

July 2019









# Contents

| Acknowledgements         | 2  |
|--------------------------|----|
| Introduction             |    |
| Findings                 |    |
| Proposed response        | 9  |
| Approach                 |    |
| Implementation           | 10 |
| Organisational Structure | 12 |



# **Acknowledgements**

This material has been funded by UKaid from the UK government; however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies



#### Introduction

LIFT is a six-year (March 2014 to -August 2020), DFID funded-programme that aims to improve the incomes of the rural poor and enhance economic growth through three components: Second Level Land Certification (SLLC); improved Rural Land Administration Systems (RLAS); and increasing land productivity through a 'making markets work for the poor' approach (M4P). LIFT aims to certify 14 million parcels in 140 woredas for approximately 6.1 million households (around 70% of parcels being jointly or individually owned by women) in Oromia, Amhara, SNNP and Tigray regions. As of April 2019, 12,376,062parcels had been demarcated. About 93% of the parcels hold women's name, as joint (73%) and as individual (22%) holder (Annual Review Report September 2018).

In response to the practical challenges faced during the early stages of the programme to mobilize landholders and ensure engagement of women and vulnerable groups during SLLC, LIFT piloted a Social Development Officer (SDO) position in June 2017 in six woredas. Its impact was immediately visible and landholders', especially women's, participation in the SLLC process improved. The support SDOs provide to women and VGs has resulted in parcels, which were illegally occupied being restored to them. The positive result of the SDO pilot intervention facilitated its scaling up to all the SLLC woredas in August 2018.

A question, however, remained: what has happened to women and VGs in SLLC woredas where a SDO was not in place and more specifically (1) what is the situation of the land rights of these women and VGs in non SDO-woredas? (2) what is the status of unresolved land disputes involving VGs' after SLLC has completed and the SDO has moved to another SLLC woreda? (3) what impact does SLLC have on women and VGs in terms of security and control of their land? (4) how can support from local institutions, such as the Good Governance Task Force (GGTF), be sustained so that assistance to secure the land use rights of women and VGs is available and accessible?

To respond to these questions, LIFT launched a SDO impact study in March 2019. The study was conducted in 15 Woredas (7 SDO and 8 Non SDO) and woredas were selected based on number of disputes as well as proximity between the woreda for effective use of time. The table below shows the Woredas visited during the study.

| Region  | SDO Status | Woreda            | No. of dispute in the SLLC Weekly Report | No. of VG dispute in the SDO Exit Report |
|---------|------------|-------------------|--|--|
|         | SDO        | Mojana Wodera     | 0  | 4  |
| Amhara  | 300        | Angolelana Tera   | 0  | 6  |
|         | Non SDO    | Tarma Ber         | 0  |  |
|         | Noil 3DO   | Menz Mama Midir   | 116                                      |  |
|         |            | Daawoo            | 92                                       | 26                                       |
| Oromia  | SDO        | Ejersa Lafoo      | 22                                       | 3  |
| Oronna  |            | Dandi             | 406                                      | 4  |
|         | Non SDO    | Ameya             | 411                                      |  |
|         | SDO        | Arba Minchi Zuria | 0  | 8  |
| SNNPR   | 300        | Humbo             | 633                                      | No Exit report                           |
| SININFR | Non SDO    | Damot Sore        | 69                                       |  |
|         | טעפ ווטאו  | Damot Woyide      | 372                                      |  |
|         |            | Adwa              | 0  |  |
| Tigray  | Non SDO    | Tahtay Mayichew   | 61                                       |  |
|         |            | Lailay Maychew    | 144                                      |  |

# **Findings**

The study found that in non-SDO woredas that;

- The WLAO and Field Teams didn't provide women and VG landholders with specific support during SLLC as they were not aware of their needs.
- Public awareness activities were limited due to constrained staff who had the dual responsibility of managing demarcation activities. Therefore, information on SLLC had a limited reach to landholders particularly women and VGs and resulted in low participation of landholders in the adjudication/demarcation and public display.
- The resulting low participation of landholders during adjudication/demarcation and public display caused Field Teams to rely heavily on KLAC members to obtain landholder information. Consequently, women and VGs' parcels could potentially be registered incorrectly, and landholders lacked the opportunity to lodge any land dispute.



• Those who did report disputes didn't receive the necessary support to resolve their dispute due to a lack of capacity of Field teams to provide this.

A detailed listing of challenges identified in non-SDO woredas and how the introduction of SDOs has addressed these is presented in the table below

|       | Issues identified (non-  |   | How Inclusion of SDOs   | Procedures for Future  |
|-------|--|---|---|--|
| No.   | SDO Woredas)   | Effect  | have addressed this   | SDO woredas  |
| 1.1   | The WLAO didn't provide specific guidance or instructions to Field Teams (FTs) on providing specific assistance to VGs during SLLC   | This lack of guidance<br>and instruction can lead<br>to VG's land rights being<br>compromised during<br>SLLC  | SDOs gave continuous awareness raising to WLAO staff and FT are provided additional support by the SDO in ensuring SLLC process is inclusive of VGs. Additionally, the SDOs mobilise the Good Governance Taskforce (GGTF) to ensure their engagement in the SLLC process  | The success of the SDO relies mobilization capacity (social skill) and commitment. Those who lack these key skills should be detected and replaced as soon as possible.  Recommendation on these skills is worth than formal recruitment.  |
| 1.2   | The WLAO views VG's land rights as a "Justice" issue as opposed to a "Vulnerability" issue.  | This assumption leads to a lack of understanding of how powerplay and other forms of discrimination affects their land use rights as VGs lack the resources to take legal action and therefore justice is inaccessible to them. | Through the awareness raising efforts of the SDOs and GESI sensitivity training given to relevant actors in the SLLC process now have more understanding on VGs land rights issues  | Continue to show vulnerability of women and VGs using Case stories from the different studies and SDO reports.   |
| 1.3   | During SLLC Field Teams were heavily reliant on support provided by the KLAC during the Demarcation and Adjudication process and therefore potentially vulnerable to KLAC members' support being affected by influential landholders | VGs can be disenfranchised from their land rights by the sway of influential landholders on the decision-making processes of KLAC members.  | The presence of SDOs has resulted in FTs being supported by an unbiased third party when VGs raise disputes during the demarcation and adjudication process thus mitigating the risk of KLAC members being influenced by landholders  | KLAC elections or endorsements by the community should be undertaken prior to kebele level leadership training. During PAC (public awareness and communication), the Audience Segmented message in the SDO Guide that is developed for KLAC should be well communicated to them. |
| Field |  |   |   |  |
| 2.1   | FTs were not appropriately trained on the needs of VGs and how to provide support during SLLC.   | FTs may register to the wrong claimant, or VG boundary may be encroached as they don't take the necessary precaution to protect VGs.  | Through the community mapping process that is undertaken by SDOs prior to demarcation, the FTs are provided with VG maps indicating where VGs are located that require additional due diligence during adjudication & demarcation and Public Display (PD).  Weekly meetings are also held between WC, WLAO, SDO and FTs to improve understanding of the problems and support level. | Weekly or fortnightly regular meeting between the WC, WLAO, SDO and FT must be ensured. Currently, Amhara woredas have a regular weekly meeting while others do it on an irregular basis.  |



| No.   | Issues identified (non-  | Effect  | How Inclusion of SDOs  | Procedures for I  |
|-------|--|---|--|---|
| 2.2   | SDO Woredas)  The scale and duration of the programme requires a high weekly demarcation rate by FTs   | The fast pace results in FTs having less time available to intensively consult landholders with disputes and VGs which may cause loss of land use rights.   | have addressed this  The SDO position focuses on undertaking intensive awareness raising activities prior to demarcation to ensure that more landholders are mobilised and resolve most disputes prior to demarcation, thus reducing the burden on the FT during demarcation | SDO woreda  |
| 2.3   | During Demarcation FTs were heavily dependent on KLAC members and relied on their knowledge in instances where landholders were not present during demarcation.  | Can result in incorrect information on the SLLC certificate as KLAC members cannot know is the exact details of every landholder (i.e. they may know the current land user but not the true landholder. They cannot know the exact boundaries of every parcel). | According to Field Teams interviewed, better organized public awareness undertaken by the SDO position has led to greater participation of landholders during demarcation and therefore has reduced the need for FT's to rely on KLAC members.                               | Strictly avoid demarcation of par without the particip of landholders.  |
| 2.4   | FTs did not provide sufficient information on SLLC to landholders when undertaking demarcation and adjudication. When asked what the purpose of SLLC, FTs respondents replied, "we are just here to measure."  | Low awareness results in low participation of landholders in the SLLC process and subsequent low certificate uptake. As a result, latent dispute of holding or boundary encroachment might be high.   | Well organized public awareness conducted by the SDO has improved landholders' understanding on the purpose of SLLC and resulted in greater participation during adjudication/ demarcation and public display leading to better certificate uptake.                          | Reinforce SLLC be<br>message in the SL<br>PAC materials. The<br>current message for<br>on the process.<br>Additionally, integr.<br>SLLC benefit mess<br>the RLAS PAC ma   |
| Falsi | fication of Evidence   |   |  |   |
| 3.1   | In woredas where FLLC didn't occur (E.g. Ameya), documents showing holding right are easily fabricated (in some cases even lawyers/judges fabricate documents for disputants). Such documents include land tax, inheritance will, gift evidence and even court orders) | High likelihood of VGs losing land right and high number of latent disputes.  | The inclusion of the SDOs has enabled the programme to give timely information on SLLC to VGs to prepare their evidence and representatives, helped clarify land rights with the community and even up to the woreda when faced with dispute.                                | PAC messages to include information the legal conseque of forgery and perjudence. Once permade aware, it should be accountability. Mar wrong doers are lesunpunished (landhand service providespite the Criminal Code has sufficient coverage for the difforms of violations. |
| 3.2   | False information/deception by husbands to discourage wife's participation from the SLLC.  | Women's VG loss of land right   | Women separate meeting gave clear information for women to better understand how critical their participation in the SLLC process is.  | All SDOs to condu-<br>kebele level wome<br>separate meeting,<br>because some do<br>kebele level.  |
| 3.3   | Counterfeit FLLC book of holdings produced by long-term rentees (tenants) and therefore  | VG loss land right  | Same as above  | Same as above   |



| No.           | Issues identified (non-<br>SDO Woredas)   | Effect  | How Inclusion of SDOs have addressed this  | Procedures for SDO wored   |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|
|               | FTs registered parcel in  |   | nave addressed this  | SDO Wored  |
|               | their name because the landholder (renter) was  |   |  |  |
|               | absent during AD and  |   |  |  |
| Name          | PD. and Naming Issues   |   |  |  |
| 4.1           | In some localities of   | Under the legal   | SDOs monitor FTs to  | SDOs should cor  |
|               | SNNPR and Oromia  | framework this results in   | ensure that they register  | ensure staff are   |
|               | cultural norms dictate that a wife's surname  | the wife/wives being viewed as a sibling to   | women using their maiden name as per the   | the Capacity Buil  |
|               | should be their   | their children and can  | guidance given in the  | Teams and instru   |
|               | husband's name and therefore wife/wives are   | result in land rights issues when requiring to  | Capacity Building Procedure for FTs.   | the need to regis<br>women by their r  |
|               | registered as a joint   | prove identity as under   | 1 Toccoure for 1 13.   | name.  |
|               | holder using their  | Ethiopian law wives   |  |  |
|               | husband's s name.   | should keep their maiden name   |  |  |
| 4.2           | When certificates are   | Wives cannot check  | Certificate distribution   | Names of joint h   |
|               | distributed, only the husband's name is read  | whether they are included in the certificate  | occurs after SDOs have left and moved to the   | should be read vehicles handing out cert   |
|               | out at events.  | as most of them fear  | next woreda undergoing   | This should be in  |
|               |   | their husbands to request.  | SLLC   | in the training mand for woreda and h  |
|               |   | roquoot.  |  | leadership as the  |
|               |   |   |  | responsible for o  |
| 4.3.          | Pictures of female joint  | With high illiteracy rate   | SDOs undertake   | Landholders in r   |
|               | holders are not provided  | among women, they   | intensive PAC activities   | photograph region  |
|               | in SNNPR and Tigray as this is not required by  | would not be able to read the information on  | and hold separate meetings with women to   | should produce evidence of iden  |
|               | regional land   | the SLLC certificate on   | ensure they actively   | card or any evid   |
|               | proclamations   | the landholder's details and not identify if  | participate in the registration process  | that witness rela<br>joint holders) wh   |
|               |   | another name has been   |  | come to collect t  |
|               |   | provided and thus potentially lose their land   |  | Certificate  |
|               |   | rights.   |  |  |
| Certif<br>5.1 | ficate Issuance and distrib<br>Some VGs are unable to   | Unable to access the  | SDOs move to next  | Accessing official   |
| 0.1           | collect certificates due to   | benefits associated with  | woreda once  | representation s   |
|               | health issues or  | the certificate   | demarcation and adjudication is  | for VGs with phy<br>mobility issues  |
|               |   |   |  | mobility issues  |
|               | disability.   |   | completed and therefore  |  |
|               | disability.   |   | are not present in the   |  |
|               | ·   |   |  |  |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified   | VGs will lose control   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience   |  |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG   | VGs will lose control over their land   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in  | Care Givers sho  |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf  |   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and  | Care Givers sho<br>promoted. But it<br>implementation  |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the   |   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs   | Care Givers sho<br>promoted. But its<br>implementation I<br>the government   |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf  |   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and  | Care Givers sho<br>promoted. But it<br>implementation<br>the government<br>and accessibility<br>service shall be   |
|               | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the rightful holders  | over their land   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs helps to take more responsibility.  | Care Givers sho<br>promoted. But it<br>implementation<br>the government<br>and accessibility<br>service shall be<br>improved.  |
| 5.2           | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the   |   | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs helps to take more  | Care Givers sho<br>promoted. But it<br>implementation<br>the government<br>and accessibility<br>service shall be<br>improved.<br>SDO Guide to re   |
|               | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the rightful holders  Landholders don't collect their certificates for various reasons such as                        | over their land  Without proper storage certificate could be damaged or lost. The       | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs helps to take more responsibility.  SDO's PAC activities have created better awareness amongst                    | Care Givers sho promoted. But its implementation I the government and accessibility service shall be improved.  SDO Guide to rethe message on benefit and the response in the message of t |
|               | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the rightful holders  Landholders don't collect their certificates for various reasons such as not being available, a | Without proper storage certificate could be damaged or lost. The SLLC objective will be | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs helps to take more responsibility.  SDO's PAC activities have created better awareness amongst landholders on the | Care Givers sho promoted. But its implementation I the government and accessibility service shall be improved.  SDO Guide to rethe message on benefit and the response in the message of t |
|               | Instances were identified where relatives of a VG who receive the SLLC certificate on their behalf didn't provide this to the rightful holders  Landholders don't collect their certificates for various reasons such as                        | over their land  Without proper storage certificate could be damaged or lost. The       | are not present in the woreda during certificate collection.  The audience segmented message in the SDO Guide targeted for Caregivers and communicated by SDOs helps to take more responsibility.  SDO's PAC activities have created better awareness amongst                    | improved.  SDO Guide to re the message on benefit and the r timely Certificate   |



| No.           | Issues identified (non-<br>SDO Woredas)            | Effect   | How Inclusion of SDOs have addressed this      | Procedures for SDO wore            |
|---------------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
|               | incorrect perceptions of                           |  |  |                                    |
|               | avoiding government tax by not collecting their    |  |  |                                    |
|               | certificates.                                      |  |  |                                    |
| Docu<br>6.1   | mentation and follow up o Not all VGs report their | f Dispute<br>loss of land use rights.                  | Better awareness                               | Audience segme                     |
| 0.1           | disputes for fear of losing                        | 1035 of farid use rights.                              | raising, and support                           | message for Car                    |
|               | social capital or were                             |  | provided by SDOs gave                          | to be well                         |
|               | threatened not to report disputes.                 |  | VGs the confidence to report their disputes.   | communicated. legal consequer      |
|               | diopatoo.  |  | roport trion diopatos.                         | intimidation and                   |
|               |  |  |  | VGs intended to their land use rig |
| 6.2           | VG dispute is not                                  | High possibility of VGs'                               | VG disputes are well                           | WLAO to segre                      |
|               | segregated, documented                             | loosing land use right                                 | identified documented                          | dispute data for                   |
|               | and followed up. Disputes involving VGs            | due to lack of support and follow-up to resolve        | and followed up. SDOs provide Exit Report to   | and support after                  |
|               | are not known and it is                            | their disputes.  | WALO on non-resolved                           | ODO Hao fort the                   |
|               | not followed up after the SLLC is completed.       |  | disputes, which enables the WLAO to better     |                                    |
|               | SLLC is completed.                                 |  | follow up pending                              |                                    |
|               |  |  | disputes that involve                          |                                    |
| 6.3           | Proclamation of Oromia                             | Woreda court is less                                   | VGs.<br>SDOs facilitate local                  | Strengthen loca                    |
|               | region stipulate that                              | accessible to VGs and                                  | level dispute resolution                       | dispute resolution                 |
|               | when disputes are not resolved at the kebele       | those who are in a financially better position         | by involving local elders and the woreda GGTF. | provides strong foundation for \   |
|               | level, it must be reported                         | take advantage of this by                              | This makes dispute                             | Touridation for v                  |
|               | directly to the woreda court.                      | refusing to disagree with<br>kebele level decisions so | resolution accessible to VGs.                  |                                    |
|               | court.   | that the dispute goes to                               | vos.   |                                    |
| 0.4           | 0  | the Woreda court.                                      | 000  | 0                                  |
| 6.4           | Cases reported to the woreda may not favour        | Loss of land use rights                                | SDO support hugely minimized the size of       | Same as above                      |
|               | because VGs lack                                   |  | dispute going to higher                        |                                    |
|               | access to legal advice and assistance to           |  | levels   |                                    |
|               | resolve disputes. They                             |  |  |                                    |
|               | are challenged to cover travel cost, low           |  |  |                                    |
|               | knowledge level and                                |  |  |                                    |
|               | informal lawyers taking                            |  |  |                                    |
|               | advantage of VGs ignorance will all                |  |  |                                    |
| 0 -           | disfavour them.                                    |  | 7  |                                    |
| 6.5           | Weak support provided to VGs by the Women &        | Continued vulnerability of landholders.                | The presence of SDOs during SLLC improved      | Enlighten the of work on land rig  |
|               | Children Affairs and/or                            | 5. Idilaliololol                                       | the engagement of                              | protection of the                  |
|               | Labour & Social Affairs Offices                    |  | Women & Children Affairs and/or Labour &       | groups                             |
|               | Offices  |  | Social Affairs Offices to                      |                                    |
|               |  |  | support VG land                                |                                    |
| Aw <u>a</u> r | eness and Participation of                         | women & VGs  | disputes                                       |                                    |
| 7.1           | Low participation of VGs                           | Women and VG   | Well organized and                             | Ensure informa                     |
|               | during SLLC as information on the                  | landholders do not participate in SLLC.                | systematic PAC that specifically targets       | reached women<br>VGs to appear t   |
|               | process and benefits of                            | ,  | women and VGs (i.e.                            | SLLC process of                    |
|               | SLLC didn't reach VGs                              |  | separate meetings for women) ensures that      | their trusted representative       |
|               | İ  |  | women ensures that                             | representative                     |



| No. | Issues identified (non-<br>SDO Woredas)   | Effect  | How Inclusion of SDOs have addressed this  | Procedures for Fu<br>SDO woredas   |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 7.2 | Lack of awareness of land rights  | Loss of land or period of limitation could be wrongly applied to disputes (i.e. (a widow has no information about SLLC. She lives outside the kebele. After the death of her husband in 2009, her father-in-law took the parcel and registered it in his name. She did not report her case because she is waiting for the time when her daughter reaches the legal age to claim her right). | Same as above  | Provide awareness land rights of the different social grou   |
| 7.3 | Tigray - When VGs migrate to other localities their land was given to someone else. Migrant landholders may not get information about the SLLC and others (rentee or relatives) could register on their holding. Even if they are not away more than the time stated (3 years), their powerful disputants or the kebele administration can take advantage of the situation. | Loss of land right  | Earlier information and awareness by the SDO could have helped migrant landholders to appear during SLLC. SDOs could have supported VGs if they face problems in relation to wrong translation of the law on migrant landholders (Tigray).   | Understand the situation of migrant landholds (they may migrate seasonally to secure additional income as land may not provide them enough product and support them no lose their land use migrations. |
|     | gamous wives  |   | 1101   |  |
| 8.1 | 1st wife in polygamous<br>marriage not named on<br>the certificate and<br>unaware if other wife<br>is/wives are   | Loss of land use right<br>and divorce could be a<br>pretext to deny her land<br>use right.  | Women separate meetings organised by SDOs helped polygamous wives to get better information on SLLC and be involved in the process and attend PD.  | Representation of Women and Village Elders during PD is important to confirm wives to the FTs tha must be adhered all time.  |
| 8.2 | Difference between the named wife as the landholder on the certificate and the wife who is the land user.  The one using the land is not registered as holder of the parcel, but the other wife.  | Potential eviction of the wife who is the current land user if the certificate holder wife claims to the court. Or Certificate holder unable to use the land despite possessing a certificate, if informal arrangement continues.   | Awareness raising undertaken by the SDOs and engagement with co-wives results in better awareness and information to ensure they are registered on the certificate of the land parcel they depend on or refuse other women to be registered on their land, jointly or individually held. | The SDO Guide to integrate polygamou wives' specific mess and provide the information during p awareness.  |
|     | VGs<br>Siblings living on the   | Loss of land aspecially   | Awareness raising  | Pe-enforce masses  |
| 9.1 | Siblings living on the farm refuse access to siblings living in town.   | Loss of land especially for orphan children not living in their village.  | Awareness raising undertaken by the SDOs informs people on the rights and obligations of all siblings that will not disregard those living   | Re-enforce message<br>OC in the current SD<br>Guide and<br>communication mate  |



| No. | Issues identified (non-<br>SDO Woredas)   | Effect                                  | How Inclusion of SDOs have addressed this  | Procedures for Future SDO woredas  |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
|     |   |   | outside of the kebele. Additionally, SDOs provided support in such disputes.     |  |
| 9.2 | Violence inflicted on a destitute man (DHHM) after obtaining a court decision in his favour | Attempted murder on a renter by rentee. | SDO support helped smoother dispute resolution and prevented violence situation. | SDO Guide to include articles in the Criminal Code that have relevance to land right violation and violence. |

# **Proposed Response**

To respond to these findings, LIFT proposes a short term SDO intervention in non-SDO woredas that completed SLLC to ensure the SLLC has caused no harm to land holders and particularly women and VGs. The specific objectives are:

- Reinforce awareness of land holders particularly women and VGs on the benefit of SLLC and the need for regular updating of titles
- Identify women and VGs with land disputes and support them in resolving these disputes
- Provide guidance to women and VGs with complex disputes and facilitate support from the Woreda Good Governance Taskforce

#### Benefits of Short Term SDO Intervention in Non SDO SLLC Woredas

Expected benefits from the short term SDO intervention are:

- The SDOs will help to identify active and latent disputes involving women and vulnerable groups (VGs), which were not captured as disputes during SLLC due to lack of information or fear of reporting the dispute;
- Better awareness raising, and support will give women and VGs the confidence to report their disputes and restore parcels illegally taken from them;
- SDO support in SDO woredas prevented violence during the resolution process;
- VG disputes will be documented and follow up provided by the WLAO;
- The woreda Good Governance Task Force will be activated to help women and VGs resolve their disputes locally, which makes dispute resolution accessible;
- Women separate meetings will give better information that will help to monitor their registration. Polygamous wives get better information on SLLC and be proactive to protect their land right;
- Correction of women's maiden name and updating of rights will be possible for those who registered in their husband's name in place of their father's name;
- Better awareness amongst landholders on the purpose of SLLC will motivate to collect their certificate(s), especially those woredas with low certificate uptake;
- Migrant landholders will have the opportunity to report their grievance;
- Woreda stakeholders, particularly WLAO will gain better awareness on the challenges facing women and VGs and how important their continued support is;
- Engagement of Women & Children Affairs and/or Labour & Social Affairs Offices will be improved to assist women and VGs in the dispute resolution process.

# Approach

There are 94 LIFT woredas that underwent SLLC without an SDO in post (totalling 2,003 kebeles) across the four regions. The following section provides an outline of the proposed pilot approach, which is planned to take place from September 2019 to June 2020 in 3 woredas in Oromia with wrap-up activities occurring from July to August 2020.



# **Implementation**

#### Recruitment of SDOs

LIFT's GESI Team in consultation with LIFT RCs will identify current SDOs based on their performance against set criteria which includes:

- Good interpersonal communication skills
- · Good physical capability to walk long distance
- Commitment to help women and VGs and undertake extensive travel to make house visits to those with physical mobility problems
- Gender and VG sensitivity

The selected SDOs will be replaced through an internal recruitment of Field Team members who will then undertake an induction by the SDO they are replacing prior to being deployed on the SDO intervention. The new SDOs selected from the FTs will be provided with the necessary training.

#### **Training**

SDOs will be provided with two days training to induct them on their duties and responsibilities which will include the following:

- 1-day training on the objective of the position, role of the SDO, activities to be performed
- 1-day Workplan Development (regions to develop their workplan, present and discuss in plenary)

# Deploying SDOs to the Woreda Land Administration Office

- LIFT SMT will update the regional Land Administration and Use Bureaus on the assignment of SDOs and the Regional Coordinators will communicate with Land Administration and Use Bureau.
- LIFT's RC and the Regional Land Administration and Use Bureau will then introduce the deployed SDO to the WLAO to make them aware of their purpose and to provide the necessary support to the SDOs
- The SDOs will then undertake the following activities upon their arrival to the relevant Woreda

#### Day 1:

- WLAO will introduce the SDO to the woreda administration and request to call a meeting with the GGTF and other stakeholders for training to be delivered on the second day.
- Engage with key offices such as the Justice office, Court and WCA.

#### Day 2:

- Deliver training to WLAO and GGTF staff as well as other stakeholder members which will include the following topics:
  - o The challenges women and VGs face in terms of land tenure security
  - The impact of SDOs in SDO woredas and the issues identified during SLLC that occurred in non-SDO woredas
  - The impact of non-engagement of landholders (dispute and loss of right)
  - o Dispute type, identification and reporting
  - o Dispute Resolution Process
  - $\circ\quad$  Women naming, its impact and the need to correct it
  - The role of the GGTF in land dispute resolution (for woreda level training)
- The need to reinforce message on SLLC benefit and the need for continuous updating. The SDO will
  then present and discuss their proposed workplan (developed during the SDO training) and have this
  endorsed by the attendees
- Based on the workplan two-person teams for the different kebeles will be established and will consist of
  one member of the WLAO (lead) and one member of the GGTF (the exact number of teams will be
  determined by the number of available WLAO staff to undertake the team leader role). The
  responsibilities of the teams will be to



- Reinforce awareness on SLLC. RLAS and EEU
- Organize sub kebele Public Awareness and Communication and Dispute Identification and Resolution (DIR) Teams which will engage the community through kebele and sub-kebele level meetings
- Provide 5 days for the DIR Teams to identify disputes and report these to the kebele offices or present to the team when they are back to the kebele.
- Advise landholders on the procedures to follow to report disputes and the resolution process.

#### Deployment of Teams to the Kebele

**Day 3:** The two-person Teams will be deployed to the different kebeles concurrently and the kebele teams will Reinforce Public Awareness to the community through one general kebele level meeting and one woman only meeting and cover the following topics:

- Undertake a reminder on SLLC: and if there is a significant number of landholders that are not aware of SLLC assess the magnitude and the reasons for this and inform the WLAO to follow up on awareness during RLAS.
- Assess whether landholders have collected their certificates and assess the magnitude and the reason for non-collection and advise the WLAO to undertake redistribution.
- Reinforce awareness on the benefits of SLLC and encourage those positively impacted to share their story of success.
- Assess if women were encouraged to take their husband's name during SLLC and if this was widespread, advise them to make corrections to their name immediately
- Provide awareness on formally registering transactions

The venue will also be used as a forum for dispute identification and consultation whereby:

- Encourage participants to cascade the information provided on disputes to women and VGs with land disputes
- Landholders who have attended the meeting and have a land dispute can remain after the meeting to formally report their dispute
- Participants who know landholders with a land dispute that have not attended the meeting will be requested to remain after the meeting to give necessary information for follow-up.
- organize a sub-kebele Dispute Identification and Reporting (DIR) Team.

#### Sub-kebele PAC & DIR Team Structure

Each kebele will be divided into four to five sub kebeles depending on size and topography of the kebele and the DIR Team will consist of the following:

- Three male Elders who will be elected during the public meeting based on their knowledge and impartiality.
- Two female Development Group Leads selected at the women only meeting.

If possible the 5 members will be from different villages to facilitate easy communication for their assignment and one point of contact who is literate will be elected to record information while in the field.

#### Sub kebele PAC & DIR Team Fieldwork:

Following the public meeting and formation of the team, members will receive the necessary orientation and training to undertake their responsibilities and will follow the below approach which will occur over 5 days all members of the sub-kebele DIR Team will be allocated villages near to their residence and pass key messages to landholders within their area on registering disputes and collect dispute information.

### Dispute Resolution:

After 5 days of the first public meeting the two-person team will return to the kebele and undertake the following:

 landholders with grievance will come to kebele (those with physical problem, to send their trusted representatives)



- The two team will listen to the disputants (priority to women, the elderly, PWD, orphan children)
- Screen the problems and guide disputants on their next step:
  - o Easier disputes will be settled with local elders
  - o Less complex ones to be referred to the KLAC and Kebele Administration
  - Those complex problems cannot be resolved at the kebele level will be presented to the woreda GGTF by the two-person team
  - o The Woreda GGTF to give appointment to the kebeles resolve the dispute
  - o Those requiring Review of Judgment will be delegated to the Justice/Prosecutors' office

### **Organisational Structure**

