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# **Background**

Desert Locust (Schistocerca gregaria) is one of the dangerous trans-boundary pests that cause severe threat to the livelihoods of farmers and pastoralist communities of Ethiopia and other neighboring countries in the region. According to FAO survey estimate, in Ethiopia the desert locust invasion resulted in loss of about 4,865,830 quintals of cereal, about 2% of the estimated total cereal production of 346,369,767quintals from Meher production 2019/2020.

The project called ‘Ethiopian Emergency Locust Response (P173702)’ has been designed to control the desert locust infestation and support the livelihoods of the locust affected farmers, pastoralists, and agro-pastoralists. The project is financed by the World Bank. The development partners, such as, FAO provide technical and financial support to the MoA on locust control and surveillance.

This project has been designed to address, (i) community-based desert locust control is a paramount measure because it empowers and equips local communities with the necessary knowledge, skills and tools to regularly monitor and detect the pest right in the breeding grounds in their respective localities; (ii) it enables communities to detect the disaster early so that timely action can be taken by national locust teams.

The nature of the project highly necessitates stakeholders’ engagement at different stages of preparation and implementation. The concerted community action, along with national, regional, and international collaboration is important to tackle the menace of the Desert Locust impacts in the Horn of Africa. National plant protection programs, international development organizations, policy makers and the donor community should strengthen regional cooperation and community-based Desert Locust control as part of a holistic locust pest management strategy. A stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) has been updated for managing and facilitating future engagement through the various stages of the Project’s lifecycle building on the implementation experience of the parent project (P173702) SEP.

The designing of the SEP for the parent project was under the state of emergency due to the COVID19 pandemic in which the project adopted a progressive approach towardstheevolvingsituationofCOVID19inmanagingcommunityandstakeholderconsultationalongwith the different project components both at the preparation and implementation stages. As the COVID19 situation continues to unfold, the parent project for stakeholders’ engagement include:

1. Adopting engagements to small groups allowed by law (up to four people in one group).
2. Phased seed, fertilizer, and forage distribution (everybody is not going out at the same time to collect the livelihoods support which blimits congregations).
3. Multiple distribution sites for seed, fertilizer, and forage distribution.
4. Maintain physical distance.
5. Using facemasks.
6. Frequent hand washing and sanitization (with soap and alcohol).
7. Providing information during spraying and post spraying which helps in COVID-19 prevention by limiting congregation and encouraging people to stay at home.

# **Project Objectives**

The Project objectives would be achieved by supporting investments across three pillars as per the regional approach to the desert locust outbreak response.

1. Monitoring and controlling locust population growth and curbing the spread of swarms while mitigating the risks associated with control measures.
2. Protecting livelihoods of locust-affected households to prevent asset loss, and return them to productivity; and
3. Preventing future locust upsurges by strengthening capacity for ex ante surveillance and control operations to facilitate early warning and early response.

# **Project Components**

Activities under the Ethiopian Desert Locust Response Project will be structured into four main components:

1. Component 1: Locust monitoring and control
2. Component 2: Livelihood protection and restoration.
3. Component 3: Strengthening Early Warning Systems and Preparedness Component
4. Component 4: Project Management

**Table 1: Project Components and Activities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Key Activities** | | |
| **Component 1: Locust Monitoring and Control (USD 13,929,914.38 Adopting two pronged approaches for locust monitoring and control.**   * Direct support to improving surveillance and assessment of locusts’ situation, habitat conditions and geographic exposure as well as targeted aerial and ground spraying; and, * Capacity building for relevant national institutions and communities prone to locust breeding and invasion. | | | |
| **Sub-component -1.1: Continuous Surveillance** | | **To inform effective control operations and identification of affected and atrisk communities for assistance under Component 2 including: the following key activities.**   * Finance procurement of equipment and operational costs to deploy expert teams and drones for the collection of data at strategic locations. * Reporting occurrences and possible occurrences of outbreaks and assessing geographic exposure to locusts. * Support to community-based monitoring and forecasting in both pastoralist and farming communities prone to locust breeding and invasion. * Provision of training of scouts and sensitization campaigns for community/village leaders. | |
| **Sub-component-1.2: Control Measures** | | **Reduce locust populations and prevent their spread to new areas through targeted ground and aerial control operations including the following key activities**   * Procurement/rental of equipment (sprayers, vehicles, drones, aircrafts). * Support to field operations (aerial and ground operations). * Input for field operations will be provided to the MoA through FAO. * Awareness raising and training for farmers, scouts, experts, and officials at different levels (including training on pesticide management and control) will be provided. | |
| **Sub-component 1.3 Risk reduction and management** | | **Monitor and assess environmental and human health risks associated with locust control and implement health, environmental and safety measures to reduce risks to an acceptable minimum including the following key activities.**   * A detailed pest management plan (PMP) will be developed and closely monitored as part of the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) to mitigate any environmental impacts of chemical and pesticide use. Activities would include: * Testing of human health and soil and water for contamination from use of insecticides, * Optimizing the selection of control strategies, protection measures, and insecticides based on situational and environmental assessments; and * Providing safety and awareness training for spraying teams and other locust control personnel as well as public awareness campaigns on possible environmental and health effects of insecticides, before, during and after locust control operations. | |
| **Component 2: Livelihood protection and restoration (USD 31, 354, 175.07**Under this component, the project will provide a seed-fertilizer-pesticide package to selected farmers to ensure planting in the upcoming cropping season and, in pastoralist areas, fodder to guard against further livestock losses and thus loss of their main productive assets. Additionally, the project will provide fodder seed to affected communities to rehabilitate pastures in rangeland areas depleted by the desert locust invasion. | | | |
| **Sub-component 2.1: Livelihoods Support** | | | **This component would be achieved through delivering the following activities:**   * Farmer packages to get food and fodder production re-started as soon as possible after the impact of locust swarms has been assessed and the scope of the damage is determined; and forage to the affected pastoral households. |
| **Sub-component 2.2: Pasture rehabilitation** | | | **Coverage is an estimated area of 81,000 hectares and activities will include:**   * Temporary forage/feed provision in pastoralist areas impacted by the locust outbreak for short term pasture improvement; and, * Compensation for unintended damages that may result from accidental pesticides spray impacts beyond the defined buffer zone on people, livestock, agricultural produce, and livestock feed. * Procurement of inputs, such as crop and fodder seed will be carried out by RBoAs (or Pastoral Community Development Offices) from existing seed sources including Government Seed Enterprise, Agricultural Cooperative. |
| **Component 3: Strengthening Early Warning Systems and Preparedness (US$ USD 3.74%)**.Under this component, the project would assist Ethiopian MoA in establishing an integrated system for locust detection, occurrence projection, early warning and systematic data analysis and comprehension. Activities will include the following. | | | |
| **Component 3: Strengthening Early Warning Systems and Preparedness** | | | * Acquisition of state-of-the-art data collection and dissemination tools and improving data collection methods. * Building analytical capacity for understanding data. * Assessment of current strengths and weaknesses in locust occurrence projection and early warning systems and development of a roadmap on how best to develop the systems based on international best practice. * Capacity building for federal and regional experts using both national and international experts. * Technical assistance through appointing senior plant protection experts to work with regional desert locust control units. |
| **Component 4: Project Management (US$ =5%).** Under this component, financing will be provided for the following activities. | | | |
| **Component 4: Project Management** | | | * Hiring of a pest management expert, safeguard specialist and communication specialist * Operating costs for monitoring (particularly related to financial management and safeguards), technical backstopping at different levels. * Communication and information exchange. * The project will be implemented by the Directorates (PPDs) within the RBoAs of each regional state within the desert locust invasion area under the oversight of the MoA. Project management activities will be carried out by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU)established at the federal MoA. |

# **Objective of Stakeholder Engagement Plan**

TheobjectiveofthisSEPistodefineaplanofactionforstakeholderengagement throughout the proposed AF project life cycle, including through ensuring technically and culturally appropriateapproachesforpublicconsultationandinformationdisclosure.It builds on the parent project SEP. specifically, the key objectives of the AF SEP addendum are summarized as follows:

* Outlines the ways in which the project team will communicate with stakeholders, including members of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups, such as women, persons with disabilities, the elderly, etc., and includes a mechanism by which people can raise concerns, provide feedback, make complaints about project activities, and received responses to the comments and concerns they raise.
* It included measures to be used to remove obstacles to participation and how the views of different affected groups will be captured.
* Raises awareness in abroad, culturally appropriate, and adaptive manner to familiarize the communities in a meaningful and understandable manner to the potential project- related benefits and risks, including those related to pesticides praying on human health, livestock, agricultural product and fodder, including the precautionary measures, roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
* Provide information on the stakeholder engagement relevant to the project components.
* Immediate livelihood support for Farmers and pastoralist and component three.
* Strengtheningtheplanthealthsystemtoimproveearlywarningsystemintheproposed project areas.

# **Stakeholder Identification and Analysis**

There are no new stakeholders identified during the parent project implementation and the AF preparation. The stakeholders identified and their interest on the project remain the same as outlined in the parent project SEP. Project stakeholders are defined as individuals, groups, or other entities who:

* Are impacted or likely to be impacted directly or indirectly, positively or adversely, by the Project (also known as‘affected parties’). This includes project-affected parties who, because of their circumstances, may be disadvantaged or vulnerable; and,
* May have an interest in the Project (‘interested parties’). They include individuals or groups whose interests may be affected by the Project and who have the potential to influence the Project outcomes in anyway.

In all phases of the project, in formation disclosure, consultation, cooperation and negotiation with stakeholders is essential. Stakeholder engagement will be inclusive, free from manipulation, interference, coercion, and intimidation, and conducted on the basis of timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information, in a culturally appropriate format. It will provide stakeholders with an opportunity to raise their concerns and opinions and ensures that this information is taken into consideration when making project decisions, and that the project provides feedback to stake holders in response to their concerns and related views.

The stakeholders such as Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (MoLSA) and Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA) have been merged together making Ministry of Women and Social Affairs (MoWSA). Therefore, this MoWSA will play the roles that have been played by each minister office (MoLSA/MoWCA). The Ethiopian Aviation Authority will be a new stakeholder, which has the mandate on all aircraft permits for spraying and control activities. The regional and federal Environment and Climate Change Authority will strongly take part in the project as an environmental regulatory authority. The MoH will be one of the new stakeholders in the AF, as we work on coordination on matters related to pre and post spraying, storage workers test. These stakeholders will be engaged using official letters, emails, and workshop and other forums organized as determined relevant to the national, regional and local context.

# **Summary of Stakeholder Needs, Methods, and Tools for Engagement**

The FAO Desert Locust Control Guideline notes that the public must be informed about the impacts of pesticide before, during and after locust control operation. The operationalization of such requirements at different stages; prior to spraying, during and post spraying is presented under table three below. The guideline states:

*It is important to keep the public informed about possible environmental and health effects of insecticides, before, during and after locust control operations. This is to ensure that precautionary measures are taken whenever needed but also to reduce any misunderstandings that may exist about the risks of locust control. It is suggested that a specialized communication and information officer must be assigned to this task, especially if the campaign is expected to be large (FAO, 2003).*

Some of the most common methods of stakeholder consultation include (i) use of phone and email; (ii) interviews (one-to-one); (iii) distribution of leaflets and pamphlets; (iv) public meetings; (v) group discussion; (vi) use of local radios; and (vii) newsletters. When deciding the frequency and appropriate engagement technique to consult particular group of stakeholders, the following three criteria must be taken into consideration; (i) the extent of impact of the project, (ii) the extent of the influence of the stakeholder on the project, (iii) the culturally appropriate and acceptable engagement and information dissemination.

It will also be important to ensure that vulnerable people, including children, either receive necessary information or that the community ensures that they follow the requirements under the locust control. For component 2, the FAO guideline does not provide detailed information, but lessons-learned will be integrated from several projects MoA is implementing with support by the World Bank, including rural safety nets and public works projects, agricultural projects, rangeland management projects, landscape management projects, etc. The SEP is being updated to outline detailed engagement procedure for Component 1 on how the above points will be addressed by the Project.

Using time and generation tested traditional information sharing mechanisms; Dagu is in Afar, clan leaders in Somali, Oromia (Abba Gedda religious leaders), SNNPR (clan leaders), and government Kebele leadership to pass on information in the respective locust affected areas is also another means of information dissemination. These community level communication and information sharing tools will be used in the respective regions, as these are region specific and may not be available in all regions.

# **Summary of Stakeholder Engagement for the Parent Project (P173702) Implementation**

The SEP describes measures that the project will use to remove obstacles to participation, including differentiated measures to allow the effective participation of those identified as disadvantaged or vulnerable groups. This can include, among others, household-outreach activities, group discussion, use of local radios of different languages, and the use of verbal communication or pictures, etc. Since the start of the project implementation, SEP has been under implantation in different ways. While country-wide awareness campaigns were undertaken, area specific communication and awareness raising consultations were conducted at different part of the project area when combating infestation of locust in a given locality.

Stakeholder engagement has been conducted in the form of consultation workshops, group discussions, trainings, community sensitizations, awareness creations programs, official letters, e-mail, phone callings and the like. Stakeholder engagements have also been conducted by using different mechanisms including regularly disseminating information through electronic media such as the federal and regional television and radios. The information have been disseminating with the local and regional languages including Amharic, A/Oromo, Somaligna, Afaregna, Tigirigna, Sidamigna, Konsogna, Gamogna and other languages in S/Omo zone in collaboration with Arbaminch FM radio. The slot time and the frequency of transmission were varying with the severity of the infestation of the DL in the respective regions. For instance, if the infestation of the DL is high in Somali region, more slot time has been covered by Somali language and the same to others. The transmission of the interviewing of the officials in the ministry has been taking place in Amharic on a daily bases.

During the chemical spraying operation activity, the district chair persons have been directly involved by communicating with the federal officials through phone and email and by writing official letters.

Direct face to face consultation was conducted with the DL taskforces established in each affected kebele. The taskforces members include the kebele chairman, kebele manager; DA and the community representative. Discussion between the federal and regional experts and the taskforces on the DL situation and community sensitization has been conducted in affected kebeles. Whenever chemical spraying activity is to take place at a certain area, the taskforces inform the community about the time and the specific place where to be sprayed.

In 2020/21, consultation workshop was held with the regional agricultural bureau heads, plant protection director, and crop production directors. The consultation was organized by the Crop protection directorate of the MoA to discuss on the performance of component two and it was facilitated by the project coordinator and state minister. A total of 35 participants (2 females) took part on the workshop. Social issues such as beneficiary targeting mechanism, GBV, and GRM were also discussed. The participants exchanged their experience and good practices.

Similar consultations were cascaded to the regions and woredas with regard to the selection of target beneficiaries, and the general implementation of the livelihood component. In Afar region the same consultation was undertaken where a total 96 people (17 females) participated and discussed on the planned component 2 activities.

Out of the total 125,436 households who were provided with the crop seeds and fertilizers 23,008 are female headed households. Similarly, out of 58,760 households, who have supported with the pasture restoration,7,628 are female headed households. Before the provision of the supplies, discussions were made with the affected community and they expressed their interest regarding the inputs.

Stakeholder engagement in the form of awareness creation trainings for federal, regional and woreda experts and scouts was conducted on Health and Safety issues for a total of 1,148 experts (1072 M and 76 F) from the federal MoA, regional BoA, Pastoral development from the pastoralist and agro pastoralist areas. The awareness has been given by the federal MoA and regional bureau of Agriculture (SNNP region) project implementations. Additionally, awareness on the health and environmental impacts of the chemicals and its mitigation measures has been given for 68 drivers (4 drivers who transport pesticides and 64 drivers who operate vehicle mounted sprayers) and 20 drum crashers have been raised. Similarly, awareness has been given for 10 store keepers about safe handling of chemicals and empty drums. In total the awareness of 98 people (all males) who directly involved on chemical spraying has been raised. 720 scouts were trained on Desert Locust monitoring and survey. Community awareness and sensitization on Desert locust monitoring, identification and control was conducted for 40,000 community members in all project regions.

In 2021/22, stakeholder consultations have been conducted in the form of consultative workshop, trainings, and awareness creation activities. Accordingly, consultative workshop was conducted for 223 participants, who were invited from federal and regional agriculture research centres, relevant universities, FAO, DLCO-EA, agriculture research council, different directorates of MoA, regional agriculture bureaus and experts from federal and regions. The objective of the workshop was to discuss on and enrich the draft document of base establishment and plant protection road map.

The engagement of different stakeholder in the past year was strongly conducted both at the federal and regional levels by the project staffs, directors, and other actors. The basic stakeholders of the project are the beneficiary farmer or pastoral communities in the affected districts. The awareness creation activities conducted for 159,384 community members, the training of 278 woredas, zonal and regional safeguard focal persons and other regional and federal relevant staffs, the training of 186 scouts, the sensitization of 5,030communities among others are part of the stakeholder engagement activities. The discussions made with the farmers, pastoral communities DAs, regional and woreda experts and bureau heads during project monitoring and technical support on the safeguard issues and other project activities are also part of stakeholder engagements. With is regard, formal discussions have been made with the focal persons, other staffs and bureau heads in 39 woredas and 6 regional states in the last six months. Official letters have been written from the Ministry of agriculture to BoA food security directorates regarding the establishment GRM for EELRP.

The project has technical team that regularly meets to evaluate the project activities against the forecast of DL and make some decisions. This technical team involves members from MoA, FAO, DLCOEA and FDRM. Annex 2 presents a summary of stakeholder engagement, issues raised, responses provided and agreed points.

# **Stakeholder Engagement for the Additional Financing (P178434)**

During the Adama environment and social risk management training 87 trainees (9 Female) who came from Amhara, Afar and part of Oromia regions drawn different stakeholders have taken part and raised their implementation experience. The intention of the observation was to get general overlook about the environmental and social safeguard activities in the project. Those stakeholders who observed the training session and discussed with the trainees as well as the trainers were the State Minister of the Agriculture Development and Horticulture, two people for the Ministry of Finance who are responsible for the additional finance, the plant protection director and food security director of the MoA. The stakeholder consultation or engagement with regard to the additional financing will strongly continue in the future.

# **Consultation with Environment and Social Regional, Woreda Focal Persons**

Consultation was conducted in Adama city during the training of environmental and social safeguard session. The discussion was held between the trainees, the trainers, the state minister for Agriculture and Horticulture Sector, and the Plant Protection Directorate in the MoA. The trainees were from the EELRP woredas, zonal and regional experts of Amhara, Bale and East Bale Zones of Oromia, and Afar regions. The participants were regional, zonal and woreda focal persons, regional chemical storekeepers, food security heads, regional plant protection heads, gender expert from the gender directorate of BoAs. In total 84 people (9 female and 75male) participated in the consultative workshop. This discussion was facilitated by the plant protection directorate. The discussants rose that the attention given for plant protection in general from the federal to the woreda is very low. While plant protection is the base for the country’s economy, the support given for the sector is not satisfactory. Further,

* At the woreda level, the resources are very scarce while the scope of work is very high.
* The current effort to strengthen the plant protection department at the MoA, support to plant laboratories is very encouraging.
* The activities that have been taken to control the desert locust are also encouraging.
* The need for Additional Financing for the project become tantamount since the threats of the DL and other migratory pests still exists, covering broader geography and the capacity to control it remain low.
* Finally, the State Minister responded to ideas raised by the participants and reaffirmed the MoA dedication to strengthen and support the plant protection than ever before.

# **Consultation with Ministry of Finance and Project Environment and Social Experts**

Discussion was conducted between the trainees and two senior experts of the MoFEC. The discussion was facilitated by the projected coordinator. The trainees raised points such as:

* The problem of the desert locust was very high. Thanks to the parent project support for surveillance, control and capacity building. It would have been impossible to undertake control, surveillance, and mitigate the impacts of desert locust on livelihoods of affected people, had the project been not there.
* Why did the project not have project technical staff at the region and woreda level like other projects? We know there are environment and social focal persons in each woreda.
* What is the Ministry of Finance doing to expand the scope of support on livelihoods of the locust affected households and number of woredas in the future?
* The project is very crucial for the farmers. There for it must continue.
* There are zones and woredas highly affected by drought and DL. Therefor especial attention has to be given for those areas, if additional resources are envisaged.
* The two experts from the MoFEC on their hands thanked the discussants for the points they raised and the efforts they made to control desert locust. They also pointed out that the project will continue if it demonstrates satisfactory implementation performance and complies with the financer and GoE procedures.

Additionally, during the awareness creation for Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) in Bale Zone desert locust affected woredas, the committee members and the plant protection heads have been raising about the need for support in terms of logistics and financial support to cover administrative costs.

# **Lessons Learned from the Parent Project (P173702)**

# **Environment and social risk management implementation experience**

The parent project has dispatched all ESRM instruments prepared for the parent project, including, ESMF, SA, GBV/SEA Plan, LMP, SEP. The dissemination of these instruments was followed by institutional capacity building at different levels of the project implementation. The implementation of the environmental and social risks in the implementation of EELRP is that the woreda and regional environmental and social safeguard focal persons have got training that enable them to prepare environmental and social risk management tools. Project screening and approval have been practiced in all woredas. There have been drawbacks in rating the risks of the project and hence there were gaps in proper categorization of projects and preparation of proper environment and social management tools. In the future the focal persons will practice how to give proper rate for sub-projects based on their environmental and social risks.

# **Environmental and social audit on pesticide spraying aircraft crash incidents**

The project conducted an environmental and social audit following three pesticide spraying aircraft crash incidents. The assessment further covered environment and social risk management instruments implementation performance, including awareness. The findings from the environment and social audit have been put in an action plan and implementation has commenced. Among the findings relevant to the SEP are, (i) lack of information among stakeholders, (ii) lack of participation of stakeholders, and (iii) variability on the functionality of the GRM to receive, sort, register and provide response. These findings have been included in an action plan.

# **Grievance Redress Mechanism Establishment and Functionality**

As a key element of the SEP, the parent project has established GRMs in non-PSNP woredas and strengthened GRMs in new woredas. The AF shall build on existing systems to strengthen and establish new GRMs into the new project areas. In the parent project implementation period GRM committee established in 156 from the total project woredas.. The remaining woredas GRMs committees will be established in the AF implementation period. . Both the former and the future GRM committees need to be assisted for their proper functionality For this, awareness creation activities are going to be provided by the ELRP project experts during the additional finance period. The safeguard specialist and focal persons at the PIU and the regional focal persons at the woreda level will handle the strengthening activities. There have been awareness creation activities that will continue in under the proposed additional finance. In addition to these awareness creation activities, trainings will be delivered in the future to acquaint them with the technical skills. Furthermore, the establishment of the committee at the kebele level will be started soon as deemed relevant. The parent project implementation performance on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups engagement has been several times evaluated as unsatisfactory. But the update says nothing about this. There is also no mitigation measure identified for improving the engagement of these groups during the AF.

# **Vulnerable groups engagement during the parent project implementation**

The engagement of vulnerable people in the project in different ways has been encouraging during the implementation of the parent project. The participatory selection of female headed households during the targeting of livelihood support was one of the examples of vulnerable group engagement. On the other hand, females have not been participated in any activities that involved chemical pesticide handling such as spraying, chemical, transfer and empty barrel handling. This is to reduce the exposure of women into the hazards and risks of chemical pesticides. In the AF, the involvement of different vulnerable groups such as old people, women headed households; disabled people etc. will be carried out strongly. The assessment and identification vulnerable people in all kebeles by the woreda focal persons will take place prior to targeting for the livelihood support program. During the targeting the updating of the assessment will be carried out and priorities will be given for these kinds of people.

.

# **Annex 1: Stakeholders’ Consultation Reporting Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Supporting question** | **Objective and Guidance** | **Relevant Information to include** |
| 1 | How did the project identify stakeholders to be engaged in relation to environmental and social impacts? | | |
| 2 | When did the project engage with stakeholders? | | |
| 3 | What goals were set for engagement processes (e.g., to convey information, to hear views, to obtain feedback, to work in collaboration, to reach agreements, to transfer control over decision making, resources and activities to stakeholders. | | |
| 4 | Which stakeholders has the project team engaged with? | | |
| 5 | Which formats of engagement are prioritized and why? To convey that the form of consultation was tailored to the nature of the project and based on the stakeholder analysis and engagement plan   * Brief description of events and discussions (location, format, number of participants, key issues and concerns raised, how it was documented, whether agreement was reached. * Provided information to stakeholder groups prior to consultation events. * Locations, languages, and formats chosen and reasons? why. * Documents on key environmental and social issues disclosed publicly. * Disclosure of results of the consultation process. * Amount of time given to stakeholders to review and discuss the information. * Measures to ensure the process was respectful of people’s views. * Examples of stakeholders buying in and trusting the engagement process was fair and legitimate. * Types of forums and methods applied for the consultation process. * Notable differences in the events conducted with subgroups such as vulnerable and marginal group | | |
| 6 | How did the views of stakeholders influence the project design and implementation of the project? | | |
| 7 | How has the project established a Grievance Redress Mechanisms, and how is it functioning? | | |

# **Annex 2: Summary of Stakeholders’ Engagement for the Parent Project (P173702) Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | | **Issues Raised** | **Responses from the consultation with federal High Level Technical Expert** | | **Responses of Federal level Key Informant Interviews** | | **Responses of Regional and Woreda level KII** |
| **I. Assessment on existing locust control using pesticides** | | | | | | |  |
| 1 | | As an organization, do you think IPM will have a room to reduce the application of pesticides? How? Please describe it with tangible evidence. | Yes, IPM has a room to reduce pesticides. Integrated Locust control starts from early monitoring then early warning helps to control locust in small area. Again ,in most areas destruction of egg field, digging trenches and cover soil over hoppers, Mechanically killing settled swarms and use of bio-pesticides reduce locust population density reduce amount of pesticides application. | | The key informant from MOA said that, IPM will definitely reduce chemical use for it deals with cultural practices and other methods that reduce pest which is good agronomic practice. The key informant also raised that though they have a certain level of toxicity, these pesticides are lethal dose limited for desert locust. | | The key informant from regions agreed that IPM helps to reduce the use of chemical application through use of other methods including biological, mechanical, and manual which are not toxic. For instance, the use of cultural or traditional method of control make use of hitting with stick, smoking, making, noise can reduce the use of the pesticides.  Key informants from SNNP confirmed that IPM begins with attitude and learning the behaviour of the desert locust. It helps to make use of agronomic practices which reduce the use of pesticides. |
| 2 | | Evaluate and discuss the nature of proposed pesticides for Locust control: Malathion 50% EC, Malathion 95% ULV, and Chlorpyrifos 24% ULV in terms of toxicity & efficacy referring the national regulation and registry; FAO; and the WHO and other standards. | 1. Malathion and Chlorpyrifos belongs to Organophosphate group and the group is mammalian safe compared to Organochlorine   2.Thegroupisnon-persistent  3.Malathion is slightly hazardous and in WHO classification categorized in class III4. Chlorpyrifos categorized in classII and moderately hazardous  5. Both are efficient if the target is well identified, located and time of application Arranged based on the biology and behaviour of locusts. Until no win most targets efficacy evaluated above 90%  6. Referring the national regulation and registration both are registered based on WHO toxicology classification. The  Regulation and registration allow classII, III and Unlikely hazardous groups | | The Key informant explained that the effectiveness of the proposed pesticides for Locust control: Malathion 50% EC, Malathion 95% ULV, and Chlorpyrifos 24% ULV when operated manually it is effectiveness is between 94-96% and when sprayed with aircraft it about 90%. On average its effectively is about 95%. Regarding toxicity he claimed that first of all the use of chemical should be and is a last resort, when it is difficult to control with cultural practices. Apart from that these chemicals are toxic to a certain level. The natal dose for killing locusts. Their toxicity can be reduced using appropriate PPE and following good spraying practice taking into consideration wind direction, time, and the characteristics of the locust. | | The key informants from almost all regions agreed that if appropriately used it is effective. The key informant from Oromia further explained the effectiveness of the pesticides on average could range between 80-90%. He went on saying if the spray is conducted while the desert locusts are moving the effectiveness could be up to 50%. However, factors like wind direction, time of spray should be considered.  Regarding the toxicity, the regional key informants confirmed that these pesticides are registered in the country and among the recommended by the FAO. Accordingly, their toxicity level is less compared other chemicals. In this regard key informant from Somali reported that the chemical can only remain on pasture, crops and plants etc limited time not more than 48 hours. In addition, key informant from Oromia said as the pesticides lists are annually renewed and are less toxic.  Key informant from SNNP said that the Malathion 50% EC is water dilute and administered with equipment on the back of a person and less toxic. Whereas Malathion 95% ULV, and Chlorpyrifos 24% ULV are used for aircraft and vehicle mounted spray and are toxic. The latter two are not water dilute. |
| 3 | | As an organization do you have any pesticide alternatives which have less toxicity but high efficacy for locust control? If any, please list out | As far as pesticides toxicity is concerned, these we are using no ware classified as moderately and slightly hazardous in Who classification.  However, Fipronil (pesticide) orn blanket application of *Metarhiziumacridium* (bio pesticide), suggested a slow toxic in trial carried out locust prone countries. | | There are no alternative pesticides apart from these pesticides | | No, the regions have no mandate to do this. In such cases it is the federal government in charge of administer. |
| 4 | | Asanorganization,doyouhaveproper storage facilities? Where and how is it being properly stored in terms of bulk pesticide storage? Please describe it indetail | We have chemical store at National with more than 400,000lt capacity,inEastDireDawa100,000lt,In Samara100,000ltcapacity,100,000ltinJigjiga,50,000ltcapacityinHawassa,100,000ltcapacityinBishoftu,Kombolcha100,000lt Bahir Dar, 100,000lt and Mekele100,000lt capacity and there are also medium storage in all zones in the country  However, the storage handling system and standard may need improvement | | The key informant confirmed that the project will be using the existing permanent and temporary pesticides storages in the target mainly Arba Minch airport, Bale Robe airport, JigJiga airports and Borena Teletele airstrip. This storage is meant for chemicals storage and is guarded to avoid local people exposure to the insecticides. In terms of distance from the community the storage is well situated. One key informant said, we have chemical store at National main warehouse with more than 400,000lt capacity, in East Dire Dawa 100,000lt, In Samara 100,000lt capacity, 100,000lt in Jigjiga, 50,000lt capacity in Hawassa, 100,000lt capacity in Bishoftu, and Kombolcha 100,000lt Bahir Dar 100,000lt and Mekele 100,000lt capacity and there are also medium storage in all zones in the country. However, the storage handling system and standard may need improvement. | | The key informants confirmed that the for this operation purpose we have not prepared pesticide storage center as the operation of spraying is coordinated and lead by the federal government. But, for the regional purpose the storage regional and zonal and woreda bureaus are used to store chemicals.  Regarding storage the key informant from SNNP confirmed that their storage. However, some facilities are lacking such as showering and shelf. |
| 5 | | As an organization, do you have solid waste management plan? Especially pesticide containers. Please describe it in detail.  Do you have procedure and practices in disposal of expired or left over pesticides? What standard experience of disposal of pesticide do you have? Please describe it in detail. | During the past obsolete pesticide disposal project implementation period solid waste management plan was prepared and the activities stated in the plan are collecting back empty drums and crush all containers and make ready for final disposal The country disposed huge pesticide quantity and we have good experience | | Previously there was system in which empty containers collected from sites and sent back to Kality from all over the country where it is crushed using dram crusher. However, this time the dram crusher is not functioning as a result currently being done with regard to container is collection and transporting back to Kality site and where it is stored.  The key informant confirmed that we have no clear an articulated procedure and practices in disposal of expired or leftover pesticides and this is the problem as country as their expired chemicals disposing mechanisms are not available in the country. But disposal of expired or leftover pesticides has been done with the support of development partners mainly FAO. He also added that, search for financing/funding is on progress to dispose the remaining expired pesticides. | | All most all regional key informants reported that, they have solid waste management system and institution for solid waste management their region and the city administration. However, is not realistic for pesticides container.  The key informants said that there is a procedure, but not realistic. As per the report from the regional key informants the mandate for disposal of expired or leftover pesticides is not regional governments`. The Federal government is responsible for their disposal.  In this regard key informants from the Amhara region said that it is not their mandate to dispose expired or leftover pesticides.  The key informant from SNNP in his part confirmed that they once it was disposed in Finland and the it is very expensive |
| 6 | | Describe actual measures and precautionary measures being carried out not to pollute the natural habitat in general and non-target  Species in particular during Arial pesticide  Spraying activity | We are using FAO standard procedure; the procedure has steps which are:  1. Identify the target(Locust)  2. Decide whether sprayable or not  3. If sprayable, decide type of chemical, tool, plate form  4. For safe spray, discuss with community and de limit the spray target, record for corner GPS and aware the community about waiting period of the pesticide to  Keep away their domestic animals and human being for the decided period. Then the team evaluate efficacy and impacts if any | | Before every mission, the community are asked questions which include questions such as  What do you know about it? What is it? What is the impact on you? What do you want us to do? And then they ask for intervention, then the pesticide identified and purchased for locust control will be checked for lethal dosage for killing the desert locust. Then the community will get information as a result of awareness creation and sensitization programs/events conducted for the purpose of safe spraying so that the impact on the community and, and the environment, such as water, and other natural resources staye safe.The community was asked where they drink water from? Besides, the community are told to cover water sources. If there are water bodies and other non-target species, the spray won`t be carried out until they are out of that sensitive area. Meanwhile, the desert locust will be chased so as to protect the crops, pasture, and plants from being damaged by the desert locust. After chasing them to non-sensitive area, spraying will be carried out in the morning at a locality where they spent the night.  In addition, the spray is carried out taking into consideration factors such as wind direction, topography, water body, village, and schools are not within the range of the spraying area. Besides, buffer zone is defined. | | The regional key informants confirmed that the safe spray not to spray in sensitive areas rather to chase or use cultural method when feasible. Take in to account the wind direction, use of better spray equipment.  The key informant from Oromia also emphasized the taking GPS Coordinated in at night to effectively execute the operation. |
| II. **Assessment of traditional or agronomic practices of locust control** | | | | | | |  |
| 1 | | List out best traditional and agronomical practice of the locust control. And at which stage of Locust life cycle is these practices being effective.  **N.B:** Please attach published documents, if any. | Traditional or agronomic practices are:   1. Digging or destruct egg fields after egg laying of adults 2. Mechanical killing of settled adults before their flying early in the morning. 3. This is applied to Immature and Mature Adults 4. Digging trenches and guide or push all hoppers in the surrounding towards trenches and cover the soil in the top. This works for 1st, 2nd and 3rd instar Hoppers | | The federal key informant reported Various cultural methods made use to control desert locust. For instance, when the locust lay their egg the area is ploughed so that to crush their eggs (this is done during the egg stage before hatching). The other practice is hitting with stick (locusts are cold blooded insects. As a result, they are inactive from mid-night to the sun rise. They feel the hot after 1-2 hours and their body relaxes as their limb is full of fat. Hence, they start moving after their body relaxed with the sun, mainly their limb). This makes it simple for hitting with stick as they cannot escape during this time). The other method is the practice of using smoke and collecting with suck and kill and digging hole and buries them). The other key informant responses on traditional or agronomic practices are:   1. Digging or destruct egg fields after egg laying of adults, 2. Mechanical killing of settled adults before their flying early in the morning. This is applied to Immature and Mature adults 3. Digging trenches and guide or push all hoppers in the surrounding towards trenches and cover the soil in the top. This works for 1st, 2nd and 3rd instar hoppers. | | Regarding traditional practices locust control practice the regional key informants confirmed that traditional method is one the most used methods. Among the traditional method mentioned by key informants include creation of noise using different material and disturbing the locusts, plough areas when eggs are lied to crush the eggs before hatching, hitting with stick hopper stage before it grows wings, digging trenches for hoppers to fall into or beating hoppers with sticks, smoke etc. |
| III. **Assessment on existing institutional and capacity building efforts** | | | | | | |  |
| 1 | Describe capacity building efforts made related with locust control | | | Desert Locust is a unique insect pest due to their ability to change behaviour including their density  and color. Desert Locust survey and management requires knowledge of its biology, behaviour and ecology.  Based on global and national existing situation forecast training given to different groups of experts and community locust scouts.  TOT given to Desert Locust information, Survey and forecasting, Logistic and campaign management and control experts.  Training given to regional locust focal experts  Training given to community, village leaders, scouts, religious and community elders before, during and after control of locust outbreak. | | According to the information from key informant, training has been provided before ahead of desert locust prevention campaign. So far capacity building has been provided to SNNP, Oromia, Dire Dawa, Somali, Amhara and Afar. The approach is through ToT. In this respect, the federal ministry of Agriculture plnt protection directorate trained experts coming from the regions, the regions in turn trained Zonal officials and experts, and the zonal offices trained woreda level experts, the woreda experts trained kebele and elders, Development Agents, extension workers and through them to the community. Besides, technical assistance is continuously provided to the regions on different areas including resources, technical support on survey and surveillance, identifying, treatment and control. | All regional key informants agreed that awareness creation for the community using different communication channels has been made so far. They also emphasize the role of communities in the campaign to control and prevent the desert locust infestation. Previously, mass mobilization of students, security staffs and the community at large has been wasdone; but currently due to COVID-19 and SOE the approach have been changed and is based on the direction of the command post. Accordingly, to reach the farmers and create awareness the use of communication channels such as community elderly, local Radio, devolving government structure from region to kebel and mainly development agents and extension workers in the locality are used. The woredas trained by the regions and zones. After receiving the necessary information or training the zone will reach all their woredas and the woreda will reach all their kebelles and DAs and EA agricultural extension workers and community representatives (elders). A key informant from Harari reported that committees have been established from regional to kebelle level and these committees at all level are responsible for awareness creation for the community. A key informant from Amahara also reported that the agricultural extension workers at the kebelle level are providing information keeping their social distance from the audiences. |
| 2 | * Describe capacity building efforts made with safe use and application of pesticides on locust control * Describe capacity building efforts made on the environmental and social management instruments such as ESMF, RPF and others * At Federal level, do you familiar with these environmental and social management instruments? If yes, please describe some. If no please suggest some interventions | | | During capacity building safe use and handling of pesticides and application equipment management was the major area covered theoretically and practically  EHS (Environmental and Health Standard) is a special topic and locust officers were trained by FAO/CRC The environment, health and safety (EHS) status of the country was evaluated during pest control operation by using software FAO monitoring tool. | | In this regard the key informant confirmed that, the experts in the devolving government structure and the representatives of the community (clan leader, religious and traditional faith leaders, elders) on the purpose spraying and impact of pesticide use and precautionary measure they should be taken.  For officials, experts, scouts’ capacity building efforts made include provision of training on when, where how and what pesticide to use; factors to be considered during use of pesticide use (wind direction, topography, time, spraying, calibration of machines), proper Use of PPE; communication with community need to be taken before, during and after the spray are among efforts made.  FAO guideline on safety and environment precautionary Guideline 2003 has been used before. Apart from this, so far no capacity building has been provided in relation to ESMF and SA. But, the documents for this project has been prepared without related capacity building efforts. .  Responses from one key informant about EHS  1. During capacity building safe use and handling of pesticides and application equipment management was covered theoretically and practically  2. EHS (Environmental and Health Standard) is a special topic and our locust officers trained by FAO/CRC  3. The country level in EHS during pest control operation evaluated by using software prepared by FAO.  3. We are not so much familiar with the instruments.  No, only FAO guideline on safety and environment precautionary Guideline 2003 is what we are using and well aware about it. | As per the regional key informant capacity building on safety and spraying of pesticides on the locusts control has been provided for spraying teams, farmers, scouts, experts and officials at different levels or sensitization campaigns for community/village leaders. The capacity building efforts made include provision of training on when, where, how and what pesticide to use; factors to be considered during the use of pesticide use (wind direction, topography, time, spraying, calibration of machines), proper Use of PPE; communication with community need to be taken before, during and after the spray are among efforts made.  They raised that training cascaded from MoA to Regional, Regional to Zonal, Zonal to Woreda and DAs and kebelle and to the community.  During the training environmental, health and safety components are incorporated. They all confirmed they did not receive capacity building on instruments such as ESMF, SA and other instruments for this campaign.  The key informants confirmed that they are familiar with Environmental and social managements such as ESIA and RAP |
| 3 | Describe Existing Federal level institutional arrangement on Locust control program/project | | | The Federal level institutional arrangement in Locust control include:   1. Ministry of Agriculture 2. Agriculture sector state Minister 3. Plant Health Regulatory Directorate General 4. Plant Protection Directorate 5. Migratory pest management case team 6. Desert Locust officer experts 7. Partners FAO, DLCO, WB, WFP, USAID etc | | The key informants mentioned the MoA, FAO/DLCO; and Plant protection Directorate as relevant institutions. | Regional Bureau of Agriculture, Zonal Agricultural Bureau and Plant protection; Woreda Agricultural Bureaus, Kebele level DAs and Agricultural extension workers |
| 4 | * Describe the institutional arrangement on Environmental, Social and Health and safety organs: * At Federal level, for this and related program and/or projects, do you have Environmental and Social safeguard specialist/s? please state the existing condition | | | Yes, the project has a dedicated environmental and social safeguard specialist. Moreover, there is also an individual expert trained on EHS serving in Plant protection Directorate. The latter assists on health monitoring practices. | | Environment Forest Climate Change Commission and MoLSA  Currently, we do have Environmental and Social Specialist hired for this project,. | As per the key informant interview the regional government has a unit in charge of environmental issues though the structure varies from one region to the other. Accordingly, some regions have Environment, Forest and Climate change Authority/Agency; While the other Environmental Protection and Land Use Administration Authority (EPLUA). With regard to the safety and social issues the Regional, zonal and Woreda Bureau of Labor and Social Affairs are in charge of the social and safety issues. At regional Agricultural Bureau, Zonal and Woreda level Environmental and Social focal persons are assigned and trained. In addition, other plant protection experts at all levels are also assisting safeguard practices as appropriate. |
| **IV. Assessment on communication means for surveillance of the occurrence of paste and control efforts** | | | | | | |  |
|  | | Describe technical supports and communication mechanisms with regions in terms of locust surveillance and control | Federal level Plant protection Directorate experts give regular support during survey and organize control operations in breeding seasons and outbreak. Communication is through report that is daily, weekly and monthly reports including monthly bulletin. Standard survey format is used; elocust tablets and elocust3m Telephone and email are also daily communication channel. | | According to the key informant the technical assistance provided to the region on different areas including resources, on survey and surveillance, identifying, treatment and control of desert locust. He also confirmed that they are also in regular communications with regions in provision of early warning and control support the communications channel used include email, and RAMSAS and telephone, letter. However, the tablet used for RAMSEs are limited to federal and regions such as Afar, Somali, and Oromia regions. | | The regional key informants made clear that they provide training; including technical assistances to regional and woreda based on the technical support they received from the Federal.  The communication on the locust surveillance and control at the woreda level exchange information with the kebele and zonal staffs.  Whereas Zonal administrations exchanges information with the Woreda and Regional government and the regions exchange information both bottom up from the zonal to Federal and top down from federal to zones. The communication means used include email, telephone, letter and face to face etc.  They further explained that the communication also exists between the neighboring regions and between zones and woredas with in a region. In this regard, the key informant from Tigray informed that they are coordinating and working with Afar region on areas where the desert locust breeding, its stage of expansion, coverage and distribution etc. The key informant from Dire Dawa also confirmed that they are working with Somali and Oromia regions. Like wise, the key informant from Harari also confirmed that they communicate with Oromia region. |
|  | | Describe technical support and communication means with Special Woredas in terms of locust surveillance and control | Migratory or trans-boundary pest management is organized and leaded by Federal Ministry. Region Bureaus are supporting the operation. The Ministry of Agriculture assign experts to the hotspot District and region and zone offices involve in Campaign. Daily update prepared by using standard reporting format and woreda office daily communicate with the zones and directly with Plant protection Directorate in the Ministry. | | Assistance provided including resources, on survey and surveillance, identifying, treatment and control of desert locust. He also confirmed that they are also in regular communications through regions in provision of early warning and control support the communications channel used include email, telephone, and letter. | | See the above |
| V. Assessment of technical support and communication with international organization dealing on locust control | | | | | | |  |
|  | | Describe technical support and communication means with FAO in terms of locust surveillance and control | FAO developed Desert locust Biology, Survey, Information Forecasting, Environmental and social impacts, campaign leading, control. FAO developed standard survey format and the Ministry communicate twice a week and monthly by monthly bulletin. FAO professionals technical support all front-line countries during training, field operation, survey tools and control tools handling and management | | FAO is very much supporting us through provision of information about the desert Locust and provision of early warning and resources (pesticides) to control the desert locust. We are also in regular communications with FAO in terms of surveillance and control. The communications channel used includes email, The FAO/DCCO RAMSAS Inter locust interlinked, Elocust software and telephone and letter. | | According to information from the regional key informants, the Federal government provide the regional governments with information on areas where the desert locust is posing damages, its stage, coverage and distribution and the resources used to prevent and control desert locust. The communication channels used include email, and RAMSAS and telephone, letter. However, the tablet used for RAMSEs are limited to federal and regions such as Afar, Somali, and Oromia regions. |
|  | | Describe technical support and communication means with East African Locust Control Program in terms of locust surveillance and control | Desert Locust Control Organization for Eastern Africa is one of the collaborators and Ethiopia is pioneer member of the organization. The experts of DLCO-EA carry out survey and support field experts and also deploy spray aircraft. | | Where the desert locust, its stage, its distribution and direction. The communication channels include Email, information exchange and software elocust M3(recent version) | | The environmental impact mentioned by the key informants include environmental pollution if not well administered or potential spillage of pesticides, improper disposal of empty containers, potential lack of or less quality PPE, etc. The impacts include loss of yield, food insecurity and loss of means of their livelihood, migration of family including women and children in search of pasture for their livestock and employment away from home, and potential conflict on resources such as water and pasture mainly among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Key informant from Oromia also added the potential for family disintegration. Key informant from Amhara also raised the psychological impact of the infestation. The Key informant from Tigray in his part added the increase in labor coast to harvest as a result of demand raise and urgency to harvest to harvest. |
| VI. Stakeholders’ environmental and social concerns of the  project | | | | |  | |  |
| 1. 1   1 | | List out all environmental and social concerns of all stakeholders at Federal level (implementing agencies, Environmental Organs, project affected persons and beneficiaries) related with this project | 1. The core concerns that are listed by the stakeholders include practicing safe locust control practices, avoiding chemical contamination of water, air, grazing fields, crops; addressing community complaints; proper management of livelihoods restoration, such as supply of forage, seeds and fertilizer 2. Least but not last addressing dissatisfaction if there are dissatisfaction in beneficiary targeting | | Pollution of the environment if the necessary precautionary measures are not taken; crop damage, economic losses, health problem on the sprayers and other operational staffs are among the impacts mentioned by the key informant. | | The fact that the locust can travel 42km2/hour ;the desert locusts are beyond the controlling capacity of the regions; Budget and logistic(cars/transportation, motor bike,) related challenges; favorable/conducive condition i.e., temperature and presence green vegetation, rain for desert locust; limited spraying apparatus compared with the scale of invasion ;Climate change(which has made conducive environment for the locust); the Covid-19 pandemic; lack of spraying machine which fits to the topography of the country(e.g. Drone) in areas difficult for the aircraft; PPE compared to the massive force engaged in the campaign, pesticide impact on the health of operational staffs and community. Are among the concerns mentioned by key informants; 100% substitution of all pesticides with ULV might affect the campaign; lack of elocust; |
| VII. Recommendations | | | | | | |  |
|  | | Please forward your recommendations to be used as an input for realizing this project’s objectives |  | | Continuous communication is crucial for the campaign so that the community should be informed regularly and participated. Operational staff should have appropriate quality and number of PPEs, and the necessary precautionary measures should be taken for environment, people, crops and pasture during spraying are among the recommendation provided by the federal key informant. | | The key informants provided the following recommendations. These include Allocation of sufficient budget, on going information provision ,awareness creation and sensitization for all parties with different means; provision of appropriate quality and number of PPE; use of drones for topographic areas difficult to use air craft and traditional methods; making available vehicle, vehicle mount sprays, motor bikes; extensive media coverage with different language about the Desert locust infestation and scale and magnitude of damage; Information linkage between regions, zones and woredas and provision of latest information from WHO/DLCO; provision of training based gap and need assessment for experts, scouts and DA and extension workers; |

**Stakeholder Engagement Plan for AF 2022-2026 Project period**

Implementation of the desert locust prevention and control activities requires the engagement of key stakeholders that have the expertise and experiences in controlling the risks that will be posed by the emergence of locusts. During the planned additional finance period (2022-2026), key stakeholders need to convene twice every fiscal year, i.e., at the beginning of the year to approve the plan and pave the way for implementation of the activities. The same group of stakeholders needs to come together and discuss or consult each other thereby to evaluate the course of implementation, evaluate the level of participation of the stakeholders, such as communities effectively, underline strengths, identify challenges, and pick lessons. The list of stakeholders is highlighted, but this list can be increased by attracting any potential stakeholder at every level that is willing and has the capacity to contribute to this common good sort of intervention. Hence, the list can possibly be increased as necessary by the MOA in its structure all down to the community level.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SN | Planned Stakeholders Engagement Activities | Planned consultns | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | Remark |
| 1 | Consultation/discussion between /and among stakeholders at the Federal level , i.e., MOA, FAO, DPPC, MOH, MOF, DELCO-EA, Civil Aviation authority, EIAR, Federal environment protection authority etc., on AF-induced desert locust preventions and control as well as implementation progresses, data/information exchange and management; disaster risk control and early warning base establishment, compliance issues, collaboration between stakeholders, etc., | 1 or more than 1 |  |  |  |  |  | Consultations that comprises key partners and/or collaborators that aim to address issues that are at stake in launching/ starting to implement AF of the EELRP shall be discussed and shared amongst them. If possible to handle all the stakeholders to bring them together, the MOA need to have a freedom to do so as appropriate |
| 2 | Consultation and/or discussion between regional level stakeholders will be held at project regions facilitated MOA and/or respective PIU. RBoA, Regional bureau of health, disaster risk prevention and preparedness commission office, Regional environmental protection authority, regional civil aviation office (if any etc., will held a joint annual/ by-annual discussion and/or consultation to examine the efficacy of the implementation of EELRP AF activities in their respective region | At least 1 consultation per project beneficiary region |  |  |  |  |  | The RBOA need to stir up coordinating at least one or possibly more than one consultation among region level stakeholders on desert locust control and prevention related issues and pave the way for effective project implementation, monitoring an evaluation as well as collaboration and enhance the national capacity to deal with such issues in the future |
| 3 | Consultations and/or discussions between and among stakeholders stipulated above will be held at administrative zones of the project regions to discuss AF induced locust related prevention works once in a year, or at the beginning of the same and this level of engagement need to be carried out by the Ministry’s PIU | Twice a year |  |  |  |  |  | Zonal level regional administrative structures are linking Regional Bureaus with respective woredas. Hence, it would be necessary for them to consult with zone level structures twice a year. |
| 4 | Woreda level stakeholders consultation and engagement will be held once in a every project year during the project period. The Ministry of Agriculture will a lot a budget for woreda based stakeholders’ engagement. It shall also facilitate and lead the discussion. Participants of the woreda level discussion will be invited by the respective RboA. | One Consultation will be held with woreda level sector offices |  |  |  |  |  | Consultation is will be held at every woreda with relevant woreda level stakeholders to discuss about the various aspects of desert locust prevention and control related issues |
| 5 | Community consultation will be conducted with facilitations by the woreda EELRP focal persons. This consultation is a key platform to understand whether or not the community was at the center of DL prevention works or whether or not necessary participation was achieved at every level. Hence, this consultation will help to draw lessons, strengths and challenges and shall be held once in every year in the project period. | Community level consultation need to be held at launching and implementation stages |  |  |  |  |  | Two rounds of consultations will be held. The first to raise awareness of affected communities about the plan,  Second, consultation shall be held to evaluate the implementation, identify challenges and lessons |
| 6 | Key stakeholders in the area of research and knowledge generation, such as agricultural universities (Haro Maya, Hawassa, Jimma, Ambo, Bahir Dar, etc.,) and Agricultural Research Centers, such as Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, regional Agricultural Research Institutes (RARIs, DELCO-EA, FAO, ICIPE) need to have a platform to consult and discuss about desert locust prevention and control related issues. The discussion will be facilitated by MOA | annual |  |  |  |  |  |  |