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Pastoral development and livestock development are two different concepts.

Pastoralism as an economic activity: an animal production system which takes advantage of the characteristic instability of rangeland environments.

Specific number of pastoralist unknown, but estimated to be more than 100 million worldwide.

Pastoralists are amongst the poorest and most vulnerable populations in developing countries. Most of the pastoralists live in Africa and Asia, and some in South America.
### IFAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of Projects</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total allocation ($ million)</td>
<td>847.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral oriented activities ($ million)</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD’s investment in Pastoral Dev.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predominant focus: capacity building, institution dev., rangeland management, animal health
FAO and IFAD engagement in Pastoral Development (2)

**FAO**

Total number of Projects 163
Total allocation ($ million) 380
FAO’s investment in Pastoral Dev. 5%

Predominant focus: emergency assistance, policy development, veterinary services
Methodology

Objective
Identify cross-cutting issues and lessons, and generate recommendations.

Evidence base
A. **In-depth review of documents**: 65 FAO and IFAD evaluation reports and other documents prepared during the period 2003-2013, covering more than 25 developing countries.
B. **Interviews**: Extensive consultations with Management and key staff in IFAD and FAO
C. **Data analysis**: Developed and analyzed database of all FAO and IFAD ‘pastoral-oriented’ projects in 2003-2013.
Pastoral development is relevant to IFAD’s and FAO’s mandate of promoting food and nutrition security, and improved livelihoods.

There has been and still is lack of clarity between pastoral development and livestock development, and limited understanding of pastoral systems, including the specificity of pastoral poverty.

Monitoring and institutional learning and subsequent influence on new projects is mixed.
Common Themes

- Poverty and Hunger
- Risk Management
- Natural Resource Management
- Participation, Institutions and Land Tenure
- Advocacy
- Gender
Poverty and Hunger

- Efforts in both organisations to reduce poverty and hunger through pastoral development have been largely moderately satisfactory
- Insufficient attention devoted to targeting pastoral poverty
- Inadequate context analysis (e.g. beneficiaries’ relationship to value chains; role of milk in pastoral households) to inform project interventions.
- Monitoring of pastoral systems and implementation of activities has been weak
Main Findings (2)

**Risk management**

- Little analysis of risks faced by pastoralists, and more attention devoted to risk avoidance/reduction. Mobility involves taking and managing high levels of risk for better impact.

- Challenge of capturing risk-management or resilience factors at the scale of operation relevant to pastoral systems (regional crop-livestock integration and urban-rural linkages).

- Vulnerability–reduction solutions benefited better-off producers.
Natural resource management

- Focus on rangeland management and rehabilitation, technical packages, community-based management solutions and policy dialogue

- Many projects operated within the received wisdom that rangelands are degraded caused by an unbalance between stocking rates and pasture availability (carrying capacity), leading to overgrazing

- Positive results with community based approaches (e.g. transhumance corridors, rangeland management committees)
Main Findings (4)

Participation, Institutions and Land Tenure

- Positive results with community-based participatory approaches (e.g. participatory natural resource management (IFAD)).
- Some innovative examples of improving institutional set-ups for pastoral development.
- Access to rangeland critical but efforts and results in securing tenure for pastoralism insufficient

Advocacy

- Strategic frameworks and recent initiatives of the two organisations pay enhanced attention to advocacy work
- Results in advocacy vary (Pastoral policy gap analysis, potential for playing a “convening role” underutilised)
Main Findings (5)

Gender

- Stated benefits from income generating activities, training, and microcredit are often based on aggregated percentages of women amongst the beneficiaries.

- Women were rarely targeted as livestock professionals.

- Activities manifest little attention to changes in gender roles in pastoral communities.
Recommendations

- FAO and IFAD should equip themselves with a policy for pastoral development to help ensure a coherent conceptual framework and systematic direction.

- Build and adapt capacity in IFAD and FAO for systemic engagement in pastoral development.
Recommendations

 Prepare a risk management and resilience strategy for every pastoral programme (risk management rather than avoidance of risk).

 Support advocacy by pastoralists and on behalf of pastoralists and people whose livelihoods depend on pastoral systems.