggested for inclusion in the ESSA. The suggested list of additional risks and its rating as suggested by group IV are shown in the table below.

No.	Risk Description	Suggested rating
1	Land related corruption (issuing Land certificate for false owners, grabbing communal land)	Moderate
2	Poor level of awareness in land administration	Moderate
3	Mere issuing of certificate by itself do not create sense of ownership if the land belongs to the government	Substantial
4	Inadequate compensation	Substantial
5	Absence of proactive, vibrant and harmonized land admin structure throughout the country	Substantial
6	Inadequate payment and office facilities	Substantial
7	Lack of integration between different sectors	
8	Lack of land use plan	Substantial
9	Lack of Land use policy and integrated master land use plan	substantial
10	Lack of self standing (out of land claimer) Land use institution	substantial
11	Lack of prioritization of the land use plan (the cart before the horse)	substantial
12	Poorly addressing the overall integrated watershed management activities (more emphasis on SWC)	Substantial
13	Lack of synergy with other sectors	
14	Inappropriately implementing the watershed development activities without following its logic and principles	

During the plenary discussion on the findings of group IV, it was explained that many of the suggested risks for addition into the ESSA may become difficult for the ESSA has to remain focused to the risks directly related to the CALM program. However, the ideas suggested as risks are magnificent and will be kept in the minutes for future reference.

5. Conclusion

At the end of the full day deliberation, participants of the consultation meeting reached on a common consensus on the ESSA and endorsed it. The stakeholder consultation meeting was closed at 5:45 PM in the afternoon.

6. Photo plates showing the deliberations of the CALMP ESSA stakeholder consultation workshop.



Photo plate 1: Showing presentation and plenary discussion sessions of CALM ESSA



Phase II: Showing group discussion sessions

7. Scanned copies of workshop participants attendance

World Bank Ethiopia Country Office
Attendance sheet
Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop on CALM Program ESSA - PforR

April 22nd, 2019 Venue: - Capital Hotel and SPA

Name	Organization	Telephone	E-mail
Arabu Yimam	TEPLAUA	0914324330	arabu1230@gmail.com
Yeshi Abebe	Rural Land Ministry	0112141250	Yeshi Abebe@gmail.com
ECHEM BERHADI	Service office	0912134342	ECHEM BERHADI@gmail.com
Tesfaye Fasil	AGU - OIG	0911816903	Tesfaye Fasil 2019@gmail.com
Tahir Tilms	Env. protect off	0911461422	-
Tefno Bezu	Asst officer	0912390401	Tefno Bezu 12@gmail.com
Gashaw Gebremariam	Agriculture office	0912244224	gashaw Gebremariam@gmail.com
Tadale K. Gassa	Env. protection	0926235583	tadale k. gassa@gmail.com
Faniku Abebe	ZEPFCCA	0979043958	fanikuabebe2019@gmail.com
Dawit Abebe	Land Admin. & Survey	0110663374	dawitabebe@gmail.com
Bizunesh Selamawit	LAUA, SNNPR	0912247474	bizunesh@gmail.com
Fitreunde	LA Copact, SNNPR	0915316929	fitreunde796@gmail.com
Tonyk Tlat	Agriculture office	0922324422	Tonyk Tlat@gmail.com
Ali Jiraneh	Env/E/S/SC team	0913384939	-
Solomon Tesfay	ASU - MBM	0911122271	Solomon Tesfay@gmail.com
Gizmay Bekhane	TEPLAUA	09147229020	Gizmay Bekhane@gmail.com
Kassahun Alemu	TEPLAUA	0914742415	Kassahun Alemu@gmail.com
Mart Testa	TEPLAUA	0911105323	Mart Testa@gmail.com
Gebrselwot Berhe	TEPLAUA	0914275437	Gebrselwot Berhe@gmail.com
G/Ansea Ayela	TEPLAUA	0914866521	G/Ansea Ayela@gmail.com

World Bank Ethiopia Country Office

Attendance sheet

Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop on CALM Program ESSA - PforR

April 22nd, 2019

Venue: - Capital Hotel and SPA

Name	Organization	Telephone	E-mail
Belste Fetene	Ambasa environmente Authority	0913426296	belste2002@gmail.com
Rwash Tut Get	Chankela BOEFCO	0911032730	rwashtutget@gmail.com
Zetalew Getachew	Bank of Dal Sanit	0919011541	Zetalewget2@gmail.com
Desalegn Alemsegh	Debre Dabor Kibana	0913296371	desalegn2006@gmail.com
Bantamix Wondimnow	Ambasa BOA	0934629102	bantamix2002@gmail.com
Yosef Desalegn	Ambasa BIAU	0918217754	Yosefdesalegn201@gmail.com
Abulid Muhammad	Ambasa BERLAU	090131307	abulidmuhammad6@gmail.com
Worqu Wessalige	B/G B/ANB	0912917264	worqu2005@yahoo.com
W/berhan Kuma	B/G B/ANB	0904917922	
W/berhan Kuma	EFCCA(SNNPR)	0911819394	wberhankuma@yahoo.com
Yusef Tibe	EFCCA(SNNPR)	0916863252	YusefTibe2014@gmail.com
Yohannes Getu	Gambella	0913929131	
Kun Misual	Gambella	093407151	KunMisual201@gmail.com
Pegna Omod	Gambella	0932284864	pegnaopama@gmail.com
Roza Ojani	Gambella	0912319823	
Mekonnen Fetene	AmiT NR	0910421818	mekonnenfetene@gmail.com
Qinnu Obang	Gambella	091102923	
Legese Puluged	Agri	0915820744	Legesepuluged29@gmail.com
Girma Assefe	Agriculture	0910855109	girmaasfe29@gmail.com
Montabu Belay	"	0915567477	montabubelay@gmail.com

World Bank Ethiopia Country Office

Attendance sheet

Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop on CALM Program ESSA - PforR

April 22nd, 2019

Venue: - Capital Hotel and SPA

Name	Organization	Telephone	E-mail
Aluchisa Molla	MBA	0918016026	aluchisa@malla@gmail.com
Gatachew Kibede	MBARR	0916027327	gatachew.kibede@gmail.com
Sintayehu Befkid	DEFCCA	0911095485	goss2016@gmail.com
Tolosa Yadessa	EFCCC	0913754272	tyterfo@gmail.com
Mitiku Bekete	OBOLAMU	0905094411	mitiku2008@gmail.com
Kedade Debele	"	0920531691	kedadedebela@yahoo.com
Adugna Erkena	"	0910090963	adugnaerkena63@gmail.com
Tadale Regassa	EPFCCA	092627550	
Zelalem Wakjira	DEFCCA	0911713416	zelalem.wakjira@yahoo.com
Bogale Terefe	MOA RLAUD	0911629125	bogaleterefer@gmail.com
Ababw Abebe	MOA RLAUD	0918094115	ababwabebe@gmail.com
Fassahun Girma	"	0917042224	
Niguse Geeshe	"	0920353143	niguseg@gmail.com
Zereu Girmay	World Bank	0911-347013	zereu21@yahoo.com
Tamirat Tefera	World Bank	0911114567	tamirat1985@yahoo.com
Yacob Wondimkun	"	0115176044	yendaylalu@worldbank.org
SAMUEL LULE	"	0115176087	sdemsash@worldbank.org
Lemessa Hirpe	EFCCC	0913838681	lemessa.hirpe@gmail.com

World Bank Ethiopia Country Office

Attendance sheet

Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop on CALM Program ESSA - PforR

April 22nd, 2019

Venue: - Capital Hotel and SPA

Name	Organization	Telephone	E-mail
Abera Hadera	TEPLUA (Tigray)	0914322351	aberrahadera@yahoo.com
Thacker Bral	Env. Protection (Geme)	091103089	maclunorpa@gmail.com
Belay Girma	Agriculture Dept	0912856215	belay938@gmail.com
Getaneh T/mariam	Agriculture (Amhara)	0912415661	getanehmariam@yahoo.com
Anberber w/asegn	Agriculture dept	0913446137	
Tamrat Damassa	Amhara Justice Bureau	0911221995	tamrat1923@gmail.com
Scntayihul Betab	Disc. Ombudsman	0915075920	betabscntayihul@gmail.com
Gemechu Erera	ELAS Bureau	0912206412	gomecherera27@gmail.com
Nega Weldesemine	BNK (Tigray)	0914568336	negaw614@gmail.com
Tseab Gisiassie	Association of Bankers (Tigray)	0914112524	tseabg@gmail.com
Sulfiya Shah	Amhara Bank Managers	0921128565	shahsulfiya@gmail.com
Ayele Birto	Agriculture Office (N.A.p)	0916-839943	Ayelebirto.2012@gmail.com
MOHAMMED NUR FARUJ	RLA (Lalibela)	011536086	mohamednurfaruj@yahoo.com
Gilen Bekegedu Amede	Agriculture Office (N.A.p)	091466119	gilenbekegedu609@gmail.com
Abinet Bahama	BG ELAI Bureau	0913155665	abnetbahama123@gmail.com
Biresaw Mekonnen		0912124542	biresaw@gmail.com
Semench Alemu	BG BeELAI	0913081517	semenchalemu@gmail.com
Seife hailu	MOA	0911022291	seifehailu80@gmail.com
Getachew Asrat	MOA	0935093839	getachewasrat1962@yahoo.com
Wondafrisk mtecha	nam coordinators	0912224205	edemwondafrisk05@gmail.com