

Executive summary Tesfaye Shiferaw

This study addresses rain fed farming systems in six *Kebeles* of which three were marked as food secure and three food insecure according the Food Safety Net Program. This study comprises the results of 78 surveyed households in Adami Tulu Jido Kombolcha Woreda of which 50% lived in food secure *Kebeles* and 50% in food insecure *Kebeles*. Through farm surveys and interviews with key stakeholders the study identifies physical factors, management variables, and perceptions of farmers associated with food secure and food insecure *Kebeles*.

Farm holding size varied between 2.5 and 3 ha and was not different in food secure and insecure *Kebeles*. In contrast, the family size was larger in food insecure *Kebeles* (9 vs 7.2 family members). Food insecure households work more off-farm (as field laborer), which maybe some kind of coping mechanism, though incomes from off-farm employment are very low. Food aid is the major coping mechanism for food insecure households in periods of food shortages. Cattle and food storage are major coping mechanisms for food secure households.

Crop yields (maize, teff and wheat) were significantly higher in food secure *Kebeles* than in food insecure *Kebeles*, but in absolute terms still low. For example, average maize yields in food secure *Kebeles* were 2.3 t/ha vs 1.8 t/ha in food insecure *Kebeles*. The higher crop yields are associated with higher application rates of fertilizers (especially phosphate) and manure in food secure *Kebeles*. This suggests that the input of external nutrients may have a positive yield effect in this semi-arid area. The data do not allow an economic assessment of crop activities and to evaluate the effect of nutrient inputs on economic returns of the crops. The study, however, did collect prices which farmers received for their crop products. Interestingly, food secure households were able to get significantly higher prices for teff, wheat and maize. Food insecure households are forced to sell their products at harvesting time when prices are lowest. Yet, retail prices of crop products at the local market are about 25% higher than the prices received by food secure households.

Although both types of household perceive soil fertility as a major production constraint (in addition to drought and land availability), food insecure households perceive an increase in

soil fertility, while food secure households perceive that soil fertility is decreasing. In general, food secure households seem more aware of possible soil-related constraints such as erosion, lack of fertilizer, continuous cropping, etc. In addition, food secure households perceive crop pests and diseases more as constraint as food insecure households, which may be related to the higher and less nutrient-constrained yields of food secure households (i.e. other growth reducing factors such as pests become more important). Results also show that capital (credit) is constraining food secure households much more than food insecure households. Both types of households indicated that the land tenure system constrains production, which calls for a more flexible and more market-oriented land tenure system.

The study does not allow identifying causal relationships, for example, food insecure households are poor because of lower crop yields, or lower crop yields are the result of fewer assets of food insecure households (no cash for fertilizers). However, the results suggest that food secure and food insecure households differ in various aspects requiring targeted policy interventions aimed at specific households. At the same time, very consistent constraints have been identified related to drought, land availability and especially land tenure, which may be addressed through more generic policy instruments.

Executive summary Tafesse Kefyalew Estifanos (text linken, zie boven)

The aim of this study is to assess the use and importance of the ecosystem functions and services provided by Abijata-Shala Lakes National Park (ASLNP), and investigating the stakeholders' interaction in the use of the Park. In the study different methods have been used to realize this objective, ranging from field observations, household surveys, tourist surveys and participatory approaches, interviews with key stakeholders. In total 164 households and 46 tourists were interviewed. The surveyed households were both from inside and outside the NP, allowing to better understand the dependency of the local population on the Park's resources.

The study classifies the NP in eleven so-called landscape units which provide different services to stakeholders. Food production is the major service provided by the Park. More than 90% of the households inside or living on the border of the NP has arable land inside the Park boundaries. The same percentage of households living on the border of the Park produces charcoal from its woody resources. The percentage of households living in the Park depending on charcoal production is smaller, i.e. 77% of the interviewed, which may be related to the fact that the population on the Park border lives closer to the main road from Addis to Awassa facilitating the selling of charcoal outside the sight of the Park management. In addition, people living inside the Park may have been reluctant to tell the truth in the interviews knowing that charcoal production is illegal. Also sand winning is an illegal activity which is widely practiced (almost 50% of the Park inhabitants are involved) and contribute to the income of the local population. Wood resources are not only used for fuel but also for construction, furniture and agricultural tools; similar dependency scores have been recorded for these services provided by the woody resources of the Park. Only 31% of the interviewed people use the wetland shores of Abijata for grazing their livestock suggesting that most of the animals grazing along the shores are from further away. The interviewed population living just outside the Park boundaries depend much less on the services provided by the Park, but still 73% of the interviewed use fresh water and 37% of the interviewed fuel wood from the Park. Even 17% of the interviewed people living outside the Park borders cultivate arable plots in the Park. These numbers indicate the pressure on the Park's resources and provide an underpinning of what is observed, i.e. the increased conversion of natural vegetation into

cultivated land. The information also indicates the dependency of the local population on the Park's resources, not only of inhabitants of the Park but also of the population living in its vicinity.

Although the number of tourists visiting the Park more than doubled and associated returns of the Park almost tripled over the last seven years, it is still very small in absolute terms and certainly not sufficient to cover large scale investments to improve Park management. The study recognizes the potential of the NP for eco-tourism development but it also shows that there are no joined efforts to exploit this. Prerequisite is that the local population shares in the benefits derived from (eco) tourism. In general, any management plan for the NP should pay attention to the interests of the inhabitants of the Park and people living in the vicinity as they depend on its resources. In this respect it is worth to increase conservation awareness and ownership of the local population as they are rapidly degrading their own resource base. Local and national Government could contribute to this by improving the socio-economic conditions of the local population, i.e. better water supply, health centers, and alternative means of income.