

**FINAL DRAFT**

**Humbo and Soddo Community-Managed Natural Regeneration  
Project: Results of Consultations with Communities**

**By  
Beyene Kebede Ph.D.**

**April 21, 2006  
Addis Ababa**

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Objectives.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Results of the Consultations.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Case studies.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Meetings with government officials.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Rapid Rural Appraisal.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>First round Focus Group Discussions.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Historical perspective.....	8
User groups.....	9
Current problems.....	9
Possible solutions.....	9
Demarcation and User rights of communal lands.....	10
<b>Second round Focus Group discussions.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Project concept and communities commitments to the project.....	12
Border demarcation.....	13
User rights.....	14
Protection of the area to be closed .....	16
Forest Management.....	17
Benefit sharing.....	18
Role of Women.....	18
<b>Conclusion and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Next steps and future directions.....</b>	<b>23</b>

<b>Appendices: .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	
<b>Table 1: Kebeles Covered in the Consultation.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Table 2: Number of Participants in the Focus Group.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Case Studies.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Humbo Regeneration Carbon Project</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference for Community Development</b>	
<b>Consultant.....</b>	<b>34</b>

## **Introduction**

In any community development program, people's participation is essential. People are central to the use and management of natural resources in general and forests in particular. Reforestation programs of degraded areas are usually long range in their nature and the benefits are therefore often not appreciated by farmers in view of their immediate pressing requirements of food, fodder and fuel. In order to convince people to participate in a community-managed reforestation program, we have to be able to show them that the expected benefits from participation will exceed the expected costs of participation. Affordable 'win-win' technologies that provide acceptable, competitive economic benefits to the community and have positive effects on the environment should be available.

People's participation also requires community based organizations and institutions in order to ensure the full participation in decision making, coordinated community action, conflict resolution and access to governmental support. Moreover, the rights of the local community to manage resources equally have to be supported by the legal framework and policies.

Community-based reforestation programs can only succeed if all stakeholders in the target area participate in the planning, implementing and evaluating of the different activities in the envisaged programs. Social unity and equity are crucial to enhancing community action and peoples' participation, including women and marginalized groups within the community.

The continuous degradation of Ethiopia's forest system and the diminishing availability of forest products have been talked of in many instances. Given that an open access regime prevailed, the natural vegetation of the Humbo and Soddo areas has been denuded over the years through over-exploitation and mismanagement of forest resources and grazing lands by the community. More

than 85% of the people living in the area are considered to be below the poverty line. The overall goals of this project are the sequestration of carbon in a biodiverse native forest through a Farmer Managed Natural Revegetation technique, and the alleviation of poverty in the Humbo and Soddo districts of Southern Nations, Nationalities and People Region (SNNPR). This paper summarizes the findings of initial consultation between January 18 and 20 and a second round of more in-depth consultations between February 28 to March 10, 2006.

## **Objectives**

While the overall objective of the consultations was to try and understand, accommodate and integrate the community needs and expectations of the project, the specific objectives of the community consultation were:

- To understand the perception of the different stakeholders about the degradation of the natural resources;
- To find out their commitment and readiness to participate and look for possible solutions and opportunities to the problem in a community based forest management program; and
- To provide information, create awareness and give opportunities for discussions, and seeking feedback on specific issues (see TOR; attached as Appendix 3).

It is also hoped that, with such a process, a high degree of local ownership for the project would be achieved, and that there would be broad agreement among the communities to support a management regime necessary for natural re-growth/carbon sequestration.

## **Methodology**

In order to meet the above objectives, the following methods were followed:

- Relevant reports and documents dealing with natural resources/forest conservation were reviewed and case studies on three projects from within Ethiopia and three from outside Ethiopia on natural resources management programs were undertaken;
- Consultation meetings were undertaken with relevant government officials at the regional, wereda and kebele levels in Awasa, Humbo, Soddo and Alaba Woredas; and
- A Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) was conducted on communities from selected Kebeles of Humbo, Soddo and Damot Gale Woredas to gather information on different aspects of people's participation in the envisaged project. The RRA involved informal interviews with farmer's focus groups made-up of elders, representatives of women and the youth, user groups and local leaders.

## **Results of the Consultations**

### **Case studies**

Three case studies from Ethiopia, namely: (a) Antsokia Area Development Program of World Vision Ethiopia which is found in the Amhara Regional state about 350 km north of Addis Ababa; (b) Adaba Dodola Forest Management project of GTZ which is found in Adaba Dodola of the Oromia Regional State; and (c) Rekame Self Help Development Organization which is found in Alaba Wereda of SNNPR, were undertaken. In addition, three case studies from outside Ethiopia, namely: (a) People's participation in Begnastal and Rupatal (BTRT) watershed management in Nepal; (b) A watershed management project in Wuhua County, Guangdong province of China; and (c) A participatory watershed management at Ralegan Siddhi Village in district Ahmadnagar, Maharashtra in India were undertaken.

The summary of the findings of these different case studies are presented in Appendix 2.

### **Meetings with government officials**

At the regional level, consultations were held with the Natural Resources and Rural Land Administration Office at Awasa. In addition to providing a brief on the project concept, discussions were undertaken on different topics including, the regional government's policy on land ownership system, including communal lands, issuing of land title to individual farmers, and organizing of farmers into cooperatives.

At the wereda level, consultations were held with members of the Humbo Wereda Agriculture and Natural Resources Development Office .We were briefed on the natural resources situation of the wereda including the physical features, rainfall pattern, land use, population size and distribution, major constraints especially with reference to natural resources degradation and measures taken.

### **Rapid Rural Appraisal**

The consultation was done in two rounds through focus group discussions. The first round consultation was more of an exploratory type of consultation and was undertaken on three of the 5 possible sites considered for the project (Sites 1,2 and 3). The second round consultation focused on two of the sites which were ultimately selected to be the project sites, i.e. Site 1 located in Humbo Wereda and Site 3 located in Soddo Zuria and Damot Gale Weredas. An in-depth consultation was done with communities from 7 Kebeles of the Humbo Wereda surrounding Site 1, and 8 Kebeles surrounding Site 3, 6 of which are from Soddo Zuria Wereda and 2 from Damot Gale Wereda. The names and some statistics of the Kebeles visited in the second round consultation are shown in Appendix 1 Table 1.

### **First Round Focus Group Discussions**

During the first round visit, seven focus group discussions were held: three in Site 1 from Longena, Bosa Wanche and Obecha Kebeles of Humbo Woreda; three in Site 2 from Siretawerta, Kodo Kanko and Fango Gelchecha Kera Kebeles of Humbo Woreda, and one in Damota Kebele of Soddo Zuria Woreda.

The focus groups were first given an explanation of the purpose of the meeting. In the introduction it was emphasized that both WVE and the World Bank firmly believe in communities' participation in decision making and implementation process of any development program and their active and sincere participation in the discussion is very important. Then they were consulted on different topics with regard to the natural resources condition and management of their respective villages/kebeles, including:

- The historical background of their natural resources situation (Trend analysis).
- Identification of the major current user groups
- Identification of the major current problems.
- Possible solutions to the problems identified
- Demarcation and user rights of communal lands

Since there are similarities in responses by the different communities, the responses are summarized below and not reported for each kebele separately. The results of the discussion are as follows:

***Historical perspective.*** In the trend analysis elders described how the natural vegetation condition has changed over the last few decades in their respective kebeles, and what pressures or factors caused these changes.

In all sites they indicated that, when land was privately owned during the Imperial (Haile Selassie) regime, some 30 - 35 years back, the natural vegetation cover

was abundant and areas were covered with thick forests and there were lots of wildlife including lions and leopards. Different tree species that were used for timber, fuelwood and wild fruits were abundant. Since the land was owned by landlords, they were strictly controlling the cutting of trees. After the fall of the Imperial Regime and the emergence of the socialist military regime (Derg), land was nationalized by the Government and this has led to a loss of sense of ownership and as part of the open access regime the “tragedy of the commons” occurred that led to the destruction of the forests including the wild animals. This period was further affected by the drought and famine that had occurred during this period and the community was generating its income through sale of wood and charcoal by destroying the forest.

During the current regime (EPRDF), recurrent droughts, increased population pressure, poverty and lack of ownership have further aggravated the situation and the natural resources degradation has even gotten worse.

***User groups.*** The current user groups of the communal land in the different kebeles include livestock owners for grazing land, fuelwood collectors for home consumption and for sale, charcoal makers, and hay collectors for sale. (such kind of classification is a bit misleading as all households are not purely depend on one activity. For instance livestock owners are also collect fuelwood for consumption and some may also collect for sale. So rather than giving such general classification may be better to write the following: the communities are using the project area as sources of fodder, firewood, charcoal making, etc. both for won consumption and sale livestock)

***Current problems.*** Some of the problems identified by the different communities include climatic changes with shortage of rain and moisture, shortage of grazing land, overgrazing, illegal cutting of wood and charcoal making, encroachment of their grazing area by neighboring villages/kebeles,

flood and soil erosion and wild animals like monkeys and warthog destroying their crops and hyenas killing their livestock.

**Possible solutions.** The communities firmly believe that the area has to be demarcated and the natural vegetation has to be protected. Different options for protection were discussed including community sensitization, area closures, fencing and guarding. While some communities believe that communal lands should be fenced and protected by guards, others believe that the community has to be conscious enough and be aware of the possible consequences of natural resources degradations and the community should therefore take the lead to protect its forest and grazing land. The communities believe that awareness creation programs including seminars and training should be organized. Cost to be incurred for fencing and/or payment to guards was also discussed. In general, most Kebeles indicted that they don't have the resources to pay for fencing and/or for guards, which would have to be covered by other projects like safety-net and employment generating schemes. Some communities indicated that they would take turns to guard their areas.

**Demarcation and User rights of communal lands.** Demarcation of the communal lands and user rights between different kebeles and communities within kebeles were also discussed. It was generally felt this has to be dealt with in a general meeting (or series of meetings) that would involve all the stakeholders. However, the user rights of the current different user groups of the communal lands including charcoal makers, fuelwood collectors and those that graze their livestock and cut hay for their animals, were discussed. For the charcoal makers and wood sellers, it was proposed by the communities that alternative income generating activities should be investigated including involving them in the safety net or other employment generating schemes or employing them as guards of the communal land. Farmers who used to graze their livestock in the communal land could be allowed to cut and carry hay from the closed area. Alternative grazing land should be sought until the grass regenerates in the

closed area and is ready for cutting hay. Another alternative suggested by some communities was not to close the whole area at once but do it in phases, thereby allowing some area for grazing.

### **Second Round Focus Group Discussions**

During the second round consultation, three focus groups (key informants) were formed in each of the concerned Kebeles. The first focus group was composed of the Kebele Cabinet which included the Kebele Administration Chairman, his Deputy and other members of the cabinet representing different sectors such as education, health, agriculture, social and economic affairs, etc., and community Development Workers and some government offices representatives such as teachers, school directors, health officers, etc. The second group was composed of community representatives including elders (men and women), youth (male and female) and user groups (farmers, wood sellers, charcoal sellers, etc). The third group was composed of women (youth and elders) only. Each focus group was consulted separately. The number of the different focus group consulted in the different Kebeles is shown in Appendix 1 Table 2.

Members of the focus group in each of the Kebeles were asked to draw the map of their Kebele or refer to the map that is already found in the Kebele administration office. The different focus groups were asked to locate on the map the proposed site for the regeneration program in reference to their Kebele and also indicate their neighboring Kebele(s) that share the same boundary of the proposed site and discussion was undertaken using the map.

Major topics discussed during the second consultation meeting were:

- Project concept and communities commitments to the project
- Border demarcation

- User rights
- Protection of the area to be closed
- Forest Management
- Benefit sharing
- Role of Women

Since the responses from the different Kebeles/communities and focus groups have a lot of similarities, it is found unnecessary to report here on Kebele by Kebele basis or on a focus group basis. Rather, references are made to the specific Kebele(s) or focus group when there are divergent views.

***Project concept and communities' commitments to the project.*** The discussion with each focus group was started by reiterating to the participants of the focus group what elders have told us during the first round of community consultation on the historical trend analysis of the conditions of the proposed sites and by emphasizing the possible consequences that will follow if the trend is going to continue unchecked. The consequences of climatic changes, globally and nationally and the possible causes for it, including carbon emission, were intimated to the different groups. Carbon emission reduction (CER), as one of the solutions to the problem and the Carbon Project concept in support of CER and the role of the World Bank/World Vision were explained to them.

It was also emphasized to the communities that their participation in the proposed project is purely voluntary and the whole idea of the consultation is to discuss the project with them and to try and understand, accommodate and integrate their needs and expectations from the project as well as from the site to be regenerated.

They were then asked if they have understood the concept and if they had any question and if they were willing to participate in the project. The responses from

all the focus group discussions were that they fully accept the concept of the project and are committed to it. However, they have indicated that the area to be closed in the communal land has been the only means of livelihoods for some and a coping mechanism for many members of the community during times of drought or until the next crop harvest is ready through the sale of fuelwood, charcoal and hay. Invariably, all focus groups raised the major question of what plan(s) do we have for those that are going to be directly affected by the closure of the communal land. They also indicated that the communal land was used for grazing their animals and asked where they will be grazing their animals if the whole area is to be closed.

In response it was emphasized to them that the project is theirs and that they are equally responsible to seek solutions to the problems they have raised. However, they were also reminded that the problems are only temporary and will occur during the first 2-3 years of the project life and starting the second year, the project will start generating income from the sale of hay and possibly from carbon which can be used to alleviate some of the problems they have raised. They were also assured that the project will try to find out alternative income generating activities including job opportunities and alternative income generating activities for those who will be affected most. The problem of grazing land will also be something that will be addressed during demarcation of the site at the implementation of the project. It was suggested to them that the alternative solutions that the community could consider during demarcation include, among others, to either set aside an area for grazing or to close the site in stages.

**Border demarcation.** Each Kebele was asked if they know their border(s) with their adjacent Kebele(s) within the communal land and if there is or had been any history of border conflict with their neighboring Kebele(s). Most Kebeles indicated that they know their borders and where it is not known clearly; it can be resolved through elders selected from the respective Kebeles. There was no reason for border conflict among Kebeles since an open access system of the communal

land has been practiced, and no border disputes are currently being reported within the communal areas.<sup>1</sup>

The actual demarcation of the area to be closed at both sites has not yet started. However, Humbo and Soddo WV ADPs, with the help of GPS experts and the assistance of the respective Kebele administrations have completed measuring the area that could be considered for inclusion in the project. This is just to get a rough estimate of the area at each of the sites. WV staff and some Kebele officers that participated during the measurement told us that in taking the measurements, enough care was taken to exclude private holdings and settlement areas as well as to take into consideration communal grazing lands. The data is now being compiled at the WV headquarters in Addis Ababa, and the size and the map of the area will be available shortly. However, community representatives did not participate in the measurement and the idea is to involve them during the actual demarcation of the area which will be done later on following a sensitization meeting of the whole community of the Kebele.

**User rights.** The current user system that is being followed in the communal lands of both Sites 1 and 3 is an open access system where any member of the bordering Kebeles, or anyone for that matter, can go to the communal land and graze his/her animals, cut hay, collect fuelwood or make charcoal. User right certificates are given to individual holdings by Kebele administrations but no community user rights certificate for communal lands has been issued as of now, although it is in the proclamation and will be done eventually.

Each community/Kebele was asked if they prefer to protect and develop the communal land as one group with all the Kebeles that are bordering the area to be closed, i.e. all the 7 Kebeles in the case of Site 1 and all the 8 Kebeles in the case of Site 3 - OR- to delineate the boundaries of each Kebele within the area to

---

<sup>1</sup> However, border disputes **outside** the communal land have been reported for Bosa Wanche with Abela Shoya; Bosa Wanche with Bola Wanche; Gurmu Koisha with Damot Gale; Abela Longena with Abela Gafeta; Hobicha Bongota with Wolayta zone (Wolayta and Sidama conflict). It appears, though, that most of these conflicts are past history and have been resolved.

be closed in the communal land and each Kebele to be responsible for its respective area within the communal land. Invariably, all the Kebeles indicated that they would rather have their boundary delineated and they will be responsible for their own share of the communal land. Asked if they know their boundaries within the communal land, most of them indicated that they know their boundaries or wherever it is not known, it can be done through elders selected from the relevant Kebeles. Some Kebeles around Site 1, like Abela Longena indicated that, with the anticipated benefits from the project, there can be conflicts in user rights and they consider demarcation as a priority before any intervention programs are being undertaken.

Each community is subdivided into sub-Kebeles (or zones) and each sub-Kebele is further subdivided into Development Teams (“Mengistawi Buden”) as shown in Table 1. The communities were asked if the communal land within their respective boundaries should be sub-divided into sub-Kebeles or Development Teams and user rights be given to each sub-Kebele or Development Team. Moreover some sub-Kebeles are adjacent to the area to be closed whereas others are far away from it, and each Kebele was asked if user rights should be given to only those sub-kebeles that are adjacent to the closed area. Again, invariably, all the Kebeles, except Kokate Kebele of Soddo Zuria Wereda, responded that there should be no subdivision of their respective areas into sub-Kebeles nor into Development Teams, and the whole area should be developed and managed by the whole Kebele together.

Kokate Kebele has 8 sub-Kebeles and two of its sub-Kebeles, 1 and 8 are adjacent to the area to be closed, i.e. Damota Mountain, while the others are further away from it. During the focus group discussion with the community, the dwellers of sub-Kebeles 1 and 8 claimed that there are no communal or government lands on their side of the mountain and that they have exclusive user rights over the whole area. This line of thinking was more so with members of sub-Kebele 1 and even more so with those farmers that have land adjacent to

the mountain as opposed to those farmers that have land further away from the mountain within the same sub-Kebele. On the other hand, other sub-Kebeles and members of the community do not agree to what those members of sub-Kebeles 1 & 8 claim and have indicated that there are communal lands on Damota Mountain and that they have equal users right to the communal land. The focus group discussion ended up in a heated debate, and it was not possible to come up with any form of agreement. It was then decided to call a meeting of all members of sub-Kebele 1 and 8 through the Kebele administration office and WV to seek solution and resolve the issue. Once an agreement is reached on whether there is communal land or not, then a meeting of all the 8 sub-Kebeles of Kokate will be called to discuss the matter. During the focus group discussion with the Kokate Kebele cabinet, we were told by the Chairman of the Kebele that land measurements of individual holdings have been completed and no farmer has registered a land holding size of more than 0.5 hectare and there is plenty of extra land that belongs to the Kebele which is considered communal.<sup>2</sup>

An attempt was made to find out if the same problem as in the Kokate Kebele exists with the other 7 Kebeles and their sub-Kebeles surrounding Damota Mountain but it appears that the problem does not exist there. Nevertheless, WV should follow up this matter.

***Protection of the area to be closed.*** Communities were asked on the best way(s) of protecting their respective area within the site to be closed. There were mixed views by the different Kebeles and also by the different focus groups within Kebeles. For example, in Abela Longena Kebele, while the Kebele cabinet and development workers focus group indicated that the area should be fenced with barbed wire, the community focus group indicated that fencing is too expensive and unattainable and instead guards should be hired. In Hobicha Bongota Kebele the community focus group did not want to make any suggestion

---

<sup>2</sup> During the workshop held on April 10 -12, 2006 in Soddo, we were told this problem has been resolved and the community has agreed that all sub-kebeles of the Kokate Kebele have equal right to the communal land and share the benefit equally.

at all but said the community at large should make the decision at a general assembly while the cabinet focus group of the same Kebele suggested fencing using barbed wire and treated poles as the preferred option. Some members of Damot Wajai Kebele indicated that, first, the demarcation has to be done before they will even talk about fencing (does this mean that sub-kebele 1 and 8 are convinced how the project will be operated?). In general, most Kebeles believe fencing with barbed wire is the best option, provided the project can cover the cost of the materials. If fencing with barbed wire is not possible, live fences are recommended by some Kebeles such as Abela Shoya, and the community will be responsible for providing the labor and the planting material. Members of the community focus group of Gurmu Waide suggested using guards but indicated the guards have to be paid. In general, nearly all believe that there should be guards in addition to the fence. Asked if they are willing to provide free labor for guarding or doing development work in the forest, most focus groups said that they are willing to provide free labor. However, they believe paid guards will be more effective. Members of the Gurmu Waide community indicated that community members in their respective area, and elsewhere for that matter, are used to being paid for any services they give, and that it is not only difficult to get free labor, but that it is also ineffective.

During the workshop held in Soddo on April 10 -12, 2006, there was a general agreement by the community representatives that fencing can be avoided but paid guards will still be essential and alternative means of payment should be investigated.

***Forest Management.*** Communities were asked whether they would prefer to form their own Forest Management Group or jointly with all the bordering Kebeles in each of the Sites 1 and 3. Nearly all Kebeles said that it is better to have a separate management body for their own Kebele but they also see the

merits of the idea of a joint management of all Kebeles to be formed at the Woreda level with their representation in the joint management.<sup>3</sup>

Focus groups were also asked if their share of the communal land should be subdivided into their respective sub-Kebeles and managed by the sub-Kebeles or whether no sub-division should be made and the management should be done by all sub-Kebeles together. Most Kebeles indicated that there should not be subdivision into sub-Kebeles, while Bosa Wanche Kebele, which has all its three sub-Kebeles and Damot Wajai and Warz Lasho Kebeles which each has two of their sub-Kebeles bordering the area to be closed, indicated that each sub-Kebele should be given an area adjacent to it and be responsible for protecting it, while the benefit be shared amongst all community members.

**Benefit sharing.** As indicated above, nearly all Kebeles, except Kokate, indicated that their respective area of the communal land should not be subdivided into their respective sub-Kebeles. Accordingly, all Kebeles believe that the benefit accrued from the closed area should be shared by all members of the Kebele. They also indicated that the benefits from the project should be spent on community priority development areas amongst which, water, both for drinking and irrigation, was the most suggested priority area by most Kebeles. Flour mill, school (higher grades), road, health facilities (clinics, health officers and drugs) maintenance and control of gully formation are also the other priority areas suggested.

**Role of Women.** During the focus group discussion with the community representatives, both men and women were participating together in the discussions. At the end of the discussions, women members were asked to stay behind and were encouraged to air out their opinions on the proposed project. More specifically they were asked to respond to three questions, namely:

---

<sup>3</sup> There is an issue of how best the community should be organized i.e. as a self-help association/non-profit organization or as a cooperative. The issue is being followed-up by the legal consultant and has not yet been resolved.

- How would they be affected as women as a result of the closure of the communal land?
- What do they think their role should be in the implementation of the project?
- How do they think they should benefit from the income that would be generated from the project?

There were mixed opinions with regard to the first question. While some believe that both men and women are equally affected, others believe that it is women and small children that collect fuelwood and hay from the communal area and sell in the market, and they will be the most affected if the area is to be closed. They indicated they use the money from the sale of fuelwood and hay to send their children to school. Women also collect fuelwood from the closed area for cooking food.

With regard to their role in the project, they indicated that they are ready to participate in any activity including in management. They also indicated that, although they might not be involved as forest guards, they can play a significant role in many forest development activities such as weeding, hay cutting, nursery establishments, etc.

As far as benefit sharing is concerned, they believe income generated from the project should be spent to alleviate some of the problems that women face such as grinding grain at home, lack of medical attention during pregnancy and at giving birth, lack of cash to cover some expenses, etc. They suggested money earned from the project should be spent on projects such as establishing flour mills, building clinics that would help women during pregnancy, training midwives, creating alternative income generating activities such as small businesses, poultry production, dairy cows, sheep and goat rearing, and handicrafts.



## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

During the first visit in January and the second more comprehensive visit from February 28 to March 10, 2006, focus group discussions were held to initiate a process of provision of information to all communities, to create awareness, and to get communities' feedback on specific issues regarding the Carbon Project.

### **Conclusions**

In general the representatives of the communities were convinced that the natural vegetation should be restored and protected and they have indicated their commitment and willingness to participate in the project. There will be little, if any, problem to get sufficient ownership of the project by the community and this will form a basis for a successful natural regeneration of the sites selected.

While the community fully believes in the closure of the area and the regeneration of the natural resources, it would also like to see alternative solutions for problems that might arise as a result of the closure of the area.

There were generally small differences among the focus groups on the modalities of the implementation of the project and how the communities perceive the management regime of the closed area should be. Each community/Kebele prefers to develop its own share of the communal land. Nearly all members of the community believe that the best option for protecting the area to be closed is by fencing and employing guards/forest wardens. However, they also recognize the fact that this option is costly and they cannot afford it. On the other hand, if funds could be made available to buy fencing materials they would be ready to contribute free labor. They are also ready to guard their respective area freely in turns until such time the community can afford to hire guards. This issue requires further attention as the project moves toward implementation.

As far as management of the sites is concerned, each Kebele/community prefers to manage its own forest area and to have its own Forest Management Group (FMG). However, there is a general consensus by all communities/Kebeles to support the idea of having an overall coordinating/management body at the Wereda level for all those formed at Kebele level.

### **Recommendations**

Additional provision of information and follow-up discussions by World Vision will be needed with the community at large in each of the Kebeles.

There will be a segment of the community that will be negatively affected especially during the initial stages of the project (charcoal makers, hay and fuelwood venders, livestock owners). The livelihoods of some members of the community entirely depend on the area to be closed. World Vision could come up with different livelihoods diversification programs through on-farm and off-farm income generating activities. For example for on-farm activities, the introduction of honey-bee hives, poultry, silk production could be introduced on an experimental basis and for off-farm activities employment of those most affected in different activities of the project including guarding and fencing could be considered as possible sources of supplementary income. For longer term livelihoods diversification programs, plantation of fruit trees like mango, guava, avocado etc., spices, and valuable medicinal plants could also be considered. Community woodlot or backyard plantation should also be considered by WVE in order to minimize leakages.

For the protection of the natural resources in the communal land and the maintenance and sustainability of the program, in principle, the community has to agree to mobilize its own resources, including human resources, and to assume full responsibility. Where the community decides to build fences around the closed areas, it should be cost effective and the pre-condition for fencing should

be to use locally available fencing material or live fences and the community contributes labor and local material.

The FMG is expected to be people-centered local institution that gives local leadership and plays an important role in enlisting people's participation, mobilizing people's resources and energy. It is seen as an institution that has the responsibility for the management of the closed area and is expected to provide motivation and leadership to the community on an ongoing basis. The formation of the committee should, therefore, be thought thoroughly and carefully. The candidates and the final selection of FMG members should be approved by the majority of the community. Issues such as the number of female members and representatives of interest groups, and who should hold which post will also be decided by the community.

In order to make the program truly participatory, it is vital to have a mechanism that ensures continuous two-way dialogue between the community and the FMG. This is enhanced by creating “community facilitators” from each sub-Kebele who are chosen from the community and provide regular feedback to the FMG from their respective field experiences.

After the establishment of the FMG, each community should undertake a Participatory Self Assessment (PSA) every 6 months. The outcome of such evaluation will also help the External Evaluation Team of the World Bank and/or WVE. In addition, a monitoring and follow-up visit should take place six months after closure of the area by a multi-disciplinary team including WV ADP staff, Wereda Agriculture and Rural Development staff, together with the FMG, to monitor the regeneration of the natural resources in general, and tree stumps and grasses in particular.

## **Next steps**

For the community to effectively participate in and manage the Humbo and Soddo Regeneration Carbon Project, its members have to be further sensitized, organized and empowered to do so. World Vision, with the support of the respective Kebele officials, needs to call a meeting of all community members at each Kebele for further discussions about the project. After discussion with the community at large and getting the full trust and commitment of the community, a committee should be set up from the WV, Kebele Cabinet and representatives of the community selected from each Kebele to demarcate the boundary of the periphery of the project site as well as the boundaries between neighboring Kebeles in the communal land. The community decides on the demarcation of the boundaries in a participatory decision making. Potential conflicting spots and interests among the villagers should be assessed and resolved on the spot or in subsequent meetings. Communities' concerns on grazing land and fuelwood sources should be taken into consideration during demarcation.

A two-day workshop was organized by World Vision Ethiopia and held on April 10-11, 2006 with regional, zonal and Werda level representatives of different relevant government offices, representatives of the community from the participating Kebeles (one to two representatives per community) and some civil societies' representatives. The workshop discussed, among others:

- The concepts of 'participatory' and 'community-led development' and enhancement of people's sense of ownership
- The management of the natural resources in the communal lands including
  - resource investigation,
  - planning the use of the resources,
  - different options of protecting the communal land i.e fencing and/or guarding.
  - activities that could be implemented from their own resources and activities that need external support

- coordination mechanisms among the stakeholders including the formation of management groups
- etc.
- Legal matters including the draft by-laws
  - Discuss amongst the communities on access rights to the potential project sites (dwellers and non dwellers) and resolve, from the outset, all possible conflicting issues.
  - Discuss amongst the communities on ways of partitioning the project sites (blocks, sub-kebeles, households etc.) and user rights of the community over the land within the project sites.
  - Discussion on the sharing of benefits (sale of grass, twigs, fallen trees etc and from the carbon sale.) accruing from the project
  - The role of different stakeholders such as World Vision, local authorities (Wereda and Kebele councils) and Natural Resources Desk of the Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development at the Wereda and/or Kebele levels, etc. in project implementation will be discussed.

After the issue of whether to incorporate the Humbo and Soddo Forest Management Groups as non-profit self-help associations/NGOs or as cooperatives is resolved, the next step will be the formation of the Humbo and Soddo Forest Management Groups. After the formation of the FMGs, members should be given a 2-3 days training to develop their management capability. The training will cover topics such as, the use of participatory methods in decision making; resource mobilizations; financial planning and operation and maintenance of fund; as well as organizing educational programs fostering legal knowledge and awareness.

**Post Assessment Conclusions to pending issues – Community Consultation**

Issue	Resolution
1. Sensitization Required	Sensitization undertaken with each kebele, as well as with Woreda and Government officials
2. Boundary Demarcation Committee Established	Boundary demarcation committees established, and project boundaries established, as well as inter-project boundaries identifying management per Kebele.
3. Resolution of more appropriate legal structure	Communities decided to incorporate as community forestry cooperatives
4. Legal entities established	Communities established 7 community forestry cooperatives
5. Training in finance, management, resource mobilization, participatory decision making	Training in these areas has been carried out – please refer to separate file provided.

## Appendix 1

**Table 1: Kebeles Covered in the Consultation**

No.	Name of Kebele	Number of Sub-Kebeles	Number of Devt. Teams	Number of Households
<b>HUMBO WEREDA</b>				
1	Hobicha Beda	9	40	1765
2	Hobicha Bongota	8	36	1726
3	Bosa Wanche	7	31	906
4	Abela Longena	6	20	
5	Abela Gefeta	4	20	876
6	Bola Wanche	3	17	525
7	Abela Shoya	2	11	428
<b>SODDO ZURIA WEREDA</b>				
1	Gurmu Koisha	12	36	1465
2	Kokate	8	25	961
3	Gurmu Waide	7	NA	1194
4	Delbo Wegene	5	15	675
5	Damot Wajai	7	38	1109
6	Warza Lasho	8	34	1147
<b>DAMOT GALE WEREDA</b>				
1	Washi Gale	7	17	645
2	Kunasa Fulasa	5	15	520

## Appendix 1

**Table 2: Number of Participants in the Focus Group Discussion**

No.	Kebele	Cabinet and Dev. workers	Community Representatives.	Women Representatives.
<b>HUMBO WEREDA</b>				
1	Hobicha Beda	12	22	8
2	Hobicha Bongota	7	16	6
3	Bosa Wanche	5	32	10
4	Abela Longena	20	24	8
5	Abela Gefeta	7	27	8
6	Bola Wanche	8	37	11
7	Abela Shoya	10	16	4
<b>SODDO ZURIA WEREDA</b>				
1	Gurmu Koisha	8	21	10
2	Kokate	5	25	5
3	Gurmu Waide	4	15	8
4	Delbo Wogene	5	23	7
5	Waraza Lasho	4	27	11
6	Damot Waje	6	21	6
<b>DAMOT GALE WEREDA</b>				
1	Kunasa Fulasa	4	19	8
2	Washe Gale	3	11	4

## Appendix 2: Case Studies

From Ethiopia three case studies were made: namely, (a) World Vision's Antsokia Food Security program in the Amhara Region; (b) GTZ's Alaba-Dodola Integrated Forest Management Project (WAJIB) in Oromia region, and (c) FHI's Alaba REKAME Self Help Development in Southern Nations and Nationalities Region and from outside of Ethiopia another three case studies were made namely; (a) Nepal's BTRT Watershed management; (b) China's Wuhua County, Guangdong province Watershed program, and (c) India's Participatory watershed management at Ralegan Siddhi Village in district Ahmadnagar, Maharastra\*

**Antsokia Food Security Program:** This is one of the ADPs of World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) which is found about 350 km north of Addis Ababa. The area includes about 45% lowlands, 44% midlands and about 11% uplands. It has a rainfall ranging between 800-1200 mm per annum. River Borkena flows in the middle of the Antsokia valley and the ADP, with a land area of 59,501 ha, lies within the watershed of the River Borkena. The district has a human population of about 92,920 of which 17% of them operate in the highlands, 18% in the mid-highlands and 65% in the lowlands. The major crops grown are sorghum, teff and maize. However production and productivity of these crops has been declining because of unreliable rainfall and recurrent drought. Flooding is also another problem and causes serious loss of the top soil through erosion leading to gullies formation.

Antsokia was believed to have been covered once by thick forests but by the mid 1980s it was totally deforested and the mountains were denuded with very little vegetation that survived in inaccessible areas on the mountain slopes, around churches, graveyards and few plantations near dwelling places.

Following the 1984/85 drought and famine WVE started to be involved in the Antsokia area and has carried out three phases of interventions, namely the 'relief phase' (1984/85), the 'rehabilitation phase' (1986-89) and the 'Area Development' phase. The first phase was mainly distributing relief aid while the second phase focused on facilitating the recovery of those affected by famine and bringing attitudinal changes among the target population. The third phase, which has been undergoing since 1990, deals with food security

During the third phase improved social infrastructure and environmental rehabilitation programs that contribute to food security and sustainable development have been carried out.

One way that WVE has attempted to address household food insecurity is through the promotion of agroforestry and garden crops, by making the best use of available resources. Using the community's indigenous knowledge and information gathered about the resource potentials of an area and the utilization pattern adopted by the community, it

was possible to diversify farmers' sources of income. Irrigation is used to promote agro forestry and garden crops. Farmers are encouraged to be organized into interest groups and were given all the support they need including training on agronomic and social aspects of irrigation and agro forestry, provision of small irrigation equipment and seeds and seedlings.

**Adaba-Dodola Integrated Forest Management Project:** Adaba –Dodola is located in the Oromia region, about 250 km south of Addis Ababa. The Adaba-Dodola forest is one of the 38 State-owned forest areas. It covers some 53,000 hectares of degraded natural forest area. In the past, the Forest Service attempted to protect the forest by prohibiting access to the forest but unregulated access to the forest area and illegal wood extraction and overgrazing have resulted in over-utilization and degradation of the area. After the conventional ways of forest conservation did not bring any impact, the local people, both living inside and outside the forest, together with the forest service and local authorities agreed to come up with a forest management strategy known as “WAJIB”, which is an abbreviation in Oromifa (Oromo language) means “Forest Dwellers Association”. The WAJIB set-up involves dividing the forest into 400 hectares blocks and assigning up to 30 homesteads, organized in an association, per block, depending on the carrying capacity of the forest. Each association (WAJIB) signed a contract (FBAA) with the Dodola Agriculture and Rural Development Office. FBAA is a binding document that gives the WAJIBs guaranteed rights over settlement in the forest and exclusive rights for the forest products. It also includes sanctions to be applied for non-compliances. Up to now 60 WAJIBs have been established and some 30,000 ha of forest was put under WAJIB management. Currently the WAJIBs are organizing themselves into higher forms organizations. Accordingly, 4 forest coops, 1 tourism service provider coop and 1 union have been established.

The WAJIB approach is now being replicated in other forest areas elsewhere in the country and to neighboring countries. Guidelines are being prepared to assist the process. It is also believed that the WAJIB approach will contribute to a policy dialogue for participatory forest management (PFM) at the regional level.

The lessons learned from the WAJIB experience are that PFM is mainly a social process and local people can take care of the forest and the government is ready to support. It has also helped forester's attitudinal change, i.e. from “policing” to “facilitating” and that PFM is not just “forest use” but “forest management”. Some of the challenges observed are gap in capacity and knowledge, difference in the thinking of professionals and rural people and finally forest valuation methods in terms of subsistence values and environmental benefits are poorly developed

Focus group discussion with WAJIB members and non WAJIB members were undertaken separately. Both groups strongly support the WAJIB approach and believe that not only it has protected the forest but has also contributed to climatic changes with relatively better rains. However the non-WAJIB members complained that, unlike the initial agreement made, they are neither allowed to cut and carry hay nor to graze their animals in the forest area. Instead the WAJIB members are selling the hay to the non-

WAJIB. On the other hand the forest dwellers/WAJIB are allowed to farm in the lower areas outside the forest area and are sharing the agricultural land with the non-WAJIB. The non-WAJIB members also complained that part of their grazing land is now included into the forest area and are lacking space to keep their animals. They also complained that they are not getting the benefit from the rent that the WAJIB are paying to the respective Kebeles which they were told they will indirect beneficiaries of the fund.

**FHI's Alaba REKAME Self Help Development Project:** The project is found in a place called Rekame near Alaba town of SNNPR, about ??/ km south of Addis Ababa on the way to Arbaminch along the same road to Humbo and Soddo. The project started more than 7 years ago by FHI, an international NGO, that initiated a community forest establishment through the use of Food for Work program. Five hundred hectares of denuded area was planted with trees by the community. At the end of the project, nearly 7 years ago, FHI transferred the plantation area to the community and the community formed a self-help development organization called Rekame Self Help Development Project.(RSHDP) The Alaba Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development Office is now the caretaker of the Project. RSHDP is a legal organization registered by the Ministry of Justice as a self help development organization. It is made up of 6 Kebeles performing on 534 hectares of community forest.

The organization is made up of 150 board members (general assembly) with 25 representatives from each of the 6 Kebels. It has also 12 executive board members with 2 representatives from each of the 6 Kebeles. There is also a Governing Board made up of 7 (?) members, with the Wereda Administrator as the Chairperson and the Bureau Head of Agriculture and Rural development as the Deputy Chairperson of the Governing Board and 5 technical people as members. The Governing Board has no executive power but gives only technical support. RSHDP has its own by-laws which is approved by the Ministry of Justice and in the bylaws, among other things, the rights and obligations of its members is spelled out; the rights being to share the benefits of the forest and the obligation being to protect the forest. All members of the 6 Kebeles are members of the RSHDP and there is no membership contribution.

The forest was initially protected by members of the Kebeles freely but now guards are hired by the organization and their payment comes from the sale of hay, some forest products, and penalty fees. RSHDP has sold forest products worth about 1.7 million Birr, and it has used the money for community development work that included installing a flour mill, water establishment, soil and water conservation activities, etc.

**Nepal :A case study of people's participation in Begnastal and Rupatal (BTRT) watershed management.** :The Begnas Tal (lake) and Rupa Tal (BTRT) watershed area is located at about 10 km east of Pokhara in Western Nepal which is about 200 km west of Kathmandu. The watershed covers an area of 173 km<sup>2</sup> of two main lakes Begnas and Rupa and three other minor lakes. There are seven Village Development Committees (VDC) in the BTRT. About 31,000 people inhabit in the BTRT area.

The BTRT Project has been concentrating its efforts on watershed management using participatory approaches and is considered to be the best area for studying participatory approaches in watershed management in Nepal. Local people are actively involved in planning, implementing, follow-up, and maintaining community watershed resources. The role of watershed management technicians is relegated to that of technical facilitators.

Communities are organized into Community Development Conservation Committees (CDCC) and each household in the community is represented in the CDCC. At the project's initiation, a CDCC analyzes its problems using a participatory community approach and then presents its conservation needs to the project office. As of the end of 1994 there were 100 CDCCs in operation in the BTRT area.

The project has handed over the responsibility for managing natural forests near villages to the local users. This is resulting in denser forests. Women's CDCCs are especially keen on managing forests. The use of traditional farm management technology is common and farmers manage their land very well. Terrace slopes are within the prescribed limits and in general in good condition.

The Project identified the need for quality agricultural inputs and support services needed for utilizing marginal lands. Many groups of farmers are involved in the marginal land improvement agro-forestry program initiated with the help of the project. Farmers are not only ready to pay for fruit saplings, but they also convince their neighbours to participate in the program so that there will be a larger group fund.

Local women are very active in forest management and conservation farming activities and are fully involved in the decision making process. The major factors facilitating women's participation in CDCC proceedings were: a clear prospect of benefit sharing, support from their families and the small size of the group area served.

Many conservation farmers have adopted improved agricultural practices and share these experiences with their neighbors. They have set up demonstrations on their farms and have converted many followers, who are monitored by the conservation farmers themselves. In this way improved farming practices were spread throughout the area. Homestead agroforestry plots were established and kitchen gardens introduced to great economic benefit. The sale of coffee, pineapples, oranges, cardamom, broom grass, and other varieties of fruits and vegetables is generating cash income for the farmers.

A Community Development Board, which operates at the village level, was formed to foster communication between the CDCCs and the VDCs. All ward members of a VDC and the chairmen of the CDCCs in a VDC are the members of the board. Technical staff in the VDC serve as advisors and facilitators of farmers' groups/organization.

In sum, the factors that contributed to the success of people's participation (PP) in the BTRT watershed management are:

- Clear and transparent decision making procedures by project management.

- Clear and simple guidelines, and flexible operational procedures to facilitate PP in watershed management.
- Well defined programs, budgets, plans, implementation procedures and benefit sharing mechanisms.
- Integration of a wide range of diversified watershed management activities and guarantee of benefits.
- Strong motivation among project staff.

**China, watershed management in Wuhua County, Guangdong province:-**Wuhua county is located at the mid-eastern part of Guangdong Province, China. The county has serious erosion and watershed degradation problems. The population density is 280/km<sup>2</sup>, and the average arable land per capita is only 0.1 ha. Soil and water erosion in the county is responsible for weak geo-morphology, poor soils and vegetation, hydrological problems, irrational land-use and many socio-economic problems.

To address the problem, a comprehensive management system of small watersheds (5-40 km) has been introduced in Wuhua county. Planning and selection of these watersheds were carried out by a multi-disciplinary team of technicians, NGOs, village leaders and farmers. Under this system, local county Government and farmers provide financial support, where as Provincial Government provides necessary materials, tools and equipments to implement the program at a small watershed level. People's participation in land management is through various contractual arrangement such as Family Contract System, Collective or Group Contract System, Sub-lease Contract System, Professional Contract System and Specialized Contract System. Because of these systems of people's participation, soil and water conservation works in China have been carried-out successfully. These systems have significantly improved the rural economy and standard of living of farmers of Wuhua county. This is achieved by soil and water conservation techniques which give quick economic benefits.

The concept of small watershed-based development is practiced successfully in the Wupi river watershed of Wuhua county. The overall plan for the management of a small watershed emphasizes comprehensive erosion control measures including measures for hill slope and gully stabilization, regulating river system, and rearranging farm lands. Principles of soil erosion control have been further developed by combining soil erosion control measures with the optimum utilization of biological measures. Under these principles, short-term, medium-term and long-term objectives have been formulated. The short-term objective is to upgrade agricultural production, the medium-term objective is to increase fruit production, and the long-term objective is to develop forestry and eventually to combine ecological and economic benefits. The focus on economic benefits is based on the fact that the people would participate in soil erosion control works only if it results in quick economic benefits for them.

**India: Participatory watershed management at Ralegan Siddhi Village in district Ahmadnagar, Maharashtra:**

In recent years the notion of sustainable development has emerged as a reaction to the highly technological and centralized processes that have governed thinking on development, the green revolution being a classic example. The process of sustainable development envisages that people should not merely participate, but be in charge of their own development. Some initiatives in India have grappled successfully with this complex process, and different models of people driven development have emerged. Perhaps the most notable of these is the remarkable work of Mr. Annasaheb Hazare in Ralegan Siddhi village. When he first returned to his village in 1975 it was an extremely degraded village. There was large scale migration, ill health, low productivity and a flourishing business in the illegal distilling of alcohol, resulting into violence especially against women. Today Ralegan is very different. Productivity has increased manifold. There is a sense of community and sharing among all the people, and complete self-sufficiency in foodgrains. Ralegan only demonstrates what village people can do when they take control of their own development. It serves as a testimony to community interest taking precedence over self-interest. This miracle was achieved by:

- The emergence of local leadership: Annasaheb Hazare is from the village and his intimate knowledge of the community, its culture and traditions and his exposure to the outside world enabled him to play the role of a catalyst and a bridge.
- Underpinning of moral sanctions: He recognized the conflict in development between old and new, traditional and modern, violent and peaceful. His intervention gave space to the traditional leadership to reassert their moral authority and lay the foundation for a moral, just, and human social order. The basis of Annasaheb Hazare's intervention is a moral and voluntary code of conduct which has been adopted by the entire village community. This is a six point program that includes: ban on open grazing; ban on tree felling; ban on dowry; ban on consumption of liquor; family planning; and donation of labor (Shramdan).
- Involvement of all sections of society, especially the weak and vulnerable: Right from its inception, the Ralegan village participation process involved women and lower castes (Harijans) in all planning and implementation.
- Identification of People's Priorities: Annasaheb Hazare being a son of the soil, was able to identify water development as the primary need of the village, and that helped to mobilize popular opinion in his favour.
- The use of simple but effective technology: Annasaheb recognized that merely providing a strong moral basis would be insufficient to motivate people towards constructive change. His intervention to manage rain-water runoff through watershed development was cheap, local, and maximized their use of local resources especially labor.
- Holistic and sustained development: Having started with water management, Annasaheb Hazare went on to include community work to prevent erosion and to

promote widespread afforestation. The holistic impact of these measures began to be felt within a decade. It is noteworthy that the villagers have been working continuously on this process for the last 20 years by now. Thus, long term continuity is a vital ingredient in the strategy for sustainable development.

- The primacy of the village assembly (Gram Sabha): Although Annasaheb has taken the leadership in Ralegan, all major decisions are taken in the Gram Sabha, which has institutionalized a democratic style of functioning.

## Appendix 3

### Humbo Regeneration Carbon Project

#### Terms of Reference for Community Development Consultant

##### A. Background

It is estimated that Ethiopia retains only 2.7 percent of its original forest cover, and clearing continues as the rural poor seek to make a living. While cleared forest is used for agricultural production, unsustainable exploitation can result in reduced yields, erosion, lack of clean drinking water, local flooding, fuelwood scarcity, and a loss of biodiversity.

The regional city of Soddo, and the nearby town of Humbo are located about 320 km southeast of Addis Ababa in a high elevation region with rainfall of 1200 mm per annum. The 15,000-hectare area where the proposed Humbo Community Forest is to be located was cleared prior to the late 1960s.

In order to restore and protect the forest, and to achieve increased benefits from it, improved land management is needed. The limited resources of the Ethiopian Forestry Department would not allow for large-scale community reforestation in this region, and World Vision could not justify the project at the expense of other, more compelling food security projects elsewhere in the country. However, the sale of Verified Emission Reductions (VERs), combined with the additional forest products to be harvested from this area, would make the project viable, and there is potential for a large proportion of the population to benefit.

The project would be implemented through a proposed ***Humbo Forest Management Group (HFMG)***, incorporated as a non-profit entity and comprised of local people, including both men and women, and would represent the diversity of land users in the Humbo region. The HFMG would also include representation of World Vision and the Ethiopian Forestry Department. The proposed method to be used is the Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) which would involve regeneration by area closure and selected planting with seedlings from nurseries.

##### B. Preparation of a BioCarbon Fund Project

Preparation of a BioCarbon Fund Project entails undertaking analytical and preparation work in accordance with both the World Bank's and the BioCarbon Fund project cycles. ***Regarding the World Bank project cycle***, a draft Project Concept Note has been prepared and is scheduled to be reviewed on November 9, 2005. The Bank will formally appraise the project (including application of relevant environmental and social safeguards) on the basis of a draft Project

Appraisal Document. ***Regarding the BioCarbon Fund project cycle***, following acceptance of the Project Idea Note, a Carbon Finance Document (Attachment 2) was developed and submitted in early July 2005 for review by the BioCarbon Fund Investors. Prior to implementation, detailed project preparation will include technical and economic analyses, development of a monitoring plan, and preparation of a Project Design Document in accordance with the BioCarbon Fund format and standards. Subsequently, project design would be subject to independent validation, and the Humbo Forest Management Group, through World Vision would negotiate an Emission Reductions Purchase Agreement (ERPA) with the BioCarbon Fund by June 2006.

### **C. Specific tasks to be carried out**

World Vision Ethiopia, in consultation with other stakeholders, has already undertaken a preliminary identification of the communities to be covered by the Project. The final identification of the communes will be reviewed and confirmed by the consultant in the context of this assignment (and in parallel with the determination of boundaries of the land to be afforested within these communes).

To confirm or revise the communes that will be covered by the pilot project, the consultant will undertake initial consultations of communities, seasonal users such as herders and individuals to confirm their commitment and willingness to participate in the project, and the absence of conflicts over land-use, which may jeopardize the success of the project. If there were potential conflicts the consultant would propose appropriate mitigation measures and make preliminary suggestions on how all parties can satisfactorily benefit from the proposed land use changes.

On the basis of these initial consultations, the consultant will prepare a brief write-up of his preliminary findings including his assessment of whether, in his view, it would be feasible to create sufficient ownership within the communities -- including through the funds that would be available from the project for community development -- to have successful natural regeneration without the need for a lot of fencing or wardens.

The write-up would also contain a specific proposal for follow-up community development work which would (a) provide information and create awareness; (b) help achieve a sufficient degree of local ownership for the project so that there would be broad agreement among the communities to support a management regime necessary for natural regrowth/carbon sequestration without a lot of fencing and wardens; and (c) to help build some capacity of local stakeholders (government, local institutions, NGOs, communities). Such follow-up work may include organizing and leading local workshops and training sessions including: (i) at least 1 one-day multi stakeholders workshops in each of the selected communes for the pilot, (ii) at least 1 seminar at the sub-regional level with the expected participation of at least thirty stakeholders representing

government, local residents, and NGOs, and (iii) at least 1 one-day training session for at key staff of the relevant Government entities as well as key members of the NGOs, agricultural and herders associations, etc.

#### **D. Deliverables**

The consultant would participate in the field visit and then produce the initial write-up as described above no later than January 31, 2006 (15 days of work)

If the World Bank agrees to proceed with preparation and if the proposed work contained in the initial draft above is approved, that work will then be carried out as agreed at that time (20 days of work) including production of a report by March 15, 2006

Given the broad experience of the consultant his TORs also include reviewing and commenting on drafts by others specialists (5 days of work).