



# FAO's and IFAD's Engagement in Pastoral Development (2003-2013) - Joint Evaluation Synthesis

Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE, IFAD) and Office of Evaluation (OED, FAO)

92<sup>nd</sup> session of the Evaluation Committee

21 June 2016

# Background

- 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 and FAO engagement in Pastoral Development (1)

## IFAD

Total number of Projects	31
Loans	24
Grants	7
Total allocation (\$ million)	847.5
Pastoral oriented activities (\$ million)	380
IFAD's investment in Pastoral Dev.	11%

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.

# Overarching Findings

- 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



# Main Findings (1)

## 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 benefitted better off producers

# Main Findings (3)

## 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.