

**Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
and
the Office of Evaluation of FAO**

Concept note (June 2014)

**Joint Evaluation Synthesis Report on FAO's and IFAD's
engagement in pastoral development**

Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Background	1
III.	Objectives, scope and methodology	4
IV.	Work components	6

Annexes

I.	Draft table of contents	9
II.	Preliminary bibliography	10
III.	List of IFAD on-going pastoral projects not yet evaluated	14
	List of FAO on-going pastoral Projects not evaluated	16
IV.	A preliminary typology of pastoral livelihoods (IFAD)	18
V.	IFAD and FAO strategic objectives	19

Concept Note

Joint Evaluation Synthesis Report on IFAD and FAO's engagement in pastoral development

I. Introduction

1. This evaluation synthesis¹ report on pastoral development will be jointly produced by the FAO Office of Evaluation and the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD. It is one concrete activity to implement the 'Statement of Intent' which entered into force on 2 April 2013 and was signed by the heads of evaluation of CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP to strengthen collaboration in evaluation across the Rome-based agencies.

II. Background

2. **Definition.** Pastoral development is the development of a livelihood system where households make more than half of their income from livestock-related activities using some degree of mobility to access commonly managed pastures. Such livelihood systems are not necessarily based entirely on livestock – they may include some agriculture, hunting or selling charcoal for example – but livestock are the principle source of income (Kratli and Swift 2014). Mobility is a key strategy used by pastoralists to cope with environmental variability and to take advantage of the heterogeneity of pasture composition (IUCN 2011). Mobility may be classified by purpose: production-related (especially the search for high quality feed), market-related or conflict-related (fleeing a threat).

Two main characteristics make pastoral systems particularly suitable to meeting the needs of the rural poor in marginal lands:

- Pastoralism enables the productive use of very large grassland areas, at low opportunity cost since it has few or no other uses;
 - Pastoralism is highly flexible, giving it resilience and an ability to react to environmental risks and threats (Catley, Lind and Scoones 2013, Oxfam 2008).
3. Pastoral development refers to activities targeted at the pastoral livelihood system in its entirety; livestock development is a sectoral set of activities targeted directly to livestock. This synthesis evaluation is concerned with pastoral development within specific landscapes, in which livestock form an important, but by no means the only, component.²
 4. The figure of 200 million pastoralists (UNDP 2003) worldwide is sometimes used, with little authority; in reality the number of pastoralists is unknown with any precision. A synthesis by FAO and the World Bank ranked the incidence of poverty among various cropping systems, and ranked poverty in pastoral and agro pastoral systems as 'extensive' compared to 'moderate' in maize systems, and 'limited' in cereal root crop systems (FAO World Bank 2011).
 5. **Model of pastoralism.** Since the 1990s the way pastoralism is conceptualised has changed substantially, reflecting larger changes in the development environment. This provides new ways of analysing pastoralism itself. The most important features of the emerging new view of pastoralism are:
 - (i) Recognition that many of the practices, beliefs and understandings of traditional users are not, as previously thought, irrational, but, given the

¹ A synthesis can be defined as a process of drawing together literature and studies on a particular topic with the purpose of providing analysis. (K.Olsen, S. O'Reilly,2011).

² Pastoral systems exist in Europe, in the mountain chain from Wales to Slovenia, former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece; this report does not include them in its analysis because there are few projects in these countries, but they carry lessons for pastoralism in other continents.

environments occupied by pastoralists, intensely rational. This changed view is in part the result of the rejection of several myths (e.g. the tragedy of the commons) about pastoralists which had distorted the views held by most outsiders and governments about pastoral development. This process is not yet universal but myths no longer dominate thinking about pastoral development.

- (ii) Pastoralism prospers in landscapes where other livelihood systems either are at their limit (dryland farming) or require large investments (irrigated cropping). The opportunity cost of pastoralism is low; the resources it uses are not in general of high value to other livelihood systems (wetlands in drylands are an exception).
- (iii) Growth of new institutional economics³, and the recognition for example of the difference between common access and open access to natural resources and the ability of customary communities to make and enforce rules about natural resource access.
- (iv) Work on the economic value of pastoralism and its development potential, showing that far from being the low productivity subsistence economy it was reputed to be, pastoral livelihoods make a major contribution to GDP and in many countries to exports. This is only partially captured by national economic statistics. For example, in Mongolia pastoral livestock accounts for one third of GDP and represent the second largest source of foreign exchange earnings (32 percent) after minerals (41 percent); in Ethiopia the inclusion of more accurate calculations of the contribution of livestock, especially in pastoral production, means readjusting the agricultural GDP figures upwards by 47 percent (IGAD 2013).
- (v) A better understanding of risk in pastoral livelihood systems, its impact on the capital embodied in pastoral herds, and the need for appropriate risk management strategies.
- (vi) Work on the grazing strategies of herders accessing widely scattered concentrations of nutrients in a targeted manner, making a revised and more favourable view of mobility necessary.
- (vii) A realisation that pastoralists are not responsible for widespread environmental degradation, but that pastoralism is generally sustainable at current stocking rates. It is no longer thought that extensive rangelands necessarily always tend towards a botanical equilibrium with stable climax vegetation, or that carrying capacity is an indispensable management concept. These ideas have been replaced in some circumstances by a non-equilibrium model, in which external events such as drought or animal disease are the main ecological drivers in drier areas; this difference between equilibrium in wetter areas and non-equilibrium in drier areas demands that different approaches are adopted in different ecologies (Catley, Lind and Scoones 2013 and J. M. McPeak, P. Little, Cheryl Doss, 2012).
- (viii) A changing macro-economic environment in which pastoral livelihoods are adapting to the new markets created by rapid urbanisation in and around all pastoral areas, and the rapid growth of urban demand for milk and meat.

³ New Institutional economics: the argument is that institutions influence economic outcomes; NIE analyses the efficiency of institutions. Efficiency in the sense of how well and at what cost an institution - e.g. a set of customary land tenure rules - achieves certain objectives, in comparison with other known real alternatives e.g. a formal land tenure system. Institutions act as substitutes for missing or defunct markets or as alternatives to present arrangements. Among other things NIE demonstrated the efficacy of customary governance arrangements, where previously they had been thought to be irrational. (Douglass North, 1990 and Elinor Ostrom, 1990).

- (ix) A changing security environment, in which some pastoralists find themselves simultaneously the victim of violence by terrorist forces and the target of national and international armies. This has both direct and indirect effects: direct when pastoralists are themselves involved in fighting, indirect when conflict closes markets and services.
 - (x) A realisation that pastoralism, by virtue of its mobility, flexibility and resilience, may be a good starting point in managing climate change.
6. In parallel with new perceptions about the nature of pastoralism is a growing understanding that poverty in a pastoral economy may take different forms from poverty in an agricultural economy. Because of their ownership and management of livestock, valuable assets for any rural household, pastoralists may appear richer than farmers in the same area and poverty rates correspondingly lower. But a livestock-based economy may be riskier than an agricultural one, vulnerable to the effects of drought (or very cold winter), conflict, theft of animals and other threats. Pastoralists may need a different form of targeting from that used in other rural economies.
 7. **Pastoralism within IFAD and FAO.** The two organisations have different histories of engagement with pastoral development. FAO's involvement is now largely through grant-funds supporting (extra budgetary sources) mainly emergency, livestock and food security projects, IFAD's through both loan and grant funded projects, but especially the former. For both, pastoralism is sometimes the main focus, sometimes a component of an activity with wider scope. A preliminary desk review by IOE of 28 IFAD financed projects and grants initiated between 2003 and 2013, showed that 14 (or half) were pure pastoralist projects, meaning that they identified pastoral communities as their main target group. A provisional estimate is that in the last decade IFAD financed a total volume of US\$ 378 million for initiatives which directly or indirectly⁴ dealt with pastoral issues. Of this amount, IFAD's commitment to grants was US\$ 88 million.
 8. Many IFAD projects with a focus on pastoral development include capacity building and rangeland management. These initiatives frequently aim to deliver direct benefits to pastoralists (such as restocking or rural infrastructure) in order to create immediate improvements in livelihood security. Another important area of intervention is animal health.
 9. FAO's interventions have focused more on emergency livestock activities and animal health but its institutional history has led it to have pastoral development programmes managed by several services. A wide spectrum of activities relevant to pastoral development has been undertaken, including both development projects and policy and strategy work. These include work on pasture land tenure and risk in Central Asia, animal health and animal genetic conservation, pastoral systems and climate change, and especially dry area grasslands. A lot of this work has been done principally in one service or another, but there is also cross-service work, among which the LEAD initiative on livestock and climate change is notable. There is also work on Eastern European grasslands, emergency and rehabilitation in the Greater Horn of Africa and other emergency related activities dealing with pastoral livelihood systems. The experience of FAO in managing cross-cutting activities of this sort will be an important synthesis theme. FAO's focus means that a relatively high proportion of the case studies examined in the synthesis will concern emergencies and this may have implications for the methodology. A rough estimate of FAO's commitment in the last decade is that US \$ 208 million have been devoted to support projects which indirectly or directly focused on pastoral development.

⁴ In this context indirect support refers to projects where pastoral development was not the main objective, pastoralists were not the main target group or where pastoral activities were just a sub-component of a larger project.

10. IFAD does not have a documented strategy on pastoral development issues. There is however evidence that the Fund wants to remain active in this domain: IFAD records show that the number of projects approved which dealt directly or indirectly with pastoral development issues is on the increase. In the period 2002-2005, 7 development initiatives were approved while from 2005 onwards their number rose to 21 (of which 9 are grant-funded programmes). Of the latter 16 have been approved in the last four years (2009 onwards) indicating a continued interest in this field by the Fund. The reasons for this will be further investigated as part of this synthesis.
11. **Pastoral programmes of other agencies.** Many other agencies have pastoral development programmes. The World Bank and the European Union have worked on natural resource management, pastoral institutions, poverty and emergencies. The Swiss Development Corporation has worked on pastoral institutions. Several non-governmental organisations, including Veterinaires sans Frontieres, SNV (Netherlands Volunteers) and Oxfam, have worked extensively with pastoralists, focussing often on service delivery, institutions and emergency activities. This body of work provides a useful background against which the activities of IFAD and FAO can be analysed.

III. Objectives, scope and methodology

12. This section outlines the audience, objectives, key evaluation questions, scope and methodology for the synthesis.
13. **Audience.** The audience for this report is IFAD and FAO management and staff as well as the Governing Bodies in the two institutions (the Evaluation Committee in IFAD, and the Programme Committee in FAO). Many of the issues addressed will be of concern to a wider audience including other development agencies and donors with pastoral development programmes.
14. **Objective:** The joint synthesis will generate findings and document lessons and good practices that can inform the design and implementation of ongoing and future policies, strategies and work in pastoral development.
15. **Evaluation Questions and Scope.** In light of the above objective the joint synthesis will focus on the following strategic question:

To what extent, in what activities and subsectors, and by what methods should IFAD and FAO concentrate future project and non-project work to optimally support pastoral development?
16. The overall framework for assessing the work of the two organisations is the two agencies' strategic objectives.⁵ For each set of objectives, an overarching question is identified. These are shown in summary form in table 1, organised into a set of common categories. Gender, governance, climate change and environment are cross-cutting issues.

⁵ IFAD, Strategic Framework, 2011-2015. Rome. FAO, Strategic Framework 2010-2019 Rome 2009. The full text of the strategic objectives is in Annex 4.

Table 1
FAO and IFAD: Strategic objectives and key questions

Intervention domain	Strategic objective	Overarching question
Poverty, hunger, services, knowledge	IFAD SO 2 (Access to services), 3 (Farm and off-farm enterprises) FAO SO 3 (Reducing Rural Poverty)	To what extent did activities contribute to the strategic objectives of FAO and IFAD in reducing poverty and hunger, and to improving services?
Livelihood systems	IFAD SO 1 (Asset base and resilience) FAO SO2 and SO5 (Provision of goods and services from natural resources and resilience of livelihoods to threats and crisis)	To what extent did activities contribute to the creation of more resilient livelihood systems?
Institutions, organisations, policies	IFAD SO 4 (Policies) IFAD SO 5 (Institutions) FAO SO1 (Eradication of Hunger)	To what extent did activities contribute to building new and better adapted institutions, organisations and policies?
Risk, resilience, insecurity	IFAD SO 1 (Asset base and resilience) FAO SO 5 (resilience of livelihoods to threats and crisis)	To what extent did activities contribute to the identification of risk and the establishment of effective risk management policies and structures
Gender	Cross-cutting	To what extent did activities contribute to promote gender equality and women's empowerment?
Governance	Cross-cutting	To what extent did activities promote good governance
Climate change	Cross-cutting	To what extent did activities promote resilience to climate change?
Environment	Cross-cutting	To what extent did activities contribute to more sustainable environmental management?

17. The set of projects to be investigated are (i) all IFAD and FAO projects wholly or partly dealing with pastoralism for which there are completed end of project or other evaluations by IOE and OED between 2003 and 2014⁶, and (ii) ongoing projects with an identifiable pastoral development component.⁷

⁶ Approximately 21 evaluations for IFAD and 15 evaluations for FAO covering 32 projects (see annex 1).

⁷ Approximately 19 IFAD projects and 23 FAO projects (see annex 2).

18. **Methodology.** The synthesis will be based on documentary evidence mainly but not exclusively from within the two organisations. Documents to be reviewed include: IFAD, FAO and other project or policy related documents, as well as some government policies, country evaluations, COSOPS and other literature. The synthesis recognises the discrepancies that can occur between planning and implementation, and that planning documents do not necessarily reflect what happens on the ground. It will combine a review of documents with interviews with FAO and IFAD headquarters and visiting field staff (especially CPMs), and key policy level staff in both agencies. It will furthermore explore what other agencies, including IUCN, are doing in order to identify wider lessons which may be of relevance to the two agencies. Many of the evaluation criteria to be applied are embedded in the framework above and the strategic question (e.g. relevance, gender, environment, institutions and policies etc.). In addition the synthesis will investigate sustainability and to the extent possible impact.

IV. Work components

Component 1. Literature review

19. The synthesis will undertake a short desk review of the wider scientific and evaluation literature which underlies the development model supporting IFAD and FAO's work in pastoral areas and the way new ideas about pastoralism were incorporated by development agencies such as IFAD and FAO into that model; the focus will be on the key elements of the new approaches to pastoralism to provide a background for a more detailed discussion later in the document. In addition, the policies and work of other IFIs, UN agencies and other relevant donors will be briefly reviewed to provide a context to the FAO and IFAD programmes. This literature review will provide the background for wider lesson learning.

Component 2. Synthesis of evaluation findings

20. Evaluation reports will be analysed for the lessons they contain using the questions listed in table 1. Building on the desk review of the evolving understanding of pastoral development undertaken during component 1, the analysis will be performed mainly on evaluation reports. In the case of ongoing projects, the synthesis will analyse the relevance of the design. In some cases the synthesis may also have to draw on on-going projects to get specific information (e.g. updated financial information) and supervision reports as well as self-evaluations. This analysis will be aimed not so much at measuring performance of projects (already carried out at evaluation), but at drawing out lessons for pastoral development to be learned and good practices to be identified.
21. Reviews under component 2 will include:
 - (i) A typology of interventions in technical fields, emergency activities, in institutions and policy related work, with an analysis of level of funding and trends.
 - (ii) Assessment of the extent to which projects contributed to the strategic objectives of FAO and IFAD. Additionally an analysis of selected themes and the lessons that can be learned (e.g. risk, environment, gender, institutions) will be carried out.

Component 3. Review of IFAD and FAO strategy and approach

22. Once a comprehensive picture of the IFAD/FAO approach to pastoral development has been drawn via the literature review in component 1, and the document analysis and preliminary answers to the evaluation questions in component 2, specific aspects will be explored at greater depth by means of semi-structured interviews with key senior decision-makers in IFAD and FAO (Policy and Technical Advisory Division (PTA), the concerned Country Programme Managers and Country

Programme Officers), and their equivalents in FAO. This will help to deepen understanding of the strategic intention in respect of pastoral development in each agency, the links between strategic objectives and projects and more general policies, and the limitations imposed by project design. A review of the extent to which wider lessons learned in the evaluation reports produced during the last 10 years have been internalised into IFAD and FAO thinking and planning, and in second and later rounds of projects will be undertaken. General lessons at the project and strategy level will be formulated.

Risks

23. The following risks must be managed: (i) *Risk*: joint evaluations are more risky than single owner studies. This is because there is increased scope for disagreement about methods, priorities or findings, actual or perceived financial shortcomings and because the reputations of the evaluation units and the agencies as a whole are on the line. *Response*: The firm ownership by management in both institutions gives the evaluation special strength, but does not eliminate risks. Accordingly IFAD and FAO will put in place appropriate risk mitigation measures, by reaching firm advance agreements and by building mutual trust. (ii) *Risk*: Project documents and evaluations do not contain enough detailed material to answer the analytic questions listed above. *Response*: on the basis of an initial document sweep, it seems likely that taken together with government and agency policies and strategies it will be possible to have access to enough material to answer these questions.

Management and Timeline

24. **Management** The proposed synthesis will be carried out jointly by FAO and IFAD. It will share the same evaluation framework and methods, will be conducted by a single team of consultants and will result in a single joint final report. The preparation of the synthesis will be jointly financed by OED and IOE.
25. From the IFAD side, Catrina Perch, IOE Evaluation Officer, is Lead Evaluator of the synthesis report. She will be supervised by Ashwani Muthoo, IOE Deputy Director and Laure Vidaud, IOE Evaluation Assistant will provide all required administrative support. The Lead Evaluator in FAO is Tullia Aiazzi, Senior Evaluation Officer, who will be supported by Arwa Khalid, Evaluation Officer in the Office of Evaluation FAO.
26. Dr. Jeremy Swift, is the consultants' team leader for the preparation of the evaluation synthesis report. He will be assisted by a research assistant (Marina Izzo) and an FAO OED staff member, who will retrieve and analyse information from IFAD and FAO's respectively The consultants will report to both evaluation offices but Catrina Perch will be the focal point for the synthesis.
27. **Joint Management Committee.** The Joint Management Committee will be composed of the Director of the Office of Evaluation (OED) in FAO and the Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE) in IFAD. The main purpose of this committee will be to provide any necessary guidance and oversight to the evaluation.
28. **Core Learning Partnership.** An important goal of the synthesis is to enlarge the community of people learning from past experience. This will be achieved in the following ways. A core learning partnership of key staff involved in pastoralism from IFAD and FAO headquarters will be set up at the start to channel views and feedback from each agency into the synthesis process; this group will meet as necessary and be consulted on key deliverables of this synthesis. The composition of the CLP will be determined by OED and IOE. From the IFAD side it will include staff from IFADs Technical Policy Advisory Division (PTA), environmental advisors and Country Programme Managers. From FAOs side it will involve staff from the Climate, Energy and Tenure Division (NRC), Plant Production and Protection

Division (AGPM), Livestock Production Systems (AGAS), Animal Health Service (AGAH).

Communication and Dissemination

29. A workshop will be organized in Rome between IFAD and FAO towards the end of the evaluation process. This workshop, which will focus on learning, will allow multiple stakeholders to exchange views on the key findings and lessons.
30. The published final report will thereafter be widely distributed. The main text of the synthesis report will be around 50 pages, written in English.

Timelines for the production of the evaluation synthesis report.

31. The below table shows the main activities, deliverables and timelines for the production of the synthesis report.

Events and deliverables	Date
Share draft concept note between IOE and OED	26 March 2014
Comments on concept note received from IOE and OED	7 April 2014
Share revised concept note with core learning partnership	24 April 2014
Meeting of Core Learning Partnership	9 May 2014
Revised final concept note approved	14 May 2014
Work on components 1 (literature review) and 2 (evaluations) starts	15 May 2014
Component 3 starts	26 June 2014
First draft report completed sent to IOE and OED for comments	5 September 2014
Receive comments from IOE and OED on first draft	19 September 2014
Submit revised draft to core learning partnership	1 October 2014
Final draft report	15 October 2014
Learning workshop	November 2014

Draft table of contents

JOINT EVALUATION SYNTHESIS ON PASTORAL DEVELOPMENT

FOREWORD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. Background

- A. Pastoralism: definition, pastoral livelihood systems
- B. Donor involvement in pastoral development
- C. Pastoral livelihoods in IFAD and FAO
- D. Functioning of pastoral livelihood systems: evolving understandings

II. Methodology

- A. Objective of the synthesis report
- B. Methodology and process

III. IFAD and FAO pastoral programmes

- A. Focus and typology of IFAD and FAO interventions in pastoral development
- B. Spending in pastoral development by IFAD and FAO over survey period

IV. Findings and lessons

- A. Extent to which projects have contributed to the strategic objectives of FAO and IFAD
- B. Analysis of selected themes (e.g. risk, gender, institutions)
- C. Have lessons been learned and used?

V. Wider lessons

- A. Lessons from other pastoral development evaluations
- B. Recent evolution of pastoral development approaches in other agencies (e.g. WB, European Commission, DFID, SDC, GIZ and some NGOs).

VI. Assessment of IFAD's and FAO's approach to Pastoral Development

- A. To what extent, in what interventions and subsectors, and by what methods should IFAD and FAO concentrate future project and non-project operations to optimally support pastoral development?

VII. Conclusions

VIII. Issues for further consideration

- A. Added value of a joint approach between IFAD and FAO, and other agencies?

Annexes

Appendices

Preliminary Bibliography

IFAD's IOE evaluations reports on pastoral development

- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2013. *Rural Poverty-Reduction Programme Mongolia. Project Performance Assessment (PPA)*. Rome: IFAD. (Report n.2701)
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de Évaluation (IOE), 2013. *République du Mali. Évaluation du Programme de pays*. Rome: IFAD (Rapport n.3011-ML).
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2012. *Hasmemite Kingdom of Jordan. National Programme for Rangelands Rehabilitation and Development. Project Performance Assessment (PPA)*. Rome: IFAD (Report n. 2525- JO)
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2012. *Project Completion Report Validation. Badia Rangelands Development Project*. Available from: http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/validation/2010/index.htm
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2009. *Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Country Programme Evaluation*. Rome: IFAD (Report n. 2045-ET)
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2011, Project Completion Report Validation, Pastoral Community Project (phase 1).
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de l'évaluation (IOE), 2008. *Royaume du Maroc. Évaluation du Programme de pays*. Rome: IFAD (Rapport n. 1980-MA).
- FIDA, Bureau Independent d'Évaluation (IOE), 2013 Royaume du Maroc, Évaluation de la performance du projet, Développement Rural dans les Zones Montagneuses de la Province d'Al Haouz.
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de Évaluation (IOE), 2007. République Programme Spécial National Phase II. Evaluation terminale. Rome: FIDA. (Rapport n.1920-NE) et *Ensuring realistic design: learning from experiences in Niger*. Evaluation profile, n.48. Available from: http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/profile/pa/ne.pdf
- FIDA, Bureau independent de l'évaluation, 2011 République du Niger Evaluation du Programme de Pays (Rapport No 2350)
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2007. *Arhangai Rural Poverty Alleviation. Completion Evaluation*. (Report n.1889-MN).
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de l'évaluation (IOE), 2004. République du Sénégal. Évaluation du programme de pays. Rome: IFAD (Rapport n.1516-SN).
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de l'évaluation (IOE), 2013, République du Sénégal, Evaluation du programme de pays.
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2004. The Republic of Lebanon. Smallholder Livestock Rehabilitation Programme. Completion Evaluation. Rome: IFAD (Report n. 1560 - LB).
- IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2002. Republic of Namibia. Northern Regions Livestock Development Project. Interim evaluation Report. Rome: IFAD. (Report n.1313-NA)
- FIDA, Bureau Independent de Évaluation (IOE), 2002. *Royaume du Maroc. Projet de développement des parcours et de l'élevage dans l'Oriental (PDPEO), Rapport d'évaluation intermédiaire*. Rome: FIDA. (Rapport n.1304-MA)

IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), (Year not specified), *Lessons from pastoral programmes*. Available from:
http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/lle/interegion/l071live.htm

FIDA, Bureau Independent de Évaluation (IOE), 2003. *République tunisienne. Évaluation du Programme de pays*. Rome: IFAD (Rapport n. 1422-TN)

FIDA, Bureau Independent d' Evaluation (IOE), 2011. République du Niger. Evaluation du programmes de pays. Rome: IFAD (Rapport n. 2350 – NE)

IFAD, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2009. Republic of Sudan. *Country Programme Evaluation*

IFAD Bolivia, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), 2014, Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia Evaluación del Programa en el País

Evaluation Reports by FAO

FAO. 2005. Support to Livestock Exports from the Horn of Africa (EXCELEX). Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2007. Evaluation of FAO's Emergency and Rehabilitation Assistance in the Greater Horn of Africa 2004-07. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2008. Support to Pastoral Livelihood Development. Office of Evaluation (OED) Project Evaluation. Rome.

FAO. 2008. Evaluation of Early Recovery Assistance for the Agriculture Smallholder and Early Recovery Assistance to War-affected, Resource-poor Livestock Keepers in Southern Lebanon. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2009. Evaluation of the FAO Response to the Pakistan Earthquake. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2009. Evaluation of FAO Cooperation in Tajikistan. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2009. Restoration of Veterinary Services in Iraq. Office of Evaluation (OED) Project Evaluation. Rome.

FAO. 2009. Restoration and Development of Essential Livestock Services in Iraq. Office of Evaluation (OED) Project Evaluation. Rome.

FAO. 2010. Enhancing technical coordination and backstopping of the Food Security and Livelihood sector in the restoration and sustaining of household food security of vulnerable conflict affected populations in the Greater Darfur Region of Sudan. Office of Evaluation (OED) Project Evaluation. Rome.

FAO. 2010. Evaluation of FAO Sudan Cooperation. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2011. Evaluation of FAO Cooperation in Ethiopia. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome

FAO. 2012. Impact Evaluation of FAO's programme under the Common Humanitarian Fund in Sudan. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2013. Sudan Productive Capacity Recovery Programme (SPCRP) Independent Final Evaluation. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

FAO. 2013. Evaluation of FAO's Cooperation in Somalia. Office of Evaluation (OED). Rome.

IFAD and FAO documents relating to strategy and policy

IFAD

- Rota A. and Sperandini S., (not dated) Livestock and pastoralists. *Livestock Thematic Papers. Tools for project design.*
- Rota A. and Sperandini S., (not dated) Emergency livestock interventions in crisis and post-crisis situations. *Livestock Thematic Papers. Tools for project design.*
- Rota A., Chakrabati S. and Sperandini S, XX. Women and pastoralism. *Livestock Thematic Papers. Tools for project design.*
- PTA Division, XX. *IFAD supporting pastoralism:livestock and infrastructure.* Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/livestock.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Pastoral and common resources in Africa: some IFAD experiences and lessons. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/range/pastoral.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Pastoralist incentive structures. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/range/pastoral.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Pastoralist organizations: the experience of IFAD. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/pls.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Pastoralist risk management. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/prm.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Restocking destitute nomads: post-disaster rehabilitation. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/input/index.htm>
- PTA Division, XX. Sheep production system in the Near East and North Africa region: the experience of IFAD in alleviating technical, socio-economic system and policy constrains. Available from: <http://www.ifad.org/lrkm/theme/husbandry/index.htm>
- IFAD, 2011. *Strategic Framework 2011-2015.* Rome: IFAD.
- IFAD, 2009. *Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.* Policy. Rome: IFAD.
- IFAD, 2008. *Improving access to land and tenure security .* Policy. Rome: IFAD.

FAO

- FAO.2010. Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions 2010 -2013 and 2014-2017. Rome.
- FAO.FAO. 2001. *Pastoralism in the New Millennium.* Animal Production and Health Paper. No.150. Rome.

Other References

- Catley. A., J.Lind, I.Scones, 2013, *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins.* Earthscan, Routledge.
- Douglass North, 1990, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance.*
- Elinor Ostrom, 1990, *Governing the Commons.* Cambridge University Press.
- FAO, 2011, *Farming Systems and Poverty.* FAO/World Bank
- IGAD, 2013, *The Contribution of Livestock to the Ethiopian Economy,* IGAD Policy Brief Series.
- IUCN, 2012, *Supporting Sustainable Pastoral Livelihoods – A Global Perspective on Minimum Standards and Good Practices.* IUCN/FordFoundation/IFAD.
- Kratli, S., Swift, JJ, *Counting Pastoralists in Kenya.* Nairobi: Oxfam.

McPeak, J., P. Little, C. Doss, 2012, *Risk and Social Change in an African Rural Economy: Livelihoods in Pastoralist Communities*. Routledge

Olsen, K., O'Reilly, S., 2011 *Evaluation Methodologies*. IODPARC

Oxfam, 2008, *Survival of the Fittest. Pastoralism and Climate Change in East Africa*. Oxford: Oxfam International.

Rota, A., Sperandini, (date not available), *Livestock and Pastoralists*. Livestock thematic papers. Tools for Project Design. IFAD: Rome

Scoones, I., 1996, *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. Intermediate Technology Publications

UNEP and IUCN, 2014. *Sustainable pastoralism and the post-2015 Agenda. Opportunities and barriers to pastoralism for global food production and environmental stewardships*.

UNDP, 2003, *The Global Drylands Imperative: Pastoralism and Mobility in the Drylands*. Challenge Paper Series.

List of IFAD on-going pastoral projects not yet evaluated

IFAD's projects closed but not evaluated yet (implemented over period 2003/2013)

Country	Project Title	Implementation years
Eritrea	Gash Barka Livestock and Agricultural Development Project	2003-2009
Lesotho	Sustainable Agricultural and Natural Management	2005-2011
India, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Mongolia, China, Nepal, Bhutan, Pakistan, Georgia, Afghanistan, Russia, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Israel, Yemen, Oman, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates	First Asia Regional Gathering of Pastoralists Women in Gujarat (Grant)	2009-2011
Algeria , Morocco, Sudan	Assessment and improvement of camel milk production and marketing in some Arab countries (Grant)	2011-2012

Projects still on-going and not evaluated yet

COUNTRY	NUMBER	TIT.	IMPLEMENTATION YEARS	IFAD's contribution
Afghanistan	1637	Community Livestock and Agriculture Project	(2013-2019)	USD 53 million
Algeria, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania.	1175	WISP/IUCN Grant	(2009-2014)	USD 950,000 (Grant)
Algeria, Morocco, Sudan	1398	Alternative uses of <i>Prosopis fulifilosa</i> for Animal Feed in Eastern Sudan and Somalia	(2012-2015)	USD 270,000 (Grant)
Algeria , Morocco, Sudan	1277	Assessment and improvement of camel milk production and marketing in some Arab countries	(2011-2013)	USD 300,000 (Grant)
Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru.	1292	Building and scaling up knowledge on high Andean livestock - FUNDACION BIODIVERSIDAD	(2011-2014)	USD 497,000 (Grant)
Chad	1446	Projet d'hydraulique pastorale en zone sahélienne (PROHYPA)	(2009-2014)	USD 22,6 million (Grant)

Annex III

Ethiopia	458 (phase 2)	Pastoral Community II	(2009-2016)	USD 39 million (19, 5 million IFAD's loan + 19,5 million DSF Grant)
Kenya	MPDKI-IPAF 001	Kivulini Trust	(2011-2014)	USD 33,000 (IPAF Grant)
Kyrgyzstan	1626	Livestock and Market development Programme	2013-2019	USD 20 million (IFAD's loan 10 million + DSF 10 million)
Mauritania	1255	SIP-Participatory Environmental Protection and Poverty Reduction in the Oases of Mauritania	(2009-2014)	USD 11,4 million
Mongolia	1455	Project for Marker and Pasture Management Development	(2011-2017)	USD 11,5 million
Tanzania	1306	Agricultural Sector Development Programme-Livestock (Support to Pastoral and Agro- pastoral Development)	(2006-2015)	USD 20, 6 million
Tunisia		Programme de développement agro-pastoral et de promotion des initiatives locales pour le Sud-Est (PRODESUD II)	(2014-2020)	USD 11,39 (IFAD loan 10,9 million + IFAD Grant 487,000)

List of FAO on-going Pastoral Projects not evaluated

Angola:

1. OSRO/RAF/404/USA

Title: **Disaster risk reduction/management to support agro-pastoral communities affected by recurrent droughts and other natural disasters in southern Angola and northern Namibia**

Budget: 1 600 000

Duration: 01 Jan 2014 - 31 Dec 2014

2. GCP /ANG/049/GFF

Title: **Land rehabilitation and rangelands management in small holders agro-pastoral production systems in Southwestern Angola (PPG)**

Budget: USD 133 700

Duration: 01 May 2012 - 31 Dec 2013

Sudan:

1. OSRO/SUD/304/USA

Title: **Enhancement of food security and livelihoods of vulnerable households in the Three Protocol Areas (Abyei, South Kordofan and Blue Nile), Sudan.**

Budget: USD 1 500 000

Duration: 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Mar 2014

2. OSRO/SUD/305/USA

Title: **Restoring and improving food security and livelihoods of the affected communities in Darfur**

Budget: USD 1,500,000

Duration: 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Mar 2014

3. TCP/SUD/3401

Title: **Surveillance and Diagnosis of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD)**

Budget: USD 491 000

Duration: 22 Mar 2012 - 21 Mar 2014

4. GCP/SUD/069/CAN

Title: **Integrated Food Security Project (IFSP) in Kassala, Sudan (Former - Sustainable Food Security Through Community-Based Livelihood Development Project, South Kordofan, Sudan)**

Budget: USD 5 818 419

Duration: 01 Apr 2011 - 31 Mar 2015

Somalia:

5. OSRO/SOM/308/CHA

Title: **Livelihood Support to Pastoral and Agro-pastoral communities in southern Somalia through improvement of Animal Health**

Budget: USD 1 580 417

Duration: 01 Oct 2013 - 31 Mar 2014

6. OSRO/SOM/304/EC

Title: **Sustainable Peri-urban Dairy and Economic Development of the Milk Value Chain in Somaliland**

Budget: USD 2 492 814

Duration: 18 Aug 2013 - 17 Jun 2016

7. OSRO/SOM/203/UK

Title: Sustainable Employment and Economic Development Programme (SEED)
Phase II
Budget: USD 7 454 590
Duration: 01 Oct 2012 - 30 Sep 2014

8. OSRO/SOM/120/ITA

Title: Support and diversification of livelihood opportunities in urban/peri-urban centres of Puntland
Budget: USD 1 333 333
Duration: 01 Nov 2011 - 01 Jul 2014

9. OSRO/SOM/110/EC

Title: **Improvement of livelihood of vulnerable households in urban and peri-urban areas of Central Somalia and Mogadishu (in collaboration with ILO)**
Budget: USD 1 663 652
Duration: 10 Feb 2012 - 31 Dec 2014

10. TCP/SOM/3402

Title: Public sector support and capacity building for the meat sub sector
Budget: USD 397 000
Duration: 01 Jan 2014 - 30 Jun 2015

11. OSRO/SOM/305/CHS

Title: Integrated Assistance to sustainable reintegration of IDPs at their place of origin in South-Central Somalia
Budget: USD 650 000
Duration: 01 Aug 2013 - 31 Jul 2014

12. OSRO/SOM/301/MUL -Baby1,2,3-

Title: **Resilience Programme**
Budget: USD 12 710 394
Duration: 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2015

13. OSRO/SOM/201/MUL - 13 babies

Title: **Emergency Response Programme to the Humanitarian Crisis in Somalia (2012) -Emergency Programme**
Budget: USD 42,686,638
Duration: 01 Jan 2012 - 30 Apr 2014

Grassland

Angola GCP /ANG/048/GFF full project
Angola GCP /ANG/049/GFF PPG

Burkina Faso GCP /BKF/054/LDF full project
Burkina Faso GCP /BKF/077/LDF PPG

Mali GCP /MLI/038/LDF full project
Mali GCP /MLI/039/LDF PPG

Mozambique GCP /MOZ/112/LDF full project
(PPG under approval)

NRC

<http://www.fao.org/climatechange/china/qinghai/en/>

A preliminary typology of pastoral livelihoods (IFAD)

From a preliminary analysis of appraisal reports, a typology of pastoral interventions can be made as demonstrated by the following table.

<i>Typologies of pastoral projects</i>	<i>Activities implemented</i>
Rangeland management	Measures aiming at the creation and management of sustainable grazing systems, the protection and improvement of basic rangeland resources such as soil, water, plants and animal life (e.g. support to the development of pasture monitoring, upgrading technical skills of land management staff, restoration of pasture productivity).
Capacity building for herders	Activities through which the pastoral communities can develop specific skills allowing them to enhance and protect their livelihoods (promotion of community-led planning, strengthening of the institutions for management of natural resources, poverty eradication, pastoral infrastructure management , curriculum development).
Pastoral infrastructure	Construction of facilities aiming to secure water supply and sanitation (watering points, drinking water supplies, access roads, new market places and equipment, communications infrastructure (mobile phone masts, broadband)
Risk management	Design and implementation of measures aimed to identify and monitor potential threats to pastoral livelihoods such as climatic fluctuation, animal diseases, market failures and early warning and rapid response systems.
Animal health	Provide animal disease control in order to avoid the outbreaks of major epizooties in pastoral areas (e.g. vaccination campaigns, provision of basic treatments for animals, strengthening of veterinary services, production and distribution of vaccines)
Social services for herders (i.e. human health and education)	These measures include provision of basic education including mobile and distance learning facilities for primary education, delivery of immunization in remote communities, provision of training for health care assistants.
Commercialization	Initiatives which support the conservation, transformation and marketing of agro pastoral products (milk, dairy products in general)
Microfinance	All the measures taken to facilitate the access of herders to the market of formal financial services.
Support to legal framework/policy dialogue	Measures which promote the equitable and secure access to and by nomadic and transhumant pastoralists.

This typology will be adapted in the light of the document analysis as the work proceeds.

IFAD and FAO strategic objectives

The following are full statements of the strategic objectives of FAO and IFAD

FAO

1. Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition
2. Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner
3. Reduce rural poverty
4. Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international levels
5. Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises.

An objective on technical quality, knowledge and service, and two cross-cutting themes on gender and governance, are integral to the achievement of the Strategic Objectives.

(Source: FAO Reviewed Strategic Framework, 38th session of Conference, 15-22 June 2013)

IFAD

1. A strengthened natural resources and economic asset base for poor rural women and men that is more resilient to climate change, environmental degradation and market transformation;
2. Enhanced access of poor rural women and men to services that are essential for reducing poverty, raising incomes and strengthening resilience in a changing environment that presents both new opportunities and new risks;
3. Strengthened capabilities of individual poor rural women and men and their organizations to take advantage of market opportunities and influence the policies and institutions affecting their livelihoods; and
4. Improved institutional and policy environments for rural economies, including the agriculture and non-farm sectors.

(Source: IFAD Executive Board, 101st session 14-16 December 2010).