

RELPA

RELPA OVERALL

Findings

- Overall RELPA was supposed to 1. Increase Efficiency 2. Resilience against Drought and 3. Innovate. This was to be done through a direct support of COMESA secretariat by one staff member support as well as through PACAPS and ELMT/ELSE field activities discussed below.
- It supported and deepened EW/ ER and CSSD, trans-boundary pastoralist migration, animal health services, animal trade and range rehabilitation/ use as detailed elsewhere through field
- RELPA, based in USAID EA, managed to influence the country based USAID offices and vice versa, as well as other key donors, like FAO, to take EW/ER, CSSD, livelihoods, trans-boundary livestock mobility, livestock trade and pastoralists' friendly approaches in their programming and funding. It is too soon to evaluate the impact of this contribution.
- Equally important was the lessons learned, along the same lines by the consortia partners and their subcontractors.

Conclusions/Lessons Learned

- Whereas African regional organizations, can initiate regional policy, ultimately such policy must be adopted by the national governments. Since regional bodies do not have either sticks or carrots, they can be ignored. Further, the planning of field activities must resonate with the operating political and policy frameworks of the particular countries. The lack of a national government in Somalia limited what could be done to its border areas abutting Kenya. In the case of Ethiopia, the policy framework denied activity identified as either addressing conflict or its mitigation.
- Non-synchronized and independently contracted cooperate partnership consortia are very problematic in terms of programming, management and community organizational focus.
- It is problematic to design and implement pastoralism policy at the regional, national, local and community levels. It is even more so when the contractors and subcontractors are a mixture of INGOs, LNGOs, CBOs independent companies and universities for each subspecies demands different outcomes. It is practically impossible to coordinate such a mixture systematically other than through personalities and loose networks.
- RELPA assumed that COMESA will drive policy and national government institutions would domesticate it. No doubt this is true in terms of the CAADP policy process of mainstreaming pastoralists production into this national systems.
- It is not clear how the COMESA level policy making is relevant to the policy and implementation needs of many pastoralists' community levels.
- Relevant policy at that level is both formal and informal and is driven by local governments and community processes as is made clear by the Maikona peace process which created peace and thus enabled the saving of many livelihoods in trans-boundary framework. The fact that the Moyale Peace Meeting of November 2009 took place, with Ministers from Ethiopia and Kenya, is an example of local policy driving national policy. The reverse is the failure to get the peace processes taking place in Mandera district in Kenya to spill into Region Five of Ethiopia. A different example is the large numbers of Kenyan pastoralist cattle in Somalia in spite of the absence of national working state structures and peace.
- Pastoralists' **memory**, of past interventions by donors and governments is as important, if not more, as pastoralists' **voice** in the planning of trans-boundary interventions at the pastoralists' producer level.
- Note, for example, that the markets, market routes and the mobility are based **historical memory**. Therefore auditing community thinking on past interventions by donors and governments is as important as CSSD.
- Therefore, a donor, interested in systematically funding pastoralists' livelihood interventions, should first audit the implementing institutions' track records, especially on the **Do No Harm Framework** from pastoralists' point of view for they remember institutional failures and

- successes of implementers equally. It is this, which should inform the decisions of what locally based institutions to contract, not their longevity in an area.
- Significant numbers of donors, who do their projects at the local government and community levels, are domiciled in specific areas over very long periods. Typically they **straddle emergency, relief, recovery and development work**. Funding and activities are **fudged** from a community point of view. They create local brokers who limit the generation of policy upward. Therefore funding focus on specific policy generation dialogue at the pastoralists' producer level is crucial.

RELPA Recommendations

Activities worth continuing are inter alia:

1. Trans-boundary peace building
2. Trans- boundary and pastoral areas infrastructure build up.
3. Regional pastoralism trans-boundary mobility policy development through COMESA-ACTESA/ IGAD.
4. Domestication of regional pastoralism trans-boundary mobility and trade policies by national governments.
5. Localization of trans-boundary policy and development through negotiations with trans-boundary local governments and communities. Unit of focus would be the proximate districts, woredas, and provinces/ regions in descending order.
6. Long term livestock (live and dressed) trade negotiations with GCC, the region and others through COMESA-ACTESA and IGAD.
7. Livestock products value addition in pastoral areas.
8. Pastoral lands rehabilitation/management.
9. Coordination of development actions and funding agencies in trans-boundary areas.
10. The budgeting obligation policy should be that 85% of available resources should be spent on to activities **with direct livelihood contribution to pastoralists** and not on implementing institutions.
11. Among the significant financiers in trans-boundary pastoralist areas are DFID, EU, FAO, WB, and DGIS etc. These should be brought to negotiation after internal agreement between USAID EA and the country offices of USAID so as to systemize and coordinate funding for trans-boundary pastoralists' development.
12. Given the desired focus on local government and community capacity building for livelihoods, some of the previous RELPA subcontractors, country CAREs, country VSFs Suisse, Country SCUKs and SCUSs should be considered. However, they should be mixed with LNGOs with capacity. Their program activities should be disaggregated from their normal programs.

COMESA

Findings

- Over and above the activities through PACAPS, discussed below, COMESA signed a limited Scope Grant Agreement for the facilitation and implementation of the RELPA program with regard to: 1. Support the CAADAP processes in the region 2. Support roads and other long-term infrastructure inclusion in national plans through CAADP endorsement 3. To liaise with IGAD and other African organizations to clarify mutual roles and responsibilities.
- The first activity has been done for the envisaged staff with expertise in livestock/pastoral livelihoods working in COMESA's agriculture office was hired. It is not clear that the last two have been done.
- CAADAP processes have been supported to include livestock and livestock products into the national systems. The Kenya process is still ongoing. Ethiopia is supposed to have signed in November 2009.
- The envisaged **Regional Committee for Pastoralism**, in COMESA, with ten staff, program engagement does not seem to have happened. It was supposed to move country experiences (policies) into the regional COMESA system and vice versa. Even if one assumes that all the Tuft staff would have gone to COMESA, the target of 10 professionals would still not have been achieved. There is no evidence that the envisaged clarification of roles and definitions of IGAD

- and other African (regional and continental?) institutions was undertaken and a specific document produced on methods and procedures.
- Significant in house COMESA staff reorientation, to include pastoral concerns into policies crucial for pastoralist livelihoods, was done by PACAPS. Towards that end, several symposia were held at different pastoralists' production sites to understand the region's pastoralism variety in contexts and actions. The three regional symposia included CAADP-AU-IBAR focal persons in Ethiopia, Djibouti and Kenya, and LPI, FAO and IGAAD.
 - COMESA logoed policy briefs were prepared for it under PACAPS. They are: 1. Pastoralists, Food Security and Disaster Response: The Use of Preparedness Auditing to Strengthen Contingency Planning 2. Trigger Happy? Signals for Timely Humanitarian Response in Pastoral Areas. 3. Regional Cross-Border Livelihood Analysis. 4. Cross Border Pilot Livelihood Profiles. A Draft Summary Report titled; *System Failure-Time to Reboot: Taking a Systems Perspective to the Problems of Timely Response to Crises in the Horn of Africa*, by Simon Levine documents lessons learned out of the Early response experiences in the HoA It underscores the role of Crisis Calendar Analysis in addressing the limitations of planning and the attendant weak link to early response.
 - Key COMESA policy outputs were: 1. The PACAPS drafted commodity based trade policy paper adopted by the COMESA Ministers of Agriculture on March 2008: 2. A policy paper recognizing trans-boundary mobility as the key to pastoral livelihoods was drafted and adopted by the COMESA Council of Ministers in September 2009: 3. A recommendation on Trans-boundary livestock trade, which was adopted by the COMESA Council of Ministers in September 2009: 4. It is expected that COMESA will enact a Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoral Areas, which is under process. This will go beyond incorporating pastoral concerns into trade or a national food security policy for it is specifically oriented to assuring pastoralists' food security. The three crucial policies, passed by COMESA together with the expected fourth, will only become operational if adopted by COMESA member states.
 - Efforts were made to improve COMESA capacity to include pastoralism concerns within itself and into national CAADAPS. However, its ability to lead is constrained for once it generates policies, it is the states which have to make decisions for their own cases.
 - Joint meetings and a symposium were held with key donors, partners on the issue of livestock disease and exports especially to the GCC. COMESA is to pursue setting up a long-term trade regime with the GCC if agreement is reached on disease control over and above the opportunistic opening of trade by Saudi Arabia in November 2009.
 - Some HoA countries do not favor Djibouti port, envisaged as a prime outlet to Yemen and Saudi Arabia.
 - Further efforts in inter and intra regional efforts were the analysis of Kenya and Ethiopia livestock trade policies.
 - More important were livestock and meat studies done for COMESA in Mauritius and Democratic Republic of the Congo. Underlying these studies is the idea that the region should trade within itself whilst still pursuing the GCC market.
 - COMESA created a specialized agency titled Alliance for Commodity Trade in Eastern and Southern Africa (ACTESA), in November 2008. It inherited the person who used to be in the secretariat to push forward the regional livestock activities.
 - However, ACTESA's initial work plan emphasizes coordination of producer associations.
 - Further, the COMESA Heads of State, in June 2009, ruled that smallholder producers were to be included. Therefore the revised ACTESA objectives are a. To improve policy environment and competitiveness of the staple crop sector b. To improve and expand market facilities and services for staple foods. c. To integrate smallholder farmers into national and international markets.
 - Arguments were made that the interests of pastoralists' livelihoods will be assured through the CAADP national systems but the fact that they are not specifically mentioned in ACTESA objectives should raise concern especially since smallholders have disproportionate **voice** in the region.
 - ACTESA has already attracted funding from the EU over and above funding from USAID for Regional Agro-inputs Program, which essentially is credit to smallholders and agro-dealers and to organize agro-dealers and set up competitive seed industry for smallholders.

- ACTESA's baseline survey is to be completed by June 2010. It is not clear how her objectives will be delivered to producer pastoralists although interviews show that USAID, in some countries has agreed to fund it to expand a livestock markets program.

COMESA Conclusions/Lessons Learned

- COMESA-ACTESA and CAADP have put livestock and livestock products into the national trade and food security policy concerns. USAID EA has decided to extend funding ACTESA. Efforts should be made to focus its programming to pastoralists' producer concerns so as to jog regional governments to action particularly because of the Heads of State ruling on smallholders.
- COMESA/IGAD should get support for extending inter-regional and external livestock trade negotiations.
- However, it is doubtful that the target of national and regionally coordinated livestock trade policies and protocols, which emphasize international standards related to animal health in pastoralists' areas, are realistic given the paucity of veterinary services and their diversity in the HoA.
- Policy focus should be to support pastoralists' livelihoods first, by assuring them functional primary markets, regional trade second and international trade third initially.

PACAPS

Findings

- The Program Pastoral Areas Coordination, Analysis and Policy Activity (PACAPS) was based on a cooperative partner agreement.
- The objectives were: 1.0. Strong technical coordination of RELPA activities to enable effective developmental programming, effective early response in the event of crises and systemic assessments to inform regional pastoral food security policy.1.1. Establish effective coordination mechanism, information flow and technical support modalities for routine implementation of ELMT activities.1.2. Improved capacity of ELMT partners to support timely and harmonized livelihoods based cross-border relief interventions, informed by a regional perspective of livelihood conditions.1.3. Lessons from ELMT developmental and relief interventions used to inform debate and improved programming.2.0. Strengthen cross-border animal health delivery, disease surveillance and epizootic disease contingency plans in the Mander Triangle.3.0. Improved EW/ER analytical approaches introduced and tested at community and organizational levels and used to inform future planning and institutionalization of a regional livelihoods Monitoring and Response facility.4.0 Improved capacity of COMESA to lead the coordination of pastoral initiatives in the Horn of Africa region. 5.0 Improved capacity of COMESA to lead regional harmonization of national livestock trade policies and protocols with emphasis on international standards related to animal health in pastoral areas. 6.0 Ensure Coordination of RELPA conflict prevention and mitigation activities with other RELP initiatives at field and policy level.
- The first TWG on 28/09/07 meeting struggled with the problem of M&E and concluded that although PACAPS had overall technical advice on M&E, it would not carry out the function for the consortium partners!
- Minutes of the same meeting state that PACAPS and ELMT would develop and harmonies their PMPs in line with their grant agreements and USAID Operational Plan. We have not seen a formal document showing this.
- Minute 2/8 of the second TWG meeting, of 10/12/07, states that there would not be a consolidated M&E framework but USDAID EA had its own PMP, which factored in the consortium partners indicators. Minute 3/4/4, of the third TWG meeting, on 03/03/08, notes that since some PMP indicators in contracts and grants had either been added or deleted it was important to resubmit Work Plans, PMPs and indicator to USAID. Minute 4/5 of the following TWG meeting shows that the PMPs were still not finalized. Minute 5/2/6 of TWG meeting 5 of 15-16/09/08 called for their submission by Mid October 2008. It is not raised in all subsequent TWG meetings. **So we conclude that there have been Work Plans and PMPs only in the last program year.** Tufts, on its part, argue that it failed to coordinate since it was clearly told by the contracted partners that their contracts were autonomous!

- The distribution of PACAPS staff and consultants was: Chief Of Party in Nairobi; Principal Investigator and Senior Livestock Marketing Specialist in Addis Ababa; Senior Livestock Policy Specialist at Lusaka; Early Warning Advisor in Nairobi and Early Response Advisor in Kampala. Tufts internal processes drove this.
- Further, the first RELPA Technical Management and Co-ordination Group, held on 28/09/07, was renamed RELPA Technical Steering and Coordination Group to signify that PACAPS did not have overall consortium management responsibilities given the contractual realities. This led to the operation of consortium partner programs essentially as stand alones.
- The training of RELPA partners in application of PIA tools should be noted together with the PIA done on Community Based Animal Health in Mandera district under VSF Suisse.
- The inclusion of livestock and pastoralists' livelihoods concerns into the CAADP policy processes in Kenya and Ethiopia (others include Djibouti and Sudan) is a significant achievement.
- Studies of live animal trade possibilities through the Djibouti, Bosasso and Berbera ports were done.
- Livestock trade routes were mapped in the Mandera Triangle.
- Together with FEG, PACAPS planned and conducted two contingency planning workshops for ELMT contractors and subcontractors. Guidelines on Contingency planning were the outputs.
- PACAPS, FEG and ELMAT/ELSE conducted trans-boundary livelihoods analysis.
- PACAPS established a **Horn of Africa Pastoral Network**, focusing on long-term pastoralists' concerns. REGLAP picked it up. Both REGLAP and PACAPS supported RECONCILE to take up the secretariat of the HoA Pastoralist Network in spite of its funding limitations as well as its being active in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania and not Ethiopia and Somalia. It is expected that Oxfam/Echo may continue funding this activity.
- PACAPS, in collaboration with FEG and IDS, has been in contact with the new Ministry for the Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands on strategy, restructuring, institutional set up and operational structure of the DSGs. However, during the *Regional Symposium on Livestock Marketing in the Horn of Africa: Working towards Best Practices*, which the evaluation team attended, this ministry did not feature for it was the Minister of Livestock Development who opened the symposium!
- PACAPS did not institutionalize a **Regional Livelihoods Monitoring and Response Facility** but activities spread over partners and their clients.
- To date there is no evidence that there is a prototype **Strategic Livelihood Support Plan** to assist pastoral development planning including contingency planning.
- PACAPS, coordinated with ELMT and COMESA, for monitoring and planning for control of Rift Valley Fever in the HoA, as well as holding constant discussions on the same with the GCC, perhaps the major external market for pastoral livestock from the HoA, is significant. It should be noted though that no vaccination was undertaken before the October 2009 rains since most of Kenya's pastoralists' livestock are in Somalia and Ethiopia. Some vaccination was done in Ethiopia. We do not have any data on Somalia.
- Over two years, there has been continuous dialogue between PACAPS and partners on moving from using EW to ER incorporating drought timelines and ultimately to using predictive livelihoods HEA analysis tools to identify livelihoods support demand. Livelihood zones have been mapped. This has led partners into livelihoods support rather than food aid. A key output was the trans-boundary contingency planning for expected El Nino rains.
- Partners expressed the opinion that it is expected that FEWSNET will continue the EW-ER role. However, presentation from FEWSNET indicated that the current program would end soon.
- It should be noted that as early as the fifth RELPA Technical Steering and Coordination Group Meeting 15-16/09/08, it was concluded that all ELMT does not do policy for it is exclusively the mandate of PACAPS!
- Other than the COMESA and CAADP efforts, PACAPS has attempted this through the new Ministry of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands.

PACAPS Conclusions/Lessons Learned

- It seems as if the understanding was that all PACAPS staff would be based in COMESA headquarters in Lusaka. They were not. An argument is made by some that a consortium would

- have been better based in Nairobi where they could take advantage of better communications as well as having access to USAID EA, COMESA and IGAD.
- To date there is no evidence that there is a prototype **Strategic Livelihood Support Plan** to assist pastoral development planning including contingency planning.
 - Given the stand-alone contracting, program designs and different award dates for the partners in the consortium, it is not a surprise that coordination became problematic. Many partner presentations emphasized this point. They also said that it is only in the second year that they began to coordinate in substantive ways by essentially recognizing specific partner competences.
 - Trans-boundary livestock movements are still a major problem from a disease control point of view as the work of VSF-Suisse shows. Veterinary services collapsed under the privatization thrust of the past. Community based animal health services, through CAHWS and small-scale veterinary shops are better than pastoralists' treatments but have minimal coverage and cannot cope with epidemics. Expected regional policy coordination on this is worth pursuing in the future.
 - In Ethiopia, the pastoralists' development policy actions have been at the regional, woreda and community levels mainly but some agencies think there could be a pastoralists' policy support breakthrough at the Federal level soon.

PACAPS Recommendations:

- PACAPS did make a major contribution to COMESA's policy making for the region. This needs deepening but decisions already made by USAID EA—essentially to build up ACTESA- do not show a clear way forward.
- The argument on where PACAP's staff should have been located to some extent is vitiated by the funding of ACTESA by USAID EA and its historic support for COMESA. It does not exhaust the salience of funding IGAD.
- PACAPS work is highly regarded in ELSE. Perhaps this has to do with the “research role and learning “ role PACAPS played. Such a role is desirable if activities are continued.

RCPM

RCPM Findings

- The purpose of for the Regional Conflict Prevention and Mitigation (RCPM) effort, as defined in the IQC (page3) were: 1. Conduct Conflict Prevention, Mitigation and Response (CPMR) training and skill building in conflict sensitive service delivery for RELPA implementing partners, ensuring organization's understanding of the link between peace and sustainable livelihood. 2. Convene RELPA partners from three countries (Kenya, Ethiopia, Somali) to build a network working in Mandera Triangle for information sharing, lessons learned and best practices in conflict sensitive delivery. 3. Strengthen partnership between RELPA partners and existing peace committees/local government structures. 4. Provide opportunities for joint planning and implementation to ensure geographic and sectoral coverage.
- The MSI Technical proposal added a PRA baseline survey. It also redefined the objective as: *To strengthen the effectiveness of Conflict Sensitive Approaches used in targeting and delivery of humanitarian and sustainable livelihoods assistance in the Greater Mandera Triangle* thereby making the IQC categories specific tasks and also shifting to CSSD rather than CPMR.
- A CSSD baseline survey and a needs assessment were done in Kenya. None were done in Ethiopia for reasons of national government sensitivity on such issues. None were done in Somalia either, given security concerns.
- CSSD's simple guide, baptized Cheat Sheet, was developed. This and other materials were put in CD for distribution.
- ELMT and PACAPS consortia staffs and others were trained in CSSD through three workshops.
- Mini CSSD clinics for Oxfam partners in Wajir, Wajir DSG, CARE Somalia, CARE Kenya and its partners, Oxfam GB staff and National Early Recovery Cluster (GOK, UN, INGOs and LNGOs) were conducted.
- MSI/PACT area of concentration was Wajir district in Kenya but it supported CARE Kenya and its partners in Isiolo, Marsabit and Wajir and VSF Suisse in Mandera.

- MSI/PACT reports that 100 NGO workers, 15 GOK staff at district level and “many” community representatives have CSSD skills.
- Oxfam GB a partner in RELPA has main streamed CSSD in all its programs as well as keeping a data base on CSSD practitioners.
- Development Concern includes CSSD into their areas of work.
- MSI/PACT was not able to travel to Somalia because of security. GoE did not approve CSSD work! USAID Country office in Ethiopia was sensitive to the GoE concerns.
- Different RELPA consortia contracting timelines and the subsequent delay in subcontracting locally denied MSI/PACT the possibility of developing case studies and following them up with the RELPA partners.
- After the end of the MSI/PACT contract in November 2008, Pact Kenya-funded by USAID Kenya-continued to collaborate with ELMT. Significant was the joint work with the Somalia conflict advisor on the good practice guidelines, needs assessment, which identified Garissa and Ijara, in Kenya, as problem areas.

RCPM Conclusions/Lessons Learned

MSI /PACT concludes that: 1. Peace building needs to be embedded into all regular development efforts where there are endemic conflicts. 2. Planning of programs should include CSSD from program identification through implementation to be most effective. 3. There is limited conflict analysis in the Triangle. 4. There are disconnects in competences and programming between peace workers/agencies and others 5. Government must be brought on board for CSSD as exemplified in Wajir where the DSG was actively involved. We agree.

RCPM Recommendations

- MSI/PACT made a formal recommendation that CSSD not be limited to RELPA partners but broadened to include government, local networks, CSOs and other development actors working in Mandera Triangle.
- The lack of synchrony in award dates limited the institutionalization of the process of CSSD. However, presentations by many agencies lead us to believe that many have adopted the approach. This can and should be continued.
- It is clear that peace building is essential in Early Response and Development in all trans-boundary pastoralists’ communities. However, there are two questions of detail.
- First, are organizations that do Emergency Work, Early Response Work and Development Work seriatim, in a particular community, capable of doing peace building work in the same area? We think not for given community **memory** and **voice**, it is likely that such a scenario would trigger conflict.
- The second issue is the desired neutral facilitative role of peace builders. An agency doing other work in an area cannot be neutral. Thus it cannot do peace building. Therefore it follows that peace building activities be given to entities which are not connected to implementing areas in a particular community. It is important that they also do the work independent of other local development actors.
- Further, those doing ER and development work should follow DO NO HARM and CSSD practices.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The RELPA experience shows that there is need:

- To support pastoralists’ livelihoods diversification, stabilization and protection.
- To generate evidence based policy data for pastoralists’ livelihoods advocacy at regional, national and local levels.
- To support livestock and livestock derivatives trade for local, national, regional and international markets.
- To enhance pastoralists’ community driven NRM preservation and production strategies.
- To develop systems of trans-boundary livestock disease control.

A program addressing these issues needs to be funded on long-term basis-say 15 years. Further, it must be developed through dialogue with national governments on what national institutions, will carry trans-boundary pastoralists' policies, programs and projects at regional, national and local levels. In this dialogue, national government concerns on Peace Building, in terms of programs, projects and geographical areas of specific operations over and above specific interventions on livelihoods, NRM, trade etc must be clarified. It is not clear that RELPA did this systematically.

Program activities need to be done by staff with professional and working experience in pastoral areas as well as management over and above technical competence in fields like NRM, Livelihoods, Policy, Peace Building and Participatory Approaches.

If this approach is taken it can be envisaged that the program will:

1. Build on previous RELPA achievements in supporting regional trade negotiations and inclusion of livestock into the food commodities.
2. Create region-wide policies on peace building as the sin quo non of ER and development of trans-boundary pastoralists' communities.
3. Generate specific regional trans-boundary policies to assure pastoralists' mobility, key to securing their livelihoods.
4. Expand region wide inter trade policies favorable to pastoralists' products –livestock and livestock derivatives.
5. Continue negotiations on external livestock and livestock derivatives trade policies and trading clearances favorable to pastoralist.
6. Develop region wide livestock disease control programs to assure regional and international trade.
7. Get national official recognition of the necessity of protecting trans-boundary pastoralists' mobility, production and thus livelihoods.
8. Lead to positive local government coordination, supervision and facilitation of pastoralists' development activities.
9. Extensive evidence that RELPA partners built on local government and community capacities for making formal and informal policies exists in Ethiopia and Kenya. Some have been adopted at national levels. An example is the Camel Forum in Ethiopia. In Ethiopia also there is a development activity budget approval system at various administrative levels. In the Kenyan case peace groups have led to conflict resolution policies that are subsequently recognized by national government entities or line ministries. Examples can be seen in Mandera, Wajir and the north of Eastern Province. Such local government and community actions should be affirmed as a matter of development policy of the pastoralists' communities. Such an approach may be the key in generating pastoralists' long-term land security policy. This may begin to assure pastoralists' livelihoods in the long-term since migration must be to assured landscapes.

PRESENTATIONS: REGIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON LIVESTOCK MARKETING IN HOA

Gatarwa Kariuki and Robert Kaitho-Application of ICT in Dev. of Livestock Market I.S

Churchill Amantha and Michael Kibue---Market Info---Kajiado---

James Kundu and Adrian Mukhebi---Smallholder Based Market Info---

Genevieve Owuor, Diana Onyango and Diba D Wako---Milk Supply---Mandera

Mohamed Kuti
Almed El Sawahy

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Name

Robert F. Buzzard
Shirley Erves
Girma Kabede Kassa
Cary Farley
Candace H. Buzzard

Dr. Jeremiah Akumu
Venessa Tilstone
Patrick N. Kimani
Fiona Flintan
Dawit Abebe
Farouk Jiwa
Vittorio Cagnolati
Francis Chabari
Ilona Glucks
Mohamed Abass
Baroe Aden

Adrian Cullis
Tesfu Kahsay
Demeke Eshete
Trudi Dale
Roba Godana
S. K. Maina

Dil Peeling
Dr. Berhe Gebreegiabher

Peter D. Little
Steven A. Smith
John Graham
Emma Proud
Dr. Abera Deressa
Zewdu Desta
Leslie F. Mitchell
Simon O'Connell
Mesfin Ayele
Andy Catley
Mohamed Abdinoor
Gijs Van't Klooster
Fatuma S. Abdikadir
Izzy Birch
Dr. Kadir Musema
JosephK. Wachira

Suleman Mohamed

Minister for Livestock, GOK.
AU-IBR

Organization

General Development Officer- USAID Kenya
Senior Regional Policy Advisor-USAID EA
Deputy Chief of Party-ELMT
Chief of Party ELMT
Office Director-Regional Economic Growth and Integration –
USAID EA
Livestock Coordinator ELMT
Learning Monitoring &Evaluation Advisor ELMT
CEO Kenya Livestock Producers' Association
Technical Advisor, NRM-ELMT/ELSE
Senior Pastoralism and Policy Specialist-PACAPS
Senior Regional Technical Advisor-CARE US
AU-IBAR
Chief of Party –PACAPS
VSF-Suisse
CEO Kenya Livestock Marketing Council
Chair, Mandera Branch, Kenya Livestock Producers
Association
SCUS, Ethiopia
ELSE Operations Manager, Ethiopia.
SCUK Ethiopia
SCUK Ethiopia
Northern Kenya Livestock Traders Association
Coordinator, NSC. Peace Building and Conflict Management
Secretariat. GOK
CTA, IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative
Director, Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Directorate.
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, GoE
Emory University, USA
Democracy and Governance Chief, USAID Ethiopia
Senior Policy & Strategic Advisor, USAID, Ethiopia
Mercy Corps ,Ethiopia
State Minister, Min. of Agriculture and Rural Dev.
Pact Ethiopia.
Country Representative, Pact.
Country Director, Mercy Corps, Ethiopia
Asst. Country Director, Mercy Corps, Ethiopia
PI, Tufts University, Ethiopia.
TA, Pastoral & Livestock, USAID Ethiopia.
International Consultant, Livestock, FAO Ethiopia.
National Coordinator,ALRM, Office of Prime Minister, GOK.
Advisor, Min. of DNK&ALS?
CARE International, Ethiopia
Senior Regional Conflict, Democracy and Governance
Adviser, USAID EA.
FEWSNET Regional Representative, Kenya