

Executive Summary

RELPA was an ambitious undertaking from its inception. Emerging from the PLI 1 project and funded as a “one-off” Famine Prevention Fund grant RELPA was designed to bridge a gap between short term food aid/food dependence and a longer term view toward enhancing Pastoralist livelihoods as a coping mechanism for drought consequences and pressures on the natural resource.

Two keys elements of the RELPA program that seemed to be pivotal were both philosophical and actual. The philosophical argument was to challenge the concept that Pastoralists were part of the problem leading to natural resource degradation and should be “prodded” into alternative lifestyles but rather Pastoralists, through a set of well-planned and adaptive interventions, could actually increase animal production and range utilization. Thus the “not the problem, but perhaps the solution” concept was woven into the fabric of RELPA. The other was the dialogue led by PACAPS and supported in COMESA that livestock products be considered in the food mix of commodity-based trade.

The first element led to the unique regional concept of RELPA, realizing that traditional grazing corridors are borderless; a cross border perspective was required to fully address mobile pastoralism. The second element led to the addition of needed nutritional requirements into the food aid mix, which heretofore consisted of grains and served to show that indeed a program such as RELPA could be influential in helping to shape policy.

RELPA is a two-year program designed to increase self-reliance of populations in pastoral areas through increased livelihoods in the Mandera triangle and to support and strengthen the capability of COMESA to support regional policy initiatives that enhance livelihoods in pastoral areas. The program has five components: OFDA, COMESA, PACAPS, ELMT, RCPM. The OFDA component was not evaluated.

The evaluation of RELPA was undertaken by a four man team of experts (see Appendix??) to undertake an innovative approach to look at the effectiveness of RELPA’s cross-border, cross-cultural, multidisciplinary approach to addressing the recurring crises and chronic vulnerability in the pastoral the Mandera Triangle area, and to identify areas of progress and failure, and to make recommendations that will guide future approaches to programming in conflict ridden areas of East Africa. The Scope of Work for this evaluation included illustrative questions and issues, which the team used as a backdrop for its investigations and the answers to which were included in the various sections. The general methodology used in the evaluation was: Findings-literature review, field trips to Garissa, Garba Tula, Isiolo and Mpala in Kenya and Yabello and Negelle in Ethiopia, interviews with numerous individuals (see Appendix??), and attending the Livestock Marketing Symposium, and the Holistic Management work shop.

Conclusions/lessons learned- emanating for findings and finally recommendations.

General comments expressed to the evaluation team were that RELPA was a good concept, innovative in its regional approach but too complex, too ambitious and had too short a time frame. Specifically:

- 1) The design was flawed in that it was anticipated coordination, collaboration and management among the partners would be glued under a broad umbrella of “Cooperation of the Willing”, a concept that worked only marginally. Originally, PACAPS was to be the consortium coordinator. This did not occur, resulting in a lack of cohesive management to ensure control and linkage. Care Somalia was the coordinator for the ELMT consortium, but somehow was not able to manage individual grantees.
- 2) Implementation was staggered due to contractual issues such that PACAPS was implementing work while ELMT contractors were still negotiating sub grants. In fact, while ELMT was executed in May of 2007 the last sub grantee was on board by May 2008. The result was that effectively ELMT had a little over a year to obtain results in its IRs,
- 3) ELMT was burdened with 6 NGOs each with its own grant contract and approximately 30 sub grantees.
- 4) Only two ELMT working groups could be considered effective. Reasons given were the successful ones had strong leadership and more input. Other working groups had nominal time placed into leadership roles.
- 5) RALPA failed to take into consideration different countries had different policy and governing perspectives and thus some insensitivities to protocol and planning led to problems.
- 6) The original design did not encompass the diverse populations, the magnitude of “drop outs” or transition livelihood needs in the long term. It is estimated that between 10 and 20% of the pastoralist population is either dropping out of pastoralism or transitioning to alternative livelihoods. Of an estimated population in the pastoral areas of Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia of 20,000,000 this means anywhere between 2 to 4 million are moving out of the pastoral way of life. The magnitude alone suggests a realignment of thought on creating industries large enough in scale to absorb these numbers.

RELPA successes:

- 1) COMESA recognized and is considering adding livestock products into the governing policy. COMESA, Pastoral Food Security Policy Framework
- 2) A regional concept was recognized by partners, cooperating governments, donors and commissions as having a credible potential to bridging bilateral verticality and addressing issues that could be best be handled from the perspective of regional
- 3) First use of Conflict Sensitivity Model, which partners are adopting
- 4) Fodder production
- 5) Small scale industries: beekeeping, weaving, camel milk marketing
- 6) Camel forum, initiated in Ethiopia and adopted in Kenya
- 7) Business education and innovative graphic training module.

- 8) Recognition by the coordinator and special advisor to the Ministry of Northern Kenya that both PACAPS and ELMT have established a beneficial relationship and that ELMT was most effective in arranging the (check with Girma) conference in Moyale by taking their time to bring all the actors together.

It is the decision of the evaluation team that a regional program aimed at enhanced livelihoods in the Pastoral area be continued and funded by USAID EA. This program should be designed from the lessons learned and successes of PLI 1 and RELPA and should consider:

- Design component sufficient to utilize recognized experts in regional programs, community based development with pastoralists, NRM and water, peace building and an innovative holistic perspective to prepare a program that has at least a 15 year time horizon;
- Contractual mechanism that has built-in contract management such as a prime contractor;
- Develop a Regional Management Unit as an independent entity having the ability to engage with COMESA, IGAD, ACTESA and others in a participatory manner. The RMU is envisioned to have technical staff, act as a clearing house and repository for information and a bridging entity for bilateral activities;
- Contracts should emphasize expertise both by entity and individual in pastoral livelihoods, marketing and NRM with a proven ability to for relationships at all levels;
- Program elements should be kept to a few doable, priority components which could include:
 - Evidence-based Policy change advocacy
 - Livestock and Commodity trade
 - Harmonization of regional Transitory Animal Disease control strategies in the HoA countries
 - Livelihoods protection & diversification
 - Community driven NRM strategies, to include the context of climate change
 - Enhanced response to stress triggers

Any ongoing program should be of sufficient duration to allow the actors to catch up.

2.0 Findings

2.1 RELPA

The RELPA program addresses the intentions of the Famine Prevention Fund specifically to:

- Validate promising potential solutions to chronic vulnerability
- Be innovative and catalytic, while providing flexibility in assisting famine prone countries or regions
- Help leverage funds from other donor partners
- Promote institutional and policy reform as part of a coordinated effort including other sources of funding, both public and private, including other donors.
- Program funds as part of a coordinated effort including other sources of funding, both public and private, including other donors

Overall RELPA was supposed to:

1. Increase Efficiency
2. Resilience against Drought and
3. Innovate

These actions were to be done through direct support to the COMESA Secretariat as well as through PACAPS, RCPM and ELMT/ELSE field activities. It supported and deepened EW/ ER and CSSD for trans-boundary pastoralist migration, animal health services, animal trade and range rehabilitation/ use. 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 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 were the lessons learned, along the same lines by the consortia partners and their subcontractors. It is too early to suggest the level and degree to which pastoralist producers have been impacted on. Its value additions were upgrading thinking about pastoralist mobility and inclusion of livestock into COMESA and national CAADAP

Components under RELPA were:

- OFDA (not evaluated)
- COMESA
- PACAPS
- ELMT/ELSE
- RCPM

2.1.1 COMESA

- 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. It is not clear that the last two activities 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 been 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 Tufts

- 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 differentiation. The three regional symposia included CAADP-AU-IBAR focal persons in Ethiopia, Djibouti and Kenya, and LPI, FAO and IGAAD.
 - COMESA four policy briefs were prepared under PACAPS:
 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 it and into national CAADPS frameworks. 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 the 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.
 - Livestock and meat studies were 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 personnel from 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:
 1. To improve policy environment and competitiveness of the staple crop sector
 2. To improve and expand market facilities and services for staple foods.
 3. 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 a 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.

2.1.2 PACAPS

- 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 Mandera 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 organizational
 - 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.

MAIN ACTIVITIES/OUTPUTS OF PACAPS

IR 1: Coordination within the RELPA program & partners

- Took lead to establish Horn of Africa Pastoral Network (HoA-PN): a wide range of Regional Dev & Humanitarian actors, donors and community representatives now working towards a long term pastoralist development strategy.
- Regularly disseminated livestock and Pastoralism Info to HoA-PN partners and other regional/national partners
- Performed role of secretariat to quarterly RELPA Technical Steering & Coordination meetings.
- Trained ELMT partners in application of PIA tools. Carried out PIA of the Community based Animal Health activities supported by VSF-Suisse in Mandera district as part of ELMT activity
- PACAPS technical experts contribute as resource persons of ELMT Technical Working Groups
- Ensured livestock and pastoralism components were added to the CAADP Processes in Kenya & Ethiopia. PACAPS contributed in preparing ToR for livestock & Pastoralism inclusion and monitored process.

Discussed with Oxfam-ECHO for commitment and funding for HoA-PN to continue for another 2 years. Funding is now confirmed.

IR 2: Enhancing Regional preparedness planning for Rift Valley Fever and other TADs

- Held joint meetings with USDA, USAID, AU-IBAR, COMESA on TADs and Trade. Major symposium held April 2009, co-sponsored by PACAPS, in effort to connect livestock exporting countries in HoA with importing countries of Middle East/GCC
 - Supporting RVF preparedness audit of HoA countries.
 - Harmonizing RVF preparedness actions in HoA with needs of importing countries in GCC
- COMESA committed to pursue framework trade agreement with GCC to include livestock trade on basis of agreed disease control protocols

IR3: Capacity building for disaster Early Warning – Early Response to ELMT partners

- EW tools discussed and agreed with partners -2 yr dialogue
 - Livelihood zones mapping completed in the ELMT region
 - Predictive livelihoods Analysis tools using HEA established
 - ER process using drought timelines, instead of Drought Cycle Management, tested and found more appropriate.
 - ELMT partners in Northern Kenya and bordering Somalia region supported to develop X-border Contingency Plans using drought/El Nino preparedness timelines
 - Progress in achieving mindset shift from pure EW-ER with food aid to supporting livelihoods
- Agreed FEWSNET takes over lead role in EW-ER coordination process among donors and actors in case PACAPS work does not continue

IR 4: Enhancing Pastoralist friendly policies via COMESA

- Commodity based trade concept drafted by PACAPS and adopted by COMESA Ministers of Agriculture, March 2008
- Cross-border mobility for survival of pastoralism, drafted and adopted by COMESA Council of Ministers, Sept 2009
- Cross-border livestock trade, recommendation adopted by COMESA council of Ministers, Sept 2009
- PACAPS conducted Trainings for COMESA Secretariat, AU-IBAR, IGAD & reps of Ministries of Livestock in Kenya and Ethiopia on: Livelihoods & Trade; Mobility; Food security and Droughts
- Regional Livestock & Pastoralism Forum established, with COMESA as secretariat
- COMESA Pastoral Food Security Policy Framework under process, targeting adoption by next sitting of COMESA Council of Ministers.

IR 5: Enhancing Inter/intra-regional trade in Livestock & Livestock Products from COMESA Region

- Livestock trade policies in Kenya and Ethiopia analyzed and key recommendations for value addition made.
 - Livestock/meat trade studies done in Mauritius and DRC to inform COMESA on potential for inter-regional expansion
- ACTESA to continue with livestock & commodity trade support initiatives

IR 6: Conflict Prevention and Mitigation

This was carried out under separate Task Order via MSI/PACT

Additional Findings

- 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 harmonize 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 USAID 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 indicators 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. It should be noted though that no vaccination was undertaken before the October 2009 rains since most of Kenya's pastoralists' livestock were 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 Household Economic Analysis (HEA) 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 ELMT would not involve policy, which was apparently the mandate of PACAPS!
 - Together with the COMESA and CAADP efforts, PACAPS has influenced policy through the new Ministry of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands.

2.1.3 RCPM

- 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.

2.2 ELMT

Findings

Since an ELMT evaluation is being carried out concomitantly, this section of the RELPA evaluation will not be NGO specific. Rather it will provide an overview of what has been carried out in the last two years by the program as a whole. Many of the consortium members started work at different times and each NGO tended to concentrate *de facto* on a specific intermediate result (IR), according to expertise. Numerous initiatives by ELMT to increase livelihood resilience have been undertaken. Some are beneficial, some did not have time to bear fruit, and some are extension of traditional interventions that do not suggest an innovative approach. However, the real issue is whether any of these initiatives can be scaled up to accommodate an estimated 10-20 % annual ‘drop out’ rate from pastoralism.

RELPA was designed to bring about increased resilience to drought. In the pastoralist context it is also about reducing poverty within the vulnerable groups, which need to be defined. In Kenya, the PRSPs define all ASALs as poor, without recognizing that there is a marked difference between for example, the resource poor Turkana or other destitute pastoralists, and the wealthy or middle-income pastoralists such as Somalis in the three countries, who have considerable business acumen and enjoy good communications.

ELMT addressed the following six IRs:

- IR1. Protection of livestock-based livelihoods during emergencies (drought).
- IR 2. Improved livestock production, health and marketing.
- IR 3. Enhanced Natural Resources Management (NRM).
- IR 4. Alternative and complementary livelihood strategies.
- IR 5. Strengthening the capacity of customary institutions in peace building, civil governance and conflict mitigation.
- IR 6. Stronger pastoralist ‘voice’ in dryland policy formulation and implementation.

The ELSE/ELMT brief of Oct 30 2009 mentions only IR 1, with two outcomes and one output (Annex). Confusingly, Outcome 1 then has eight numbered points, so it is difficult to relate the brief to the original ELMT document. Then, to confuse further, the undated RELPA/ELMT brochure refers to the six IRs as ‘outputs’ so it is clear that there was some lack of understanding in the program between intermediate results, outcomes and outputs.

Activities reported

- Harmonization of early warning (EW) system, and efforts towards integrating the traditional and modern EW systems conducted
- Multi-agency EW assessments and analysis meetings supported/organized
- PIA on the drought response intervention
- Refresher training on contingency planning developed and updated by District Steering Groups (DSGs) including provision of contingency funds to district level Disaster Management Committees. Based on the contingency plan, funds were secured in some cases. There was some limited early response (ER) to emergencies, including water provision from tankers and limited supply of fodder to breeding animals. Through leveraging from other projects, some funds were diverted to emergency situations e.g. funds from the ECHO-funded RREAD in Mandera Central for rapid response teams and to increase livestock offtake, support to borehole development and provision of fuel subsidies to boreholes as the stress period prolonged.
- EW collection and information centers were started and linked to the national peace building and conflict mitigation office. EW systems were strengthened through conflict sensitivity linkages between food and peace monitors
- Enhanced knowledge and understanding was fostered on drought preparedness

Evaluation findings on the specific IRs

IR 1. Protection of livestock-based livelihoods during emergencies (drought).

- Pastoralism is a livestock-rearing livelihood that is, and will probably continue to be, the most efficient and effective use of grass and forage in semi-arid and arid land.
- Pastoralism appears to be in transition from a low-input, milk-based subsistence activity towards a commercial rearing enterprise. The incentives for herd growth are both cultural and economic. While the primary incentive for selling livestock is still expedience, there is evidence that pastoralists are becoming market orientated.
- Traditional grazing corridors are often trans-boundary; therefore a regional approach to pastoralism is beneficial and logical, but it is also problematic and complex.
- Traditional movement patterns are increasingly being squeezed. Land with potential for more lucrative activities such as irrigated agriculture is being acquired, which is also reducing grazing areas. Conflicts between pastoralists and farmers, and between clans and tribes, will continue to increase owing to land pressure and competition for resources. This situation is exacerbated by some pastoralists' tendency to settle.
- There is some evidence that livestock-based livelihoods have been marginally protected against drought by commercial de-stocking, providing cash for livelihoods, and fodder production. However the magnitude of the problem was apparently beyond the scope of RELPA. For instance during the 2009 drought in Kenya, large but unspecified numbers of animals have died and more people are on famine relief than ever before.
- Any attempt to understand, let alone address the problems of cross-border pastoralism (i.e. livestock-based livelihoods) in two years is optimistic. Increasing pastoralists' resilience to drought in such a short time was also not a feasible goal in the short time period.
- The term pastoralist 'dropout', which is common parlance in development jargon, is fundamentally pejorative because it suggests that some people are too indolent or ill equipped to continue the pastoralist way of life. A pastoralist is not born a pastoralist any more than a development worker is born a development worker. Some pastoralists are making a rational livelihood transformation into more sustainable and more profitable/ less risky ways of life. Others are forced out of the traditional way of life by loss of assets, disease or poor management and some are migrating to peri-urban centers where some become urban poor.
- Although many pastoralists continue their transhumant way of life, numerous former pastoralists consulted in this evaluation stated that they preferred the settled way of life where they could have access to services (health, water, commerce and education). The importance of this statement indicates the magnitude of livelihood interventions needed to absorb this volume of people that exit.
- Livelihoods had been divided into livestock-based, alternative, and complimentary. The evaluation team added to this **competitive** (e.g. crop production on land previously used as dry season grazing [often near rivers]) and **negative** (livelihoods that reduce biodiversity or cause land degradation [tree felling and charcoal burning]). IR4 deals with alternative and complimentary livelihoods.

IR 2. Better livestock production, health and marketing.

- The Borana have adopted camel production in recent years as a natural response to bush encroachment and high mortality of cattle in overgrazed landscapes and during drought. Camel keeping can therefore be regarded as an enhanced form of traditional cattle pastoralism. This is a natural trend that has been ongoing for 25 years.
- The establishment of a camel forum (FAO/CARE/SC-US) in Ethiopia has been a positive impact of ELMT as it has brought civic society, governments and camel owners together from both the Horn of Africa and the Middle East to discuss management, health, nutrition, destocking and marketing issues. The 14th KCF was sponsored by ELMT in Moyale and was the largest gathering in the region to discuss camel husbandry. Participants from Ethiopia joined this meeting for the first time.
- The purpose of the Camel Forum is to provide an overview of the status of research and development of Ethiopian camels, as well as guidelines and an Action Plan to motivate both

Government and the private sector. These are currently being produced. The Camel Forum had significant input in bringing together key actors-camel owners, government officials, organizations, research and higher learning institutions and private sector players to deliberate on issues pertaining to camel development. The deliverables from this annual forum were a deeper understanding of the camel, insight into value-addition, and commercialization of the camel and camel products. Such a forum also creates opportunity to promote peace among the various camel keeping communities in Kenya; as well as influencing policies so as these address camels and the pastoralist behind it.

- There is great potential in scaling up the camel milk trade regionally by improving hygiene, cold storage, and marketing. There is a big market in Nairobi, Hargesa and even the UAE.
- Camel meat production also needs to be taken to scale. WFP have finally allowed locally produced livestock products to be used for food aid and there is potential in the drying of meat (particularly camel meat) at the end of the wet season in preparation for the next dry season or drought.
- Support to livestock marketing and milk processing cooperatives: in Kenya a partnership was forged with the Kenya Camel Association (KCA) which implements value addition. CAHWs have been transformed into Camel Service Providers (CASPROs), as most CAHWs lack practical knowledge of camel husbandry, yet it is the key species in the drought-prone area of Mandera Triangle. Training effected in collaboration VSF-Suisse and reinforced animal health and husbandry training with strong emphasis on camels. Training increased knowledge on management, health and treatment of camels, weight estimation and value addition on camel products. Linkage was established between the Government of Kenya (GoK) trainers and the CASPROs in disease surveillance and reporting (some CASPROs are submitting monthly reports to District Vets). A CASPRO training manual in being finalized.
- Capacity building has been done for the Pastoralist Production Groups (PPGs), which are legal entities engaged in commercial livestock production and marketing. The initial models were the Kenya Livestock Producers Association (KLPA) and the Kenya Livestock Marketing Council (KLMC), both private trading companies set up to access credit through the equity banks. This was not realized because the partner bank, Equity has not been transparent in sharing reports on loan uptake and there is still a poor marketing strategy for the loan facility. There were concerns about Sharia-compliance of the loans as such most Moslem traders shied away from the credit. Other reasons for poor uptake were inadequate collateral within the pastoralist context and the bank's insistence on applying the conventional loan procedure requirements. Under these circumstances PPGs could not access the loan facility in the second year as planned.

Animal Health

- Animal health is discussed in two contexts, national and community-based. National attitude to disease control varies by country. Ethiopia tends to take the practical, risk-based concept of FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius, based on the premise that most epizootics cannot be eliminated in the short term. The aim is to ensure safe livestock products by pasteurization and safe meat handling/ canning. The other is the concept of disease-free zones set by the World Organization for Animal Health, which is largely unrealistic but is still aspired to Kenya.
- Within the context of national animal health policies, harmonization was weak and communication was often minimal. ELMT conducted cross-border livestock disease assessment and established links with veterinarians across the border. While pastoralists moved freely through the borders there were no direct links between veterinarians from either side of the border so it was difficult to respond to outbreaks or share information on diseases.

Community Animal Health

- Support to Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs¹) has been on going for the last 25 years². The CAHWs are usually pastoralists themselves and now undertake a complementary livelihood as service providers to other pastoralists. The recent drought has affected the CAHWs: not only did they lose about half of their own livestock but the pastoralists whose livestock they treated have been in no position to pay for the services.
- Training needs and skill gap assessment were carried out, and refresher training conducted for CAHWs to enable them to respond effectively to livestock disease and to improve service delivery.
- Proactive livestock disease mapping was done to plan preventive vaccinations before the outbreak of livestock disease.
- The CAHWs is a sound concept but still difficult to put on a sustainable footing, evidenced by the number of NGOs who still support CAHWs in all three countries.

Rural pharmacies:

The provision of business training to rural pharmacies is a beneficial intervention as it makes it easier for CAHWs to get access to veterinary supplies locally, chiefly antibiotics, anthelmintics, acaricides and trypanocides³. The rural pharmacies buy from Veterinary drug suppliers⁴ who will provide credit and in turn the local pharmacies provide credit and discounts to the CAHWs.

Peri-urban Animal Health Issues:

In all peri-urban centers, the abundance of plastic waste was noted. Widespread ingestion of plastic bags was observed. This causes rumen impaction, decreased digestive efficiency and in some cases death. In discussions with personnel at the Garissa abattoir, it was stated that most of the slaughtered cattle had plastics in the gut. In the Isiolo abattoir the team was told that on one day twenty slaughtered cattle had plastic bags in their rumens.

Livestock Marketing:

The issues of livestock marketing need to be addressed both at the policy level (e.g. COMESA) and at the community level. Of particular importance is to direct intervention toward the primary markets to provide market infrastructure (appropriately designed market sites), market schedules, information dissemination and pricing structure that rewards quality and timeliness of sale, all aimed at ensuring pastoralists receive the best price for their livestock and that they are able to take advantage of this price potential. Market information on livestock prices has increased, but getting this information to producers at the grass roots level has been a challenge. It has also been difficult to institutionalize this process at Government level. Much more work is needed to establish policies and procedures directed towards enhancement of marketing potential as opposed to exploitation. At the grassroots marketing interventions still favor traders over producers.

ELMT established market associations of elders to reduce trade barriers at Moyale, which conducted cross-border market price collection and dissemination to market associations and local government in Moyale. The information flow benefited 1200 households.

IR 3. Enhanced Natural Resources Management (NRM)

¹ Also known as paravets, village animal healthcare workers, *wasaidizii*, or barefoot vets, CAHWs do not received formal veterinary training but are normally trained locally. They can diagnose simple ailments are trained to treat minor infections and worm burdens. They do not administer vaccines for epizootic disease.

² One of the evaluation team attended the 1992 ITDG village animal health care workshop in Feb 1992, which looked at paravet initiatives during the 1980s in Africa, Asia and South America. The discussions centered on the sustainability of village-based animal health care projects in Kenya. 18 years later CAHWs still seem to be supported by donors.

³ Mainly Novidium tablets for cattle (Ksh 50 each) and Triquin for camels.

⁴ E.g. Vet Agro Company in Nairobi

- The condition of most rangelands in the Horn of Africa is deteriorating due to changing rainfall patterns, overgrazing, and poor grazing management. When rain comes, stock and flocks are herded onto the young grass, which is eaten as quickly as possible. This has two major effects: first, primary production is negatively affected (because photosynthesis is a function of leaf area), and second, the grass is never allowed to set seed so the chance of dense swards developing becomes less.
- Improved NRM is the core of increasing resilience to drought but the solution is largely socio-cultural (i.e. community control of grazing) rather than technical (e.g. reseeding).
- Land tenure will increasingly become a serious issue in the arid lands as it has become in the semi-arid lands in Kenya. Already there is pressure on the Kenyan group ranches for sub-division into small plots.
- Improved NRM will come about through greater community control over resources and can be supported by science-based range management training and holistic management which can be used to introduce concepts such as carrying capacity, grazing days and measurement of primary production.
- ELMT supported the concept of holistic management through training at Impala Ranch and limited adoption by the Laikipia Wildlife Forum in Kenya but there was no evidence of widespread adoption by pastoralists. However, the Borana were exposed to the concepts and could easily re-introduce the ideas into their system because holistic management is essentially what they have always practiced.

IR 4. Alternative and complementary livelihood strategies.

- 10-20% of pastoralists are either dropping out or transitioning from pastoralism. Micro-enterprises such as bee-keeping, basket weaving, and camel milk marketing will not be able to absorb this dropout rate. A study was conducted on pastoralist ‘dropouts’ on the Borana plateau to understand the numbers of people transiting and livelihood options these people are engaged in develop an approach that can be used elsewhere.
- Technical Training on income-generating activities included beekeeping and mat weaving to further the product design, development skills, and improve quality of hand-made products for increased incomes for their products.
- The evaluation team visited two women’s groups in Garissa that operate 50 frame hives (Langstroth) donated by the Ministry of Livestock, Arid Lands and ELMT. It was both observed and commented by the women that there was a low colonization of bees. One of the evaluation team members consulted the two top apiculturalists in East Africa for their advice regarding the low population. The advice from one of the experts was:⁵:

“Almost all the frame hives I have seen in Africa have been project-related in some way, or kept by specialized beekeeping enthusiasts. There is no evidence that frame hives have been adopted by peasant farmers in central Africa, apart from being subsidized by projects. I suggest this is because of the high cost of hives, poor construction and availability, and the high defensiveness of the African honeybee. Frame hives are only going to work to advantage if they are well used and understood. If they are badly made to less than an accuracy of 1.6 mm, they will be a menace to work with. In development projects, frame hive technology has not been satisfactory in Africa. Frame hives should be advocated only in exceptional circumstances.”

⁵ Paterson, P. 2005. The basis for success in beekeeping projects. In *“The role of beekeeping in development programmes”* organized jointly by **Bees for Development** and the **Tropical Agriculture Association**. April 2000.

- No explanation was provided as to why the NGOs had secured 50 hives from three different donors to one group of women. Up scaling would have been achieved if ELMT had provided 10 new groups with 2 hives each.
- ELMT trained pastoral dropouts on income generating groups (IGA) training and provided them with seed money. In Kenya, livelihood training was given on hides and skins processing, crop production (in collaboration with the District Agricultural Officer [DAO] in the Ministry of Agriculture).
- A baseline study was carried out to characterize IGAs and identify feasible businesses.
- Provision of small grants (seed money) to develop alternative income generating activities; in some cases the small grants are to scale up existing income generating activities
- Provision of non-formal adult education was an integral part of business skills training. Targeted training was given on cooperative principles, management, leadership, policy and procedure, and negotiation skills;
- Linkages were strengthened between community members and secondary/ tertiary livestock markets; market linkage with cereal traders was facilitated for the pastoral groups/cooperatives.
- The community-managed cereal bank initiative of PLI I was scaled up in Ethiopia, whereby the groups were linked with grain suppliers in the highlands. Communities with no market, or those in remote locations were beneficiaries.
- The following alternative livelihoods options were explored in northern Kenya
 - Camel milk marketing
 - Agricultural development: in many riparian areas, irrigated cropping is becoming common. The elite have already taken possession of the best land for fruit and vegetable growing. Irrigated agriculture could be made more efficient but
 - Pilot fodder production: Irrigated fodder production is not a sustainable option because where water is available, growing fruit, grains or vegetables is much more profitable. An emergency response by donors increasingly is the provision of fodder. This concept needs to be moved from the realm of emergency response to enhanced livelihoods, and from irrigated to rain fed. The preparation and provision of rain fed, high quality dried fodder is easy, cheap and well within the abilities of pastoralists as an enhanced livelihood.
 - Conservation work planning in partnership with Northern Rangeland Trust (Marsabit) such as the possibility of developing a pilot Payment for Environmental Services (PES) scheme.
- Efforts were made in Kenya to create linkages between producer groups and processors. Progress was limited but capacity building was done to enhance the business development skill of the producer groups.
- A field-tested Business Development Skills (BDS) training manual was produced. It can be either country-specific, or for regional use. The development of a draft set of Northern Kenya specific BDS training materials is eliciting interest from a number of organizations, including outside northern Kenya. The training included Introduction to business, Personal aspects of running a business, Business Planning and Adding Value, Market Information and Marketing, Costing and Pricing, Record keeping.
- The BDS training resulted in a number of specific and useful topics including business planning, resource allocation, calculation of profit and loss, market research, negotiation skills and record keeping. A number of individuals have opened bank accounts and diversified into other businesses.
- Establishment of Saving and Credit Groups and linked to the livelihoods groups/enterprises as a strategy to improve economic security and internal resource mobilization. The cumulative savings and number of loans increased, and in some cases an interest-free approach was introduced to the groups (religious beliefs dominant in the area require this).

- ELMT developed a training plan focused on the need for groups to mobilize resources and manage them effectively in order to improve their income and build their businesses. The goal is to initiate as widely as possible business oriented saving and credit groups.

IR 5. Strengthening capacity of customary institutions in peace building, civil governance and conflict mitigation.

- Conflict management has been addressed by many NGOs over the last 25 years with variable success. Yet unless conflict management at a higher Government level is addressed concomitantly, the successes at ground level can be undermined.
- The learning curve in conflict resolution has been steep but rewarding. Most NGOs interviewed have strengths in capacity development for peace building, which has involved the creation and reform of institutions, reduced violence and an increased sense of security.
- ELMT was not directly involved in PEACE II, which is another USAID initiative.

IR6. Stronger pastoralist ‘voice’ in dryland policy formulation and implementation.

- DfID has produced an excellent summary paper entitled “Raising Voice-Securing a Livelihood’ pointing out the problems of marginalized pastoralists. It points out that pastoralist elites and states are engaged in a long game of repositioning and transforming pastoralist-state engagement. The conclusion that results suggest that opening up space for this engagement is both possible and essential if marginalized voices are to be heard and acted upon.
- Nevertheless, despite the optimism of the donors, pastoralists have an ever-decreasing voice and the RELPA program has had insufficient time to demonstrate that the pastoralist voice is stronger because of its existence.

Section 3. Conclusions/Lessons Learned

3.1 RELPA

- Whereas African regional organizations, can initiate regional policy, ultimately such policy must be adopted by the national governments. Since regional bodies have neither sticks nor 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 can pose problems in terms of programming, management and 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 would drive policy, and national governmental institutions would domesticate it. No doubt this was true in terms of the CAADP policy process, which mainstreamed awareness of pastoralists' production into national systems.
- It is not clear however, how COMESA level policy making is relevant to the policy and implementation needs of many pastoralists' community levels.
- Relevant policy at the community level is both formal and informal and is driven both by local governments and community processes (as is made clear by the Maikona peace process). 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 as pastoralists' **voice** in the planning of trans-boundary interventions at the pastoralists' producer level.
- Note, for example, that informal markets, stock routes and mobility are based on **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 review the implementing institutions' track record, especially on the **Do No Harm Framework** from the pastoralists' point of view for it is they who remember both institutional failures and successes. It is this perspective, which should influence the decision, of what locally based institutions to contract, not their longevity in an area alone.
- Significant numbers of donors, who do their projects at the local government and community levels, are domiciled in specific areas for long periods. Typically they **straddle emergency, relief, recovery and development work**. Direction should be concerted toward development of improving livelihoods and as such it is crucial that funding focus needs to be on specific policy generation dialogue at the pastoralists' producer level.

3.2 COMESA

- 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.

3.3 PACAPS

- It appears that initially there was an understanding that PACAPS staff would be based in COMESA headquarters in Lusaka. Ultimately one PACAPS staff was seconded to COMESA, and the remainder of PACAPS personnel were either in Nairobi or Addis Ababa. The argument for this staff placement was 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, coordination became problematic. Interviews with many consortium members emphasized this point. It was also stated that it was only in the second year that coordination in substantive ways took place and this was essentially by 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. Community based animal health services through CAHWS and small-scale veterinary shops offer better options than pastoralists' treatment alone, but these 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.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS /Lessons Learned (COMESA/PACAPS)

RELPA/PACAPS played significant role in educating the COMESA secretariat and the COMESA Council of Ministers of Agriculture (and Livestock) and Environment on the contribution of pastoral livelihood in the economies of member countries, especially those in the Greater Horn of Africa. Evidence has been gathered through studies and searches of databases to both qualify and quantify the contributions of livestock and the dryland ecosystems to the GDP of member countries. These reports are now in the database of COMESA in the form of seminar presentations, study reports, policy papers and policy briefs.

A training program mounted by PACAPS mainly for COMESA staff, but also including staff of strategic partners like AU-IBAR, IGAD and Ministries of Livestock Development in Kenya and Ethiopia, has had positive impact in changing the perceptions about pastoralism among policy makers in these institutions. In fact IGAD is in the process of inaugurating a Livestock program into its working activities.

A functional Regional Livestock and Pastoralism Forum managed by the COMESA secretariat has been established. The main purpose of the forum is to discuss and analyze key issues that need professional input and synthesize such issues for deliberation by the Council of Ministers. Often the synthesis has resulted in key policy formulations for the Council of Ministers.

Key policies drafted through PACAPS initiative and adopted by COMESA Council of Ministers of Agriculture and Environment include:

- i) The recommendation to adopt commodity based trade in livestock products and to have the African union present the agenda to OIE for ratification
- ii) The recommendation for neighboring countries to facilitate cross-border livestock trade from pastoral production systems
- iii) The recommendation to facilitate cross-border mobility of pastoral communities and livestock in search of grazing for their livestock

Within the CAADP process RELPA/PACAPS contributed to ensuring that livestock and pastoralism are given due prominence in the compacts of Kenya and Ethiopia. Livestock development (read: **asset protection**) in the pastoral sector is listed among priority bankable projects in the compacts of these countries. Ethiopia has already launched the national compact while Kenya is in the final stages of the launch of the compact.

Livestock and products trade is of direct interest to a market facilitating institution like COMESA. The secretariat is in the process of finalizing a homemade SPS instrument labeled the "COMESA Green Pass". REALPA/PACAPS has studied the existing as well as the potential livestock and products markets in the COMESA region between Kenya and Mauritius; and between Ethiopia and Democratic Republic of the Congo. Both studies pointed huge potential to expand live animal and products trade in the region, especially by enhancing value addition processes. COMESA is encouraged to enhance trade discussions between these potential partners. The greatest livestock trade destination from the HoA is however the Middle East. The main impediment in trade with ME has been trade bans related to occurrence of Trans-

boundary animal diseases, especially Rift Valley Fever. The process is on going with AU-IBAR, FAO, IGAD and COMESA to have countries of HoA harmonize control strategies of the TADs to win higher level of confidence with the livestock importing countries in the ME.

A draft COMESA **Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas** is under review. The framework will contain evidence that has been gathered in all pastoralist livelihood assets in the region and will argue the case for supportive policies to allow pastoralist live sustainably off their livestock and other assets. The framework presents challenges, especially in form of mindsets, that need to change to allow pastoralism a fair chance in national and regional programming. The framework also argues for protection of assets as mitigation and response measures to natural shocks, like droughts, and de-emphasizes direct food aid that seems to undermine resiliency.

The Early Warning –Early Response activity has increased the dialogue between donors, humanitarian actors and developments agents. It is generally agreed that sufficient EW info is generated via existing agencies on the ground in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia. The main problem has been timeliness of response and the instruments used that are often inappropriate and arriving late. RELPA/PACAPS value in the dialogue has been to use the drought calendar to anticipate the shocks and activate appropriate response measures before the situation develops to emergency stage. The HoA PN developed out of the need to bring regional donors, humanitarian actors and development agents within a common framework and to agree to participate in formulating a common strategy for supporting pastoral development in the HoA. The HoAPN initiative is continuing with funding via the ECHO-Oxfam Drought Disaster Preparedness program.

3.4 RCPM

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

3.5 ELMT

General in the context of RELPA:

- The vision of RELPA, viz. a regional approach to create resilience in dry areas is both necessary and worthwhile. Cross-border programming is an essential adjunct to interventions in the pastoral areas in the Horn of Africa. The RELPA initiative has helped bring this to the fore but the effectiveness was limited.
- RELPA's aim of moving from emergency response ('50 years of Food Aid') to sustainable development (Food Security, Sustainable Trade and Environmental Resilience {FOSSTER}) is a goal of all development workers in the Horn of Africa but it is far from being achieved.
- Two years is an inadequate duration to achieve any of the six intermediate results (IRs) in any significant manner. The bottom line is whether pastoralist resilience has increased in the two years of RELPA's existence and the overall conclusion from interviewees is "not yet".
- RELPA has created and enhanced processes and networks, and increased dialogue between NGOs and other institutions.
- RELPA's approach was cross-border, cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary. This was too ambitious within the time frame. In addition, different countries have different contexts and trajectories, which make the task even harder.
- The design of RELPA was flawed and hence this curtailed the effectiveness of the program. For instance it tried to cram too many activities into two years, it had four separate contractual

- agreements with no adequate management or collaboration interfaces. In the case of ELMT the prosecuting NGOs themselves had management, collaboration and reporting issues.
- The innovative approach of RELPA was to attempt to link in-country activities to similar initiatives across the border. The ELMT consortium was designed to achieve this but despite numerous cross-border workshops and training, it has been difficult to demonstrate that this was successful. ELMT appeared to have moved away from the central tenet of cross-border programming because of the logistical difficulties and the fundamental differences in the politics of the three countries.
 - In view of the fact that numerous institutions in the Horn of Africa have been striving to achieve the above for the past quarter of a century, it is not surprising that the successes in RELPA have been modest. Some of what ELMT has been trying to do has been successful but on a small scale, and is probably the same type of activities the NGOs would have embarked on anyway without RELPA so the value addition is difficult to assess, once the regional initiative has been removed.
 - Bilateral programs could easily support intelligent cross-border programming, but need to initiate a bridging concept.
 - ELMT would have been more worthwhile if it had been truly innovative and sought to go beyond what other organizations are doing, and had realized the magnitude of pastoralists dropping out or transitioning which would have placed a different emphasis on small scale/cottage industry versus the necessity of larger scale planning.
 - A coordinating unit working with six NGOs and at least 30 other partner organizations is unwieldy and complex.
 - There were plenty of examples of “turf wars” between institutions and NGOs at all levels, which made coordination very difficult and numerous suggestions that RELPA’s components did not effectively work together.
 - The widespread view was that the consortium model worked better in PLI (2005-2008) because of the openness and the readiness to listen to others within one country; the fact that it did not work in RELPA was in part the difficulties of a cross-border dimension.
 - The impression was that ELMT did not take advantage of existing experiences in Borana that were outside the consortium. Neither was it apparent that the program took experiences from other countries.
 - Conflict resolution (peace building) initiatives were in general successfully implemented by NGOs particularly when local government and communities worked together and new ideas were tried (e.g. community contracting for infrastructure development). These successes were based on trust and continuity and a field presence established by NGOs over many years.
 - Of the six working groups, only one (NRM) was truly functional in addressing and disseminating best practices, and the Conflict working group was marginally functional.
 - USAID should move away from being judged, and of judging projects on “burn rates”. Slow burn rates are often indicative of projects overcoming hurdles and a cautious approach. They can also allow cost-neutral extensions when time is a more precious asset than financial resources.
 - The benefits of the RELPA program to the beneficiaries are difficult to assess in the short timeframe. Participatory impact assessment (PIA) is an important tool in this regard but as the baseline was not measured, impact will be difficult to demonstrate.
 - The evaluation team considered that RELPA was more centered on getting the program components to work in the short time allotted (two years) than the realities of truly building the resilience of those living in pastoralist areas.
 - At an *ad hoc* meeting in November 2009 on Cross-border contingency planning for livelihoods-based support to discuss incorporating livelihoods planning approaches and long-term pastoral development strategies in a cross-border context, it is clear that most of the humanitarian NGOs and donors are still struggling to come up with answers to how to make livelihoods more resilient to disasters (in particular drought).

- Despite widespread knowledge of drought EW warning, the widely expected outcome of early livestock offtake was not adequately demonstrated. The average response between EW and ER across all donors and NGOs is still at least 5 months and often longer. Greater coordination may reduce this time lag.
- Most of the policy responses to drought at the local level tended to address immediate needs, providing short-term and costly remedies (like water tankers), and attempts to balance competing interests in a charged atmosphere.
- While EW information from numerous sources was generated and reaches the various government offices and NGOs, this is not yet reaching all communities. In many cases EW information failed to trigger appropriate response, in part because coordination between government actors between district and country can be almost non-existent. There is a need to develop and implement a contingency plan and operational framework. Where timely contingency plans bring about significant impact e.g. in the case of the Dollow, the contingency planning process and response activities, and inflexible funding mechanisms can curtail the ER based on the contingency plans. Most plans did not explain or say where the funds will come from. Having a local level contingency fund is the key to the successful implementation of contingency plans. In-built 'crisis modifier' funds can allow NGOs to shift budget from development to emergency activities in the event of crisis.
- ELMT provided technical backstopping and facilitation of community discussion and training on preparedness and early responses but the widespread view was that the impact was modest in view of the other constraints.
- RELPA tried to improve contingency planning and early response through PACAPS and ELMT focused on government and NGO-led contingency plans at local level. Understanding the challenges and limitations of contingency plans in pastoral areas preceded this.
- A review of the contingency plans in place indicated a lack of detailed livelihood analysis and understanding; the following was lacking:
 - No clear objective or purpose for undertaking different livelihood interventions;
 - A lack of early warning trigger;
 - A lack of defined roles and responsibilities at the local and national level;
 - A lack of contingency fund or resources to implement planned drought response activities;
 - Too much focus on food aid and too little on livelihood protection; lack of preparedness

Livelihoods and savings groups

- Lessons from previous USAID programs could be used for scaling up if past experiences are learnt from. For instance the cereal banking groups were initiated during the PLI I and in RELPA these were scaled up to reach more beneficiaries, by providing seed money, and promoting adult literacy and accounting skills, thereby addressing two of the common problems, working capital and illiteracy.
- Formation of saving and credit groups is not an end in itself. Once the voluntary groups are formed, there is a need for capacity building in creating a group that develops mutual trust, maintains coherence, and preserves the cultural advantages. Saving over extended periods and creating workable by-laws are pre-requisites to the provision of seed money to help boost working capital.
- There were variations both in the amount of seed money provided and in the timing when the seed money was given out to groups. There is a need for guidelines in pastoral settings, which could serve in standardizing the approach in the establishment of saving and credit groups, as well as in defining the relevant training to strengthen the group's organization.

Livestock Marketing

There is a great deal of cross-border trade between the three countries. This has probably always existed but is driven more these days by price differentials than pastoralists' innate non-observance of international borders. However, the days of uncontrolled cross-border animal and human movement are probably numbered in view of security issues. Ultimately, geopolitical reality will ensure that security agenda will

always trump livelihood issues. But in the meantime, it should be clearly demonstrated that a free trade area is more profitable than an over-controlled border. It is also interesting to note that Ethiopia is now moving strongly towards a free trade area and away from its former isolationist stance. At present, cross-border trade probably favors Ethiopia since large numbers of cattle from Kenya move north to Ethiopia where the prices are much better. Yet the evaluation team saw no substantive economic and quantitative analysis of cross-border trade and this should be undertaken.

Animal health

Training and capacity building is always worthwhile. On the ground, the evaluation team repeatedly came across 'initiatives' that had been inherited from other NGOs. For example, the CAHW work of VSF-Suisse had been taken over from the EU Emergency project (2008-9). Before that Farm Africa had been training the CAHWs. Prior to that, the Italian NGO COOPI had run the program in 2002-4 and they took over from the Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid (CORDAID), which left in 2001. It is difficult to see the value addition but leaves an impression that the wheel is being constantly reinvented.

Natural Resources Management (NRM)

- Land degradation is inextricably linked to land tenure and competition forever-increasing resources. RELPA-ELMT did not address this issue in any serious way.
- Improved NRM is the core of increasing resilience to drought. The solution is largely socio-cultural rather than technical. 'Holistic management' (HM) has been practiced by the pastoralists for centuries with very good effect. HM manages resources (people, land and money) in 'wholes', as one indivisible unit. It reaches decisions through a holistic 'process' approach using 'knowledge blocks learning' (setting aside the dominant mechanical 'systems' approach to decision making). The complexities of such an approach are taken into account and decisions made are tested to ensure that they are economically, socially and environmentally sound. It is debatable whether HM can play a major role in the pastoralist setting because it suggests that the solution to land degradation is technical.
- The "Savory method" is one technique for grazing control and increasing grass germination. The method of intensive grazing using cattle to get seed into the soil certainly has a beneficial effect on some soils prone to capping. The method was widely used with good effect both in Africa and the Middle East before the technique became eponymous and it is one of several useful techniques that could be used to improve range condition. The NRM working group in Ethiopia has produced Practical Rangeland Management guidelines.
- Of far greater importance is the community control of grazing management. The problems and the solutions are socio-cultural not technical. Improved NRM will not come about without community control over resources. This control existed when customary institutions and low animal numbers allowed unrestricted transhumance to better grazing and recovery of grazed areas. Today, outsiders, who may be other pastoralists or agriculturalists from the higher potential zones, are squeezing traditional pastoralists. Encroaching bush means camel and goat keepers invade the cattle areas. Droughts in one area coupled with low primary production mean that other tribes/clans/ groups are forced into new areas to keep their livestock alive. This creates conflict, exacerbated by the need for water.
- Enhanced NRM must entail control over land by either individuals or groups. The precedent has been set in Kenya with communal ranches but this often ends up with members wishing to privatize their own share through sub-division and fencing, which is an untenable option in arid lands (and marginal in semi-arid lands).
- Eventually arid areas may all be privatized and registered. The inevitability of this can be seen in Kenya over the last 20 years where huge swathes of semi-arid land and community ranches have been surveyed, subdivided and sold, a scenario quite unthinkable in the 1970s. Even the Borana system has become increasingly fractured owing to land use/ land tenure issues and forced movements.
- The menace of invasive plants (in particular the exotic bush *Prosopis juliflora* and the native *Acacia drepanolobium*) is spreading in many of the RELPA areas. In Dollo near Mandera,

Prosopis is spreading at a rate of 2.5 km a year and the issue of use vs. eradication has not been resolved.

4.0 Recommendations

Based on findings, conclusions and lessons learned the RELPA evaluation team determined the following recommendations.

1. Trans-boundary peace building must continue in order to provide any meaningful regional development and to optimize resources within any given region.
2. Trans-boundary and pastoral areas infrastructure build up is a necessity for absorption of the numbers of individuals that either dropout or transition from pastoralism.
3. Regional pastoralism trans-boundary mobility policy development through COMESA-ACTESA/ IGAD must be emphasized and reinforced.
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. Budget 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. The significant financiers in trans-boundary pastoralist areas are DFID, EU, FAO, WB, and DGIS. There should be coordination among these entities, in conjunction with 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 for ongoing regional development, however, they should be mixed with LNGOs and the private sector, and their program activities should be disaggregated from their normal programs such that innovative approaches toward magnitude are incorporated into design and that they emphasize bridging of bilateral activities into a regional environment.

COMESA

USAID has already decided to fund COMESA-ACTESA. Some of their activities will be inputs to CAADP, trade, and trans-boundary disease control. These activities should be funded in the long-term by perhaps a consortia of donors.

IGAD, which sits in COMESA as an observer, has complementary activities to COMESA and specifically works for HoA. Its reach is long and effective. Therefore, it is sensible for donors to design joint long-term programs with them.

PACAPS

- 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 (Completed activities and will not continue but the following activities should be considered or integrated into another program)

- 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.

A regional program should be continued utilizing the initiating work under RELPA and carrying forward momentum, presence and work accomplished. The program should be designed and implemented to improve and enhance the livelihoods of the populations living in Pastoral areas of Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia.

The program should first take an appropriate time (6 months) to construct a design that will be effective, appropriate, be doable, have a contracting mechanism providing management as well as collaboration, have realistic goals, and ultimately have input from recognized professionals with definable presence and knowledge in working with Regional entities, Ministries and bilateral organizations at the policy or intervention level and, at the community level. Those individuals should have relationship building experience and for local level work should have a strong knowledge of the socio-culture as well as technical considerations necessary to develop a program aimed at improving and enhancing livelihoods. The program should be designed long enough to provide continuity, acceptance, the ability to be adaptable in a changing world, and most of all sufficient in time to allow the “actors” to catch up to the content. It is suggested that 15 years is the minimum, and this could be phased into three five year increments with each successive phase tailored to progress made in the previous phase. The design should lay out specific levels of effort and responsibilities for the contracting/management entity and it is strongly suggested that full time LOE be advocated. Part time involvement as evidenced in RELPA is does not appear to be an efficient nor effective mechanism for success. The design should stress not only personnel with experience, but with relationship and leadership skills. Criteria for contracting entities should not just be based on area presence alone, nor on projects done, but in the ability to inaugurate innovation based on community needs in a changing and challenging world.

The subsequent program should have both a Policy component and a Livelihood component and must have a strong management structure to ensure success. One approach put forth herein would be to center the program around a Regional Management Unit (RMU) Figure 1 (put the organizational chart in here.)

The RMU is envisioned to be a stand-alone entity that would have the ability to inter phase with either COMESA or IGAD or both. This flexibility would allow to changing emphasis or country affiliation, which seems to be the current case and would also allow for more of a broad regional perspective (COMESA) of market and trade policy and providing support for the CAADP framework, and a more Horn of Africa perspective (IGAD). The RMU will provide a conduit for regional activities and its purpose is four fold:

- Adapting,
- Bridging,
- Channeling
- Linking.

Adapting relates to those activities associated with Livelihoods in the Pastoral areas and addresses the fact that there are differentiations in socio-cultural perspectives, practices, perceptions and levels of change or intervention acceptability or absorption. Tailoring policy, training, technical input and policy are critical for success.

Bridging refers to the horizontal exchange, connection and transference between bilateral entities, National Governments, donors and all parties interested in a regional approach to development.

Channeling refers to the vertical exchange of information between the local, national and regional levels to address the “community voice” and policy. The flow goes both ways.

Linking is reaching out to regional and local partners for exchange of information, sharing of ideas, and coordination so that redundancy is kept to a minimum, best practices are standardized, harmonization of policy advocacy, development activities are replicated or modified and adapted, and that partners are able to capitalize on synergies, complementarities and not on competition, The goal here is to become more efficient, cost effective in driving benefits to the community through a collective and concerted representation of donors and field workers.

Objectives:

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

Staffing policy:

- The staff should have professional and working experience in pastoral areas as well as management over and above technical competence in fields like NMR, Livelihoods, Policy, Peace Building and Participatory Approaches.

Contract:

- The contracting should specify the contractor’s budget and the development budget.

Qualification of Implementers:

- RMU should audit knowledge and livelihood track record of the institutions and individuals to be subcontracted for field implementation of trans-boundary pastoralists’ ER and development programs.
- Contracts to specific institutions should be activity specific and not obligation of resources to an entity because it is working in an area which is trans-boundary or proximate to such an area.

Development Budget Obligation:

- Seventy per cent of all development budget resources given to RMU should be spent at pastoral communities level, 30% at regional and national levels each.

National Governments’ Clearance:

- RMU must develop the program through dialogue with national governments on the national institutions, which will carry trans-boundary pastoralists’ policies, programs and projects at regional, national and local levels.

- RMU will have to clear with such institutions 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.

Specific Themes:

(Note that the outputs of the themes at all times be targeted to regional, national and local levels in ascending order.)

REGIONAL (COMESA/ACTESA and IGAD)

1. Build on previous achievements in supporting 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 policy 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 trade policies and trading clearances equally favorable to pastoralist.
6. Develop region wide livestock disease control programs to assure regional and international trade.

NATIONAL

7. Domesticating the policies created for the region by regional bodies above.
8. The premier national governments policy requirement is official recognition of the necessity of protecting trans-boundary pastoralists' mobility, production and livelihoods.
9. Each government will have to decide where to anchor pastoralists ER and Development concerns. In the region such concerns are either in agriculture and/or livestock line ministries or area specific ministries.
10. A subset 7 above is that states must recognize that the benefits of trans-boundary pastoralism will be regional and cannot be disaggregated to specific countries without limiting mobility and pastoralism. Such policy must be formally communicated to the states' lower levels of government.
11. Where sensitive activities, e.g. peace building, are needed, the supervision locales in the national government and its lower levels should be specified to donors.
12. Policy on Peace Building ought to be domesticated at the national level by coordination of the concerns of the ministries concerned about security and those involved in the development of pastoralists for it is on the issue of security that past programs have floundered.
13. Policy on which pastoralists' areas are to be foci of programs and projects should be cleared by those national entities primarily interested in security and pastoralist development activities before RMU chooses program implementers. In the past it is the program implementers who sought such clearances.
14. A significant subset of 11-14 above is that there should be a Peace Building specialist at the RMU tasked with following clearances on operational areas at national levels.
15. National governments should have a working group of its agencies from coordinating the raising of donor funds for long-term pastoralist development, which are distinct from emergence and disaster funds.
16. Such should be a working group, including RMU, and not a network.
17. A further subset is that this working group should have its own identity and not a subset of the disaster working groups found in some countries in the region.

LOCAL

{Note by local level we mean regions/provinces, districts /woredas and ultimately pastoralists community organizations where specific projects are to be implemented. Further, policies at this level are both formal and informal}

18. Positive local government coordination, supervision and facilitation of pastoralists' development activities should be formalized by discussions led by national governments, and including the local governments and communities.
19. That there are situations where communities can initiate such discussions should be recognized by national and local governments and included in long term government development planning.

- Examples of the later are the Maikona Peace Agreement, which has ultimately led to coordination by two states. Another example is the traditional movement of livestock through historic trade and grazing routes in spite of conflict and or lack of systemic peace.
20. Peace building policy to diminish conflict, and to support CSSD and Do No Harm should be acknowledged by national and local governments. This will only be possible if driven by national government.
 21. Policy on pastoralists' youth development activities is crucial in the long-term sustainability of pastoralists' households. It is estimated that youth form 60-65% of the regions pastoralists' communities. Therefore projects targeting youth should be at least fifty percent of the budgetary commitment to the pastoralists' communities.
 22. Policies supporting women, who drive inter-generational survival and health of the pastoralist communities, should be the second priority.
 23. Local governments should affirm policy favoring systematic Participatory Approaches for pastoralists have knowledge, which generally is not used by many development implementers, donors and governments.
 24. Therefore, program design and project activity specification should be driven by upward dialogue involving pastoralists' communities, local governments and specific implementers within already agreed national frameworks.
 25. Within the PIA process of identifying development priorities, youth and women should be given hearing for in some socio-cultural setups, their voices are marginalized.
 26. There should be policy that local level implementers should build community capacities to the extent that they make themselves redundant at the end of the program. Such specification needs to be included and monitored from identification to closure.
 27. 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 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 local level. Such an approach may be the key in generating pastoralists' long-term land policy.

ELMT Any successor to RELPA/ELMT might consider the following ideas:

- Design should be done in collaboration with the pastoralists themselves.
- It should NOT be to emulate or duplicate what all the other agencies are doing but should be innovative, flexible and opportunistic and should be preceded by a serious philosophical review of the issues and potential solutions. Creative thinking will be required.
- It should be less ambitious, more bottom-up and more practical. It is better to have two achievable IRs that are modest in scope and likely to succeed than a hugely ambitious program.
- It should be long-term: the WB/IFAD/ Ministry of Federal Affairs Pastoral Community Development Program (PCDP) in Ethiopia is a phased 15-year program and any future program should be given a similar time-scale.
- More needs to be done to shift from crisis management to a more proactive approach to risk management, which emphasizes preparedness, mitigation, prediction and EW targeted at the grass root level.
- Pastoralism is a dynamic system that is changing drastically. The phrase "We are trying to preserve pastoralism" was heard on various occasions. The aim should not be to preserve pastoralism but to enable it to adapt and cope with the numerous pressures that threaten it.
- A future program should try and work with one or two NGOs that have a strong regional focus.
- The program should consider four focal points (e.g. Moyale, Mandera, Garissa and Dollo Odo/ Dollo Bay).

- More preliminary consultation with NGOs and bilateral institutions (e.g. Oxfam, OFTA, DfID), which have long experience in cross-border programming, would be constructive even if they were not or cannot be recipients of USAID funding.
- Training for implementers is still needed on conflict sensitivity, management training and decision-making but one is forced to ask what RELPA/ELMT's added value is from addressing these issues when probably every NGO addresses the same issue with a great deal more experience.
- Contingency plans should link emergency and development activities that can allow them to be more realistic and address both long term and emergency response activities.

NRM

- Primary production is the basis of the pastoral system. The most serious threat facing pastoralists is probably not climate change⁶ but land degradation and overgrazing, which together drastically reduce annual biomass production. Primary production can be greatly enhanced by good range and traditional grazing practices and these should now be a priority for any future program.
- NRM is the key tool for raising primary production but NRM can only be done where the land users (groups or individuals) have complete control over the land.
- A successor to RELPA could grasp this nettle and negotiate with Governments to grant long leases (999 or 99 years) to groups who would then have sole control over the land. The areas must be large enough (250,000-500,000 ha) to allow seasonal grazing. Groups might allow others to graze on payment of grazing rents on 'per animal/ per week' basis but this would need strong control.
- To achieve the requisite trans-boundary element to the program it is recommended that the program preempt the inevitability of land tenure change in semi-arid lands and explore the logistics of developing community ownership in two areas in Ethiopia and Kenya. This would involve long negotiations with the governments and communities.
- Biodiversity conservation should be included within NRM. A system of village conservation areas (25-50 ha) should be established around settlements both as a dry season fodder reserve, a seed bank, a protein bank and as a supply of ethno-medicine.
- Special attention should be paid to strengthening or restoring the inherent adaptive capacity of pastoralists. Initiatives started by outsiders seldom last: there is strong need to build or revive community-driven customary institutions.
- Water provision is a central issue to all pastoralists. NRM should include a look at infrequent watering of livestock as a method of coping with drought. At present water is always the number one priority in any PRA. Yet restricting water to livestock saves 25-30 percent of livestock water needs, reduces dry matter intake and metabolic rate with no deleterious effects on mortality, and allows greater access to remote grazing areas (>20km from water).
- Soil and water conservation (SWC) should be an integral part of NRM and should cover both water conservation in soil to reduce runoff, and rainwater harvesting from structures (schools and institutions) with large areas of corrugated iron roofs. Water is becoming a critical issue: the water table around Isiolo has dropped 45m owing to upstream irrigation and many former perennial rivers are drying up for part of the year.
- A future program should concentrate its efforts on say four focal points locations (e.g. in reasonable distance from the four offices in Mandera, Moyale, Garissa and using the Millennium Village Model).
- Formal (i.e. Government) land use planning (LUP) should be done either in close consultation with pastoralists or preferably after community-based LUP has been done. The latter should be a consultative process whereby the land users themselves should demarcate what land should be used for dry season grazing reserves, community conservation areas, and enclosure. Traditional grazing lands need to be delineated by good land use planning. Pastoralists need the voice to ensure that their lands are both controllable and controlled. The tragedy of the commons was that

⁶ There is no evidence of lower annual rainfall in the ASALs of the Horn of Africa, only more unpredictable rainfall.

land was not controllable. No man's land will soon become one man's land and the precedents are already there.

- Charcoal production could be made considerably more efficient with improved kilns. Likewise, solar cookers have a place in ASALs.