



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE

CENTER FOR FEDERALISM AND GOVERNANCE STUDIES

Vertical Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-Building in Ethiopian Federation; A Case Study of the Federal Ministry of Peace and Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau.

By

Mikias Tadesse Demeke

Advisor: Mohammed Dejen (Dr.)

A Thesis Submitted to Addis Ababa University; Center for Federalism and Governance Studies In partial Fulfillment for the Requirements of the Masters of Arts (MA) in Federalism and Governance

June 2024

Declaration

I Mikias Tadesse, ID No_ GSR/5183/15, do hereby declare that “Vertical Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-Building in Ethiopian Federation; A Case Study of the Federal Ministry of Peace and Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau.” is my own original work which has not been presented for any degree or examination in any university and the source used are have been duly acknowledged and cited.

Declared by

Student **Mikias Tadesse Demeke**

Signature _____

Date _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval to college Supervisor

Advisor **Mohammed Dejen (Dr.)**

Signature _____

Date _____

Approval

The undersigned certify that they have read and hereby recommended to the Addis Ababa University Center for Federalism and Governance Studies to accept the Thesis submitted by Mikias Tadesse, entitled “Vertical Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-Building in Ethiopian Federation; A Case Study of the Federal Ministry of Peace and Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau.”, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of a master’s degree in, Department of Federalism and Governance.

Advisor: Mohammed Dejen (Dr.) Date _____ Signature _____

Examiner: _____ Date _____ Signature _____

Examiner: _____ Date _____ Signature _____

Approval of Center Head

_____ Signature _____ Date _____

Approval of college Head

_____ signature _____ Date _____

Addis Ababa

June, 2024

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I express my deepest gratitude to the Almighty God for granting me the strength, wisdom, and perseverance throughout this research journey. His divine guidance has been the cornerstone of my endeavors.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to my beloved mother, Mulunesh Fitsum, whose unwavering support and encouragement sustained me in every step of this research. Her love and belief in me have been my source of inspiration.

Special appreciation goes to my advisor, Mohammed Dejen, (Dr.), for his invaluable guidance, expertise, and unwavering support. His mentorship has been instrumental in shaping the direction of this study.

I am deeply grateful to the Ministry of Peace, the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Office, the Sheger City Security Administration Office, the House of Federation, and Constitutional and Federalism Indoctrination Center for their generous support and cooperation. Their assistance in facilitating interviews and providing access to documents significantly enriched the research process.

Finally, I extend my sincere thanks to all the participants who generously shared their insights and experiences, contributing to the depth and richness of this study.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	2
Approval	3
Acknowledgements	4
Table of Contents	5
Abstract.....	8
CHAPTER ONE	9
1. INTRODUCTION	9
1.1. Background of the Study	9
1.2. Problem Statement	11
1.3. Objectives of the study.....	13
1.3.1 General Objective	13
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	13
1.4. Basic Research Questions.....	13
1.5. Research Design and Justification	14
1.5.1 Qualitative Case Study Design	14
1.5.2 Justification.....	14
1.6 Sampling Techniques:.....	15
1.6.1 Purposive Sampling	15
1.6.2 Snowball Sampling	15
1.6.3 Combining Sampling Techniques.....	16
1.7 Sources and Types of Data	16
1.7.1. Interviews,	16
1.7.2. Document Analysis,	16
1.7.3. Observations,	17

1.8. Significance of the Study	17
1.9. Scope of the Study	18
1.10. Overview of the Organization of the Study	18
CHAPTER TWO	19
2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION ON IGRS AND PEACE-BUILDING	19
2.2. Definition of Concepts	19
2.2.1. Intergovernmental Relations	19
2.2.2. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations	21
2.2.3. Peace-Building.....	21
2.3 Link between IGR, Conflict resolution and peace-building comparative Cases	22
2.3.1 Intergovernmental Relations and Conflict Resolution in India.....	22
2.3.2 Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-building in South Africa.....	26
2.3.3. Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-Building in Switzerland.....	28
CHAPTER THREE.....	30
3. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN ETHIOPIA: A CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION FOR COOPERATION AND CONSENSUS.....	30
3.2 A Constitutional Foundation for Cooperation and Consensus	31
3.3. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations (V-IGRs) in Ethiopia: Institutions and Practices	32
3.3.1 The Role of Political Parties in V-IGR.....	32
3.3.2 The Role of the House of Federation (HOF) in V-IGR.....	33
3.3.3 The Role of the Ministry of Peace in Vertical IGR.....	34
3.4. 3. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) and Sector-Based IGR in Ethiopia: A Framework Established by Proclamation No. 1231/2021	35
CHAPTER FOUR.....	38
4.2 Overview of Addis Ababa City	39
4.2.1 Geographical Context.....	40

4.2.2 Administrative Structure	40
4.3. Actors and Coordination in Peace-Building	40
4.3.1. Key Actors Involved in Peace-building Process in Addis Ababa City	40
4.4. Collaboration Mechanisms among Actors	42
4.5. Analysis of Intergovernmental Relations between MOP, AAPSB and Sheger City security Administration office	45
4.6. Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Vertical IGRs for Peace-Building.....	46
4.7. Impact of IGR in Addis Ababa City Administration	47
4.8 Recommendation	50
4.9 Conclusion.....	51
References.....	53
Annex I; List of Interviewees.....	63
Annex II; Interview question	65

Abstract

This study explores the interplay between formal and informal intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and the Sheger City Security Administration Office in their contributions to peace-building initiatives in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The research, employing a qualitative case study approach with interviews and document analysis, reveals a complex landscape. While a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) exists between MOP and AAPSB, informal communication and reliance on personal connections significantly influence collaboration. The absence of a formal IGR structure, including dedicated forums and offices, coupled with a limited legal framework for fiscal arrangements and a lack of awareness of IGR mechanisms, act as significant hurdles to effective collaboration. The study identifies both institutional and political factors impacting IGRs. Institutionally, the lack of skilled personnel trained in IGR practices and the absence of a dedicated body like a National IGR Secretariat hinder progress. Additionally, the current IGR proclamation lacks detailed implementing regulations and directives. Financial constraints further impede efforts towards joint planning and awareness creation. Politically, factors like party affiliation, overreliance on informal party channels, and a lack of commitment from leaders pose challenges. Despite these limitations, informal IGRs have demonstrably contributed to successful conflict management and improved peace in Addis Ababa. The presence of the MOU signifies progress in cooperation. However, to ensure sustained and effective collaboration for future peace-building efforts, the research recommends strengthening institutional frameworks, establishing dedicated IGR forums and a National IGR Secretariat, enhancing capacity building, and improving the legal framework for IGRs. By implementing these recommendations, IGRs can evolve into a more robust and impactful tool for peace-building in Addis Ababa.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Intergovernmental relations (IGRs) serve as the lifeblood of federal systems, providing essential pathways for collaboration and coordination between central, regional, and local authorities in pursuit of shared objectives (Nigussie, 2015). This complicated relationship of governance levels plays a critical role in navigating the complexities inherent in federal structures, ensuring effective governance and the achievement of common goals (Opeskin, B. R. 2001). Recognizing the significance of this dynamic relationship, this research delves into the vertical intergovernmental relations within Ethiopia's federal structure, specifically examining the interactions between the Federal Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa City Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB).

Countries employ various mechanisms, both formal and informal, to facilitate communication and collaboration between different tiers of government (Phillimore, J. 2013). Formal approaches entail the establishment of institutions guided by legal frameworks, while informal mechanisms rely on unwritten, socially shared rules that operate beyond official channels (Ketema, 2017). Regardless of the approach, the overarching objective remains the creation of a conducive platform for negotiations and the establishment of sustainable partnerships among government tiers (Assefa, (2009). For over two decades, Ethiopia has employed both formal and informal IGR mechanisms, with a notable reliance on the latter (Ketema, 2017). The focal points include an in-depth analysis of formal structures and mechanisms, an assessment of coordination between MOP, APSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office identification of challenges impeding effective relations, an examination of their impact on peace and security outcomes, and the formulation of recommendations to enhance these crucial intergovernmental dynamics.

The vertical intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia's federal system have significant implications for governance, service delivery, and peace Building (Kenna, 2014). Understanding this complex system requires examining the global, regional, sub-regional, and country-level facts that shape the dynamics of intergovernmental relations (Assefa, 2009). This background

section will follow a deductive approach, starting with general global facts and gradually narrowing down to specific country-level facts and the need for this particular study

At the global level, federal systems are prevalent in many countries around the world. These systems aim to distribute power and responsibilities between central governments and subnational entities, fostering regional autonomy while maintaining national unity (Watts, R. L. 1998). The study of intergovernmental relations in federal systems provides valuable insights into effective governance, cooperation, and conflict resolution. Regionally, even if Africa is known for its resistance to federal systems as they usually consider it as a “divide-and-rule tactic” of colonial powers, there are federal systems in countries such as Nigeria, South Africa, and Ethiopia (Suberu, R. 2009). Ethiopia, in particular, adopted a federal system in 1995, The Ethiopian federal system is unique in its composition, with diverse ethnic groups and regional entities that require effective coordination and cooperation for sustainable development and peace building (Keller, E. J. 2002).

At the case of Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia, presents a significant context for studying vertical intergovernmental relations. Addis Ababa is not only the political and economic center of the country but also it is the seat of the Regional State of Oromia that makes the IGR and other forms of coordination more complex; Addis Ababa is a melting pot of diverse regional identities (Yonatan, (2020). Consequently, managing peace building in Addis Ababa requires effective coordination between the MOP and AAPSB.

At the country level, Ethiopia's federal system is characterized by a division of power and responsibilities between the federal government and regional states. This division has created a complex web of vertical intergovernmental relations, which are crucial for ensuring effective governance, service delivery, and peace and security outcomes. However, the functioning of these intergovernmental relations is not without challenges and gaps (Nigussie, 2015). Existing studies on vertical intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia's federal system have primarily focused on broader aspects of governance, decentralization, and regional autonomy. However, there is a shortage of research specifically examining the dynamics, challenges, and opportunities of intergovernmental relations in the context of peace building, particularly between the MOP and AAPSB.

This study aims to fill this research gap by focusing on the specific case of MOP and AAPSB. By analyzing the formal structures, coordination mechanisms, challenges, and opportunities of their intergovernmental relations, this study will provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of vertical intergovernmental relations in addressing peace and security challenges in Addis Ababa.

Generally, this study is motivated by the need to understand and improve the vertical intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia's federal system, specifically in the context of peace Building. By examining the global, regional, sub-regional, and country-level facts, this research aims to contribute to the existing literature and provide practical recommendations for enhancing intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia. This research thus serves as ideal, guiding efforts towards strengthening the foundations of governance and fostering sustainable peace building in Ethiopia and beyond.

1.2. Problem Statement

Vertical intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia's federal system face critical challenges (Habtamu & Zelalem, 2019) that hinder for effective peace-building. Despite expectations for effective peace building through strong vertical intergovernmental relations between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa City Government Peace and Security Administration Bureau (AAPSB), news reports paint a different picture. Addis Ababa has grappled with persistent insecurity despite the existence of formal structures dedicated to peace building, like the Ministry of Peace MOP and the Addis Ababa City Government Peace and Security Administration Bureau (AAPSB) (Proclamation No.74/2021 and (Proclamation No. 1263/2021).¹ This mismatch between expectation and reality begs the question: are the vertical intergovernmental relations between these institutions truly conducive to effective peace building? While frameworks and protocols may exist, the recent clashes outside the Grand Anwar Mosque, resulting in the tragic loss of innocent lives, cast a stark shadow on their efficacy.²

¹ The reporter newspaper, Mass protests erupt over mosque demolitions, By Tewedaj Sintayehu April 24, 2021 and Ministry under fire: where is the Peace? By Nardos Yoseph February 3, 2024

² The Reporter, Mass protests erupt over mosque demolitions, By Staff Reporter, May 27, 2023

These challenges arise from the gaps in properly understanding Multilayer Governance and Jurisdictional Complexity Complicating matters further; Addis Ababa operates within a multilayer governance structure outlined in Article 49 of the FDRE constitution (FDRE Constitution, 1995). Addis Ababa serves as the seat for both the autonomous Addis Ababa City Administration and the Oromia regional state and also the Federal Government (Ibid), which adds an additional layer of complexity to the vertical intergovernmental relations within the city. The coexistence of these administrative bodies requires careful coordination and cooperation and also a sustainable and certain means of communication to effectively manage governance, service delivery, and peace building.

From a literature perspective, several scholars have explored intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia. For instance, (Nigussie, 2015) examined the Federal-state Intergovernmental Relationship in Ethiopia, while (Habtamu & Zelalem, 2019) studied the Inter-Federal-Regional Conflict Resolution Mechanisms in Ethiopian Federation. (Assefa, 2009) focused on the system of intergovernmental relations (IGR) in Ethiopia, and (Yonatan, 2020) investigated intergovernmental cooperation, divided societies, and capital cities, specifically the case of the Ethiopian capital. (Kenna, 2017) explored the impact of federal-states intergovernmental relations on regional states' autonomy in Ethiopia, and (Ketema, 2017) delved into the institutionalization of IGR in the Ethiopian federation. Although these studies provide valuable insights into IGR in Ethiopia, they primarily concentrate on broad aspects of IGR encompassing various levels of government and policy areas within the Ethiopian federal system. However, none of the existing research focuses specifically on vertical IGR and peace-building, nor does it examine the relationship between the Ministry of Peace (MoP) and the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AACPSB). This research aims to address this gap in the literature by focusing on vertical IGR, specifically analyzing the interaction between the MoP and the AACPSB in their peace-building efforts. By zooming in on the vertical dimension of IGR and studying the MoP-AACPSB relationship, this research intends to provide valuable insights into vertical IGR mechanisms for peace-building within the Ethiopian federal system. The findings of this study can contribute to improving collaboration and coordination between federal and city-level peace-building institutions.

So this lack of focused research from peace-building perspective underscores the importance of this study, which aims to fill this gap by examining the interplay between MOP and AAPSB in managing peace-building challenges within Addis Ababa's unique and complex context. Especially with the introduction of the IGR Proclamation a timely and relevant study is necessary to bridge these gaps and provide a comprehensive understanding of the vertical intergovernmental relations between the MOP and AACPSB.

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objective

Examine the role and Challenges of Vertical Intergovernmental relation in Peace-Building between MOP and AAPSB.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study will be to:-

- ✚ Analyze the legal and institutional framework governing vertical IGRs between MOP and AAPSB, in the context of peace-building.
- ✚ Assess the strategies and approaches employed by the MOP and AAPSB in promoting vertical IGRs for peace-building.
- ✚ Identify the key factors influencing the effectiveness of vertical intergovernmental relations between these two entities.
- ✚ Identify the coordination and collaboration between the MOP and AAPSB and its contribution to successful peace-Building in Addis Ababa.
- ✚ Identify the actors and assess how they coordinate for Peace-building in Addis Ababa.

1.4. Basic Research Questions

1. What strategies and approaches do the MOP and AAPSB employ to promote vertical IGRs for peace-building?
2. Who are the actors and how do they work and coordinate for Peace-building in Addis Ababa?

3. What are the key factors influencing the effectiveness of vertical intergovernmental relations between the MOP and AAPSB?
4. How does the coordination and collaboration between the MOP and AAPSB contribute to successful peace-building in Addis Ababa?

1.5. Research Design and Justification

This research employed a qualitative case study approach to investigate the vertical intergovernmental relations (IGR) between the MOP and AAPSB in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. This approach was particularly appropriate for this study because it allowed for a deep and nuanced understanding of the complex and dynamic nature of IGR in the context of peace-building.

1.5.1 Qualitative Case Study Design

A qualitative case study design was characterized by its focus on in-depth exploration of a particular phenomenon within a specific context (Yin, R. K. 2003). In this instance, the case study focused on an explanatory case study on the IGR between the MOP and AAPSB, examining their interactions, challenges, and successes in promoting peace-building in Addis Ababa. The qualitative approach allowed for the collection of rich and detailed data through methods such as interviews, document analysis, and observations.

1.5.2 Justification

The choice of a qualitative case study design was justified based on the following compelling reasons: Qualitative research methods enabled a deep and holistic exploration of the research topic (IBID). By conducting in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and analyzing relevant documents, this design provided a comprehensive understanding of the IGR and their implications for peace-building. A case study design allowed for the investigation of a specific context, in this case, Addis Ababa, and the unique dynamics and interactions within. This approach enabled the examination of the IGR within their specific cultural, political, and administrative context, providing a rich and nuanced understanding (Gerring, J., & McDermott, R. 2007). The qualitative case study design allowed for the collection of data from multiple sources, including interviews, document analysis (Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. 1994). And this triangulation of data enhanced the validity and reliability of the findings and provided a more comprehensive picture of the IGR. Also, the qualitative case study design was well-suited

for addressing real-world issues and providing practical recommendations. By examining the Vertical IGR, this research identified strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities, informing policy and decision-making processes in the field of peace-building (Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989).

1.6 Sampling Techniques:

This study employed two sampling techniques: purposive sampling and snowball sampling. These techniques were well-suited for selecting individuals with relevant expertise and knowledge in the field of intergovernmental relations and peace-building in Addis Ababa. The justification for each sampling technique was as follows:

1.6.1 Purposive Sampling

In this study, purposive sampling was used to select 10 participants from MOP, 3 from AAPSB, 3 from HOF, 1 from the Constitutional and Federalism Indoctrination Center, and 1 from the Sheger City Security Administration Office. These participants were chosen based on their in-depth knowledge, experience, and decision-making authority in intergovernmental relations and peace-building.

Justification

Purposive sampling ensured that the selected participants possessed the necessary expertise and insights to provide valuable information and perspectives on the research topic. This technique was well-suited for studies that aimed to gather data from individuals with specialized knowledge and experience, which was crucial for understanding the complexities of intergovernmental relations and peace-building (Maxwell, J. A. 2021). Also, by selecting individuals with decision-making authority, the study gained insights into the actual practices and challenges faced in managing vertical intergovernmental relations.

1.6.2 Snowball Sampling

Snowball sampling was the technique used to identify and recruit participants by obtaining referrals from initial participants. Through this method, 3 participants from the Sheger City Security Administration Office, 1 participant from AAPSB, and 1 participant from HOF were selected.

Justification

Snowball sampling allowed the researcher to tap into existing networks of experts and officials, potentially uncovering additional key informants who may not have been identified through other sampling techniques (Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). By utilizing snowball sampling, the study gathered data from individuals with diverse perspectives and experiences, enriching the understanding of vertical intergovernmental relations and peace-building. Also, this technique was particularly useful for reaching individuals who may have been difficult to identify through traditional sampling methods, such as those working in informal or non-traditional roles (Saunders, M. N. (2012).

1.6.3 Combining Sampling Techniques

By combining purposive sampling to select experts and higher officials and snowball sampling to expand the network within the Addis Ababa City Administration, this study gathered data from individuals with diverse perspectives and insights, enhancing the richness and depth of the research findings. This approach ensured that the study captured a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of vertical intergovernmental relations and peace-building in Addis Ababa.

1.7 Sources and Types of Data

This research utilized multiple sources and types of data to provide a comprehensive understanding of the vertical intergovernmental relations (IGR) between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB). The following sources and types of data were employed:

1.7.1. Interviews, A total of 23 in-depth interviews were conducted with key stakeholders, including officials from MOP, AAPSB, Sheger City Security Administration, HOF, Constitutional and Federalism Indoctrination Center representatives, as well as experts in the field of intergovernmental relations and peace-building. The purpose of these interviews was to collect valuable insights, perspectives, and experiences regarding IGR and its influence on peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa.

1.7.2. Document Analysis, Relevant documents, such as policy documents, reports, agreements, and official correspondence, were analyzed to gain an understanding of the formal

mechanisms, processes, and policies governing the vertical IGR between the MOP and AAPSB. Document analysis helped identify the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges in the existing framework and provided a historical context for the study.

1.7.3. Observations, Direct observations of meetings took place in June at the Sheger City Security Administration Office, involving representatives from Sheger City and AAPSB. The discussions focused on Addis Ababa City Woreda representatives from the Peace and Security Office, Sheger City Security Administration neighboring Woreda representatives, and events related to intergovernmental relations and peace-building. These observations aimed to provide firsthand insights into the dynamics of interactions, decision-making processes, and collaborative efforts between the MOP and AAPSB.

By utilizing a combination of interviews, document analysis, observations, this research aimed to triangulate the data from multiple sources, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings, and providing a comprehensive understanding of the vertical IGR and its implications for peace-building in Addis Ababa.

1.8. Significance of the Study

The research findings will provide valuable insights for policy makers in the field of intergovernmental relations and peace-building. By understanding the institutional framework, factors influencing effectiveness, and challenges faced in vertical intergovernmental relations, policy makers can develop targeted interventions and policy reforms to enhance cooperation, coordination, and governance in peace and security affairs. Peace-building practitioners will find the outcomes of this study relevant to their work in Ethiopia and similar contexts. The identification of effective practices, lessons learned, and potential areas for improvement in vertical intergovernmental relations will guide the design and implementation of development programs and initiatives aimed at strengthening peace, security, and governance. The study's contributions to the wider research community lie in its methodological approach and data sources. By employing a comprehensive and focused methodology, utilizing diverse data sources, and analyzing the specific case of the MOP and AAPSB, this research sets a precedent for future studies examining vertical intergovernmental relations in the peace and security domain.

1.9. Scope of the Study

The scope of the study focused on the concept of vertical intergovernmental relations and its implications for peace-building in the Ethiopian Federation. Specifically, it examined the legal and institutional framework governing vertical intergovernmental relations, the strategies and approaches employed by the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) in promoting peace-building, and the key factors influencing the effectiveness of vertical intergovernmental relations between these two entities.

The study primarily concentrated on the context of vertical intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia, with a particular emphasis on the relationship between the MOP and the AAPSB. Case studies from Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, and the surrounding Oromia regional state were utilized to illustrate the dynamics of intergovernmental relations in practice.

The snowball sampling method of data collection also led the study to include the Oromia Regional State Peace and Security Office since Addis Ababa is surrounded by the Oromia regional state, and Addis Ababa serves as the seat for the Oromia regional state government. This inclusion provided a comprehensive understanding of the intergovernmental dynamics between the MOP, AAPSB, and the Oromia Regional State Peace and Security Office.

To achieve its objectives, the study employed a cross-sectional approach, examining the then-current state of intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia.

1.10. Overview of the Organization of the Study

This study is organized into several key sections to effectively examine and analyze the vertical intergovernmental relations between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) in Ethiopia's federal system, with a specific focus on their impact on peace-building in Addis Ababa. It will include an introduction, literature review, examination of the institutional framework and interaction between the MOP and AAPSB, analysis of factors influencing effectiveness, assessment of challenges and opportunities, and a conclusion summarizing findings and implications for future research

CHAPTER TWO

2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION ON IGRS AND PEACE-BUILDING

2.1 Introduction

Chapter Two delves into the theoretical and conceptual foundations of Intergovernmental Relations (IGRs) and their critical role in peace-building. IGRs, a complex interplay between various levels of government, are fundamental to the functioning of federal and decentralized systems. They encompass the interactions, negotiations, and collaborations between central and sub-national governments, aiming to achieve coherent governance and resolve disputes. This chapter seeks to define key concepts related to IGRs, exploring their vertical and horizontal dimensions and their implications for governance.

The chapter further examines the concept of peace-building, distinguishing between negative peace (the mere absence of violence) and positive peace (the presence of justice and the absence of structural and cultural violence). By integrating these concepts, the chapter highlights how effective IGRs contribute to conflict resolution and promote stability.

Through comparative case studies from India, South Africa, and Switzerland, this chapter will illustrate how different federal systems utilize IGRs to address conflicts and foster peace. These cases offer valuable insights into the practical applications of IGRs in maintaining stability and achieving sustainable peace in diverse political contexts.

2.2. Definition of Concepts

2.2.1. Intergovernmental Relations

Defining intergovernmental relations (IGR) in a concise and definitive manner is a challenging task. However, Intergovernmental relations refer to the interactions, collaborations, and coordination among different levels of government within a federal system, and they play a crucial role in the functioning and effectiveness of such systems (Phillimore, J. 2013). At its core, IGR serves as a platform for negotiation between the federal government and sub-national governments on matters of common interest. When conducted with a spirit of partnership, IGR facilitates the pursuit of shared goals through collaboration (Assefa, 2009). By its very nature,

IGR is cross-cutting, encompassing all interactions and relationships between various units of government (Habtamu & Zelalem, 2019), (Opeskin, B. R. 1999). This includes the intricate and interdependent relational spheres of government and the coordination of public policies across different levels (Mitullah, W. V., & Nguri, J. 2012). More specifically, IGR refers to the relations between and within different levels of government, aiming to achieve common goals through cooperation and interaction. This process is facilitated by legal and institutional mechanisms that enable bilateral and multilateral interactions within and between various levels of government, ultimately furthering governmental policies and functions (Opeskin, B. R. 1999). As such, IGR can be aptly described as the "glue" that holds the different levels of government together (Bello, M. L. (2014). IGR manifests in two distinct dimensions: vertical and horizontal. The vertical dimension encompasses interactions between/among the federal government, sub-national constituent units, and local governments. Conversely, the horizontal dimension primarily involves interactions between/among sub-national/constituent units themselves (Anderson, G. 2008). The overarching objective of IGR is to foster synergistic, effective, and efficacious governmental activities. This includes the delivery of services, the promotion of sustainable democratic processes, and the strengthening of delivery capacity across all spheres of government for the collective betterment of society (Habtamu & Zelalem, 2019).

IGR also plays a crucial role in establishing a culture of negotiation between the federal government and the states. By fostering dialogue and cooperation, IGR can curb the trend of centralization and enhance the bargaining power of the states (Assefa, 2009). Moreover, IGR sheds light on how different orders of government in federal political systems communicate and collaborate with each other. It facilitates negotiation, non-hierarchical exchange of information, and cooperation between the institutions of the two levels of governments (Nigussie, 2015).

In essence, IGR serves as a fundamental principle in achieving synergy among different levels of government, both within the broader governance system of a country and within specific levels for the overall stability of the entire government apparatus (Mitullah, W. V., & Nguri, J. 2012). Furthermore, the goals of IGR extend to promoting peace and harmony, minimizing (avoiding) inter-jurisdictional conflicts among federal and state orders of government, improving greater natural economic integration, and enhancing the effective and efficient utilization of available

human and material resources (Deme, K. 2014). Institutionalizing IGR could, thus, further facilitate resolving potential central vs. state conflict (Assefa, 2009).

2.2.2. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations

Vertical intergovernmental relations (IGR) encompass interactions between the central government and lower levels of government within a nation-state. These interactions are particularly prominent in unitary and federal systems (Phillimore, J. (2013).

In unitary systems, vertical IGR typically involves the national government and local governments. In federations, such interactions occur between the central or federal government and the constituent units of the federation. For instance, the United States and Australia have central governments that interact with states, while Canada's central government engages with provinces (George, A. (2008).

Vertical IGR takes on various forms depending on the structure of the government. The central government may interact directly with all constituent units, a select few, or just one, depending on the issue at hand (Habtamu & Zelalem, (2019).

Vertical IGR can be bilateral, involving interactions between the central government and a single constituent unit, or multilateral, involving multiple constituent units. In federal systems, the crucial intergovernmental relationship typically exists between the constitutionally protected constituent units and the central government. Vertical IGR plays a pivotal role in federal systems, enabling the central government to achieve its objectives and facilitating the effective implementation of national policies across the country (Ile, I. U. 2010). It also provides a platform for lower levels of government to participate in decision-making processes and raise their concerns with the central government (Ketema, 2017).

The dynamics of vertical IGR are complex and can be challenging to navigate. However, effective vertical IGR is essential for achieving national goals, implementing policies effectively, and ensuring that the concerns of all levels of government are considered and addressed (IBID).

2.2.3. Peace-Building

The concept of peace is a contested term, subject to various interpretations. In common parlance, as well as in government and academia, peace is often defined negatively as the mere absence of

war and physical violence (Grewal, B. S. 2003). However, this definition poses problems, particularly because different groups involved in a conflict often have different understandings of peace. To provide a broader and more positive understanding of peace, Johan Galtung introduced the concepts of negative and positive peace.

Negative peace refers to the absence of direct violence, such as the loss of lives. Positive peace, on the other hand, encompasses not only the absence of direct violence but also the absence of structural violence, which includes harm caused by poverty, and cultural violence, which includes factors that blind people to injustice or enable them to rationalize it (Galtung, J. 1969). While the "negative peace of order and the cessation of direct violence" may not align with justice, the "positive peace of reconciliation and psycho/social healing" largely assumes justice as a prerequisite (Grewal, B. S. 2003).

The concept of peace-building is also lacks a single unified definition, with different organizations presenting their own interpretations. Peace-building encompasses a wide range of measures implemented in emerging, current, or post-conflict situations, driven by a primary commitment to preventing violent conflicts and promoting lasting and sustainable peace (Gawerc, M. I. 2006). Peace-building aims to stabilize post-conflict situations by creating or strengthening national institutions. It complements preventive diplomacy, peacemaking processes, conflict resolution, and peacekeeping operations. It involves measures to prevent violent conflicts and promote lasting and sustainable peace, requiring reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution at all levels of society (Barnett, M., Kim, H., O'donnell, M., & Sitea, L. 2007).

2.3 Link between IGR, Conflict resolution and peace-building comparative Cases

2.3.1 Intergovernmental Relations and Conflict Resolution in India

Intergovernmental relations in India are governed by a well-established policy framework that defines the roles, responsibilities, and powers of the different levels of government. The Indian Constitution provides for a federal system of government, where power is divided between the central government and the state governments (Swenden, W., Saxena, R., & Sharma, C. K. 2022). According to part 11 of the Indian Constitution, also lays down the principles of

cooperative federalism, which emphasize the need for collaboration and cooperation between the different levels of government.

This system allows for intergovernmental relations to play a crucial role in resolving conflicts.

One way in which India solves conflicts through intergovernmental relations is by establishing institutions that facilitate cooperation and coordination between the central and state governments. For example, the Inter-State Council was set up to promote cooperation among states on matters of common interest, while the National Development Council serves as a forum for discussing and coordinating development policies (Sharma, C. K. 2011).

Another way in which India resolves conflicts through intergovernmental relations is by providing constitutional mechanisms for resolving disputes between the central and state governments. The Constitution provides for a range of institutions, such as the Supreme Court and High Courts that can adjudicate disputes between different levels of government.

To facilitate effective intergovernmental relations, the Indian government has established several institutions and mechanisms. These include the Inter-State Council, which is a constitutional body that facilitates cooperation and coordination between the central government and the state governments. The Council is chaired by the Prime Minister and includes the Chief Ministers of all the states and Union Territories (Ibid).

Another important aspect of the policy framework for intergovernmental relations in India is the establishment of administrative mechanisms to facilitate coordination and cooperation between the different levels of government. These include the Joint Consultative Committees, which facilitate consultation between the central government and the state governments on matters of mutual concern. The Indian government has also established several intergovernmental bodies to address specific issues such as water resources, transport, and urban development (Ibid).

Therefore, the policy framework for intergovernmental relations in India is based on the principles of cooperative federalism, subsidiarity, and decentralization. The Indian government has established several institutions and mechanisms to facilitate effective coordination and cooperation between the different levels of government. This framework has played a key role in promoting the overall development and progress of the country (Saxena, R. 2021).

The Indian intergovernmental relations framework also includes a system of institutions that facilitate cooperation between different levels of government. These institutions include: Inter-State Council: According to Article 263 of the Indian constitution, this is a constitutional body

established to promote cooperation among states on matters of common interest, National Development Council: This is a non-constitutional body that brings together representatives from different levels of government to discuss national development issues, Finance Commission: This is a constitutional body that recommends how tax revenues should be shared between the center and states, Planning Commission: This was a non-constitutional body that was responsible for formulating five-year plans for national development until it was replaced by NITI Aayog in 2015 (Ibid).

Intergovernmental relations refer to the interactions and relationships between different levels of government. In India, there are two types of institutions that facilitate intergovernmental relations- formal and informal. Formal institutions refer to the legal framework that governs the relationship between the central and state governments. Informal institutions, on the other hand, refer to the non-legal mechanisms that facilitate intergovernmental coordination and cooperation (Sharma, C. K. (2011).

The formal institutions of intergovernmental relations in India are primarily governed by the Constitution of India. The Constitution defines the powers and responsibilities of the central and state governments, and provides for a number of mechanisms to facilitate intergovernmental coordination. These include the Inter-State Council, the National Development Council, and the Finance Commission. The Inter-State Council is a constitutional body that was created to promote and facilitate coordination between the central and state governments. The National Development Council is a non-constitutional body that serves as a forum for discussing issues related to national development. The Finance Commission is a constitutional body that is responsible for recommending the distribution of financial resources between the central and state governments (Singh, N. (2004).

In addition to these formal institutions, there are also a number of informal institutions that facilitate intergovernmental coordination and cooperation. These include conferences of Chief Ministers, meetings of the Planning Commission, and various other forums for intergovernmental dialogue. These informal institutions play an important role in facilitating communication and coordination between different levels of government, and are often instrumental in resolving disputes and addressing issues of mutual concern (Saxena, R. (2021).

Overall, the formal and informal institutions of intergovernmental relations in India play a vital role in promoting coordination and cooperation between different levels of government. While

the formal institutions provide a legal framework for intergovernmental relations, the informal institutions facilitate dialogue and coordination between different levels of government. Together, these institutions help to ensure that the central and state governments work together effectively to promote the overall development and welfare of the country.

2.3.1.1 Vertical Intergovernmental Institutions in India

In India, the Vertical Intergovernmental Relations (VIGR) Institutions play a crucial role in strengthening federalism and ensuring smooth coordination between the central and state governments. These institutions are responsible for maintaining a healthy relationship between the two levels of government and facilitating cooperation and collaboration on various policy matters.

One of the most important VIGR institutions in India is the Inter-State Council (ISC), which was established in 1990 under Article 263 of the Constitution. The ISC is chaired by the Prime Minister and includes all Chief Ministers and Union Ministers as members. It acts as a forum for discussing and resolving issues of national and regional importance, and it also plays a key role in promoting cooperative federalism (Sharma, S. K. (1976).

Another important VIGR institution in India is the National Development Council (NDC), which was established in 1952 under Article 263 of the Constitution. The NDC is chaired by the Prime Minister and includes all Chief Ministers, Union Ministers, and experts as members. It is responsible for formulating and reviewing the country's Five-Year Plans and ensuring their effective implementation.

In addition, there are several other VIGR institutions in India, such as the Planning Commission, the Finance Commission, and the Zonal Councils, each of which plays a critical role in promoting intergovernmental cooperation and fostering a strong federal system.

The Indian intergovernmental relations system is a complex network of relationships between different levels of government. At the center of this system is the local government, which plays a crucial role in ensuring effective governance and service delivery at the grassroots level. The local government is responsible for providing basic services such as sanitation, healthcare, and education, as well as promoting economic development and social welfare in their respective jurisdictions.

According to part 9 and 9 (A) of the Indian constitution, the local government is recognized as the third tier of government, along with the central and state governments. The Constitution of

India provides for a decentralized system of governance, with powers and functions assigned to the local government through the 73rd and 74th constitutional Amendments. These amendments empower local governments with the authority to prepare and implement plans for economic development and social justice, and to levy taxes, fees, and other charges in their areas of jurisdiction (The constitution of INDIA 1950).

The local government is also responsible for ensuring the participation of the people in the decision-making process, as well as promoting transparency and accountability in governance. The local government bodies, such as the Municipal Corporation, Municipal Council, and Panchayats, are elected by the people and have the mandate to represent their interests and needs.

In recent years, the role of local government in the intergovernmental relations system has become increasingly important. With the growing demand for better services and governance at the grassroots level, local governments have been given greater autonomy and resources to address the needs of their citizens. The central and state governments have also recognized the importance of local government in promoting inclusive and sustainable development, and have initiated various schemes and programs to support their efforts (Prabhakar, R. P. (2011)).

2.3.2 Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-building in South Africa

In South Africa, the Department of Cooperative Government (CoG) plays a crucial role in intergovernmental relations. Over the past 17 years, South Africa has transitioned from a predominantly informal intergovernmental relations (IGR) system to a statutory system that incorporates mechanisms and forums for policy alignment, integration, and coherence. The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 13 of 2005, has played a significant role in facilitating this transformation. The establishment of the National Planning Commission has also been pivotal as it assesses the country's policy coherence, coordination, objectives, and priorities at the macro-level. These institutional developments have enhanced dialogue, coordination, and cooperation among the different levels of government, contributing to peace-building efforts in South Africa (Malan, L. 2005).

South Africa's post-apartheid journey presents a captivating case study in navigating the intricate dynamics of intergovernmental relations and harnessing their power for peace-building. This journey began with a fundamental shift—the dismantling of the apartheid regime's absolute

power and the establishment of a robust system of checks and balances enshrined in the 1996 Constitution. Anchored in the rule of law and overseen by the formidable Constitutional Court, this shift replaced the concentration of power with a framework that emphasizes accountability, transparency, and the protection of fundamental rights (Groenewald, A. J., 2018).

Within this framework, South Africa's unique governance symphony unfolds. Although not a traditional federation, the Constitution establishes three distinct spheres of government—national, provincial, and local—each with its own defined powers and responsibilities. This decentralization fosters a dynamic interplay of autonomy and interdependence, empowering local communities while ensuring national coherence, a crucial element in promoting peace and stability (de Visser, J., & Steytler, N., 2018).

Further strengthening this harmonious arrangement is the emphasis on cooperative governance. Recognizing the interconnectedness of the spheres and the need for collaborative problem-solving, the Constitution and the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act of 2005 outline mechanisms for resolving disagreements through dialogue, mediation, and, as a last resort, judicial review. This focus on dialogue and collaborative solutions fosters a spirit of cooperation, mitigating potential conflicts and promoting peaceful coexistence (Malherbe, R., 2006).

The success of this model is evident in South Africa's remarkable transformation since 1994. The post-apartheid era, while not without its challenges, has witnessed an inspiring journey, with the country emerging as a beacon of democracy and reconciliation in Africa. This success story offers valuable lessons for other nations grappling with internal divisions and conflicts, particularly those seeking to navigate the complexities of federalism and intergovernmental relations (Omoyefa, P. S., 2014).

Ethiopia, with its federal structure and emphasis on cooperative governance, shares certain similarities with the South African model. The 1994 Ethiopian constitution established a federal system with nine regional states, each with its own elected government, and also emphasizes the importance of collaboration among different levels of government (Nigussie, 2015).

The case study of the Ministry of Peace and the Addis Ababa City Government Peace and Security Administration Bureau provides a microcosm for exploring the practical application of intergovernmental relations in peace-building efforts within the Ethiopian context. Examining

their collaborative initiatives and challenges in addressing local security concerns can offer valuable insights for strengthening the overall peace-building framework in Ethiopia.

However, the direct application of the South African model requires careful consideration of Ethiopia's unique context due to the country's diverse ethnic landscape, historical legacies of conflict, and ongoing political tensions. These factors necessitate a nuanced adaptation. Additionally, the relative youth of Ethiopia's IGR proclamation, compared to South Africa's, requires a focus on building strong institutions and fostering a culture of collaboration at all levels of government.

In conclusion, South Africa's model of intergovernmental relations offers a compelling source of inspiration for Ethiopia, showcasing the potential of cooperative governance and collaborative conflict resolution in promoting peace and stability. However, it should not be viewed as a blueprint for imitation. Ethiopia must adapt and implement key elements of this model, drawing inspiration from its successes while acknowledging its own unique challenges and context. By fostering a spirit of dialogue, collaboration, and respect for diversity, Ethiopia can build upon its own strengths and chart its own path towards a more peaceful and prosperous future.

2.3.3. Intergovernmental Relations and Peace-Building in Switzerland

Collaboration between the Addis Ababa City Administration and Sheger City Administration can draw valuable lessons from Switzerland's renowned system of intergovernmental relations. Switzerland's highly decentralized system involves cooperation and coordination among different levels of government, including federal, cantonal, and municipal governments (Ketema 2020). This system plays a crucial role in maintaining peace, resolving conflicts, and promoting stability within the country.

Switzerland is a federal state comprised of 26 cantons, each with its own constitution, government, and parliament. While the federal government handles national defense, foreign affairs, and monetary policy, the cantons have authority over education, healthcare, and other local matters. This highly decentralized structure allows for tailored policies that reflect local needs and preferences (Linder, W., & Vatter, A. 2001).

One key aspect of Switzerland's system is the emphasis on cooperation and collaboration between different levels of government (Steiner, R., & Kaiser, C. (2018). Regular meetings and

consultations ensure that decisions are made collectively, taking into account the interests of all stakeholders. The Conferences of Cantonal Directors serve as highly institutionalized platforms responsible for joint decision-making and inter-cantonal harmonization. This system of intergovernmental relations fosters collaboration, facilitates policy alignment, and contributes to peace-building in Switzerland (Arens, A. 2020).

It is important to note that while Switzerland's Federal Peace Center is a renowned institution primarily focused on international peace-building efforts, domestic peace-building in Switzerland relies more on a collaborative network without a single federal entity (Andrey, M. 2010). The cantons have the primary responsibility for maintaining peace within their jurisdictions, while the federal government provides support and coordinates efforts across cantons. This joined-up approach allows for close monitoring of potential conflicts within communities, early intervention, and leveraging of federal resources when needed (Wild, C. 2014).

The autonomy of the cantonal level in addressing conflicts considering local cultural nuances can be more effective than a one-size-fits-all federal approach. Best practices and lessons learned from conflict resolution at the cantonal level can be shared with other cantons and the federal government, improving national conflict resolution strategies. This collaborative approach minimizes conflicts and fosters peaceful solutions to disagreements (Gemperle, S. 2010).

By involving all levels of government in decision-making processes, Switzerland is able to address potential conflicts at an early stage. Open communication channels and regular dialogues help prevent misunderstandings and disputes. The decentralized nature of Swiss governance allows for efficient resource allocation based on local needs and priorities, helping address socio-economic disparities and reduce tensions that could lead to conflicts. During times of crisis or conflict, the vertical intergovernmental relations enable swift and coordinated responses, with the federal, cantonal, and municipal authorities working together to mitigate the impact of crises and restore peace and stability.

CHAPTER THREE

3. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN ETHIOPIA: A CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION FOR COOPERATION AND CONSENSUS

3.1 Introduction

Intergovernmental relations (IGR) form the backbone of governance in federal systems, orchestrating the dynamic interactions between different levels of government. In Ethiopia, the constitutional framework provides a foundation for these relationships, albeit without a detailed blueprint. The 1995 Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution establishes a federal system characterized by a dual government structure comprising federal and regional states, yet it does not explicitly outline the principles or institutions governing IGR. Instead, it emphasizes the need for collaboration, cooperation, and consensus between the federal government and regional states, highlighting the importance of mutual engagement for national stability and progress.

The Ethiopian Constitution articulates the necessity for such cooperation through various provisions. For example, Article 51(3) tasks the federal government with setting nationwide standards in crucial areas such as public health and education, while leaving the implementation to regional states. This arrangement inherently demands a collaborative approach between federal and regional authorities. Similarly, Articles 52(2)(d) and 88(2) stress the need for coordination in managing land, natural resources, and fostering inter-group relations, thereby underscoring the constitutional impetus for a cooperative IGR framework.

Despite these constitutional mandates, the Ethiopian approach to IGR has often relied on informal mechanisms, particularly during the era of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF). Political parties, such as the EPRDF and more recently the Prosperity Party, have played a pivotal role in shaping IGR through party-based channels rather than formal institutions. While this has facilitated policy coordination and implementation, it has also raised concerns about regional autonomy and the potential for political centralization to undermine effective governance.

The formalization of IGR has been an ongoing concern, leading to significant reforms such as the enactment of Proclamation No. 1231/2021. This proclamation aims to institutionalize IGR by establishing structured forums that facilitate vertical interactions between federal and regional governments, as well as horizontal relations among regional states. The introduction of these forums reflects a move towards greater transparency, accountability, and effectiveness in IGR.

This chapter delves into the constitutional foundation for intergovernmental relations in Ethiopia, exploring how the principles of cooperation and consensus are embedded in the federal structure. It examines the roles of key institutions, such as political parties, the House of Federation (HOF), and the Ministry of Peace, in shaping vertical IGR. Additionally, it discusses the impact of recent reforms aimed at formalizing and institutionalizing IGR practices, providing a comprehensive overview of how Ethiopia's federal system navigates the complexities of governance across different levels

3.2 A Constitutional Foundation for Cooperation and Consensus

The 1995 FDRE constitution, in Article 50 (1) and (2), establishes a dual government structure that recognizes two levels of government (federal and state) and outlines their respective jurisdictions (The FDRE constitution, 1995). While the Ethiopian Constitution does not explicitly define the fundamental principles guiding the system of intergovernmental relations (IGR) or the key institutions that facilitate its operation (Assefa, (2009), Nigussie, (2015) and Ketema, (2017), on the other hand it recognizes the need for collaboration, cooperation, and consensus between the federal government and the constituent states for the common good of the country's governments, nationalities, and peoples. This is evident in several provisions of the constitution.

The FDRE Constitution in its preamble is aimed at building one common political and economic community based on the rule of law and capable of guaranteeing sustainable peace, underscoring the need for collaboration among the concerned governments. Furthermore, Article 51 (3) mandates the federal government to establish and implement nationwide standards and basic policy criteria for public health, education, science and technology, and the protection and preservation of historical and cultural legacies (The FDRE constitution, 1995). This provision highlights the federal government's responsibility to set general principles, while implementation is entrusted to the respective regional states within their specific contexts. Such framing of general standards and implementation necessitates ongoing communication, discussion, and

consensus-building, which in turn forms the core of intergovernmental relations (Nigussie, (2015). Additionally, Article 52 (2) (d) of the FDRE Constitution mandates the management of land and natural resources in accordance with federal law, highlighting the importance of coordination in resource management, also Article 88 (2) of the FDRE Constitution reaffirms the importance of relations and collaboration among the diverse groups in the country, aiming to foster mutual understanding, unity, and respect. Article 98 of the FDRE Constitution grants concurrent taxation power, while Articles 51 and 52 provide for shared power in economic and social policy formulation and implementation. Article 52 (2) (f) stipulates the implementation of civil servant-related issues based on national standards, further emphasizing the need for collaboration.

In summary, while the Ethiopian Constitution does not provide an explicit framework for IGR, it contains several provisions that underscore the importance of collaboration, cooperation, and consensus-building between the federal government and the constituent states. These provisions serve as the foundation for the establishment and operation of IGR institutions and mechanisms in Ethiopia.

3.3. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations (V-IGRs) in Ethiopia: Institutions and Practices

3.3.1 The Role of Political Parties in V-IGR

Political parties play a significant role in IGRs in many countries, including Ethiopia. In the absence of strong legal frameworks and established institutions, political parties often serve as a channel for informal, party-based IGRs rather than formal, institutional ones (Kenna,(2017).

Under the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) era, the dominant/hegemonic nature of the party facilitated intergovernmental relations between the federal government and regional states. During The EPRDF regime informal IGR institutions were like utilized party channels to implement, coordinate, and evaluate nationwide policies, strategies, and programs (Ketema, (2017), Nigussie, (2015), Assefa, (2009) and (Kenna,(2017).

Also under the current Prosperity party this kind of party based IGR have been seen on some instances (Nigussie, (2022).

While dominant-party systems can yield positive outcomes in IGRs, they also raise concerns about the potential limitation of regional autonomy (Kenna,(2017) and (Nigussie, (2015). Conversely, others maintain that centralized political power, closely linked to a deeply embedded party system, can promote stability (Rohrbach, L. (2021). Some even argue that a dominant, disciplined, and centralized party, controlling both levels of government, can be an asset for divided countries like Ethiopia (Nigussie, (2015) and Rohrbach, L. (2021).

However, a dominant-party system's success in IGRs is contingent on the loyalty and support of the subordinate parties remaining constant (Ketema, (2017). A shift in the political landscape and power balance can lead to deterioration. The 2005 elections and the victory of the opposition Coalition for Unity and Democracy (CUD) in Addis Ababa serve as a significant example of how political shifts can alter intergovernmental relations (Assefa, (2009) and Ketema, (2017).

"If the move of the Prosperity Party during the third meeting of the Forum is not constrained forthwith, the overwhelming political domination of the Prosperity Party is likely to render the Ethiopian IGR system ineffective." (Nigussie, (2022)

These events and other legal and institutional irregularities underscore the need for formality and institutionalization in IGRs. Formalization and clear guidelines are crucial for effective, sustainable, and strong IGR institutions, and ultimately, a healthy federation.

3.3.2 The Role of the House of Federation (HOF) in V-IGR

The House of Federation (HOF) is one of the key institutions involved in IGRs in Ethiopia. While the Ethiopian constitution does not explicitly outline a comprehensive framework for IGRs, the HOF has been assigned certain responsibilities that fall within the realm of IGRs (Assefa, (2009), (Ketema, (2017) and (Nigussie, (2015). For instance, Article 48(2) of the constitution grants the HOF the authority to resolve border disputes between regional states based on settlement patterns and the wishes of the concerned populations. This dispute resolution mandate necessitates ongoing communication and negotiation between the HOF and the relevant stakeholders, a process that falls under the purview of IGRs (Ketema, (2017) and Nigussie, (2015).

Additionally, Article 62 of the constitution provides the HOF with further IGR-related responsibilities. Sub-Article (3) empowers the HOF to address issues pertaining to the rights of Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples (NNPs) to self-determination, including the right to secession,

as outlined in Article 39 of the constitution. Sub-Article (4) further mandates the HOF to promote the equality of NNPs and foster their unity based on mutual consent.

Furthermore, Sub-Articles (5) and (7) of Article 62 grant the HOF the authority to implement powers concurrently held by the HOF and the House of Peoples' Representatives, as well as to determine the distribution of revenues derived from joint tax sources between the federal government and the regional states and to determine any subsidies that the federal government may provide to the regional states. These responsibilities clearly involve IGRs and require coordination and negotiations between the different levels of government.

The HOF employs both formal and informal mechanisms to facilitate IGRs. Two primary formal IGR structures have been established: the "Forum of Speakers" and a joint forum of the federation and regional states (Nigussie, (2015) and (Ketema, (2017).

The "Forum of Speakers" brings together the speakers of both federal houses and the speakers of all regional state assemblies.

3.3.3 The Role of the Ministry of Peace in Vertical IGR

The Ministry of Peace, one of the executive organs of the federal government, also plays a significant role in IGRs. Proclamation No. 1263/2021, which defines the powers and functions of the executive organs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), explicitly mandates the Ministry to serve as a focal point for strengthening the federal system by cultivating good relationships and cooperation between the federal government and the regions based on mutual understanding and partnership (Article 41(i) of Proclamation No. 1263/2021.

Furthermore, Article 41(j) of the proclamation empowers the Ministry to facilitate the resolution of disputes arising between regions, without prejudice to the provisions of Article 48 and Sub-Article (6) of Article 62 of the FDRE Constitution and other relevant provisions. These provisions provide the Ministry with the authority to engage in intergovernmental negotiation, discussion, and cooperation on issues of common concern between the federal government and regional states (Nigussie, (2022).

Prior to the establishment of the Ministry of Peace, several other executive organs of the federal government had played similar roles in IGRs. The first was the Office of Federal Affairs, which was established within the Prime Minister's Office to oversee issues related to regional states

(Assefa, (2009), (Ketema, (2017) and (Nigussie, (2015). Following the dissolution of the Office, the Ministry of Federal Affairs emerged as one of the executive branches of the federal government to address matters connecting the federal government and regional states. It was authorized to engage in and organize activities related to IGRs (Nigussie, (2015).

The Ministry's power to organize IGR forums was also specified under Proclamation No. 691/2010. According to this proclamation, the Ministry had the responsibility to collaborate with various stakeholders at the federal and regional levels to maintain public peace and security (IBID).

The Ministry coordinated, integrated, and monitored the support provided by other federal organs to these regional states (IBID).

Despite criticisms regarding the Ministry's fulfillment of its duties and responsibilities, many scholars believe that it played a significant role in facilitating IGRs during its existence (Ketema, (2017) and (Nigussie, (2015).

3.4. 3. Vertical Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) and Sector-Based IGR in Ethiopia: A Framework Established by Proclamation No. 1231/2021

Prior to the enactment of Proclamation No. 1231/2021, intergovernmental relations (IGR) in Ethiopia were characterized by a prevalence of informal interactions and a dominant centralized party politics controlled by the EPRDF. This prompted numerous scholars to advocate for the formalization and institutionalization of IGR based on principles of transparency, accountability, and effective participation.³

In response to these calls for reform, the Ethiopian government introduced Proclamation No. 1231/2021, which aims to establish a structured system of IGR within the federation. This proclamation outlines six distinct forums that facilitate interactions between the federal

³All those four Authors raised and recommend the importance of formalization and institutionalization of IGR; Ketema, (2017). Institutionalization of IGR in the Ethiopian federation: Towards cooperative or coercive federalism. *Ethiopian Journal of Federal Studies*, 4(2), 121-160., Nigussie, (2015). The federal-state intergovernmental relationship in Ethiopia: Institutional framework and its implication on state autonomy. *Mizan Law Review*, 9(2), 341-368., Assefa, (2009). The system of intergovernmental relations (IGR) in Ehtiopia: in search of institutions and guidelines. *Journal of Ethiopian Law*, 23(1), 96-131, and Kenna, (2017). Federal-states intergovernmental relations impact on regional states autonomy in Ethiopia: A view with Oromo protest. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 11(5), 125-143.

government and the regional governments, as well as among the regional states themselves (Nigussie, (2022)).

Out of the six forums established by the proclamation, five fall under the category of vertical intergovernmental relation (IGR), encompassing approximately 83% of the total scope of application. Vertical IGR refers to the hierarchical relationship between the federal government and the regional governments. These forums are: The National Legislatives' Relations Forum, The National Executives Relations' Forum, The National Judicial Relations' Forum, The National Executives Sectoral Relations' Forum, The House of Federation and Regional States Relations' Forum

The sixth forum, the Regional Relations Forum, falls under horizontal IGR, which refers to interactions between and among regional governments.

The Vertical National Sectoral Executive Relations' Forum, established under Article 13 of Proclamation No. 1231/2021, is a prime example of vertical IGR in action. This forum comprises: Heads of each and every Federal Sectoral Executive Offices and Heads of the Nine Regional States' as well as the Addis Ababa City and the Dire-dawa Administration Sectoral Offices

The Vertical National Sectoral Executive Relations' Forum plays a crucial role in coordinating and integrating the efforts of the federal government and the regional governments in various sectors, ensuring alignment with national policies and strategies.

Sector-based or policy-oriented IGR has been a longstanding practice and widely implemented strategy in Ethiopia (Ketema, (2017),(Nigussie, (2015) and Assefa, (2009)). Sector-based IGR often involves the establishment of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between ministries and regional bureaus to promote collaboration on specific policy areas.

For instance, the Ministry of Health and the regional health bureaus signed an MOU to enhance their collaboration on major nationwide policy areas. This agreement has served as a legal framework for their partnership and cooperation in various areas of mutual interest. Regular meetings are held at the level of high-ranking officials from the Ministry of Health and the respective regional health bureaus to evaluate progress and address common concerns. These meetings are supported by a technical joint steering committee that facilitates the smooth operation of the partnership (Nigussie, (2015)).

Similarly, the Ministry of Agriculture maintains a similar platform for collaboration with the regional agriculture bureaus. The Ministry and the regional bureaus work together on key policy areas such as agricultural extension, natural resource management, and livestock development programs (IBID). They have established a strategic oversight committee composed of representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, regional agriculture bureaus, and donors. This committee monitors, evaluates, and reports on the shared engagements and activities of the concerned parties (IBID).

CHAPTER FOUR

4. VERTICAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS FOR PEACE BUILDING IN ADDIS ABABA: STRATEGIES AND APPROACHES

4.1 Introduction

Chapter four of this research delves into the dynamics of vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) within the context of peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa. As Ethiopia's capital, Addis Ababa stands out not only for its historical significance but also for its complex socio-political landscape, shaped by its diverse population and strategic importance. With a population exceeding four million and a rich blend of ethnicities and religions, the city is a microcosm of Ethiopia's broader socio-cultural and political fabric.

Established in 1889 by Emperor Menelik II, Addis Ababa has evolved into Ethiopia's political, economic, social, and cultural hub. Its role as the heart of national governance and development is underscored by its significant contribution to the country's GDP and its disproportionate share of infrastructure and investment.

The city's unique administrative framework, enshrined in Article 49 of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution and further articulated through Proclamation No. 87/1997, grants Addis Ababa a level of autonomy that shapes its interactions with both federal and regional authorities. This framework, complemented by the IGR Proclamation No. 1231/2021, ensures that Addis Ababa operates with a degree of self-governance while remaining integrally connected to the federal system.

The chapter focuses on the strategies and approaches adopted by key actors involved in peace-building within Addis Ababa. It examines the roles of the Ministry of Peace (MOP), the Addis Ababa City Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and the Sheger City Security Administration Office. Each entity plays a critical role in fostering peace and security, navigating a landscape characterized by both formal and informal communication channels.

The study highlights the interplay between these actors, analyzing their collaborative mechanisms, coordination challenges, and the impact of their efforts on the city's peace and stability. Despite the absence of a well-defined formal structure for IGRs, informal

communication and cooperation have proven effective in managing and resolving conflicts, as evidenced by recent initiatives to address community tensions.

This chapter will also explore the factors influencing the effectiveness of vertical IGRs, including institutional, political, and socio-economic elements. By identifying areas for improvement and proposing recommendations for enhanced communication and collaboration, this research aims to contribute to a more structured and effective framework for peace-building in Addis Ababa.

4.2 Overview of Addis Ababa City

Addis Ababa, with a population estimated to be no less than 4 million, is a cosmopolitan city in Ethiopia, characterized by its multi-ethnic and multi-faith composition (Central Statistics Agency (CSA), (2021)). Similar to many capital cities worldwide, it is home to diverse communities. The largest ethnic group in the city is the Amhara, comprising 47.5 percent of the population, followed by the Oromo at nearly 20 percent and the Guragie at just over 16 percent. In terms of religion, the majority of the population (74.7 percent) practices Orthodox Christianity, while Muslims account for 16.2 percent, and Protestants make up 7.8 percent (Central Statistics Agency (CSA), 2014).

Addis Ababa serves as a melting pot for people from various backgrounds, where they assimilate into the vibrant "metropolitan culture" that defines the city. The lingua franca of the city is Amharic, which is also the language of the federal government. Furthermore, Addis Ababa is not only the political capital but also the economic, social, and cultural capital of Ethiopia. Approximately 25 percent of the country's urban population resides in Addis Ababa, and it holds a disproportionate concentration of investments and infrastructure projects. The city alone contributes to 50 percent of the national GDP (Central Statistics Agency (CSA), 2014).

Since 1889, Addis Ababa has served as the capital city of Ethiopia. According to legend, Empress Taytu requested her husband, Emperor Menelik, for a land to build a house near the hot springs of Filwoha, located south of Entoto where Menelik had established his capital in 1881. The chronicler of Emperor Menelik suggests that the establishment of the capital around the hot spring of Filwoha fulfilled the prophecy of his grandfather, King Sahle Selassie, who foresaw the construction of a city in the area. Empress Taytu played a significant role in naming the city

Addis Ababa, which translates to the New Flower. By 1891, the capital had completely relocated from Entoto to the hot springs of Filwoha, as the Chiefs received plots of land and built their houses in the newly formed city (Pankhurst, R. (1961).

4.2.1 Geographical Context

Addis Ababa is situated at an elevation of approximately 2,355 meters (7,726 feet) above sea level, with coordinates of 9.1450° N latitude and 38.7210° E longitude (Google Maps, 2023). Its central location within Ethiopia provides easy access to various regions and facilitates coordination with regional authorities.

4.2.2 Administrative Structure

Addis Ababa operates under an autonomous city administration system, as established by Article 49 of The FDRE constitution and Proclamation No. 87/1997, known as the Addis Ababa City Government Charter. This framework grants the city a certain level of self-governance, allowing it to handle its affairs while maintaining strong connections with the federal government. Additionally, the IGR proclamation bestows upon Addis Ababa an equal status with regional states (Proclamation No. 1231/2021).

4.3. Actors and Coordination in Peace-Building

4.3.1. Key Actors Involved in Peace-building Process in Addis Ababa City

Several key actors play important roles in peace-building within Addis Ababa. These actors include: The Ministry of Peace (MOP), the Addis Ababa City Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) and Sheger City Security administration Office plays crucial roles in peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa City. Here is an overview of their respective mandates and responsibilities:

4.3.1.1 Ministry of Peace (MOP)

The MOP was first established in 2018 by Article 13 of Proclamation No. 1097/2018 as the executive body of the Federal Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. According to proclamation no.1263/2021 a proclamation to provide for the definition of the powers and duties of the executive organs of the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, The ministry is empowered to formulate policies, strategies, and laws related to peace and implement

them upon approval. It collaborates with relevant federal and regional government organs to maintain public peace and develops strategies for the protection of public peace. The MOP engages with cultural and religious organizations, as well as other relevant bodies, to promote peace and mutual respect among diverse religious and ethnic communities. It conducts studies to identify causes of conflicts among local communities and proposes recommendations to prevent conflicts and instability. Additionally, the ministry serves as a focal point to strengthen the federal system by fostering good relationships and cooperation between the Federal Government and the Regions based on mutual understanding and partnership.

4.3.2.3 Addis Ababa City Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB)

According to Proclamation No. 74/2021 a Proclamation to provide for the Establishment of the Executive Organs of the Addis Ababa City Government, the AAPSB is responsible for designing city-wide peace and security policies based on national guidelines. It formulates strategies and legislation for conflict prevention and resolution within Addis Ababa. The bureau identifies and addresses potential causes of conflict within the city, utilizing both traditional and modern methods for conflict resolution. AAPSB collaborates with relevant federal, city, and religious institutions to maintain peace and mutual respect among diverse groups. It establishes working relationships with other entities for conflict prevention, resolution, and resident safety. Gathering and analyzing security information, conducting research, and presenting findings to relevant bodies are also part of AAPSB's responsibilities. The bureau works towards involving the public and private sectors in local security and peace-building initiatives. The AAPSB is Proclamation No. 74/2021 Art 21 responsible for designing city-wide peace and security policies based on national guidelines. It formulates strategies and legislation for conflict prevention and resolution within Addis Ababa. The bureau identifies and addresses potential causes of conflict within the city, utilizing both traditional and modern methods for conflict resolution. AAPSB collaborates with relevant federal, city, and religious institutions to maintain peace and mutual respect among diverse groups.

4.3.2.4. Sheger City Security administration Office

Established by based on the regulation no. 233/2023 Art 18(1)(M) responsible Work in collaboration with the concerned government bodies, and with other concerned bodies with a view to ensure peace and mutual respect and to avoid conflicts, Plan on strengthening

relationships with the neighboring regions; work in collaboration with them on activities that help to intensities amongst neighboring regions and on security matters;

4.4. Collaboration Mechanisms among Actors

The research findings indicate that the Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) collaboration for the peace-building process in Addis Ababa City Administration is facilitated through various collaboration and coordination methods. The Ministry of Peace (MOP) has developed a peace-building strategy that enhances coordination and collaboration among actors involved in the peace-building process within the Addis Ababa City Administration⁴. There are MOUs signed between the MOP and Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and between AAPSB and the Sheger City Security Administration office⁵. These MOUs facilitate coordination and collaboration for peace-building activities. Regular informal communication, including telephone calls, emails, and letters, allows for the timely sharing of information and coordination on peace-building initiatives⁶. National meetings held four times a year include the participation of peace and security offices from all regions, including AAPSB, fostering communication and information sharing⁷.

A focal person from the MOP is assigned to follow up on AAPSB's activities, providing a point of contact for ongoing communication and support⁸. Monitoring and evaluation teams from MOP provide feedback to AAPSB through various communication channels and occasional visits, ensuring continuous improvement of peace-building efforts⁹. MOP provides material support, such as tablets for conflict early warning and response, along with training and capacity-building initiatives to enhance the effectiveness of AAPSB¹⁰. These meetings, held four times a year, involve peace and security offices from all regions and provide a platform for sharing information and strategies. Informal communication through telephone calls, emails, and letters

⁴ Interviewee Mr. Liyew Mezgebu, Senior Expert for peace Building at MOP

⁵ There is assigned MOU document in 2024 with MOP and AAPSB, and also another signed MOU document in 2024 between AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration office which the document found at those three institutions.

⁶ Interviewee Mr. Dawit fantu, Team leader for Peace Value Building and Training at AAPSB

⁷ Interviewee Mr. Gezahegn Tilahun, Head of National consensus Desk at MOP

⁸ Interviewee Mr. Amanuel G/Medhin, Desk Head for situation room at MOP and Mr. Gezahegn Tilahun, Head of National consensus Desk at MOP

⁹ Interviewee Mr. Alemu Zeweld, Team leader for plan preparation, monitoring and evaluation at MOP

¹⁰ Interviewee Mr. Tatek Negash, Directorate Director for Security information, Early warning and rapid Response at AAPSB

is the most common form of interaction between the Addis Ababa City Administration and other actors. Due to the general nature of the IGR proclamation and the lack of detailed implementation guidelines, collaboration between different government levels is based on mutual understanding and party channels rather than formal procedures¹¹.

Despite the absence of clear legal frame work for formal IGR, there is collaboration between the Addis Ababa City Administration and Sheger City Administration, especially in joint training sessions and peace-building initiatives¹². MOP monitors and evaluates AAPSB's peace-building process, providing feedback through a designated focal person and regular communication¹³. MOP supports AAPSB with material resources and training, although financial support is limited¹⁴. MOUs exist between MOP and AAPSB, as well as between AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office, serving as formal frameworks for collaboration. Letters exchanged between MOP and AAPSB facilitate requests for material support and invitations for training, enhancing communication and coordination.

Despite strong informal communication and collaboration, the formal intergovernmental relations and coordination mechanisms are relatively weak, relying more on individual goodwill and informal understanding¹⁵. An MOU exists to facilitate collaboration. AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration jointly plan and evaluate peace-building efforts¹⁶. They collaborate on tasks like security threat identification, deployment of security forces, and joint evaluation through frequent communication and joint meetings¹⁷. Regular communication occurs between districts bordering Addis Ababa through letters, phone calls, emails, and meetings¹⁸. Youth from

¹¹ Interviewee Mr. Girma Cheru , Head of Intergovernmental relation Desk at MOP

¹² Interviewee Mr. Dawit fantu, Team leader for Peace Value Building and Training at AAPSB and Mr. Merha Tibebu, Directorate Director for Security organs coordination at Sheger City Security administration office

¹³ Interviewee Mr. Amanuel G/Medhin, Desk Head for situation room at MOP and Mr. Gezahegn Tilahun, Head of National consensus Desk at MOP

¹⁴ Interviewee Mr. Endale lema, Formerly Senior Expert for Conflict durable solution and Currently Desk Head of pastoralist and Special Support Desk at MOP and Mr. Abdulfetah shemsu, Security information Monitoring and evaluation Expert at AAPSB

¹⁵ Interviewee Mr. Wondimagegn Haile, chief Executive for Federalism and IGR at MOP

¹⁶ Mr. Alemayehu Dinsa, Directorate Director for plan preparation, monitoring and evaluation at Sheger City Security administration office

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ Interviewee Mr. Legesse Endale, Community training dialogue and Conference Expert at peace building Directorate at Sheger City Security administration office

both cities actively participate in joint discussions and peace-building initiatives¹⁹. The interview findings reveal as there is collaboration between AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office despite the lack of a formal framework.

There is communication exists through letters, joint meetings, and collaborative tasks. Joint peace-building plans and evaluations ensure coordinated efforts. Frequent discussions foster continuous dialogue crucial for effective peace-building. Youth engagement promotes unity and cooperation in peace-building initiatives. Joint leadership of national holidays and office structural arrangement support during Sheger City Administration's establishment exemplify successful collaboration²⁰.

Joint minutes were found between AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office, indicating discussions on peace-building issues in Addis Ababa. AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office have a joint plan and jointly perform and evaluate tasks²¹. They also collaborate on national holidays and events, such as the celebrations of Holly Epiphany (Timket), True Cross finding (Meskel), and Errechaa²².

Efforts to ensure coordination among key actors in peace-building include joint coordination mechanisms involving representatives from MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Administration overseeing peace-building activities. Each actor has defined roles, ensuring complementary and coordinated efforts. Regular reports on activities, achievements, and challenges allow for monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of peace-building efforts. By establishing effective collaboration mechanisms, clear roles and responsibilities, and promoting coordination, the key actors can achieve sustainable peace and stability in Addis Ababa.

The Ministry of Peace (MOP) and Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) employ several strategies to promote vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs). MOUs between MOP and AAPSB serve as a foundation for collaboration, although a more

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ Interviewee Mr. Dereje Terefe, Directorate Director for HR and Institutional reform leadership at Sheger City Security administration office

²¹ Interviewee Mr. Alemayehu Dinsa, Directorate Director for plan preparation, monitoring and evaluation at Sheger City Security administration office and Mr. Elias Kejela, Senior Expert for Peace Value Building and Training at AAPSB

²² Interviewee Mr. Merha Tibebe, Directorate Director for Security organs coordination at Sheger City Security administration office

permanent forum is needed. Regular informal communication through telephone, email, and letters promotes collaboration. National meetings organized by MOP provide a platform for dialogue and cooperation. A dedicated focal person ensures regular communication and coordination between MOP and AAPSB. MOP conducts monitoring and evaluation activities, providing feedback and guidance. MOP supports AAPSB with material resources and training programs.

These key actors work together to promote peace, security, and stability in Addis Ababa City. Their collaboration, coordination, and communication channels facilitate peace-building activities and contribute to the overall peace and security situation in the city.

4.5. Analysis of Intergovernmental Relations between MOP, AAPSB and Sheger City security Administration office

The intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and the Sheger City Security Administration Office exhibit a mix of informal communication and limited formal coordination. The primary mode of communication among these entities is informal, relying on telephone calls, emails, and letters. While this has facilitated ongoing dialogue, it highlights the absence of a well-defined and formalized communication structure for IGRs. Additionally, the implementation of IGRs is largely through party channels, relying on the goodwill of leaders from the Prosperity Party. This informal approach can limit transparency and accountability, as it depends on individual relationships rather than formal procedures.

There is a limitation on joint planning between MOP and AAPSB, while AAPSB and Sheger City demonstrate better collaboration. The planning process for peace-building initiatives is primarily driven by MOP, with limited input from AAPSB, indicating a top-down approach that could benefit from greater inclusion of AAPSB. Furthermore, the IGRs lack a formal structure, including a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or explicit agreements. While an MOU exists between MOP and AAPSB, its impact on day-to-day collaboration is unclear. The absence of formal structures suggests a need for formalization to enhance coordination, accountability, and transparency.

Moreover, there is no dedicated IGR forum or office to facilitate intergovernmental relations, further underscoring the informal nature of current interactions and the need for a structured approach. The lack of a legal framework governing fiscal arrangements complicates financial coordination and resource allocation. There is also a lack of awareness about formal IGR mechanisms and insufficient implementation of the IGR proclamation, limiting the effectiveness of intergovernmental relations. Despite the lack of a formal IGR framework, there is successful collaboration between AAPSB and Sheger City Administration in peace-building initiatives, such as joint training programs, indicating potential for positive intergovernmental relationships at the regional level.

The findings highlight positive aspects and areas for improvement in vertical IGRs for peace-building in Addis Ababa. While informal communication channels have facilitated dialogue and cooperation, the lack of detailed provisions in the IGR proclamation and reliance on individual goodwill indicate a need for further development. Successful collaboration between AAPSB and Sheger City Administration showcases effective peace-building efforts, supported by MOUs and MOP's involvement. The findings underscore the importance of formalized intergovernmental relations to enhance the effectiveness of peace-building initiatives.

Overall, the IGRs between MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City are heavily reliant on informal communication and individual goodwill, which can limit transparency and formal collaboration. The lack of detailed provisions in the IGR proclamation, limited influence of AAPSB in the planning process, and absence of a formal IGR structure present significant area for improvement. Developing clear rules and regulations, enhancing formal coordination mechanisms, and fostering greater collaboration and inclusion of AAPSB in decision-making processes can strengthen intergovernmental relations for more effective peace-building efforts.

4.6. Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Vertical IGRs for Peace-Building

The effectiveness of vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) is influenced by several institutional and political factors. Institutional challenges include a lack of skilled manpower, the absence of a supra-structural institution for IGR, and vague guidelines in the IGR proclamation, regulations, and directives. Financial constraints further hinder awareness creation and fiscal arrangements, impacting joint planning and overall effectiveness.

Political factors, such as party affiliation, often lead to reliance on informal channels, reducing transparency and accountability. Additionally, there is insufficient commitment from leaders and a general lack of awareness about IGR mechanisms, diminishing the effectiveness of intergovernmental relations.

Despite working together, AAPSB and the Sheger City Security Administration office lack a legal framework for fiscal arrangements. Coordination challenges between MOP and AAPSB include the general and vague nature of the IGR proclamation, which necessitates clearer rules and regulations for practical guidance. Informal communication predominates, with AAPSB having limited involvement in planning processes largely driven by MOP.

Analysis of IGRs among MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Security Administration reveals heavy reliance on informal communication, occasional joint planning between AAPSB and Sheger City, and an overall lack of formal IGR structures, including forums and offices. This absence, along with insufficient legal frameworks and awareness about formal IGR mechanisms, limits effective collaboration.

Institutional factors play a crucial role in influencing the effectiveness of vertical IGRs. A clear legal framework, aligned policies, adequate resource allocation, and formal procedures are essential for cooperation and coordination. Political influences, including informal communication and party affiliations, affect stability and decision-making. Socio-economic factors, such as collaboration and socio-economic development, contribute to effective intergovernmental relations.

Addressing these factors by establishing formal procedures, clarifying the IGR proclamation, enhancing planning inclusivity, and ensuring adequate resources can improve vertical IGR effectiveness. Recognition and mitigation of institutional, political, and socio-economic challenges can enhance collaboration among MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Administration, fostering sustainable peace and stability in Addis Ababa.

4.7. Impact of IGR in Addis Ababa City Administration

The informal IGR mechanisms have demonstrated a positive impact on the peace and stability of Addis Ababa City. The collaboration between AAPSB, MOP, and Sheger City Security Administration Office has successfully managed conflicts that arose in the surrounding areas of

Addis Ababa. For example, the conflict over mosque demolitions in Sheger City was effectively resolved through the concerted efforts of these entities. This conflict also extended to the Anuar Mosque in Addis Ababa, where it was similarly resolved through their collaborative efforts. This case illustrates the potential for informal IGR to positively impact peace in Addis Ababa by managing and resolving conflicts.

Enhanced Coordination and Collaboration Despite the informal nature of intergovernmental relations in Addis Ababa City Administration, there have been successful instances of coordination and collaboration between different government entities. For example, the collaboration between the Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) and Sheger City Security Administration Office has resulted in joint planning, task performance, and evaluation. This has fostered a sense of unity and cooperation, particularly among the youth from both regions, contributing to peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa City.

The active engagement and coordination between Sheger City and Addis Ababa City Administration have positively impacted the peace situation in the region. The informal communication and collaboration have led to better peace-building initiatives and a more harmonious environment. The joint efforts in organizing national holidays, such as the Holy Epiphany and Errechaa celebrations, demonstrate the successful coordination between the two cities.

The Ministry of Peace (MOP) has provided support to the AAPSB by offering material assistance, such as tablets for peace-building and conflict early warning purposes. Additionally, the MOP has conducted training sessions, experience sharing, and provided other forms of capacity building support to enhance the capabilities of the AAPSB. These efforts have contributed to the continuous improvement of peace-building activities in Addis Ababa City.

Although the formal intergovernmental relations framework is weak, the informal communication between different government entities has been excellent. The frequent telephone conversations, email exchanges, letters, and visits between the MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Administration have facilitated effective information sharing, coordination, and decision-making. The success of informal communication highlights the importance of establishing a more formalized and structured IGR framework.

The collaboration between the MOP, AAPSB, Oromiya Regional State, and Sheger City Administration indicates a shared commitment to peace-building. Despite the absence of clear rules and regulations governing their collaboration, these entities have worked together to address peace and security challenges in Addis Ababa City. This unity and collaboration have contributed to the overall success of peace-building efforts in the region.

4.8 Recommendation

To improve communication and collaboration for more successful peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa, several key recommendations should be implemented. Developing strong institutional frameworks is essential, with a clear delineation of roles, responsibilities, and processes for intergovernmental relations (IGR). Establishing a National IGR Secretariat will serve as a supra-structural institution responsible for coordinating IGR activities across various government levels, ensuring effective communication and collaboration. Formalizing IGR forums and offices, both nationally and regionally, will facilitate regular and structured dialogue between government entities, while regional sectoral executive relations forums can address specific regional issues, enhancing local-level coordination and cooperation.

Increasing awareness and building capacity on IGR is crucial. Conducting awareness campaigns and training programs will equip government officials and stakeholders with the necessary knowledge and skills to understand the importance and mechanisms of IGR. Ensuring inclusive participation in IGR processes by involving all relevant stakeholders, including local communities, will ensure that their needs and perspectives are considered. Allocating sufficient budget resources for IGR activities, such as awareness creation, training, and joint planning initiatives, is also necessary to support these efforts.

Legislative frameworks should be regularly reviewed and updated to provide clear guidelines for implementing IGR, with these frameworks being cascaded into detailed regulations and directives. Finalizing and ratifying the IGR Policy currently under process by the House of Federation (HOF) will provide a comprehensive policy framework for IGR. Additionally, completing and implementing the Peace and Development Charter currently under process by the Ministry of Peace (MOP) will guide peace-building efforts within the IGR framework. It is also vital to finalize and ratify the IGR directive currently under process by the HOF to offer detailed operational guidelines for IGR.

Finally, demonstrating a strong commitment to Proclamation No. 1231/21, which governs IGRs, is imperative. This commitment should be reflected through strict adherence to the proclamation's provisions at all government levels. By adopting these recommendations, Addis Ababa can enhance its institutional and operational capacity for IGR, leading to more effective communication, collaboration, and peace-building efforts.

4.9 Conclusion

This research into the vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and the Horizontal IGRs between Sheger City Security Administration Office and the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) highlights both the achievements and challenges of collaborative peace-building efforts within the Ethiopian Federation.

The study reveals that Addis Ababa operates under a semi-autonomous administrative structure, allowing it a degree of self-governance while maintaining vital connections with the federal government. Key actors in the city's peace-building process include the MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Security Administration Office, each playing a critical role in fostering peace and security.

The research identifies that despite the existence of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and some structured coordination, the dominant mode of communication among these entities remains informal. This informal approach, characterized by frequent telephone conversations, emails, and letters, has facilitated some effective peace-building activities but also reveals a significant gap in formalized procedures and institutional frameworks.

The findings highlight several institutional and political factors influencing the effectiveness of vertical IGRs. Institutional challenges such as inadequate skilled manpower, a lack of a supra-structural institution for IGR, and vague guidelines within the IGR proclamation are significant hurdles. Politically, the reliance on informal channels and party affiliations has sometimes undermined transparency and accountability.

Despite these challenges, the study underscores positive aspects of the informal IGR mechanisms. Collaborative efforts between AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office have resulted in successful conflict management and joint planning initiatives, demonstrating the potential of informal IGRs to impact peace positively. Notable examples include the resolution of conflicts related to mosque demolitions and the successful organization of national holidays, which illustrate the effective coordination and unity fostered through these informal channels.

To enhance the effectiveness of vertical IGRs for peace-building, several recommendations are proposed. Establishing a National IGR Secretariat and formalizing IGR forums and offices will create a more structured approach to communication and coordination. Increasing awareness and capacity-building on IGR mechanisms, alongside a clear legislative framework, will provide the necessary guidelines and resources for effective implementation. Furthermore, finalizing and implementing key policy documents such as the IGR Policy and the Peace and Development Charter will support a more robust and formalized IGR framework.

Finally, while the current informal mechanisms have facilitated some progress in peace-building efforts, there is a clear need for a more structured and formalized approach to intergovernmental relations. Addressing the identified challenges and implementing the recommended measures will strengthen the collaboration among MOP, AAPSB, and Sheger City Security Administration Office, leading to more effective peace-building initiatives and contributing to the stability and harmony of Addis Ababa.

References

- Anderson, G. (2008). *Federalism: An Introduction* Pp67 (Forum of Federations, Oxford Univ. press)
- Andrey, M. (2010). Security Implications of Neutrality: Switzerland in the Partnership for Peace Framework. *Connections*, 9(4), 83-96.
- Arens, A. (2020). Federal Reform and Intergovernmental Relations in Switzerland. *An Analysis of Intercantonal Agreements and Parliamentary Scrutiny in the Wake of the NFA (PhD Thesis)*. Berne: University of Berne, Switzerland.
- Assefa Fiseha (2009). The system of intergovernmental relations (IGR) in Ethiopia: in search of institutions and guidelines. *Journal of Ethiopian Law*, 23(1), 96-131
- Bellali, J., Strauch, L., Oremo, F., & Benson, O. (2018). Multi-level climate governance in Kenya. *Activating mechanisms for climate action*
- Bello, M. L. (2014). Intergovernmental relations in Nigeria: An assessment of its practice at the local government level. *Journal of poverty, Investment and Development*, 4, 66-76)
- Bercovitch, J., & Jackson, R. D. W. (2009). *Conflict resolution in the twenty-first century: principles, methods, and approaches*. University of Michigan Press.
- Bernd Spahn, P. (1997). "13 Switzerland". In *Fiscal Federalism in Theory and Practice*. USA: International Monetary Fund.
- Blindenbacher, R. (2005). Fiscal Federalism and accountability within the Swiss System of Government. In *China: Forum of Federations*.

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method, *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40
- Bush, K. D. (2004). *Building capacity for peace and unity: the role of local government in peacebuilding*. Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM).
- Buzan, B. (1991). New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century, *International affairs*, 67(3), 431-451
- Central Statistics Agency (CSA). (2021). Population Size by Sex, Region, Zone and Wereda: July 2021. *CSA: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*.
- de Visser, J., & Steytler, N. (2018). Multilevel government in South Africa, Ethiopia and Kenya. Forum Of Federations
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Elazar, D. J. (1965). The shaping of intergovernmental relations in the twentieth century. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 359(1), 10-22.
- FDRE Constitution, 1995
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Gemperle, S. (2010) The Concept of Swiss Federalism as Basis for Decentralization as Conflict Management Policy in Swiss Development Cooperation, Institute of Federalism University of Fribourg Summer University.

- Gathumbi, G. K. (2018). *Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms as a tool for Dispute Settlement in the Devolved Governance System in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi)
- Gawerc, M. I. (2006). Peace-building: Theoretical and concrete perspectives. *Peace & Change, 31*(4), 435-478.
- George, A. (2008). *Federalism: An Introduction*.
- Gerring, J., & McDermott, R. (2007). An experimental template for case study research. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(3), 688-701.
- Govil, P. (2013). Ethical considerations in educational research. *International journal of advancement in education and social sciences, 1*(2), 17-22.
- Greminger, T. (2011). *Swiss civilian peace promotion: assessing policy and practice*. ETH Zurich.
- Grewal, B. S. (2003). Johan Galtung: Positive and negative peace. *School of social science, Auckland University of technology, 30*, 23-26.
- Grewal, B. S. (2003). Johan Galtung: Positive and negative peace. *School of social science, Auckland University of technology, 30*, 23-26.
- Grodzins, M. (1960). American political parties and the American system. *Western Political Quarterly, 13*(4), 974-998.

- Groenewald, A. J. (2018). *A strategic and integrated approach to South African peace-building: the case of the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO)* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University)
- Habtamu Birhanu, & Zelalem Keabu, (2019). Inter-Federal-Regional Conflict Resolution Mechanisms in Ethiopian Federacy: A Comparative Appraisal on the Legal and Institutional Frameworks. *Beijing L. Rev.*, 10, 1374.
- Hamilton, A., Madison, J., & Jay, J. (1961). *The federalist*. Harvard University Press.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2006). What are institutions?. *Journal of economic issues*, 40(1), 1-25.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods.
- Ile, I. U. (2010). Strengthening intergovernmental relations for improved service delivery in South Africa: Issues for consideration. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 7(1), 51-57.
- Jaspal, R. (2020). Content analysis, thematic analysis and discourse analysis. *Research methods in psychology*, 1, 285-312.
- Judger, N. (2016). The thematic analysis of interview data: An approach used to examine the influence of the market on curricular provision in Mongolian higher education institutions. *Hillary place papers*, 3.
- Keller, E. J. (2002). Ethnic federalism, fiscal reform, development and democracy in Ethiopia. *African Journal of political science*, 7(1), 21-50.

- Kenna Deme (2014). P3 *The Impact of Federal-States Intergovernmental Relations on Regional States Autonomy in Ethiopia* (Doctoral dissertation, Addis Ababa University).
- Kenna Deme (2017). Federal-states intergovernmental relations impact on regional states autonomy in Ethiopia: A view with Oromo protest. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 11(5), 125-143.
- Ketema Wakjira (2017). Institutionalization of IGR in the Ethiopian federation: Towards cooperative or coercive federalism. *Ethiopian Journal of Federal Studies*, 4(2), 121-160.
- Ketema wakjira (2020). Local governance in Switzerland: Adequate municipal autonomy cumintergovernmental cooperation?. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1763889.
- Lecours, A. (Ed.). (2005). *New institutionalism: Theory and analysis* (Vol. 23). University of Toronto Press.
- Linder, W., & Vatter, A. (2001). Institutions and outcomes of Swiss federalism: The role of the cantons in Swiss politics. *West European Politics*, 24(2), 95-122
- Malherbe, R. (2006). Does the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005 confirm or suppress national dominance?: aantekeninge. *Journal of South African Law/Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg*, 2006(4), 810-818.
- Marvasti, A. B. (2014). Analysing observations. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*, 354-367.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2021). Why qualitative methods are necessary for generalization. *Qualitative Psychology*, 8(1), 111.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*.
sage.
- Mitullah, W. V., & Nguri, J. (2012). Intergovernmental Relations Act 2012: Reflection and proposals on principles, opportunities and gaps.
- Mitullah, W. V., & Nguri, J. (2012). Intergovernmental Relations Act 2012: Reflection and proposals on principles, opportunities and gaps
- Moretti, F., van Vliet, L., Bensing, J., Deledda, G., Mazzi, M., Rimondini, M., ... & Fletcher, I. (2011). A standardized approach to qualitative content analysis of focus group discussions from different countries. *Patient education and counseling*, 82(3), 420-428.
- Nigussie Afesha (2015). The federal-state intergovernmental relationship in Ethiopia: Institutional framework and its implication on state autonomy. *Mizan Law Review*, 9(2), 341-368.
- Nigussie Afesha (2022). “Functional Domains of IGR Forums, House of Federation and Ministry of Peace in Ethiopia: The Need for Clarity”, 16(2) *Mizan Law Review*: 305-338.
- Omoyefa, P. S. (2014). Post-apartheid South Africa: A need for genuine conflict transformation. *Journal of conflictology*, 5(1).
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Weinbaum, R. K. (2017). A framework for Using qualitative comparative analysis for the review of the literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(2), 359-372.
- Opeskin, B. R. (1999). Mechanism for Intergovernmental Relations. In *International Conference on Federalism Mont-Tremblant*. Ottawa: Forum for Federation. <http://www.forumfed.org>.

- Opeskin, B. R. (2001). Mechanisms for intergovernmental relations in federations. *International Social Science Journal*, 53(167), 129-138.
- Pankhurst, R. (1961). Menelik and the foundation of Addis Ababa. *The Journal of African History*, 2(1), 103-117.
- Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball sampling. *SAGE research methods foundations*.
- Phillimore, J. (2013). Understanding Intergovernmental Relations: Key Features and Trends, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 72(3), 228-238
- Prabhakar, R. P. (2011). Local Government's Administrative System in India, *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 943-952
- Proclamation No. 1231/2021; The System of Inter-Governmental Relations in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia's Determination Proclamation
- Proclamation No. 1263/2021 Definition of Powers and Duties of the Executive Organs Proclamation
- Proclamation No.74/2021 A Proclamation to Provide for the Establishment of the Executive Organs of the Addis Ababa City Government
- Rohrbach, L. (2021). Intra-party dynamics and the success of federal arrangements: Ethiopia in comparative perspective. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 31(4), 475-494.
- Saunders, M. N. (2012). Choosing research participants, *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges*, 35-52.

- Saxena, R. (2021). The Working of Cooperative and Collaborative Federalism in India: Understanding Intergovernmental Relations. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(2), 153-164.
- Saxena, R. Mechanisms of Intergovernmental Relations in India.
- Schmid, C. L. (1981). *Conflict and consensus in Switzerland*. Univ of California Press.
- Schnabel, J., & Hegele, Y. (2021). Explaining intergovernmental coordination during the COVID-19 pandemic: Responses in Australia, Canada, Germany, and Switzerland. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 51(4), 537-569.
- Sedgwick, P. (2013). Snowball sampling. *Bmj*, 347
- Sharma, C. K. (2011). *Intergovernmental Coordination Mechanisms in India*.
- Sharma, S. K. (1976). *Inter-State Council: An Aspect of Cooperative Federation*. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 22(3), 539-548.
- Simiyu, F. N. (2015). Recasting Kenya's Devolved Framework for Intergovernmental Relations: Lessons from South Africa. Available at SSRN 2692607
- Singh, N. (2004). *India's System of intergovernmental fiscal relations*. UC Santa Cruz SCCIE Working Paper, (04-17).
- Stewart, I. (2004). Men of Class: Aristotle, Montesquieu and Dicey on Separations of Powers and the Rule of Law. *Macquarie LJ*, 4, 187.
- Steiner, R., & Kaiser, C. (2018). Inter-municipal Cooperation in Switzerland. *Inter-municipal Cooperation in Europe: Institutions and Governance*, 173-187.

- Suberu, R. (2009). Federalism in Africa: The Nigerian experience in comparative perspective. *Ethnopolitics*, 8(1), 67-86.
- Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis, *Qualitative research journal*, 11(2), 63-75
- Swenden, W., Saxena, R., & Sharma, C. K. (2022). Understanding multilevel dynamics in India: constituent power and multilevel governance. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 10(1), 1-11.
- The constitution of INDIA
- The FDRE constitution, 1995
- The Intergovernmental Relations Act of Kenya, 2012
- Toonen, T. A. (2010). Multi-level governance and intergovernmental relations: Integrating the theoretical perspectives. *Governance and Intergovernmental Relations in the European Union and the United States: Theoretical Perspectives*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 29-50.
- Watts, R. L. (1998). Federalism, federal political systems, and federations. *Annual Review of political science*, 1(1), 117-137.
- Wiles, J. L., Rosenberg, M. W., & Kearns, R. A. (2005). Narrative analysis as a strategy for understanding interview talk in geographic research. *Area*, 37(1), 89-99.
- Wild, C. (2014). Peacebuilding: Switzerland's approach to local ownership. *Is Local Beautiful? Peacebuilding between International Interventions and Locally Led Initiatives*, 79-86.

- Wyss, K., & Lorenz, N. (2000). Decentralization and central and regional coordination of health services: the case of Switzerland. *The International journal of health planning and management*, 15(2), 103-114.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Designing case studies. *Qualitative research methods*, 5(14), 359-386.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5). Sage.
- Yonatan T. Fessha (2020). Intergovernmental cooperation, divided societies and capital cities: The case of the Ethiopian capital.
- Zelalem Tesfaye Sirna (2018). Addis Ababa/Finfinee: A blueprint towards twin-city administration. *Ethiopian Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities*, 14(1), 83-103.

Annex I; List of Interviewees

List of Interviewees			
No.	Name	Position	organization
1	Mr. Wondimagegn Haile	chief Executive for Federalism and IGR,	MOP
2	Mr. Girma Cheru	Head of Intergovernmental relation Desk	MOP
3	Mr. Gezahegn Tilahun	Head of National consensus Desk	MOP
4	Mr. Tasew Jego	Senior Expert for Intergovernmental relation	MOP
5	Mr. Endale lema	Formerly Senior Expert for Conflict durable solution and Currently Desk Head of pastoralist and Special Support Desk	MOP
6	Mr. Haile Meskel Tsegaye	Head of Social capital Building Desk	MOP
7	Mr. Liyew Mezgebu	Senior Expert for peace Building	MOP
8	Ms. Zina Desye	Expert for peace Building	MOP
9.	Mr. Amanuel G/Medhin	Desk Head for situation room	MOP
10.	Mr. Alemu Zeweld	Team leader for plan preparation, monitoring and evaluation	MOP
11	Mr. Dawit fantu	Team leader for Peace Value Building and Training	AAPSB
12	Mr. Elias Kejela	Senior Expert for Peace Value Building and Training.	AAPSB
13	Mr. Tatek Negash	Directorate Director for Security information, Early warning and rapid Response	AAPSB

14	Mr. Abdulfetah shemsu	Security information Monitoring and evaluation Expert	AAPSB
15	Mr. Merha Tibebu	Directorate Director for Security organs coordination	Sheger City Security administration office
16	Mr. Legesse Endale	Community training dialogue and Conference Expert at peace building Directorate	Sheger City Security administration office
17	Mr. Alemayehu Dinsa	Directorate Director for plan preparation, monitoring and evaluation	Sheger City Security administration office
18	Mr. Dereje Terefe	Directorate Director for HR and Institutional reform leadership	Sheger City Security administration office
19.	Mr. Muluken Habtu	Public relation Expert	Constitutional and Federalism Indoctination Center
20.	Mr. Gebru Gebreselasie	Team Leader for Diversity and Unity Study	HOF
21	Ms. Menderin Markos	Intergovernmental relation and Democracy culture Directorate Director (representative)	HOF
22	Mr. Fantahun Ketema	Peace Building Expert	HOF
23	Waqtole Dadi(Ph.D)	Directorate Director for Fiscal Issues and Regional Equitable Development	HOF

Annex II; Interview question

Interview question for MOP and AAPSB

1. Is there a Memorandum of Understanding or any signed agreement between the Ministry of Peace (MOP) and the Addis Ababa City Administration Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB)?

- Is there an established formal agreement between MOP and AAPSB?
- Is there an Inter-Governmental Relations (IGR) structure in place between the two institutions?
- Are there representatives from both institutions involved in the IGR structure?
- Is the office furnished and operational?
- Has there been any allocation of finance to support their collaborative efforts?

2. Who are the actors involved in the peace-building process of the Addis Ababa City Administration?

2. How do MOP and AAPSB work together?

- What is the nature of their cooperation and collaboration?
- Is there joint planning between the two institutions for peace-building initiatives?
- Do they provide support to each other in terms of expertise, capacity building, financial resources, and material resources?
- Is there a provision for constructive feedback between the two institutions?
- Is there a joint monitoring and evaluation system in place to assess peace-building performance?
- Do they have a platform for sharing knowledge and experiences between the two governmental offices?

3. How does the relationship between MOP and AAPSB help in peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa?

- What positive outcomes or benefits result from their collaborative work?
 - How does their partnership contribute to peace-building initiatives in Addis Ababa?
 - Are there any challenges or negative aspects associated with their relationship?
4. How does the federal government (MOP) working with the city government (AAPSB) help peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of this collaborative relationship?
 - How does MOP develop plans with AAPSB for peace-building in Addis Ababa?
 - Do they jointly create short-term, medium-term, and long-term plans for peace-building?
 - Can you provide an example of how they work together on peace-building plans?
5. Can you give an example of a successful peace-building project that MOP and AAPSB worked on together?
- Is there a specific instance where their collaboration led to a successful outcome in resolving a conflict or promoting peace in Addis Ababa?
6. Apart from MOP and AAPSB, who else is involved in conflict management and peace-building in Addis Ababa?
- Are there other organizations, institutions, or individuals actively engaged in peace-building efforts in the city?
7. Do MOP and AAPSB share information with each other?
- How do they facilitate the exchange of information between the two organizations?
8. How does MOP support AAPSB in sharing information with other stakeholders involved in peace-building in Addis Ababa?
- What methods or platforms are used to ensure effective information sharing?
9. Is there any financial support provided by MOP to AAPSB for peace-building?

- Does MOP allocate resources or funding to support the activities of AAPSB?

10. How do MOP and AAPSB measure the effectiveness of their peace-building efforts in Addis Ababa?

- Do they have specific mechanisms or indicators to track progress and evaluate outcomes?

11. Do you believe that the collaboration between MOP and AAPSB contributes to building peace in Addis Ababa?

- In your opinion, does their joint effort have a positive impact on peace-building in the city?

12. In the event of a disagreement, how do MOP and AAPSB resolve conflicts or conflicting orders?

- Is there a structured process for conflict resolution between the two organizations?

13. Can you provide an example of a time when the collaboration between MOP and AAPSB helped resolve a conflict in Addis Ababa?

- Is there a specific incident or case where their joint efforts successfully contributed to conflict resolution?

Interview question for AAPSB and Sheger City Security Administration Office

1. How would you describe the current level of collaboration and coordination between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB) in peace-building efforts?
2. What are the existing mechanisms or platforms for intergovernmental collaboration between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB?
3. In your opinion, what are the key challenges or barriers hindering effective vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB?
4. What specific strategies or initiatives have been undertaken to promote inclusive planning and decision-making processes between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB in peace-building?
5. How can the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB enhance their capacity in peace-building through training, knowledge-sharing, or other capacity-building programs?
6. Are there any formal agreements or memorandums of understanding (MOUs) in place between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB to facilitate and guide their collaboration in peace-building? If yes, how effective have these agreements been?
7. What are the potential areas for improvement in the legal framework or policy guidelines to strengthen vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB in peace-building?
8. How can the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB establish more structured and regular communication channels for information exchange, joint planning, and reporting on peace-building initiatives?

9. What steps can be taken to ensure adequate allocation of financial resources and budgetary support for intergovernmental collaboration between the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB in peace-building?

10. Are there any best practices or successful models of vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) in peace-building that the Sheger City Security Administration Office and the AAPSB can learn from and potentially emulate?

Interview question for House of Federation

1. How does the House of Federation contribute to enhancing vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) for peace-building between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City in Addis Ababa?

2. What specific mechanisms or platforms does the House of Federation utilize to promote collaboration and coordination between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City in peace-building efforts?

3. In your perspective, what are the key roles and responsibilities of the House of Federation in fostering inclusive planning and decision-making processes between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City for peace-building in Addis Ababa?

4. How does the House of Federation support capacity building and training programs for officials involved in peace-building from the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City? Are there any specific areas of focus or expertise that receive particular attention?

5. Are there any formal agreements, memorandums of understanding (MOUs), or policies established by the House of Federation to guide and facilitate vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) for peace-building between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City? If so, how effective have these agreements been in practice?

6. In your opinion, what improvements or additions could be made to the existing legal framework or policy guidelines to further strengthen vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) for peace-building between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City in Addis Ababa?
7. How does the House of Federation facilitate structured and regular communication channels among the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City to ensure effective information exchange, joint planning, and reporting on peace-building initiatives in Addis Ababa?
8. What steps can be taken by the House of Federation to allocate sufficient financial resources and budgetary support for intergovernmental collaboration between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City in peace-building efforts?
9. Are there any successful examples or best practices of vertical intergovernmental relations (IGRs) for peace-building that the House of Federation has observed or implemented? How can these experiences be applied to improve collaboration between the Ministry of Peace (MOP), Addis Ababa Peace and Security Bureau (AAPSB), and Sheger City?