



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



Investing in rural people

Office of Evaluation

Independent Office of Evaluation

## FAO's and IFAD's Engagement in Pastoral Development Joint Evaluation Synthesis

### Overview and FAO and IFAD Management's responses



## Overview

### Introduction

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) have a history of engagement in pastoral development which is likely to continue. In the face of growing challenges posed by climate change, as well as new economic and political realities, pastoralism offers a production system that prospers in landscapes where other livelihood systems are either at their limit or require large investments.

The sector is highly relevant to the fundamental goals and strategic frameworks of both agencies. For example, resilience thinking has recently been adopted as core to both agencies' development programmes and policies. There is also a growing awareness of the limits of representing the world in terms of closed and self-regulated systems, and of the need for an approach which integrates variability as the rule rather than the exception.

Nevertheless, challenges for pastoralism prevail. Past performance of some development work based on incorrect assumptions has left a problematic legacy and unintended consequences that must be acknowledged and addressed. The historic and new partners of IFAD's and

FAO's work – government and private sector – are at times active parties to the initiatives that lead to the economic and/or socio-political exclusion of some groups. An unchecked focus on comparative advantage as a guiding principle might draw attention away from sparsely populated areas and geographically scattered groups, or from the complications of operating at the far edge of exclusion.

Over the last ten years, IFAD and FAO have carried out significant work in pastoral development. Important achievements include the scaling-up of innovative solutions in community-based animal health and natural resource management. Overall though, engagement with pastoral development has remained peripheral to pastoral systems themselves, without a clearly focused, systematic strategy and theory of change. The result is a fragmented and mixed picture across the sample.

**Evaluation objectives and approach.** To remain relevant, IFAD and FAO must improve the quality of their services. Learning and knowledge offer an important competitive edge. To contribute to this challenge, IFAD and FAO's Evaluation offices (IOE and OED, respectively) prepared a Joint Evaluation Synthesis (JES). The aim of the JES was to analyse and document lessons learned from both successful and failed efforts in order to enhance IFAD and FAO's ability to create and use knowledge and best practices. The JES also developed sound recommendations for both agencies' future engagement in pastoral development. Clearly, there are distinct differences between the two agencies in the size of interventions and the ways of working on the ground. IFAD as a funding agency focused on capacity building, rangeland management, and animal health. FAO as a technical agency focused on emergencies, veterinary services and the policy arena. Despite the differences between the two agencies, common themes and challenges were identifiable. The JES is structured around themes identified across the two agencies' strategic objectives:

- reduce poverty and hunger in and around pastoral settings;
- increase resilience and strengthen pastoral risk management;
- build new and better-adapted institutions in pastoral development;
- promote gender equality in pastoral communities;
- promote sustainable natural resource management; and
- advocate on behalf of the rural poor who live in pastoral settings.

The JES analysed projects and interventions carried out by both agencies between 2003 and 2013. Findings were drawn from a wide range of sources: different types of evaluations and studies; aggregate data from IFAD and FAO databases; IFAD and FAO strategies and studies; academic literature; and interviews.

The sampling strategy included two sets of analyses. The first set, "the core sample", consisted of an in-depth review of 65 documents. The majority of these were evaluations, with varying

degrees of focus on pastoralism (43 evaluations; four management responses; and 18 documents about the design of ongoing projects).

The second set, the “comprehensive inventory”, identified all pastoral-oriented projects carried out between 2003 and 2013: a total of 31 IFAD projects and 163 FAO projects. The analysis of the comprehensive inventory defined the degree of engagement with pastoral development, based on title and objectives (pastoral development as the main focus of the project or as a component) and the distribution of allocations. The projects in the comprehensive inventory were also analysed with regard to the frequency of activities by category.



Most projects across both the core sample and the comprehensive inventory were in Africa. The average duration of projects was 72 months for IFAD and just below 20 months for FAO. Projects and programmes with a focus on pastoralism represent about 45 per cent of IFAD inventories and 21 per cent of FAO inventories. Projects and programmes with a pastoral-oriented components represent about 45 per cent and 42 per cent of IFAD and FAO inventories, respectively.

**Context.** It is important to underline some key characteristics of the wider context in which pastoral development takes place.

**Drylands represent 40 per cent of the planet's total land mass** and are inhabited by some 2.5 billion people; including 40 per cent of Africans, 39 per cent of Asians and 30 per cent of South Americans. While only a fraction of these people are directly involved in running pastoral systems, many more have a stake in them. The figure of 200 million pastoralists worldwide is sometime used. The review of the “Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative” estimated the number of pastoralists/ agro-pastoralists at 120 million worldwide, 50 million of whom are in sub-Saharan Africa. In reality the precise number of pastoralists is unknown and also depends on the definition used.

**Pastoral systems saw a U-turn about 20 years ago.** From being viewed as an “irrational” way of life barely able to cope with a harsh environment, pastoralism came to be understood as an adaptation to environments dominated by variability, and as a production and livelihood system that was both ecologically sustainable and economically efficient.

The most dramatic implication of the U-turn concerned understanding **mobility as a strategy to increase productivity**. In the drylands, variability in rain distribution can result in drought conditions and green areas only a few miles apart. Through mobility, pastoralists interface this variability in the environment with variability in production.

Other strategies for **managing drylands' variability** include: keeping adapted breeds to match a wide range of conditions; developing flexible forms of access to land; and adapting the size of the herding household to seasonal labour requirements.

**Pastoralism specializes in taking significant levels of risk with the lowest possible incidence of disasters.** However, some dimensions of risk are now beyond the reach of traditional strategies, brought about by new governance, development or market forces. These include restricting mobility, replacing tested technology with new risk-prone technology, and large-scale land-use conversion.

**Poverty in pastoralism** has been met with polarized positions in development circles: those who believe that pastoralists are mostly poor and those who believe they are mostly rich. When all pastoralists are seen as poor, this is taken as confirmation that the system is inefficient and that people would abandon it if provided with alternatives. When all pastoralists are seen as rich, development efforts are concentrated outside pastoralism. Pastoralists are neither all rich nor all poor, and those who are relatively rich in assets are usually “poor” in terms of services. This also induces exit strategies in the hope of increasing access to services, usually at the expense of efficiency in production.

**A deeper analysis of gender issues within pastoralism is needed**, in particular to circumvent beliefs that women will benefit from settling by gaining access to services. In fact, these services are often poor and, by settling, women lose access to the bulk of the herd. This has significant costs in terms of their social status and with regard to their control over milk for their children and for marketing.

**Insecurity and localized conflict** exist in contexts where customary means of governance have been weakened and modern-state institutions are still only nominal. Small- and medium-scale producers face the threat of reduced mobility and impoverishment, as sedentary life leads to reduced opportunities and increased costs.

**When pastoral systems decline in the drylands, vast and remote spaces become empty and ungoverned.** The possible consequences of this became clear in the early 2000s, when international organized crime and radical groups penetrated these relatively empty spaces. International interest is now turning to the positive role that can be played by vibrant pastoral economies populating and monitoring remote areas.

**Political and technical exclusion** occur in the drylands, where there is a lower presence of key state functions, basic infrastructure and services compared to the national average. Exclusion can have political causes, but is often embedded in bureaucratic procedures. For example, funding education based on the numbers of children in school discriminates against the countries with low enrolment.

## Main evaluation findings

Rural poverty reduction is a fundamental goal for both agencies, and as such **pastoralism fits into the strategic planning of both IFAD and FAO (2003-2013)**. They favour a systemic approach, see themselves as enablers of the rural poor, and commit to advocacy on their behalf. Both IFAD and FAO's national and international presence and track record as neutral, "honest brokers" place them in an ideal position to fulfil this role.

At the moment, **neither agency has a policy on engagement with pastoral development**. However, both agencies emphasize their commitment to target disadvantaged and excluded groups, especially in remote and neglected areas.

From IFAD's **overall allocations** in loans and grants for the 2003-2013 period, the proportion that concerned the 31 pastoral-oriented projects in our comprehensive inventory was about 11 per cent. In the same period, FAO allocated funds to 163 projects in the comprehensive inventory, corresponding to 5 per cent of total allocated resources.

**IFAD and FAO have carried out important and useful pastoral interventions on the ground**. The initial decision to engage in this area was backed by the full weight of the two organizations. The agencies also engaged in a certain amount of advocacy on behalf of pastoralists. FAO's work on pastoral risk in Central Asia, especially Mongolia, reflected the new thinking about pastoralism. Much of IFAD's work on pastoral organizations and pasture tenure has reflected the changing perceptions of pastoralism. Occasionally, projects by IFAD, FAO and their partners have been at the forefront of thinking on pastoralism.

**For most project evaluations, supporting "pastoral and agro-pastoral communities" means supporting them in sedentary activities**, and there is usually no indication in the evaluations of how the project engaged with the objective of supporting pastoral livelihoods. Some evaluations offer valuable insights on the ways the projects did or did not engage with pastoral systems. However, as pastoralism is a small component in a larger project, such observations remain out of the recommendations or executive summary, which inevitably affects the learning process.

**There have been some positive highlights in projects aimed at reducing poverty and hunger in and around pastoral settings**. This is especially true with regard to strengthening household economy following animal health interventions in FAO projects, and in community-based participatory approaches to institution-building in IFAD projects, used to identify and manage key resources and conflict. Evaluations praise the efforts of animal health inspection and certification for export, and the development of veterinary field services. In particular, the training of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs) is consistently found to be effective in reaching pastoralists.



However, the JES found **a lack of data regarding the effectiveness of targeting and monitoring**, so that it was not possible to assess reduction in hunger or poverty through the evaluations. In addition, neither IFAD nor FAO has a team working specifically on pastoral systems or a systematic way of disaggregating pastoral-oriented interventions from their portfolio.

**Targeting poor pastoralists with the conventional knowledge-based approach has high transaction costs** even in relatively data-rich countries. Weak targeting is of particular relevance to pastoral development, where conditions are atypical and interventions take place on the back of a legacy of ill-oriented efforts. Therefore, flexibility in design and implementation, and the capacity to learn and adapt, are critical to success.

**Sometimes, interventions that target vulnerable pastoralists, actually benefit other groups.** This is often the case in interventions with an underlying goal of increasing off-takes for marketing, particularly exports. Vulnerable pastoral producers rarely have enough animals to take

advantage of export-focused interventions. Their main priority is rebuilding a productive herd, with an effort to reduce off-takes, not increase them.

**Poor contextualization of design and implementation has also meant missing opportunities** to build on ongoing processes of spontaneous modernization. For example, there is little mention in the evaluations of the new technologies that are transforming pastoral livelihoods: motorbikes, portable motor-pumps, phone banking, market information, and resource mapping using Google earth.

An **emphasis on enhancing resilience in agricultural settings**, especially through preparedness and early warning systems, has been part of FAO's strategic frameworks since 2000. In IFAD, the concept is part of the 2002-2006 strategic framework, and reappears in a central role in the framework for 2011-2015.

If stabilizing measures may increase resilience in many situations, introducing stability in systems dominated by variability has been observed to effectively decrease resilience. Whether resilience can and should always be measured by the same set of indicators is therefore a pertinent question for engagement in pastoral development.

Risk management has long been a key concern of FAO, but the **lack of a risk management strategy is mentioned in several evaluations of IFAD projects**. Three general issues emerge from the analysis. First, there is the challenge of capturing risk-management or resilience factors at the scale of operation relevant to pastoral systems. Second, there is a need to distinguish between risk reduction and risk management. In pastoral settings, risk-taking is part of the functioning of the production system. Mobility involves taking and managing high levels of risk. Therefore, in engaging with pastoral development, managing risk and reducing risk are strategies that may go in opposite directions. Third, there is a need to consider that reducing risk in one part of the system may increase it in another.

**Building new and better-adapted institutions in pastoral development is key**. Customary institutions still govern many aspects of pastoral life – for example, managing deep wells or overseeing the rules that govern access to pastures. Such institutions often combine aspects of customary and formal organizations, and a crucial question concerns the relationship between the two. Often, governments and funders create a hybrid partner organization with whom to negotiate project activities.

Key aspects of governance in the context of pastoral development include the relationship between central, regional and local government, the institutions that regulate economic behaviour and access to resources (especially land tenure rules and procedures) and the structures of economic production and exchange within customary groupings, such as camps and neighbourhood groups.

Several projects engaged with natural resource management and service provision, but the institutional dimension was often the weaker aspect of these interventions. Building a well or demarcating a trans-humance route is not the same as securing the institutional framework for their sustainable and peaceful operation.

Some documents link institutional inadequacy in land tenure with conflict. For example, in Somalia, land disputes between farmers and pastoralists are estimated at 145 incidents annually per locality. In Somalia, FAO moved towards a more community-oriented model of development that can be expected to make it more effective in its engagement with pastoral development. Similarly, in Bolivia, IFAD has been experimenting with building on local competence by transferring the power of managing funds for technical assistance directly to the small producers.

**Assessing a project's contribution to gender equality based on the proportion of women among the beneficiaries can be misleading.** In Kenya, a project worked in an area where a strong out-migration of men and the traditional responsibility of women in subsistence agriculture meant that high participation by women was inevitable. In Somalia, work in a sub-sector dominated by women resulted in above-average scoring for the "gender" criterion although gender mainstreaming had not been included in the project and no gender analysis had been conducted.

In many projects, significant efforts were made in capacity-building and institutional empowerment targeting women, for example through training, enhanced access to institutions, or the creation of mixed or women-only organizations.

Filtering access to technical training on the basis of literacy may introduce a barrier for women. This has been the case with Community Animal Resource Development Associates (CARDAs), the "upgrading" from CAHWs: while CAHWs experienced a proportion of women up to 60 per cent, and Farmer Field Schools up to 30 per cent, the proportion of women in CARDAs, which requires literacy, was as low as 0-5 per cent.

On the positive side, an initiative like the first global gathering of women pastoralists, held in Mera, India (supported by an IFAD grant) opened up opportunities for pastoralist women to meet and voice their perspective in the international arena, and is an important achievement. An innovative participatory evaluation included in a project in Senegal allowed pastoralists, women and youth to make their voices heard, and included their participation in the design of the second phase. Most projects developed various types of income-generating activities involving women (in the case of IFAD, this included interventions in microfinance).

**The JES noted an almost complete absence of attention to milk except as a commodity to be traded.** A critical element of childhood nutrition in the first 60 months of life, milk is particularly important for food and nutrition security in pastoral contexts. Additionally, small-

scale milk economy, both formal and informal, is typically in the hands of women and plays a key role in the negotiation of their status. Promoting the commodification of milk, in the absence of a sound understanding of the gender dimension of food sovereignty in pastoral households, is likely to lead to conditions in which the control of the value chain is taken over by men, with negative consequences on both household nutrition security and women's income.

Ongoing projects in the core sample show relatively more attention to milk economy, including its informal role in food and nutrition security, as well as acknowledging women's primacy in it.

**Sustainable management and utilization of natural resources** is one of FAO's three global goals and directly related to IFAD's first strategic objective. The comprehensive inventory shows "rangeland rehabilitation" and "natural resource management" to be the project focus or key objective in 10 cases for IFAD and 13 for FAO. Both organizations have engaged with various dimensions of rangeland management and rehabilitation, including technical packages, community-based management solutions, and policy dialogue. Interventions aimed at promoting the sustainable management of the rangelands and conservation agriculture sometimes take place within contexts that prioritize mechanization or forms of land acquisition, and the replacement of customary agreements with market-based forms of land use. The evaluation of FAO-Sudan cooperation in 2004-2009 highlights the growing importance of land issues, warning that social "polarization is increasing with land grabbing". Land grabbing was also cited in the IFAD country programme evaluation in Mali in 2013, and the evaluation of FAO cooperation in Somalia.

**Various projects have engaged with issues of land tenure**, especially promoting reforms and the introduction of titling, and sometimes alternative solutions, (including community-based) aimed at guaranteeing access to land by poor households and women.

**In the context of pastoral development, advocacy is particularly important.** Negative or misleading assumptions about pastoral systems have populated rural development for decades. These assumptions remain entrenched in a number of governments' policies.

Advocacy was identified as a top priority during the Mera Gathering in 2010. Some evaluations recorded significant efforts in advocacy; others found them insufficient. Sometimes a relatively low input in direct advocacy was accompanied by support to civil society organizations. In Senegal, IFAD maintained this support at a time when the voices of small producers were largely unheard by the state. Between 2007 and 2012, FAO successfully advocated for the formulation and ratification of the Meat Inspection and Control Acts in Somaliland and Puntland. However, evaluations of FAO's work in the Horn of Africa 2004-2007 and more recent work in Sudan found that the agency should be more effective in its advocacy efforts.

Advocacy is now a core objective of the recently launched FAO Pastoralist Knowledge Hub. Building on FAO's intergovernmental dimension (critical in pastoral development) the hub supports pastoralist associations, organizations, movements and networks, and raises awareness of pastoral issues among politicians, researchers and extension workers.

**Regarding lesson learning and knowledge management**, the 42 evaluations in the core sample include 24 lessons learned and recommendations which concern pastoral development (6 per cent), concentrated in 15 evaluations.

Recommendations to improve the understanding of pastoral systems are found in evaluations of both IFAD and FAO projects. This is seen as necessary for: sustainable rangeland management; pastoral risk management and resilience-building; management of farmer-herder conflict; and the identification of appropriate long-term indicators to monitor livestock conditions, the pastoral economy, and preparedness.

Recommendations about services concern: the extension of microfinance to pastoral communities; the provision of education services adapted to mobile livelihood conditions; the provision of animal health outside the veterinary service supply chain; and pastoral water infrastructures for livestock and river basin management.

Recommendations about pastoral institutions focus on strengthening them and securing legal recognition, especially of land tenure. They support local institutions for the management of key resources and building capacity of pastoral organizations.

The small set of ongoing projects in the core sample would suggest that at least some of the lessons stemming from previous evaluations were embedded in later project design. However, with regard to the two main areas of required improvement — understanding of pastoral systems and support to pastoral mobility — change is not emerging in any systematic way.

**In conclusion**, there remains considerable confusion between pastoral development and livestock development, and no clear understanding of pastoral systems, including the specificity of pastoral poverty. This has led to a considerable degree of hit-and-miss in the results, although exceptions exist.

Despite individuals' competence and dedication, monitoring and institutional learning appears weak at several levels and largely incapable of capturing the agencies' engagement in pastoral development as such.

Overall, both agencies have invested in pastoral development regularly. However, this has mostly relied on off the shelf packages with minimal adaption to specific context of pastoralism.

## Recommendations

### **Recommendation 1. FAO and IFAD should equip themselves with a policy of engagement in pastoral development.**

FAO and IFAD cannot achieve their strategic objectives without programmes of pastoral development. The new understanding of pastoral systems has not yet been fully translated into development practice, from project design, to implementation, to evaluation. A policy would be a useful way to guide the adaptation of new concepts to realities on the ground. The first recommendation of the JES is that FAO and IFAD both develop policies for their work in pastoral development. These policies should not be developed in isolation from one another, and should stress coordination within and between the two agencies. In developing these policies, the long-term economics of preventing and managing conflict, and avoiding the encouragement of rural to urban migration should be carefully considered.

### **Recommendation 2. Build and adapt capacity in IFAD and FAO for systemic engagement in pastoral development.**

IFAD and FAO's capacities to achieve their goals with regard to pastoral systems need to be expanded and adapted. This includes developing a better understanding of pastoral systems, their operational logic, and their relation to dryland economies. It also includes capacity development of staff.

Building capacity means that staff should develop understanding about pastoral poverty, its shape, causes and remedies and how it differs from agricultural or urban poverty. It also means commissioning research to define, measure and reach pastoral poverty more accurately and effectively. Mobility and gender will be key concepts in theoretical discussions and practical application. A major goal should be that project and headquarters staff better understand the concepts of resilience and variability. Work needs to be done to enable both organizations to identify and draw conclusions about the outcomes of projects, not just outputs. IFAD and FAO should continue to specialize, FAO on the technical and policy side and IFAD on the development programme side.

### **Recommendation 3. Manage, rather than avoid, key dimensions of risk.**

Dimensions of risk need to be acknowledged and managed when engaging with drylands and pastoral development. The main adaptive livelihood and production strategy consists in harnessing variability as distinct from avoiding it. In engaging with pastoral development, IFAD and FAO should assume that such risks are the rule rather than the exception, and embed measures to manage them as standard practice at all levels of operation. A contextual risk-management and resilience strategy should be prepared for each project in pastoral

development and dryland areas. It should include a clear conceptual and operational distinction between risk management and risk reduction. The FAO Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis model provides a possible framework for such work.

**Recommendation 4. Support advocacy by and on behalf of pastoralists and people whose livelihoods depend on pastoral systems.**

IFAD and FAO's significant influence in the international and national arenas represents an invaluable asset in the ongoing global effort to update the public perception of drylands and pastoral systems and come to terms with the legacy of misunderstanding and technical exclusion. The relatively small amount of advocacy promoted by IFAD represents an important dimension to the agency's work in support of its technical projects. The new Pastoralist Knowledge Hub project, building on FAO's intergovernmental dimension, is a potential platform for stepping up evidence-based advocacy work. Advocacy is a crucial component to today's engagement with pastoral development, but steps should be taken to keep it within a systemic approach, subject to critical scrutiny and carefully targeted in light of the new understanding of drylands and pastoralism.



# IFAD Management's response

## Introduction

Management appreciates IOE's efforts in preparing a succinct evaluation synthesis report, which has distilled interesting learning through a combination of background literature review to enhance IFAD's understanding of and approaches to pastoral development and the desk study of IFAD and FAO project documentation, including evaluations. Management also appreciates IOE's efforts in addressing comments from Management on previous versions of this report. This note covers Management's responses to the evaluation recommendations and additional comments provided below.

## Recommendations

The evaluation synthesis reports (ESRs) are valuable learning tools and provide an analytical framework for IFAD's interventions. Management notes that this document builds on a large body of evaluative evidence, including 65 documents from FAO and IFAD, and a comprehensive inventory of pastoralism-oriented projects (31 from IFAD and 163 from FAO). With a lot of evaluation experience available, efforts should be given to learning in the institution in order to ensure greater value added from recommendations in ESRs. Care will be taken to ensure the PRISMA (President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions) contributes to this important learning function.

Management would like to make the comments noted below on the specific recommendations from this ESR.

### **Recommendation 1: FAO and IFAD should equip themselves with a policy of engagement in pastoral development.**

Management agrees with the recommendation. Management agrees that IFAD needs firm principles of engagement for pastoralism. Management is thus studying the different options and based on the evidence available decide on the best modalities, including possibly a policy. Other instruments such as Guidance Notes or Policy Briefs may also be developed to address issues across different contexts. This effort will reach its conclusion with the Farmers Forum 2016, which will include a special session on Pastoralism. The special session could also be associated with the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism, given their past collaboration with IFAD on pastoralism issues.

Management recognizes that this is a crucial time with regard to IFAD and FAO's engagement in pastoral development. IFAD is an active member of the FAO's Pastoral Knowledge Hub (PKH) and through an IFAD grant to *Vétérinaires sans Frontières* (VSF) is supporting the organization of five (5) Regional consultations in collaboration with the Farmers' Forum Steering Committees,

pastoral civil society organizations and other partner organizations (FAO, IUCN-World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism, European Union, etc.).

**Recommendation 2: Build and adapt capacity in FAO and IFAD for systemic engagement in pastoral development.**

Management agrees with the recommendation. Management agrees that there is scope for further and continuous professional development in this area both through skill building and enhanced business practices. Management will redouble efforts to build internal capacity through systemic learning within the Policy and Technical Advisory Division (PTA), sharing project lessons among regional divisions and accessing knowledge generated by specialized partner institutions including FAO (e.g. International Land Coalition, IUCN, Intergovernmental Authority on Development, International Institute for Environment and Development, VSF, Billital Maroobe, NGOs, pastoral civil society organizations, etc.) on all aspects concerning pastoralism.

Capacity will also be reflected in more coordinated approaches between PTA and regional divisions in addressing pastoral issues, since these cut across thematic areas such as livestock, natural resources, indigenous people, institutions and gender. The experience of FAO Investment Centre will be used during design work and Management will also explore options for a wider use of the regional grants window in support of loan projects, for more effective development initiatives on pastoralism given its trans-boundary/cross-country nature.

IFAD's learning agenda will also be guided through engagement with the latest research globally, and building on the lessons emerging in house, including from the Strategy and Knowledge Department. IFAD will have to tap into external resources to the extent possible rather than develop all resources in-house. This will be done to a greater extent, including relying on technical resources and learning developed within the FAO PKH.

**Recommendation 3: Manage, rather than avoid, key dimensions of risk.**

Management agrees with this suggestion. Projects engaged in pastoral development often have to deal with key risks such as displacement of communities. Through support from PTA, projects designed in this area will increasingly be supported to consider these risks during design, and design strategies to mitigate them.

At a broader level, the Programme Management Department (PMD) is currently working to upgrade and improve the portfolio review processes, focusing on developing a results-focused and forward-looking review. In this context, management of risks will also be a focus area in divisional reviews and reports. Divisions and country teams will be encouraged to develop a contextual risk-management and resilience strategy for every pastoral programme or project pastoral development and, by extension, in dryland areas. The Environment and Climate Division has already provided substantial support through the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP) in recently designed projects on pastoral development (it should be noted that these projects have been designed after 2013, and recent improvements will be captured in future evaluations).

#### **Recommendation 4: Support advocacy by pastoralists and on behalf of pastoralists and people whose livelihoods depend on pastoral systems.**

Management notes this recommendation and agrees on the importance of advocacy. In this context, IFAD will continue supporting advocacy by pastoralists themselves, by (i) building the capacity to voice their needs, (ii) facilitating the active participation of pastoral civil society organizations to international fora and (iii) continuing working through partners, including the Farmers' Forum, the Indigenous Peoples' Forum, the FAO PKH and other representative organizations. In the current spirit of IFAD's work with the fora, IFAD will strengthen other representative organizations to participate in advocacy, but given the sensitivities around advocacy work, IFAD will not directly participate in advocacy activities. Advocacy could be critical and not well suited to all political set-ups. This needs to be adapted to the specificities of concerned contexts.

PTA is currently undertaking comprehensive reviews, consultations and development of tools on how to engage in country-level policy dialogue. The sensible route is to use project experience as an evidence base when discussing policies with governments. In consultations with the reference group (including country programme managers), it was also noted that policy dialogue could be a sensitive and contentious process. Along those lines, IFAD will empower representative organizations but will ensure it is not viewed as 'advocating' for communities or groups, especially in sensitive environments.

#### **Additional comments**

The report, and IFAD's response, could address more explicitly the challenge of diminishing pasture access to pasture land and mobility due to competing land use. This has been hinted in the report. However, an explicit discussion might be warranted given the challenges of land grabbing. Mobility is strongly linked to the loss of access to land. The diminishing access to pasture land is equally important to the discussion about definitions of equilibrium and mobility.

Finally, Management would like to suggest that in future joint evaluation reports for IFAD and FAO, better efforts be made to generate differentiated recommendations and lessons with operational relevance for each of the institutions.

## FAO Management's response

The evaluation is a useful tool for FAO and IFAD to rethink the approach on how to reduce poverty and increase resilience of pastoralist communities in arid and semi-arid lands. Not all pastoralist communities have equal living standards and support provided to countries for the development of arid and semi-arid lands has to be tailored to the specific needs and situations of the pastoralist communities.

### **Recommendation 1: FAO and IFAD should equip themselves with a policy of engagement in pastoral development.**

Recommendation 1 calls for a clear policy for engagement in pastoral development. Such a policy is indeed needed, but the policy should focus on a territorial approach (such as on arid and/or semi-arid lands) rather than a systems approach (pastoralism). A common FAO position and strategy on the future of pastoralism (as a vibrant economy with a long term perspective or as an economy which could eventually disappear with the development of national economies providing new decent work opportunities) is needed and will require internal discussions within FAO to start the process of developing such a position. Once drafted, the policy and strategy can be streamlined in the FAO programme of work, notably under SP3 and SP5. Emigration and immigration are now catching the attention of media and the general public. Forced migration, a common reality in arid and semi-arid lands, is usually the result of a mix of economic, environmental and political (insecurity) factors that need to be addressed altogether.

The need for closer collaboration between FAO and IFAD is fully acknowledged. FAO welcomes a stronger collaboration. A closer collaboration should also extend to other United Nations partners (e.g. World Food Programme), financial institutions (e.g. World Bank), the European Commission, AU-IBAR and others. The IOE is also engaged in pastoral development. Pastoralist civil society organizations have to be fully involved and engaged. First steps in this direction are currently undertaken by the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub, an initiative led by FAO to increase collaboration and coordination. It should be reminded that collaboration is essential to have more efficient programmes and to achieve positive impact at large scale.

The high hit-and-miss rate of projects that failed to support pastoral development can be avoided by promoting an institutional understanding of the special nature of pastoral systems. Infrastructural development in pastoral areas, for example in the fields of energy or education, can specifically address the very nature of pastoral systems and have to take pastoral mobility into account.

FAO will soon publish the Technical Guide on Governance of Tenure in Pastoral Rangelands. This document explains in depth the nature of pastoral systems regarding its challenges,

opportunities and legal frameworks. The document provides a good starting point for policy negotiations on pastoral development both in FAO and IFAD and with countries.

**Recommendation 2: Build and adapt capacity in IFAD and FAO for systemic engagement in pastoral development.**

Given the level of poverty and the increasingly volatile situation in arid and semi-arid lands, the strengthening of internal expertise in FAO and IFAD proposed under recommendation 2 is a welcome and important recommendation that will go towards FAO being in a better position to deliver under its SP2 (institutional capacity development), SP3 and SP5 programmes and to meet its global goals. FAO should continue to specialize on the technical and policy aspects of pastoral development.

Institutional learning is much needed across various areas of work and subject areas taking into account the diverse landscapes where pastoralism is practised. In the case of FAO, training and capacity development should go through key divisions such as AGL, AGP, AGA, OPC and FOM. FAO technical staff need to be trained in risk management and resilience-building in dry land areas in general, and in pastoral system in particular. The Technical Guide on Governance of Tenure in Pastoral Rangelands will provide a good base in understanding how sustainable pastoralism contributes to food production and biodiversity conservation.

At the global level, FAO has been advocating for pastoralists issues in different ways, such as in the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, in the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and in the Convention on Biological Diversity. Pastoralism is addressed in the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources and in the Agenda for Action on Sustainable Livestock. The Background Study Paper No. 66, Rev.1 – ‘Ecosystem services provided by livestock species and breeds, with special consideration to the contributions of small-scale livestock keepers and pastoralists’ has raised awareness on the positive externalities and overlaps with protected areas of pastoralism. The Pastoralist Knowledge Hub aims to lead and coordinate pastoralist advocacy. An international conference on the pastoralist-rangeland nexus is planned for 2017 and the idea of a global rangeland and pastoralist partnership has been ventilated with partners.

Lately, the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub has completed the seven regional pastoralists gatherings in Asia; Latin America; Europe; Central Asia; Near East; West Africa; and Eastern and Southern Africa. These regional meetings co-facilitated between pastoralists organizations, FAO and some of the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub partners like IFAD and VSF, have resulted in: identification of priorities and regional workplans; mapping of key actors working in pastoralism at country level and improved governance and coordination in the regions. The results from these regional meetings will guide FAO technical work on pastoralism at the regional level.

In addition, FAO through the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub has been discussing with some member countries and pastoral organizations the possibility of presenting to the United Nations General Assembly a request for an International Year of Pastoralists. This would enable, following the example of the International Year of Soils, of channeling advocacy efforts on pastoralism that could pave the ground for Regional work plans on Pastoralists and a FAO Policy on Pastoralists.

FAO, together with partner organizations and regional member countries groups, will look into the drafting of a Pastoralists' Policy. This Policy would identify the challenges and make targeted recommendations to support herders' mobile livelihoods. The Pastoralist Knowledge Hub offers the best environment for development partners, members and civil society to contribute to the successive drafts of the Policy.

In the field, One Regional Initiative for Africa on Building resilience in Africa's drylands covers pastoralists. At national level, FAO is engaged in improving risk management and resilience-building in dry lands area, and in supporting pastoral communities in Eastern Africa. For example, FAO-Kenya is working in the pastoral regions of northern Kenya on water and vegetation monitoring, natural resource management and Pursuing Pastoral Resilience control. At the sub-regional level, FAO commissioned a study on engaging with traditional institutions in pastoral areas of the Horn of Africa for increased impact and sustainability of its investments and those of its partners.

### **Recommendation 3: Manage, rather than avoid, key dimensions of risk.**

Recommendation 3 insists on making the distinction between risk management and risk reduction. Under its SP5 Programme, FAO is working on the preparation of Guidance Notes on FAO's role and work in Protracted Crisis within the context of the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (CFS-FFA). As many pastoral areas are unfortunately in zones in Protracted Crises, these guidance notes will be an opportunity to rethink and redefine FAO's approach and better distinguish between risk management and risk reduction.

The scientific, technical and field expertise of FAO is a great comparative advantage in the development and implementation of field activities for pastoral development. This FAO comparative advantage constitutes a strength on which the synergies between FAO and IFAD should be built.

### **Recommendation 4: Support advocacy by pastoralists and on behalf of pastoralists and people whose livelihoods depend on pastoral systems.**

FAO takes note of recommendation 4 and welcomes the mention of the FAO lead Pastoralist Knowledge Hub as a potential platform for stepping up evidence-based advocacy work. It represents a shift to a people-centered approach to pastoral development. The Hub is so far project-funded but is intended to become a programme funded by different sources. The initiative works together with pastoralist civil society and aims to promote coordination and

collaboration between international organizations working with pastoralists. FAO and IFAD are among the partners of the Hub. Other partners are the European Commission, World Bank, United Nations Environment Programme, IUCN and international organizations such as World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous People, SlowFood, Vétérinaires Sans Frontières, International or Coalition of European Lobbies for Eastern African Pastoralism. New organizations and partners are approaching the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub to become members. Lately, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Land Coalition joined. The Hub links to policy processes such as the Technical Guide on Governance of Tenure in Pastoral Rangelands, includes empowerment for improved governance of pastoralists, better data for improved policy advice and global advocacy. The Hub's website and discussion fora are being used by 350 stakeholders for regular exchange on policy and technical topics. The Hub is linked to a range of programmes within FAO (land restoration, climate change assessment and adaptation, livelihoods, risk management). The 2016 Committee on Agriculture has included as one of its main topics of discussion the eradication of the peste des petits ruminants (small ruminants' pest). This topic will also need to be discussed among pastoralists, who have specific contributions to make to the technical debate.



# Contents of the full evaluation report

Abbreviations and acronyms

Executive summary

IFAD Management's Response

FAO Management's Response

## **I. Introduction**

## **II. Objectives, methodology and process**

## **III. Pastoral systems**

- A. The U-turn in foundational knowledge
- B. Pastoralism and poverty

## **IV. Portfolio review**

- A. Pastoralism in the strategic planning of IFAD and FAO (2003-2013)
- B. Typology and focus of interventions
- C. Allocations
- D. Changes in interventions and allocations 2003 – 2013
- E. Methods of evaluation and pastoral development

## **V. Analysis of FAO and IFAD interventions on the ground**

- A. Overall considerations
- B. Reducing poverty and hunger in and around pastoral settings
- C. Increasing resilience and strengthening pastoral risk management
- D. Building new and better adapted institutions in pastoral development
- E. Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment in pastoral settings
- F. Promoting sustainable natural resource management
- G. Advocating on behalf of rural poor in pastoral settings
- H. Lessons learned and knowledge management

## **VI. Wider pastoral development context**

## **VII. Storyline, conclusions, and recommendations**

- A. Storyline
- B. Conclusions
- C. Recommendations

## **Annexes**

- I. Core sample
- II. Pastoral systems
- III. Visibility of pastoralism in the project management system
- IV. Average rating of pastoral-oriented projects in IFAD
- V. Specialist expertise in the evaluations of the core sample
- VI. Total number of projects in the core sample
- VII. Joint evaluation synthesis comprehensive inventory
- VIII. Senior independent advisers' report
- IX. List of key people met
- X. Learning event on joint IFAD/FAO evaluation synthesis report on pastoral development
- XI. References

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluation synthesis report was coordinated by Catrina Perch, Evaluation Officer in the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE); and jointly managed with Tullia Aiazzi, former Senior Evaluation Officer, and later with Arwa Khalid, Evaluation Officer, in FAO's Office of Evaluation (OED). They were ably supported by Saverio Kratli, senior consultant, Marie Monimart and Jeremy Swift, consultants. Marina Izzo worked as a research analyst in both organizations.

The work benefited from feedback and advice provided by Ashwani Muthoo, IOE Deputy Director; Pradeep Itty, IOE Senior Evaluation Officer, IOE; Marta Bruno, Knowledge Management and Evaluation Officer, OED, and Cees de Haan senior independent adviser.

Appreciation is due to several staff members of FAO and IFAD for their active engagement, in particular: Philippe Ankers, Chief, Animal Production and Health Division, FAO; Antonio Rota, Lead Technical Specialist, Policy and Technical Advisory Division, IFAD; and other members of the "Core Learning Partnership". Administrative support was provided by Laure Vidaud, IOE Evaluation Assistant.

## Abbreviations and acronyms

CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JES	Joint evaluation synthesis report
OED	FAO's Office of Evaluation
PKH	FAO's Pastoral Knowledge Hub
PTA	Policy and Technical Advisory Division
VSF	Vétérinaires sans Frontières (Veterinaries without Borders)

## Photos

Cover: Kenya - ©IFAD/Silvia Sperandini

Page 3: Somalia - ©IFAD/Marco Salustro

Page 7: Mongolia - ©IFAD/Thomas Rath

Page 13: Senegal - ©IFAD/Roberto Faidutti

Page 20: Bolivia - ©IFAD/Cristóbal Corral





International Fund for Agricultural Development

Via Paolo di Dono, 44 - 00142 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 06 54591 - Fax: +39 06 5043463

E-mail: [evaluation@ifad.org](mailto:evaluation@ifad.org)

[www.ifad.org/evaluation](http://www.ifad.org/evaluation)

[www.ruralpovertyportal.org](http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org)

 [ifad-un.blogspot.com](http://ifad-un.blogspot.com)

 [www.facebook.com/ifad](http://www.facebook.com/ifad)

 [instagram.com/ifadnews](https://www.instagram.com/ifadnews)

 [www.twitter.com/ifadnews](https://www.twitter.com/ifadnews)

 [www.youtube.com/user/ifadTV](http://www.youtube.com/user/ifadTV)



Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - 00153 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 06 57051

E-mail: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

[www.fao.org/evaluation/oed-home/en](http://www.fao.org/evaluation/oed-home/en)

 [www.linkedin.com/company/fao](http://www.linkedin.com/company/fao)

 [www.facebook.com/UNFAO](http://www.facebook.com/UNFAO)

 [slideshare.net/faoftheun](https://slideshare.net/faoftheun)

 [www.twitter.com/faonews](https://www.twitter.com/faonews)

 [www.youtube.com/faovideo](http://www.youtube.com/faovideo)