

Self help approach (Ethiopia)

DESCRIPTION

Self help

Aims / objectives: To develop his doing of activity by himself in order to manage his land., By consulting, Survey, Contain, bund for mation, embankment, Doing of terracing, Transporting of stones.

LOCATION



Location: Region 3, Ethiopia

Geo-reference of selected sites38.0. 11.0

Initiation date: n.a.

Year of termination: n.a.

Type of Approach

traditional/ indigenous recent local initiative/ innovative project/ programme based

APPROACH AIMS AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Main aims / objectives of the approach The Approach focused on SLM only

The objective of self help approach is only to motivate every one should have done in his own land than on others land.

The SLM Approach addressed the following problems: He couldn't do his duties of the right time due to so many causes.

Conditions enabling the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

• Legal framework (land tenure, land and water use rights): The existing land ownership, land use rights / water rights greatly helped the approach implementation: The land use right gives right and obligate to do his land properly, so it enhance self help approach.

Conditions hindering the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

• Legal framework (land tenure, land and water use rights): The low of implementing S.W.C. is not so much strong. Treatment through the SLM Approach: Every one has perform his land at the right time and together.

PARTICIPATION AND ROLES OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

Stakeholders involved in the Approach and their roles

What stakeholders / implementing bodies were involved in the Approach?	Specify stakeholders	Describe roles of stakeholders
local land users/ local communities		Working land users were work equally divided between men and women. The youngest household even he has no any wealth, he can manage his land by using his family labour.
national government (planners, decision-makers)		
international organization		

Lead agency

The SWC specialist and the land users together.

Involvement of local land users/ local communities in the different phases of the Approach



Mainly:public meetings; partly: workshops/seminars; Training Mainly: workshops/seminars; partly: public meetings; With watershed committees Mainly: responsibility for minor steps; partly: casual labour; By using family labour for every activities. interviews/questionnaires, measurements/observations;

evaluation of well-documented SLM knowledge (evidence-based

personal experience and opinions (undocumented)

Flow chart

Decision-making on the selection of SLM Technology

Decisions were taken by

- land users alone (self-initiative)
- mainly land users, supported by SLM specialists
- all relevant actors, as part of a participatory approach
- mainly SLM specialists, following consultation with land users
- SLM specialists alone

politicians/ leaders

IS/ TEAUETS

TECHNICAL SUPPORT, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The following activities or services have been part of the approach

Form of training

on-the-job farmer-to-farmer

courses

demonstration areas

public meetings

- Capacity building/ training
- Advisory service
- Institution strengthening (organizational development)
- Monitoring and evaluation
- 🔽 Research

Capacity building/ training

Training was provided to the

- following stakeholders
 Iand users
- field staff/ advisers
- planners (1), politicians/decision makers (2), extensionists/trainers (3)

Advisory service

Advisory service was provided

on land users' fields at permanent centres Name of method used for advisory service: PADETS; Key elements: Demonstration, Training system; 1) Advisory service was carried out through: government's existing extension system; Extension staff: mainly government employees 3) Target groups for extension: land users

Decisions were made based on

decision-making)

research findings

Subjects covered

Advisory service is inadequate to ensure the continuation of land conservation activities; The SWC activities left for some one else, no body, ensure sWC activities. The gov't do nothing for cont neuation of SWC wherever.

Institution strengthening

Institutions have been strengthened / established no yes, a little yes, moderately yes, greatly	at the following level local regional national	Describe institution, roles and responsibilities, members, etc.
Type of support financial capacity building/ training equipment y contributing labour		Further details
Monitoring and evaluation		

bio-physical aspects were ad hoc monitored through observations technical aspects were regular monitored through observations socio-cultural aspects were ad hoc monitored through observations economic / production aspects were ad hoc monitored through measurements area treated aspects were ad hoc monitored through measurements no. of land users involved aspects were regular monitored hrough observations management of Approach aspects were monitored through observations There were no changes in the Approach as a result of monitoring and evaluation

Research

Research treated the following topics

sociology

economics / marketing ecology

technology

FINANCING AND EXTERNAL MATERIAL SUPPORT

Annual budget in USD for the SLM component

< 2.000 2.000-10.000 10,000-100,000 100,000-1,000,000 > 1,000,000 Precise annual budget: n.a.

Approach costs were met by the following donors: local community / land user(s) (For commarical work): 100.0%

Research was carried out on station

The following services or incentives have been provided to land users

0

- Financial/ material support provided to land users \checkmark 1 Subsidies for specific inputs Credit
 - Other incentives or instruments

Financial/ material support provided to land users

agricultural: seeds	partly financed fully financed
agricultural: seeds: fertilizers	
Biocides	

Labour by land users was

voluntary food-for-work paid in cash

rewarded with other material support

IMPACT ANALYSIS AND CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Impacts of the Approach

Did the Approach help land users to implement and maintain SLM Technologies? Because of the soil degradation improvement.	No Yes, little Ves, moderately Yes, greatly
Did the Approach improve issues of land tenure/ user rights that hindered implementation of SLM Technologies? The problem is likely to be overcome in the near future. If land use policy practiced	
Did other land users / projects adopt the Approach? Every one has choosen/Adopt/self help activities than mobilization.	V

Main motivation of land users to implement SLM 🗸 n.a.

Sustainability of Approach activities

Can the land users sustain what hat been implemented through the Approach (without external support)?

no yes

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

Strengths: land user's view

• Motivate self help activities than mass mobilization (How to sustain/ enhance this strength: By giving training.)

Strengths: compiler's or other key resource person's view

- It gives right to do on his land
- One man do more in his own land than others land
- The activiries have had quality wise

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: land user's viewhow to overcome

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: compiler's or other key resource person's viewhow to overcome

- Starting time were delayed Motivating & regulating to do so.
- Making continious of SWC activities eg. Cut of drain on different
- pieces of land By giving training and regulating the group activities.

REFERENCES

Compiler Philippe Zahner	Editors	Reviewer Fabian Ottiger	
Date of documentation: Jan. 21	, 2009	Last update: July 24, 2017	
Resource persons Philippe Zahner (philippe.zahner	r@deza.admin.ch) - SLM specialist		
Full description in the WOCAT https://qcat.wocat.net/en/wocat	database :/approaches/view/approaches_2377/		
Linked SLM data n.a.			

Documentation was faciliated by

Institution

• Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (DEZA / COSUDE / DDC / SDC) - Switzerland Project

• n.a.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareaAlike 4.0 International

