



# Evaluation Of the Regional Pastoral Programme in the HECA Region

Full Report

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

March 2009

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Cathy Watson, Mike Wekesa

## Executive Summary

This review of the Oxfam GB Regional Pastoral Programme was carried out between January and March 2009, to assess the programme's impact, effectiveness and added value. The RPP was initiated in 2003 as a regional programme encompassing the individual pastoral programmes in 6 of the 8 countries in the HECA Region, together with a regional component. This review addresses only the regional component, hereafter referred to as the RPP.

Largely because of the organisational changes within Oxfam GB, including the shift to Country Programmes (CPs) as the key business unit, the RPP has become relatively detached from the country pastoral programmes and no longer plays a coordinating role. It has also suffered from a lack of institutional understanding and support as well as from the more general uncertainty surrounding regional roles vis-à-vis the CPs. The RPP currently carries out four key functions: information sharing; managing specific projects (namely ROSP, DCM/IPL, and REGLAP); technical backstopping for CPs; and some involvement in cross-border work.

Pastoralists continue to be significantly marginalised economically, politically and socially across the region, and the mobility that underpins their livelihood strategies presents a challenge for both relief and development interventions. The need for a regional approach to many of the key issues facing pastoralists is recognised by most stakeholders.

The **key achievements** of the RPP over the last three year phase, whereby value has been added to Oxfam (largely internally) include: information sharing and technical support; training and capacity building; some key outputs of the specific RPP projects; and helping to sustain a regional perspective on pastoralist issues within Oxfam. The greatest value added is still potential – yet to be realised.

The **constraints and challenges** the RPP has faced comprise: the lack of clarity on the RPP's mandate, lack of institutional support and understanding about the aims and origins of the programme; absence of a clear fundraising strategy; high staff turnover and loss of institutional memory; and the failure to maximise external linkages and advocacy opportunities.

The **conclusion** of the Review is that there is a justifiable need for a pastoral component at regional level, but different from the RPP. This conclusion is based on the continued marginalisation of pastoralists and the need to address pastoral issues at the regional level; Oxfam GB's experience and reputation in this field; the potential for a regional initiative to implement Oxfam's 'one programme approach' since many of the key issues relate to governance, to livelihoods and to humanitarian response rather than only one of the three; and the consequent opportunity to 'mainstream' pastoralism in the region using a 'twin track approach'.

The main **recommendation** of the Review therefore is that a Regional Pastoral Initiative (RPI) be established, with a clear mandate and institutional support from the organisation. Five key functions are recommended: advocacy and policy with regional institutions; promoting learning; support to cross-border work; facilitating capacity building on specific issues ('mainstreaming pastoralism'); and fundraising. A 3-year Strategy has been developed (available as a separate document) based on these functions, which includes a log frame and detailed ways of working for the future of the RPI.

## Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. BACKGROUND TO THE REGIONAL PASTORAL PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 <i>The origins of the RPP.....</i>	5
1.2 <i>The RPP today .....</i>	5
1.3 <i>The changing organisational context.....</i>	6
1.4 <i>The external context: pastoralism in the Horn and East Africa.....</i>	7
<b>2. ACHIEVEMENTS AND VALUE ADDED OF THE RPP .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 <i>Key achievements .....</i>	9
2.2 <i>Value added .....</i>	10
<b>3. CONSTRAINTS, CHALLENGES AND KEY LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4. COORDINATION, LINKAGES AND RELATIONSHIPS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. KEY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1 <i>Key conclusions.....</i>	16
5.2 <i>Recommendations .....</i>	17
<b>ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Review.....</i>	21
<i>Annex 2: People Consulted .....</i>	23
<i>Annex 3: Documents Consulted .....</i>	25
<i>Annex 4: Pastoral Populations in the HECA Region.....</i>	27
<i>Annex 5: Summary of RPP-managed projects.....</i>	28
<i>Annex 6: The Role of Pastoralism in the National Change Strategies.....</i>	29
<i>Annex 7: List of Acronyms.....</i>	31
<i>Annex 8: Acknowledgements.....</i>	31

## Introduction

Oxfam GB's Regional Pastoral Programme (RPP) was initiated in 2003 to address the poverty and marginalisation of pastoralists in the Horn and East Africa. The programme covers 6 of the 8 countries in the Horn, East and Central African Region (HECA): Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. The RPP was originally conceived as an integrated programme across the HECA Region, comprising individual pastoral programmes within each of the 6 countries, supported by a regional component.

This Review takes place at the end of the second 3 year phase of the RPP, and in the context of restructuring at the HECA Regional Centre (see Section 1.3 below). The main objective of the Review is: *to assess the impact or effectiveness of the Regional Pastoral Programme to date, and in particular to assess the added value of the regional coordination body on programme impact within country programmes*. The outcome of this Review were used as a basis for developing a strategy for Oxfam's work on pastoralism at the regional level. The full Terms of Reference are attached below as Annex 1.

The Review was carried out between January and March 2009. The methodology was based on the following process:

- Interviews (either face-to-face or by telephone) with country directors, country pastoral programme staff, and regional staff (see Annex 2 for full list)
- Interviews with OGB partners and other external stakeholders (see Annex 2)
- A review of programme reports and relevant documentation (listed in Annex 3)
- Circulation of a first draft of the Review Report to all contributors
- A workshop (held on 11<sup>th</sup> -12<sup>th</sup> March) with key pastoral programme staff to discuss the first draft of the Review Report and formulate a Strategy for the way forward
- Presentation and discussion of the Review findings and Strategy with members of the Regional Management Team (16<sup>th</sup> March)
- Finalisation of the Review Report and Strategy (the Strategy is available as a separate document)

# 1. Background to the Regional Pastoral Programme

## 1.1 The origins of the RPP

Pastoralists comprise at least 12% of the population of the six focus countries in the HECA Region (see Annex 4 for population data) and are considered to be among the most vulnerable and marginalised in the region. The RPP was established in recognition of this and the fact that many of the issues pastoralists face are common across national boundaries in the region, largely as a result of the mobility that underpins their livelihood strategies, crossing international and local borders.

The RPP was established in 2003 as a 15 year programme, with the explicit intention of making an institutional commitment on the part of Oxfam to long-term pastoral development in the region. The aim of the RPP was: *to support pastoralists to integrate more effectively into political, social and economic systems, enjoying the same rights and fulfilling the same obligations as other citizens.* As such, the programme was considered to fit within Oxfam's Strategic Aim 4: the Right to be Heard (RTBH). The overall thrust of the programme was on the empowerment (both political and economic) of pastoralists through their own institutions - in particular to develop a movement of pastoral organisations across the region - and on increasing the awareness and understanding of others. This is reflected in the four outputs listed in the RPP log frame, which applied to the individual country-level pastoral programmes as well as to the regional component:

1. Broad-based alliances of pastoral and other organisations improving attitudes towards pastoralism
2. Increase responsiveness of government and other institutions to pastoralists' needs
3. Strong, vibrant pastoral organisations effectively representing the interests of pastoralists
4. Programme developed and managed based on strong learning and sharing, and contributing to wider pastoral development thinking and practice.

The RPP was established to work at four levels: the local level within countries, the national level, cross-border where relevant, and the regional level. Planning was an iterative process between these different levels.

The RPP was reviewed at the end of its first phase, in 2006. Key recommendations from this review included: the continuance of the RPP, including the individual country programmes and the regional component; the need to debate the management of cross-border initiatives and consider addressing the linkages between HIV/AIDS and pastoralism, and between disability and pastoralism; developing new approaches to capacity building in country programmes; building broader alliances at regional level; encouraging debate about future scenarios for pastoral development in the region; and developing the Report on the Status of Pastoralism (ROSP) as an internal and external advocacy tool (Morton 2006).

## 1.2 The RPP today

The RPP has retained the log frame and its associated purpose and objectives, but the nature of the programme has changed significantly since it was originally established, largely due to the internal and institutional changes within Oxfam GB discussed below. The current RPP is based on four key functions:

1. Sharing information and progress between country pastoral programmes, based on the bi-annual Coordination Group meetings
2. Managing specific activities at regional level: the Improving Pastoral Livelihoods (IPL) project, which grew out of work on Drought Cycle Management; the Report on the Status of Pastoralism (ROSP) project; and hosting the Regional Livelihoods Advocacy Project (REGLAP) which is run by a consortium of NGOs including Oxfam GB (see Annex 5 for more details on these projects).
3. Technical backstopping: support to pastoral work within country programmes, generally on an *ad hoc* basis
4. Cross-border work: historically, there has been a lack of clarity about the role the RPP should play in cross-border work. The RPP has been and remains involved in some cross-border projects, although in general the responsibility for such projects rests with the relevant country programmes.

Pastoralism continues to be a key focus of all six country programmes (see the table in Annex 6 which summarises the role of pastoralism in the new National Change Strategies of each country programme), but it is clear that they no longer see themselves as part of an overarching regional programme, as the RPP was originally conceived (henceforth in this report, 'RPP' is used to denote the regional component only, and does not include the pastoral work of the individual country programmes in the region). The lack of support and understanding of the RPP within the region, together with the shifting of some country pastoral programmes to sit within other sectors such as governance or ASAL, means that Oxfam itself may be in danger of contributing to the marginalisation of pastoralists described below in section 1.4.

Although the RPP was established under the governance (RTBH) strategic aim and many people still consider it as a 'rights-based' programme, the table in Annex 6 shows that the actual focus of the work in the various country programmes includes both governance-related activities (capacity and local institution building for example) and livelihoods-based support (for example development of services, support to livestock health and trade). At the same time many pastoral areas are affected by crises of different sorts (in particular drought and conflict) and are therefore the recipients of humanitarian interventions by Oxfam, which may or may not be integrated into the ongoing pastoral 'development' work in the area.

### 1.3 The changing organisational context

The development of the RPP since its inception has been strongly influenced by changes in the organisational context within Oxfam GB. Along with other regional offices around the world, the HECA Regional Office was established in the late 1990s with the aim of increasing coherence, consistency and cost-effectiveness between the individual country programmes in a region. The RPP was established soon afterwards and reflected this concept of coherence and common strategic thinking across the programmes within the HECA Region. However, in 2003-4 there was a shift in organisational policy within Oxfam GB which led to an emphasis on country programmes as the 'key business unit'. As part of this shift, the National Change Strategy process was initiated, whereby each country programme has developed over the last 18 months a strategy outlining the key drivers of change and the changes they wish to contribute to within their country context.

As a result of this shift in organisational policy, the RPP, along with other technical advisory roles based in the Regional Centre, has suffered a degree of uncertainty and lack of clarity about its role in relation to country programmes (as was highlighted in the recent Review of the HECA Regional Centre – see Coventry 2008). Another organisational feature of the evolution of the RPP since its inception has been its

dependence on ‘champions’ of pastoralism and its susceptibility to personnel changes (both within and outside the programme). Rather than an institutional commitment to working on pastoralism in the region (as was anticipated in the creation of a 15-year log frame), the RPP has been somewhat dependent on individuals within the programme, and the personal commitment of key managers outside the programme, for its ability to operate. Changes in these key personnel have affected the way in which the RPP is viewed within the organisation and its perceived legitimacy, as well as contributing to a loss of institutional memory on pastoralism within the Region.

Finally, the HECA Regional Centre is currently undergoing a restructuring process, which also has organisational implications for the RPP. The RPP now needs to justify its contribution to the HECA Region, in particular in terms of added value to country programmes, in the context of a diminishing resource base (particularly with regard to unrestricted funding). This Review aims to present a concrete way forward for the RPP in the light of these challenges, based on the potential of the RPP to contribute to Oxfam’s aims in the region.

#### 1.4 The external context: pastoralism in the Horn and East Africa

As shown in Annex 4, pastoralists comprise a significant proportion of the population of the Horn and East Africa, and form a disproportionate percentage of the marginalised and vulnerable. In many cases this vulnerability may be linked to poverty, but in others it is also a reflection of the challenging environments in which pastoralists live. For example, some pastoralists are asset-rich in terms of livestock ownership, but remain highly vulnerable to external shocks - in particular drought and the increasing effects of climate change - but also to policy shocks as a result of their political and social marginalisation. Devereux (2006) illustrates this distinction between poverty and vulnerability by noting that in some regions of Ethiopia pastoralists are much less likely to suffer from *chronic* malnutrition (compared for example to smallholder farmers in the poor highland agricultural areas) but are much more likely to suffer from *acute* malnutrition in response to shocks.

In spite of some progress in pastoral development in the last two decades, pastoralists in the Horn and East Africa remain largely marginalised from national political, social and economic processes, chiefly as a result of the continued lack of understanding of, and at times prejudice against, pastoral production systems,<sup>1</sup> in particular the strategy of mobility. A continued focus on pastoralism as a livelihood strategy and a way of life therefore remains a priority for development agencies in the region.

John Morton’s recent pastoralism scoping study for DFID (Morton 2008) summarises six key themes which have come to the fore in recent years, building on the ‘new thinking’ with regard to disequilibrium environments which was developed in the 1990s:

1. Addressing the **relief-development continuum**, through for example Early Warning systems, Drought Cycle Management, and Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives
2. Recognising the continued need to address **governance and rights** with regard to pastoral development, and that ‘voice poverty’ constrains development in pastoral areas
3. Increasing access to **livestock markets** and economic infrastructure, vital to address pastoralists’ economic marginalisation

---

<sup>1</sup> For example the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP) states: In recent years there has been a growing consensus that pastoral poverty is rooted in the social, economic and political marginalisation of pastoralists...In order to achieve the twin goals of WISP, rangeland environmental sustainability and pastoral poverty reduction, it is therefore necessary to overcome anti-pastoral prejudice and bring an end to damaging policy and practice. ([www.iucn.org/wisp](http://www.iucn.org/wisp))

4. **Diversifying pastoral livelihoods** and identifying alternative livelihoods for some pastoralists and ex-pastoralists
5. Researching new forms of **economic valuation**, to identify the real contribution of the pastoral economy (projects such as ROSP have a large contribution to make here; see also recent WISP studies on the economic contribution of pastoralism: WISP 2006, 2008)
6. Investigating the possibility of **payment for environmental services** in the future.

Other stakeholders consulted during this Review (for example partners RECONCILE and MPIDO, and the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism – WISP) echoed many of these points, highlighting the importance of strong pastoral organisations, the development of pastoral area infrastructure, and the creation of diverse livelihood strategies as key issues facing pastoralism today. The importance of advocacy to address the negative view of pastoralism which persists among many governments and decision makers in the region was also emphasised by these stakeholders.

One of the key issues that distinguishes pastoralists from others living in arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs), and which necessitates their special treatment, is their mobility and the trans-boundary strategies they employ. This mobility may be linked to production (following natural resources to maximise productivity); to exchange (to obtain access to markets or food aid); or for ‘escape’ (to avoid conflict or drought) (Swift 2008). This movement may not respect international boundaries yet remains vital for pastoralists’ survival. For example, in the 1999-2001 drought, Turkana pastoralists were able to save around 100,000 head of cattle and avoid a major catastrophe by successfully negotiating for water and pasture in the Kidepo National Park in Uganda (Aklilu and Wekesa 2002).

This mobility however presents a number of challenges. First, pastoralists are not easy to reach, and hence dialogue and work with them (for example on censuses, disease control, provision of basic services) is expensive for governments and other agencies. Second, they occupy peripheral areas along national borders and it is sometimes unclear which side they belong to, since a common language is often spoken on both sides of the border – another challenge for national governments. Third, pastoralists’ access to markets, trade, natural resources, goods and services, including veterinary drugs, may involve the crossing of international borders by both people and livestock. Fourth, pastoralist areas are generally drylands with limited infrastructure and frequently insecure, which can act as a disincentive for governments and other agencies to work there. These factors, whilst making work with pastoralists all the more challenging, are also the reason why pastoral development work requires specific strategies to address the trans-boundary nature of their livelihoods and should be clearly distinguished from work with other livelihood groups in ASAL and other areas.

The need to address some of these issues at the regional, as well as national and local, level is increasingly recognised by external stakeholders. For example, the East African Community is in the process of establishing a Technical Steering Committee on Pastoralism, which will aim to provide leadership, coordination and harmonisation for pastoral and drylands development in the EAC region, as the draft Terms of Reference for the committee notes: *‘pastoralism issues are transboundary in nature and therefore require not only national efforts but also regional initiatives’* (East African Community 2008). The commonality of pastoral issues requires this response, at the same time as the acknowledgement of the diversity and heterogeneity of the various pastoral communities within each country.



## 2. Achievements and Value Added of the RPP

Perceptions of the RPP's achievements and value added vary considerably within and outside Oxfam according to the perspective of those consulted. For example, the East African Community and the Arid Lands Resource Management Project within the Office of the President in Kenya, together with Oxfam GB's Somalia Country Programme and the Ngorongoro Pastoral Programme in Tanzania consider the RPP as a useful and important aspect of Oxfam's engagement with pastoralists in the HECA Region. Other agencies such as CORDAID and World Vision also look to Oxfam's regional work with pastoralists as a model for learning and programming, particularly with regard to cross-border work. In contrast, some Oxfam GB Country Directors consulted in this Review felt that support to pastoralism within the region may be adequately delivered under the remit of Country Programmes alone.

This range of views is in part a result of the lack of clarity in the RPP's mandate, particularly in the context of the shift of emphasis to Country Programmes as the 'key business unit', as discussed above in Section 1.3. The programme's rather loose logical framework<sup>2</sup> also contributes, since the four outputs of the programme (as outlined in Section 1.1 above) are not linked to tangible indicators and are hence difficult to monitor progress against. Nonetheless, the RPP has made some significant achievements in the current phase, as summarised below. These achievements are presented according to the four functions listed in Section 1.2, namely: sharing information; managing specific projects; technical backstopping; and cross-border work.

### 2.1 Key achievements

#### **a. Sharing information:**

The RPP facilitates regular regional meetings of Country Pastoral Programme Coordinators who meet together every six months to share lessons and experiences, plan joint actions and allocate responsibility for implementation (see Section 4 below for more details). Meetings have covered topics such as women's empowerment, participation, and cross-border trade, and are generally highly valued by the country-level pastoral staff. The 'expanded' meetings, including project partners, are deemed to be particularly useful. The challenge remains however to ensure follow-up and effective implementation of agreed action points.

#### **b. Specific projects<sup>3</sup>:**

- *Disaster Risk Reduction/Drought Cycle Management Training:* Under the RPP a Drought Cycle Management (DCM) Learning Toolkit was developed to strengthen capacity in DCM and hence improve the timeliness, appropriateness and effectiveness of drought mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities. The training focused on pastoral programme and partner staff, Country Directors and humanitarian programme coordinators as well as regional level managers and advisors. To date this training has been very well received and the training materials well regarded. For example Oxfam and partner staff in Somalia commented that their knowledge and skills in DCM have improved as a result of this initiative. This portfolio has now been expanded to include Disaster Risk Reduction issues and new materials are being developed. This work has the potential to contribute to the integration of Oxfam's humanitarian, development and campaigning work, although this potential has not yet been fully realised.

---

<sup>2</sup> This 'looseness' was deliberate at the start of the RPP, in order to give country programmes flexibility in their interpretation of it. Paradoxically however this looseness has made it difficult for the RPP to monitor and prove its effectiveness.

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 5 for summary of RPP-managed projects

- *Report on the Status of Pastoralism (ROSP)*: ROSP has enormous potential to benefit regional governments and partners in terms of providing much-needed statistics on the contribution of pastoralism to national economies and on the socio-economic status of pastoralists in the countries of the region. However, this potential has yet to be realised. Implementation challenges such as contractual agreements with partners, the lack of an exit strategy, and the absence of a fundraising strategy (see below, Section 3) have also limited the capacity of the ROSP to achieve its potential in the future.
- *Regional Livelihoods Advocacy Project (REGLAP)*: REGLAP is not an Oxfam project per se, but a multi-agency initiative hosted by Oxfam and managed through the RPP. It aims to address a key constraint to pastoral development in the region, namely a lack of sound policy implementation. It is too early to assess the achievements of this project, although it does have significant potential to bring tangible advocacy benefits to the region and to Oxfam's own initiatives.

#### **c. Technical backstopping:**

Some country programmes, for example the Somalia Country Programme and its partners, have requested technical backstopping from the RPP and have benefitted greatly from inputs from for example the Regional DCM/Livelihoods Advisor and the Regional Programme Development Manger in the past. This technical backstopping also includes support to fundraising from external donors. Other country programmes such as Kenya and Uganda rely less on this type of support, and only occasionally consult with RPP technical advisors. In general technical backstopping appears to be carried out on an ad hoc basis and is linked to personal relationships between individuals, rather than institutional arrangements – *'the culture of personal networking to get things done'* (HECA Review, Coventry 2008). There appears however little justification or mandate for continuing this backstopping function in the future, in the current organisational and financial context.

#### **d. Cross-border work:**

Although it has not always been clear what role the RPP should play with regard to cross-border work, the programme is currently involved in coordinating the Somaliland-Ethiopia Cross Border programme and has developed guidelines on managing cross-border work. The RPP has also been asked by five country programmes to coordinate a joint application to the Regional Drought Decision.

## **2.2 Value added**

The status of the RPP as a 'regional component' placed outside the line management structure of the country pastoral programmes means that it needs to be able to prove the added value that it brings to Oxfam in order to justify its existence, hence value added is one of the key questions of this Review. The key areas in which the RPP has added value to Oxfam's work in the current phase are summarised below:

- The existence of the RPP, and more specifically the current RPP Coordinator, has succeeded – in spite of the lack of clarity in mandate and role discussed elsewhere in this report - in ***sustaining a regional perspective*** on pastoralist issues within Oxfam, contributing to regional lesson learning and documentation of these experiences. The presence of a staff member at regional level has also helped to maintain the profile of pastoralism at the regional management level. This is very important for Oxfam's liaison with external stakeholders and also for its own internal institutional memory, particularly because of the high turnover of staff at both country and regional level.

- The RPP has added value to the work of some country programmes through **technical support**. For example RPP technical staff (particularly the DCM/Livelihoods Coordinator and the RPP Coordinator) have been available and accessible to country programmes for specific technical backstopping for DCM issues and proposal development for fundraising from donors.
- The RPP has also added value in terms of **training and capacity building**. For example, the work on DCM, climate change and poverty monitoring and information gathering has been particularly appreciated, especially by the Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia country programme staff.
- As it currently stands, **the greatest value added of the RPP is largely potential**, not actual. Given Oxfam's standing and experience in pastoralism in the region, there have been and continue to be significant opportunities to develop linkages with regional institutions (such as the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, the East African Community, and the African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources) which have not yet been maximised. A review in 2006 of Oxfam's cross-border work in the region made concrete recommendations for further developing the role and added value of the RPP with regard to cross-border work and how a regional level perspective could add significant value to the work of country programmes in this area, but these recommendations do not appear to have been implemented. Similarly, the ROSP project represents a huge potential for advocacy in the future, yet to be realised.

### 3. Constraints, Challenges and Key Lessons Learned

As implied in the previous sections, the RPP faces a number of constraints and challenges, summarised as follows:

**Lack of clarity regarding RPP mandate and institutional support:** from its inception, the RPP has been the subject of debate within Oxfam, reflecting perhaps the ongoing wider external debate on the viability of pastoralism and also the internal debate within Oxfam about whether pastoralists constitute a distinct target group or not. The original formulation of an integrated programme operating at regional, national and local level with common strategic direction has been overtaken by organisational changes. The shift of focus to country programmes was not accompanied by a rethink of the RPP's mandate, with the result that it is currently operating without a clear agreed goal, objectives and measurable indicators and consequently attracting some (understandable) criticism within the organisation for its perceived lack of purpose, tangible outputs and accountability. The dependence on 'pastoral champions' to promote both the programme and the issue of pastoralism within the organisation has enabled the programme to continue to exist without concrete organisational support. Some management support has been given to the RPP from the Regional Management Team and other regional staff, but this appears to have been largely based on individual staff relationships and 'sympathy' to the pastoral cause, rather than structural management support for the programme. It is also not clear whether pastoralism features prominently or is considered a crucial sector at the Oxford level.

**Lack of clarity regarding ways of working:** the RPP works through relationships with country programmes, most directly with pastoral programme coordinators, with whom it does not hold a line management relationship. These relationships therefore need to be negotiated and are largely dependent on the goodwill and support of the relevant Country Directors. There is no structured agreement between country programmes and the RPP to deliver specific regional outputs and hence the RPP remains relatively vulnerable and powerless to implement activities, and at the same time open to criticism from country programmes that it does not deliver or add value to their work<sup>4</sup>. With regard to the North Sudan country programme, there appears to have been a communication breakdown: the RPP appears to feel that Sudan prefers not to be linked into the regional pastoral programme and resents any supposed interference; while the staff from the N Sudan office interviewed for the Review implied a willingness to be connected with the RPP, assuming there can be clear communication about the Sudanese programme's needs and how the RPP could help to meet them.

**Absence of a clear fundraising strategy:** the RPP does not appear to have an agreed fundraising strategy, both for the programme's overall activities nor for some of the specific components (e.g. ROSP). There is currently a significant amount of goodwill among donors for regional programming which the RPP has not taken advantage of. However, specific funds have been raised from the European Union's Regional Drought Decision (RDD) and support given to specific country programme staff with regard to proposal formulation, largely by the DCM/Livelihoods Advisor. The failure to address fundraising for the ROSP in the years since its initiation is a gross omission. It is the opinion of the reviewers that funding could have been obtained from external donors even before the final product is available; failing that, an interim prototype could have been produced as a basis for fundraising. Failure to do this has jeopardised the future of an initiative that has the potential to be a very useful and highly regarded advocacy tool.

---

<sup>4</sup> This lack of clarity with regard to ways of working is in part symptomatic of the broader ambiguity surrounding regional advisory roles in general, as discussed elsewhere in this report.

**Lack of institutional commitment and clear strategy at the regional level for cross-border work:** the history of cross-border work within the RPP is one of some confusion. The original intention was for the RPP to be involved in some way in cross-border work. With the shift to country programmes as the key business unit, cross-border projects are generally managed by country programmes. However at the time of the last RPP review the debate was still continuing about how cross-border work should take place, and as noted above, it appears that the recommendations of the review of cross-border work in 2006 were not in general implemented at the regional level. Cross-border work is undoubtedly difficult and expensive, and requires a long-term commitment. It is unlikely that donors will commit long-term funding to such work unless there is strong participation of regional governments and bodies such as IGAD, EAC, COMESA and the AU, to help ensure cooperation and sustainability.<sup>5</sup> In spite of these challenges, a cross-border approach to pastoralism in the region remains vital to address many of the issues facing pastoralists today, as described in Section 1.4 above.

**Skills and capacity within the RPP, and high staff turnover:** the RPP Coordinator position requires a multiple skill set including an understanding of ASAL and pastoral livelihoods, networking, advocacy, liaison, training, fundraising and management skills, among others. Previous holders of this position have had some but not all of these skills, with the result that the programme has leaned towards one or other aspect of the wide remit. It may not be possible to find all these skills embodied in one individual, and this highlights the fact that a pastoral function at regional level may require more than one person to support it – which may include the use of additional temporary or permanent staff, and/or increased collaboration with other staff and departments ('mainstreaming' pastoralism - see Section 4 below). High staff turnover in other positions in the HECA Region also limits the wider understanding of the origins and purpose of the RPP outside the programme. This also contributes to limited institutional memory with regard to the Region's pastoral work. In addition participants at the Strategy planning workshop also noted that in some parts of Oxfam there still remains a fundamental lack of understanding of pastoral systems.

**Failure to maximise external linkages and advocacy opportunities:** in 2003, the RPP established an informal regional coordination group involving ITDG EA (now Practical Action), AU/IBAR, the Pastoral Communication Initiative (PCI) and Oxfam, in order to establish linkages with other agencies. However, this group appears to have lapsed, and over the current phase of the RPP linkages with external stakeholders do not appear to have been maximised and opportunities for learning and influence have consequently been lost (although the REGLAP project is now participating in a Horn of Africa Pastoral Forum together with UN-OCHA and PACAPS and hence is beginning to address this issue). CORDAID and World Vision are both currently in the process of planning regional pastoral work, with significant potential for collaboration with Oxfam. Such collaboration may also contribute to leveraging funds. The PACAPS-COMESA initiative aimed at developing a structured regional pastoral strategy framework, and the EAC's establishment of a regional pastoral coordination committee are indicators of the recognition of the urgent need for regional cooperation, collaboration, advocacy, networking and sharing of resources to address the issues facing pastoralists in the region. The RPP has in general failed to maximise these opportunities and make such linkages with regional governments, regional bodies and like-minded stakeholders and hence missed an additional opportunity to add value to Oxfam's work with pastoralists at country and local level.

---

<sup>5</sup> The recent disarmament initiatives in northern Uganda are a case in point: in the absence of cooperation and simultaneous activity on the Kenyan side, the Ugandan work was undermined and proved largely ineffective.

#### 4. Coordination, Linkages and Relationships

When the RPP was established a Coordination Group was set up, consisting of the country pastoral coordinators (or if none, a relevant pastoral staff member), the RPP Coordinator and one of the two Regional Programme Managers (now Deputy Regional Directors). The Group meets twice a year in different locations in the region, and some of the meetings have been 'expanded' to include local partners and the relevant Country Director. According to the RPP Programme Framework, the tasks of the Coordination Group are as follows:

- Take collective responsibility for the direction of the RPP
- Provide a forum for sharing experiences
- Decide strategic direction and alliances, allocation of regional resources, shape of the regional log frame and priorities of the RPP Coordinator
- Ensure a coherent approach across the programme
- Identify relevant policy issues to be taken forward
- Coordinate learning and capacity building across the programme

The coordination role of the RPP was always intended to be 'light' but to help maintain strategic coherence across the HECA Region. However, the organisational changes described above in Section 1.3 have impacted on the ability of the Coordination Group to fulfil this role – in other words the Group has suffered from the general lack of clarity about regional roles and regional strategy affecting the Regional Office overall. In particular, the shift in emphasis to the country programmes and the subsequent lack of clarity regarding regional advisory roles, together with the change in personnel and personalities, have limited the scope of the Group, especially with regard to ensuring coherence across the country programmes and defining a common strategy.

Consequently the RPP log frame is largely ignored by most of the country programmes or considered irrelevant to their planning processes. The key achievements of the Coordination Group in the current phase have therefore focused on support to pastoral staff and sharing of information and project experiences, a role which is clearly appreciated by the participating staff themselves. However, the Country Directors do not appear on the whole to value the Group, viewing it as unfocused and lacking useful outputs.

Partly as a result of the issues outlined above, the RPP has become rather isolated from the rest of the Regional Office in recent years. This means that horizontal linkages with for example humanitarian and advocacy teams have not been maximised, in spite of the fact that the potential for positive collaboration appears to be quite high in the current internal context. For example, the RPP has considerable potential to contribute further to the new 'one programme approach', combining advocacy, livelihoods and humanitarian work. The current work on Disaster Risk Reduction and Drought Cycle Management has contributed to the development of this approach in the region and has also made linkages with the humanitarian team, with the potential to develop this more, particularly given the fact that many emergencies in the region take place in pastoral areas. Most staff acknowledge that appropriate emergency responses in pastoral areas can only be made when the implementing staff have the capacity and skills to design interventions appropriate to pastoral areas. There is potential scope therefore for further 'mainstreaming' an understanding of pastoral systems into humanitarian responses, as well as increasing capacity and understanding of humanitarian interventions among pastoral programme staff and partners. This work has begun in Kenya through the merging of the pastoral and humanitarian

programmes into a single ASAL programme, and also in Somaliland, where the key country programme work is pastoral-based.

Similarly, with regard to policy and advocacy, the potential for increased linkages and collaboration between the components of the RPP and the relevant regional staff is high and yet does not appear to be maximised at present. For example, the REGLAP programme does not have obvious linkages with the campaigns staff (although this in part reflects the focus of the campaigns team until recently on wider, non-programme-related issues), nor has the ROSP project, which will provide a huge advocacy and campaigns opportunity in the near future. Communication between these programmes appears to be little and concrete collaboration not planned for. Similarly, regional campaigns staff noted unused potential for leveraging Oxfam's pastoral work, including that of the RPP, for example using the media to change public perceptions of pastoralism.

## 5. Key Conclusions and Recommendations

### 5.1 Key conclusions

The RPP as originally conceived (i.e. a collection of individual country programmes linked together under a common strategy, with value added at the regional level) is no longer appropriate nor feasible in the HECA Regional Office in the current context. However, it is the key conclusion of this Review that **there remains a justifiable need for a pastoral component at regional level** but different in nature and function from the existing RPP, for the following reasons:

- ❖ Pastoralists are a key marginalised group in the HECA Region and form a significant proportion of Oxfam’s target group, as identified by the National Change Strategies.
- ❖ Oxfam has considerable experience and reputation in pastoral development in the region over the last two decades. A number of stakeholders look to Oxfam as a lead agency in the region on pastoral development work, disaster risk reduction and humanitarian programming, and the linkages between them - expectations which are not at present consistently met.
- ❖ Pastoralism continues to be misunderstood and pastoralists remain politically, economically and socially marginalised within the region (see Section 1.5 above). Considering pastoralists as one of several vulnerable livelihood groups will fail to address this misunderstanding and has the potential to further marginalise them.
- ❖ There is a clear justification for working on pastoral issues at regional level. The HECA Region Review (2008) highlights the importance of regional work in general: *‘many of the poverty-related issues in the region are cross-border and there is scope for a clearer regional framework setting out, for example, the synergies between country-level programmes... There are sufficient cross-border problematics in the region – for example, adaptation to climate change, peace building, vulnerable livelihoods, good governance etc. – to suggest that there could be more ‘regional’ programming.’* (Coventry 2008:16;40). The OGB internal consultation paper on defining regional and national roles similarly notes the potential for coordination, support, analysis, learning and campaigning at the regional level (HECA Region, Nov 2008). There is a general consensus among the people consulted for this Review (both internal and external) that because of its common concerns and cross-border nature, pastoralism as an issue is suited to a regional approach, to complement national and local level initiatives.
- ❖ The pastoral work that Oxfam is currently engaged in within the HECA Region (at both country programme and regional level) falls under both governance and livelihoods sectors, and increasingly under the humanitarian sector as well, and hence has great potential for the ‘one programme approach’. Pastoral work cannot therefore be easily slotted under one or other of these areas and indeed has considerable potential to contribute to the development of the ‘one programme approach’ within the region.
- ❖ Issues relating to climate change and disaster risk reduction are increasing institutional priorities for Oxfam. Both issues impact significantly on pastoralist populations in the region, while at the same time pastoral programming can generate useful opportunities for lesson learning and policy debate on these topics.



- ❖ Pastoral development requires a ‘twin-track approach’<sup>6</sup> similar to that sometimes used to address gender inequalities. In other words an understanding of pastoralism and of pastoral development work needs to be more ‘mainstreamed’ into other programmes and activities (for example humanitarian responses, advocacy and campaigning work); while at the same time some specific, targeted initiatives are needed to address particular needs and issues relating to pastoralism. A regional pastoral initiative has the potential to pilot and adopt this ‘twin-track’ approach.

However this initiative requires greater clarity with regard to its mandate, scope and activities, with full institutional and management commitment to whatever is finally agreed.

## 5.2 Recommendations

It is therefore the recommendation of this Review that **the HECA Regional Centre establishes a Regional Pastoral Initiative (RPI) with a mandate from the organisation to support pastoralism in the region**, through support to Country Programmes and through external networking and advocacy. This Initiative differs from the RPP in a number of ways:

- The new Initiative has no remit to address quality control or coordination with regard to the individual country pastoral programmes and will focus on activities at the regional level
- The new Initiative is to be endorsed by the Regional Management Team and have a clear mandate within the organisation
- There is a significant shift of emphasis in the focus of the Initiative, away from technical backstopping and information sharing to working mainly on policy advocacy at regional level (see functions below)
- Unlike the RPP which worked as a standalone (and relatively isolated) programme, the Initiative takes a ‘twin track approach’ to supporting pastoralism, with specific pastoral-focused activities (in collaboration with other staff) while at the same time building pastoral capacity and understanding within other teams

**The Review recommends that the RPI focuses on 5 key functions, namely:**

1. Advocacy and policy with regional institutions
2. Promoting learning
3. Support to cross-border work
4. Facilitating capacity building on specific issues (‘mainstreaming’ pastoralism)
5. Fundraising

The following table presents these functions in more detail:

Key Functions	Activities/Definition	Justification/Rationale
<b>1. Advocacy and Policy with Regional Institutions</b>	➤ Focused advocacy targeting specific institutions and policy frameworks, based on a detailed and specific advocacy strategy with clear intended and measurable outputs, in collaboration with the regional campaigns team and country programme policy staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders and analysts suggest that there is increasing potential for influencing regional institutions such as IGAD, EAC, AU, and COMESA on pastoral issues.</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> The ‘twin track approach’ is taken from the experiences of mainstreaming gender within development agencies: it is increasingly recognised that mainstreaming gender requires both gender-specific expertise and activities on the one hand, and increasing the gender understanding and capacity of all staff on the other (see for example APRODEV 2004).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ As far as is possible, this work should draw on priorities and expressed needs of pastoralists themselves through direct and partner-led work with pastoral communities and organisations.</li> <li>➤ Focus on cross-border and regional issues, such as trade and conflict (link with one of the key themes identified in Section 1.5: <i>livestock product markets</i>; with the potential also to increase <i>pastoral 'voice'</i> in the way that the advocacy is carried out)</li> <li>➤ Key potential advocacy targets may include the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative, the East African Community technical committee on pastoralism, and the COMESA initiative on pastoralism through Tufts University.</li> <li>➤ The REGLAP programme provides a useful opportunity to channel these advocacy outputs in the forthcoming year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oxfam is well placed in the region, based on its reputation, experience and current work with pastoral communities, to take on this role.</li> <li>• ROSP should provide valuable evidence to support this process (and contributes to the issue of <i>economic valuation</i> as noted above in Section 1.5).</li> </ul>
<b>2. Promoting Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Using a specific, targeted learning framework, sharing best practice and experience from within and outside Oxfam among country programmes.</li> <li>➤ Based on tangible outputs with a consistent format where possible (e.g. a series of briefing papers)</li> <li>➤ This function may and should overlap with the policy work described in no. 1 above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A regionally-based RPI is well placed to facilitate learning between country programmes, and also to keep abreast of current debates on pastoral development, learning from other actors in the region and elsewhere and sharing information with them</li> <li>• Key issues to address include those highlighted above in Section 1.5, namely: <i>trade, livelihood diversification, and pastoral voice</i></li> </ul>
<b>3. Support to Cross-Border Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Promoting and facilitating cross-border work; and sharing learning between programmes and from elsewhere.</li> <li>➤ This support does not necessarily include the management of such projects, which will generally remain the province of individual country programmes (in bilateral relationships where appropriate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A regional perspective can add significant value to cross-border work, in particular sharing learning and successful approaches.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Facilitation of Capacity Building on Specific Issues</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change are two key topics where a pastoral perspective can have much to offer other parts of the organisation, both at regional level and within individual country programmes, based on a clear and focused strategy.</li> <li>➤ Discussion and should be held with each Country Programme and with other regional programmes to identify the topics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RPI needs to move away from generalized technical backstopping of country programmes. Although this is clearly appreciated by pastoral staff within country programmes, this type of technical support should, according to Oxfam policy, be increasingly obtained locally.</li> </ul>

	<p>which the RPI can uniquely support and which fit gaps in CP capacity, and to agree ways of facilitating this capacity building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Collaboration with the humanitarian team to build the humanitarian capacity of pastoral staff (and vice versa) is particularly important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, on specific topics such as DRR and CC, the RPI is well placed to build capacity within the region.</li> <li>• This addresses one of the key themes listed in Section 1.5, namely support to the '<i>relief-development continuum</i>'.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Fundraising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Identifying donors and securing funding to support the above activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RPI needs to work towards being ultimately self-supporting, rather than relying on unrestricted funds. This should also help to increase accountability and transparency</li> </ul>

It is the view of the Reviewers that a Regional Pastoral Initiative carrying out these functions has the **potential to add significant value to the country programme work on pastoralism in the HECA Region**. This value is added both 'inwards' (supporting country pastoral programmes themselves) and 'outwards' (drawing on and synthesising country programme work to develop regional level advocacy messages and engage in policy debate at the regional level).

These five functions listed above were used to develop a 3-year Strategy for the RPI at a workshop with pastoral programme staff which took place on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> March (see Annex 2 for participants). The Strategy, available as a standalone document separate from this Review Report, includes a log frame with clear outputs and indicators and a process for monitoring and reporting, to ensure accountability and ownership of the RPI across the HECA Region. This relatively structured approach is necessary to address the previous rather loose arrangement and provide a framework for the future, but also relies on the development of effective ways of working with staff in the regional centre and country programmes.

It is further recommended that the following **ways of working** be adopted by the RPI:

- The key functions and mandate of the RPI, together with the Strategy developed during the pastoral workshop in March 2009, should be agreed by the regional senior management and endorsed by the regional Country Directors.
- The implications of the agreed Strategy for the RPI for individual country programmes should be identified and as necessary included in their log frames or PIPs, and agreed methods of communication and liaison established between country programmes (in particular Country Directors) and the RPI.
- These structural commitments are necessary to give institutional backing to the new initiative and hence to avoid the constraints that the RPP has faced in recent years including a reliance on the passion and conviction of individuals and the lack of institutional support. At the same time it is recognised that the implementation of the new initiative still requires conviction and personal commitment and will depend on the negotiation of collaborative relationships across the region, thus cannot rely solely on structural support.

- The Strategy contains plans for collaboration between the RPI and other regional sectors, including the new livelihoods advisory post, the governance focal point, the campaigns team and the humanitarian team, in order to ensure that pastoral expertise is not 'locked up' in the RPI but is also 'mainstreamed' as appropriate in other programmes of work.
- The Strategy also contains a commitment to developing a detailed plan for the future of ROSP. Given the potential of the outputs and the considerable investment in this initiative thus far, it is important that this opportunity is not wasted. The plan should include a fundraising strategy and a sustainability/exit plan for the future.
- In recognition of the way in which pastoral livelihoods are changing the remit of the RPI should encompass all those living in pastoral areas, and not be confined to 'pure' pastoralists.<sup>7</sup> It should address issues relating to enhanced pastoral livelihoods, diversified pastoral livelihoods and alternative livelihoods to pastoralism.<sup>8</sup> All such work, both that addressing support to and diversification of pastoral livelihoods and that which promotes alternative strategies, should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the dynamics of the pastoral production system.
- The 'Coordination Group' should become the 'Pastoralism Learning Group'. Each meeting should focus on a specific theme or topic, and be attended by pastoral staff members together with other relevant internal and external resource people. Key management staff (for example Country Directors, Regional Directors) may also participate as appropriate to keep informed on pastoral development in the HECA Region and to maintain management support for the RPI.
- The RPI should develop a strategy for extending and maintaining linkages with external actors working on pastoralism in the region, for example CORDAID and World Vision, as well as with Oxfam International.
- In order to implement the RPI, at least one dedicated staff member is required. This is necessary both in terms of the workload involved in carrying out the functions described above, and also in order to maintain Oxfam's institutional commitment and prioritisation of pastoral issues at the level of the Regional Centre.

---

<sup>7</sup> Previous definitions of pastoralists such as 'people who derive more than 50% of their livelihood from extensive livestock production' (Swift 1988) are the subject of growing debate as more 'pure' pastoralists are forced to diversify their livelihoods, drop out of the pastoral sector to become ex-pastoralists in urban centres, or identify alternative livelihoods including agro-pastoralism.

<sup>8</sup> See Oxfam et al 2005 for a useful breakdown of future pastoral livelihood strategies [the fact that this report, which was carried out by Oxfam together with other actors, is not widely known among key actors in the Region further highlights the loss of institutional memory in the Region]

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Review

### 1. Background

The Horn/East Africa Regional Pastoral Programme (RPP) is a 15-year programme which seeks to address the poverty and marginalisation of pastoralists in the Horn and East African countries of Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. The RPP officially commenced work in July 2003 and builds explicitly on the previous East Africa Regional Pastoral Programme that ran from 1998-2002.

Oxfam and other NGOs have led the way in developing more appropriate local approaches to pastoral development. However these projects have only covered geographically limited areas and are constrained by unfavourable national policy frameworks. Oxfam has also made some progress on advocating for more favourable policies towards pastoralism in the region. The RPP aims to respond to these challenges by increasing the coherence between programmes, undertaking learning and reflection assignments, coordinating the approaches used in the programmes and retaining the programme focus on increasing the voice of pastoralists.

### 2. The Regional Pastoralist Programme

The RPP is an ambitious programme with a long-term objective of bringing pastoralists close to decision making processes while increasing their integration into political, social and economic systems at national and regional levels, thus addressing the fundamental problems of marginalisation and weak governance that lie at the root of the chronic poverty and vulnerability of pastoral areas.

The Regional Pastoral Programme (RPP) as a whole consists of six country components and regional-level projects, closely linked to form an integrated regional programme. Each country component includes a national and local-level component. National-level components will focus on research, policy development/dialogue, and the dissemination of best practice, in conjunction with government and non-government actors. This will derive from local-level components in each country which deliver direct benefits to target pastoral communities and develop best practice in working with pastoral communities (based on Oxfam's approaches developed to date in the region).

The Regional Pastoral Programme is bound together by common objectives, approaches and ways of working for the programme as a whole which apply at all levels (local, national, and regional).

The RPP is now nearing the end of its 2<sup>nd</sup> three-year phase and Oxfam GB wishes to carry out a review of the programme to date to guide the design and implementation of the next phase. The review should focus on the country projects initiated under the RPP, regional projects of the RPP as well as gauge progress towards meeting the objectives of the Regional Pastoral Programme as a whole. This review is not a review of the individual programme components of the RPP but rather an overall programme review looking at the programme objectives, how they are aligned with objectives of country pastoral programmes in line with national change strategies and themes/issues that affect pastoralists in the region.

### 3. Organisational context

Oxfam GB has just concluded a lengthy process of strategic review and planning at country level. The result is that each country has a clear strategy for moving forward over the next 5 years. We have also been through a review to assess what the added value and role of the regional centre should be in relation to empowered country programmes.

There is a need to revisit the current Regional Pastoral Programme both in light of the priorities coming out of country programmes through the National Change Strategy process, and in terms of the defined role of a regional centre. We need to ensure that any work on pastoralism is adding value to country programmes whilst supporting the regional vision. This is expected to lead to a change in focus, ways of working and set-up of advisory services at the regional centre. The pastoral programme review will be fed in to inform this process.

### 4. Purpose and Objective of the strategic review and planning

The purpose of this programme review is to assess the impact or effectiveness of the Regional Pastoral Programme to date, and in particular to assess the added value of the regional coordination body on programme impact within country programmes. In addition, it will use this as a basis for developing a strategy for taking forward the Oxfam GB's work on pastoralism based on the direction which countries are taking and the leadership/support needed at a regional level.

Specific objectives include:

#### Review

- To understand to what extent the regional component of the programme has achieved its objectives as set out in the programme framework
- To understand what have been the main achievements of the programmes falling under the regional pastoral programme and what added value the regional coordination body has brought to these, if any
- To capture the current strengths and weaknesses of the regional component in relation to a) the individual programmes implemented by Oxfam GB and partners and b) a wider group of stakeholders inside and outside of Oxfam GB, and to make recommendations as to how the regional component may increase its impact on each group of stakeholders.
- To draw out some of the key emerging lessons learned through the Regional Pastoral Programme. Identify model innovative programmes/projects including cross border programmes/projects that can address large number of target communities and impact on attitude, belief, practice and policy change at wider scale.
- To appraise the efficacy of the current mechanisms used to co-ordinate the Regional Pastoral Programme – particularly looking at the Co-ordination group mechanism and the extent towards achieving its objectives.

#### Strategy development

- To develop a common vision for Oxfam's work with pastoralists within the region over the next 5 years, based on input from the National Change Strategies, including an understanding of how change happens and what Oxfam's role within that change might be
- To draw out what added value any regional component on pastoralism would add to country strategies and our regional vision, working on which areas, and what that might look like
- Explore greater links between the pastoral programme and humanitarian work while ensuring that pastoral development work is more joined up with other livelihood work in the region.

### **5. Methodology**

The consultant will be expected to refine the methodology to be used with the Regional Pastoral Programme Co-ordinator. However, it is anticipated that the review will include:

- A review of published and unpublished programme reports and documentation
- Field work with selected projects belonging to the RPP in order to capture their understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme
- Discussion with Oxfam GB staff as well as partners
- Making an overall external environment scanning by meeting at least few key actors in the sector to know/learn any experience from their work
- Bringing key internal stakeholders together to develop a vision and strategy for work going forward, taking into account available resources to support the programme in its next phase

### **6. Output**

A short report (maximum 15 -20 pages) setting out the findings against each of the objectives of the review process and with a set of recommendations. The report is intended primarily for an internal OGB audience, but should be written in such a way that it can be shared with partners and other external contacts.

**[Annex 2 Removed]**

### **Annex 3: Documents Consulted**

- Acacia Consultants, 2006. **Co-ordination, Management and Learning Arrangements for Cross Border programmes in the Horn and East Africa** Oxfam GB Horn and East Africa Regional Pastoral Programme, Nairobi
- Aklilu, Y. and M. Wekesa, 2002. **Drought, Livestock and Livelihoods: Lessons from the 1999-2001 emergency response in the pastoral sector in Kenya** Network Paper No. 40, Humanitarian Practice Network, Overseas Development Institute, London
- APRODEV, HelpAge International, One World Action and WIDE, 2004. **Transforming the Mainstream: Seminar report on mainstreaming and inclusive approaches in EU development cooperation** London
- Bushell, Helen, no date. **Project Outline: Improving Pastoral Livelihoods** Oxfam GB
- Coventry, Cowan, 2008. **Oxfam GB HECA Regional Review: Meeting Expectations, Delivering Cost-effectively** Oxfam GB
- Devereux, Stephen, 2006. **Vulnerable Livelihoods in Somali Region, Ethiopia** Brighton, IDS
- East African Community, 2008. **Terms of Reference: The Regional Technical Steering Committee on Pastoralism and Drylands Development**
- HECA Region, Nov 2008. **Defining country and regional centre roles with country as the key business unit** Draft for consultation. Oxfam GB
- Morton, John, 2006. **A Review of Oxfam GB's Horn/East Africa Regional Pastoral Programme** Final Version. Oxfam GB Nairobi
- Morton, John, 2008. **DFID's Current and Potential Engagement with Pastoralism: A Scoping Study** DFID
- Nori, Michele, Michael Taylor, Alessandra Sensi, 2008. **Browsing on Fences: Pastoral Land Rights, Livelihoods and Adaptation to Climate Change** IIED Issue Paper No 148. International Land Coalition, WISP, Irish Aid and IIED, London
- Oxfam GB, no date. **Integration of Drought Cycle Management into Pastoral Development Programmes in Horn/East Africa: Project Terms of Reference**
- Oxfam GB, 2004. **Oxfam GB Somaliland: Country Strategy Paper for the Pastoral Programme**
- Oxfam GB, 2005. **Regional Pastoral Programme: Programme Management Framework**
- Oxfam GB, 2007a. **Oxfam GB Strategic Plan** Summary
- Oxfam GB, 2007b. **Tanzania National Change Strategy 2007-2017**
- Oxfam GB, 2008a. **Ethiopia National Change Strategy 2009-2019: The changes that need to happen in Ethiopia and Oxfam GB's role**
- Oxfam GB, 2008b. **Kenya National Change Strategy 2008-2011**
- Oxfam GB, 2008c. **Uganda National Change Strategy 2008-2013**
- Oxfam GB, 2008d. **Somalia National Change Strategy 2009-2011**
- Oxfam GB, 2008e. **Principles of Cross-Border work in the Somaliland-Ethiopia Cross Border Drought Preparedness Project**



Oxfam GB website: **Programme Learning: Livelihoods: Pastoralism**

Oxfam GB. **Regional Pastoral Programme Coordination Meeting Reports and Updates 2003-2008** [March 2003; October 2003; February 2004 (Coordination Principles and Procedures); September 2004; March 2005; September 2005; Sept 2006; March 2007; Sept 07; July 2008]

Oxfam International, 2008. **Survival of the Fittest: Pastoralism and Climate Change in East Africa** Oxfam Briefing Paper 116

Pettit, Jethro, et al, 2008. **Aim 4 Review: Oxfam GB's Work on Governance and the Right to be Heard** Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton

Regional Pastoral Programme (RPP). **Regional Co-ordination Workplans 2005/6; 2006/7; 2007/8; 2008/9** Oxfam GB Horn/East Africa

Swift, J., 1988. **Major issues in pastoral development with special emphasis on selected African countries** FAO/UNDP, Rome and IDS, University of Sussex.

Swift, J., 2008. **The Big Picture** presentation to the Regional Workshop *Securing Pastoralism in East and West Africa* November 10-14 2008, Dessalegn Hotel, Addis Ababa, IIED and SOS Sahel UK

World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP) website: [www.iucn.org/wisp](http://www.iucn.org/wisp)

World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP), 2006. **Global Review of the Economics of Pastoralism** IUCN, Nairobi

World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP), 2008. **A Global Perspective on the Total Economic Value Of Pastoralism: Global synthesis report based on six country valuations** IUCN, Nairobi

#### Annex 4: Pastoral Populations in the HECA Region

##### Approximate national and pastoral populations in the HECA Region

Country	Total Population	Pastoralist Population	Pastoralist Population as % of Total
Uganda	24.4 million	340,000	1.4%
Tanzania	33.5 million	1 million	3%
Kenya	31 million	3 million	3%
Ethiopia	75 million	9 million	12%
Sudan	33.5 million	5 million	15%
Somalia	8 million	4.8 million	60%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>205.4 million</b>	<b>24.14 million</b>	<b>11.8%</b>

*Source: National Change Strategies; individual interviews*

## Annex 5: Summary of RPP-managed projects

### 1. Report on the Status of Pastoralism (ROSP)

ROSP was initiated in 2005 with the aim of providing quantitative data on the situation of pastoralists in the region, along the lines of the Human Development Report. Similar reports have been produced for other focus groups around the world - for example the Romany people of Eastern Europe and Arctic populations. Local partners were identified in each of the participating countries to manage the process of identifying gaps and collecting the data. Linkages were also made with national bureaux of statistics. The key outputs will be country-level reports from Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, bringing together data on pastoral populations including their contribution to the national economy. The first reports are anticipated in April 2009.

### 2. Improving Pastoral Livelihoods (IPL)

The IPL project grew out of the one year Drought Cycle Management (DCM) project, which focused on integrating DCM into long-term development work. IPL broadens the focus recognising the link between the 'productive' and the 'protective' aspects of OGB's livelihoods work. The aim of the project is therefore to enhance and protect the livelihoods of people living in the ASALs through developing and institutionalising best practice on integrated programming.

The IPL and DCM projects have together produced a number of outputs thus far, including: case studies on drought management capacity in six countries; a briefing pack on DCM; a training pack on Disaster Risk Reduction, which is being rolled out under the Humanitarian department; and a regional DRR/CCA induction pack to promote awareness and understanding of adaptation and risk reduction issues in the region.

### 3. Regional Livelihoods Advocacy Project (REGLAP)

The 'Reducing the Vulnerability of Pastoral Communities through Policy and Practice Change in the Horn and East Africa' project is an ECHO-funded initiative which aims to inform thinking to enable policy makers to keep abreast of new opportunities and threats in the rangelands. Run by a Regional Coordinator reporting to a consortium of international NGOs, and hosted by Oxfam GB, the project focuses on five thematic areas: climate change; demographic trends; social protection; preparedness planning and cross-border issues. Key activities include knowledge gathering; policy dialogue; policy and practice change through advocacy; and civil society advocacy networking and capacity building. A set of policy briefs and reports based on baseline studies of existing policies in the region will be published in April 2009.

## Annex 6: The Role of Pastoralism in the National Change Strategies

Country	Pastoralists in Context	Change propositions/overall strategy	Programme aims with regard to pastoralism
Ethiopia	Pastoralists are severely socio-economically and politically marginalised, among the voiceless and excluded (with women and ethnic minorities)	Economic empowerment	Focus on pastoralists and small scale farmers. Shifting from RTBH and service delivery to emphasis on livelihoods, in particular economic development through livestock commercialisation.
Kenya	Pastoralists are one of the marginalised groups in the country (along with women, urban poor, young people and PLHIV). Highest poverty is in northern pastoral districts.	Urban and rural groups claim their rights and provide enabling environment for positive institutional change to reduce economic and social marginalisation	Work with pastoralists is one of 3 strategic directions (others being urban poor; and internal capacity building) Pastoral programme now merged with humanitarian programme into single ASAL programme, aim to address livelihood issues and at same time stabilise chronic humanitarian crises.
Somalia	60-70% of population are pastoralists Faces of poverty are pastoralists, women and children, urban poor, minority clans and IDPs. Pastoralists' livelihoods increasingly under threat	Somaliland: improve governance and livelihoods for pastoralists and women Southern Somalia: provide humanitarian assistance and protection to IDPs	Three core programmes: humanitarian; governance and livelihoods. Country Programme views itself as a pastoral programme
Sudan <sup>9</sup>	High pastoral population (15%); pre-oil revenue livestock contributed 80% of GDP		Working on strategic and practical needs of pastoralists Plan to shift emphasis from service delivery to state and national level advocacy
Tanzania		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for systematic DCM and community preparedness (against drought etc.)</li> <li>Pastoral communities can demand for their rights</li> </ol>	Plan to continue focus on pastoralists Three themes: governance, livelihoods and education No national level pastoral programme (pastoral work falls under governance with

<sup>9</sup> It was not possible to review the North Sudan NCS document during the Review.

		3. People in marginal/vulnerable areas can have thriving livelihoods if their rights to assets and resources are upheld	regard to management)
Uganda	Poverty is concentrated in the East, Karamoja (pastoral area) and the North (war). Pastoralists identified as one of the key vulnerable groups, are behind in all HDR indicators. Huge disparity between north and south of country with regard to livelihood opportunities and rights to basic services.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduce rural poverty</li> <li>2. Increase resilience to disasters</li> <li>3. Build accountability</li> <li>4. Promote women's rights</li> </ol>	Other agencies are looking for a greater leadership role from Oxfam on pastoralism. Pastoralism continues to be a specific focus area, within the broad themes of livelihoods and governance/voice. Pastoralists generally considered as under 'marginalised groups' by Uganda CP

*Source: National Change Strategies, supplemented by individual interviews*

## Annex 7: List of Acronyms

ASAL	Arid and semi-arid lands
AU	African Union
AU/IBAR	African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources
CC	Climate Change
COMESA	Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DCM	Drought Cycle Management
EAC	East African Community
HAVOYOCO	Oxfam GB partner organisation in Somaliland
HECA	Horn, East and Central Africa
IDP	internally displaced persons
IGAD	Inter Governmental Authority on Development
IPL	Improving Pastoral Livelihoods project
MPIDO	Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organisation
OGB	Oxfam Great Britain
OI	Oxfam International
PACAPS	Pastoral Areas Coordination, Analysis and Policy Support (USAID-funded)
REGLAP	Regional Livelihoods Advocacy Project ('Reducing the Vulnerability of Pastoral Communities through Policy and Practice Change in Horn and East Africa')
ROSP	Report on the Status of Pastoralism
RPP	Regional Pastoral Programme
RTBH	Right to be heard (Oxfam's 4 <sup>th</sup> Strategic Aim)
WISP	World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism

## Annex 8: Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks are due to all staff, partners and other stakeholders (listed in Annex 2) who gave their time to discuss the RPP, in particular those who attended the Strategy Workshop. Particular thanks are due to John Letai for his support and smooth facilitation of the logistics of the Review.

© Oxfam GB 2009

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email [publish@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:publish@oxfam.org.uk)

For further information on the issues raised in this document email [phd@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:phd@oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

**[www.oxfam.org.uk](http://www.oxfam.org.uk)**