



# Evaluation of Pastoral Programme in Somaliland

Executive Summary

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

March 2007

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Mr. Joseph M. Githinji

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Background:** Below is a summary of the March 2007 review of Oxfam GB Pastoral Somaliland Programme. The programme was initiated with the aim of strengthening pastoral organizations before influencing institutions to be more responsive to pastoralist needs. The expected results were better integration of pastoralists into the political, social and economic systems at National and Regional levels. The key activities included establishment of 12 pastoral organizations, increased responsiveness of Government institutions to pastoralist needs, increased access to good quality primary health care, increased access to resources and alternative livelihoods, effective drought monitoring and preparedness, development of a suitable model for cross boarder operations, enhancement of the capacity of local implementing organizations, and effectiveness in management of the Somaliland programme. The key stakeholders were Havoyoco (a local NGO), the Ministry of Pastoral Development and Environment (MOPDE), NERAD, Oxfam and the community (represented by the pastoral organizations). Havoyoco implements the programme with support from Oxfam GB. The initial phase of the programme was inaugurated in April 2005 and ends in 2008. This review only covers the first two years of the first phase of the 15 year programme that has been divided into 3 year phases. The purpose of the review was to establish the impact of the program, look into the programme approach, document the lessons learnt, and provide the way forward. The methodology used is detailed below.

**Methodology:** The review used focus group discussions, key informant interviews, meetings, direct observation and literature reviews to gather most of the information detailed in this report. The review team visited 4 pastoralist organizations and held 8 focus group discussions with committees and beneficiaries in Toghdeer and Galbeed<sup>1</sup> regions. In addition, the review team met and discussed with all the key stakeholders at National and Regional levels. These included the Line Ministries, the Local Councils, the staff of the implementing organizations, Havoyoco, Oxfam, NERAD, Governors, Deputy Governors and Director Generals in the respective regions. Open ended questions were used as the basic foundation against which the primary data was gathered. In addition, the review team relied on secondary data from progress reports, proposals, and field monitoring reports.

The main constraints encountered during the review included the large number of programme actors to be interviewed, limited timeframe for the exercise, language barrier, and the limited timeframe allocated to pre-review preparations before the field work.

**FINDINGS:** Overall, the programme managed to accomplish at least 90% of the programme work, scheduled for 2005-2006. The remaining 10% was delayed by technical reasons such as delayed approvals and/ or the need to lay down some foundations before the actual activities could begin. Good examples include the setting up of the National Disaster Preparedness and the establishment of community based animal health services. Secondly, the general approach of the programme was found to be effective although refinements are needed as detailed under the recommendations. Generally, the progress made include establishment of 12 pastoralist organizations (4 in Galbeed and 8 in Toghdeer) compared to 11, as originally planned. The organizations normally mobilize resources through membership fees, undertake environmental cleanups, conduct awareness creation, link the satellite villages, provide help to the marginalized people, and also provide a link within the community and between the community and the Government institutions. Inter community linkages have been emphasized at these formative stages, but less so between pastoral organizations and the Government. Only one pastoral organization indicated actual linkages while others planned to have linkages with the Government institutions. Such links are yet to take the form of advocacy, but they are expected to evolve and become stronger once NERAD, DDC and pastoral organizations become stronger. These pastoral organizations ensure road maintenance and mobilize members for training, construction of health posts, adult literacy, income generation, flood control, building of pastoral offices, restocking, construction of garbage pits and manage Qoranic / adult education classes. Quality of services and the number of activities vary from one pastoral organization to another. Activities are funded by external

---

<sup>1</sup> Galbeed region is locally referred as Maroodijeex or Hargeisa region.

support as well as internal membership contributions. On average, at each site, as many as 60% of the households in the main settlement and the satellite villages are members of the pastoral organizations.

In general, pastoralists in pastoral organizations are enjoying better services compared to non target pastoralists. In addition, the participation of development actors in planning, approval of action plans, monitoring and review of pastoral programme activities has somehow increased awareness and responsiveness of institutions to pastoralist needs. However, this is a gradual process that needs a sound foundation for good results at community level. The foundation is still being laid. Again, the programme has improved access to resources and alternative livelihoods, whether through restocking or through income generating activities. The programme has also made a lot of progress in many other areas such as primary health care by training and equipping trained community service providers such as TBAs, CHWs, Animal Health Workers and Adult Teachers. However, it is important to note that challenges exist. The most common being the limited resources, the weak local institutions, integration of long term development programmes with emergency interventions, high level of illiteracy at community level, lack of backup services at community level, limited resources for cross boarder operations and modelling, coordination hitches and lack of sustainability of programme activities at pastoral organization levels. Despite these challenges, the programme has done well and implementation has been smooth and on course. Below is a summary of the recommendations.

### **Recommendations/ way forward:**

A few of the recommendations contained in this report are summarized below;

#### **a) General programme management.**

The review team recommends uptake of the review finding in the remaining period of Phase I and during re-planning of Phase II. During this process, the partners, including the Government, should define roles, responsibilities and expected outputs for each actor, do priority setting together, define facilitation requirements at various levels, come up with resource mobilization plans for each partner, conduct joint planning and eventually, do joint execution of the funded plan. To ensure better impacts, emphasis should be placed on boosting the achievements made so far. Subject to availability of resources, expansion of programme activities to other needy areas is recommended.

#### **b) Programme approach/ activities undertaken.**

- In regard to capacity building at community level, doubling of the trained community service providers (TBAs, CHWs, teachers and community health workers) is required. Demand for services at community level has outstripped the existing capacity to offer such services. In addition, Oxfam and other stakeholders in the district should join hands and establish associations of former Government forestry staff that could provide services on conservation of forests and planting of trees. Scale up of exchange learning tours between the pastoralist organizations themselves, and different communities (including cross boarder) is also required. Similarly, inter country exchange visits on early warning systems and drought preparedness is recommended. Overall, capacity building of Government Departments should be restricted to those that provide tangible project outputs. Capacity building should also be tied to delivery of expected outputs from the entities undergoing capacity building.
- Scale up of community awareness on environmental issues followed by exchange visits to pastoral organizations that have unique practices (like environmental management based on fines and enforced by the pastoral organizations) are recommended. This would encourage adoption of easily adoptable concepts developed from traditional approaches.
- An assessment of functional literacy needs of adult learners should be conducted to form the basis of formulation of a curricular for adult learners. Adult education needs to go beyond knowing how to read and write. It should also be extended to satellite villages in every pastoral organization.
- Priority needs to change from construction of new water points to rehabilitation of new ones. Secondly, technology impact analysis and benefit cost comparisons between different water harvesting technologies is required. Cheaper alternatives that can replace construction of expensive barkads should be adopted. Sand dams, subsurface dams and black-cotton-soil lined water pans should be considered during this process.

- There is need to pilot a cooperative for income generating groups for pastoral organization against empowerment and expansion of two groups per every pastoral organization. This pilot study would give the best way forward for ensuring few groups that don't compete against each other in each pastoral organization.
  - More in-depth gender mainstreaming, based on the current gender strategy 2007-2010 is required.
  - NERAD should address overlaps and misunderstandings on its mandate with Line Ministries. It should start small in a pilot region, using the limited capacity, before building up the systems gradually. An expatriate staff could be used to put systems in place and ensure that they work, do on-job training for local staff, and then let them take over gradually. Again, support to NERAD should be tied to realization of expected outputs. These outputs should be spelt out clearly in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- c) **Coordination, communication and learning:** All should be strengthened by improving information flow between Pastoral organizations, District Development Committees, Mayor's Office, Government Line Ministries, NGOs operating in the region, the Governor and the Minister in Charge. Work plans should be disseminated before implementation of the programme activities. The review team also recommends careful analysis of the programme communication and information dissemination strategy to make it more effective and consistent, taking into account the local differences in respect to programme involvement, understanding, and preferred mode of communication.
- d) **Funding and long term capacity building:** Sources of funding and resources for long term capacity building of Havoyoco should be diversified. It is important to explore resource mobilization from Somalis in the Diaspora using Oxfam GB offices in the various countries as a channel for resource and information flow between the programme and the people in the Diaspora.
- e) **Sustainability of services offered:** To ensure sustainability of services at community level by community service providers (TBAS, CHWs, adult teachers and Animal Health workers) Oxfam, Havoyoco, and the pastoralist organizations ought to deliberate and come up with a motivation model based on three principles; First, individual recognition of services offered and reciprocation for such services, second, large scale community reciprocation for services offered, to be done at scheduled intervals, and finally, communal replenishment of kits/ materials being used, also on periodical basis. This model can be piloted before adoption. In absence of such a model, rewarding community service providers with livestock, at specific intervals, should be encouraged to ensure sustainability of the community service.

<p><b>Conclusion:</b> During the period under review, the programme made significant progress towards attaining its objectives and mandate. In addition, the general approach of the programme was found to be sound although some adjustments are needed in some specific areas. The review team noted the existence of challenges such as coordination, inadequate capacity of stakeholders and inadequate resources to cover existing needs and to expand services to new beneficiaries. Despite these challenges, the programme remains on course and benefits seem to outweigh the costs. Lastly, the remaining phase of the programme should take into account the above review findings. The same should be considered during re-planning of phase II. Finally, the pastoral programme should put more effort in fundraising to cover emerging gaps.</p>
---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.0 REVIEW METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Expected outputs.....	9
<b>3.0: REVIEW CONSTRAINTS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.0: REVIEW FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1: The extent to which the programme activities were implemented versus the plans made.	10
4.2: Programme impact for various development interventions. ....	12
4.3: The program approach by Oxfam, Havoyoco and partners. ....	14
4.4: Key challenges.....	15
4.5: Lessons learnt.....	16
<b>5.0: CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Annex.1: Planned activities, achievements and reasons for variance. ....	22
Annex. 2: Case studies; verbatim accounts of programme impacts at individual levels. ....	30
Annex .3: References .....	31
Annex. 4: Focus Group Discussions (FGD) / key respondents during the review.....	32
Annex. 5: Itinerary .....	32

© Oxfam GB 2007

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)**