

**Citation: Campbell, T (2022) 'Climate Change Policy Narratives and Pastoralism in Ethiopia: New Concerns, Old Arguments?'. *Nomadic Peoples*, 26 (1), pp.106-133**  
<https://doi.org/10.3197/np.2022.260106>

**CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY NARRATIVES AND PASTORALISM IN ETHIOPIA: NEW CONCERNS, OLD ARGUMENTS? (Pre copy-edited, post peer review version)**

*Thomas Campbell*

**Abstract**

This article examines the ways in which discourses and narratives around pastoralism and climate change have been communicated within policy-making in Ethiopia over an eleven-year period (2007-2017), the interests of different actors shaping these policies, as well as some of the consequences of policy solutions for pastoralist livelihoods. Employing discourse analysis of policy relevant documents, combined with data drawn from interviews with a cross-section of policy actors, it highlights how new concerns over climate change – combined with the drive for transformation and modernisation of pastoral areas – are being used by the state and other powerful actors as tools in contestations over land and other resources. Predominantly technocratic policy prescriptions and investments are, in turn, leading to new patterns of social differentiation and vulnerability for some. The extent and nature of change in Ethiopia's drylands call for political responses that address social inequities and power imbalances, that safeguard pastoralists' resource rights, and that allow for more inclusive forms of governance

Keywords: Pastoralism, Climate Change, Policy Narratives, Ethiopia

**Introduction**

While there is a growing body of knowledge on the effects of climatic and other forms of change on pastoralism in the Horn of Africa (HoA), less is known about how recent policy responses and development interventions in the name of climate change and pastoral area development are shaped by certain discourses and narratives and by political interests. This is important because the simplifications that often characterise

policy narratives can fail to acknowledge the politicised nature of many environmental problems in local contexts. The pastoral drylands of Ethiopia are no exception, where claims to land and other resources remain deeply contested. Central to this understanding is the need to identify and unpack ‘policy narratives’: how particular discourses are framed within policy, what forms of knowledge count, and whose understandings and interests predominate (Roe 1991; Adger et al. 2001; Dryzek 2013). In Ethiopia (as elsewhere in Africa) pastoral dryland areas (and pastoralism) have long been equated with narratives of poverty, low productivity, environmental degradation and conflict, despite a growing acceptance of pastoralism as a legitimate land-use system (AU, 2010). More recently, new policy narratives have emerged - built largely around ‘climate resilience’, ‘green economic growth’ and the need for ‘climate-smart agriculture’. These are being invoked by policymakers, as the state, donors and other development actors seek to respond to global and national concerns about climate-change, food-security and political-security imperatives (Yirgu et al. 2013; Death, 2016).

It has been argued that some of the narratives driving these current climate-change policies in the HoA are not necessarily ‘new’, but are instead rooted in the same historical discourses around ‘unproductive’ drylands, the poor as agents and victims of environmental degradation, and the need for modernisation (Odhiambo, 2014; Weissner et al. 2014; Krätli, 2019). Taking Ethiopia as a unit of analysis, and drawing on the findings of a systematic discourse analysis of policy-relevant documents, combined with the results of key-informant interviews, this article aims to examine if such claims hold-up to closer scrutiny. It does so by addressing a number of critical questions: What are the dominant discourses and narratives around pastoralism found in current national climate-change and drylands policies in Ethiopia and have these

changed over time?; Who are the principal actors and institutions shaping these policy narratives, and what are their interests?; What are the ramifications of policy narratives for pastoralist livelihoods?

The research makes use of an analytical framework originally devised by Keeley and Scoones (2003), designed to make sense of complex policy processes. The framework distinguishes between discourse (a shared meaning of a phenomenon) and narratives (the ways in which a discourse is communicated), actors and institutions, and the politics and interests that together shape policy. To this I have added a fourth component: focused on the material outcomes or consequences of policy prescriptions. This is important because it helps give insight into the complex 'political economy of winners and losers' (Adger et al. 2001: 688) that might otherwise be hidden within policy narratives.

An environmental policy narrative approach acknowledges that large-scale policymaking and planning needs simplifications, or 'crises narratives', to generate political consensus and make action possible in the face of uncertainty (Roe 1991; Krätli 2013). The most successful or 'dominant' narratives are generally those that serve the interests of powerful constituencies. Historically in the Horn, these have been governments, aid bureaucracies and scientists (Adams 2009; Whitfield 2016). As Roe (1991) observes, the simplicity and political power of narratives makes them very persistent. Institutionalisation of narratives can thus occur over a long time. In Ethiopia the modernising and technocratic approach to agriculture and natural resource management that is a characteristic of state-led rural development policy, has its roots in the imperial era, but became embedded in successive regime institutions and the practices of government bureaucracies (Morris 1998; Halderman 2004). In

such cases, ‘scientific expertise’ helped to legitimise and shape the promotion of a range of interventions, with far-reaching consequences for dryland communities (Adams 2009; Behnke and Kerven 2013; Fratkin 2014).

Despite the emergence of a new model of range ecology in the 1990s - that took on board unpredictable variability as the defining feature of arid and semi-arid ecosystems (Behnke et al. 1993; Scoones 1995; Naimir-Fuller 1999; Krätli 2015) - and the strong presence in the literature of new understandings of pastoralism and its relationship to climatic and other uncertainties (Ericksen et al. 2013; Herrero et al. 2014), there is a sense that ‘old narratives’ still persist. Ruling national elites and international agencies continue to use the kind of ‘problematizing narratives’ (Weisser et al. 2014: 114) about environmental degradation, resource scarcity and low productivity to justify policies that promote the conversion of rangelands to other uses (Little 2013, Scoones et al. 2019; Krätli, 2019) – uses in themselves that are drivers of degradation, pastoralist displacement and ultimately failed economic development (Catley et al. 2013; Abbink et al. 2014).

Drawing from the literature, I identify three broad discourses that characterise much of the scholarly and development debate around pastoralism more generally, but are also relevant to the intersection between climate change and pastoralism discussed here. One view – categorised here as a ‘pure pastoralism’ discourse – is that mobile pastoralism is the most ecologically and economically appropriate form of land use in dryland areas (Naimir-Fuller, 1999, Scoones, 1995; Krätli, 2015). Restrictions on mobility constitute the chief constraint, and removing this constraint is the main solution. Pastoralists have been managing environmental variability and ‘adapting autonomously’ to climate variability and other uncertainties in Africa for millennia

(Eriksen et al. 2013; McGahey et al. 2014). Deviation from the traditional way of life is a threat to the system itself, one that will further marginalise and impoverish herders, and has negative consequences for dryland ecosystems – if, for example, mobile livestock-keeping is replaced with other inappropriate forms of land use (Behnke and Kerven 2013; Krätli 2015). In this understanding pastoralism is not a ‘problem to be solved’, but rather an inherently sustainable and highly specialised production system that needs to be acknowledged and protected.

In contrast, a ‘transforming pastoralism and dryland areas’ discourse – common until recently within a great deal of UN and donor agency literature and, as this research reveals, to the fore in national climate change, development and agricultural policy-making in Ethiopia – holds that nomadic pastoralism is no longer viable in the face of climate change, population growth and increasing fragmentation of rangeland resources (Headey and Kennedy 2012; Headey et al. 2014). Pastoralists are viewed as resorting to ‘negative coping strategies’ – cattle-raiding, joining militant groups, encroachment into areas set-aside for conservation – so having a ‘maladaptive’ effect on others (Cervigni and Morris 2016). Hence the need for the ‘transformation of pastoralism’ and externally-directed and managed climate adaptation. Instead of being suitable for extensive livestock-keeping the drylands are seen as offering an opportunity for other, ‘more productive’, forms of investment.

Distinguishing between a ‘purist’ position on the one hand and a ‘transforming’ position on the other is not new (McPeak et al. 2011) but provides a useful basis on which to further develop my analytical framework. I have added a third, perspective – what I refer to as a ‘modern, mobile and green pastoralism’ discourse - the term ‘modern and mobile’ coming from the title of a 2009 book by IIED/SOS Sahel, with ‘green’ being added to reflect more contemporary concerns around environmental

change. This takes the middle ground, recognising pastoralists as entrepreneurs and innovators (Catley et al, 2013), and advocates for ‘improved pastoral area governance’ (Herrera et al. 2014; Davies et al. 2016), ‘diversification of livelihoods’ as a means to complement existing livestock-keeping (Dyer 2012; Fratkin 2013), and for pastoralists to be recognised for adding value to the ‘green economy’ (McGahey et al. 2014). It is important to stress that these three discourses are not necessarily mutually exclusive, or always clearly distinguishable.

### **Ethiopia’s policy context**

Arid and semi-arid pastoral areas comprise some 60% of the total land area in Ethiopia, with pastoralism estimated to support the livelihoods of close to 12 million people (FDRE-CSA 2013), making it the country with the most pastoralists in Africa. The major pastoral areas include Afar, Ethio-Somali, parts of Oromia, Gambella, and Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples’ Region (SNNPR). The average population growth rate in what have been described as pastoral *woredas* (administrative zones) in these five regional states is about 2.6 percent - deemed a high figure for pastoral areas, which are traditionally characterised by sparsely distributed populations covering vast areas (Gebremeskel et al. 2019). Exact figures on the numbers who are currently ‘settled pastoralists’ are harder to gage (Fratkin 2013). In recent decades, Ethiopia has experienced severe drought and food crises in parts of the country, most notably in 2011/12, and again in 2015/16. While evidence suggests that temperatures will continue to rise and climate change will mean greater rainfall variability there is still a great deal of uncertainty on how these trends will manifest (Funk et al. 2012; EPCC 2015).

That successive Ethiopian governments have been determined to transform the pastoralist way of life into a sedentary one and convert pastoral lands to other forms of land use is well documented (Lavers 2012; Galaty 2013; Little 2013; Abbink et al. 2014; Fratkin 2014; Yimer 2015; Regassa et al. 2019; Gebremeskel et al. 2019). Areas selected for appropriation are invariably the more fertile and strategic lands, such as those close to rivers, or areas offering potential for resource extraction and/or infrastructure development. Lands that may appear to some as ‘empty’, ‘marginal’ or ‘unused’ – or are claimed as such – are targeted for private and state investment, ignoring their function as critical dry-season grazing reserves (Mulatu and Bekure 2013; Mosley and Watson 2016; Regassa et al. 2019). In tandem, the widening gap between rich and poor and the related inequalities in power dynamics, as effected by many internal and external socio-economic factors, is creating unprecedented social stratification within pastoral areas (Catley and Akilu 2013; Krätli 2019). While there is a growing ‘pastoralist elite’ – pushed up by structural transformations and the ability of certain groups to take advantage of new investments and commercialisation of livestock production – Krätli (2019) reminds us that the vast majority of pastoralists in Ethiopia remain poor. The emergence of large-scale social-protection programmes in pastoral areas of Ethiopia over the last decade is symptomatic of this trend (Tsegay 2017). Yet these developments are generally perceived as part of a wider and necessary dynamic of commercialisation and growth (Krätli 2019).

In recent years, the state has been planning to resettle up to 1.5 million pastoralists under its ‘villagization’ programme, ostensibly intended to improve access to basic services, despite the often outright opposition of many communities to engage (Addis

2015; Oakland Institute 2019).<sup>1</sup> Customary claims to communal grazing land are rarely officially recognised and the best land is being progressively taken over for irrigated cultivation as the agricultural sector becomes more commercialised (Yimer 2015; Hodbod et al. 2019; Krätli 2019; Rettberg 2020) – a process actively encouraged by national policy frameworks.

According to Anbessa (2015), the restructuring of the Ethiopian state into ethnically based Regional States in 1994 gave hope that the longstanding sense of pastoralists being at the margins was finally being addressed. Article 40 (5) of the 1995 Constitution states that ‘Ethiopian pastoralists have the right to free land for grazing and cultivation as well as the right not to be displaced from their own lands’ (FDRE 1995). Several Regional State Proclamations (Afar, Somali) ‘guarantee the land-use rights of pastoralists’ (IGAD, 2016: 23). The establishment of the Pastoralist Affairs Standing Committee (PASC) in the Ethiopian parliament, the holding of an annual ‘National Pastoralists Day’, the setting up of Pastoral Commissions in several Regional States, and the formulation of a new *Pastoral Development Policy and Strategy* (PDP) in 2018, would appear to open up new opportunities for pastoralist policy engagement. It remains to be seen how effectively this policy will be implemented, especially at a time when the Ministry responsible for Pastoralist Affairs is likely to have shifted its attention to security concerns during a period of political instability.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, Ethiopia is in the process of implementing a number of climate-change and green economic growth policies and strategies – incentivised by the availability

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers actually resettled may be less than originally envisaged. A WB study reports that in 2017/18 in Afar State alone, 24,500 pastoralist households were relocated into 154 ‘commune centres’ (Gebremeskal et al. 2019).

<sup>2</sup> The Ministry for Federal and Pastoralist Development Affairs (MoFPDA) was renamed the ‘Ministry for Peace’ in late 2018.



of international climate finance and donor funding (Held et al. 2016). All policies are designed to align with broader national development policy frameworks, such as the 2015–2020 *Growth and Transformation Plan* (GTP II) and the 2011 *Climate Resilient Green Economy* (CRGE) Strategy. More recently Ethiopia has prepared a revised (2017) *National Adaptation Plan*, alongside working on the *Ending Drought Emergencies* (EDE) and other sector-specific resilience strategies. Ethiopia’s flagship *Productive Safety Net Programme* (PSNP) and its offshoot, the *Household Asset Building Programme* (HABP), have been extended to pastoral regions, such as Afar, and reframed by policymakers as a central component of Ethiopia’s climate-change adaptation efforts (FDRE/WB 2013).

## **Methodology**

Following a constructivist perspective, discourse analysis (DA) and semi-structured interviews were deemed appropriate tools for unpacking how certain ‘global’ discourses of climate governance and the green economy are used in drylands development policies and, in turn, how particular discourses and narratives around pastoralism are evident in climate policies. While not adhering strictly to a specific type of DA, the research was influenced by the work of several theorists associated with the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) ‘school’ (Fairclough 2001; van Dijk 2001), by Foucault’s understanding of power, as well as by environmental policy DA. For theorist Michel Foucault, the term ‘discourse’ does not refer to formal linguistic aspects, but to how the social world, expressed through language, is affected by various sources of power (Foucault 1990: 93). In other words, the use of language is not neutral but can be used to establish or legitimise social values and practices (van

Dijk 2001). Foucault's ideas on the production of discourse raise broader questions about the practices of government, and how 'public policy is formed, shaped and reshaped' (Hewitt 2009: 5). Analysis of discourses has the potential to show the link between political rhetoric and how discourses are created and maintained. Environmental discourse analyst Maarten Hajer (2006) proposes three tools to help identify discourses within research materials – 'metaphor', 'storyline' (narratives) and 'discourse coalitions' – an approach employed here. Metaphors are 2–3 word phrases or rhetorical devices that symbolise the key ideas of a discourse. Storylines, or narratives, encapsulate the essence of a discourse in shorthand, using the metaphors. 'Discourse coalitions' are defined as 'groups of actors that in the context of an identifiable set of practices, share the usage of a particular set of storylines over a particular period of time' (Hajer 2005: 302).

A criticism of DA is that it only operates at the 'micro' level of social order (i.e. language use) and can lead to an over-representation of what are minor shifts in language (van Dijk 2001). There is also a concern that the documents analysed are somehow not 'representative' of the main actors in the area, or that some texts remain hidden. Conscious of this, I was careful to review as many policy relevant documents related to climate change, green economy and drylands that had been produced in Ethiopia within a particular time period as was possible. Interviews were a useful means of crosschecking if the actors who participated were invoking similar discourses and narratives – in itself, evidence of the power of discourse.

It is useful at this point to briefly distinguish between what is meant by a policy, a strategy, a plan and a programme. A policy outlines the issues of concern, and the principles and goals required to guide decision-making around that issue. A strategy

in turn sets out how those goals will be achieved and what actions and measures are required. Plans and programmes are used for more detailed planning of the goals and objectives defined in the strategy (Aragrande and Argenti 2001). Throughout this article, I use the term ‘policy documents’ as an umbrella term to describe all government-formulated policies, strategies and plans. Of the 17 documents analysed (Table 1), 15 were, or are, national and/or sub-national policies or strategies, and include the principle government climate-change mitigation and adaptation policies and plans, two Regional State climate plans, several documents specific to the agriculture and/or livestock sector, a national development plan, as well as a policy document specific to development of pastoral areas.<sup>3</sup> The remaining two are an example of policy-relevant climate-resilience programme documents produced by donors and /or implementing partners in Ethiopia. These were selected to provide additional insight into international agency narratives.

2007 was deemed an appropriate starting point for analysis. In the run-up to the 13<sup>th</sup> COP to the UNFCCC, held in December 2007, developing countries were being encouraged to commit to GHG emissions reductions. Substantive finance for adaptation was also being made available through a newly established global Adaptation Fund. Consequently, 2007 was the year Ethiopia’s first *National Adaptation Programme of Action* (NAPA) was released.

---

<sup>3</sup> All of the policies reviewed were available in English and in the public domain when the documents were analysed in 2017 and 2018. It is possible that some may have been originally written in Amharic or other regional languages and subsequently translated into English, losing some nuance in the process,

Table 1: Sample of Ethiopian policy documents

Agency	Year	Title
FDRE-NMA	2007	<i>Ethiopian National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA)</i>
FDRE	2008	<i>Policy Statement for the Sustainable Development of the Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Areas of Ethiopia ('Pastoral Areas Policy')</i> <sup>4</sup>
FDRE	2010	<i>Afar Regional State Programme of Plan on Adaptation to Climate Change</i>
FDRE	2011a	<i>Somali Regional State Programme of Plan on Adaptation to Climate Change</i>
FDRE-MoA	2010	<i>Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) 2010–2020</i>
FDRE-EPA	2011	<i>Ethiopian Programme of Adaptation to Climate Change (EPACC)</i>
FDRE	2011b	<i>Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy (GES)</i>
FRDE/WB	2013	<i>Coping with Change: How Ethiopia's PSNP and HABP are building resilience to climate change</i>
FDRE	2014	<i>Growth and Transformation Plan 2 (GTP II) 2015–2020</i>
FDRE-MoA	2015	<i>Ethiopian Livestock Master Plan (LMP) 2015–2020</i>
FDRE	2015	<i>Nationally Determined Contributions of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia</i>
EPCC	2015	<i>EPCC Climate Change Working Group First Assessment Report: Impacts, Vulnerability, Adaptation and Mitigation – Agriculture and Food Security</i>
FDRE-MECC	2015a	<i>CRGE: Agriculture and Forestry Climate Resilience Strategy</i>
FDRE-MECC	2015b	<i>CRGE: Water and Energy Climate Resilience Strategy</i>
USAID / Mercy Corps	2016	<i>Climate Resilient Development Case Study – Ethiopia: Integrating climate change into market-based development programmes</i>
Farm Africa Ethiopia	2016	<i>Market Approaches to Resilience</i>

<sup>4</sup> The latest *Pastoral Development Policy and Strategy (2018)* was not included in the policy documents reviewed here, which only covers the period 2007-2017. For analysis of this policy see the *Quick Reference Tool* prepared by Krätli (2021) <http://www.celep.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Policy-reader-Short.pdf>

Agency	Year	Title
FDRE	2017	<i>National Adaptation Plan, Ethiopia's Climate Resilient Green Economy (NAP-ETH)</i> <sup>5</sup>

In addition, 32 interviews were held with informants whose knowledge and expertise included drylands development and/or climate change, from a range of policy actor groups and perspectives - including relevant government ministries, international agencies, local researchers and pastoralist organisations - during fieldwork in 2018. These generated original data that illuminated the themes that emerged in the preceding DA. A list of organisations and institutions from which interviewees were drawn is provided in Table 2.

It is likely that more interviews with certain actors - additional Regional State and local government officials, for example - would have added further insight. The fact that some civil servants may have been reluctant to offer views that could be perceived as in any way critical of state policy is acknowledged as a further limitation.

Table 2 – List of interviewee’s organisations

---

<sup>5</sup> The latest Ethiopian NAP was first published in 2017, which is the document analysed in this research. However, a revised NAP-ETH, with just some minor additions to the text, was prepared in 2019. Only the 2019 document is currently available online. See: <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/NAP-ETH%20FINAL%20VERSION%20%20Mar%202019.pdf>

<b>ETHIOPIA</b>		
<b>Name of Organisation</b>	<b>Type of Organisation</b>	<b>N. Partic.</b>
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Bi-lateral Aid agency	1
US AID	Bi-lateral Aid agency / Donor	1
World Bank	Donor	2
Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)	UN agency	2
Ministry for Agriculture and Natural Resources	Federal government ministry	2
Ministry for Environment, Forests and Climate Change	Federal government ministry	3
Ministry for Federal and Pastoral Development Affairs	Federal government ministry	1
Oromia Pastoral Area Development Commission	Regional State government commission	1
CARE Ethiopia	INGO	1
Misereor	INGO	1
Danish Church Aid	INGO	1
Christian Aid	INGO	1
Mercy Corps	INGO	2
SOS Sahel Ethiopia	INGO	1
Drylands Research Directorate, Ethiopian Institute for Agricultural Research	National research institute	1
Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University	International research organisation	2
The International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)	International research organisation	1
Climate and Development Knowledge Network (Ethiopia)	Research consortium	1
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)	International research institute	1
Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia	Pastoralist representative organisation	1
Oromia Pastoralist Association	Pastoralist representative organisation	1
Agricultural Policy Unit, African Union	Regional organisation	1
Freelance drylands development consultants, researchers	Local researchers	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>32</b>

## **Discourses and Narratives**

DA reveals that ‘transforming pastoralism and pastoral areas’ is the most dominant discourse across almost all documents analysed, with little change over time, despite some inroads made by emerging climate-resilience and green-economy narratives. Looking first of all at Ethiopia’s climate-change policies, from the first NAPA (2007) to the 2017 *National Adaptation Plan* (NAP-ETH), it is evident that, although there is a great deal of consensus on the climate vulnerability of drylands and pastoralists, the planned policy responses do differ somewhat on the importance of supporting pastoralist adaptation or on the role pastoralist mobility. In the NAPA, land degradation and poverty are framed in the same deterministic manner as Malthusian narratives of overpopulation (of people and livestock) and poverty and climate hazards leading to environmental degradation and food insecurity that have been a feature of drylands planning in the HoA for many decades. ‘Rain-fed farmers and pastoralists’ who are engaged in ‘coping mechanisms’ as they deal with climate

extremes are identified as ‘the most vulnerable’ (Ibid. 5). There is an assumption that existing systems are inefficient and unproductive, and some kind of intervention needs to take place. There is a need for ‘greater awareness about natural resource management amongst livestock keepers’ and for more ‘rational use of resources’ (Ibid. 33). Adaptation measures typically include: ‘improved/productive animal breeds to reduce herd size and its pressure on the land’, ‘promotion of grazing management’, ‘de-stocking’, and the introduction of ‘irrigation and mixed farming systems, where appropriate’ (Ibid. 40). There is a call for the ‘reorganisation of drought-affected community’ (Ibid. 44), a thinly disguised call for sedentarisation. In the *Ethiopian Programme of Adaptation to Climate Change* (EPACC) that replaced NAPA in 2011, there is some recognition of the positive role that mobility and the heterogeneity of drylands play in animal production. There are calls to ‘rehabilitate and manage dry-season rangelands through customary institutions’ (FDRE-EPA 2011: 38) and for ‘promotion of cross-border livestock trade’ (Ibid. 39). It is in the two Regional State adaptation plans where elements of a ‘pure pastoralism’ discourse and a more nuanced understanding of the causes of vulnerability can be found. Given that both regions are characterised by aridity, with pastoralism as the dominant production system, this is not surprising. The *Afar Plan* observes that ‘the vulnerability of pastoral communities to climate risks and shocks is thus more a consequence of their marginalization than climate change per se’ (FDRE, 2010: 3). Similarly, the *Somali Plan* maintains that ‘for a long time, a poor understanding of herding systems resulted in inappropriate policies that undermined pastoral development — such as by constraining herd mobility, leading pastoralists to become sedentary’ (FDRE, 2011a: 82). The same plan asserts that ‘climate alone is rarely the reason people fall into poverty; instead, it interacts with existing problems and makes

them worse' (Ibid. 8). In the language of CDA, the Afar and Somali texts can be read as 'sites of discursive struggle' (Hajer 2006: 73), in that they reveal traces of different discourses and ideologies struggling for dominance.

Ethiopia's 2017 NAP-ETH builds on the earlier NAPA and EPACC and is designed, according to its authors, to address the perception that climate change adaptation initiatives have been overly 'sector-specific, and regionally focused' (FDRE, 2017: 3). 'Short term coping mechanisms' in the predominantly pastoral regions of Afar, Somali and Oromia are deemed no longer sufficient in the face of climate-change. There is a need instead for 'building resilience and adaptive capacity for vulnerable communities' (Ibid. 12). Unlike the Regional adaptation plans, there is no reference to non-climatic drivers of vulnerability, or to pastoralists' own agency. Technical solutions – 'improved (livestock) breeding and feeding systems and improved pasture/grazing management', 'improving the resilience of value-chains and marketing systems for livestock', 'improved early-warning systems' and 'livestock insurance' - along with adaptation options that include 'livelihood diversification and voluntary resettlement', are once again to the fore (Ibid. 18-20).

A number of policies address the agriculture sector in the context of a changing climate. All of these documents contain a strong narrative thread of the need to intensify and commercialise agriculture – including the pastoral economy, in order to meet the twin imperative of tackling climate change and food insecurity, while also driving economic growth. Central to this transformation is the extension of commercial agriculture into 'under-utilised lowland areas' (FDRE-MOA, 2010: 6). The authors argue that the *Agriculture PIF* will lead to 'improving the adaptability of the agricultural sector to climate change and achieving national carbon neutrality by



2020' (Ibid. 28). There is no mention of mobile pastoralism as a viable production strategy. In the *GTP II* 'modernisation of agriculture' remains central to Ethiopia's vision for a *CRGE* (FDRE, 2014: 2). The target set for irrigation schemes is 4.1 million hectares by 2020, while the ambitious target for national forest coverage is 20% by end of *GTP II* (Ibid. 95). As afforestation means less land is available for livestock grazing, there are implications for the pastoral lowlands. *GTP II* states that the livestock sub-sector is 'still at the lowest state of development, being still dependent on backward production methods...efforts will be made transform the sub-sector' (Ibid. 122). Ethiopia's LMP (2015) sets out similar investment interventions to improve livestock-sector productivity, with only a small section devoted to pastoralism. Counternarratives to the dominant transforming discourse are found in the *EPCC Assessment Report* (2015), which focuses on agriculture and food security, offering insight into what messages are coming from the Ethiopian scientific community. While the *AR* typically portrays a bleak outlook on future climate impacts on the pastoral way of life, pastoralism is acknowledged as: 'a proven, adaptive livelihood system that supports human populations to inhabit one of the most remote and inhospitable regions of the world' (EPCC 2015: 185). 'Investing in pastoralism', the authors argue, can 'help secure livelihoods, conserve ecosystem services, promote wildlife conservation and strengthen cultural values and traditions' (Ibid. 209).

Several of the documents reviewed come under the umbrella of Ethiopia's vision for a '*Climate Resilient Green Economy*' (CRGE). The 2011 *GES* is the first of these. Agriculture and forestry are seen as offering the greatest 'GHG abatement potential' (Ibid. 28). The *GES* explicitly refers to the 'creation of new agricultural land in arid areas through irrigation ...agricultural land could be created from un-cultivated non-forest areas, thereby reducing emissions from the expansion of total cropland' (Ibid.

138). While there is no explicit mention of sedentarisation, the assumption that traditional pastoral systems are no longer viable is still strong. Policy prescriptions include: ‘reducing herd size and switching to more efficient livestock systems’, ‘improving (rangelands) to enhance their carbon-sequestration potential’ and encouraging ‘a partial shift towards lower emitting sources of protein’ (Ibid. 24). The theme of ‘climate resilience’ is also central to two sector-specific *CRGE* strategies produced in 2015. Drylands are identified as ‘highly vulnerable’ (FDRE/MECC, 2015a 21) to climate risk, with potentially ‘large impacts on livestock production and net revenues’ (Ibid. 38). Interestingly, the same document stresses ‘the need for resilience responses that are grounded in the local context’ (Ibid. 17). Despite revealing a broader understanding of resilience, the document contains little that has not been stated elsewhere, or that moves beyond a narrow focus on technocratic solutions. The second resilience strategy focuses on water and energy (FDRE/MECC, 2015b) setting out Ethiopia’s plans to expand irrigation and energy in peripheral areas, including Afar and Somali. Plans to expand forest cover, exploit renewable energy potential (notably hydropower) and reduce emissions from livestock are also at the heart of Ethiopia’s *NDC* commitments from 2015 (FDRE, 2015).

Two documents that are outside of state policymaking but nonetheless provide insight into how donors and INGOs are thinking, are the Farm Africa (2016) and USAID (2016) policy-briefings describing donor-funded resilience programmes. Here we might expect a ‘modern, mobile and green’ discourse to feature more prominently. However again there are mixed messages about the sustainability of the pastoral way of life. While the importance of ‘customary institutions’ is recognised and certain metaphors such as ‘resilience’, ‘adaptive management’ and even ‘green technologies’ are used, the (by now) familiar Malthusian narrative that traditional pastoralism is no

longer tenable in the face of climate change, population growth and other uncertainties is still predominant. Pastoralists ‘lack climate information and adaptation strategies, as well as the ability to effectively manage natural resources’ (USAID 2016: 2). ‘Market-based approaches’ and ‘diversification of livelihoods’ are offered as the primary means of improving the ‘resilience of vulnerable pastoralists’ (Ibid. 2). We gain little sense of pastoralists’ own agency and innovation being acknowledged. Instead, ‘resilience’ and ‘pastoral development’ are processes that only the state, donors or INGOs can facilitate and manage, with little space for valuing local or indigenous forms of knowledge and practice - arguably, a form of discursive power in the Foucauldian sense.

From the DA it is evident that there are mixed, and sometimes contradictory, messages on pastoralism emanating from Ethiopian policy-making. These emerge from a predominant discourse that, for the main part, believes in state-mediated commercialisation and ‘transformation’ of the Ethiopian pastoral lowlands. Across all documents reviewed, the impact of climate change and the drive for rapid (green) economic growth and food security are clearly guiding narratives for mobilising support for this vision – just as similar narratives of desertification and ‘tragedy of the commons’ shaped drylands planning in the past (Swift 1996; Adams 2009). Although mobile pastoralism is acknowledged as a proven adaptive livelihood strategy in some documents, any positive direct references to pastoralism are lost in the overall negative representations.

### **Policy Actors and their interests**

Interviews revealed that government actors were more likely to frame contemporary challenge facing pastoral areas in terms of a naturalistic understanding of vulnerability while prescribing largely technocratic solutions – matching the dominant ‘transforming pastoralism’ discourse found in documents analysed. Pastoralist mobility is essentially seen as a fixed ‘coping strategy’ no longer sufficient for dealing with the uncertainties brought about by climate change and shrinking rangelands, with pastoralists becoming *‘dependent on government interventions’*, or exiting pastoralism altogether. Competition for diminishing resources is deemed a primary driver of conflict. Such naturalistic framings of the causes of conflict tend to obscure the many and complex factors that were undoubtedly behind an upsurge in inter-group clashes in Ethiopia in 2018 and 2019<sup>6</sup>, or ignore the fact that the most valuable lands are being targeted by investors with other uses in mind.

As we have seen, ‘environmental-crises’ and ‘resource-scarcity’ narratives are frequently evoked to amplify the perception that some kind of intervention is necessary. There was consensus amongst officials interviewed that there is a need to *‘build the resilience and adaptive capacity’* of pastoralists in the face of drought and other ‘shocks’.<sup>7</sup> Their respective Ministries were working hard to provide key infrastructure and social services, water development, ‘improved rangeland management’ and ‘improved marketing of livestock’. For these informants, such interventions are not only a means to develop the hitherto untapped potential of Ethiopia’s lowlands, but also a precursor to the creation of *‘climate-resilient livelihoods’*. Referring to the new PDP, one senior civil-servant asserted that: *‘The*

---

<sup>6</sup> Despite the reform process underway since 2018, ethnic-based conflicts persisted in several parts of Ethiopia in 2018 and 2019, most notably along the border between Oromia and Benishangul-Gumuz regions, and across Ethiopia’s Oromia and Somali Regions, with large numbers displaced.

<sup>7</sup> Interview with MoECC official, 30/05/2018.

*whole idea of the policy framework and strategic thinking is to create resilient pastoralism ... resilience in terms of diversified livelihoods*'.<sup>8</sup> The view that settlement in one place means formerly marginalised pastoralists could avail of better services, and avoid the worst affects of natural hazards, was frequently expressed. While this discourse predates concerns about climate change, climate-resilience and climate-adaptation interventions described thus far have clearly been absorbed by the transforming discourse – giving credence to the argument that narratives shift to suit the needs of actors as new opportunities arise and new contexts unfold (Otto-Naess et al. 2015).

For state actors such as the MoFPDA, partnership with other Ministries, with donors, with dryland 'experts', as well as with pastoralist leaders and CSOs like the Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia adds a layer of credibility to their policy initiatives. The potential to attract donor funding was undoubtedly a contributory factor when developing the PDP.<sup>9</sup> Stakeholder consultations in turn satisfy the concerns of international donors, even if – according to several non-state informants – they rarely reach out beyond a select group.<sup>10</sup> For one international researcher, while the rhetoric may talk of 'resilience' and 'climate smart', the motivations and interests of powerful actors in terms of accessing new funds and knowledge around the green economy remain the same: the pastoral lowlands of Ethiopia are being targeted – not for what

---

<sup>8</sup> Interview with MoFPDA official, 25/05/2018.

<sup>9</sup> In 2019, the WB approved \$350 million in the form of concessional credit and grants for a major '*Lowlands Livelihood Resilience Project*'. <http://www.mofed.gov.et/hi/web/guest/-/ethiopia-signs-financing-agreement-with-the-world-bank>.

<sup>10</sup> Several interviewees asserted that the WB and USAID have both been influential in the push for the new PDP and bringing different interest groups together around a common agenda.

they can bring to pastoralists, but rather as a ‘new frontier’ for investment and as means of extending state control and security to border areas.<sup>11</sup>

Non-state actors, utilising metaphors and narratives more usually associated with ‘pure pastoralist’ and ‘modern and mobile’ discourses, were more likely to point towards the increased trend of privatisation and fragmentation of formerly communal lands as undermining pastoralist’s inherent adaptive capacity. Several donor representatives acknowledged gaps in policy coherence and policy implementation. According to one:

*The Government needs to recognise the importance of mobility and customary institutions and move away from any enforced villagization. Local land-use plans would help, as would an overarching land-use policy.*<sup>12</sup>

There was an assumption amongst donor officials interviewed that incorporating pastoralists into the market economy was necessary for pastoralists to adapt to climate change. Pastoralists could benefit from irrigated land ‘set-aside’ for growing pasture, and from ‘outgrower schemes’<sup>13</sup>.

*Transformation is not just changing pastoralists to agrarians. But improving their production system...The two (mobility and commercialisation) are actually compatible. Those people who stay in the system are going to benefit from the market, from the demand for livestock. So the system will continue to grow, but with commercialisation.*<sup>14</sup>

INGO staff and dryland researchers interviewed were cognisant of the hardships caused by recurrent drought, but several felt there is still too much uncertainty to

---

<sup>11</sup> Interview with international researcher, 12/05/2018.

<sup>12</sup> Interview with USAID official, 29/05/2018.

<sup>13</sup> Interview with WB official, 23/05/2018.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

reach definitive conclusions about future climate impacts. For these informants, pastoralists have shown that they are capable of adapting and innovating in the face of climate and other forms of change. Pastoralists are taking advantage of new market opportunities and technologies, such as the use of mobile phones, mobile money and trucks to transport livestock. Instead of calling for reduced livestock emissions, as the various CRGE strategies discussed above do, these actors advocate instead for recognition of the critical role pastoral systems play in maintaining rangeland ecosystems, meeting food security needs and offering an adaptive land-use system in the face of climate change. Pastoralist organisation representatives in particular were eager to counter the perception that pastoralists were culturally resistant to change, or reluctant to sell livestock before a drought. The extent, nonetheless, to which these actors' narratives have informed actual policy still remains limited. The reasons for this evidently lie in the highly centralised nature of Ethiopian policymaking in general and the fact that for many years CSOs were severely restricted from engaging in rights-based or advocacy work under the *Charities and Civil Society Proclamation*.<sup>15</sup> As a consequence they have been reluctant to challenge mainstream narratives (around villagization for example) for fear of reprobation. According to one interviewee: *'It's ok to talk about delivering services in pastoral areas, but not rights*.<sup>16</sup> CSOs that support pastoralists, have nonetheless, according to several informants, sought to influence policy discourse by other means – by cultivating contacts with key individuals within government ministries and state agencies, or by using their wider contacts to influence policy at regional level.

---

<sup>15</sup> This legislation was replaced in late 2018 under a new Civil Society Proclamation.

<https://freedomhouse.org/article/ethiopia-civil-society-proclamation-advances-essential-freedoms>

<sup>16</sup> Interview with INGO staff, 23/05/2018

## **‘Winners and Losers’**

The outcomes that flow from policy narratives have consequences for future pastoralist pathways in Ethiopia and thus deserve consideration. Unsurprisingly, the views of government informants interviewed were largely positive about Ethiopia’s climate-change, green-economy and broader pastoral-area-development policies and programmes. These officials asserted that new policies, and support towards formerly peripheral pastoral areas in general, are bringing benefits, especially in terms of improved services and infrastructure, and are part of a wider dynamic of economic growth. According to a senior official, pastoral development programmes are now *‘linking the pastoralist economy to the agricultural economy...this is a positive engagement, an economic link, rather than pastoralists feeling themselves as marginalised, or as out of the economy.’*<sup>17</sup> Similarly, for one MoECC official, the latest NAP:

*Brings positive change ... there are measures for example, early warning systems will help them (pastoralists) to prepare before they are affected by droughts and floods. Irrigation may help them minimise the effect of drought. Infrastructure helps to protect against the impact of floods.*<sup>18</sup>

According to a MoA official, Ethiopia’s flagship PSNP has taken on board the kind of integrated drylands development thinking found in such regional (HoA) initiatives as

---

<sup>17</sup> Interview with MoFPDA official, 25/05/2018.

<sup>18</sup> Interview with MoECC official, 30/05/2018.



the RPLP<sup>19</sup> and is now: *‘very supportive (of pastoralism) ...now the future is in drought resilience.’*<sup>20</sup>

In contrast non-state actors interviewed were sceptical about the extent pastoralists and pastoral areas were really benefitting from strategies such as the *CRGE*. According to one:

*The green economy is more concerned with taking primary resources from pastoral areas, such as livestock, while processing or value-addition is at the highlands.*<sup>21</sup>

Several felt that the *CRGE* (in its initial phase) was overly focused on mitigation at the expense of adaptation, despite what they perceived as compelling evidence for the latter. Plans to extend tree-cover, exploit renewable-energy potential and reduce emissions from livestock are also at the heart of Ethiopia’s NDC targets (FDRE, 2015). While rural electrification is considered a priority for pastoral areas, hydropower schemes – such as the controversial Gibe III dam on the Omo River – have been constructed primarily with agricultural intensification and energy exports in mind. While government officials were reticent about discussing the negative consequences of infrastructure development – several non-state informants spoke of how these ‘mega-projects’ have led to the human-rights violations among indigenous agro-pastoralists in the Lower Omo Valley. Thousands who have been displaced by the conversion of former grazing land to irrigated sugar plantations and by associated resettlement. Affirming what has been documented extensively elsewhere (Kefale and Gebresenet 2014; Hodbod et al. 2018; Oakland Institute 2019; Regassa et al. 2019)

---

<sup>19</sup> The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) *Regional Pastoralist Livelihoods Programme* (RPLP).

<sup>20</sup> Interview with MoA official, 22/05/2018.

<sup>21</sup> Interview with INGO staff, 15/05/2018.

and in media reports.<sup>22</sup> Only in recent years has such displacement been acknowledged by senior officials in government.<sup>23</sup> There is clearly a risk that technocratic policy prescriptions in the name of climate mitigation or adaptation (irrigation, or satellite-based early-warning systems, for example) that are not cognisant of customary institutions and strategies (such as mobility) will repeat the development mistakes of earlier drylands interventions in the 1980s and 1990s - such as concentrating people and livestock around boreholes. Water development, for many years a core element of Ethiopia's sedentarisation programme and now also central to the CRGE strategy, was highlighted as particularly problematic. In the words of one non-state informant, water provision can be:

*Devastating to these lowland areas, particularly when they are putting in water in the wet-season grazing areas...and of course, they couch it in terms of helping with climate change.*<sup>24</sup>

At the same time, while many pastoralists are clearly feeling the negative effects of the kinds of transformations that are described above, others are taking advantage of new opportunities such as the growth in cross-border and international livestock markets. There was a view amongst government officials, donors and some researchers that those who were able to grow their herds, have access to markets and diversify were better placed to avail of these opportunities. For others, livestock

---

<sup>22</sup> In 2019, there were reports of ongoing human-rights abuses by the Ethiopian military against Bodi and Mursi agropastoralists in Lower Omo. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2019/oct/21/the-nobel-peace-prize-can-inspire-abiy-ahmed-to-new-heights-in-ethiopia>

<sup>23</sup> At a seminar in April 2019, Government Minister Seyoum Mesfin stated that the new government recognised that certain 'development interventions in the pastoralist areas ... came with a cost' <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2019/jun/13/state-projects-leave-tens-of-thousands-of-lives-in-the-balance-in-ethiopia-study>

<sup>24</sup> Interview with INGO staff, 15/05/2018.

ownership is increasingly ‘concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of people’.<sup>25</sup> This new class of livestock owners:

*Start to appropriate land and water. You get this privatisation of rangeland, which makes it more and more difficult for the poor guys to stay in the system.*<sup>26</sup>

Although wealth disparity is not a new phenomenon among pastoralists (Catley and Aklilu 2013; Korf et al. 2015), it is evident that there are growing social inequities, with some groups emerging as ‘winners’ from the transformation of Ethiopia’s predominantly pastoral lowlands, and others ‘losing out’ in the process. The winners include the state itself – in terms of a growing national economy and increased agricultural export earnings, as well as its claim to have achieved greater national energy and food security (USAID 2018), investors who have moved into the fertile riparian areas of the lowlands to take advantage of changes in land-use, as well as a new commercial class of wealthier pastoralists who have profited from a lucrative regional and international market for livestock, and/or who can afford to diversify their interests. Poorer pastoralists, meanwhile, who make up the majority of pastoralists in Ethiopia (Krätli 2019; World Bank 2020), and whose mobility and access to critical seasonal rangeland resources is increasingly restricted by changes in land-use and infrastructure development, are evidently the ‘losers’ from the kinds of changes described thus far. It is these groups who have found it hard to rebuild their herds after successive droughts, many falling into destitution as a result (Gebremeskal et al. 2019). Facing particular challenges, as we saw above, are minority indigenous agro-pastoralist ethnic groups, such as those inhabiting the Lower Omo Valley, who have been displaced from their traditional lands to make way for industrial sugarcane

---

<sup>25</sup> Interview with international researcher, 11/05/2018.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

cultivation, as well as pastoralist communities along the interface between Somali Regional State and Oromia displaced by growing ethnic and political tensions.<sup>27</sup>

There are some signs for optimism. The MoA with the support of USAID is developing a comprehensive national Land Use Policy (Haddis et al. 2017): Local land-use plans would in turn offer:

*A type of protection against further fragmentation, and beyond that, by improving this rangeland, by reseeding or removing invasive species, etc ... you are showing that you're using the land productively and you're investing in rangelands. That's also a form of security.*<sup>28</sup>

Several informants, cited the USAID-supported LAND<sup>29</sup> project in Borana zone as an example of where a customary land-tenure system with traditional grazing area units (*dheeda*) has been formally recognised, and which offers potential to be replicated elsewhere.

## **Conclusion**

While pastoralism may no longer be considered as 'backward', or the antithesis to the modern state, to the extent it was in the past, and that the language of 'climate resilience' and 'green growth' has evidently been absorbed by state actors as a means to rationalise government-mediated development interventions, this research finds that a discourse built around the transformation and accelerated development of what

---

<sup>27</sup> Tens of thousands of ethnic Oromo were reported to have been evicted from Somali region during 2017 and 2018, with similar numbers of Somali displaced from Oromia in retaliation.

<https://qz.com/africa/1411519/ethiopias-ethnic-violence-history-with-oromos-amharas-somalis-tigray/>

<sup>28</sup> Interview with international researcher, 14/05/2018.

<sup>29</sup> Land Administration to Nurture Development (LAND) programme.

were once considered peripheral pastoral areas remains dominant within state-led policy-making in Ethiopia. Dovetailing with the interests of donors and other development actors, ‘building resilience’ provides a convenient means for the Ethiopian state of mobilising climate finance and other support for such a vision. Technocratic policy prescriptions are, in turn, largely privileged over measures that would strengthen pastoralist land-rights, or critically, protect mobility. And while land appropriation in Ethiopia’s pastoralist areas is clearly not a new phenomenon, this research provides further evidence to support the argument that the state is using ‘new’ concerns over climate change, food security and need for green economic growth to legitimise, and profit from, the re-emergence, or continuation, of past unpopular policies and programmes – namely sedentarisation, large infrastructure development, and the replacement of mobile livestock production with irrigated cropping. All of which serve to exacerbate the displacement and vulnerability of certain groups. While adaptation, drought resilience and social protection policies and measures may reduce some of the risk to these groups in the short term, they do not necessarily address the development needs and rights of pastoralists that enable them to adapt to climatic and other uncertainties in the longer term.

Ultimately, policies and interventions in the name of climate-change adaptation and pastoralist development need to be considered within the context of political interests and governance in pastoral areas. Climate-adaptation and resilience-building types of policies and programming on their own, whether well-intentioned, or, as we have seen, designed with other interests and priorities in mind, are clearly insufficient to address the multiple challenges faced by pastoralists, not least restrictions on mobility and the loss of access to key resources. The extent and nature of change in the Ethiopian drylands call for political responses that address social inequities and power

imbalances, that safeguard pastoralists' resource rights, and that allow for more inclusive forms of governance. Further research to determine to what extent implementation of Ethiopia's various climate resilience plans and programmes lead to a fair distribution of benefits, particularly with regards the economic, political and social trade-offs at the local level, would be of significant interest.

### Bibliography

- Abbink, J., K. Askey, D.F. Dori, E. Fratkin, E.C. Gabbert, J. Galaty, S. LaToskey, J. Lydall, H. Mahmoud, J. Markakis, G. Shlee, I. Strecker and D. Turton. 2014. 'Lands of the Future: Transforming Pastoral Lands and Livelihoods in Eastern Africa'. *Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Working Papers. WP number 154*, Halle Salle, Germany: Max Planck Institute.
- Adams, W.M. 2009. *Green Development* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). London: Routledge.
- Addis, E. 2015. 'Implementation of Government Development Strategies on Afar Pastoralists in Ethiopia'. In Abera, Y. and M. Abdulahi (eds), *The Intricate Road to Development: Government Development Strategies in the Pastoral Areas of the Horn of Africa*. Addis Ababa: IPSS, Addis Ababa University. . pp. 106-144
- Adger, W.N., T.A. Nenjaminsen, K. Browne, and H. Svarstad. 2001. 'Advancing a Political Ecology of Environmental Discourses'. *Development and Change* 32(4): 681–715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00222>
- African Union (AU). 2010. *Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities*. Addis Ababa: Dept. of Rural Economy and Agriculture, African Union.
- Anbessa, M.D. 2015. 'Ethiopian pastoralist policy at a crossroads: further marginalisation or revitalisation?' In Abera, Y. and M. Abdulahi (eds), *The Intricate Road to Development: Government Development Strategies in the Pastoral Areas of the Horn of Africa*. IPSS, Addis Ababa University. pp. 16-71
- Aragrande, M. and Argenti, O. 2001. *Studying Food Supply and Distribution Systems to Cities in Developing Countries and Countries in Transition – Methodological and Operational Guide*. Rome: FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-x6996e.pdf> (Accessed 16 June 2020)

- Behnke, R.H., I. Scoones, I. and C. Kerven (eds). 1993. *Range Ecology at Disequilibrium: New Models of Natural Variability and Pastoral Adaptation in African Savannas*. London: ODI.
- Behnke, R.H., and C. Kerven. 2013. 'Counting the costs: replacing pastoralism with irrigated agriculture in the Awash Valley'. In Catley, A., J. Lind, and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 57–70. London Routledge.
- Bekure, S. 2018. 'Formally recognising pastoral community land rights in Ethiopia.' *Land-Links*. USAID. <https://www.land-links.org/2018/03/formally-recognizing-pastoral-community-land-rights-in-ethiopia/> (Accessed 08 February 2021)
- Catley, A and Y. Aklilu. 2013. 'Moving up, or moving out? Commercialisation, growth and destitution in pastoralist areas'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa; Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 85–97. London: Routledge.
- Catley, A., J. Lind, and I. Scoones. 2013. 'Development at the Margins: Pastoralism in the Horn of Africa'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa; Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 1–26. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203105979>
- Catley, A. 2017 *Pathways to Resilience in Pastoralist Areas: A Synthesis of Research in the Horn of Africa*. Boston: Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University.
- Cervigni, R. and Morris, M. 2016. *Confronting Drought in Africa's Drylands: Opportunities for Enhancing Resilience*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- Davies, J., P. Herrera, J. Ruiz-Mirazo, J. Mohamed-Katerere, I. Hannan and E. Nuesri. 2016. 'Improving governance of pastoral lands: Implementing the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security', *FAO Governance of Tenure Technical Guide 6*. Rome: FAO.
- Death, C. 2016. 'Green states in Africa: beyond the usual suspects'. *Environmental Politics* 25(1): 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2015.1074380>
- Dryzek, J. 2013. *The Politics of the Earth; Environmental Discourses (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dyer, K.W. 2012. 'Pastoralists in the Horn of Africa; Diverse livelihood pathways', *CAADP Policy Brief 06*. Brighton: Future Agricultures Consortium, IDS, University of Sussex
- Ericksen P., J. de Leeuw, P. Thornton, M. Herrero and A. Notenbaert. 2013. 'Climate change in Sub-Saharan Africa: What consequences for pastoralism?' In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 71–81. London: Routledge.
- EPCC 2015. *EPCC Climate Change Working Group First Assessment Report: Impacts, Vulnerability, Adaptation and Mitigation – Agriculture and Food Security*. [http://www.eas-et.org/new/images/docs//EPCC\\_Reports/Agriculture%20and%20Food%20Security.pdf](http://www.eas-et.org/new/images/docs//EPCC_Reports/Agriculture%20and%20Food%20Security.pdf) (Accessed 30 June 2017)

Fairclough, N. 2001. 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a method in social scientific research'. In Wodak, R. and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods in Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 121–138. London: SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020.n6>

Farm Africa Ethiopia 2016. *Market Approaches to Resilience*. <http://www.farmafrica.org/downloads/resources/braced-market-approaches-to-resilience.pdf> (Accessed 30 June 2017).

FDRE 1995. *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia*. <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/lexdocs/laws/en/et/et007en.pdf> (Accessed 18 June 2019).

FDRE 2007. *National Adaptation Plan of Action*. [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8522\\_eth01.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8522_eth01.pdf) (Accessed 25 May 2016).

FDRE 2010. *Afar Regional State Programme of Plan on Adaptation to Climate Change*. [http://www.academia.edu/18627729/Afar\\_National\\_Regional\\_State\\_Climate\\_Change\\_Adaptation\\_prog](http://www.academia.edu/18627729/Afar_National_Regional_State_Climate_Change_Adaptation_prog) (Accessed 30 June 2017).

FDRE 2011a. *Somali Regional State Programme of Plan on Adaptation to Climate Change*. <http://www4.unfccc.int/nap/Documents/Climate%20Change%20Impacts,%20Vulnerabilities%20and%20Adaptation%20Strategies%20in%20Somali%20Region.pdf> (Accessed 30 June 2017).

FDRE 2011b. *Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy*. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/ethiopia/docs/Ethiopia%20CRGE.pdf> (Accessed 30 June 2017).

FDRE 2014. *Growth and Transformation Plan 2, 2015-2020*. [http://dagethiopia.org/new/images/DAG\\_DOCS/GTP2\\_English\\_Translation\\_Final\\_June\\_21\\_2016.pdf](http://dagethiopia.org/new/images/DAG_DOCS/GTP2_English_Translation_Final_June_21_2016.pdf) (Accessed 30 June 2017).

FDRE 2015. *Nationally Determined Contributions of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia* <http://www4.unfccc.int/ndcregistry/PublishedDocuments/Ethiopia%20First/INDC-Ethiopia-100615.pdf> (Accessed: 30 June 2017).

FDRE 2017. *National Adaptation Plan, Ethiopia's Climate Resilient Green Economy*. <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/NAP-ETH%20FINAL%20VERSION%20%20Mar%202019.pdf>

FDRE-EPA 2011. *Ethiopian Programme of Adaptation to Climate Change*. Addis Ababa: Environmental Protection Agency.

FDRE-MECC 2015a. *Climate Resilience Green Economy: Agriculture and Forestry Climate Resilience Strategy*. [http://ggi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/CRGE\\_AgF\\_FINAL.compressed.pdf](http://ggi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/CRGE_AgF_FINAL.compressed.pdf) (Accessed: 30 June 2017).

FDRE-MECC 2015b. *Climate Resilience Green Economy: Water and Energy Climate Resilience Strategy*. <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/eth170274.pdf> (Accessed: 5 January 2022).



- FDRE-MoA 2010. *Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework 2010-2020*. <https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC149550/> (Accessed: 5 January 2022).
- FDRE-MoA 2015. *Ethiopian Livestock Master Plan (LMP) 2015-2020: Roadmaps for Growth and Transformation*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283781705\\_Ethiopia\\_livestock\\_master\\_plan\\_Road\\_maps\\_for\\_growth\\_and\\_transformation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283781705_Ethiopia_livestock_master_plan_Road_maps_for_growth_and_transformation) (Accessed 30 June 2017).
- FRDE/WB 2013. *Coping with Change: How Ethiopia's PSNP and HABP are building resilience to climate change*. [http://www.ltsi.co.uk/images/M\\_images/PSNP%20Coping%20with%20Change.pdf](http://www.ltsi.co.uk/images/M_images/PSNP%20Coping%20with%20Change.pdf)
- FDRE Central Statistics Agency 2013. *Population Projection of Ethiopia for all Regions at Woreda Level from 2014-2017*, Addis Ababa: CSA.
- Foucault, M. 1990. *The history of sexuality, Volume 1: an introduction*. London: Penguin
- Fratkin E. 2013. 'Seeking alternative livelihoods in pastoral areas'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 197–205. London: Routledge,
- Fratkin E. 2014. 'Ethiopia's pastoralist policies: development, displacement, and resettlement', *Nomadic Peoples* 18(1): 94–114. <https://doi.org/10.3197/np.2014.180107>
- Funk, C., J. Rowland, G. Eilerts, E. Kebebe, N. Biru, L. White and G. Galu. 2012. *A Climate Trend Analysis of Ethiopia, U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2012–3053*. [https://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2012/3053/FS12-3053\\_ethiopia.pdf](https://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2012/3053/FS12-3053_ethiopia.pdf) (Accessed: 13 July 2020).
- Galaty J.G. 2013. 'Land grabbing in the Eastern African Rangelands'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp.143–153. London: Routledge.
- Gebremeskal, E.N., S. Desta and G.K. Kassa. 2019. *Pastoral Development in Ethiopia: Trends and the way forward*. Washington DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/31818>
- Haddis, Z., S. Bekure, A. Dagne, T. Gebremeskel and B. Tafere. 2017. *Ethiopia's Move to a National Integrated Land Use Policy and Land Use Plan*. Paper presented at the 2017 World Bank Conference on Land and Poverty, The WB, Washington DC, March 20–24 2017. [https://land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/USAID\\_Land\\_Tenure\\_WB17\\_Ethiopia\\_Move\\_Land\\_Use\\_Plan.pdf](https://land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/USAID_Land_Tenure_WB17_Ethiopia_Move_Land_Use_Plan.pdf) (Accessed 26/01/2018).
- Hajer, M.A. 2005. 'Coalitions, practices, and meaning in environmental politics: From acid rain to BSE'. In Howarth, D. and J. Torfing (eds), *Discourse Theory in European Politics*, pp. 297–315. London: Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523364\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523364_13)
- Hajer, M.A. 2006. 'Doing discourse analysis: coalitions, practices, meaning'. In van den Brink, M. and T. Metzger (eds), *Words matter in policy and planning: discourse theory and method in the social sciences*, pp. 65–74. Netherlands Geographical Studies 344. Utrecht:

KNAG/Nethur.

Halderman, M. 2004. 'The political economy of pro-poor livestock policy-making in Ethiopia'. *Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) Working Paper No. 19*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

Headey, D. and Kennedy, A. 2012. *Enhancing Resilience in the Horn of Africa*. Washington DC: USAID and IFPRI

Headey, D., Taffesse, A.S., and You, L. 2014. 'Diversification and development in pastoralist Ethiopia', *World Development* 56: 200–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.015>

Held, D., C. Roger and E. Nag. 2013. 'Ethiopia's path to a climate resilient green economy'. In: Held, D., C. Roger and E. Na (eds), *Climate Governance in the Developing World*, pp. 218–237. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Herrera, P.M., J. Davies and P. Manzano-Bena (eds) 2014. *The Governance of Rangelands: Collective Action for Sustainable Pastoralism*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315768014>

Herrero, M., J. Addison, C. Bedalian, E.A. Carabine, P. Havlik, B. Henderson, J. van de Steeg and P.K. Thornton. 2016. 'Climate Change and pastoralism: impacts, consequences and adaptation', *Rev. Sci. Tech. Off. Int. Epiz* 35(2), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.20506/rst.35.2.2533>

Hodbod, J., E. Stevenson, G. Akall, T. Akuja, I. Angelei, E.A. Bedasso, L. Buffavand, S. Derbyshire, I. Eulenberger, N. Gownaris, B. Kamski, A. Kurewa, M. Lokuruka, M.F. Mulugeta, D. Okenwa, C. Rodgers, E. Tebbs. 2018. 'Social-ecological change in the Omo-Turkana Basin; synthesis of current developments', *Ambio* 48(10): 1099–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-018-1139-3>

Hewitt, S. (2009) 'Discourse Analysis and public policy research', *Centre for Rural Economy Discussion Paper Series No. 24*, Newcastle University. [<http://ippra.com/attachments/article/207/dp24Hewitt.pdf>] (Accessed 05 January 2018)

Keeley, J. and I. Scoones. 2003. *Understanding Environmental Policy processes: Cases from Africa*. London: Earthscan.

Kefale, A., and F. Gebresenbet. 2014. 'The Expansion of the Sugar Industry in the Southern Pastoral Lands.' In Rahmato, D., M. Ayenew, A. Kefale and B. Haberman (eds), *Reflections on Development in Ethiopia: New Trends, Sustainability and Challenges*. Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies. <https://www.fssethiopia.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Reflections-on-Development.pdf> (Accessed 05 February 2021).

Korf, B., T. Hagmann and R. Emmenegger. 2015. 'Re-spacing African drylands: Territorialisation, sedentarisation and indigenous commodification in the Ethiopian pastoral frontier'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 42(5): 881-901. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2015.1006628>

Krätli, S. 2015. *Valuing Variability: New Perspectives on Climate Resilient Drylands Development*. London: IIED.

Krätli, S. 2019. *Pastoral Development Orientation Framework: Focus on Ethiopia*. Bischöfliches Hilfswerk MISEREOR e.V., Aachen, Germany. <http://www.celep.info/wp->

[content/uploads/2019/09/2019-Misereor-pastoral-development-orientation-framework.pdf](#)  
(Accessed 15 March 2020).

Lavers, T. 2012. 'Patterns of agrarian transformation in Ethiopia: State mediated commercialisation and the 'land grab''. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39(3–4): 795–822.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.660147>

Little, P.D. 2013. 'Reflections on the future of pastoralism in the Horn of Africa?'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, pp. 243–249. London: Routledge.

McGahey, D., J. Davies, N. Hagelberg and R. Ouedraogo. 2014. *Pastoralism and the Green Economy – a natural nexus?* Nairobi: IUCN and UNEP.

McPeak, J., P.D. Little and .R. Doss. 2011. *Risk and Social Change in African Rural Economies; Livelihoods in Pastoralist Communities*. London: Taylor and Francis.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203805824>

Mosley, J. and E.E. Watson. 2016. 'Frontier transformations: Development visions, spaces and processes in Northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia'. *Journal of East African Studies* 10(3): 452–475.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2016.1266199>

Morris, J.R. 1998. 'Under 3 flags: The policy environment for pastoralism in Ethiopia and Kenya', *SR/GL-CRSP Pastoral Risk Management Project Technical Report No 04/99*. Utah State University.

Mulatu, A. and S. Bekure. 2013. 'The need to strengthen land laws in Ethiopia to protect pastoral rights'. In Catley, A., J. Lind and I. Scoones (eds), *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*. pp. 86–194. London: Routledge.

Naimer-Fuller, M. (ed.) 1999. *Managing mobility in African Rangelands: The Legitimization of Transhumance*, London: IT Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780442761>

Oakland Institute 2019, "How they tricked us": *Living with Gibe III and sugarcane plantations in Southwest Ethiopia*.  
<https://www.oaklandinstitute.org/sites/oaklandinstitute.org/files/ethiopia-tricked-gibe-dam-sugarcane-plantations.pdf> (Accessed 22 July 2020).

Odhiambo, M. (2014) 'The unrelenting persistence of certain narratives: An analysis of changing policy narratives about the ASALs in Kenya', *IIED Country Report*. London, IIED.

Otto Naess, L., P. Newell, A. Newsham, J. Phillips, J. Quan and T. Tanner. 2015. 'Climate policy meets national development contexts: Insights from Kenyan and Mozambique', *Global Environmental Change* 35: 534–544.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.015>

Regassa, A., Y. Hizekieland B. Korf. 2019. 'Civilizing the pastoral frontier: land grabbing, dispossession and coercive agrarian development in Ethiopia'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 46(5): 935–955.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1420060>

- Rettberg, S. 2020. 'Shifting regimes of violence within Ethiopia's Awash investment frontier'. In Lind, J., D. Okenwa and I. Scoones (eds), *Land Investment and Politics: Reconfiguring Eastern Africa's Pastoral Drylands*, pp. 166–176. Suffolk: James Currey.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvxhrjct.20>
- Roe, E.M. 1991. 'Development Narratives, or making the best of blueprint development'. *World Development* 19(4): 287–300.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(91\)90177-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(91)90177-J)
- Scoones, I. (ed.) 1995. *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. London: IT Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780445335>
- Scoones, I., R. Smalley, R. Hall and D. Tsikata. 2019. 'Narratives of scarcity: framing the global land rush'. *Geoforum* 101: 231–241.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.06.006>
- Swift, J. 1996. 'Desertification narratives, winners and losers'. In Leach, M. and R Mearns (eds), *The Lie of the Land: Challenging received wisdom on the African environment*. London and Oxford, James Currey
- Tsegay, B. 2017. 'Critical reflections on safety net policies and practices with respect to social protection among pastoral peoples in Sub-Saharan Africa'. *SPIDA Working Paper Series* <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/25767/1/tsegay-SPIDA-social-protection-in-SSA.pdf> (accessed 5 January 2022).
- USAID / Mercy Corps 2016. *Climate Resilient Development Case Study -Ethiopia: Integrating climate change into market-based Development programmes*.  
[https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/Mercy\\_Corps\\_CRD\\_Case\\_Study\\_ETHIOPIA.pdf](https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/Mercy_Corps_CRD_Case_Study_ETHIOPIA.pdf) (accessed 5 January 2022).
- USAID 2018. *Global Food Strategy: Ethiopia Country Plan*  
[https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1867/Ethiopia\\_GFSS\\_Country\\_Plan\\_WS\\_Edits\\_9.21.pdf](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1867/Ethiopia_GFSS_Country_Plan_WS_Edits_9.21.pdf) (Accessed 04 July 2020).
- Van Dijk, T.A. 2001. 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In: Schiffrin D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H. (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 352–394.
- Weisser, F., M. Bollig, M. Doevenspeck and D. Muller-Mahn. 2014. 'Translating the 'Adaptation to Climate Change' paradigm: The politics of a travelling idea in Africa', *The Geographical Journal* 180(2): 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12037>
- Whitfield, S. 2016. *Adapting to Climate Uncertainty in African Agriculture: Narratives and knowledge politics*. London: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315725680>
- World Bank 2020. *From Isolation to Integration: The Borderlands of the Horn of Africa*. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- Yimer, M. 2015. 'Sedentarization and drought resilience: government strategies to support pastoralist livelihoods in Ethiopia'. In Abera, Y. and M. Abdulahi (eds), *The Intricate Road to Development; Government Development Strategies in the Pastoral Areas of the Horn of Africa*, IPSS, Addis Ababa University.
- Yirgu, L., N. Nicol and S. Srinivasan. 2013. 'Warming to change? Climate policy and

agricultural development in Ethiopia', *Future Agricultures Working Paper 071*, Brighton: IDS, University of Sussex.