The Ones Left Behind: Policy Coherence and Sustainable Development in Ethiopia

By Julia van Stenis[1]

ABSTRACT:

The United Nations' 2030 Agenda strives to 'leave no one behind'. The Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development framework employed by the Netherlands, aims to leverage mutually beneficial relationships in its development cooperation efforts and aspirations towards SDG attainment. The assessment of its merits is situated in the context of Ethiopia's pastoral communities, investigating the interplay of SDG 13 (climate action) and SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) as well as the role of resilience in addressing consequential hardships. This research integrates critical and inclusive development theory in understanding the dynamism of the development arena between the Netherlands and Ethiopia, their underlying national policy priorities, and the (non-)inclusive efforts towards pastoral engagement. The qualitative research design employs in-depth interviews and informal meetings with experts and policy makers complemented by a two-step policy analysis. The findings indicate a prominent focus on short-term threat assessments, declining medium-term risk management mechanisms, and unfavourable long-term resilience building efforts dictating the lived experiences of Ethiopia's pastoralists. Furthermore, the inherently politicized nature of the policy process reveals the dominating ideas, interests and institutions of the Netherlands, Ethiopia, and other international actors in shaping the pastoral policy arena and its outcomes. The substantial and procedural incoherence of policy translates into the continuing marginalization and exclusion of pastoral communities from national and global development agendas. Hence, policy recommendations call for participatory horizontal and vertical dialogues on an international scale and the enhancement of consultative practices in working towards policy coherence and striving to achieve the universal pillar of 'leaving no one behind'.

1. Introduction

"Cattle from upland, cattle from lowland; goats from here, sheep from there. Are you [my camels] ever going to have the trees you once had all for yourselves? In the summer, the floods; in the winter, the locusts. In the upland, the Christians; on the lowland, the sorghum fields. In Awash, the Woyane trees [Prosopis juliflora]. Where should I take you, my heart [my she-camel]?" (Balehegn, 2016, p. 486)

An awareness and sense of urgency is communicated through the Gāli Sāré poems of Ethiopia's pastoralists, a nomadic herder community reliant on their livestock as the cornerstone of their livelihoods (Balehegn, 2016, p. 486). The poem communicates a multi-fold message of contemporary environmental fears rooted in causes of untailored government policies and institutional mismatch. Ethiopia's pastoral communities are particularly vulnerable to the adverse risks of climate change (Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005; Habte et al., 2022), worsened by their multidimensional poverty (Dika, Tolossa &

|[1] Graduate MSc International Development Studies, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Eyana, 2021) and increased prevalence of ethnic conflict (Tadesse et al., 2016; Burka, Roro & Regasa, 2023). The Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) framework from the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) aims to address such multifaceted issues, acclaiming short-term responses and long-term sustainability (OECD, 2023). With a focus on the revolutionizing nature of the United Nations' 2030 Agenda in the capacity of its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a transformative approach of 'leaving no one behind' is promised (UN Sustainable Development Group, 2024). The Netherlands has, since the inauguration of the 2030 Agenda, adopted a partnership-oriented approach to development (De Jong & Vijge, 2021), with efforts aiming to foster policy coherence across low- and lower-middle income countries around the world (Yunita et al., 2022). Focusing on Ethiopia, the Netherlands' alliance takes a broad-based approach, with multilateral assistance supporting the SDGs holistically in fostering meaningful change at the local level, within the national policy arena, and in their bilateral relations (Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2023). In utilizing the SDGs as the guiding framework to international commitments, The Netherlands claims it's 'aid to trade' shift contributes to less fragmentation and high policy relevance (OECD, 2018b); however, difficulty remains in revealing valuable impacts and successful contributions to a pro-poor approach (Bitzer, van Balen & de Steenhuijsen Piters, 2017). While inclusivity is often emphasized in international cooperation frameworks, genuine representation of pastoralist communities in early policy design remains limited. In Ethiopia, national strategies like the GTP II have largely bypassed sub-national and community-level participation (Srigiri & Scheumann, 2023). Without meaningful mechanisms such as free, prior, and informed consent, and pathways for actively involving pastoralist communities in shaping policy priorities from the outset, the promise of 'leaving no one behind' risks remaining rhetorical rather than transformative.

Therefore, this paper examines Ethiopia's pastoralist communities, whose livelihoods are shaped by the interplay of climate (SDG 13) and conflict (SDG 16), through the lens of the Netherlands' PCSD framework. In doing so, it contributes to a three-fold knowledge gap: (1) the role of PCSD in Netherlands-Ethiopia development cooperation, (2) the interaction of climate and conflict-related SDGs within Ethiopia's pastoralist systems, and (3) how these dynamics influence the broader principle of 'leaving no one behind' – seeking to answer the central research question: *How is the Netherlands' Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) framework formulated in relation to Ethiopia's pastoralist communities, and what does this reveal about the interplay between SDG 13 (climate action), SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions), and resilience-building?*

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 The Climate-Conflict Nexus and Resilience in Pastoral Ethiopia

The lower lying lands of Ethiopia are home to the pastoralist communities, making up 12 percent of the Ethiopian population – a cumulative 14.4 million individuals (Jaouen, 2023). Pastoralism is a livelihood system found in Ethiopia's (semi-)arid lands, with individuals relying on livestock production (of cattle, goats, sheep and/or camels), communal rangeland resources and embedded cultural, economic and social practices for their survival (Mohamed, 2019; Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017). These practices play a

vital role in the regional, national and, to a certain extent, global economy (Arjjumend, 2018). Pastoralists support Ethiopia's GDP (by 10 to 40 percent) through its livestock, milk production and value chain contributions; they aid in meeting global meat and milk demands by boosting national exports (20 percent); make up most of Ethiopia's livestock trade (90 percent); and comprise nation-wide annual milk supply (80 percent) (Abdulkadr, 2019; Desta, 2013; Arjjumend, 2018). Notably, they hold the largest livestock population in Africa (and fifth in the world) (Abdulkadr, 2019). Varying degrees of ecological productivity lead to a (semi-)nomadic way of living according to the seasonal availability of resources and access to fresh pasture and water (Arjjumend, 2018). Extended periods of drought have defined pastoral livelihoods since the 1980s, resulting in livestock loss, varied mobility routes, resource scarcity, changing grazing patterns and violent means of reacquiring herds (Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005; Headey, Taffesse & You, 2014). With the complex nature of pastoral conflict lying at the intersection of environmental pressures, political transformations, and cultural factors, it becomes essential to approach it through an integrated, context-sensitive lens.

These dynamics will be explored through four complementary theoretical frameworks: Property Rights Theory, Environmental Security Theory, Political Ecology, and the concept of Customary Institutions. Together, these theories offer a multi-scalar perspective – from institutional structures to individual agency – on how resource access, environmental pressures, power relations, and local governance systems shape resilience and vulnerability among Ethiopia's pastoralist communities. *Property Rights Theory* renders that ambiguity over land use and resource control leads to disputes arising from poorly defined and weakly enforced property rights (Beyene, 2017; Tadesse et al., 2016). Since the early 1990s, a growing trend is witnessed regarding new forms of land use: traditional communal tenure systems shifting to farming and private land enclosures, individual landholdings, reducing communal grazing areas (Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017; Reda, 2016). Land enclosures are associated with the availability of water points, shaping pastoralists' mobility strategy, imminent to animal productivity and, consequently, their income (Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017). *Environmental Security Theory* connects supply- and demand-induced resource scarcity and environmental degradation to heightened conflict risk (Beyene, 2017; Tadesse et al., 2016). The common pool rangeland resources have become inadequate in supporting pastoral groups; thus, the supply-induced scarcity leads to competition over diminishing key assets needed to sustain livestock and pastoral life (Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005; Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017). High fertility rates and rapid population growth contributes to the demand-induced resource scarcity, exerting significant pressure on a dwindling resource base (Headey, Tafesse & You, 2014). Hence, the uncertain access to pasture and water results in conflicts over resource acquisition and/or livestock raiding as a means of rebuilding herds after drought. (Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017; Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005). *Political Ecology Theory* suggests that conflict stems from a motivation to acquire more livestock (i.e. greed) or in response to the relative marginalization and political exclusion experienced by the pastoral community (i.e. grievance) (Beyene, 2017; Burka, Roro & Regasa, 2023). The imposition of an ethnic-based federal system transformed relationships between ethnic groups, politicizing access to resources and livestock (Beyene, 2017) by manipulating administrative boundaries and implementing sedentarisation policies (Burka, Roro &

Regasa, 2023; Reda, 2016). The forced adaptation of pastoral societies to such policies, often deepens their sense of exclusion, fuelling grievances over their marginalized position in state decision-making arenas (Hagmann & Mulugeta, 2008). Finally, *customary institutions* play an imminent role in community resource-sharing, collective decision-making, and the informal governance of weather-related risks and conflict mitigation (Di Falco & Bulte, 2009; Tadesse et al., 2016). However, top-down interventions on pastoral land management have increasingly marginalized these systems, weakening their authority and exacerbating competition over resources (Tadesse et al., 2016; Unruh, 2005). This reflects the wider governance challenge of legal pluralism, where statutory and customary systems coexist but often conflict in practice, creating institutional ambiguities and enforcement gaps (Atmaja, 2018). While federal land policies in Ethiopia formally recognize communal land rights, they do little to reconcile these with locally embedded customary practices, leaving pastoralist governance structures excluded from formal decision-making spaces (Reda, 2016; Reid, Fernandez-Gimenez & Galvin, 2014). This unresolved overlap contributes to policy incoherence and sustains resource-related tensions. Addressing this requires not only recognizing the important status of customary systems but also developing mechanisms to actively align statutory and customary governance in ways that enhance conflict resolution and policy implementation in pastoralist regions (Gebeye, 2019). In sum, the interlinked nature of ambiguous rights, increasing competition over scarce resources, greed and grievance sentiments and disregarded customary institutions create an iterative process of altering community dynamics and intensified occurrences of violence.

　　　Amid these challenges, pastoralists employ a myriad of adaptation strategies to cope with the consequences of climate change, such as strategic mobility, a rotational pasture system, livestock diversification, and the utilization of traditional knowledge (Arjjumend, 2018; Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005). Yet, Ethiopia's pastoralist resilience remains poor (Tofu et al., 2023). Immediate impacts of climate-conflict interactions result in a loss of livestock and lives, destruction of assets and disturbance of livelihood practices, manifesting into food insecurity, water shortage, degeneration of social relations, displacement, negative psychological impacts, and intensified insecurity (Gelan, Getahun & Beyene, 2017). Thus, in this research, resilience refers to the capacity of pastoralist communities to withstand, adapt to, and recover from the combined stresses of climate change and conflict, in a way that maintains their livelihoods, social structures, and overall well-being (Ambelu et al., 2017). It is understood as a multi-dimensional and dynamic process, considering known adaptation strategies and positioning them in an environment of changing climate and socio-political conditions – allowing a further glimpse into the response mechanisms of Ethiopia's pastoralists and the extent to which they are being 'left behind'.

2.2 Policy Coherence and The Sustainable Development Goals

　　　The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) writes on the framework of Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD), calling on national governments to incorporate "sustainability considerations in each step of the policy cycle" (OECD, 2023, p. 9). The aspirations of the Netherlands in working with the PCSD framework evolved in response to the shift from the Millennium Development

Goals (MDGs) to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), transitioning from a poverty reduction strategy focused on economic growth to one that emphasizes a broader range of objectives and dimensions (De Jong & Vijge, 2021) – developing a partnership-oriented approach vis-a-vis the earlier donor-recipient relation. However, aspirations for alignment have not altered international organizations' operations nor led countries to construct a unified development approach – questioning the transformative force of the PCSD in practice (Biermann et al., 2022). The Netherlands arguably employs SDG strategies as a "tool to frame and formulate policies that are already in the pipeline", strengthening the unequal North-South dynamic and deepening the disconnect in international SDG implementation (Yunita et al., 2022, p. 95). The technocratic nature of the Dutch SDG frameworks disregards the inherently political discussions amongst actors bringing their own interests, goals and ideologies to the table of PCSD discussions (De Jong & Vijge, 2021; Yunita et al., 2022) – privileging the appearance of coherence over substantive and transformative sustainability.

A focused analytical framework is presented by Blind (2019), portraying the SDG targets as key linking mechanisms across the previously distinct goals. The three lenses of context (understanding the environment where crises occur), conflict (analysing duration and impact), and contingency (viewing crises from a threat, risk or resilience perspective) aid the understanding of complex and overlapping factors. Understanding context-specific cases in broader spheres, Shawoo et al. (2022) highlights the influence of ideas, institutions, and interests as critical in shaping policy processes and outcomes. Meanwhile, the three-stage model of Nilsson & Weitz (2019) including policy interactions (input), integrated policy making (process) and assessment of ex-ante policy (output) can help identify if and how efforts mitigate trade-offs (and maximize synergies) in SDG attainment. Based on recommendations from Nilsson et al. (2022) and OECD conceptualizations (2018a), policy coherence, in this context, will be studied as a consequence of the alignment of goals, strategies, policies and/or implementation at the national level from international influences. Therefore, the term 'policy alignment' will be levelled to reflect the delineation of international cooperation efforts at enhancing PCSD in Ethiopia's pastoral communities.

3. Methodology

3.1 Critical Development and Inclusive Development Lens

The four theoretical frameworks – Property Rights Theory, Environmental Security Theory, Political Ecology, and Customary Institutions – offer concrete entry points for understanding how access to land and resources, institutional arrangements, and environmental stressors shape pastoralist vulnerability and response. Yet, to critically assess who is included or excluded, whose knowledge is recognized, and whose interests are served, these frameworks must be interpreted through broader analytical lenses. Therefore, this paper will assess the underlying assumptions of the nature and scope of human knowledge and experiences at the interface of Critical Development Theory (CDT) and Inclusive Development Theory (IDT). CDT emphasizes the need to examine power dynamics, historical context and inequalities present and dictating the policy arena (Munck and O'Hearn, 1999). IDT critiques mainstream development models that prioritize

economic growth over equity, often overlooking the needs of marginalized groups (Pouw & Gupta, 2017). Together, these theories provide normative grounding to evaluate whether the PCSD framework empowers pastoralist communities, considers the merit of their traditional practices, and integrates tailored development efforts in their cooperation approaches.

3.2 Research Design, Sampling, and Data Analysis

A conscious choice is made for a qualitative research design. Note that a mixed-methods approach was attempted through the production and distribution of a survey, yet its minimal reach made its findings only pertinent and relevant on a descriptive level. Data collection is conducted remotely from the Netherlands. A non-probability sampling is employed, indulging convenience and snowball methods for virtue of accessibility. The sampling of expert interviews consists of three channels: personal network, LinkedIn, and SDG/NGO websites. Thirty informal meetings were held and ten interviews conducted. The respondents were mostly based in Ethiopia (n=29), holding either Ethiopian nationality (n=26) or Dutch nationality (n=3), and included individuals working in governmental roles (n=10), academia and research (n=8), and international development organizations (n=11). The remainder of the sample was based in the Netherlands with Dutch nationality (n=7), likewise working in governmental (n=3), academic (n=2), and development cooperation roles (n=2). A final group of respondents held other nationalities (n=4) and were similarly active across policy, consultancy, and academic positions in international and multilateral institutions. For a mixed inductive-deductive approach, the coding application Atlas.Ti was used for data analysis.

The sampling of policy documents consists of a Google and Google Scholar search relating to pastoral policy in Ethiopia, NL Development Cooperation, climate-conflict policy, SDG coherence, and resilience building in NL/Ethiopia and more broadly. Additional policy documents and project reports are provided by interviewees and respondents spoken to in informal meetings. With a total of 70 policy documents analysed under the categories of 'Ethiopia Planning & Response' (6), 'Ethiopia Policy' (30), 'Ethiopia Projects' (29), 'NL Policy' (5). The policy documents are analysed in a two-step manner (1) by means of the oSDG.ai tool for an overview of SDG priorities from various documents (2) a criteria analysis to assess the effectiveness of policies in meeting predetermined objectives (based on the model by Patton, Sawicki & Clark (2015)), employing the normative criteria of Shahab, Clinch, & O'Neill (2017) for evaluating policy instruments. For relevance, only content related to SDG targets 13.1, 13.b, 16.1 and 16.7 was analysed.

The study follows ethical principles of no harm, informed consent, privacy, and transparency. Participants received an informed consent form and confidentiality options, with verbal consent recorded and data securely stored under GDPR compliance. Interview participants are anonymized using codes I1–I10, where "I" refers to the interview number. Similarly, meetings and informal consultations are coded as M1–M30, and policy and program documents reviewed are referenced as PD1–PD70 (see Appendices A–C for full lists). These codes are used throughout the analysis to ensure traceability while maintaining confidentiality. As a European-based, young female researcher, I acknowledge the cultural and institutional gaps when engaging with Ethiopian pastoralist experts and Dutch

policymakers. To mitigate misinterpretation and power imbalances, this research employs triangulation, culturally sensitive practices, and continuous self-reflection.

Table 1 summarizes the key ideas, stakeholder interests, and identified implementation gaps that emerged from the interview and document analysis. This overview enhances the accessibility of the findings and provides a guiding reference for the detailed analysis in Section 4.

Table 1. Summary of Key Stakeholder Ideas, Interests, and Implementation Gaps

Stakeholder Group	Ideas	Interests	Implementation Gaps
Ethiopia's Regional Governments & Customary Institutions	Inclusive development & policy advocacy	Broad framework on pastoral development	Weak capacity to influence federal processes
Ethiopia's Federal Government & Ministry of Irrigation and Lowland Development	Governance & authority dynamics	Political control & economic growth	Top-down imposition; limited local consultation
Netherlands' Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Partners	International efforts & sustainable development	Dutch citizens & national priorities	Short-termism; siloed engagement; weak local reach
International NGOs & Civil Society	Pastoralist-centered development	Pastoral development priorities	Fragmented efforts; limited policy influence

Source: Author's own elaboration based on interview and document analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

Blind's (2019) conflict, context, and contingency lenses provide a structured approach to analysing complex crises. These three cross-cutting parameters help identify the origins of conflict (conflict lens), the environment and stakeholders involved (context lens), and crisis response strategies (contingency lens). Conflict and contingency proved to be complementary and will be analysed succinctly, followed by contextual insights. Next, the components mentioned in the policy coherence framework of Shawoo et al. (2022) are assessed under Nilsson and Weitz's (2019) three stage model. For conceptual reference, this policy arena is associated with a football game – the football stadium symbolizing the arena with two teams (high power vs low power players), different goals (control and power vs improving pastoralist livelihoods), an audience (spectators of the policy making) and individuals far outside the reach of this game (the pastoralists). The comparison is drawn up for the purposes of simplifying explanations regarding the complex policy processes at play.

4.1 Conflict, Contingency and Context Lenses
4.1.1 Short-Term Threat Assessment

The livelihoods of Ethiopia's pastoralist people are characterized as extremely vulnerable to climate-related consequences as a resilience specialist at USAID (I5), points out: "you see multiple shocks are affecting, which intersect, conflict, drought, flood, COVID, different livestock". They live in constant contact with the ramifications of life-threatening climate conditions (Abdulkadr, 2019; Dika, Tolossa & Eyana, 2021; Mohamed,

2019). The constant need for threat assessments forces pastoralists into a short-term preventive state of life, with minimal breathing space in between these persistent weather shocks. Most of the interviewed respondents agreed that the worsening impacts of climate change, exacerbating this resource scarcity, propels conflict and violence (I2-I9). This falls in line with environmental security theory, where the supply-induced scarcity of resources pushes communities to seek violence in an attempt to satisfy resource shortages (Beyene, 2017; Tadesse et al., 2016). Hence, pastoralists continue to search for their means to stay alive (I9). Regardless of the cause, these populations are always living in a state of emergency, desperate to survive, "there is always emergency, always drought" (I5), coinciding with the low resilience of pastoralist communities and their inability to resist and absorb the effects of severe dry periods (Ambelu et al., 2017). Evidently, pastoralism in Ethiopia homes vulnerability and dire conditions, yet donors and aid providers seem to focus on short-term emergency support over capacity-building, "they are more concentrated on the emergency phase rather than preparedness… the donors are very much interested on the emergency phases than just the planning and development" (I4). Without recognition for the enhancement of climate-conflict consequences over medium- and long-term periods, pastoral livelihoods will remain in a relentless short-term state of shock vulnerability.

4.1.2 Medium-Term Risk Management

With (inter-)national support present only in short-term relief, in pastoral contexts risk management is supplemented by customary institutions. As credible informal governance structures, they are accepted by the community as a trusted mediator in addressing tensions (I8). Their informal institutional strength is reinforced not only by the communities' reliance on these mediating networks but likewise the obligation the leaders feel they hold, "they have a strong sense that when something happens, they have a position to solve [it]" (I9). It acts as a system tailored to the needs of the pastoralist people in settling, responding and mediating natural resources. It also addresses weather-related risks and reinforces kinship-sharing networks, acting as an insurance mechanism (I3). These informal institutions take on the role of risk management since the "formal system is still not strong [enough] to function because the [pastoralist communities] are mostly remote and marginalized from the centre" (I3). This is further exacerbated by ethnic-based divisions, where the manipulation of administrative boundaries has attributed all-round importance to group identity (Burka, Roro & Regasa, 2023; Tadesse et al., 2016). However, two sides to the narrative remain (1) are customary institutions still prominent – even in today's modern and formalized society – due to the marginalization of their community from political centres (I10) or (2) does their inherent traditional backbone rescind them from entering into decision-making contexts as they have foreseen practices of their own (independent of those set by national bodies) (I10). In any case, with limited engagement at the formal political level, cross-regional clashes can hardly be avoided, "the political administration is not directly creating conflict, but it is the consequence" (I4). Therefore, informal institutions play a crucial role in mediating conflict resolution in politically excluded contexts, while also recognizing their limited capacity to address issues on a broader scale.

4.1.3 Long-Term Resilience Building

The long-term and capacity-building attributes are perceived to be most pertinent to strengthening resilience mechanisms. Yet the dire state of pastoral vulnerability remains. This is partly attributed to limited facilities at the municipality (woreda) level, where "the government does not have enough capacity in most technical and financial [areas] to provide such support" (I9). Additionally, working in the lowlands presents logistical and environmental challenges: the climate is harsh, communication is difficult, and seeing tangible change takes time (I2). As a result, local implementation often struggles to translate national policy ambitions into practice, exposing a structural disconnect between federal directives, regional authorities, and local service providers (Hilhorst, Desportes & De Milliano, 2019). This disconnect is further compounded by fragmented engagement with NGOs and donor-led projects, which tend to operate in parallel rather than in alignment with government systems (I1, I4, I9). The limited coordination across these horizontal (between government and NGOs) and vertical (between national, regional, and local governments) levels regenerates the vulnerable state of pastoralists year after year. As one interviewee explained, "vulnerability talks about tomorrow" (I5), highlighting how present failures in coordination undermine future resilience. A Regional Coordinator in Afar (I8) similarly described the growing gap between the needs and realities of pastoralist communities – high needs met with fragmented and limited support. Even the most promising practices are undermined by deteriorating resilience, environmental degradation, overlapping shocks, and poorly tailored, disconnected policies (I5; Arjjumend, 2018). Furthermore, the erosion of customary institutions is intensified by these pressures: "the government structure brings another governance structure, it weakens these traditional customary institutions" (I8), reflecting wider patterns of governance conflict noted by Tadesse et al. (2016) and Unruh (2005). Addressing these meso-level disconnects requires not only strengthening local government capacity but also creating mechanisms for effective coordination across sectors and levels. Multi-stakeholder platforms, joint planning processes, and accountability mechanisms could help align fragmented efforts and move beyond parallel programming, supporting more coherent resilience-building in Ethiopia's pastoral lowlands.

4.1.4 Micro-Level Needs, Meso-Institutional Operations, and Macro-State Capacity

The pastoralists are known for their widespread poverty and low levels of development (I1). Dika, Tolossa and Eyana (2021) reveal the alarmingly high level of multidimensional poverty among pastoralists with deprivations of cooking fuel, drinking water, electricity, asset ownership housing and enrollment in education. Solely pastoralism as a means of income generation becomes difficult if not supplemented by alternative methods, tailored policy and support (I9). Investing in education, for example, to support these ambitions could prove more effective (I8; Coppock et al., 2011), rather than enforcing sedentarisation and stable settlements for communities who do not house the resources nor knowledge to excel in such a foreign lifestyle (I10; Reda, 2016). The locality also plays a debilitating role in micro-need attainment. Pastoralists are close to their culture and impacting society, "pastoralism is a cultural identity, people want to be recognized" (I6). Yet, the federalist structure and ethnic boundaries have become strong contributors

to rising tensions where ownership remains contested (I2; Hagmann & Mulugeta, 2008). A health officer at the Embassy of the Netherlands (M29) describes how municipalities (woredas) and towns (kebeles) work more closely together than ministries in the regional and federal government. Even so, kebeles lack integration with broader markets, "there are gaps, especially with the lack of livestock market systems" (I7; Coppock et al., 2011). This market linkage deems crucial for pastoral sustenance to sell (even old and weak) livestock in times of prolonged drought (I3). Furthest removed from the direct point of pastoral vulnerability but, arguably, most detrimental to the pastoralist life are the macro-state decisions. At the constitutional-choice level, "the government always wants to exercise power" (I7), with this arena being dominated by the 'highlanders' (I2). With a focus on the bigger cities, the pastoralists are left behind in any sort of deliberations. Even the policies that have been designed regarding these communities come from a highlander mindset, in favor of settlement and sedentary activities (I8). Such counter-intuitive efforts are not in the interests of the pastoralists for which they are created (Kassa, Beyene & Manig, 2005), but rather further the power-exerting influence of dominant groups in Ethiopia's political arenas. From there arises the need for tailored policy, a longer-term roadmap for pastoral development, "we need to have a 30-year roadmap regarding pastoralism or pastoralist resilience, we cannot have this [be seen as a] six months issue" (I4). Tailored policies are critical in addressing root causes of pastoralist hardships, to implement modern forms of livestock rearing (I3); along with infrastructure development, supply chains and market linkages to the central economy (I4); to eventually bring about an inclusive reception of pastoralists on a wider scale – 'giving them the wings to fly' to meet their needs, support the community and contribute to national prosperity.

4.2 Policy Input, Policy Process and Policy Outputs
4.2.1 Input: Policy Interactions

Audience chants can be seen as symbolic for the external contributions, values and assumptions that the policy arena is fraught with – i.e. ideas. A first categorization of ideas relates to inclusive development and policy advocacy in addressing pastoralist marginalization (I8), giving them a voice in policy making (I4). A second categorization of ideas falls under governance and authority where figures with authoritative power aim to have their interests rule, repelling ideas that do not align, "if the government feels that what they contribute is aligned with their interest, they will listen" (I5). A third categorization considers international efforts and sustainable development, seeing these as a critical opportunity in wellbeing enhancement and the mitigation of detrimental climate-conflict consequences (I6). The Netherlands chant for the promotion of self-sufficiency and a strategy for pastoralists to mobilize themselves (M16).

Institutions are the players in the policy arena, shaping the fortune and structure of policy. Ethiopia's federal government and Ministry of Irrigation and Lowland (MIL) along with international governments are considered high-power players. Multilateral organizations, NGOs and Ethiopia's lower-level governments fall under the low-power player categorization. The federal government is needed for support (I9), for technical and administrative assistance (I8), and tailored policies incorporating the indigenous knowledge for longer-term, bigger-scale, policy success (I6). Yet, "sometimes it's like [a] top-down type of decision, because the government sees from its own political

perspective. So, that can create conflict in the pastoralist area" (I4). Non-governmental organizations present efforts to fill noticeable gaps, bringing together involved parties and beneficiaries (I7). The Netherlands employs more of a funding role, yet for pastoral development these financial resources present minimal impact (I2).

Interests represent the goals of the stadium, what the players are trying to achieve. High-power players are aiming for enhanced control. Low-power players are aiming for an improvement in pastoralist livelihoods. NGOs, pastoralist experts and enthusiasts claim the importance of focusing on the development of a wide-spanning policy framework for pastoralist livelihoods, also emphasized by Abdulkadr (2019) and Haller et al. (2019). The engagement of Ethiopia's federal government focuses on political control and economic growth. The government wants order, to regulate and easily command (I7), they wish to settle and sedentarise pastoralists (I3). The Netherlands refers to their main priority of supporting the Dutch people (M20). They are interested in short-term projects (in the more developed cities) to bring about quantifiable results and 'mutually beneficial' outcomes (M24; M25) – falling in line with the Netherlands' technocratic approach (De Jong & Vijge, 2021) and desire for 'win-win' outcomes (Yunita et al., 2022). These dynamics, as synthesized in Table 1, offer an overview of the key ideas, stakeholder interests, and observed implementation gaps across the main actor groups shaping Ethiopia's pastoral development arena.

4.2.2 Process: Integrating Policy Making

Policy formulation can be understood as passing the ball between the different teams and players. The ball can be passed amongst a team of high-power players, in their own silo, and amongst the lower-power players – in an attempt at a deliberative and inclusive process of policy making. Content can be seen as the strategy of teams in attaining the desired goals and outputs. The Netherlands' *Do What You Do Best* strategy acknowledges the interaction of conflict and climate change (PD1, p. 4, p. 34) in their policy formulation. The framework emphasizes the importance of addressing root causes in tackling extreme weather conditions (PD 1, p. 10), aspiring to help countries build their resilience, with "specific attention for the poorest people" (PD1, p. 33). Hence, substantiating the efforts towards a multisectoral approach (De Jong & Vijge, 2021). In the *Multi-Annual Country Strategy 2023-2026 for Ethiopia*, the climate ambitions are translated into agriculture-focused and humanitarian response efforts (PD2, p. 2, p. 6), with no explicit mention of pastoralists – in line with Bitzer, van Balen and de Steenhuijsen Piters (2017) description of lack of attention given to vulnerable groups. Further policy formulation of the Dutch closely coincides with EU aspirations as climate change is deemed too great a challenge to be supported on its own (PD1, p. 10). Its political and conflict resolution efforts are likewise inherently aligned with the EU security cooperatives (PD2, p. 6) – reflecting how development initiatives are being streamlined with existing ambitions (Yunita et al., 2022, p. 95). Finally, The Netherlands wants to get something in return for their efforts, a profit from this 'partnership'; thus, if their efforts do not garner sufficient 'profits', they are reluctant to collaborate (M29). *Ethiopia's Ten Years Development Plan* and the *Potential Pathways for Ethiopia 2040* similarly emphasizes tackling climate change in the agricultural sector as a resilience mechanism to raise incomes and improve pastoralist livelihoods (PD10, p. 39; PD6 p. 22). Regarding conflict, the policies acknowledge the

"historical propensity for violence" and authoritarian structures that inhibit inclusive decision-making (PD6, p. 20). With *PENHA's Ethiopia Drylands Restoration Strategy* they admit to the rise of conflict, aggravated by climate variability (PD7, p. 33); the limited capacity to manage conflicts (PD7, p. 22); and the need for a comprehensive and inclusive resilience strategy tailored to the pastoralist way of life (PD 7, p. 45). Ironically, Ethiopia's government, claiming to work to improve pastoral resilience, is largely shaped by key decision-makers from the highlands – urban centers far removed from the lowlands, where pastoral and rural communities reside (I9). This is substantiated by settlement and agricultural investments altering pastoral activities into ones they do not have the resources for nor compatibility to their needs (Reda, 2016).

4.2.3 Output: Assessing Ex-Ante Policy

Policy implementation can be compared to the team dynamics of a football game, the manner in which communication takes place, roles and responsibilities are divided, trust and cohesion is built, engagement is witnessed, and accountability is ensured. The *Draft Policy Strategy Framework* from Ethiopia's MIL, writes on the ineffective implementation of The National Disaster Risk Management Policy (DRM-SPIF) (PD17, p. 50). The recurrent droughts affecting pastoral areas lack timely responses and witness inadequate information dissemination (PD17). The *Digest of Ethiopia's National Policies Strategies Programs* writes on the remoteness of localities hindering accessibility, holding weak administrative capacities, and insufficient technical caliber staff (PD27). The explanation offered in *Ethiopia's Drylands Restoration Strategy* agrees with a "high degree of inconsistency and incoherence across programs and sectors" (PD7, p. 22) – supporting the observations of Tosun and Leininger (2017) on Ethiopia's procedural policy incoherence. On the bright side, the MIL, acting as a coordinating vocal point, "provide appropriate support, even if still there is a divergence of vision" (I5). All 22 ministries have agreed to a role in supporting pastoralism nationally, with MIL coordinating the arena (I4). Yet, the independence of ministries and their individual interests remain a priority – inhibiting the official enactment of their collaborations, "the process is really lengthy, it's like a snail moves, it's not yet enacted, they're trying to do that, but the ministries, they always claim independence" (I4). Without a solidified agreement, a unified implementation process remains absent (I5). Other key players are likewise seen operating independently (Desportes & Hilhorst, 2020), in autonomous siloes, "my learnings are humanitarian organization works separately, development organization works separately, as if there is no common objective in it" (I10). The Netherlands' conduct of good practice does not mention pastoralists nor vulnerable communities as a priority (PD2), also inhibiting their impact in the implementation phase.

Policy outputs can be seen as the game implications of a football match, where the results influence future games, team morale and league standings. Unsuccessful pastoral policy implementation reflects the lacking capacity and limited political will of formulated policy bringing about the intended results (I3). Some argue that the government's role in appraising projects, monitoring, evaluating and involving stakeholders has been impactful (I10), while others find that those mechanisms are weak in enforcing the sustainability of set-out systems (I4). The *Political Economy of Pro Poor Livestock Policy Making Ethiopia* describes the lack of consideration for the needs and

perspectives of pastoralists, leading to resentment and exacerbating violent conflicts (PD12; Burka, Roro & Regasa, 2023). This is likewise reflected in *Ethiopia's Drylands Restoration Strategy*, when they write about the failed consideration of socio-ecological specificities in the pastoralist regions (PD7, p. 9; Tadesse et al., 2016), the poor management failing to promote the peace-development nexus (PD7, p. 33), and the inability to engage communities, customary and modern institutions in decision-making (PD7, p. 19-20). Even with the SDG budget for pastoralist communities "for almost 10 years, they allocated this budget, nothing came out from that" (I2). Yet, while acknowledging the minimal level of development felt by the pastoralists, the policy making arena still holds enabling power (I8). Institutionalization of pastoralist policy, the enactment of a ministerial coordination mandate, and timely measures have every capability to benefit these communities, to save their livestock (I5). There is a difference in addressing root causes vis-a-vis arising symptoms of the problem (I8), in any case, "without these plans, without having appropriate policy, without having projects, innovative projects in the near future, the impact is only going to get worse" (I6). Hence, Ethiopia's pastoralists find themselves at a crossroads of needing institutionalized tailored policy and accepting light attestations of future prosperity. In an ideal world, "we need to be genuine, we need to just do things from [the] bottom [of] our hearts" (I4), or perhaps as genuine as we can get.

5. Conclusion

This paper has made an effort to explore the main research question: *How is the Netherlands' Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) framework formulated among Ethiopia's pastoralist communities, and what does this reveal about the interplay between SDG 13 (climate action), SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) and the role of resilience building?* In understanding on-the-ground dynamics of pastoralist livelihoods, short-term threat assessments bring to light the narrative of Ethiopia's pastoralists and relevant stakeholders engaging with climate-conflict dynamics on an emergency, crisis and humanitarian need basis. In managing the medium-term risks, pastoralists rely on informal governance structures for conflict mediation, natural resource management and kinship sharing as forms of insurance. Their long-term resilience building simultaneously remains low, leading to risky choices at the threshold of survival. Support from (inter-)national actors is limited and questionable in their efforts for pastoral livelihood enhancement, with informal institutions rapidly declining and obstructing pastoral resilience abilities. A lacking focus on micro-individual needs reflects where the high levels of multi-dimensional poverty and a need for a stable income are demanded. Weak meso-institutional systems add to the discussion of pastoralists' traditional risk-sharing mechanisms reinforcing their cultural bonds but brought into questioning by a lack of horizontal and vertical institutional coordination and restricted market linkages. The propagation of sedentarisation and settlement policies, constructed by policy makers from the urban centers, further illuminate the flawed nature of pastoral initiatives disregarding root causes.

Climate initiatives (SDG 13), lacking careful planning and untailored approaches, fuel conflict (SDG 16) from the disregard for growing tensions amidst ambiguous property rights, growing environmental insecurity, sentiments of political grievances and the

dissipation of (informal) governance systems. What emerges is not simply a gap in policy implementation, but a deeper structural tension between global development priorities and local resilience realities. Iteratively, the marginalization of pastoralist groups from institutional decision-making (SDG 16), worsens their resilience capacity (SDG 13) from an ongoing lack of access and unjust distribution of key resources. The role of the Netherlands, while framed as the change-making body, offers finite inputs in enabling the transformative capacities of Ethiopia's pastoralists. The application of the PCSD focuses on 'win-win' ambitions, bringing into question if pastoralists are a genuine interest of their development agenda. Ethiopia's federal government seems guided by notions of political control and attributable power, characteristic of their top-down and authoritative approach to policy making. The desire for economic growth either imposes agricultural and settlement-based initiatives or leaves the 'unproductive' pastoralists out of policy entirely. This logic of development – one that privileges political measurability and economic return – risks displacing the more inclusive and participatory spirit of the SDGs. The SDGs, while global in scope, are fundamentally about locally grounded change. Yet the dominance of macro-level economic and political imperatives often renders pastoralist lifeworld's invisible or inconvenient. Reconciliation between these global frameworks and the lived realities of pastoralists demands more than 'integration'; it requires a reimagining of what counts as development, who defines it, and whose resilience is being pursued. In this light, development becomes not just a set of outcomes to be delivered but a political arena in which competing worldviews – technocratic versus relational, extractive versus adaptive – are negotiated. The lack of initiative in 'leaving in no one behind' is further enunciated with the Netherlands' engagement in predominantly short-term projects, opting for quantifiable results, where strict administration can be registered and communicative trust developed – all criteria for which pastoral development initiatives do not satisfy. Even if these vulnerable communities did satisfy the criteria, the Dutch ministries operate in their own siloes and the ministries of Ethiopia along institutionally fragmented horizontal and vertical dimensions, a recipe for procedural and substantive policy incoherence. As highlighted in Table 1, these fragmented structures and diverging interests across key actors contribute to the persistent gap between policy ambitions and lived realities on the ground. Therefore, the absence of concrete outputs and outcomes leaves pastoralists indebted to the worsening climate conditions and heightened conflict tensions.

Viewed through the lens of Critical and Inclusive Development Theory, this study highlights not only a policy failure but an epistemic one: a failure to value and integrate the knowledge systems, governance traditions, and socio-ecological embeddedness of pastoralist communities. Thus, I wish to rework the Gāli Sāré poem in conceptualizing a key missing link:

*"[**PEOPLE**] Cattle from upland, cattle from lowland; goats from here, sheep from there. [**PROSPERITY**] Are you [my camels] ever going to have the trees you once had all for yourselves? [**PLANET**] In the summer, the floods; in the winter, the locusts. [**PEACE**] In the upland, the Christians; on the lowland, the sorghum fields. In Awash, the Woyane trees [Prosopis juliflora]. [**PARTNERSHIPS**] Where should I take you, my heart [my she-camel]?"* (adapted from Balehegn, 2016, p. 486)

The missing link of bridging the gap between policy and the people. The 5Ps of UN's 2030 Agenda, advocate for collaboration and coherence in coming together to ensure that no one is left behind (UN Sustainable Development Group, 2022). These can and ought to be directly assessed under the outcomes of reality, with the starting point being the people, the first 'P'. The poem adaptation reflects how the pastoralists' narrative can be applied under the 5Ps, effectively. Yet inevitably, the pastoral people and their circumstances respond to the demands of the global world, reacting to its merits and falling to the weaknesses of its systems.

5.1 Research Recommendations

Further research is needed to deepen the understanding of policy coherence and resilience among pastoralist communities across multiple levels. At *the local scale*, addressing the limitation of studying pastoralists from a distance requires a bottom-up approach that directly engages the target group. Gathering firsthand insights from pastoralists can help surface indigenous knowledge and amplify voices that are often underrepresented in academic discourse. Here future research could move beyond consultation toward exploring how such knowledge can be co-produced with pastoralist communities and meaningfully integrated into formal policy processes. This raises critical questions about whether genuine co-production is possible – and under what political and institutional conditions it could be realized. Moving beyond extractive research or top-down implementation requires joint processes where local actors and external partners co-define priorities, methods, and outcomes. Understanding how these conditions can be created is essential to ensure that development efforts reflect not only external agendas but the lived realities and aspirations of pastoralist communities themselves.

At *the national level*, reflecting on the fragmented national policy making processes and the lack of effective inter-ministerial collaboration invites a deeper analysis through the lens of Multi-Stakeholder Engagement Theory. This framework emphasizes the importance of broad-based inclusion, cross-sectoral partnerships, and principle-based governance in navigating complex, "wicked" problems. It could also shed light on the challenges of aligning national policies with the SDG agenda, particularly in contexts where institutional silos hinder coherence and implementation (Nonet et al., 2022).

At *the international level*, a question raised during a meeting with Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs professionals – "Why should the Dutch people care?" – highlights the political sensitivities surrounding international development cooperation. This prompts critical reflection on how the Dutch public perceives the value and legitimacy of investing in distant, climate-vulnerable regions. Future research could explore the public perceptions and political narratives surrounding the Netherlands' role in global development, offering insight into how citizen attitudes shape and potentially constrain coherent and equitable policy engagement abroad. Such inquiry could also illuminate the importance of fostering public awareness about global interdependence and the ecological and ethical responsibilities embedded within international development frameworks.

5.2 Policy Recommendations

The contribution to a multi-fold knowledge gap likewise provides an opportunity for multi-layered recommendations in policy and practice. With a global focus, and in

efforts to foster a truly equal playing field in the Netherlands' 'aid to trade' shift, attention should be given not only to their transformative role as an active partner, but also to how they receive and engage with Ethiopia's contributions to the partnership. This means promoting two-sided knowledge sharing, aspiring toward a decolonial approach to substance, and fostering collaboration across horizontal and vertical institutional dimensions – a policy narrative that emphasizes an *Aid to Trade of Knowledge*. Facilitating dialogue sessions can be seen as a policy opportunity for the Netherlands to leverage their inherent power position in creating widespread value. What is needed is not the 'pumping' of more resources, but rather efficient collaboration and meaningful integration of efforts. It requires people at the table from all parts of the stadium – bystanders, pastoralists, high- and low-power players alike – to understand how they can mobilize the means and knowledge they already have.

Meanwhile with a national and local focus, Ethiopia's existing legal framework for indigenous consultation holds potential to realign misplaced efforts within pastoral development agendas. The country has legal obligations to negotiate and reconcile with indigenous groups in light of development initiatives concerning their livelihoods (Ayele, 2015). Yet, past consultation has often amounted to mere participation, while deliberate consultation requires a more substantive approach (Ayele, 2015). Strengthening these practices can help propel efforts towards genuine inclusivity. Building on the *Aid to Trade of Knowledge* proposition, the Netherlands – as an active partner – can act as a mediator, a source of accountability, and guarantor of transparency. In this way, the PCSD framework can become practically relevant and socially meaningful – bringing policy to the pastoralists, and the pastoralists into policy.

References

Abdulkadr, A. A. (2019). Benefits and challenges of pastoralism system in Ethiopia. Studia Mundi – Economica, 6(3), 56–67. https://doi.org/10.18531/studia.mundi.2019.06.03.56-67

Ambelu, A., Birhanu, Z., Tesfaye, A., Berhanu, N., Muhumuza, C., Kassahun, W., Daba, T., & Woldemichael, K. (2017). Intervention pathways towards improving the resilience of pastoralists: A study from Borana communities, southern Ethiopia. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, *17*, 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2017.06.001

Arjjumend, H. (2018). Review of Pastoralists' resilience and adaptation to climate change: Can technology help pastoralists mitigate the risks? *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management*, *9*(1), 118–128. https://doi.org/10.23910/ijbsm/2018.9.1.1833a

Atmaja, G. M. W. (2018). Legal pluralism politics towards recognition of social unity in customary law and local regulation. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(2), 124–140. https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v2n2.152

Ayele, Y. (2015). Policies and Practices of Consultation with Pastoralist Communities in Ethiopia: The Case of the Omo-Kuraz Sugar Development Project. *The Intricate Road to Development; Government Development Strategies in the Pastoral Areas of the Horn of Africa,* 274-297. https://ipss-addis.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/the_intricate_road_to_development.min_.pdf#page=282

Balehegn, M. (2016). Ecological and social wisdom in camel praise poetry sung by Afar nomads of Ethiopia. *Journal of Ethnobiology*, *36*(2), 457–472. https://doi.org/10.2993/0278-0771-36.2.457

Beyene, F. (2017). Natural Resource Conflict Analysis among Pastoralists in Southern Ethiopia. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, *12*(1), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2017.1284605

Biermann, F., Hickmann, T., Sénit, C., Beisheim, M., Bernstein, S., Chasek, P., Grob, L., Kim, R. E., Kotzé, L. J., Nilsson, M., Llanos, A. O., Okereke, C., Pradhan, P., Raven, R., Sun, Y., Vijge,

M. J., Van Vuuren, D., & Wicke, B. (2022). Scientific evidence on the political impact of the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature Sustainability*, *5*(9), 795–800. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00909-5

Bitzer, V., Van Balen, R., & De Steenhuijsen Piters, B. (2017). *Aid & Trade in Dutch Development Cooperation*. KIT Royal Tropical Institute.

Blind P. K. (2019). *Humanitarian SDGs: Interlinking the 2030 agenda for sustainable development with the agenda for humanity*. United Nations Department of Economic & Social Affairs Working Paper No. 160. ST/ESA/2019/DWP/160

Burka, B. M., Roro, A. G., & Regasa, D. T. (2023). Dynamics of pastoral conflicts in eastern Rift Valley of Ethiopia: Contested boundaries, state projects and small arms. *Pastoralism*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13570-023-00267-7

Coppock, D. L., Tezera, S., Desta, S., & Gebru, G. (2011). Achieving Real Development Impact among Pastoralists: Lessons from Ethiopia. *International Rangelands Congress*, 680–685. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1218&context=envs_facpub

Dika, G., Tolossa, D., & Eyana, S. M. (2021). Multidimensional poverty of pastoralists and implications for policy in Borana rangeland system, Southern Ethiopia. *World Development Perspectives*, *21*, 100293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2021.100293

De Jong, E., & Vijge, M. J. (2021). From Millennium to Sustainable Development Goals: Evolving discourses and their reflection in policy coherence for development. *Earth System Governance*, *7*, 100087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100087

Di Falco, S., & Bulte, E. (2009). Social capital and weather shocks in Ethiopia: Climate change and culturally-induced poverty traps. *London: London School of Economics*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228348564_Social_capital_and_weather_shocks_in_Ethiopia_Climate_change_and_culturally-induced_poverty_traps

Desportes, I., & Hilhorst, D. (2020). Disaster Governance in Conflict-Affected Authoritarian Contexts: the cases of Ethiopia, Myanmar, and Zimbabwe. *Politics and Governance*, *8*(4), 343–354. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i4.3127

Gebeye, B. A. (2019). The Janus face of legal pluralism for the rule of law promotion in sub-Saharan Africa. *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne Des Études Africaines*, *53*(2), 337–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2019.1598452

Gelan, D. T., Getahun, T., & Beyene, F. (2017). Participatory Conflict Analysis: The case of pastoralist groups in south eastern Ethiopia. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, *7*(5), 39–55. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/download/36270/37267

Habte, M., Eshetu, M., Maryo, M., Andualem, D., & Legesse, A. (2022). Effects of climate variability on livestock productivity and pastoralists perception: The case of drought resilience in Southeastern Ethiopia. *Veterinary and Animal Science*, *16*, 100240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vas.2022.100240

Haller, T., Van Dijk, J., Bollig, M., Greiner, C., Schareika, N., & Gabbert, C. (2016). Conflicts, security and marginalisation: institutional change of the pastoral commons in a 'glocal' world. *Revue Scientifique Et Technique De L Office International Des Epizooties*, *35*(2), 405–416. https://doi.org/10.20506/rst.35.2.2532

Hagmann, T., & Mulugeta, A. (2008). Pastoral conflicts and state-building in the Ethiopian lowlands. *Africa Spectrum*, *43*(1), 19–37. https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-40006

Headey, D., Taffesse, A. S., & You, L. (2014). Diversification and development in Pastoralist Ethiopia. *World Development*, *56*, 200–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.015

Hilhorst, D., Desportes, I., & De Milliano, C. (2019). Humanitarian governance and resilience building: Ethiopia in comparative perspective. *Disasters, 43*(S2). https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12332

International Livestock Research Institute. (2024). *Blending indigenous traditional knowledge with scientific weather predictions to enhance livestock production in Baringo, Kenya*. https://www.ilri.org/news/blending-indigenous-traditional-knowledge-scientific-weather-predictions-enhance-livestock

Jaouen, M. (2023). *The Indigenous World 2023: Ethiopia - IWGIA - International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs*. IWGIA - International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. https://www.iwgia.org/en/ethiopia/5048-iw-2023-ethiopia.html

Kassa, B., Beyene, F., & Manig, W. (2005). Coping With Drought among Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Communities in Eastern Ethiopia. *Journal of Rural and Development*, *28*(2), 185–210. https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.288376

LD4D. (2024). Digital system helps Ethiopia's pastoralist communities prepare for the unpredictable. *Livestock Data for Decisions*. https://livestockdata.org/member-spotlight/digital-system-helps-ethiopias-pastoralist-communities-prepare-unpredictable

Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. (2023). *Countries and regions*. Development Cooperation |Government.nl. https://www.government.nl/topics/development-cooperation/partners-in-development

Mohamed, A. A. (2019). Pastoralism and Development Policy in Ethiopia: A review study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, *2*(4), 01–11. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v2i4.562

Munck, R., & O'Hearn, D. (1999). *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm*. Zed Books.

Nilsson, M., Vijge, M. J., Alva, I. L., Bornemann, B., Fernando, K., Hickmann, T., Scobie, M., & Weiland, S. (2022). Interlinkages, integration and coherence. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 92–115). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009082945.005

Nilsson, M., & Weitz, N. (2019). Governing Trade-Offs and building coherence in Policy-Making for the 2030 agenda. *Politics and Governance*, *7*(4), 254–263. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v7i4.2229

Nonet, G. A., Gössling, T., Van Tulder, R., & Bryson, J. M. (2022). Multi-stakeholder engagement for the Sustainable Development Goals: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *180*(4), 945–957. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05192-0

OECD. (2023). Executive Summary. In *Driving Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development: Accelerating Progress on the SDGs*. OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/a6cb4aa1-en

OECD. (2018a). *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2018: Towards Sustainable and Resilient Societies*. OECD Publishing, Paris.
https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301061-en

OECD. (2018b). Country profiles: Institutional mechanisms for policy coherence. In *Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development 2018: Towards Sustainable and Resilient Societies*.
OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301061-6-en.

Patton, C., Sawicki, D., & Clark, J. (2015). *Basic methods of policy analysis and planning*. Routledge.

Pouw, N., & Gupta, J. (2017). Inclusive development: a multi-disciplinary approach. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *24*, 104–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.11.013

Reda, K. T. (2016). Dynamics in pastoral resource management and conflict in the Borana rangelands of southern Ethiopia. *African Security Review*, *25*(1), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/10246029.2015.1126526

Reid, R. S., Fernández-Giménez, M. E., & Galvin, K. A. (2014). Dynamics and resilience of rangelands and pastoral peoples around the globe. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *39*(1), 217–242. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-020713-163329

Shahab, S., Clinch, J. P., & O'Neill, E. (2017). Impact-based planning evaluation: Advancing normative criteria for policy analysis. *Environment and Planning. B, Urban Analytics and City Science/Environment & Planning. B, Urban Analytics and City Science*, *46*(3), 534–550. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808317720446

Shawoo, Z., Maltais, A., Dzebo, A., & Pickering, J. (2022). Political drivers of policy coherence for sustainable development: An analytical framework. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *33*(4), 339–350. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.2039

Srigiri, S., & Scheumann, W. (2023). Governance of the Water-Land-Food Nexus for Integrated Achievement of the 2030 Agenda: The case of Lower Awash River Basin, Ethiopia. In *Governing the Interlinkages between the SDGs* (pp. 106–123). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003254683

Tadesse, B., Beyene, F., Kassa, W., & Wentzell, R. (2016). The dynamics of (Agro) pastoral conflicts in eastern Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities*, *11*(1), 29–60. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ejossah/article/download/134623/124256

Tofu, D. A., Fana, C., Dilbato, T., Dirbaba, N. B., & Tesso, G. (2023). Pastoralists' and agro-pastoralists' livelihood resilience to climate change-induced risks in the Borana zone, south Ethiopia: Using resilience index measurement approach. *Pastoralism*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13570-022-00263-3

Tosun, J., & Leininger, J. (2017). Governing the Interlinkages between the Sustainable Development Goals: Approaches to Attain Policy Integration. *Global Challenges*, *1*(9). https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201700036

Unruh, J. A. (2005). Changing conflict resolution institutions in the Ethiopian pastoral commons: the role of armed confrontation in rule-making. *GeoJournal*, *64*(3), 225–237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-005-5650-2

UN Sustainable Development Group. (2024). *Leave no one behind*. https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values/leave-no-one-behind

UN Sustainable Development Group. (2022). *The 5Ps of the SDGs: People, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership*.

Yunita, A., Biermann, F., Kim, R. E., & Vijge, M. J. (2022). The (anti-)politics of policy coherence for sustainable development in the Netherlands: Logic, method, effects. *Geoforum*, *128*, 92–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.12.002

Appendix A – List of Interview Respondents

Code	Role	Affiliation Type	Organization (if not anonymized)	Nationality	Based In	Interview Date
I1	Peace Ambassador / Research Advisor	Academic / NGO	London Institute of Peace / UNAccc / London Politica	Ethiopia	Netherlands	Feb 20, 2024
I2	Policy Officer	Embassy (Government)	Embassy of the Netherlands, Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 21, 2024
I3	PhD Researcher (Conflict & Pastoralism)	Academic / Research Institute	Water & Land Resource Center (WLRC), Addis Ababa Univ.	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 23, 2024
I4	Executive Director / PhD	NGO / Academic	Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 28, 2024
I5	Resilience Program Specialist	International NGO	USAID	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 5, 2024
I6	Senior Advisor – Research & Dev.	Foundation / Government support	Gates Foundation (supporting FDRE Ministry)	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 6, 2024
I7	International Consultant	Consultancy / Multilateral	IGAD, FAO, GALVmed, CoWater SPARC	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 6, 2024
I8	Regional Coordinator	UN-Affiliated Organization	[Anonymized]	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 7, 2024
I9	Environment & Climate Specialist	NGO	[Anonymized]	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 15, 2024
I10	Country Representative / Program Lead	NGO / Faith-Based	Woord en Daad	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 26, 2024

Appendix B – Meetings and Informal Consultations

Code	Role	Affiliation Type	Organization	Nationality	Based In	Date
M1	PhD Student	Academic	Utrecht University	NL	NL	Dec 8, 2024
M2	PhD Student	Academic	Wageningen University	NL	NL	Dec 13, 2024
M3	Researcher	Academic	Water & Land Resource Center (WLRC)	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Jan 24, 2024
M4	PhD Lead	Academic	Wageningen/Utrecht University	NL	NL	Jan 30, 2024
M5	Researcher	Academic	ILVO	Ethiopia	Belgium	Feb 2, 2024
M6	Policy Officer	Think Tank	Millennium Institute	Spain	USA	Feb 9, 2024
M7	Peace Ambassador / SDG Advisor	NGO / Multilateral	London Institute of Peace / UNaccc / London Politica	Ethiopia	NL	Feb 12, 2024
M8	Resilience Program Management Specialist	International Development	USAID	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 13, 2024
M9	Program Coordinator	NGO	EUTF SEEK II – Pact Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 13, 2024
M10	Executive Director / PhD	NGO / Academic	Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia / Addis Ababa University	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 14, 2024
M11	Policy Officer	Government	Embassy of the Netherlands in Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 15, 2024
M12	Professor / Researcher	Academic	Mekelle University	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 16, 2024
M13	PhD Researcher (Peace/Conflict)	Academic	Addis Ababa University / WLRC	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 16, 2024
M14	Country Rep. & Senior Advisor	NGO	Woord en Daad	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 20, 2024
M15	Junior Lecturer / PhD	Academic	University of Amsterdam / ISS	Iran	NL	Feb 23, 2024
M16	Environmental & Social Safeguards Consultant	Multilateral	World Bank Group	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 23, 2024

M17	Senior Int'l Consultant	Multilateral / CSO	WHO, WB, UNICEF, USAID, Global Fund & CSOs	NL	NL	Feb 24, 2024
M18	International Consultant	Multilateral	CoWater SPARC; IGAD; GALVMed; FAO	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 27, 2024
M19	Senior Advisor – Lowland R&D	Foundation / Government	Gates Foundation / FDRE Ministry of Irrigation and Lowlands	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 27, 2024
M20	Project Component Manager	NGO / Development Cooperation	GIZ-SSAP Project	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 28, 2024
M21	Policy Officer	Government	Dutch Ministry of Agriculture	NL	NL	Feb 28, 2024
M22	Environment & Climate Specialist	NGO	World Vision	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 28, 2024
M23	Humanitarian Programme Specialist	Multilateral	UNFPA Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 28, 2024
M24	Regional Coordinator	Multilateral	UNFPA Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Feb 28, 2024
M25	Senior Gender & Management Consultant	Consultancy	Impact for Sustainability (I4S) Consulting PLC	Ethiopia/NL	Ethiopia	Mar 6, 2024
M26	Programme Manager	NGO	HEKS/EPER	NL	Ethiopia	Mar 13, 2024
M27	Support Coordinator	NGO	NRC Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Mar 14, 2024
M28	Strategy Advisor DG Int'l Cooperation	Government	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs	NL	NL	Mar 18, 2024
M29	First Secretary – Health	Government	Embassy of the Netherlands in Addis Ababa	NL	Ethiopia	Mar 19, 2024
M30	Associate Professor / Academic Director	Academic	Utrecht University / CHARM-EU	NL	NL	Mar 26, 2024

Appendix C – Policy and Program Documents Reviewed

Code	Title	Source	Year	Category
PD1	Do What We Do Best	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)	2022	NL Policy
PD2	MACS 2023–26 Ethiopia	MFA	2023	NL Policy
PD3	NL & Ethiopia	MFA	2023	NL Policy
PD4	Ethiopia OS Results	MFA	2022	NL Policy
PD5	Evaluation Dutch IRBC Policy	KIT Royal Tropical Institute	2017	NL Policy
PD6	Potential Pathways for Ethiopia 2040	Donnenfeld et al.	2021	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD7	Ethiopia Drylands Restoration Strategy	PENHA	2020	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD8	Roadmap Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Early Warning/Action System	EDRMC	2021	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD9	Drought Response Plan 2023	IOM	2023	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD10	Ten Years Development Plan Ethiopia	Government of Ethiopia	2020	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD11	Ethiopia 2020–35	UNDP	2020	Ethiopia Planning & Response
PD12	Political Economy of Pro Poor Livestock Policy Making Ethiopia	Halderman	2016	Ethiopia Policy
PD13	Pastoral Dispossession Access to Resources & Policy Dialogue	Elias	2015	Ethiopia Policy
PD14	Inclusive Growth & Inequalities Ethiopia	UNDP	2020	Ethiopia Policy
PD15	Joint Programme in Developing Regional States	UN Ethiopia	2019	Ethiopia Policy
PD16	Summary Context Analysis – Enrich Draft Policy Strategy Framework	Ministry of Federal/Pastoral Development	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD17	Summary Context Analysis – Full	Ministry of Federal/Pastoral Development	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD18	Pastoralism & the Green Economy – A Natural Nexus?	IUCN/UNEP	2014	Ethiopia Policy
PD19	Pastoral D Ethiopia – Trends & Way Forward	Gebremeskel Desta Kassa	2020	Ethiopia Policy
PD20	Achieving Better Service Delivery Through Decentralization	Garcia & Rajkumar / World Bank	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD21	Crisis of Pastoralism	Future Agricultures	2016	Ethiopia Policy
PD22	Ethiopia Pastoralist Policies	Fratkin	2014	Ethiopia Policy
PD23	Development Effectiveness Review	Ethiopia Country Review	2019	Ethiopia Policy
PD24	Agricultural & Rural Transformation Ethiopia	Diriba	2018	Ethiopia Policy

PD25	Mobility Matters – COMESA Regional Livestock & Pastoralism Training	COMESA	2019	Ethiopia Policy
PD26	Drought & Food Security – COMESA Training	COMESA	2019	Ethiopia Policy
PD27	Digest of Ethiopia's National Policies Strategies Programs	Assefa	2020	Ethiopia Policy
PD28	IGAD Livestock Exports from Pastoralist Areas	Aklilu & Catley	2011	Ethiopia Policy
PD29	Policies & Strategies for Pastoral Development Ethiopia	Yimer	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD30	Policy Environment & Constraints for Pastoral Development Ethiopia	Yimer	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD31	Land Management in Pastoral Areas – Relevant Policies & Proclamations	RPLRP	2020	Ethiopia Policy
PD32	Policy Options for Pastoral Development Ethiopia	Little et al.	2014	Ethiopia Policy
PD33	Pastoralism and Pastoral Policy in Ethiopia	IIED & Tufts	2015	Ethiopia Policy
PD34	Pastoral Rangelands – Policy & Institutional Concerns Ethiopia	Gelan	2017	Ethiopia Policy
PD35	Pastoralism Ethiopia & the Policy Environment	Gebur, Desta & Coppock (ILRI)	2018	Ethiopia Policy
PD36	Evaluation of Legal/Policy Interventions in Pastoral Development Ethiopia	Gebeye	2019	Ethiopia Policy
PD37	Land, Climate, Energy, Agriculture, Development Nexus	ZEF	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD38	Ethiopia Readiness Assessment	IIED	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD39	Main Messages – VNR 2022 Ethiopia	Government of Ethiopia	2022	Ethiopia Policy
PD40	VNR 2022 Ethiopia	Government of Ethiopia	2022	Ethiopia Policy
PD41	Governing the Water-Land-Food Nexus in Lower Awash River Basin	Srigiri	2021	Ethiopia Policy
PD42	Climate Change and Conflict in Pastoralist Regions in Ethiopia	USAID	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD43	Understanding Context – TOPs Ethiopia	Teshome & Bayissa	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD44	Livestock Feeding Support during Drought	USAID	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD45	Achieving Development Impact – Pastoral & Agro-Pastoral	USAID	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD46	Alternative Livelihoods for Improved Resilience – Afar	Tufts & EU	2020	Ethiopia Projects
PD47	Water Development – USAID ODI StC	Nassef & Belayhun	2020	Ethiopia Projects
PD48	Rapid Livelihoods Conflict Analysis Ethiopia	FIC	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD49	Short-Term Fee Based Skills Development	Feed the Future	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD50	Is RIPA North Transforming Restrictive Gender Norms?	Feed the Future	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD51	Enhancing Incomes & Resilience among Pastoralists	Feed the Future	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD52	Economic Linkages between Pastoralists and Farmers	Feed the Future	2022	Ethiopia Projects

PD53	Climate Information Services in Ethiopia	Feed the Future	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD54	PSM & Application in Mali and Ethiopia	ALNAP Innovations	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD55	Mind the Gao – Commercialization & Wealth Disparity in Pastoral Ethiopia	Aklilu & Catley – FIC UK AID	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD56	Pastoral Drop Out Study	Solomon et al.	2020	Ethiopia Projects
PD57	Planning in Conflict – Do No Harm in Pastoralist Contexts	Grafe et al.	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD58	Ethiopia Lowlands Livelihood Resilience Project	World Bank	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD59	South Omo Zone Conflict Assessment	USAID	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD60	SEEK I – PEA Report	EUTF	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD61	SEEK II – Annex	EUTF	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD62	Q1 Apr–June 2021 Report	SEEK	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD63	Q2 Jul–Sept 2021 Report	SEEK	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD64	Q3 Oct–Dec 2021 Report	SEEK	2021	Ethiopia Projects
PD65	Q4 Jan–Mar 2022 Report	SEEK	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD66	Q5 Apr–June 2022 Report	SEEK	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD67	Q6 Jul–Sept 2022 Report	SEEK	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD68	Q7 Oct–Dec 2022 Report	SEEK	2022	Ethiopia Projects
PD69	Q8 Jan–Mar 2023 Report	SEEK	2023	Ethiopia Projects
PD70	Q9 Apr–June 2023 Report	SEEK	2023	Ethiopia Projects