

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

Pastoral Community Development Project II Project Performance Assessment

Executive Summary

Background

1. Previous pastoral development projects in Ethiopia focused on improving livestock productivity to the near exclusion of social infrastructure and service delivery. Coupled with remote locations and lack of attention, pastoral areas were marginalized in terms of social services. At the request of the Government, the Pastoral Community Development Project (PCDP) was initiated in the spirit of the decentralized administrative system designed to address these vulnerabilities.
2. **The project.** PCDP was launched in 2003 with three phases and extending over 15 years. It is financed by the World Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the Government of Ethiopia and beneficiary communities. PCDP I was operational from 2003 to 2008, and PCDP II was implemented from 2010 to 2014. PCDP III is currently underway.
3. The two specific objectives of PCDP II were to: (i) improve the livelihoods of targeted communities; and, (ii) increase the resilience of Ethiopian pastoralists to external shocks. The first was to be achieved through improved access to social and economic infrastructure and financial services, and increased pastoral community engagement and decision making. The second through early warning and disaster early response.
4. The project was implemented in Afar, Oromia, Somali and Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Regions, representing approximately 45 per cent of pastoral and agro-pastoral districts in Ethiopia. Coverage was expanded compared to PCDP I and the target group consisted of 600,000 rural households (nearly 1.3 million people) in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities.
5. The project's planned budget was US\$138.7 million: US\$80 million from the World Bank/IDA (US\$23.4 million loan and US\$56.6 million grant); US\$39 million from IFAD (half loan and half grant); regional Government contribution (US\$5 million); and contribution from beneficiary communities (US\$14.7 million in cash and in kind).
6. **Objectives and focus of the assessment.** The main objectives of Project performance assessments (PPAs) are to: provide an independent assessment of the overall results of projects; and generate lessons and recommendations for the design and implementation of ongoing and future operations in the country. This PPA focused on selected issues that emerged in the preparation of the assessment: Monitoring and Evaluation; Community Driven Development and the types of choices presented to pastoralists; Policy Dialogue; and Gender Equality and women's empowerment.
7. **Methodology.** The PPA follows IFAD's Evaluation Policy, and the methodology, including the methodology outlined in IFAD's Evaluation Manual. As a general rule, a PPA is not expected to undertake quantitative surveys and, as such, this assessment necessarily relies on data from the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, the World Bank Implementation Completion and Result Report, supervision reports and other project documents. In addition to a desk review, a PPA undertakes further data collection activities. These included project field visits

in the Afar and Oromia regions, and individual and group discussions with stakeholders in project sites, Addis Ababa and at IFAD headquarters in Rome.

8. As with other PPAs, the primary information collected during the short country visit was limited because of the time available. This is particularly evident in this case, as PCDDP covers a very large, remote and diverse territory. The PPA mission had to limit itself to only a few *communities* in the Afar region, with information supplemented by a visit to the Borana zone in the Oromia region. The PPA mission could not visit a large sample of PCDDP interventions to verify if they were functional and well used and managed but had to rely on the reviews carried out or mandated by the project.

Performance assessment

9. **Relevance.** The project's objectives were very relevant to the Government policies, to the aspirations of communities and to IFAD's Country Strategic Opportunities Programme. The concept and design were fairly relevant and major aspects were addressed to enhance the livelihoods of pastoralists, who are among the poorest and most neglected populations of the country. The design of the results framework had shortcomings and interventions catered more to the needs of those pastoralists who needed and wanted to settle, while not taking sufficiently into account the needs of the mobile population. Relevance is consequently rated as moderately satisfactory (4).
10. **Effectiveness.** The project development objective indicators relating to livelihoods were practically all achieved, and even grossly exceeded in the case of people accessing potable water, health services, small-scale irrigation and rural roads, and of livestock benefitting from access to veterinary facilities. However, this brings into question the way the targets were set. The indicators relating to resilience were largely achieved. Overall, as most indicators were achieved despite logistical and capacity problems in remote pastoral areas, effectiveness is rated as satisfactory (5). The main problem was the overall lack of evidence of the project's effectiveness in improving livelihoods and resilience of the pastoral target population through the combined effects of the various components.
11. **Efficiency.** Data for an overall assessment of the project costs in relation to the benefits generated are not available. However, according to the indications provided through disbursement performance, financial management, economic estimates and comparison of costs, PCDDP II has been, by and large, efficient. The rating is therefore satisfactory (5).
12. **Rural poverty impact.** Results have been reported for increased **household income** through irrigation and access to loans, although the percentage of households having increased their incomes was lower than the target. There are indications of increased assets, especially in relation to livelihood enhancement (access to finance, irrigation, and roads) and risk reduction. Based on these indications, the PPA has provided a moderately satisfactory rating (4).
13. Regarding **human capital**, the project emphasized awareness raising, training and capacity building of communities, district and regional staff in various disciplines. In total, an estimated 1.91 million people benefitted from the project, and pastoralists were empowered through the community-driven development (CDD) approach of PCDDP. This led to a satisfactory (5) rating.
14. PCDDP II lacked evidence of change in **food security and agricultural productivity**, which therefore could not be rated by the PPA. The PPA rates natural resources, **environment and climate change** as moderately satisfactory (4). The reason is that documentation is very sparse and it is not clear if the level of assessment was robust enough in enabling communities to monitor the related effects of reduced mobility and prevent potential problems linked to the interventions.

15. In relation to **institutions and policies**, significant results were reached in terms of CDD and support to decentralization. However, a rating of moderately satisfactory (4) was given due to: insufficient inclusion of local knowledge, participatory action learning and open discussion on key issues such as risk management. Furthermore, only three policy studies were produced but did not lead to policy decisions.
16. **Sustainability**. Many aspects of sustainability are positive but the PPA sees the need to ensure that infrastructure is actually functioning and that concerned authorities provide full support through closer dialogue and coordination. It also sees the need for appropriate advice for financial profitability of the interventions. Finally, in addition to supporting sedentarization for part of the pastoral population, mobility for the other pastoralists needs to be maintained. Given these factors, the rating is moderately satisfactory (4).
17. **Innovation and scaling up**. The main innovation from PCDP is the CDD approach. PCDP has been one of the furthest reaching projects in terms of depth of CDD (financial participation and management) and in terms of numbers reached across the country. The PPA mission was informed that communities have explicitly requested other projects to be implemented through the CDD approach. The work carried out under the component of Pastoral Risk Management is being further scaled up in Ethiopia and extended to Kenya and Uganda through the Regional Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Programme. Based on the above, the rating for innovation and scaling up is satisfactory (5).
18. **Gender and women's empowerment**. On economic empowerment: PCDP II enabled women in particular to benefit from income-generating activities due to their increased access to rural finance. On women and men having equal voice and influence in rural institutions: the voice of women is certainly not equal, but it has progressed, albeit modestly, in relation to rural finance committees and at the community level to determine priority investments. More equitable balance in workloads and in sharing economic and social benefits between women and men: improvement in women's workload was made in terms of time needed to access and transport water. In addition, increased access to education and health facilities should lead to greater social and economic empowerment. Considering the challenging gender situation in Ethiopia, and especially in pastoral societies, PCDP II has made worthwhile contributions to the advancement of equality. This results in a satisfactory rating (5).
19. **IFAD's performance**. As confirmed during the main mission, IFAD has built strong relationships with both the World Bank and the Government. Due to the good partnerships, the project was able to expand its activities and address implementation obstacles effectively and efficiently. The PPA rated IFAD's performance as satisfactory (5).
20. **Government's performance**. The performance of the implementing unit is rated satisfactory. In particular, the quality of the reports was good and they were submitted on time. Dissemination of testimonials and successful stories have greatly contributed to the visibility of PCDP II. One area which was less successful, both at the level of the implementing partners and of the Ministry, is exchanging experiences with other projects and ministries, in order to learn from and improve interventions for the benefit of the pastoralists being served. The rating is moderately satisfactory (4).
21. **Overall project achievement**. Overall, project achievements met most expectations and objectives, even grossly exceeding some of them. The project performed strongly on its major component, which was improving livelihoods through access to social and economic infrastructure and financial services. It was also successful in early warning and response. PCDP has not only scaled up its work from phase I to phase II, but has also improved its quality and delivery of

results. There is scope to continue accordingly. The rating of overall performance is therefore satisfactory (5).

Conclusions

22. **PCDP II has produced substantial results for pastoral communities, a neglected and vulnerable part of the population.** Achievements include the improved provision of social and economic infrastructure and financial services. Success also includes early warning and response which were widely set up.
23. **Attention was directed to women.** If this attention is sustained, remarkable transformative outcomes are likely to emerge from the improved access of young girls to education and health services and in terms of their economic empowerment through financial inclusion and income-generating activities. Monitoring gender changes will be very important to avoid possible backlashes or adverse effects on women.
24. **Empowerment of pastoral communities through CDD** also stands out, especially in the Ethiopian context. Deepening and scaling up CDD will lead to public services better catering to the needs and aspirations of the Ethiopian pastoralists and other groups.
25. **M&E and knowledge management.** PCDP has developed a relatively better system of M&E in comparison to other projects supported by IFAD in the country, which has enabled corrective measures to be made during implementation. However, the project has not generated sufficient results in terms of evidence of impact, or at least outcomes such as food security, health and income which can be expected from a programme of this duration and size. PCDP has not sufficiently well exchanged experiences to enhance learning.
26. **Environment, natural resources and climate change have not been sufficiently taken into consideration.** This is based on the PPA's observations in the field and the fact that mobility as a strategy to manage environmental risks has not been examined by the documents reviewed.
27. **Sedenterization of a part of the pastoral population brings overall benefits as long as the mobility the remaining population is preserved.** The construction of schools and health posts, potable water supplies and irrigation schemes, such as undertaken by PCDP, are likely to encourage settlements. The PPA is of the opinion that this is an unavoidable process. On the other hand, mobile pastoralism makes the most rational use of natural resources in semi-arid environments and provides the economic and social backbone in these regions, benefitting the semi-settled and settled communities.
28. **PCDP has the opportunity to capitalize on its achievements and make decisive improvements until completion in 2021.**

Recommendations

1) Improve weaker aspects of the project (while continuing to scale up through PCDP III)

29. **Local knowledge and social aspects.** PCDP III should better take into account local knowledge and social aspects in designing interventions and adapting them to the needs and circumstances of the populations in pastoral areas.
30. **Environmental effects and climate change.** Visits of a representative sample of PCDP interventions by environmental specialists to review positive and negative effects on the environment would be required to have a better view on impacts and decide if more systematic environmental screening is warranted.
31. **Sustainability of benefits.** To ensure the level of satisfaction of the past beneficiaries is maintained, and to make sure that the interventions undertaken are sustained, PCDP III should systematically revisit PCDP I and II groups of

communities (*kebeles*), together with the local services related to the other ministries.

2) Ensure that the mobility of pastoralists is maintained and not constrained

32. The Project Appraisal Document of PCDP III states that “various factors affect success of pastoralists to grow their livestock production systems. The most important of these are access to good rangeland as well as mobility, access to markets, access to services and severity of climatic shocks”. The PPA endorses this statement but ascertains that of all these factors, PCDP has not developed interventions that preserve mobility. The PPA's view is that the pastoral populations should have free and informed choice in pursuing a mobile way of life or in settling partially or fully.

3) Engage in open dialogue and collaboration

33. The targeted communities and the project impact will greatly benefit from an open exchange of experiences with other concerned ministries, departments and stakeholders, on the basis of better evidence and learning from experiences in pastoral development elsewhere.