

Section I: Identification and JP Status

Enabling pastoral communities to adapt to climate change and restoring rangeland environments

Semester: 2-11

Country	Ethiopia
Thematic Window	Environment and Climatic Change
MDGF Atlas Project	
Program title	Enabling pastoral communities to adapt to climate change and restoring rangeland environments

Report Number	
Reporting Period	2-11
Programme Duration	
Official Starting Date	

Participating UN Organizations	* FAO * UNDP * UNEP
--------------------------------	---------------------------

Implementing Partners	* Afar * BoPARD, Oromia * BoPARD, Somali * MoARD and EPA and Regional IP * PAB * PAC and SNNP
-----------------------	--

Budget Summary

Total Approved Budget

UNDP	\$1,548,290.00
FAO	\$2,029,060.00
UNEP	\$422,650.00
Total	\$4,000,000.00

Total Amount of Transferred To Date

UNDP	\$1,245,273.00
FAO	\$1,747,968.00
UNEP	\$422,650.00
Total	\$3,415,891.00

Total Budget Committed To Date

UNDP	\$1,245,273.00
FAO	\$1,747,968.00
UNEP	\$422,650.00
Total	\$3,415,891.00

Total Budget Disbursed To Date

UNDP	\$971,841.92
FAO	\$682,921.00
UNEP	\$250,000.00
Total	\$1,904,762.92

Donors

As you can understand, one of the Goals of the MDG-F is to generate interest and attract funding from other donors. In order to be able to report on this goal in 2010, we would require you to advise us if there has been any complementary financing provided for each programme as per following example:

Please use the same format as in the previous section (budget summary) to report figures (example 50,000.11) for fifty thousand US dollars and eleven cents

Type	Donor	Total	For 2010	For 2011	For 2012
Parallel	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Type	Donor	Total	For 2010	For 2011	For 2012
Cost Share	-	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Counterpart	Government	\$34,500.00	\$11,500.00	\$11,500.00	\$11,500.00

DEFINITIONS

1) PARALLEL FINANCING – refers to financing activities related to or complementary to the programme but whose funds are NOT channeled through UN agencies. Example: JAICA decides to finance 10 additional seminars to disseminate the objectives of the programme in additional communities.

2) COST SHARING – refers to financing that is channeled through one or more of the UN agencies executing a particular programme. Example: The Government of Italy gives UNESCO the equivalent of US \$ 200,000 to be spent on activities that expand the reach of planned activities and these funds are channeled through UNESCO.

3) COUNTERPART FUNDS - refers to funds provided by one or several government agencies (in kind or in cash) to expand the reach of the programme. These funds may or may not be channeled through a UN agency. Example: The Ministry of Water donates land to build a pilot 'village water treatment plant' The value of the contribution in kind or the amount of local currency contributed (if in cash) must be recalculated in US \$ and the resulting amount(s) is what is reported in the table above.

Beneficiaries

Beneficiary type	Targetted	Reached	Category of beneficiary	Type of service or goods delivered
Direct	17,502	7,902	Citizens/Men	Capacity Building for Climate Adaptation
Direct	14,658	7,153	Civil Servants/Women	Capacity Building for Climate Adaptation
Direct	6	6	National Institutions	Capacity Building for Climate Adaptation
Direct	42	39	Local Institutions	Capacity Building for Climate Adaptation

Section II: JP Progress

1 Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency Measures

Please provide a brief overall assessment (1000 words) of the extent to which the joint programme components are progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs, as well as any measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme during the reporting period. Please, provide examples if relevant. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions

Plases describe three main achievements that the joint programme has had in this reporting period (max 100 words)

outcome 1: mainstreaming pastoralist oriented CC adaptation and mitigation option in national/sub-national development frameworks has been substantiated by the progress made in developing CC adaptation and mitigation strategy and action plan, risks/vulnerabilities assessment, CC registry information registry establishment, integrating pastoralist CC adaptation measures in the GTP, developing CC communication strategy and public awareness toolkits.

Outcome 2: the accomplishment in institutional capacity building has been a positive indication of its attainment. The most commendable indicator of this are the accomplishment in mainstreaming the programme implementation governance structure into existing government structure., conducting regular reorientation of programme approaches and strategies to regional and Wereda implementation partners, provision of office equipment and materials, and conducting training and workshops on CC adaptation and mitigation.

Progress in outcomes

Even if the programme has been affected by a slow start-up, there are some promising indications that the program is on course to attain its desired results in relation to Outcome 1 and 2. Fore instance, the attainment of outcome 1: mainstreaming pastoralist oriented CC adaptation and mitigation option in national/sub-national development frameworks has been substantiated by the progress made in in developing CC adaptation and mitigation strategy and action plan, risks/vulnerabilities assessment, CC registry information registry establishment, integrating pastoralist CC adaptation measures in the GTP, developing CC communication strategy and public awareness toolkits.

As to outcome 2, the accomplishment in institutional capacity building has been a positive indication of its attainment. The most commendable indicator of this are the accomplishment in mainstreaming the programme implementation governance structure into existing government structure., conducting regular reorientation of programme approaches and strategies to regional and Wereda implementation partners, provision of office equipment and materials, and conducting training and workshops on CC adaptation and mitigation.

Beside this, the complete attainment of results foreseen under outcome 3 seems very difficult to ascertain at this point of programme implementation. This is accounted to sluggish implementation of major activities such as income generation schemes, functionalizing established cooperatives, and drought which constrained rangelands rehabilitation and improvement. Generally, delayed and prolonged process evolved in fund disbursement and delayed operationalizing programme governance set-up have attributed to the sluggish progress in outcome 3. despit that, the accomplishment in baseline survey, provision of equipment and supplies for tree nurseries and animal health posts, establishing LMC, constructing some water schemes, mobilizing programme beneficiaries, and conducting trainings and awareness creation workshops are very commendable.

Progress in outputs

The major progresses recorded today at outputs level are:

Output 1.1 & 1.2:

- CC Vulnerability profile of pastoral communities developed.
- CC policy and strategy gap analysis conducted and adaptation/mitigation strategy and action plan prepared.
- CC registry information system and website developed.

- CC communication strategy public awareness toolkits prepared.
- Guideline for mainstreaming CC adaptation/mitigation into development planning system developed.
- Institutional analysis and stakeholders' consultation undertaken to explore local CC pastoral coordination mechanism and institutional capacity needs.

Output 2.1:

- Federal, Regional, Wereda and local institutional capacity and service delivery enhanced through delivered training/ workshop and equipment and materials supplied.
- Joint M&E conducted involving partner UN agencies, federal, regional and Wereda IPs and pastoral communities and reports produced and shared for speeding up programme implementation.

Output 3.1, 3.2 & 3.3:

- Baseline survey conducted and report produced.
- CC Advocacy and communication strategy developed.
- Dams, ponds, cisterns and springs constructed and rehabilitated.
- WATSAN Committees and LMC established.
- Animal health posts rehabilitated and veterinary drug and equipment supplied.
- Nurseries established and different fodder trees and grasses produced and planted.
- Area closure for rangelands rehabilitation and improvement established.
- Training/workshop provided for LMC members, CAHWS, Development Agents, WATSAN committees,
- Community mobilization and awareness creation undertaken.
- Participatory Income generation schemes identification and prioritization conducted and report produced and shared to Regional IPs for implementation

Measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme

- 1.Government ownership of the Environment JP is enhanced by establishing mainstreamed program implementation governance/ management structure from Federal up to community (PA) level. These include NSC, PMC, and Federal lead agency, PCO/U, regional PMT, WPIT and PA PIT.
- 2.Detailed monthly action plan for IP regions and Weredas have been worked out and communicated.
- 3.Consensus building discussions on the JP objectives, expected outcomes, outputs and activities were held with concerned government institutions and with beneficiary communities
- 4.Exit strategy preparation on going.

Are there difficulties in the implementation?

Coordination within the Government (s)

Administrative / Financial

Management: 1. Activity and output management. 2. Governance/Decision Making 4.Accountability

Joint Programme design

What are the causes of these difficulties?

External to the Joint Programme

Other. Please specify

- Delayed and long process evolved in fund disbursement*
- Delayed operationalizing programme governance set-up.*
- Delayed procedure in recruiting Wereda project officers*
- Undecided initial ownership of project implementation process*

Briefly describe the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing

- Sluggish responses from regions for timely reporting,
 - Frequent changes in regional environment focal persons, especially in Somali and SNNP.
 - Delayed fund disbursement at all levels
 - Delayed response from PMC members to PCO communications and follow-up actions, such as approval/endorsement of reports, M&E framework, results Framework, Communication and advocacy strategy, ToR and the like.
- Measures taken:

Briefly describe the current external difficulties that delay implementation

- Delayed and prolonged fund disbursement from UN agencies.
- Sluggish responses from IP regions for timely reporting.
- Delayed response from PMC members to PCO communications and follow-up actions, such as approval/endorsement of reports, M&E framework, results Framework, Communication and advocacy strategy, ToR and the like.

Explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties

The actions were taken to eliminate/mitigate the difficulties:

- Reprogramming of 2004EFY AWP has been completed and Detailed monthly action plan for IP regions and Weredas have been jointly worked out and communicated
- To tackle sluggish responses from regions for timely reporting, maximum effort exerted continuously and consistent follow up made for Regions and Weredas. Mutually agreed deadline was established.
- The need to work jointly to achieve the commonly shared goal articulated in the project document and therefore it is agreed that the all implementing parties (Government & UN organizations) to carry out more coordinated work to achieve the common goals of MDGs Accordingly, established and mobilized monitoring and technical backstopping teams comprising specialist from UN agencies, MoA and EPA

2 Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One

Is the joint programme still in line with the UNDAF?

Yes true
No false

If not, does the joint programme fit the national strategies?

Yes
No

What types of coordination mechanisms

At the national level, a MDG National Steering Committee has been established to oversee and provide guidance to the joint programme. The project is managed by Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoA), The Federal EPA and regional bureaus of Pastoralist Affairs were engaged in the planning and will be the main implementing partners.

The program coordination office is hosted by Federal Ministry of Agriculture (MoA); Government ownership of the Environment JP is enhanced by establishing mainstreamed program implementation governance structure from Federal up to community (PA) level. These include PMC, and Federal lead agency, PCO/U, regional PMT, WPIT and PA PIT. They were engaged in the program planning, implementation and monitoring.

Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table below

Indicators	Baseline	Current Value	Means of verification	Collection methods
Number of managerial practices (financial, procurement, etc) implemented jointly by the UN implementing agencies for MDF-F JPs	13	13	Signed AWP, contract documents, cash disbursement notification, procurement & delivery report	Documents review
Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs	8	8	Study reports, No. of PMC meeting minutes	Document review and debriefing, Meeting minutes reported.
Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs	4	3	ToR for Joint monitoring mission and report	

3 Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action

Are Government and other national implementation partners involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?

Not involved false
 Slightly involved false
 Fairly involved false
 Fully involved true

In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved?

Policy/decision making
 Management: budget
 Management: procurement
 Management: service provision

Who leads and/or chair the PMC?

The PMC is jointly chaired by MoA and UNDP.

Number of meetings with PMC chair

Seven PMC meetings have been conducted and meeting minutes distributed to and approved by all PMC members.

Is civil society involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?

Not involved false
Slightly involved true
Fairly involved false
Fully involved false

In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved?

Management: other, specify

Participated in consultation workshop and training, consultancy services and sensitization/awareness creation.

Are the citizens involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?

Not involved false
Slightly involved false
Fairly involved false
Fully involved true

In what kind of decisions and activities are the citizens involved?

Policy/decision making
Management: budget
Management: procurement
Management: service provision

Where is the joint programme management unit seated?

National Government

Current situation

The programme management unit (PCO) is hosted by MoA. It is staffed with Training Officer, Finance Officer, Secretary, and Driver.

4 Communication and Advocacy

Has the JP articulated an advocacy & communication strategy that helps advance its policy objectives and development outcomes?

Yes true
No false

Please provide a brief explanation of the objectives, key elements and target audience of this strategy

An Integrated Communication and Advocacy Strategy for Enabling Pastoral Communities to Adapt to Climate Change and Restoring Range land Environments Program has been developed with overall strategic goal of Accelerating progress on the MDGs by raising awareness, strengthening broad-based support and action and increasing citizen engagement in MDG related policy and practice. The strategy has one outcome and four outputs and will be implemented within participating IP regions, federal government implementing partner organizations and in cooperation with UN partner institutions. The Communication and Strategy Action Plan have the following key objectives at program level to be fed into national advocacy plan.

- o To educate and raise awareness concerning the CC adaptation among all stakeholders
- o To provide a public participation mechanism and facilitate buy-in by the stakeholders
- o To provide appropriate communication tools
- o To continuously communicate adequate and useful information about CC change adaptation and its outputs to the stakeholders
- o To enhance stakeholders understanding of the issues in CC change adaptation for informed decision making and adoption of corrective measures, good environmental practices

In spite of the efforts made to articulate the communication and advocacy strategic plan of the program, funds for the implementation of the corresponding initiatives have not been set aside during the environment joint program formulation. Therefore, lack of fund for implementing the communication and advocacy plan is the major challenge which needs mobilizing additional fund from the MDG Achievement fund.

What concrete gains are the advocacy and communication efforts outlined in the JP and/or national strategy contributing towards achieving?

Increased awareness on MDG related issues amongst citizens and governments
 Increased dialogue among citizens, civil society, local national government in relation to development policy and practice
 New/adopted policy and legislation that advance MDGs and related goals
 Establishment and/or liaison with social networks to advance MDGs and related goals
 Key moments/events of social mobilization that highlight issues
 Media outreach and advocacy

What is the number and type of partnerships that have been established amongst different sectors of society to promote the achievement of the MDGs and related goals?

Faith-based organizations	Not Yet
Social networks/coalitions	Not Yet
Local citizen groups	Livestock Marketing Cooperatives
Private sector	3 Consulting Firms
Academic institutions	2 Universities, 2 Junior High Schools
Media groups and journalist	1 News agency
Other	

What outreach activities do the programme implement to ensure that local citizens have adequate access to information on the programme and opportunities to actively participate?

Focus groups discussions
 Household surveys
 Use of local communication mediums such radio, theatre groups, newspapers



Open forum meetings
Capacity building/trainings

Section III: Millenium Development Goals

Millenium Development Goals

Additional Narrative Comments

Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to de MDGs, whether at national or local level

Even if it is early to substantiate the contribution for MDGs with quantifiable outcomes at this point of delayed environment joint program implementation, there are promising performance at output and activity levels to ascertain the anticipated contributions. For instance, national/regional/ district CC adaptation and mitigation strategy and action plan was developed, water provision schemes are under construction, government and local institutions capacity is developing through material and technical support, communities are getting cash income by undertaking physical activities, and range lands rehabilitation is started

Please provide other comments you would like to communicate to the MDG-F Secretariat

1. Considering the actual start-up of the environment JP, July 8, 2010, and difficulties encountered so far during the process, three years program duration is very short to ascertain program outcomes and measure impacts. Thus, the program seeks special consideration from the MDG -F secretariat in granting no cost extension and technical back stopping for the M&E and C&A framework elaboration, and fund support for implementing the communication and advocacy strategy of the program.
2. Government partners and UN agencies accountability lines need to be clearly defined in terms of lead agency, coordination arrangement, joint implementation modalities.
3. Multiplicity of UN agencies procedure signifies the need for harmonized procedure to speed up program implementation.
4. Delayed program launching prior to finalizing the required vital coordination and governance structure arrangements have delayed program implementation.

Section IV: General Thematic Indicators

1 Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming

1.1 Number of sectors or mainstreaming laws, policies or plans supported by the joint programme

1.1.1 On Environmental Management

Policies

National	1
Local	10

Laws

National	
Local	

Plans

National	1
Local	10

1.1.2 On Climate Change

Policies

National	1
Local	10

Laws

National	
Local	

Plan

National 1
Local 10

1.2 Please briefly provide some contextual information on the law, policy or plan and the country/municipality where it is (or will be) implemented

mainstreaming pastoralist oriented CC adaptation and mitigation option in national/sub-national development frameworks has been substantiated by the progress made in in developing CC adaptation and mitigation strategy and action plan, risks/vulnerabilities assessment, CC registry information registry establishment, integrating pastoralist CC adaptation measures in the GTP, developing CC communication strategy and public awareness toolkits.

1.3 Sector in which the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) is/are focused

Nature conservation
Water management
Sanitation
Sustainable management of natural resources
Climate change: adaptation
Climate change: mitigation

Comments

The indicators illustrate the sectors in which pastoralist centred environmental management and climate change policy instruments, strategy and plan are mainstreamed to enhance pastoral communities livelihoods , reduce their vulnerability to CC related risks and challenges, and properly manage their resource bases.

1.4 Number of citizens and/or institutions that the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) directly affects

All the public management and legal/institutional arrangements serve to the whole nation. Therefore all the efforts within the Joint Programme on laws, strategies, policies and plans will directly affect the whole population of the Country

Citizens

Total 12,000,000
Urban
Rural

National Public Institutions

Total 7
Urban
Rural

Local Public Institutions

Total 48
Urban 6
Rural 42

Private Sector Institutions

Total
Urban
Rural

1.5 Government budget allocated to environmental issues before the implementation of the Joint Programme

National Budget Not available

Total Local Budget(s) Not available

Comments

Data not available at PCO level.

1.6 % variation in government budget allocated to environmental policies or programmes

National Budget

% Overall Not available
% Triggered by the joint programme Not available

Local Budget

% Overall Not available

% Triggered by the Joint Programme Not available

Comments

Data not available at PCO level.

1.7 Government budget allocated to Climate Change before the implementation of the Joint Programme

National budget Not available

Total Local Budget(s) Not available

Comments

Data not available at PCO level.

1.8 % variation in government budget allocated to Climate Change from the beginning of the Joint programme to present time

National Budget

% Overall Not available

% Triggered by the Joint Programme Not available

Local Budget

% Overall Not available

% Triggered by the Joint Programme Not available

Comments

Data not available at PCO level.

2 Institutional capacities for environmental management developed and civil society participation increased

2.1 Number of km² of land newly managed by a natural resource plan supported by the Joint Programme

Total of the area managed in Km2 340Ha.

By habitat (Km2)

Tropical forest
Temperature forest
Savannah
Shrub land 200Ha.
Grassland 140Ha.
Wetlands
Rocky areas
Desert
Sea/oceans
Artificial terrestrial

2.2 Number of institutions, civil servants and citizens trained by the JP to take informed decisions on environmental issues (excluding climate change)

Public institutions

Total 17

Private Sector Institutions

Total

NGO/CBO

Total 9 Cooperatives

Civil Servants

Total 666
Women 126
Men 540

Citizens

Total 657
Women 117

Men 540

2.3 Number of citizens supported by the JP that have organised themselves to effectively participate in natural resource management initiatives

Total 15055
Women 7902
Men 7153
Ethnic groups

2.4 Number of successful environmental service payment mechanisms that have been promoted by the JP

Total -
No. of beneficiaries -

Sectors of application

Financing source
MDGF

2.5 Has the JP had an impact on the development of national and local policies or regulations that recognize schemes of Payment for Ecosystem Services as an environmental management tool, How?

Climate Change Adaptation is a critical issue in an effort to build Carbon Resilient Green Economy. In this context the Regional and Wereda Climate Change Adaptation Program is formulated by the pilot Regions and Weredas. The Program involves vulnerability assessment of major sectors, adaptive capacity, response measures, technologies needed or available to implement those response measures and response measure for possible mal-adaptation. In this context the Program address the consideration of payment for ecosystem services in the form of rehabilitation and maintenance of different ecosystems to replace what has been taken from the environment. This involves various

stakeholders from grass root community to the policy level interventions. The Adaptation documents are also intended to influence policy level review at National and Regional level to address climate change impacts.

3 Climate change adaptation and mitigation and development of institutional capacities

3.1 Number of Km2 and type of habitat covered by mechanisms and/or actions to adapt to climate change (implemented with the support of the joint programme

The geographical unit that can be used for this question is "River Basin" in the context of MDGF 1680 Joint Programme, and the surface area of Seyhan River Basin is 20,600 km2

Tropical Forest

Temperature Forest

Savannah

Shrub land 200Ha.

Grassland 140Ha.

Wetlands

Rocky Areas

Desert

Artificial terrestrial (pastoral land, arable land, etc.)

3.2 Adaptation measures supported by JP that are addressing the following climate change issues

Land degradation

Soil fertility decrease

Change in native species dynamics

Droughm Storms/flooding

3.3 Based on available data, what kind of improvements on the population's wellbeing have been achieved through JP supported adaptation measures?

Improved livelihoods

very difficult to ascertain at this point of programme implementation. This is accounted to sluggish implementation of major activities such as income generation schemes, functionalizing established cooperatives, and drought which constrained rangelands rehabilitation and improvement. Generally, delayed and prolonged process evolved in fund disbursement and delayed operationalizing programme governance set-up have attributed to the sluggish progress in outcome 3. Despite that, the accomplishment in baseline survey, provision of equipment and supplies for tree nurseries and animal health posts, establishing LMC, constructing some water schemes, mobilizing programme beneficiaries, and conducting trainings and awareness creation workshops are very commendable.

3.4 Number of individuals and institutions with improved capacities to adapt to climate change or mitigate it

Adaptation
Mitigation

Public institutions

Total 17

Private Sector Institutions

Total

Civil Servants

Total 666
Women 126
Men 540

Citizens

Total 657
Women 117
Men 540

3.5 Interventions funded by the JP to improve capacities of individuals and institutions to adapt to Climate Change or mitigate it



Adaptation
Mitigation

Capacity building
Equipment
Knowledge transfer

3.6 Number of clean development mechanism projects registered to mitigate climate change

CO2 emissions captured through conservation	-
CO2 emission reduction through the use of renewable energies	-
CO2 emission reduction through the use of clean technologies	-



Prog/project Title: Enabling pastoral communities to adapt to climate change and restoring rangeland environments
Annex A: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
Outcome 1. Climate change mitigation and adaptation options for pastoralists mainstreamed into national development frameworks (development plans, strategy, policies)					
OUTPUT 1.1. Improved national/ regional/ local development plans, key sector policies, strategies and partnership to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation options into policy frameworks	<u>Indicator:</u> 1. Existence of national/ regional development Plans/strategic document for pastoralist that adequately mainstreamed climate change mitigation and adaptation options.. <u>Baseline:</u> Inadequate or doesn't exist	Periodic(Quarterly/ annual/ mid-term/ terminal report) progress reports review Consultant gap analysis report by the end of 1 st year of the project Consultation workshop on gap analysis report by consultant and final document produced Documents produced Filed visit	CC related risks/ vulnerabilities of the pastoral communities at national, four regions and six districts identified and assessment report produced by 1 st year of the project CC related federal and four regional states policy and strategy gap analysis report produced and policy proposal prepared by 1 st year of the project Federal, four regional states and six districts CC adaptation/ mitigation strategy, communication strategy, action plan prepared by 2 nd year of the project	UNEP + EPA	Capacity limitation, Delay in getting returns from the field, Delay in disbursement of fund,

	Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
				Pastoralist adaptation measures integrated into the development plan		
	<p>OUTPUT 1.2. Tools/ guidelines for mainstreaming CC adaptation and mitigation into federal, regional and district development planning system developed</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> 1. Existence of tool/manuals for mainstreaming CC adaptation and mitigation for pastoralist:</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> Doesn't exist</p>	<p>Periodic(Quarterly/ annual/ mid-term/ terminal report) progress reports review</p> <p>Documents produced</p> <p>Awareness creation workshop on Tools/guidelines documents produced</p>	Mainstreaming methodology, tools/manuals/indicators/ training manuals developed by the 1 st year of the project period	UNEP + EPA	Capacity limitation, Delay in getting returns from the field, Delay in disbursement of fund,
<p>Outcome 2. Government and pastoral institutional capacities strengthened to effectively respond to the climate change risks and challenges</p>						
	<p>OUTPUT 2.1. Federal/Regional/district and pastoral community institutions capacity and service delivery to respond to pastoralist community needs enhanced</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> 1. Increased satisfaction of pastoral communities for service delivered by govt organs to respond to their needs</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> To be established</p>	<p>Periodic(Quarterly/ annual/ mid-term/ terminal report) progress reports review</p> <p>Training report; Training evaluation & feed back by participants</p> <p>Field visit to verify capacity developed, gauge beneficiaries satisfaction and ascertain</p>	<p>Federal/regional/ local practioners and community members enabled to plan,/ manage CC adaptation and handle resource based conflicts by the 1st year of the project period</p> <p>Parliamentarians, federal/ regional/district civil servants, selected pastoral community leaders sensitized to make them responsive to the CC adaptation needs of the pastoral community by the 1st year of the project period</p>	UNDP + MoARD + EPA	Turnover of trained staff, Delay in disbursement of fund,

	Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
		<p>2. Increased satisfaction of regional and District govt organs in their capacities to delivery services to respond to pastoralist community needs</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <p>To be established</p>	<p>CC mitigation and adaptation package disseminated.</p>	<p>Existing capacity of pastoral communities institutions and relevant government institutions assessed, gaps identified and needs defined by the 1st year of the project period</p> <p>Immediate and critical capacity needs of key government and community institutions strengthened starting first year of the project period</p> <p>Critical mass of skilled trainees on adaptation programme management and early warning and response systems deployed starting from the 1st year of the project period</p> <p>Information on CC mitigation and adaptation packaged and disseminated by the 2nd year of the project period</p> <p>Six districts user friendly adaptation early warning and response mechanism (indicators, manuals, working procedures for info exchange) produced and presented by the 2nd year of the project period</p>		

	Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
				<p>Tailored and user friendly adaptation early warning and response mechanism operationalized</p> <p>Local pastoralist CC response coordination mechanism established by the 1st year of the project period</p> <p>Regular monitoring system established and functional</p>		
Outcome 3. Pastoral community coping mechanism/ sustainable livelihood enhanced						
	<p>OUTPUT 3.1. Climate sensitive needs identified, assessed and priority interventions agreed</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u></p> <p>1. A well elaborated assessment report with priority interventions agreed by project appraisal committee</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u></p> <p>Not exist</p>	<p>Baseline report</p>	<p>Baseline data generated on: potential, accessibility, management, availability and alternatives in: water, livestock, rangeland and market. in the selected villages of the 6 districts by the first year of the project</p>	<p>FAO + MoARD + IP – Regions</p>	<p>Delay in disbursement/ utilization of fund,</p>
	<p>OUTPUT 3.2. Integrated Rangeland Management practices promoted in the targeted districts for better livelihoods and coping with adverse climatic effects</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u></p> <p>1. No of villages’ form the target districts get access to functional water schemes among those don’t have.</p>	<p>Field visit report, Questionnaire Water committee bylaw</p>	<p>Access to functional water schemes improved on a sustainable basis in selected villages (2-3 villages per district) of the six target districts on the first, second and third years of the project</p>	<p>FAO + MoARD + IP – Regions</p>	<p>Delay in disbursement/ utilization of fund, Operation and maintenance</p>

	Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
		<p><u>Baseline:</u> To be established</p> <p>2. No of villages from the target districts start practicing better feed resource management (Systems and technologies that enhance availability of feed resources)</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> Not exist or few</p> <p>3. No of villages from the target districts start utilizing vet services and market facilities in reasonable walking distance</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> To be established</p>		<p>Systems and technologies that enhance availability of feed resources promoted in selected sites (2 to 3 villages) of the six districts improved by the second and the third year of the project</p> <p>Mechanism to increase livestock productivity and access to better market, for women and men members of the pastoralist community, put in place by the second and the third year of the project</p>		
	<p>OUTPUT 3.3. A system that enhance income generating capacity of the pastoralist communities to cope up with climate change related livelihood risks established and made functional in selected villages of the targeted six districts.</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> 1.No of community development fund established and made functional in the target districts</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> Not available</p>	Community development fund bylaws	Alternative income generating schemes identified and/or designed (in the 1 st year of the project) to be implemented by both men and women of the pastoralist community over the project life and beyond	UNDP + FAO + MoARD + IP – Regions	Delay in disbursement/ utilization of fund,

	Expected results (Outcomes and outputs)	Indicators with baseline	M&E event with data collection methods	Time frame & frequency/ means of verifications	Responsibilities	Risk and assumption
		2. No of community development fund established and made functional in the target districts <u>Baseline:</u> Not available		Six community development fund established and made functional in the six target districts to facilitate alternative income generating activities by the second year of the project 360 target community members acquire income diversification skills over the project life time		



Table No. 1. Results framework

No.	JP Outputs (with indicators and baselines)	Specific (SMART) Outputs by Participating UN organization	Reference to Agency Priority or Country Program	Implement- ing Partner/s	Key Indicative Activities for Each Output	Budget in USD			
						Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Total
1	Outcome 1. Climate change mitigation and adaptation options for pastoralists mainstreamed into national/sub-national development frameworks (development plans, strategy, policies)								
1.1	Improved national/ regional/ local development plans, key sector policies, strategies and partnership to mainstream climate change mitigation and adaptation options into policy frameworks Indicator: Existence of national/ regional development Plans/strategic document for pastoralist that adequately mainstreamed climate change mitigation and adaptation options..	1. CC related risks/ vulnerabilities of the pastoral communities at national, four regions and six districts identified and assessment report produced by 1 st year of the project (UNEP)	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	EPA	Assessment of CC related risks/vulnerabilities of the pastoral communities (in different sub-sectors) -vulnerability profile of different geographic zones prepared	60,000			60,000
		2. CC related federal and four regional states policy and strategy gap analysis report produced and policy proposal prepared by 1 st year of the project (UNEP)		EPA	- Undertake federal and four regional states CC policy and strategy gap analysis -prepare alternative policy enhancement proposal for effectively address observed and anticipated CC related threats and opportunities	20,000			\$20,000

	Baseline: Inadequate or doesn't exist	3. Federal, four regional states and six districts CC adaptation/ mitigation strategy, communication strategy, action plan prepared by 2nd year of the project (UNEP) 4. Pastoralist adaptation measures integrated into the PASDEP (UNEP)		EPA	- Prepare a federal, four regional and six district comprehensive and integrated CC adaptation/ mitigation strategy and action plans, -prepare communication strategy and public awareness toolkit , -CC adaptation integrated into the PRSP	45,000	15,000		\$60,000
1.2	tools/ guidelines for mainstreaming CC adaptation and mitigation into federal, regional and district development planning system developed Indicator: Existence of tool/manuals for mainstreaming CC adaptation and mitigation for pastoralist: Baseline: Doesn't exist	1. Mainstreaming methodology, tools/manuals/indicators/ training manuals developed by the 1 st year of the project period (UNEP)	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	EPA	1. Develop mainstreaming methodology/ tools/manuals/ indicators for different sectors at federal levels, regional levels and district levels; 2. Develop coping/adaptation programme planning, management and M&E training manual (for professionals, extension agents, community members); 3. prepare toolkits of different adaption appropriate technologies and practices (in English and Amharic) ; 4. publish and disseminate tools and toolkits	60,000	30,000		\$90,000
	Outcome Total					185,000	45,000	0	230,000

No.	JP Outputs	Specific (SMART) Outputs by Participating UN organization	Reference to Agency Priority or Country Program	Implementing Partner/s	Key Indicative Activities for Each Output	Budget in USD			
						Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Total
2	Outcome 2. Government and pastoral institutional capacities strengthened to effectively respond to the climate change risks and challenges								
2.1	Federal/Regional/district and pastoral communities' institutions capacities and service delivery to respond to pastoralist community needs enhanced Indicator: Increased satisfaction of pastoral communities for service delivered by govt organs to respond to their needs Baseline: to be established	2.1. Federal/regional/ local practioners and community members enabled to plan./ manage CC adaptation and handle resource based conflicts/ by the 1 st year of the project period (UNDP)	PASDEP/ UNDAF/ CPAP	MoARD	-Undertake federal/regional and community training on CC adaption program planning, implementation M&E/, Prepare and conduct training on resource related conflict prevention and management)	75,000			\$75,000
		2. 2 parliamentarians, federal/regional/district civil servants, selected pastoral community leaders sensitized to make them responsive to the CC adaptation needs of the pastoral community by the 1 st year of the project period (UNEP)	PASDEP/ UNDAF/	EPA	-Undertake study tour/ peer learning for Parliamentarians, regional and district council members and pastoral community leaders, EPA, MoARD; -conduct dialogue workshop at federal, four regions, and six districts (Woreda)	75,000			\$75,000
		2.3 Existing capacity of pastoral communities institutions and relevant government institutions assessed, gaps identified and needs defined by the 1 st year of the project period (UNEP)	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	EPA	-Assess capacity needs of existing pastoral communities institutions and relevant federal, regional and local government institutions -define immediate and critical capacity needs of key government and community institutions	20,000			\$ 20,000
		2.4. immediate and critical capacity needs of key government and community institutions strengthened starting first year of the project period (UNDP)	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	MoARD	-personnel, motor cycles, office equipment/furniture and supply, software (GIS), M&E	16,000	259,000	125,000	400,000

<p>Indicator 2: Increased satisfaction of regional and District govt organs in their capacities to delivery services to respond to pastoralist community needs</p> <p>Baseline: To be established</p>	<p>2.5 Critical mass of skilled trainees on adaptation programme management and early warning and response systems deployed starting from the 1st year of the project period (UNDP)</p>		MoARD	<p>Undertake Training Of Trainers (TOT) and training of target beneficiaries (federal, regional, and Woreda experts , extension agents on adaptation programme planning and management , early warning and response systems, various adaption thematic areas (livestock and rangelands management, water technology, sustainable land management, animal and human health, IAS prevention and management, community mobilization and communication, cooperatives management etc.) based on the capacity needs assessment under 2.3 ;</p> <p>-/</p>	102,000	100,000	110,000	312,000
	<p>2.6 Information on CC mitigation and adaptation packaged and disseminated by the 2nd year of the project period (UNDP)</p>		EPA	<p>-prepare information package in different language (English, Amharic, Oromia, Afar, Somali)</p> <p>-dissemination of climate mitigation/adaptation information</p>		50,000 30 000		50,000 30 000
	<p>2.7. Six districts user friendly adaptation early warning and response mechanism (indicators, manuals, working procedures for info exchange) produced and presented by the 2nd year of the project period (UNEP)</p> <p>2.8. Tailored and user friendly</p>		EPA	<p>-Prepare and adopt district/ community user friendly adaptation early warning and response mechanism (indicators, manuals, working procedures) for information exchange;</p> <p>-climate information down scaled and delivered to the pastoralist</p> <p>-provide proper advise to the</p>		70,000		70,000

	adaptation early warning and response mechanism operationalized (UNEP)			pastoralists on short and long term measures based on real-time climate information				
	2.9. Local pastoralist CC response coordination mechanism established by the 1 st year of the project period (UNDP)		MoARD	- undertake local institutional analysis to explore scenarios of coordination arrangements, -undertake stakeholders consultation; - establish local CC pastoral coordination mechanisms (a body and secretariat)	20,000	20,000	10,000	50,000
	2.10 Regular monitoring system established and functional		EPA MoARD/EP A/BoARD	Organize and undertake regular monitoring of project implementation	60,000	60,000	60,000	180,000
	Outcome Total				368,000	589,000	305,000	1,262,000

No.	JP Outputs	Specific (SMART) Outputs by Participating UN organization	Reference to Agency Priority or Country Program	Implement-ing Partner/s	Key Indicative Activities for Each Output	Budget in USD			
						Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Outcome 3. Pastoral community coping mechanism/ sustainable livelihood enhanced									
3.1.	Climate sensitive needs identified, assessed and priority interventions agreed Indicator: A well elaborated assessment report with priority interventions agreed by project appraisal committee Baseline: Not exist	Baseline data generated on: potential, accessibility, management, availability and alternatives in: water, livestock, rangeland and market. in the selected villages of the 6 districts by the first year of the project (FAO)	UNDAF, PASDEP	MoARD,	Undertake participatory assessment to generate baseline information and data on:- i) potential, accessibility and management of water resources; ii) availability and alternative mechanism to improve feed resources; iii) current situation and mechanisms by which pastoralist community improve livestock productivity and access to better market and, renewable energy.	15,000			\$15,000
3.2.	Integrated Rangeland Management practices promoted in the targeted districts for better livelihoods and coping with adverse climatic effects: Indicator 1. No of villages' form the target districts get access to functional water schemes among those don't have. Baseline: To be established	1)Access to functional water schemes improved on a sustainable basis in selected villages (2-3 villages per district) of the six target districts on the first, second and third years of the project (FAO)	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	MoARD	1 Construct dams (earth/surface/sub-surface) 300 people x1USD/day x 150 days x 6 districts =270,000 USD + for inputs=390,000 USD 2 Rehabilitate wells/ponds (11,000 USD x 30 wells=330,000USD) 3 Establish/strengthen WATSAN committee 4 Conduct workshop on Sanitation and hygiene for community water managing committees (10 people X 30 PAs X 7 days x 8 USD =12,000USD+ 9,318 USD training materials =21,000USD) 5 Construct water harvesting facilities such as cisterns and birkas. (12 Cisterns x 10,000USD =120,000 USD)	411,000	455,318	265,000	\$1,131,318

No.	JP Outputs	Specific (SMART) Outputs by Participating UN organization	Reference to Agency Priority or Country Program	Implement-ing Partner/s	Key Indicative Activities for Each Output	Budget in USD			
						Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Total
	<p>Indicator2:</p> <p>No of villages from the target districts start practicing better feed resource management (Systems and technologies that enhance availability of feed resources)</p> <p>Baseline: not exist or few</p> <p>Indicator 3:</p> <p>No of villages from the target districts start utilizing vet services and market facilities in reasonable walking</p>	<p>2)Systems and technologies that enhance availability of feed resources promoted in selected sites (2 to 3 villages) of the six districts improved by the second and the third year of the project (FAO)</p>	<p>UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP</p>	<p>MoARD</p>	<p>1 Promote area closure for rangeland regulation and/or rehabilitation (3,000 USD x 5 ha x 12 PAs=<u>180,000USD</u>)</p> <p>2 Reseed/re sow degraded rangelands (60kg seed x 50USD =3,000USD + 18,000 USD for fencing=<u>21,000USD</u>)</p> <p>3 Promote control and management of bush and invasive plants</p> <p>4 Undertake cross visits for community members(Six cross visits=6 x7,500 USD/visit =<u>45,000USD</u>)</p> <p>5 Conduct awareness creation workshop on better utilization of rangeland resources for community members</p> <p>6 Establish Nurseries for multiplication of native and improved fodder species (7,500 usd/nur X 5 Nurseries= <u>45,000USD</u>)</p> <p>7 Plant native fodder trees</p> <p>8. Promote control of soil erosion (gully treatment) (6 ha Demonstration X 1,500USD/ha = <u>9,000 USD</u>)</p>	<p>100,000</p>	<p>150,000</p>	<p>50,000</p>	<p>300,000</p>
		<p>3)Mechanism to increase livestock productivity and access to better market, for women and men members of the pastoralist community, put in place by the</p>	<p>UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP</p>	<p>MoARD</p>	<p>1 Construct/rehabilitate vet posts (10,000 USD/vet x 12 vet =<u>120,000USD</u>)</p> <p>2 .Conduct refresher training to vet staff Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWS) (5 staff/dist x 6 dist x 2 refresh training X 12 USD/day=7,200USD = (cost of 2 trainers =(2 trainers x 2 refresh training x 20 days x 20USD=1,600 usd = 1,200 cost of training materials) = <u>10,000USD</u></p>	<p>150,000</p>	<p>200,000</p>	<p>100,000</p>	<p>450,000</p>

	<p>distance</p> <p>Baseline: to be established</p>	<p>second and the third year of the project (FAO)</p>			<p>3 Provide drugs to vet posts (lump sum = <u>65,000USD</u>)</p> <p>4 Establish Livestock Marketing Cooperatives (LMC) facilitated with information service (7,500 USD/LCM x 6= <u>45,000USD</u>)</p> <p>5 Organize training and cross visits for Cooperative board members on cooperative principles, book keeping, business planning etc. by linking to out put 3.3</p> <p>6 Link LMC to community development fund to get access to initial capital (10,000UED/LCM x 6= <u>60,000USD</u>)</p> <p>9 Provide office space, materials and necessary document to Cooperatives by linking to out put 2.4</p> <p>10 Construct/rehabilitate primary market posts (25,000USD/market posts x 6=<u>150,000USD</u>)</p>				
--	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

No.	JP Outputs	Specific (SMART) Outputs by Participating UN organization	Reference to Agency Priority or Country Program	Implementing Partner/s	Key Indicative Activities for Each Output	Budget in USD			
						Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Total
3.3.	<p>A system that enhance income generating capacity of the pastoralist communities to cope up with climate change related livelihood risks established and made functional in selected villages of the targeted six districts.</p> <p>Indicator 1: No of community development fund established and made functional in the target districts</p> <p>Baseline: Not available</p> <p><u>Indicator 2:</u> No of target community members acquire income diversification skills</p> <p>Baseline: Not available</p>	<p>1)Alternative income generating schemes identified and/or designed (in the 1st year of the project) to be implemented by both men and women of the pastoralist community over the project life and beyond (UNDP)</p>	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	MoARD	<p>1. Conduct participatory assessment on the viability of potential income generating activities such as dairy processing, animal fattening, bee keeping, handcrafts, petty trading, eco-tourism and other more.</p>	25,000			\$25,000.
		<p>2)Six community development fund established and made functional in the six target districts to facilitate alternative income generating activities by the second year of the project (UNDP)</p>	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	MoARD	<p>1. Design community development fund management system in dialogue with community and local authorities 2. Training for community leaders on management of community development fund 3. Mobilize the women and men community members to get organized in different groups 4. Institutionalize community development fund for sustaining the scheme 5. Deliver fund for functioning of the scheme</p>		150,000	120,000	\$270,000
		<p>3)360 target community members acquire income diversification skills over the project life time(UNDP)</p>	UNDAF/ PASDEP/ CPAP	MoARD	<p>1. Develop or adapt technical manuals in local languages in the context of pastoral communities on identified schemes 2. Train both women and men members of the community on identified viable schemes. 3. Train both women and men pastoralist community members on Business Development, Management, Marketing skills</p>	25000	30000		55000
	Sub-Total					726,000	985,318	535,000	2,246,318

Fund Management

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Total	
By UNEP	Programme Cost	280,000	115,000	-	395,000	
	Indirect Support Cost**	19,600	8,050	-	27,650	
By UNDP	Programme Cost	323,000	699,000	425,000	1,447,000	
	Indirect Support Cost**	22,610	48,930	29,750	101,290	
By FAO	Programme Cost	676,000	805,318	415,000	1,896,318	
	Indirect Support Cost**	47,320	56,372	29,050	132,742	
Total	Programme Cost	1,279,000	1,619,318	840,000	3,738,318	
	Indirect Support Cost**	89,530	113,352	58,800	261,682	
Grand Total		1,368,530	1,732,670	898,800	4,000,000	

Budget description by Participating UN Organization

	UNDP	UNEP	FAO
1.1. Supplies, commodities, equipment and transport	540,000	-----	352,500
1.2. Personnel (staff, consultants, travel and training)	345,000	185,000	15,000
1.3. Training of counter parts	320,000	70,000	376,263.6
1.4. Contracts	242,000	140,000	1,152,554.4
1.5. Other Direct Costs	-----	-----	---
Total Direct Costs	1,447,000	395,000	1,896,318
2.0 UN Agency Indirect Cost (7%)	101,290	27,650	132,742
Grand Total	1,548,290	422,650	2,029,060