

# **SAREC Supported Dryland Research Programmes in East Africa**

**David Gibbon  
Bruce Campbell**

**Department for Research  
Cooperation, SAREC**



# SAREC Supported Dryland Research Programmes in East Africa

**David Gibbon  
Bruce Campbell**

**Sida Evaluation 98/16**

**Department for Research  
Cooperation, SAREC**

*Evaluation Reports* may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida  
S-105 25 Stockholm  
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 795 23 44  
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 760 58 95

Authors: David Gibbon, Bruce Campbell.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 98/16  
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Research Cooperation, SAREC

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: SAREC-1997-0252  
Date of Final Report: February 1998  
Printed in Stockholm, Sweden 1998  
ISBN 91 586 7607 4  
ISSN 1401—0402

**SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY**

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm  
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64  
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9  
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

ACTS	African Centre for Technology Studies
CBR	Centre for Basic Research (Uganda)
DHP	Dryland Husbandry Programme
EPOS	Research Programme on Environmental Policy and Society
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NSC	National Steering Committee
OSSREA	Organisation for Social Science Research in Africa
PENHA	Pastoral and Environmental Network for the Horn of Africa
PINEP	Pastoral Information Network



# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Terms of reference	8
1.2 Review team	8
1.3 Programme objectives	8
1.4 Programme implementation	9
1.5 Methods and materials used in this study	9
1.6 Itinerary	10
<b>2. PASTORAL INFORMATION NETWORK PROGRAMME (PINEP)</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Background, relevance and objectives	10
2.2 Scientific results and dissemination	11
2.3 Capacity building	11
2.4 Collaboration between parties	12
2.5 Methods and programme models	12
2.6 Sustainability	12
2.7 Gender issues	13
2.8 Cost effectiveness	13
2.9 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results	13
2.10 Future programme	14
<b>3. DRYLAND HUSBANDRY PROGRAMME (DHP)</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Relevance and importance	14
3.2 Administration and implementation	15
3.3 Outputs in relation to objectives	18
3.4 Cost effectiveness	19
3.5 Scientific results and dissemination	19
3.6 Capacity building	19
3.7 Collaboration among parties	21
3.8 Methods and programme models	22
3.9 Sustainability	23
3.10 Gender issues	24
3.11 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results	24
3.12 Components to be completed within the current phase	25
<b>4. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (IIED) Resource tenure and natural resource management in dryland Africa: a policy oriented programme of collaborative research</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Relevance and importance	26
4.2 Sustainability	26
4.3 Scientific results and dissemination publications: quality and effectiveness	26
4.4 Capacity building	27
4.5 Collaboration between parties	27
4.6 Methods and programme models	28
<b>5. INTER-PROGRAMME ISSUES</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 Relationships between DHP and PINEP	29
5.2 Relationships between IIED and the other programmes	29

<b>6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>29</b>
6.1 Comparison of programmes	29
6.2 Capacity to build critical masses of African scientists and to generate research results	29
6.3 New approaches to research, extension and dissemination	30
6.4 Institutional arrangements within the programmes	31
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
1. Terms of reference	33
2. Documents and materials consulted	37
3. Itinerary and persons met	45
4. Comments of involved actors to the Evaluation report	48



# SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Review Team of Bruce Campbell and David Gibbon had meetings with key actors in June and July, studied a wealth of written materials submitted by EPOS and IIED (see Annex 2.) and visited East Africa during the period August 16<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> accompanied, for part of this time, by Karin Gerhardt of SAREC. Janice Jiggins provided substantial support with background reading and analysis of the materials.

## 2. PASTORAL INFORMATION NETWORK PROGRAMME (PINEP)

The main objectives of this programme are to: 1. Build research capacity through training in Range Management at MSc level with an emphasis on rehabilitation, resource management and conservation of the pastoral system, 2. Generate relevant knowledge through research with local communities in order to raise production and living standards and, 3. Provide a forum for results dissemination through workshops of stakeholders (see Annex 1 for full terms of reference).

The main coordinating institutions are The Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi and the Environmental Policy and Society (EPOS) group at Linköping University, Sweden.

**2.1 Relevance and importance.** The work is in line with regional priorities and within a few years, provided the trained scientists remain in each of the participating countries, the programme should have a significant impact.

- *The key elements (with some modifications) in this programme should be continued.*

**2.2 Sustainability.** The team questions the sustainability of the programme if it continues to be based primarily through the University of Nairobi. It is widely acknowledged that this institution suffers from frequent closures, a deteriorating quality of facilities, political interference, an increasing dependence on external donor aid and a dependence on a small number of very active and competent persons.

- *More attention needs to be paid to linkages with other institutions, including non government agencies to spread the institutional risk of the programme.*

**2.3 Scientific results and dissemination.** The dissemination of the results of the research programme has begun and while a significant output of reports, theses and working papers have been produced, the production of papers is still at an early stage.

- *There are a number of MSc theses, and outputs from funded research, which should generate good scientific papers provided that the authors receive substantial editorial assistance.*
- *The continued weakness in the socio-economic inputs in the MSc course, in problem formulation, planning, implementation and analysis of field research, is a serious deficiency which affects the quality of the outputs.*

**2.4 Capacity building.** The MSc in Range Management has become established and is producing some competent graduates who are expected to make important contributions on their return to their own countries. Some of the graduates are clearly capable of going on to participate in PhD programmes.

- *The MSc should be continued with the same target number of students as at present.*
- *The heavy course work load for students in the current MSc programme should be reduced and more space should be made for inputs from social scientists from the Region.*

The literature reviews, both for the MSc dissertations (and for some of the collaborative papers and research projects) do not include sufficient sensitivity to the recent analyses of pastoral systems, which challenge conventional wisdom. This does not tie in with the expressed objectives of the programme.

- *Future reviews, and materials used in teaching, must include evidence from recent debates on pastoral systems and range management material.*
- *The links between PINEP and the DHP activities in Kenya could be usefully stronger, both for developing teaching resources and as a base for dissertation studies.*
- *The working papers (APF series) are of wide interest but there is a need for tighter editorial control, which could lead to a better integration of socio-economic elements and move the reports closer to journal publications.*
- *An additional load, unforeseen in the original agreement, has been placed on the Regional Coordinator, not only in management but also in editorial duties. Steps should be taken to solve this problem*

- *A post graduate student network should be set up from the PINEP hub. This will enable them to build collaborative research activities and develop substantial international research activities.*
- *More responsibility should be devolved from the Secretariat to people who have the time to carry out the duties necessary to run the programme efficiently.*
- *National coordinator posts should rotate on a regular basis.*
- *Local knowledge on animal health and disease management should be incorporated into training programmes, not only for the paravets in the DHP programme, but also for undergraduate and graduate training programmes.*

**2.5 Collaboration between parties.** The minimal use of regional lecturers in the MSc programme and irregular contact indicates that the collaboration between coordinators could be better.

- *More resources should now be made available to the regional network to support in-country research activities and support for postgraduates.*

**2.6 Methods and programme models.** There is little evidence that a truly participatory approach has been adopted, particularly in research work. It is recommended that more research, both by students and collaborating researchers, is carried out using participatory, interdisciplinary approaches, with farmers and pastoralists, veterinary assistants and researchers working together on jointly identified problem areas. The greatest interaction within and between the national and regional programmes seems to come in the Workshops.

- *Participatory research methods need to be used more extensively in all aspects of the programme.*

### **2.7 Gender issues**

- *Gender should be addressed by, 1) admitting more female students, 2) incorporating gender analysis into course curricula and in field work, and 3) working directly with women's groups and addressing their priorities*
- *The DHP site at Kibwezi should be used to develop interdisciplinary research activities with women's groups and mixed men and women groups.*

**2.8 Cost effectiveness.** In the team's view there needs to be greater justification for the proportion of resources which are allocated to EPOS. The backstopping function is vital and bears great responsibility for ensuring the international quality standard of the writing that emerges from the programme.

- *The continued lack of socio-economic input into the planning and formulation of many research activities is a matter of concern. Without this, the final output can never fully fulfil the original objectives and goals of the programme.*
- *This final assessment of the MSc could be completed more economically by correspondence and the examiners could meet the students earlier after the course work exams instead of bringing the students back for a final oral exam.*

**2.9 Regional aspects.** The first practical output, by the end of this phase, will be the production of two sets of graduates who are expected to contribute greatly to the capacities of their home country. The emergence of a regional network of dryland range scientists is of great value. The research so far carried out is providing valuable information, which needs to be incorporated into future regional planning strategies, particularly those concerned with the management of rangeland. A second output will be the publications of the funded research activities by regional scientists.

- *The programme activities, both research and training, need to be brought to the attention of policy makers and planners so that the longer term sustainability of the programme is addressed. The regular meetings of the DHP Steering Committee could be used for this.*

### **2.10 Future programme**

- *The programme should continue, bearing in mind the proposals for changes in content, gender balance, the use of local knowledge and the need for greater socio-economic inputs.*
- *Much greater use should be made of the PINEP- DHP link for collaborative research and training activities.*
- *Workshops and regional seminars continue to be important meeting points for the exchange of experience and ideas.*
- *Other means of disseminating the outputs of research to a wider range of clients, including farmers, pastoralists and local communities, should be explored.*
- *The proposal, made by members of the coordinating team that PINEP (possibly together with DHP) should have an independent existence, is not supported by the Review team.*

### 3. DRYLAND HUSBANDRY PROGRAMME (DHP)

The main objectives of the Dryland Husbandry Programme were to: 1) Establish and support a network of research and extension institutions in the IGAD region who are working on dryland problems and, 2) Train and support veterinary assistants drawn from local communities who could be used as links between research, extension and local communities (Terms of Reference are in Annex 1).

The decentralised programme was implemented in five countries and there are many differences between DHP activities in each country. Many of the comments below do not apply to the Sudanese component, which has achieved many of its objectives. The programme only started late in Ethiopia, thus limiting what could be achieved.

**3.1 Relevance and importance.** The development of this programme in its early stages involved IGADD, Sida and Swedish researchers. It was seen by Sida as potentially a valuable partner to the PINEP. One area of focus is to disseminate information through the regional network and to provide a working, development oriented research base for the PINEP research activities.

- *There appears to be modest progress so far at several of the sites. The primary objectives should be revisited with the intention of reassessing the potential of the programme to achieve its objectives.*

**3.2 Sustainability.** In some countries the Programme has tended to create its own new structures without building on existing ones. The paravet programme is worth closer scrutiny.

- *The effectiveness of the paravet training programme and the potential of paravets as potential field-based facilitators, should be assessed.*

**3.3 Scientific results and dissemination.** Although the DHP was not primarily designed as a research programme, the scientific outputs so far are relatively weak. Important research questions, which might have emerged from a closer relationship with farmers and pastoralists in the development activities, have not been captured. The programme has moved into development activity without any really substantive research components. The socio-economic inputs are very limited and the work agenda is still dominated by natural scientists' ideas of the priorities. The baseline surveys, which have been completed, need publishing urgently and then used to develop understanding of rural livelihood systems.

- *More intensive backup support is needed both from PINEP and from EPOS to improve the research planning and review process. OSSREA needs to take a more active academic involvement, rather than providing mostly administrative back-up. Research priorities need re-assessing with farmers and other rural stakeholders.*

**3.4 Capacity building.** The programme has provided opportunities for natural scientists to develop new perspectives on certain issues (e.g. the importance of participation and gender). The initial country proposals for the programme were not very strong. There were no clear plans or framework for action and many proposals appear to contain contradictions. EPOS support is not significant for this programme.

This situation raises the question as to whether Universities are best placed to do research and development work of this kind. Would it not be better for the programme to develop linkages with non-government organisations in most countries? These organisations may well be better placed in relation to linkages with grass roots/local organisations. Kenya might be an exception in this regard, but the University of Nairobi still has major problems with disruptions in the running of the University.

- *If it is decided to reformulate the programme, effective linkages with organisations that are able to achieve participatory research and extension should be explored.*

Many of the senior members of staff who are running the programme do not have sufficient time to devote to the programme.

- *Management, participation at workshops etc., should be allocated to those who have sufficient time to commit to the programme.*

**3.5 Collaboration between parties.** Weaknesses in the linkages between all the three main institutions (OSSREA, EPOS, COUNTRY TEAMS) were evident in the cases which were reviewed by the Team. Collaboration between members of the network has been uneven, and in some cases not very effective. The Workshops seem to have been very useful but they are insufficient to sustain the level of interaction necessary in a programme of this nature.

- *There needs to be more effort put into on-going linkages and information flows between actors in the programmes.*

**3.6 Methods and programme models.** Initial setting of priorities appears to be carried out with inadequate reviews of existing information, both of the literature and of the programmes and projects which have proceeded these ones.

- *There is a need for more thorough literature reviews and study of previous, relevant work, before embarking on any research activity, e.g. grass seed collection and testing, tree nursery research and development.*

Participatory research approaches do not appear to be very strong here and there is no evidence of a continuing interest and development of participatory methods.

- *The objective of using participatory methods and approaches needs to be taken much more seriously, both in the initial diagnostic work with pastoralists and in subsequent interactions with local communities.*

There is a serious anomaly in which some members of the MSc research teams are studying local veterinary knowledge in depth and yet in the teaching of veterinary assistants this knowledge is not emphasised. Instructions to the trainees are that they should recommend only drugs for the treatment of pathological conditions. Such recommendations are clearly inappropriate for poorer pastoralists who will not be able to afford such medicines. There are also health and ethical issues that need to be addressed.

- *Local knowledge should be studied and understood by the trainees and should be incorporated, wherever appropriate, into recommendations for treatment.*

Yet another anomaly has been the training of vet assistants at the University (at Makerere University in the Ugandan case). This is totally inappropriate and all future training should be field based.

- *The training of veterinary assistants should be carried out primarily in local field circumstances not in University laboratories.*

**3.7 Gender issues.** While gender issues have received attention at regional workshops, there is not really much progress on the ground in terms of gender balance in training courses, and in the emergence of gender sensitive knowledge.

- *Much more efforts should be made to address the 'gender issue' in all aspects of the programme.*

**3.8 Cost effectiveness.** The programme took some time to begin effective operations. However, over the two-year period, the programme has received 6.8 million SEK, of which 1.4 million SEK was allocated to EPOS. These are substantial amounts of resources and it is appropriate to ask for more outputs, in line with project expectations of the progress achievable, prior to the end of this phase. In the light of the resources allocated to EPOS, it would be reasonable to expect its contribution to the programme to have been greater than so far achieved.

**3.9 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results.** OSSREA has staged three regional meetings, which have generally been well received. Due to delays in the start of some programmes, it is too early to make a serious assessment of impact. The lack of activity in some national programmes would suggest that there ought to be some reassessment of resource allocation.

**3.10 Linkages between researchers/extension personnel and local communities.** The link with the PINEP is weak in some countries and should be strengthened if the programme is to be continued. The approach to research and extension is a very conventional one and there is no obvious integration of research, extension and farmers in the research process even though there are some linkages at key times. There is a surprising lack of utilisation of the DHP sites and the contact communities by the MSc students and other collaborating scientists. There is an excellent opportunity for young researchers to develop research themes with women's groups on problems and themes, which are important to them.

- *greater use should be made of the DHP sites and the established community action groups as the basis of future research projects, by the graduate students and other collaborating scientists.*

**3.11 Future programme.** The team has the following recommendations for the future programme:

- *The DHP should make better links with other scientific agencies and institutions interested in research work.*
- *More interdisciplinary research should be carried out within the DHP context.*
- *Pastoral committees should be supported and partnerships need to be built on these links.*
- *Work on innovative forms of land regeneration should be developed including the use of animal draught and soil rippers.*
- *A structured research review and replanning process should be introduced in which farmers are intimately involved.*
- *At least four new papers should be completed and published before the end of Phase 1.*

Country performance has been variable, and in view of the limited funds available it might be better to close down two of the programmes and reallocate the resources to the three other country programmes.

- *The Sudan, Kenya and Ethiopia programmes could continue and the Eritrea and Uganda programmes need major reviews. Perhaps younger scientists from these countries should be stimulated to become involved within the network through some kind of small grants programme administered by OSSREA, and by inviting them to the regional meetings.*

#### **4. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (IIED)**

IIED is based in London and has been supported by SAREC since 1991/2. It is also co-sponsored by NORAD, DANIDA and IDRC. The key objectives of the support are to identify current processes which change people's access to resources; the socio-economic consequences of such changes, the options available at local and national levels for attaining more equitable and efficient patterns of resource management and use.

This programme is qualitatively different to the other two and involves eight areas of work from the Horn of Africa to Mali and Senegal, and periodic and sometimes irregular support to a range of different organisations and individuals. The review team were able to assess only a fraction of the activities and total output of this programme.

##### **4.1 Relevance and importance**

The review team received very different perceptions of the work of IIED from different actors and partners, which indicated some confusion in their minds.

- *IIED needs to clarify its research purpose and role in this work and present a coherent programme.*

##### **4.2 Sustainability**

This type of work has built into it commitments and conviction from individuals and organisations that pastoralists will prevail in the medium or long-term. The needs and type of support will change over time and it is up to the supporting organisation (IIED) to recognise this and respond accordingly. Given the strength of the local organisational networks, it is unlikely that this work will decline.

- *More can be done to support individuals and organisations through the provision of information on relevant case law and similar activities from other countries and through the provision of literature in local languages.*

##### **4.3 Scientific results and dissemination: the quality and effectiveness of publications**

IIED has produced a large number of publications of different qualities and for different audiences.

- *There are important questions to be addressed concerning the value of the materials to the communities who are being written about and whether other forms of publication might be worth pursuing.*
- *There are some questions and uncertainty about the ownership of some of the materials, notably commissioned works by African writers, and whether they can be reproduced for other fora. There has been some ambiguity and lack of clarity by IIED on this issue and it needs attention.*
- *There is a great demand for some general interest publications (not just the ones that are considered to be relevant to pastoral struggles) by some of the community organisations and IIED should take steps to find out these needs and to respond.*

##### **4.4 Capacity building**

IIED is but one actor among many in what is a rather complex programme and it is difficult to attribute the development of capacity to any one source or agency. There was some evidence of confidence and maturity among many of the people who were interviewed and a sense of knowing where they were going and what their needs were. Initial support at crucial stages of institution building clearly has been significant.

For the programme to be really successful, it would be reasonable to expect that much of the authorship is by African scholars and activists. Many IIED publications are written by scholars from the developed countries.

- *IIED needs to develop a vision about the role of scholars from developed countries, and about its role in stimulating more authorship by Africans.*

**4.5 Collaboration between parties.** There does seem to be scope for greater collaboration between organisations in different countries that have similar aims and objectives relating to land and human rights conflict. However, there are some disagreements about who is representing the real interests of the disadvantaged.

**4.6 Methods and programme models.** The methods used have been disseminated largely through individual contacts but also has involved the use of participatory workshops, training and study tours. For this kind of work excessive formalisation may not be appropriate and responses need to be made in response to clients' expressed wishes. The work carried out so far would seem to have been effective.

**4.7 Gender issues.** Under the circumstance in which this review was carried out, it was impossible to determine whether or not gender issues - particularly whether there have been substantial benefits to pastoral women - had been addressed. Given the publications that have emerged it is safe to assume that such issues are well incorporated into the thinking and actions of the IIED group and most of their clients.

**4.8 Cost effectiveness.** The team were satisfied that the work carried out during the period was effective and carefully monitored.

**4.9 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results.** It is too early to judge the final outcomes of the land law trials which are pending, but it might be appropriate to speculate that new land access laws are likely in Tanzania and in the longer term, in the other two countries also.

**4.10 Future programme.** The team feels that the style and methods adopted by IIED have been flexible, responsive and innovative, particularly at the beginning of the programme. The needs of partner organisations have changed since the programme started. Some partners felt that IIED was not as active as it had been earlier. The following needs were identified:

- *Review, document and archive cases related to pastoralists.*
- *Steering Committee of interest groups was needed to service pastoralists. There is a need for an international forum on pastoralists rights issues?*
- *Assistance needed to publicise cases pending by using advertising space in international newspapers*
- *Documented case studies on land and human rights law from other countries would be very powerful.*
- *The provision of law books would be greatly appreciated.*
- *More workshops, with all stakeholders present, needed in East Africa region*
- *More attention should be given to developing African scholarship and authorship*
- *Greater clarity of purpose, goals and coherence is needed in the programme.*

## **5. INTER-PROGRAMME ISSUES**

### **5.1 EPOS - PINEP/DHP**

As the programme develops it is evident that the reason for persisting with the complex PINEP/DHP/EPOS model is less evident. The various elements are not always working in harmony and there is a rather inequitable distribution of resources. There is a strong case for much closer integration of the PINEP/DHP activities and it does not seem logical for them to be operating independently.

- *The relationship and structure between the partners needs to be rethought and a more integrated structure with consistent internal objectives is needed.*
- *There needs to be a greater consistency between the elements, in approaches to the use of local knowledge, in the location of the training of paravets, in developing research components and the active involvement of PINEP staff on DHP sites with local communities. Such activities need careful joint planning.*
- *EPOS should take a more supportive role in trying to help partners in identifying where and how natural and social science competence and methods can be applied to the development issues identified, and their support for developing quality publications.*

## **5.2 IIED - EPOS/PINEP/DHP**

There are few common threads between the IIED approach and the EPOS/PINEP/DHP programme and there has so far been few common activities. It was not clear to the review team why there was such a distance between the IIED work and the EPOS/PINEP/DHP programmes given the similar overall goals and programme activities. It is acknowledged that there have been discussions on this issue but no common goals and programme has emerged.

- *PINEP and DHP could benefit greatly by developing some more effective linkages with some of the IIED partners*
- *IIED could, and should be providing a more active service to the collaborating partners by making available the most recent publications and reports on pastoral management systems. These could be valuable resources for the PINEP library and for use in the courses by faculty.*
- *Another area in which IIED could make a significant contribution to the PINEP and DHP programmes is in the training of staff and researchers in participatory approaches and methods of research. Perhaps this could most effectively be done through joint dryland resource management research.*

# MAIN REPORT

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Terms of reference

SAREC has provided support for three different programmes concerned with land use in the African Drylands. These programmes are qualitatively different and have different emphases but all are designed to improve the human resource base and the understanding of the complex problems of pastoralists and other land users in their interaction with their environment. Capacity building, promotion of problem oriented research and dissemination of results are the major objectives of the programmes. The full terms of reference are given in Appendix 1.

### 1.2 Review team

The review team consisted of: Bruce M. Campbell, Director, Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Zimbabwe, Box MP167, Harare, Zimbabwe, David Gibbon, Professor of Small Farm Systems, and Janice Jiggins, Professor of Human Ecology, Department of Rural Development Studies, Swedish Agricultural University, Uppsala. Bruce Campbell and David Gibbon travelled to East Africa and put together the bulk of the report and Janice Jiggins provided background analysis of the documentation

### 1.3 Programme objectives

The three programmes evaluated have many facets in common (Table 1). DHP and PINEP both have training objectives, though DHP focuses on paravets while PINEP focuses on formal university training. All involve research, but of various types. PINEP emphasises formal scientific research largely through MSc students, while DHP and IIED give prominence to participatory and action research. IIED also undertakes policy research. All three programmes talk of disseminating the research results to stakeholders. All the programmes mention the necessary interface with policy makers, while DHP and IIED also discuss the importance of engaging local communities.

**Table 1.** Key objectives of the three Sida-supported programmes. Ticks indicate objectives that are explicitly referred to in regional or country project proposals

Objectives	DHP	PINEP	Drylands Programme (IIED)
Networking	✓	✓	✓
Training			
Field-based personnel (e.g. Paravets)	✓		
Practitioners (e.g. managers, government specialists)	✓		✓
University-based formal education	✓	✓	
Research			
Formal scientific research		✓	
Participatory/action research	✓		✓
Policy research			✓
Information dissemination			
Connecting to policy makers	✓	✓	✓
Information dissemination through working papers/		✓	✓



#### 1.4 Programme implementation

The DHP programme is relatively recent, having only been initiated in late 1995, while the other programmes were initiated in the early 1990s (Table 2). On an annual basis, IIED has received approximately SEK 0.5 million per year, with DHP and PINEP receiving, on average 4-7 times more funds per year. DHP receives the most funds on an annual basis but then it has substantial projects within each of the countries where it operates. PINEP on the other hand has utilised most of the funds utilised in Kenya.

The three programmes have markedly different ways of operating. DHP is run largely from Ethiopia, while PINEP is largely run from Kenya, and both of these programmes have a developed country institution as a partner (EPOS, Sweden). On the other hand the IIED programme is run from a developed country (UK). PINEP has centralised control under the Programme Co-ordinator in Kenya. The PINEP country partners depend on the release of funds from this central point. In contrast, DHP is strongly decentralised with country teams having their own budgets and budgetary control. IIED, London, controls the funds for its programme, and works with many partner institutions such as ARED, PENHA and ACTS.

**Table 2.** Key features of the three Sida-supported programmes

	DHP	PINEP	Drylands Programme (IIED)
Overall budget, including present phase (SEK million)	6.8	11.55	2.8
Initiation year	late 1995	1991	1991/92
Approx. SEK million/year	3.5	2.0	0.5
Countries where activities have been undertaken	Kenya ✓ Ethiopia ✓ Tanzania ✓ Djibouti ✓ Eritrea ✓ Sudan ✓ Uganda ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

#### 1.5 Methods and materials used in this study

The team were given access to a wide range of materials from all three projects and spent some time reviewing them. Appendix 2 contains a listing of many of the documents consulted.

In the time available it was not possible to visit all the key people or to spend much time at field sites, and it must be admitted that some reputedly interesting field activities (Sudan and Senegal) and important individuals (Professor Shivji, Tanzania and the IIED West African collaborators) were missed. The evaluation only covered the East Africa and the Horn of Africa IIED activities, not the West African ones.

During country and field visits the team had extensive discussions and interviews with University staff, (not just those in the projects), project staff members, graduate students, farmer groups, veterinary assistants and others not directly associated with the programmes but who had some insight into the impacts and effectiveness of the activities. A simple questionnaire, based on the terms of reference, was sent to all the key actors - national coordinators and members of the organisations supported by IIED, and only 5 were returned from DHP coordinators and one from the PINEP. This enabled us to get some qualitative feed back on the projects that we were unable to visit.

The team is aware that a major internal review of the IIED programme is being carried out by Dr Jeremy Swift and others, during the latter part of 1997. Judging by the terms of reference for this study, a great deal more valuable information should be generated which will add to the fuller assessment of the impact and sustainability of the IIED activities and it may well also provide some useful lessons for the PINEP and DHP programmes. Given the time and resources available to the SAREC team and the need to make decisions about the continuity of the key programmes soon, we could not arrange to synchronise the studies and therefore some opportunity for productive interaction has been missed

### **1.6 Itinerary**

Bruce Campbell visited Ethiopia (DHP/PINEP), Kenya, Tanzania(IIED) and Uganda (DHP), David Gibbon visited UK (IIED and Malian staff supported by IIED), Kenya (PINEP and DHP), Tanzania (IIED) and Uganda (DHP). Karin Gerhardt accompanied David Gibbon to Kibwezi in Kenya and Arusha in Tanzania where they were joined by Bruce Campbell. The three returned to Nairobi and flew to Uganda together where they visited the University, the DHP site and the Centre for Basic Research. A full itinerary is given in Appendix 3.

## **2. PASTORAL INFORMATION NETWORK PROGRAMME (PINEP)**

### **2.1 Background, relevance and objectives**

The background to this programme is the continuing “crisis of African pastoralism” in which the problems are perceived to be due to the degradation of land based resources, population pressure and a shrinking resource base, increased vulnerability and a substantial decline in household economies. The problems appear to be derived from a complex interaction among ecological, socio-economic and political economy factors despite, but perhaps in part, because of, the considerable resources poured into the pastoral economies in the form of rangeland and livestock improvement programmes during the last 30 years (PINEP brochure).

#### *Evidence from research*

Meanwhile, there is a wealth of information on pastoral systems which has been generated by a range of agencies, networks and individuals since the mid 1970s which has provided an alternative analysis of the “pastoral crisis”. The work suggests that the normal development models have been poorly designed and have made many incorrect assumptions about the needs of pastoral systems and societies. This has seriously challenged conventional wisdom about the efficiency and sustainability of commercial ranching and has shown that many older, more flexible pastoral systems were highly efficient both ecologically and economically.

#### *Ineffective transfers*

This information and evidence on the nature of pastoral eco-systems seems to have transferred very ineffectively to many agricultural educational and research institutions in the South (and some in the North) and, as a result of the paucity of research effort devoted to careful reviewing of existing knowledge, little has changed since the 70s in many institutions. Conventional training at College and University levels has also failed to incorporate this knowledge and has also been unable to recognise that there is a wealth of indigenous knowledge about livestock and range management in drylands, which needs understanding and incorporating in addition to the knowledge generated by conventional scientific studies into training programmes.

#### *The Programme*

The PINEP has been established, with support from EPOS and links to DHP, in an attempt to effect the incorporation of some of this knowledge and thinking into existing training and research activities. The three main elements in the PINEP programme are; the development of regional research capacity through the two year MSc programme in Range Management for regional students at the University of Nairobi, the development of research activities which address important dryland problems with local communities and the dissemination of results through workshops of key regional stakeholders.

The Review Team examined each of these elements through a series of interviews and discussions, the field visits and an examination of the written records. The Department of Range Management at the University of Nairobi is a key part of the training effort. The team spent time with the Regional secretariat discussing the institutional situation and the programme made during the first two years.

Dr Kassim Farah (Regional Coordinator, PINEP and Head of the Range Management Department) and Dr Nashon Musimbe (National Coordinator, DHP, and also member of the Range Management Department) were key figures in these discussions. Other key informants were the Vice Chancellor, the Principal and the Deans of the other Faculties.

One concern was that the programme is greatly and dangerously dependent on the energy and enthusiasm of Dr Kassim Farah. Without his continued inputs it is hard to see how the programme would continue as well as it seems to be doing. This is not to suggest that there are not other capable people in the university but it does make the whole programme rather vulnerable at the present time.

The centralised control by the PINEP regional co-ordinator in Kenya was a point of much frustration to some of the regional partners. Partners noted that the DHP structure, whereby each country has its own budget, is more appropriate. It was felt that if PINEP was organised along such lines, then it would be clearer to country co-ordinators as to how many students and research proposals could be funded. In addition, country co-ordinators would have a small budget to facilitate communication (currently some of these costs are being borne by the individuals themselves). A programme structure which does not give some control to country co-ordinators can never hope to build a vibrant network. The question is not whether some other modality could be designed if there were more funding. The question is the extent to which the existing design is workable at current funding levels.

## **2.2 Scientific results and dissemination**

Despite many difficulties with the operation of the University, there have been a number of interesting MSc dissertations generated by the first batch of students. The African Pastoral Forum papers (a condensed version of the Thesis) are improving in quality. However, there is much work to be done here in order to raise the standard of the theses and resulting publications. All of them need some additional help from the academic partners, including EPOS, or any other appropriate person or institution with the scientific editorial and social science skills to bring them up to an acceptable standard.

There is a more fundamental problem with the design and supervision of the theses in that the planning of the integration of social and natural science analyses, stressed in the initial objects of this programme, is not usually apparent.

The PINEP Team needs an editor as the burden falls on Dr Farah who is already heavily overloaded. Other forms of publication and communication might be explored. Emphasis so far has been to concentrate on the Forum papers and a few refereed journal articles. This is a difficult route to follow at this stage of development of the programme and it might be wiser to pursue forms of publications, which are appealing to wider audiences, particularly those in the regions where the research is being carried out. Bulletins and videos would be of interest to many people. This is particularly important given the mandate to disseminate the information gained.

A second major activity is Pastoral Research in which a number (5) of researchers have been granted US\$ 5,000 each to pursue a range of studies on dryland themes. These include a study of gum arabic production in Northern Kenya, local milk processing technology by pastoralists, indigenous knowledge in Kitui, local herbs as treatment for external parasites in Ethiopia and an economic analysis of agro-pastoral systems in Tanzania.

Much of the work is still in progress but some of the output has now appeared in the African Pastoral Forum issues.

## **2.3 Capacity building**

It was the intention in the PINEP programme to forge connections amongst disciplines. This has not occurred. In the first course there were no socio-economic inputs. The socio-economic inputs given to the second intake of students were regarded as being limited by PINEP associates. Although there are capable socio-economists within the region they were not engaged to teach part of the course. Where socio-economists were approached to teach within PINEP, the invitations from Nairobi were said to be sent too late.

It is anticipated that several generations of students will take the course and over time a strong cadre of researchers will be built up across the region. The first batch of students were interviewed in depth and showed that they had benefited from the course. Some are clearly capable of going on to read for a PhD. Degree.

The programme has had regular backstopping and advisory visits from EPOS team members but there are still some puzzling anomalies in explanation of the weakness in social science inputs in the teaching programme and in the research proposals and programmes carried out by students. Similarly, there has been relatively little development of interdisciplinary research themes in the papers and reports, which have emerged so far. It was reported that there had been some PRA training under the guidance of a social scientist but there has been no use made of these methods in the field work by the graduate students and little if any provision of training on other participatory, interdisciplinary research methods.

The programme is meant to incorporate the latest pastoral systems paradigms and yet there is virtually no reference to this work in any of the MSc theses and subsequent papers. This needs to be addressed. More resources should be devoted to collecting a set of relevant material, which can be made available in the Library for consultation and reference.

The MSc students were anxious to have a network link when they left to keep in touch and exchange experiences. This could be done through e-mail linkages. They also need help in formulating future research programmes and getting them funded.

The links between PINEP and DHP were not as intimate as we had expected. The DHP site in Kibweze offers an excellent base for research and development with local communities and as yet it is not being fully utilised.

#### **2.4 Collaboration between parties**

There have been workshops for all the major actors in the programme and at these communication between the associates seems reasonably satisfactory. The fact that the bulk of the resources goes to Nairobi is a problem and it is hard to see how this can be justified. National coordinators could be much more actively involved if there was a more equitable distribution of resources.

However, during normal working times, there is apparently very poor communication between the PINEP regional co-ordinator and the national co-ordinators. There were complaints of no replies being received to queries sent by letter or fax, no acknowledgements received in response to submitted research proposals, and no acknowledgement with respect to papers sent to the African Pastoral Forum for publication. Lack of progress in publishing submitted manuscripts was said to be marked, to the point where some authors were requesting that their manuscripts be returned. It was noted that full sets of the African Pastoral Forum were not available at the national centres as the publications were not systematically distributed. The high level of frustration amongst national co-ordinators was noticeable. It was suggested that an annual workshop should be convened to make sure that these kinds of frustrations do not reach crisis proportions.

#### **2.5 Methods and programme models**

Although there was some participatory and action research training in the MSc, there was little evidence that these methods, and the thinking behind them in relation to the development of new research approaches with farmers and rural communities, were understood by many of the PINEP team. Most of the research employed conventional natural science methods combined with some standard questionnaires, which did not seem to generate much new information.

There is little use so far of the potentially valuable PINEP/DHP link for participatory research activities, or for utilising the vet assistants in the research programmes in an innovative manner. The situation potentially offers an excellent opportunity for interdisciplinary research and training activity with communities who are clearly in need of support and who are keen to participate in any activity which will improve the reliability of water supply and food security.

#### **2.6 Sustainability**

The continuing uncertainties in the University of Nairobi raise considerable doubts about the sustainability of the MSc programme. Some concern was expressed by Dean Imungi. He felt there might be too many activities being undertaken and the manpower resources were being stretched to the limit.

There was a suggestion that the supervision of students may not always be as full as it should be, particularly in planning and when the students go away for field work due to a variety of constraints which are far beyond the programme's capacity to fix. A critical concern about the sustainability of the PINEP programme was expressed due to the Department of Range Management's extreme dependency on external funding. It was also thought that there was not enough overall control of externally funded courses and that these programmes should come under a central government research and education coordinating body.

The notion of building a critical mass of scientists is critically dependent on the trained researchers remaining in the subject field in their home countries.

### **2.7 Gender issues**

The graduate student population is overwhelmingly male. It needs a much greater effort to address this problem. The problems of pastoral societies in dry areas are not exclusively male ones. The studied communities in Kibwezi show that women play a key role in these societies. Problems such as water access and supply and the problems of developing a small stock enterprise may be predominantly those of the women. Female research students and staff involvement in the programme would greatly enrich the research and development work, while the presentation of the conceptual and theoretical dimensions of gender in the course would enable students to incorporate gender concerns into their field studies.

It was noted that getting a balanced gender intake into the MSc programme is not always simple, especially in some of the countries. Thus at Mekelle University College in Ethiopia, only 2 of the 40 students graduating with a first degree in 1997 were female. To stimulate the training of women, it is somewhat inappropriate to focus on the MSc level, as the problem may be at the undergraduate level, or even within school. Different kinds of assistance are necessary if the current gender imbalance is really going to be addressed. For example, in the case of Ethiopia, it may be necessary to provide scholarships for women to undertake first degrees, rather than focusing, in the first instance, on the MSc level.

### **2.8 Cost effectiveness**

The team has checked the balance of allocation to the partners in the network and use of resources within the programme. Although they consider that on the whole the resources have been used effectively they consider that there needs to be a stronger justification of the substantial allocation to EPOS. There is clearly a vital role for the EPOS team, both to ensure, together with other partners, that the social science input is adequately covered and to provide support for the writing of reports and papers by students and researchers. The team was disappointed to note that despite regular monitoring visits by EPOS staff, these problems remain and still do not seem to be nearer solution.

The costs of administering the MSc programme were known from the onset to be high given the exceptional circumstances at the University of Nairobi. However, the requirement in the University regulations that the MSc students be brought back for a final oral examination is unnecessary for the success of PINEP and this should be addressed as soon as possible. It ought to be possible to monitor student progress provided that the internal examiners maintain a good link with the external examiner and that at least one meeting is arranged before the student departs.

The team was surprised to learn how little the National Programme coordinators received to run their programmes. It does not seem to be wholly logical for the bulk of the resources to be allocated to the Nairobi base and so little to be given to the regional network whatever the level of overall allocation. Additional funds to the Region could help to support the network of returned graduates.

### **2.9 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results**

The regional impact and significance of this programme will grow as the number of graduates who return to their home institutions grows and they begin to play an active role in research and policy-making. We would also judge that the information produced by the programme - from Workshops, from conference papers, from the MSc theses, from the APF bulletins and from journal articles and other forms of dissemination - could be expected to have an impact in the coming years but it is too early to judge this yet. This might be considered surprising, given the time that the project has been running, but given the circumstances at the University, it will take a little longer for the material produced to be disseminated.

The Programme Coordinator has good contacts with the Nairobi University Vice-Chancellor (who considers that the programme has done much to improve the University image during its life) and with other key figures in the University and in relevant Ministries. Any significant research results will have a good chance of finding their way into the policy debate, both in Kenya and elsewhere in the Region. The Regional Workshops are a suitable vehicle for the wider dissemination of findings from the research programme.

The programme has highlighted the importance of local knowledge in the treatment of animals for diseases and disorders. This information will be widely shared among the coordinating country programmes and will provide a valuable database for future research and extension advice that is particularly directed towards poorer people. It also provides useful materials for training programmes at several levels. However, it is clear from our discussions that not all academics, particularly senior veterinarians and the paravets in the DHP programme, regard this information as particularly valuable and are therefore not likely to be supporting its dissemination.

### **2.10 Future programme**

The Team felt that on balance the programme was making progress in reaching its goals and objectives. It was ably managed by the energetic Dr Farah despite many distractions and other responsibilities within the University. He is well supported by his team, particularly Dr Musimbe, Wellington Ekaya, Irene Maeri and the administrative team. There are also many others who are involved in maintaining the daily routine, supporting students, covering for absences and ensuring that the programme keeps going. (named in Annex 3).

There is an over-concentration of resources and activity in the Department of Range Management in Nairobi and it ought to be possible to spread the resources a little more widely. Dr Farah needs to devolve some of the decision making and also to take on someone to help out with the editing of Forum Papers and journal articles.

The lack of significant socio-economic input into the courses and in advising students on social research methods is a serious problem, which needs addressing soon. It has been known for some time any it is the responsibility of all the collaborators to do something about it. There are social scientists in the Region if they cannot be found in Kenya (this we find hard to believe) who are willing to contribute. One of the main objectives of the network is to share professional skills and expertise across the region.

The continued "production" of graduates would seem to be an excellent objective *as long as* gainful employment in pastoral and range management affairs is possible on return to the participant's home country. The idea of an ex-student network, proposed by the first batch of PINEP graduates, is an excellent one and should be supported.

There is a need to utilise the excellent opportunity that the DHP offers in terms of resources and a base to operate from. We consider that more student research theses should be developed from the emerging problems of the contact communities in the villages around Kibwezi.

As we saw little of the PINEP activities in other countries, it is difficult to make any judgment about the value of the network. However, apart from the suggestion that more resources should go to the collaborating countries, we think that the national coordinators should rotate their position on a regular basis, and that the coordinator should not necessarily be a very senior faculty person, but someone who has the time and is actively involved in research.

## **3. DRYLAND HUSBANDRY PROGRAMME (DHP)**

### **3.1 Relevance and importance**

There is no doubt that the DHP programme, as conceived, is of relevance to national and regional programmes and priorities. Pastoral communities make up a sizable proportion of rural households, and pastoralism represents the dominant land use in the vast areas where there are arid and semi-arid climates. To take Sudan as an example, there are 1.5 million km<sup>2</sup> where pastoralism is important. One focus of DHP is on training of paravets, animal health problems are seen as one of the major problems facing pastoralists. DHP also focuses on providing a network amongst extensionists, researchers and

pastoralists within the framework of participatory research and extension. As a model for problem solving this is an ideal approach. IGAD, (formerly IGADD) as the regional authority dealing with pastoral problems, has been involved with the development of the programme since its inception .

### 3.2 Administration and implementation

#### *Implementing organisations*

The DHP programme is implemented in five countries, with overall co-ordination by OSSREA. EPOS is placed, together with OSSREA, at the Centre of the network in the DHP organisational chart. The implementing organisations and research stations are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.** *Implementing organisations and field sites in the various National Programmes*

Overall co-ordinators		
	OSSREA EPOS	
Country co-ordinators	Implementing Department	Research sites
Eritrea	University of Asmara	• Wokiro and Wodilo Villages
Ethiopia	Mekelle University College	• Abala Wereda
Kenya	Institute of Dryland Research and Utilization	• Kibwezi
Sudan	Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Khartoum	• Butana
Uganda	Makerere University	• Kazo village and vet clinic

#### *Documents establishing the project agenda*

The programme was based on an agreement signed between OSSREA and Sida/SAREC. In many ways the imprecision of this document is likely to be responsible, in part, for a vagueness that permeates the entire project. In the signed agreement two objectives are mentioned: (i) to establish, support and administer a network of institutions for research and development in pastoral areas through co-operation between research institutions, extension organisations, NGOs and local communities, and (ii) to establish, support and administer a training programme for Veterinary Scouts (paravets) and/or Pastoral Development Agents. The Memoranda of Understanding between OSSREA and the country teams is based on these objectives as well. No mention of any research activity is stated or implied in these objectives. That research will be done, and the kind of research, are indicated in only Annex 1 of the signed agreement, entitled "SAREC's assessment of the research activities within the programme", where the following information is given:

- Capacity objective: "Training of researchers and extension agents in participatory research and development methodology";
- Research objective: "Improved knowledge about the resource management strategies in pastoral communities";
- Research results: "Methods for improved management through participatory research and development programmes".

This annex also quantifies a number of outputs, which are reproduced in Table 4.

**Table 4.** *Outputs as originally envisaged by the SAREC programme officer versus actual outputs*

Type of output	SAREC proposal (Annex 1)	Actual output to 15th September 1997
Persons trained (person months)	500	About 80
Mutual visits of scientists	10	6 (Regional co-ordinator and EPOS staff visited a number of projects)
Number of national publications	10	1 (DHP Publications Series #1)
Number of international publications	3	0
Number of books/major reports	1	0
Number of seminars/workshops/courses	10	13 (including paravet training)

The details of what actually was done or supposed to be done within each country is given in the country project proposals. These outline the country-specific objectives, and the activities to be carried out (Table 5). All country teams proposed interactions amongst the various stakeholders and the training of paravets. In Sudan specific mention was made of training range managers as well, while in Uganda mention was made of training participants in participatory approaches. All the projects mentioned that trials would be conducted. Socio-economic aspects, studies of indigenous knowledge and participatory research were also mentioned in one form or another in each proposal.

The proposals were deliberated at the 1st Regional Workshop in June 1995. The country proposals are, in the judgement of the Review Team, of an unacceptable quality. The objectives are unrealistic, and in many cases there are internal contradictions within proposals where objectives do not match activities. Almost all the proposals mention two training sessions for paravets per year with a total of 40 paravets trained over the two years. This gives 10 paravets per course. We doubt that this scenario was carefully thought out, as in the end only one (in rare cases two) courses have been held over the two year period, and class sizes have been usually around 20 not 10. To take one proposal as an example of lack of internal consistency, reference is made to the Eritrean proposal. In this proposal there are no stated research objectives. In the outputs, it is stated that there will be participatory research on water management techniques, while in the project area the research mentioned is trials (but with no further details). In the project implementation it is stated that range improvement trials will be conducted, and a study will be made on agro-pastoral and pastoral systems through participatory research. In the budget, we get the first mention of a baseline survey, and there is also mention of range improvement trials. Thus in this proposal there are almost no linkages between the different parts of the proposal.

Within all the proposals there are no action plans and defined indicators that could be used to assess progress. OSSREA and EPOS should have taken a more active role in the development of the proposals, and provided stronger, more detailed, focussed feedback to specific country teams on their proposals. Each partner in a partnership has strengths and ways have to be found to share these in a partnership in a supportive way. It is not acceptable if proposals below standard are not allowed to proceed, and in the absence of a clear learning trajectory towards which the partnership can aim. At the 1st regional workshop, new, more realistic proposals should have been presented and ratified. In addition, the regional workshops could have been used to develop action plans (or log frames), and subsequent workshops should have been used to reflect on progress towards achieving the set criteria. In this manner, some of the problems that have developed may have been circumvented. Sida/SAREC should never have permitted the project to go ahead on the basis of the poor state of the proposals and the vague overall project document.



**Table 5.** Characteristics of the country projects within the DHP programme

	Eritrea	Ethiopia	Kenya	Sudan	Uganda
Objectives in country project documents (as implied in the document, not necessarily stated in the objectives)					
Interactions between extensionists, researchers and pastoralists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Training of paravets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trials on range/water management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Research on indigenous knowledge			✓		✓
Base-line or socio-economic studies			✓	✓	✓
Participatory research	✓	✓		✓	✓
Training					
#s M.Sc students involved		1			2
#s other students involved		4	✓?		
# of paravet training courses	2	1	1	1	1
#s paravets trained	6+21	17	20	20	21
Other short courses conducted (#s trained).				45	✓
Training manuals for short courses	1	1		2	
Research (indicated as #s of bound reports/theses, + = draft report seen; ✓ = stated to being conducted)					
Thesis type research	-	+1			+1
Action/participatory research	-	-	-	-	-
Policy studies	-	-	-	-	-
RRA/baseline surveys	✓	✓	-	-	+1
Indigenous knowledge studies	-	1	1	1	-
On-farm trials	✓	✓	✓		✓
Networking					
DHP Report series				1	
National workshops conducted (#s)			1	2	1
National workshop reports with scientific papers (exc. DHP Series)			+1	1	+1
Regional workshops conducted (#s)		(2) <sup>1</sup>			1
Active partners					
NGOs			✓		
University departments	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Local people	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Government departments	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Development activities		✓	✓	✓	
Management issues					
Funds released	11/95	5/96	11/95	11/95	11/95
Total numbers of scientific reports or training manuals available to evaluators (excel. annual reports)	0	3	1	5	1

<sup>1</sup> The two regional workshops were conducted by OSSREA not the Ethiopian national team

#### *Regional administration*

The programme was coordinated by OSSREA in Addis Ababa. An examination of files and discussion with various stakeholders indicates that the administrative role played by OSSREA was excellent. They also provided stimulation to participants to move in certain directions by providing appropriate literature, and by raising certain topics at the regional workshops. For example, at the 2nd Regional Workshop, the following topics were highlighted: participatory research, gender and indigenous knowledge. Of particular note has been their attempt to get the participants to be gender sensitive. However, on their own admission, OSSREA feels that progress in this area has been more in terms of awareness than in competence in handling gender issues as a normal part of professionalism (See OSSREA's own internal Report 1997).

However, OSSREA could have provided more critical academic leadership. As indicated in “*Documents establishing the project agenda*” the project proposals were of a poor standard, and these should have been further modified, and project action plans established, at regional workshops. In addition the internal evaluations have, in general, not been sufficiently critical. These evaluations have failed to detect many of the serious deficits in the programmes.

#### *Institutional arrangements*

In most countries the national co-ordinators see no problem in balancing their university and project responsibilities. The Review Team is of a different opinion, however. We noted that, at least in Uganda, the project team does not appear to have sufficient time to make a serious commitment to the project activities, resulting in lack of coordination within the project. In the Ugandan project, the project manager, who is supposed to be involved in day-to-day management of the project in the study area, lives and works in Kampala, and thus has little input into management. In Kenya, there was a suggestion that a project team be set up for the DHP programme as relatively independent from the university, with the co-ordinator receiving a salary (75%) from the project. This model is not supported by the Review Team as it involves the establishment of project-specific institutional structures, which are usually less sustainable than current institutional arrangements.

### **3.3 Outputs in relation to objectives**

Most of the outputs listed in Annex 1 to the agreement between OSSREA and Sida/SAREC have not been achieved (Table 4). The training objective of 500 person months of trained personnel was most unrealistic. Nonetheless, it could have been expected that each country would at least have held two training courses. This was achieved only in Eritrea (but the 1st training session trained only 6 paravets) and Sudan (one course for paravets and one for range managers) (Table 5). The research report output is also well below expectation, with only one regional publication (OSSREA 1996, based on a Sudanese workshop), and no international publications.

The objectives listed in Annex 1, to a very great extent, have not been addressed. There has been no formal training in participatory research and development, though some participants were exposed to the ideas at the 2nd Regional Workshop. There has also been very limited participatory research in the field.

Part of the problem relates to the original proposals, which bear little relationship to what was possible. For instance, in the Ethiopian proposal, there is mention of many components that are not part of the current project, including: “trials with tree legumes, spineless cactus...”, “encouraging women to engage themselves in raising small animals and in horticultural activities”, “farm residues will be demonstrated by extension workers”, “range improvement through water management” (it is currently crop production improvement, not range improvement), “in-service training for practitioners”.

One country has shown excellent progress, namely Sudan, which has produced five reports, conducted two training courses, and held two national workshops (Table 5). An important initiative in Sudan was to make a follow-up of the paravets trained. In an interesting paper, the author compares the work of the paravets, with that of formally trained veterinarians and ethnovets. Such research is essential in a programme in which one of the central elements is the training of paravets. The paper reports the type of monitoring and evaluation exercise, which is essential before a second phase of training of paravets is undertaken. A few of the papers prepared for the two national workshops in Sudan should be further developed and submitted to internationally refereed journals, namely those by Babiker Abbas and Khidar Abdel Kajrim. However, Sudan needs to incorporate participatory research within its agenda. This was a stated objective that has not been carried out.

In the other countries there are some draft reports (Table 5) but these in the main have not been completed and none of them has been put in a format which could be distributed widely (e.g. DHP Publications Series). It was understood that there would be two national workshops in each country. Two were held in Sudan, and one was held in Kenya (Table 5). In Uganda the workshop was not of a national nature, being limited to only a few days in the field. None were held in Ethiopia or Eritrea.

The progress in Eritrea has been poor, though they did hold two paravet training courses, unlike most other countries which, to date, have held only one course. The baseline survey has not been brought to fruition, the trials did not work and the development activity is yet to be implemented.

The state of the project in Uganda is not satisfactory. The field trials are not participatory, poorly planned, sited and managed, and will probably not produce a satisfactory result. In addition, the relevance of the trials to local conditions is not clear (requiring fencing, watering etc.). To date only a baseline survey has been done as part of the research effort (and this is yet to be completed). It is fortunate that a Ugandan student from Makerere University, supported by DHP, is working at the research site, as this may be the most substantial output in terms of research (Table 5). The root of the problems in Uganda might lie in the coordination of the project, and ultimately, the amount of time senior staff make available for the project (see 3.2.).

### **3.4 Cost effectiveness**

Some of the training could have been done in a more cost-effective manner. Paravets have to be trained under conditions, which they are likely to meet in the field, not in the university laboratories. Thus the training of paravets in Uganda should have been done in a more cost-effective manner in the field. Participants at the training courses with whom we spoke mentioned the importance of having the training locally where it was possible to train more people.

Considering the sums of money allocated to EPOS and OSSREA, one would expect more than one national publication by the end of Phase 1 (OSSREA 1996). A number of reports are in an advanced stage at the OSSREA office, so with some effort this situation could be rectified before the end of Phase 1. Reports are but one (but by no means the only) capacity building indicator, and stated targets must be evaluated for achievement with respect to resource commitments.

A large sum of money has been allocated to EPOS. The budget that it receives seems to be out of proportion to the input it gives to the project. EPOS's budget is twice that of any country team. While the country teams are supposed to undertake development activities, train paravets, convene national steering committees, undertake research, and have national workshops, EPOS has attended three regional workshops, made one study visit, produced a brochure on the project and produced one literature review.

### **3.5 Scientific results and dissemination**

*Written academic and educational publications: quality and effectiveness*

The publication record of the project is, to date, poor (Table 5). There is no evidence of any papers that have been prepared for the peer-reviewed international literature, and only one national publication has been produced (OSSREA 1996). Of all the reports/drafts arising from DHP it appears that two from Sudan could be further developed for publication in the international literature.

One publication has been prepared by EPOS, the results of a literature search (EPOS 1997). It is poorly organised (e.g. authors not listed alphabetically) and with a poor layout. One of the Review Team, who is currently writing a paper for the international literature on the economics of pastoralism, looked through the publication to check on its usefulness, and found only two references that added to what he currently knew. In addition, many key references on pastoralism were missing.

On the positive side there were two publications written in local languages, as training manuals for use in the paravet training (in Sudan and Eritrea).

*Publications on video, radio, and TV, and in the national news papers*

The project has been well advertised within the national media. In Kenya, the DHP national workshop received attention on radio and TV, and in the daily papers. Different features of the field activities have received coverage in the newspapers (twice) and on the radio (once). Radio and television programmes have also been made in Ethiopia and Sudan. In Sudan a video on range management has been produced but we have no information on how this has been distributed and to whom it is being shown.

### **3.6 Capacity building**

In the view of the Review Team, the key elements of the capacity building aspects of the DHP programme are potentially:

- paravet training
- training in participatory approaches
- training in a variety of fields of dryland husbandry
- improving research capacity
- improving the ability of organisations to work in multi-institutional teams.

The formal component of capacity building has been addressed by the paravet training. In the project

documents, reference is made to training in participatory approaches, but this has not occurred in a formal sense (we return to discuss it in section 3.7). Only one country (Sudan) conducted training in another field of dryland husbandry (range management). One of the agendas within a programme such as DHP is to build research capacity, and in this particular instance it is important to focus on the capacity to conduct inter-disciplinary research. Another implicit capacity building aspect relates to multi-institutional collaboration.

#### *Paravet training*

All national projects have conducted one paravet training session, except for Eritrea which conducted two, the first training only six persons. All national projects are short of the original target of 40 trained paravets. Training sessions were between one week (e.g. Kenya) and one month (Ethiopia). A flaw in the project design is that little is being done to monitor the success of the paravet training, though in Sudan they did undertake a follow-up study. Thus it is unclear whether the paravet training should be continued in a second phase, whether the current batch of paravets need a refresher course, or whether paravet training is an appropriate option.

The sustainability of the whole procedure needs to be carefully monitored. For instance, can drug supply be maintained by paravets? Attempts to sell expensive drugs to poor pastoralists are likely to be unsuccessful.

Given the focus of the current programme on indigenous knowledge and action research it is indeed surprising that the findings from the ethno-veterinary studies have not been given a place within the paravet training. As an example, the Ugandan training course of two weeks allowed only 1.5 hours on ethno-veterinary practices. In all countries the focus on ethno-veterinary practices on the one hand, and the lack of incorporation of these into the training courses on the other, is a serious contradiction that needs to be addressed. There is lip service being applied to indigenous knowledge; when confronted with problems the experts are turning back to the technocratic solutions, which may have little role in a poor pastoral community. Outputs of the technocratic approach are easily measured in terms of amounts of people trained and drugs sold. Appropriate criteria need to be developed in the context of the programme for assessing progress of alternate approaches. To integrate indigenous knowledge into paravet training experienced social science inputs are needed. The skills and patience must be present within researchers as they join with pastoralists to develop appropriate ways of improving the current animal health system.

It is unfortunate that all countries did not follow Sudan's and Eritrea's example in producing training manuals for the lessons they taught at the paravet training (Table 5). If courses are going to be sustainable, it is necessary to develop a set of training manuals to be used by instructors.

One potential problem which has never really been tackled is how paravets are integrated within the broader animal health system. Throughout the project documents, and in discussions with interviewees, the point has been raised that the professional veterinarians do not approve of the training of paravets, though in some countries these views may be changing (Kenya).

#### *Inter-disciplinary research*

DHP nationally involves collaboration between natural and social scientists but the interaction up to this point is limited and could be described at best only as multi-disciplinary. To date social science issues are not tackled in any depth, and, where addressed at all, are limited to RRA or baseline surveys. The details of tenure arrangements (e.g. with regard to the development activities), gendered knowledge, inter-community differentiation, and other such issues have not been intimately connected with DHP activities on the ground. The programme is dominated by natural scientists except in the regional co-ordinating institution. OSSREA is a social science institution, but it does have a number of programmes, which incorporate natural scientists. The question on the questionnaire sent out by the Review Team as to the way social and natural scientists worked together was regarded as "not applicable" by one of the country co-ordinators.

OSSREA tried to improve the inter-disciplinary focus of the DHP programme during the second regional workshop, by introducing three items on the open agenda: participatory approaches, gender and local knowledge. On the positive side, it is never easy to work within an interdisciplinary setting, and the DHP project is part of a process towards interdisciplinary work. For the first time, many natural scientists have been exposed to issues outside their fields of normal endeavour.

### *Multi-institutional projects*

At an institutional level, the DHP programme is seen as contributing to the ability of organisations to run successful multi-institutional projects. In Eritrea, the link between government and the university is regarded as the first of its kind. In all countries there are multiple institutions, and then there are links between countries (see the next section for more details on collaboration).

### **3.7 Collaboration among parties**

One of the major foci of the DHP programme is the establishment of a network of researchers, extensionists and local people. This process has been set in motion, with various means of collaboration. Issues of collaboration are discussed in further detail below, and in section *Extension and Dissemination*, below.

#### *National Steering Committees*

One component of the linkages between various parties is the forum provided by the National Steering Committees (NSC). Each country has a NSC. These committees are made up of a good mix of persons from government and universities. For instance, in Ethiopia, there are two members from Mekelle University, two from government departments in Addis (one of whom is the PINEP National Co-ordinator), a local administrator from the study area, and an official from a local government department in the project area (the project manager). It appears that the committees meet frequently (2 to 4 times over a six month period).

#### *Collaboration amongst national partners*

In general, there does appear to be good collaboration amongst university and government institutions. However, it is apparent the collaboration is not effective in the case of Mekelle University and the local agricultural offices, to the point where the project manager is not entirely aware of the full spectrum of project aims and objectives (see Internal Evaluation).

The various country teams have engaged pastoralists within the collaborative framework. Examples of engagement with pastoralist communities, include: (i) pastoralists addressing the other participants at the seminar held by DHP in Kazo village in Uganda; (ii) pastoralists in most countries setting the agenda for the development activities that were established; and (iii) pastoralists playing a part in the selection of paravets. However, in many cases it is not clear to what extent the process is really participatory with entire villages rather than with the select pastoralists on the project committees. Thus, in Uganda fears have been raised by the internal evaluator that the primary beneficiaries are the members of the committees, not the community at large. An indication of the lack of uniformity of purpose within country project is indicated by the fact that some of the paravets interviewed had not seen the research trials, even though they were within the paravet's home area. In Ethiopia, it was possible to speak to an external researcher proposing to undertake studies in the DHP project site. Her assessment of the project work in the study area was very positive, in that good connections had been made between the DHP research team and the local people.

The absence of NGOs within the programme is of concern to some of the current participants (Table 5). In Sudan, one of the participants at a workshop presented a paper on the role of NGOs in pastoralism. One reason given why projects do not include NGOs, is that it is more appropriate to focus on government as this is likely to ensure sustainability. While this may be substantially true, in the longer term NGOs are important stakeholders and do sometimes have excellent relationships with local communities. On the other hand, community-based NGOs can also give inappropriate messages to local communities. For instance, as recorded in one country, an NGO might distribute free materials, counteracting the self-sustainability messages that are being espoused in DHP project activities.

Another reason for not incorporating NGOs within the programme is that none are active within project sites. Some NGOs could be included because they operate at the policy level (e.g. PENHA within the Horn of Africa, Farm Africa in Ethiopia, CBR in Uganda). Given the mention of the importance of the policy links within the project documents such NGOs would make good partners. In addition, many of the NGOs have a strong social science component, which is rather missing within the current DHP programme.

#### *Collaboration amongst regional partners*

Collaboration within the region is hampered by poor communication systems; however, with electronic mail the possibilities for efficient communication are improving. The current email systems, where they exist, are still, however, not always easy to use. For instance, there is only one computer with email services in the Faculty of the implementing team at Mekelle University, and the phone lines are not very reliable.

Current communication amongst most regional partners is limited. Thus participants, other than some key members of the NSC, do not generally know what is occurring in other countries. Formal publications, and even reports, take many months to reach distribution, and most are too bulky to send out as a mass mailing. The only real possibility for communication occurs at the regional meetings, occurring twice per year. In that these meetings only include about two persons from each country (except for the host country), wider communication between project members from one country with those of another is very limited. Two regional meetings have been held in Addis Ababa, one in Uganda, and one is planned for Kenya. On reflection, one of the meetings in Addis should have been held in one of the other countries, thus giving more room for interaction by researchers in the other country. There is very little budget for other visits amongst countries. DHP (Uganda) has made good connections with IGAD as one of the NSC members is the IGAD desk officer. Through such connections links are being made between DHP (Uganda) and the Convention to Combat Desertification.

#### *Collaboration with EPOS*

The national teams have had very little interaction with EPOS, the only interaction being limited to meeting EPOS staff members at the regional meetings (Hjort and Christoplos at the 1st and 2nd regional meeting, and Karlsson at the third), and the interactions on a study visit by an EPOS staff member (Christoplos) to Eritrea, Uganda and Kenya. Another staff member (Hjort) made trips to Kenya but the DHP activities were a minor component of the agenda. The country teams were of the opinion that EPOS worked with OSSREA, not with country teams. EPOS has produced a brochure describing DHP and carried out a literature survey.

The one report coming from EPOS, on the study trip, was of an excellent quality, providing positive criticism on a number of items: gender issues, participatory approaches, communications (Christoplos 1995). These items are still a problem and it would have been highly appropriate if the criticisms were brought to the attention of project leaders during 1996 and 1997, so that these problems could have been addressed at an early stage.

EPOS should have provided depth to the project in terms of bringing concrete definitions of 'participation' to the group (see 3.8), stimulating more publication, especially in the international literature, improving the research efforts, spending more time in the field with country teams, facilitating more concrete project proposals and establishing work plans. In all of these tasks they would have worked closely with OSSREA.

### **3.8 Methods and programme models**

#### *Participatory and action research, and development initiatives*

One innovative aspect of the DHP proposals was the focus on participatory and action research. After the regional trip by Ian Christoplos in late 1995, he raised concerns that the concepts of on-farm participatory trials did not appear to be clear to all individuals within DHP (Christoplos 1995). This concern has apparently never been sufficiently addressed, as none of the trials that have been conducted can be considered to be truly participatory. The entire research procedure is still researcher driven. The field trials are poor substitutes for proper participatory experimentation. It is unfortunate that most of the trials were failures, but especially because the failures were based on the lack of fencing and irrigation, both of which are inputs not used widely by pastoralists. Such trials are unlikely to form the basis of truly participatory experimentation, or findings relevant to pastoralists' lives.

Participatory research requires that the researchers have a good understanding of institutional relationships within their target group, so that they understand who exactly they are participating with. Very little mention within any of the national projects has been made of differentiation within target communities. It is essential to understand differentiation (especially related to wealth) prior to initiating

participatory research. Gender differentiation has received some attention in all the project sites. The two-year time period is very short within the context of participatory work, in that it takes much time to build confidence between researchers and local communities.

At the start of the DHP programme, it was considered that teams should go beyond the usual pattern of doing only research, and, instead, initiate some small development activities based on a participatory approach between researchers and local people. In almost all countries such development activities have been established (Table 5). The degree to which local people are supportive of the development programme can be seen in their willingness to provide labour for the development activities in Sudan, Kenya and Ethiopia. While most DHP persons expressed satisfaction with the development initiatives, it is apparent that the interesting and relevant research and monitoring opportunities arising from the development activities have not been taken up by the researchers. To date the element of participation is mostly in the design of the development activity, not in the research.

Although the programme has failed to undertake research that is truly farmer-led, it represents a training procedure for agriculturists, most of whom have been trained in conventional agricultural science, in which participatory approaches are not being considered. Agricultural faculties are generally conservative, throughout the world, and the allegiance to old styles of working are strong. In the face of such a situation, the project has made some progress in bringing new approaches to the attention of participants. Thus, interviews with one senior academic indicated that he had learnt an enormous amount as a result of the project. He saw the value of involving people from the outset. He mentioned that through the participatory approach, researchers were better able to understand people's priorities and the potential entry points for improving technologies.

One problem of incorporating participatory research is that such an approach is not easily incorporated within an academic training programme. The participatory approach is regarded by some academics as much too open-ended for student theses, and this is one reason for some observers to question whether academic institutions are best suited to managing projects such as DHP. Willingness to undertake a project such as DHP must be translated into willingness to change the methods usually associated with academic institutions (e.g. a thesis topic within a participatory process would have to be less well-defined *a priori*). This again is a strong argument in favour of integrating PINEP and DHP activities in order to develop their complementary strengths.

The report by Christoplos (1995) mentions the importance of the participatory approach as a means to empowering pastoralists and influencing policy. This aspect of the project cannot be said to be occurring. There have been some studies on indigenous knowledge, in particular on ethno-veterinary practices, but, surprisingly, the results from these studies do not seem to have been fed back into the paravet training.

#### *Extension and dissemination*

It is apparent that the conservative concept of extension and dissemination is still held by most project participants, that is research provides appropriate technologies which are then extended by the extension service or disseminated to policy makers. In this model, extension messages will be produced at the end of the project. Given the participatory nature of the project, it is necessary that researchers become acquainted with the new ideas within agricultural extension, one of which is that extension should be conducted in a participatory manner, in which extension staff have as much to learn from farmers, as farmers learn from the extension staff. Further that an important role for extension is to promote farmer-to-farmer learning and dissemination. Extension staff, together with researchers, should be involved in the participatory research from the outset of the project.

The potential for conducting collaborative work between extension and research staff, and local communities, exists in a number of the countries, as extension staff is part of the team. For instance, in Uganda, the local veterinary officer is part of the DHP project.

### **3.9 Sustainability**

The national co-ordinators believe that questions of institutional sustainability are being addressed through the development of capacity within participating institutions, and within local communities. In terms of funding, the situation is less promising, as all project co-ordinators mention the need to maintain (and increase) the flow of funds from Sida/SAREC. The degree to which government will absorb the costs of the programme are uncertain and, generally, in most of the countries, unlikely. However, national governments are currently contributing to the programme through providing salaries to all the key

participants in the programmes. In Sudan and Ethiopia, equipment was also provided by government (e.g. large trucks for materials needed in the development activity).

The intention is to establish a sustainable paravet system. The idea is that the paravets charge for their services, and make a small profit on drugs which they procure and sell to the community. In the first instance, paravets were each given a kit of drugs and equipment. It is unclear to what extent this is a sustainable practice. In many cases paravets are having trouble selling the drugs to community members, given the general poverty. As an indication of non-sustainability, paravets are calling for new kits to be supplied. It is too early to say whether the programme will develop a sustainable, professional practice based on paravets, but it is disturbing that only in Sudan was the programme being monitored in any detail.

### **3.10 Gender issues**

Within all the country projects, there has been serious discussion about gender issues. One paper on incorporating gender issues was prepared for the second regional workshop (1996). Unfortunately, the paper has yet to be published in the DHP Publication Series, thus limiting its wider impact.

Typical numbers of women involved in workshops are 5 out of 23 participants (National workshop in Uganda), and 4 out of 21 (DHP participants at the 3rd regional workshop). In most countries (excluding Sudan and Ethiopia), one of the members of the National steering committee is a woman, though there are no women as national co-ordinators. One of the four development projects being conducted in Kenya, one is specifically run by a women's group (Wasya wa Kinguutheni goat project), while another includes many women (Ngulu Rock Catchment Group). Various components of the research are being conducted or are planned to be conducted by women members of the teams. Thus, in Ethiopia, the baseline survey was done by Ms Abay, while in Uganda, Ms. Kabyetsiza proposes to develop some work on gender aspects of pastoralism. In the paravet and other training courses there were usually no women, except in Kenya (3 out of 22). A woman on one of the pastoral committees in Uganda expressed an interest in joining the training course.

It was apparent that the gender message was even reaching local people, as our discussion with a recently trained paravet indicated. He mentioned the importance of gender considerations, without being prompted. He was appreciative of receiving a gender component within his training.

While the programme has been successful in raising the profile of gender issues, there is still a long way to go to make gender an integral part of the programme.

### **3.11 Regional aspects and practical impact of project results**

#### *Impacts at the policy level*

All project co-ordinators made the point that the project goals fit in with national and regional goals. The regional goals are represented by IGAD which was instrumental in establishing the programme, and which still has close links with the programme. The degree to which the programme is relevant nationally might be seen in the extent to which government institutions have supported the DHP programme.

Within all countries, the National Steering Committees include persons from government, and, usually, relatively senior personnel, thus the projects have the potential to reach policy makers. In some of the projects, the local implementing team contains government persons, thus any successful technologies or models that are developed in the course of the DHP programme can easily be taken up into government programmes. For those regional or national workshops which have been conducted, the opening ceremonies have been conducted by very senior government officials, including the Minister's of relevant ministries. In Uganda it was stated that the drylands had previously received minimal attention, but because of the DHP programme, drylands were now on the national agenda, and it has thus been proposed that a national drylands programme should be established.

Currently, the projects are in too early a stage to have had any significant policy impact and so it is not surprising that there have, as yet, been any policy-specific workshops.

#### *Impacts of research at the local level*

The DHP programme is at too early a stage to have had any significant impact amongst pastoralists as a result of the research that has been conducted. In addition, the research efforts within the programme have been relatively limited.



#### *Impacts of the development activities*

The communities within the countries where such activities have been initiated (Ethiopia, Kenya and Sudan) are positive about the effects of the activities. However, a thorough monitoring programme is needed to investigate these and the sustainability of the development.

#### *Impacts of paravet training*

In Uganda, the training implies a ratio of 500 cattle per paravet which should be adequate cover. It is too early to say what the impact of paravet training will be. Of concern is the high drop out of trained paravets shortly after training (could be up to 50%, but no detailed studies apart from the Sudanese one have been conducted).

### **3.12 Components to be completed within the current phase**

#### *DHP programme*

The Sudanese team, in collaboration with OSSREA, needs to publish at least one or two of its reports within the DHP Publication Series.

All countries, other than Sudan, should be required to produce publishable reports before any further funds are released, as there is no evidence of finalised and disseminated results from any of the other countries. Many countries should also be stimulated to hold National Workshops for practitioners (Uganda, Eritrea and Ethiopia).

Prior to the completion of the current phase and the release of further funds, it is imperative that OSSREA complete the publications already in hand within the DHP Publication Series, and that the final regional workshop be held. There should be an attempt to have one publication per country, but as this is unlikely to be possible, given the poor progress in some countries (especially Eritrea), the following minimum set of publications in the DHP Publication Series should be required.

- Ethno-veterinary practices in Sudan
- 2nd National workshop report from Sudan
- Gender study presented at the 2nd regional meeting
- Base-line survey from Uganda
- Something from Kenya (perhaps the ethno-veterinary study, which the evaluators did not see)
- Something from Ethiopia.

Given that EPOS and OSSREA received substantial budgets for this kind of activity it will be very disappointing if only one publication (1996) appears in the DHP Publication Series before the end of phase 1.

## **4. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (IIED) Resource tenure and natural resource management in dryland Africa: a policy oriented programme of collaborative research**

### **4.1 Relevance and importance**

Although the original programme has eight components, there have been delays in initiating some of them and some are operational in West Africa (local level planning) and some more active in East Africa (pastoral land conflict resolution). The review team has only had the time and opportunity to study a small selection of the programme and to meet very few of the actors and stakeholders. It is important that this is borne in mind when reading this review.

The significant work of IIED in East Africa has involved a handful of people, who have identified and interacted with key actors and organisations concerned with pastoralists' access to land and with human rights issues. They have also facilitated, with others, training, meetings and workshops, which do have significance in the struggle to re-establish and reclaim access to lands, and which are essential for the survival of pastoralism in the Region. Such work is unconventional and cannot be considered an entirely research activity. The work undertaken sometimes conflicts with government policies and intentions and with the vested interests of politically powerful groups in society who have their own agendas. The individuals in the community organisations and the lawyers and others who have taken up their struggle are exceptional people who are committed to fighting, through a variety of means, to put right past errors in the allocation of rights to land to those who have no customary rights.

The programme as developed by IIED does have considerable significance and relevance to particular groups of pastoral people. Such people have had access to their customary lands and passage through lands on which they have relied for many years, blocked by land grabbing, national and regional government indifference and sometimes deliberate exclusion by those in authority. Such people and their livelihoods are probably vital to the future sustainable management of the drylands across vast areas of East and Southern Africa.

### **4.2 Sustainability**

It is not possible to judge the sustainability of any of the IIED activities in isolation from other actors and donors who support similar or related activities. It is probably true to say that much of activities that they are involved in are not sustainable without continued external support.

### **4.3 Scientific results and dissemination publications: quality and effectiveness**

IIED has always attempted to make its publications accessible to a wide range of potential readers and in so doing has moved away from a focus on refereed papers aimed at scientific journals and adopted a more non-specialist style. Judged by conventional scientific criteria many of their papers might be considered rather lightweight and unbalanced. It is therefore inappropriate to judge them by the standards used for select, refereed scientific journals. However, by getting into advocacy and going for immediately accessible writing they are opening up the possibilities and boundaries of what is to be considered relevant, acceptable and of interest to wider audiences. The quality of this work was assessed by the Team, resulting in some differences of view about value to the scientific and wider community. However, it was not possible to get much feed back from the 'consumers' of these materials. This would be a great interest to the external review team and no doubt the internal review will address this issue in detail.

The publications received from IIED have varying relevance to the programmes under review. A number acknowledged donors other than Sida, or were not published by IIED, the only IIED connection being the attendance at the seminar by an IIED staff member, notably Charles Lane (e.g. Olaka-Onyango et al. 1992). The planned versus executed outputs were:

	Planned	Achieved
Number of:		
1. National publications	15	9
2. International Publications	3	53
3. Books/reports	1	4
4. Seminars/workshops	10	6

(NB. An update of publications up to the end of 1997 is given in the attachment to Annex 2, p. 45.)

Of all the institutions evaluated in the current study, IIED has the best network for publication, and thus African authors can receive international recognition through their association with IIED. IIED has a very large circulation list and it also publicises its studies in various newsletters (e.g. Haramata).

The total Haramata mailing list is 3100 of which:

693 are in East Africa	(22%)
989 are in West Africa	(32%)
188 are in Southern Africa	( 6%)
531 are in Europe	(17%)
246 are in South East Asia	( 8%)
453 are elsewhere	(15%) USA, S. America, Middle East, Far East)

Haramata readers come from the following:

	%
Research organisations	36
NGO	26
Government	10
Universities/Training institutes	10
Donors	6
Community organisations	5
Other (media, consultants, donors)	7

Source: Ced Hesse, IIED. Provisional figures, 1997.

A fuller picture with some feed back from the internal evaluation may shed some light on the reaction of the potential and actual readers of IIED publications, particularly the Pastoral Land Tenure series which we found were in demand by PINGOs' communities.

Unfortunately, not many of the IIED authors are Africans (see Capacity Building). IIED publications are less effective in getting to African institutions than the developed country institutions, though this is probably not necessarily the direct fault of IIED (the IIED publications are free to African institutions if they ordered).

#### **4.4 Capacity building**

It was difficult, initially, for the evaluators to see to where the Sida / SAREC funds went within the broader IIED programme. However, in information supplied to us by IIED later it was evident that the bulk of the allocated resources were going to African research and NGO partners. Over the three year funding period (1994-97) just under £230,000 was spent on direct programme costs of which £230,000 when directly to African organisations. (See table in Annex 4). From the initial information made available to the evaluators, we got the impression that more researchers from the developed world, rather than from Africa, were being supported. However, in a further communication from IIED (see extension to Annex 2 following page 45), it is clear that just over 50 % of the authors are African. It is accepted that IIED devotes considerable attention to getting material in a form suitable for publication, and thus African co-writers do get the benefit of excellent editorial assistance and this is an important aspect of capacity building.

Training activities have played an important role in IIED support and these have included:- training workshops in conflict resolution methods, a series of short term fellowships, including Charles Ocan from Uganda, Saruni ole Ngulay from Tanzania and three Masaai community leaders from Tanzania.

#### **4.5 Collaboration between parties**

Many of IIED's links to African institutions are to the NGO community. A relationship with IIED, gives the African partner access to the wider world, in terms of literature, international donors and other research organisations. The partners visited by the Review Team were; The African Centre for Technology Development (ACTS, Nairobi), The Centre for Basic Research (Uganda) and the Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Government Organisations (PINGOs).

It is unclear to what extent IIED forms close relationships with African partners, as some of the partners that were interviewed were somewhat critical about their relationship, particularly over the use of materials produced. In addition, some of the partners were unfamiliar with the Drylands Programme of IIED, did not have most of the literature potentially available to them, and did not know that the money they received for writing a specific paper for IIED could have originally come from the Sida/SAREC funded programme.

To look at one partner in detail, we take the Pastoral and Environmental Network for the Horn of Africa (PENHA). In the publicity brochure of PENHA, IIED is listed as one of the 13 associate institutes of PENHA. PENHA has conducted a number of seminars in the region, notably the following:

- “Pastoralism in East Africa” in Addis (Feb. 1993). IIED assisted with the publication of the proceedings, but there is no acknowledgement to Sida/SAREC.
- “Pastoral and Rangeland Management Seminar” in Eritrea (Aug. 93). There was no mention of IIED or Sida/SAREC in the proceedings of that meeting (Nyamawira et al. 1994).
- “Pastoral Land Tenure Workshop” in Eritrea (May 1996) (conducted with IIED, but no mention of Sida/SAREC funding).
- “Pastoral Land Tenure” in Addis (1997). For this workshop IIED commissioned some of the studies, but there is no acknowledgement to Sida/SAREC.

It is thus unclear as to exactly how the Sida/SAREC funds are being used by IIED, and whether they are used to support NGOs like PENHA. This perception is partly a result of an oversight on the part of PENHA and IIED in failing to ensure that publications and activities made due acknowledgement to SAREC support. The Sida/SAREC money has gone to the grants and costs associated with developing and supporting a broad range of activities on pastoral development in Africa.

Other support activities have involved key individuals from different communities. For example, Joseph Simel of the Iloodoariak community in Kenya has been supported in training for conflict resolution and in a series of court cases, which have attempted to bring about restoration of land rights. In another link, the lawyer, Ben Lobulu, has been given assistance at crucial stages of his fight to resolve land rights cases for pastoralists in Tanzania. However, there are still many additional needs which Ben pointed out would be essential if the initial investment were to be sustained. These include assistance with research, books, training and lobbying, the formation of an East African Steering Committee for pastoral organisations, the assembly of relevant case law from other countries and publicity in the Western Press.

In Uganda, through the Centre for Basic Research, Charles Ocan carried out work on the pastoral crisis in the Karamoja region and produced a bibliography on Karamoja, both of which were published.

#### **4.6 Methods and programme models**

The IIED programme is very loosely put together, with the eight research themes being pursued as a collection of topics not clearly pulled together in some analytical framework. In addition, there is no clear reason why certain countries are included within certain themes and not in others. The 1996 annual report confirms this, with an even wider array of issues and research reported. The impression gained is that the research agenda is being driven by opportunism, as researchers respond individually to items that touch their interest and/or to donors that have funds available for specific research investigations.

##### *Advocacy*

It is apparent that some of IIED's activities in eastern Africa and the Horn of Africa can be regarded as advocacy, perhaps following the interests of the main IIED person working in that region, Charles Lane. In contrast, the tenure aspects of the drylands programme in West Africa have focused on the development of participatory approaches to pastoral development. It is difficult to assess the impact of this advocacy approach, as IIED provides small amounts of support to persons who are, in their own rights, leaders in leading reform (most notably Prof. Shiiyji in Tanzania). Thus IIED can be seen to be contributing to a process of policy reform.

## **5. INTER-PROGRAMME ISSUES**

### **5.1 Relationships between DHP and PINEP**

The relationship between DHP and PINEP is limited. The Ethiopian team had been visited by the PINEP co-ordinator, but otherwise interaction has been minimal. Even all the PINEP literature was not available to the DHP national teams. Some linkages are, however, evident: students from PINEP study at DHP sites (2 students), and the ethno-veterinary study in Sudan was jointly funded by DHP and PINEP.

The formal collaboration between PINEP and DHP entails PINEP students undertaking their research at DHP study areas. One of the two Ethiopian PINEP students and the Ugandan PINEP student are working at DHP project sites in their home countries.

### **5.2 Relationships between IIED and the other programmes**

Interviews with several persons in the DHP programme indicated that they were unfamiliar with the IIED drylands programme, though a number know Charles Lane because of his participation in various conferences in the region. In addition, PENHA staff stated that they had little to do with the PINEP or DHP programme. Given their strengths in the social science aspects of pastoralism and the weaknesses within PINEP and DHP in this regard, it is unfortunate that there is not closer collaboration. There are also almost no connections between IIED and EPOS.

There were a few cases where spontaneous collaboration amongst the various projects has occurred. Thus, for instance, a PINEP associate from Kenya, Ms. W. Nyawira, wrote the executive summary for a meeting conducted by PENHA in Eritrea (Nyawira 1994) (PENHA has received support from IIED).

Given the common goals of the various programmes, it is surprising how few linkages there are amongst the programmes.

## **6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMES**

### **6.1 Comparison of programmes**

The IIED and the DHP programmes involve, at least on paper for the DHP programme, some of the recent ideas regarding research, notably the need to use research to empower local communities. In the case of DHP the intention was to accomplish this through participatory and action research. In West Africa the IIED programme also used this model of empowerment, while in east Africa and the Horn, the projects of IIED worked through advocacy. The PINEP programme is more in the tradition of conventional teaching and research. In this programme, the outputs are also more conventional, i.e. theses and working papers, the implicit assumption being that 'good' products will be taken up by policy makers and extensionists.

One positive aspect of the IIED programme is that African authors are more likely to achieve international recognition for their work, because IIED papers are widely circulated and IIED has numerous publicity channels. EPOS and OSSREA are not able to achieve the same level of publicity within the international academic and NGO circles as they are not writing in the appropriate fora, nor do they have an appropriate infrastructure and specialised staffing for wide dissemination of a diverse portfolio of publications.

The IIED programme differs from the others in being much more connected to the NGO community. Linkages to NGOs are all but absent in PINEP and DHL. Given the importance of NGOs in playing constructive roles at the grassroots, the IIED model is appropriate.

### **6.2 Capacity to build critical masses of African scientists and to generate research results**

Being based in Africa, the DHP and PINEP programmes are better placed to build capacity in African research. However, there is need to ensure high academic standards within such programmes. It is necessary that OSSREA provides more academic leadership within the DHP programme. Currently administrative support is excellent, but more critical thought is required in (i) preparing country project proposals; (ii) preparing work plans for each country (iii) the guidance of the internal evaluations, which

themselves are too uncritical (iv) guiding country teams down the road of participatory research and extension. Similarly, the EPOS backup (particularly in social science) to PINEP must maintain a more rigorous approach.

From the DHP programme, there was no evidence of any publications emerging that could be published in the international refereed press. Many more PINEP publications will emerge in international journals provided the EPOS backup is adequate.

### **6.3 New approaches to research, extension and dissemination**

#### *Participatory models*

The intention within the DHP programme was to undertake participatory and/or action research. There is no indication that any of the countries really understand what is required of such research. The trials that have been instigated are very conventional agricultural research. Even the concept of extension that is being considered is the conservative top-down extension, not the newer models of participatory extension, nor even extension in the context of liberalisation and privatisation trends. IIED has sections that are well recognised as leaders in the field of participatory research and extension. Any future work should involve institutes with capacity in these participatory models, perhaps in initial training programmes.

The only participatory parts of the DHP programme are the development projects and the selection of paravets. Participation must be extended to research and extension.

#### *Interdisciplinary studies*

Both the PINEP and the DHP programmes have not achieved the goal of undertaking interdisciplinary studies, as the social science inputs are still weak. This is an additional area where collaboration is desirable with institutions such as IIED, CBR and PENHA, all of which have strong social science components. It is essential that the research carried out within PINEP and DHP are based on an understanding of livelihood systems, incorporating farming system, pastoral, institutional and biophysical perspectives.

Given the current structure and organisation at the universities in the region it is difficult to see how interdisciplinary work can be conducted. It would need the exceptional energy and talents for someone to manage this.

#### *Learning from the literature*

Through discussions with project personnel and from looking at project documents it is obvious that researchers are not applying one of the first steps in scientific endeavour, that is to understand and study what has been done before and to build on the current state of knowledge. Some examples will suffice. Paravet training was conducted in the 1970s and through the early 1980s in Kenya and elsewhere. There is a need to revisit the early literature to see what was achieved and whether there are any lessons for the present. Other aspects that need thorough literature research include: nursery development and techniques of propagation of tree species (as in Kenya); economics of bush clearing (Uganda), (e.g. see the vast South African literature). More recently, there is a need to examine the evidence of the recent work on pastoralism, which challenges much of the conventional beliefs about the economics and efficiency of communal grazing systems in comparison to fenced ranching systems.

#### *Capturing the research opportunities*

The research component of the DHP programme is very weak. Yet the development aspects provided an excellent opportunity to introduce research and monitoring within an interdisciplinary and participatory framework. There are interesting social science and natural science questions raised by the development activities (e.g. what is the impact on the development on local power structures and institutions; to what extent has flood diversion improved yield). As the development was conducted in a participatory mode, it would have been easy to explore the communities' view of research, the role that 'informal trial-and-error' experiments play within the community, to pose questions which the community wanted answering, to devise trials with the community, and, if possible, to set up data collection methods with community members.

The paravet training in the DHP project could be an important way forward. Should one replicate the approach in a second phase? This important question remains unasked except in the case of Sudan. The project provides the ideal opportunity to test paravet training as a way forward, but it has not been seen as an opportunity for relevant and needed research.

#### *Incorporating indigenous knowledge*

Action research and participatory research implies that indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) will be incorporated within more formal knowledge systems, or at least acknowledged as having an important contribution to make in the research and development process. In some of the countries we have only seen the first step in the process in the DHP programme, namely, the documenting of indigenous knowledge by researchers. In particular, knowledge has been captured about ethno-veterinary practices. However, there does not seem to have been the accumulation of knowledge about preventative local medicine, apart from one study by an MSc student. The component which trains paravets gives the ideal opportunity to incorporate some of the ITK within the course. This has not been taken up as a challenge.

#### *Developing a research and development philosophy*

Insufficient time seems to have been devoted to developing a research and development philosophy within the programmes under evaluation. The approach and guidelines need regular discussion, planning and constant review. This does not appear to happen. So, within the DHP and the PINEP programmes, there is a huge gap between the expressed objectives and what is actually done on the ground, while the IIED programme the programme appears to consist of a random collection of topics and countries, probably more driven by personal interests and funding possibilities, than strategic vision. Within the DHP programme it is not at all clear that the local communities are really involved in the planning, execution and evaluation of field research and development activities. Thorough initial reviews of the previous work in the country and the region are necessary before any activity is initiated. The information facilities and the backup institution are vital in this process.

The international links provided in each programme are essential to this endeavour as providing access to expatriate Master and PhD research studies, and the international policy and research literature and scientific journals.

#### *Development capacities and institutional sustainability*

The flexibility and capacity of University departments to undertake this kind of development work has been questioned. For this reason, it is desirable within both of the programmes to see at least some links made with NGOs, and strong links with local government service organisations. If the development activities also involved a serious attempt at research, then it would have been easier to see the University-Development linkage.

### **6.4 Institutional arrangements within the programmes**

#### *Over committed key staff*

There is a serious problem with over-commitment by some of the key personnel within both the PINEP and DHP programmes. They essentially do not have time to develop the project at the village level. It is essential to have competent, committed persons working within the village in a participatory programme. All the projects suffer from this problem to a lesser or greater extent. In some cases there was a project manager at the local level but he was not fully conversant with the project, while in other cases the project manager was hundreds of kilometres from the study village and only visited it a few times per year.

#### *Links with EPOS*

Within the DHP programme there is little input from EPOS. The inputs could have been in terms of improving the social science component, and providing academic leadership (better project proposals, the development of country action plans, assisting with getting papers into the international arena, developing a truly participatory approach to research). Within the PINEP programme there is more frequent interaction and support but the same comments are relevant; the relationship could be more productive.

#### *Creation of new structures*

It is important that the PINEP and the DHP projects are not used as an opportunity to create new organisational structures (e.g. new institutions, pastoral committees, semi-autonomous project teams etc.). Wherever possible, the project should build on existing structures as the internal dynamics of such institutions have already been established and they are likely to be more sustainable than new structures created specifically for the project.

### *Links between DHP, PINEP and IIED*

The links are currently superficial. Most, if not all, PINEP students should be required to work within the DHP programme. There are ample unexplored research opportunities within DHP and these are not being tackled. By stronger collaboration it will be possible to build critical research mass within a country. To ensure cross-reference, research costs for PINEP students could be explicitly included as a budget line within the DHP programme. Much greater value could be gained from closer links of the DHP and PINEP with IIED, particularly in relation to access to literature, editorial skills and publications.

### *Improving communication*

Given the poor communications amongst PINEP and DHP participants from one country and those from another, consideration should be given to issuing a simple news sheet twice per year. This can be a single A4 sheet printed on both sides which is mailed from the PINEP secretariat, OSSREA or EPOS. It would be mailed to all project participants in all the countries (probably about 50-80 persons). It would contain information on all current and future activities and perhaps one longer item per news sheet documenting a specific aspect of one of the country projects. Such a mechanism for communication is simple, inexpensive and effective.

### *Country participation*

It would seem to be sensible if the PINEP and DHP activities only took place in the same countries so that the supportive links can be developed within country. While the regional network idea is fine, it is also logical to have within country linked activities.



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THREE DRYLAND RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

#### 1. BACKGROUND

SAREC has provided support to three different programmes concerned with land use in the African drylands. The overall goals of all the programmes are to improve the human resource base and the understanding of the complex problems of pastoralist's use of land and their interaction with the environment in the African drylands. Capacity building, promotion of problem-oriented research and dissemination of results are major objectives of the programmes.

Support has been given to:

- \* a regional network of research cooperation, where the university teachers are shared between neighbouring countries with management problems in similar ecological zones
- \* a regional programme that builds on local knowledge, participatory research and intends to create a structure where stakeholders and researchers can interact/communicate
- \* IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development), as to coordinate policy related research results within dryland tenure issues in Africa

In an evaluation of the programmes different aspects of SAREC's support shall be assessed. The details and focus of the review are specified below.

#### 1.1 PINEP - Pastoral Information Network programme

This regional programme has been supported in its initiation by SAREC since 1991. A total of 11.55 million SEK has been allocated. Involved countries are Kenya, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Djibouti, Eritrea, Sudan and Uganda. Regional coordinators are University of Nairobi, Department of Range Management and EPOS (Environmental Policy and Society) at Linköping University, Sweden.

#### The main objectives of the programme are to:

1. contribute to the building of research capacity by advanced pastoralist training at MSc level in range management, with emphasis on rehabilitation, resource management and conservation in the pastoral production systems.
2. generate relevant knowledge for appropriate intervention in dryland development through research and involvement of local communities (to improve production and raise living standards).
3. provide a forum for results dissemination by bringing together people at the community, policy-making, practitioner and researcher levels.

#### 1.2 DHP - Dryland Husbandry Programme

This programme originated as Sida supported, within the IGAD (Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development) initiative. It was taken over and partly restructured by SAREC in 1994. Present coordinators are OSSREA (Organisation for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa) and EPOS. Involved countries are Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda. SAREC decided to provide an initial support the programme for 2 years (6.8 million SEK was allocated) and then evaluate it to test the model/viability of its structure and objectives.

The programme has been developed as a complement to PINEP and the same Swedish expertise (EPOS) was used to prepare both programmes. MSc students from the PINEP programme have been engaged in the DHP community based research both for their MSc thesis and research after the degree has been obtained.

## **Objectives**

1. To establish, support and administer a network of organisation/institutions in the IGAD (nowadays IGAD) region for R & D of production systems of dryland areas through a network of research stations, extension organisations, local communities and NGO's.
2. To establish, support and administer a programme for training of Pastoral Development Agents/Veterinary Scouts from local communities, in order to establish them as local links between participating research, extension institutions and local communities

### **1.3 IIED - Resource tenure and natural resource management in dryland Africa: a policy oriented programme of collaborative research**

The international organisation IIED is located in London. The programme has been supported by SAREC from 1991/92. It is co-sponsored by NORAD, DANIDA and IRDC( through the Forest Trees and People Programme). SAREC's total allocation has been of 2.8 million SEK. (This was 70 % of the planned funding needed to implement the proposed programme)

## **Objectives**

1. To identify current processes changing people's access to resources;
2. to study the socio-economic consequences of such changes;
3. and to assess the options available at local and national levels for attaining more equitable and efficient patterns of resource management and use.

The programme covers eight thematic areas: participatory research methods for conflict resolution, land policy options, common property resource management, pastoral land tenure, comparison of economics of alternative tenure systems, community conservation, gender and resource tenure, and resource management planning. The programme focus lies in the production of research results, with projects of high quality by international standards, based on mutual interests of the African institutions and IIED

## **2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The current agreements of the three programmes terminate at the end of 1997. Proposals for continuing activities will be sent to SAREC and this evaluation will be one essential input for decisions about future support. As the programmes differ quite in structure, it is also of value for Sida to obtain an evaluation/analysis of the different approaches in the programmes to reach their objectives.

The review shall examine and assess the building of research capacity; the quantity and scientific quality of the result outputs. The relevance as well as the impact of the programmes on a local, national and regional level shall be evaluated. Furthermore, the sustainability of the programmes shall be assessed. Finally, the reviewers shall review how inter-disciplinary objectives have been accomplished.

The evaluation team shall in their report provide Sida and the participating institutions in the programmes with recommendations of the future objectives and directions of the programmes, particularly for the period 1998-2000.

## **3. THE ASSIGNMENT**

### **3.1 Tasks/specific issues to be assessed for the programmes**

#### *Relevance and importance*

- \* the relevance of the programme objectives shall be assessed in relation to national/regional priorities and policies

#### *Sustainability*

- \* the sustainability of the programmes is a judgement whether the collaborating institutions have the capacity to continue after the Swedish involvement ends

#### *Scientific results and dissemination*

- \* the quantity and quality of the research output
- \* dissemination of results to the scientific community in the region as well as to refereed international journals of acceptable quality
- \* dissemination of the research results to extension workers and local communities

#### *Capacity building*

- \* approaches in the different programmes to the building of research and institutional capacity

#### *Collaboration between parties*

- \* experience of the cooperation between the Swedish/English and the African parts (particularly coordinating bodies), frequency and closeness of contact, strengths and weaknesses

- \* division of labour and roles
- \* cost-sharing of the African and Swedish/English side

#### *Methods and programme models*

- \* the dis/advantages between the different models that the three programmes represent with respect to the building of critical masses of African scientists as well as generating relevant research results
- \* the extent to which the programmes have succeeded in working in an interdisciplinary manner combining both social and natural sciences

#### *Gender*

- \* the extent to which gender dimensions and gender relations have been taken into account in the design, in the capacity being built, as well as in the impact of results

#### *Cost-effectiveness*

- \* the balance between the costs and benefits/achievements of the programmes
- \* factors influencing cost-effectiveness

#### *The regional aspects/practical impact of project results*

- \* the interest from local governments and institutions of the results at a policy level
- \* the role and involvement of local communities in the different programmes
- \* the practical impact on the rural community in the region

### **3.2 Specific questions to consider in the programmes**

#### **PINEP**

- \* what is the future of the MSc students after examination?
- \* how much of the capacity building is dependent on external funding? What costs are covered by the participating universities?
- \* to what extent has the regional expertise been used in teaching of the MSc course?
- \* how can the demanding role as regional coordinator of the programme better be balanced with the duties at the university? (should the coordinator have an office outside the university?)

#### **DHP**

- \* to what extent have links been established between researchers/extension personnel/local community

### **3.3 Issues to be included in the Recommendations of the consultants:**

- \* possible focus of future programmes
- \* strengths and weaknesses of the different programmes approaches
- \* activities that should/could be terminated and new activities that possibly could be included
- \* lessons learned, and actions to avoid future mistakes

## **4. METHODOLOGY, EVALUATION TEAM AND TIME SCHEDULE**

### **4.1 Composition and competence of the evaluation team**

The team shall consist of two evaluators with experience in academic studies of social and natural sciences in developing countries. One of the evaluators will be designated as team coordinator.

### **4.2 Organisation of the evaluation**

Contracting of the team shall be made through an administrative consultant. The team shall meet with Sida officials, the administrative consultant in May/June in Stockholm, where they shall develop a plan, budget and methodology for the evaluation, including division of work. Certain aspects may be covered by subcontracting external reviewers.

### **4.3 Participation of the cooperation partners**

Project coordinators shall at the request of the team coordinator provide the evaluation team with material (proposals, reports, publications, contracts etc.). They should facilitate for the evaluation team to interview students, researchers, local communities and other project participants. Such materials may be requested in advance of the visit.

### **4.4 Role of Sida officials**

The Sida research officer is responsible for assigning the evaluation team, and for coordinating the approvals (from the participating organisations and Sida/SAREC) of the evaluation plan and reports. Sida officials may be interviewed regarding the role of Sida/SAREC. Sida's responsible research officer may participate in some visits to field sites and coordinators as an observer.

#### **4.5 Suggestions of persons/institutes to interview/contact:**

IIED- London

OSSREA- University of Addis Ababa

PINEP - University of Nairobi

EPOS - University of Linköping

Field sites in Uganda and Kenya (to be specified)

#### **4.6 Time table**

*A total of approximately 1 week preparatory work, 2 weeks in the field (end of August 1997), and 1 week for preparation of the report.*

#### **5. REPORTING**

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 60 pages excluding annexes (and a summary of maximum 6 pages). The outline shall follow Sida Evaluation report - standardised Format (Annex 3, page 71 of the Evaluation Manual for Sida). Five copies of a draft report shall be submitted to not later than October 1, 1997. Within 2 weeks after receiving Sida's comments, a final version in 3 copies and on a diskette that shall be sent to Sida. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published and distributed as a publication within the Sida Evaluations series. The report shall be written in Word 6.1 for Windows or compatible format, and should be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing.

The report includes the production of a summary according to the guidelines for Sida Evaluation Newsletter (Annex 1) and the completion of Sida Evaluation data Work Sheet (Annex 2). This separate summary and data work sheet shall be submitted along with the final report.

## ANNEX 2. DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS CONSULTED

Many documents were made available for the team to study. In the interests of trying to keep this report to a modest length, they will not be listed here. All are available for consultation at the Department of Rural Development Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.

From EPOS/PINEP/DHP these included: Agreements between SAREC and EPOS, PINEP and DHP, travel reports, workshop notes, routing meeting minutes, informal reports, working documents, publicity brochures, MSc theses, research proposals, African Pastoral Forum publications.

### General publications

- Olaka-Onyango, J. Zie, G. and Muhereza, F. 1992. Pastoralism, crisis and transformation. Report of a workshop. Centre for Basic Research. Bound report.
- Nyamawira, W.M. Proceedings of the workshop on "Pastoral and rangeland development" held in Eritrea, August 1993. Bound report.
- Simonesen, G. (1966) The Wossama Afar. A study of natural resource management of a pastoral group in north-eastern Ethiopia. MA thesis, Centre for International Environmental and development Studies, Noragric, Norway.

### PINEP publications

- Agreement on support to the Pastoral Information Network Project (PINEP)*. Drafted by Maria Berlekom. 1994
- Pastoral Information Network Programme*. PINEP & EPOS Irene Maeri & TiiaRiitta Granfelt. 1996
- Pastoral Information Network Programme. Progress Report 1994/95*. PINEP & EPOS Irene Maeri & TiiaRiitta Granfelt. 1996.
- Pastoral Information Network Programme. Progress Report 1995/96*. PINEP & EPOS Irene Maeri. 1997.
- PINEP Senior Staff BI-Weekly Meeting Held on 25-04-94. *Dr. Kassim O. Farah*. 1994.
- Announcement for 1989/90 M.Sc. in Range Management University of Nairobi*. Dr. Theuri J. Njoka.
- Activities of PINEP in Uganda*.
- PINEP Activities, 1997. *Dr Kassim O. Farah*. 1997.
- Pastoral Information Network Programme (PINEP) Progress Report (1994 – 1995). Working with pastoralists for a better tomorrow.
- Travel Report. Visit to PINEP National Co-ordinator (Uganda) (13<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> April 1997). *By Mr. Ellington N. Ekaya (Senior Technical Officer) PINEP Regional Office, Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi*.
- Travel Report PINEP 14-17 November 1994: internal memo. *Anders Hjort*. 1994.
- Activities Implemented under the Emergency Drought Recovery Programme (EDRP) as at December 1995 and the Follow on Preparation for the Arid Lands Resource Management Project. 1995.
- A Concept Paper on Drylands Security and Livelihoods in Ewaso Ngiro North Catchment: A System Approach for Policy Oriented Research. 1995.
- Follow-up of earlier conversion/correspondences regarding a new initiative within PINEP perspective focussing on the Ewaso Ngiro North River catchment. *Dr. Kassim O. Farah, PINEP Programme*. 1996. (*Enclosure 1*).
- Persons met, Programme, Time & Venue. 1996. (*Enclosure 2, 4 and 5*).
- Travel Report Kabete, Kenya 16.11-30.11.96. *EPOS, Anders Hjort af Ornäs*. 1996.
- Travel Report Kabete, Kenya 24.2 – 25.2.97. *EPOS, Anders Hjort af Ornäs*. 1997.
- Revised Report from a NAI/Sida Consultancy on IGAD Rangeland Programme 20.2 – 1.3.1992. *Anders Hjort af Ornäs*.
- The African Pastoral Forum. Pastoral Development in sub-Saharan Africa: The Role and Significance of Indigenous Technical Knowledge. *PINEP. Editor: Toloumbaye Tadingar. Working Paper Series No. 1, June 1994*.
- The African Pastoral Forum. Pastoral Development in sub-Saharan Africa: The Role and Significance of Indigenous Technical Knowledge. *PINEP. Editor: Toloumbaye Tadingar. Working Paper Series No.2, June 1994*.
- The African Pastoral Forum. A Survey of MAA Identity and Ancient Ethnoveterinary Animal Husbandry Practices among the Maasai Pastoralists of Olkonerel: Arusha Region. *Editor: Toloumbaye Tadingar. PINEP. Working Paper Series No.3, November 1994*.

- The African Pastoral Forum. Restocking Rejuvenated Agropastoral Areas and Sustainable Livestock Management. *PINEP. Editor: Toloumbaye Tadingar. Working Paper Series No. 4, January 1995.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Contrasting Traditional Pastoral and Conventional Resource Management Systems: are they compatible? *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 5 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. The Application of Indigenous Knowledge in Pastoral Production Systems. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 6 January 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Management and Development of the Arid Communal Rangelands in north-eastern Kenya: a Critical Analysis of the Past and the Present. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 7 June 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Ethnoveterinary Techniques Practised by the Maasai Pastoralist of Kajiado District, Kenya. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 8 June 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Factors Affecting Honey Production in South Kenya Rangelands: a Case Study of Kibwezi Division, Makueni District. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 9 September 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Indigenous Knowledge and Natural Resource Management: a Case Study of the Role of Fire Among the Bahima of South Western Uganda. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 10 September 1996.*
- The African Pastoral Forum. Traditional Rangeland Resource Utilisation in Selected Pastoral Communities of Tanzania. *PINEP. Editor: Kassim Omar Farah. Working Paper Series No. 11 December 1996.*
- Dryland Securities and Livelihoods in Ewaso Ngiro Catchment, Northern Kenya. *A Research Project Proposal submitted to Sida (SAREC) from PINEP and EPOS by Kassim o. Farah, Anders Hjort, Nashon Musimba and Moses Nyangito.*
- Socio-Economic Impacts of Small Holder Irrigation Schemes Among the Borana Nomads of Isiolo District, Kenya. *George K. Kariuki, Toloumbaye Tadingar and Kassim O. Farah, Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi, PO Box 29053 Kabete, Kenya. 1996?*
- Evaluating of Gum Arabic Production Potential from A. Senegal (L.) Willd. In Northern Kenya.* Preliminary Research Report by Godana Jillo Doyo and Kassim O. Farah.
- Why Pastoralists Burn the Range.* Concept from the dry Sub-humid and semi-arid pastoral ecosystems of Uganda. By E. Kyagaba, Kassim O. Farah and E.N. Sabiiti. 1996.
- Traditional Range Resource Utilization: A case of pastoralists in Tanzania.* A.J. Mwilawa, N.K. Musimba, R.S. Kidunda, D.B. Mpiri and M.L. Kusekwa. 1996.
- Cauterization: An Ancient Ethnoveterinary Technique as currently Practices by the Maasai community of Kenya.* Idle O. Farah, T.A. Ngatia and W.K. Munyua. 1996.
- Traditional Rangeland Resource Utilization in Selected Pastoral Communities of Tanzania.* Angello Joseph Mwilawa, N.K.R Musimba and Kidunda Livestock Production Research Institute PO Box 202, Mpwapwa, Tanzania. 1997.
- Effects of Grazing and Assessment of Subsequent Recovery in a Semi-Arid Rangeland of south-eastern Kenya.* By: Mworira, J.K., N.K.R. Musimba and K.O. Farah. PINEP. 1997.
- Environmental security and know-how. Combining university training and research on pastoralism in Eastern Africa.* Kassim O. Farah and Anders Hjort-af-Ornäs 08.03.97.

#### **MSc Theses. Nairobi. 1996 & 1997. PINEP**

- Factors Affecting Honey Production in South Kenya Rangelands: A Case Study of Kibwezi Division, Makueni District* by Elijah M. Mutungi. 1996.
- Traditional Rangeland Resource Utilization Among the Gogo and Maasai Pastoral Communities of Tanzania* by Angello Joseph Tiganna Mwilawa. 1996.
- Determination of Nutritive value of Acacia Tortilis and its Effect on Body Weight Gain of Goats* by Mengistu Russom Araya. 1996.
- Participation of Rural Communities in Management and Conservation of Rangeland Resources: The Case of Elodaya Project, Sudan* by Hamid H.A. Ezairig. 1997.
- The Effect of Moisture on Seed Production, Seed Properties and Short Term Dynamics of Cenchrus biflorus Grass in Arid Range lands of Western Sudan* by Mohammed Daw El Bait Eisa. 1996.
- Socio-Economic and Ecological Impact of Smallholder Irrigation Schemes on Pastoral Nomads of Garissa District, Kenya* by Ahmed Abdi-Noor. 1996.
- The Scientific Basis for Cauterization of Peripheral Lymph Nodes as an Ethnoveterinary Therapy for African Trypanosomosis* by Idle Omar Farah. 1996.
- Effects of Fire on Vegetation Composition and Forage Productivity in the Nyabushozi Pastoral Ecosystem, Mbarara District, Uganda* by Emmanuel Kyagaba. July 1996.

## **Dryland Husbandry Project references**

- Dryland Husbandry Project*. OSSREA (Organisation for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa & EPOS (Environmental Policy and Society)).
- Dryland Husbandry in the Sudan*. Workshop Report. Editor: Tegegne Teka. Collaborative effort between the Institute of Environmental Studies at the University of Khartoum, OSSREA & EPOS. 1996.
- Dryland Husbandry Project in Kenya*. Progress Report by Nashon K.R. Musimba. 1997.
- Dryland Husbandry Project. Executive Summary of Internal Evaluation (according to ToR)* by A.A. Aboud. May 1997.
- Agreement on support to the Dryland Husbandry Project within the IGAD Range Management Programme*. EPOS & IGAD. 1995.
- Extension of Agreement*. Letter from Göran Hedebro, Sida/SAREC 19<sup>th</sup> February 1997.
- Re: Extension Arrangement*. Letter from Dr. Tegegne Teka, OSSREA 13<sup>th</sup> March 1997.
- Travel Report* by Ian Christoplos 6.12.95.
- Dryland Husbandry Project. Second Regional Workshop 13-15 May 1996, Sodore Ethiopia. *List of Papers Distributed at the Workshop*.
- Re: Second Regional Workshop of Dryland Husbandry Project*. Letter with Programme from Dr. Tegegne Teka 24 May 1996.
- Second Regional Workshop*. List of Participants. 1996
- Memorandum of Understanding between OSSREA and the Mekelle University College on the Dryland Husbandry Project. *Dr. Mitiku Haile and Dr. Tegegne Teka*. 1996.
- Memorandum of Understanding between OSSREA and the Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi on the Dryland Husbandry Project. *Vice Chancellor of University of Nairobi and Dr Tegegne Teka*. 1996.
- Memorandum of Understanding between OSSREA and the College of Agriculture and Aquatic Sciences, University of Asmara on the Dryland Husbandry Project. *President, University of Asmara and Dr Tegegne Teka*. 1996.
- Travel Report: 3<sup>rd</sup> DHP workshop, 8-11<sup>th</sup> December 1996, Mbarara, Uganda by *Sylvia Karlsson, EPOS*.
- Travel Report to the Sudan 28 December 1995 to 3 January 1996 by *Dr. Tegegne Teka, OSSREA DHP*.
- Report of a Workshop on Dryland Husbandry Project held on 21 and 22 June 1995 at the National Hotel, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia by *Dr. Tegegne Teka, OSSREA and Mr Ian Christoplos, EPOS*.
- Memorandum of Understanding between OSSREA and the Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Khartoum on the DHP. *Prof. Hashim M. El Hadi and Prof. Yousif B. Abu Gideiri, Khartoum and for OSSREA Dr Tegegne Teka, Ethiopia*. 1996.
- Memorandum of Understanding between OSSREA and the Faculty of Agriculture & Forestry, Makerere University on the Dryland Husbandry Project. *Prof. J.P.M. Ssebuwufu and Assoc. Prof. E.N. Sabiti, Uganda, Dr. Tegegne Teka, OSSREA, Ethiopia*. 1996.
- Re: External Examiner Assessment by Dr. Berhane Kiflewahid regarding Determination of nutritive value of Acacia tortilis and its effect on body weight gain of goats by Mengistu Russom Araya. University of Asmara*. 1997.
- Dryland Husbandry Project in Kenya*. Six (6) Months Progress Report from November 1995 to end of April, 1996 by Dr Nashon K.R. Musimba, National Co-ordinator, Kenya.
- The OSSREA Newsletter* Volume XV, No. 1, February 1997.
- OSSREA Annual Report* December 1996.
- OSSREA Information Brochure*, January 1996.
- OSSREA Report of the Executive Secretary to the Fifth Congress* by Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed, Cape Town, South Africa, 4-8 November 1996.
- Dryland Husbandry in Sudan*.
- Dryland Husbandry Project in Uganda. Adaptive Methods for Dryland Husbandry among Pastoralists in Mbarara District*.
- Dryland Husbandry Project Report*. 1996.
- Re: Workshop Report on 21 & 22 June 1995 to discuss the Implementation of the Dryland Husbandry Project in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*. A letter from Dr. Tegegne Teka, Regional co-ordinator, DHP. 1995.
- Dryland Husbandry Project within the IGAD Range Management Programme*. Project document submitted to Sida/IGAD. EPOS, Uppsala, March 17 1994.
- Annexes. National Projects: Ethiopia - DHP in Community-based Resource Management among the Afar of Tigray; Eritrea - DHP for pastoralists in North-eastern Eritrea; Kenya - DHP in Isiolo District; Sudan - Dryland Husbandry in Northern Kordofan; Uganda - Adaptive Methods on Dryland Husbandry at the Bahema, Ankole and Rhengere Research Stations*.
- Eritrea. DHP in the Eastern Lowlands.
- Kenya. DHP in Kibwezi Division of Makueni District.
- DHP in Community-based Resource Management in Shiket - Afar Region, Ethiopia.
- Project summary.
- Literature Search Results for the Dryland Husbandry Project. EPOS, May 1997.

*Dryland Husbandry Project (DHP). Third Regional Workshop Report 8-10 December 1996, Mbarara, Uganda.*  
Regional Project Co-ordinator Dr. Tegegne Teka. February 1997.  
Annual reports, one per country (completed in early 1996).  
Christoplos, I. (1995). Travel report. Unpublished report.  
DHP files for each country, as held by OSSREA, Addis Ababa.  
EPOS (1997) Literature research results for the dryland husbandry project. EPOS, Linköping. 138 pp.  
Responses to the questionnaires sent out by David Gibbon and Bruce Campbell requesting information on the projects. Responses from Kiflewahid (Eritrea), Mitiku Haile (Ethiopia), Musimba (Kenya), Sabiiti (Uganda), Tegegne Teka (OSSREA), Yousif B. Abu Gideiri (Sudan),  
OSSREA (1997). Dryland Husbandry Projects: Internal Evaluation Reports: Eritrea (by Ogbe Giorgis 21 pp), Ethiopia (by Beruk Yemane 35 pp), Kenya (by Abdillahi Aboud 65 pp), Uganda (by Delius Asimwe 36 pp). Unpublished report, OSSREA, Addis Ababa.  
MOUs between OSSREA and each country.  
Tegegne Teka (1977). Dryland Husbandry Project (DHP). Third Regional Workshop Report 8-10 December 1996. OSSREA, Addis Ababa.

### **Eritrea**

Training manual for paravets.

### **Ethiopia**

Alemu, D.T. (no date). Effect of land use practices on woody vegetation resources in the semi-arid rangelands of the Shiket Plain, Ethiopia. Unpublished M.Sc proposal.  
Dagnatchew. Survey of the ethno-veterinary practices of the pastoralists in the Northern Afar region. Unpublished report. 50 pp.  
Training manual for paravets.

### **Kenya**

Report on the 1st DHP practitioners workshop. Draft unpublished report.

### **Sudan**

Anonymous (1997). Report on a workshop on resource management in the drylands of Eastern Sudan 23-24 March 1997. Unpublished report. Includes 5 papers, 2 potentially publishable in the international literature.  
Babiker Abbas (no date) Guidelines for the training of paravets. Faculty of Veterinary Sciences, University of Khartoum. Unpublished report.  
Babiker Abbas (1997). Comparative studies into the ethno-veterinary practices of camel pastoralists in Butana, North Eastern Sudan.  
Elsadig Yousif et al. 1996. Understanding and measuring vegetation change in the Sudan. University of Khartoum. Unpublished report. Used as a training manual.  
OSSREA (1996) Dryland Husbandry in the Sudan: Workshop report. DHP Publications Series, No 1. OSSREA, Addis Ababa.

### **Uganda**

Mugasi, S (1996). Preliminary report on the baseline survey in Kazo County, Mbarara District. Draft report.

## **EPOS Reports**

*Annual Report 1995/96.* EPOS (Environmental Policy and Society). 1997.

*Research Programme Strategy. Environment and secure livelihoods in African drylands* by Anders Hjort af Ornäs and M.A. Mohamed Salih. EPOS, Uppsala University.

### **Staff meetings EPOS (Samples)**

*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 950929*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 951019*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 951207*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 960108*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 960216*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 960329*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 960902*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 960923*



*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 961015*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 961107*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 961118*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 970108*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 970129*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 970312*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 970411*  
*Environmental Policy and Society Staff meeting 970506*

### **EPOS Travel Reports (samples)**

*Travel Report Kabete, Kenya 24.2 – 25.2.97.* Anders Hjort af Ornäs 25.2.97  
*Travel Report: 3<sup>rd</sup> DHP workshop, 8-11<sup>th</sup> December 1996, Mbarara, Uganda.* Sylvia Karlsson, EPOS.  
*Travel Report Kabete, Kenya 16.11-30.11.96.* Anders Hjort af Ornäs 30.11.96.  
*Travel Report, Kabete, Kenya Nov. 16-28, 1996.* TiiaRiitta Granfelt, Information Officer, EPOS.  
*Travel Report, Kabete, Kenya Nov. 16-22, 1996.* Margareta Norstad, Administrative Officer, EPOS.  
*Travel Report February 9 – March 13, 1996 at EPOS.* Irene Maeri, PINEP.  
*Travel Report to Kenya 19<sup>th</sup> Febr-8<sup>th</sup> March 1996.* Set Bornstein.  
*Travel Report, PINEP planning Nov 27-Dec 4, 1993.* Anders Hjort af Ornäs, December 4, 1993.  
*Travel Report, PINEP planning Nov 29 – Dec 3, 1993.* Ann-Britt Bodin, EPOS.

### **Miscellaneous papers**

*CBR Annual Report 1995.* Centre for Basic Research, P O Box 9863, Kampala, Uganda. Joseph Carasco.  
*Introducing Centre for Basic Research.* CBR.  
*PLINGO's FORUM – Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Governmental Organisations,* P O Box 12785, Arusha, Tanzania.  
*Forging Ahead. ACTS into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.* African Centre for Technology Studies.  
*Managing Biodiversity. National systems of Conservation and Innovation in Africa.* Editors: John Mugabe, Norman Clark. October 1997.  
Environmental Policy Research. *Locus Standi – Its Development in South African Environmental Law* by Elmenne Bray, University of South Africa, Pretoria. Discussion Paper No. 2. 1997. African Centre for Technology Studies.  
Environmental Policy Research. *Environmental Adjustment in Kenya – Emerging Opportunities and Challenges* by John Mugabe, ACTS, Nairobi, Kenya; Frances Seymour, WWFN, Washington D.C., USA; Norman Clark, Graduate School of Environmental Studies, University of Strathclyde, UK. Discussion Paper No. 1. 1997.

### **Local Administration (samples)**

#### **Agreements 94/95**

*Budget Proposal for the PINEP Project during the Fiscal Years 1994-1995 to 1998/1999.* Dr. Kassim O. Farah. 1994  
Pastoral Information Network Programme (PINEP). *A Collaborative effort between the Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi and Environmental Policy and society (EPOS), Uppsala University. Project Proposal submitted for funding by the Swedish agency for Research Co-operation with Developing Countries (SAREC).* March 1994.  
*Minutes of BI-weekly PINEP Senior Staff Meeting, held on the 5<sup>th</sup> September, 1994 at the PINEP Secretariat.*  
*Dryland Securities and livelihoods in Ewaso Ng'iro Catchment, Northern Kenya. A Research Project Proposal Submitted to Sida (SAREC) from PINEP, University of Nairobi, Kenya, and EPOS, University of Linköping, Sweden* by Kassim O. Farah, Anders Hjort, Nashon Musimba and Moses Nyangito PINEP & EPOS. November 1996.  
*Information co-operation between EPOS, PINEP and DHP.* TiiaRiitta Granfelt, EPOS Information Officer. June 10, 1997.  
Memorandum. Drylands Programme, IIED. Re. Evaluation of Land Tenure & Natural Resource Management Programme Budget line 550.

## **IIED Documents consulted**

### **1) Participatory research methods for conflict resolution**

*Poverty, politics and pastoralists in East Africa*, Anthropology in Action, 1996

*Working with pastoralist NGOs and Land Conflicts in Tanzania: A report on a workshop in Terrat, Tanzania, 11<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> December 1994*, Mark Bradbury, Simon Fisher & Charles Lane, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 7, IIED, 1994

*Kufanya Kazi na Mashirika Yasiyo ya Serikali ya Wachungaji na Migogoro ya Ardhi Nchini Tanzania: Taarifa ya warsha iliyofanyika Terrat, Tanzania, 11-15 Disemba, 1994*, Mark Bradbury, Simon Fisher & Charles Lane, Taarifa za Mfululizo wa Umilikaji Ardhi za Uchungaji N. 7, IIED, 1997 (Kiswahili version of the above)

*Inyut e-Maa/Ilaramatak Lorkonerei Coorganised Workshop on Conflict Resolution*, 14-15 April 1994, Arusha, Tanzania

*Democracy Training for Pastoralist Community Development Workers*, PINGOs, Tanzania, 1994

*Pastoral Land Tenure Conflict in East Africa* (Proposal)

### **2) Addressing land policy options in Tanzania**

Interim Report: *Marginalisation of Pastoralism and the Threat to Sustainable Resource Management in South Maasailand - A Research Report*, DK Ndagala & R Ole Kuney, 1995

*Ardhi ni Uhai* (a synopsis in Kiswahili of the Land Commission report "Land is Life"), Georgios Hadjivayanis, IIED/Oxfam-UK, 1995

*A Legal Quagmire: Tanzania's Regulation of Land Tenure (Establishment of Villages) Act*, 1992, Issa Shivji, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 5, IIED, 1994

*Pastoral Land Rights in Tanzania: A Review*, Dr Ringo Tenga, Pastoral land Tenure Series No. 1, IIED, London, 1992

*No future without land: Experience of pastoral land tenure in Tanzania*: Presentation to consultative Workshop on pastoralists, Land and the State in Keren, Eritrea, 9-11 May 1996, C. Lane

*Inyuat e-Maa Pastoralists Development Organisation: Aims and Possibilities*

*The Barabaig Land Case: Mechanics of state-organised land grabbing in Tanzania*, Ringo Tenga & George Kakoti

*Pastoral territory & policy debates in Tanzania*, D.K. Ndagala

*Community rights and state-control in Tanzania*, J.T. Mwaikusa

### **3) Common property resource management in east Africa**

*Kisongo Maasai Customary Land Tenure Arrangements: Social and Ecological Considerations for Sustainable Pastoral Livelihood*, Saruni Oitesoi ole Ngulay, PLT Series (forthcoming)

*Pastures Lost: Barabaig Economy, Resource Tenure and the Alienation of their Land in Tanzania*, Charles Lane, Initiatives Publishers, Nairobi, Kenya, 1996 (see also *Alienation of Barabaig pasture Land: Policy implications for pastoral development in Tanzania* Charles Lane, Pastoral Land Tenure Monograph No. 1, IIED, London)

*Who Should Own the Range? New Thinking on Pastoral Resource Tenure in Dryland Africa*, Charles Lane and Richard Moorehead, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 3, IIED, London, 1994

*Reclaiming the Commons*, The Ecologist, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 2, IIED, London, 1993

*Pour une requete des communaux*, The Ecologist, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 2, IIED, London, 1993 (French translation of the above)

### **4) Pastoral land tenure in the Horn of Africa**

*Pastoralists, Land and the State in Eritrea: A two-day workshop*, PENHA/Land Commission in Eritrea/Oxfam-UK, May 1996

*Conference on Pastoralism in Ethiopia, 4-6 February 1993*, Sue Edwards & Tafesse Mesfin (eds), Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa, 1996

*Pastoral Land Tenure Systems in the Horn of Africa - A compendium of Eight Case Studies from Ethiopia, Eritrea and the Sudan*, Edited and compile for PENHA by Seyoum Gebre Selassie and Regional Representative, PENHA

### **5) Community conservation in dryland Africa**

*Multiple Land Use in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Community Donor/supporter meeting*, London 27-29 August 1997

- Proposal and Research Design for Studying the Rights Issues pertaining to Maasai residents in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA)*, Prof Issa Shivji & Dr W.B.L. Kapinga
- Eviction of Pastoralists from the Mkomazi Game Reserve in Tanzania: An Historical Review*, Kemal Mustafa, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 8, IIED, 1997
- Ngorongoro Voices: Indigenous Maasai residents of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania give their views on the proposed General Management Plan*, Charles Lane, Forests Trees and People Working Paper, 1996
- Whose Eden: An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife*, IIED, 1994
- Barabaig displacement from Hanang District to the Usangu Plains: Changes in Natural Resource Management and Pastoral Production in Tanzania*, Forests Trees and People Working Paper, IIED/SUAS, 1994
- Property Concepts, Herding Patterns and Management of Natural Resources among the Ngorongoro and Salei Maasai of Tanzania*, Tomasz Potkanski, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 6
- Pastoral economy, property rights and traditional mutual assistance mechanisms*, Tomasz Potkanski, Pastoral Land Tenure Monograph No. 2 (forthcoming)

## **6) Gender and resource tenure**

- Vanishing Tombs, Barren Wombs: Confrontation between pastoral women and commercial cultivators in Northern Tanzania*, Astrid Blystad, IIED, London (forthcoming)
- Pastoral Women and Land Tenure: The Barabaig Case*

## **7) Planning resource management at local level amongst agro-pastoralists in Senegal and Mali**

- Les conflits fonciers et leur gestion dans la 5ème région du Mali*, Idrissa Maiga et Gouro Diallo, IIED Issue Paper (forthcoming)
- Opportunités et contraintes pour la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles: le cas du Mali*, CENAFOD, Mali, IIED Paper (forthcoming)
- Espace Pastoral et Dynamiques Foncières au Sénégal*, Oussouby Touré, PLT series (forthcoming)
- Structural chaos: Community and state management of common property in Mali*, Richard Moorehead, Pastoral Land Tenure Monograph No. 3, IIED, London (forthcoming)
- Natural Resource Management for Pastoralists: A Proposal for Enhancing Community level Planning in Senegal*, R. Moorehead & B. Gueye
- Une gestion des ressources naturelles pouru pastoralistes: proposition de mise en valeur de la planification au niveau communautaire au Sénégal*, R. Moorehead & B Gueye (French version of the above)
- Pastoralism in Peril: Pressures on Grazing Land in Senegal*, Karen and Mark Schoonmaker Freudenberger, Pastoral Land Tenure Series No. 4, IIED, London, 1993
- LOHU material (MARP adapted in Pulaar): *Connaisssons - Analysons - Choisissons* (ARED/IIED, 1996)
- Buren Annudde Nokku Men* (ARED/IIED, 1996)
- Jabtuḡol wonde ngaynaaka ganni buri*, Brigitte Thébaud, Hermann Grell, Sabine Mieke, IIED & ARED, Dakar, Senegal, 1996
- Making Local Planning Work*, Richard Moorehead, Bara Guèye and Camilla Toulmin, IIED Drylands Programme, 1996
- Relais "MARP" No 2: Bulletin de liaison et d'échange d'informations sur la Méthode Active de Recherche et de Planification Participatives*
- An account of land tenure issues affecting herders and farmers in the area of the Canal du Cyor, two papers on land tenure law in a format and style understandable to the agro-pastoralists themselves, and two papers on participatory rural appraisal techniques (ARED)
- Pastoralism in Peril* (in Fulfuldè)
- Gestion de Terroir: Principles, First Lessons and Implications for Action*

## **8) Advocacy**

- Azimio La Uhai (Declaration of NGOs and Interested Persons on Land)* Issued by the National Land Forum (A Coalition of NGOs and Interested Persons)
- Turning Adversity to Advantage: How Barabaig herders in Tanzania have united to protect their lands and advance their interests*, Charles Lane, IIED, 1996
- The State Strikes Back: Extinguishing Customary Land Rights in Tanzania*, Charles Lane, CDR-IWGIA Document No. 74, 1993
- Land Use and Environment Policy in the Rangelands of South Africa: Case Studies from the Free State and Northern Province*, Leslie Dikeni, Richard Moorehead & Ian Scoones, Land and Agriculture Policy Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa, 1995
- Taking the Bull by the Horns: NGOs and pastoralists in Coalition*, ODI Pastoral Development Network, No. 33 December 1992

## 9) Training for fellowships

*Etude portant sur les problèmes de développement et les comportements sociologiques et sociaux dans le delta intérieur du Niger, Mali*, Salmama Cissé, Proposal, 1997

*Maasai Speak Out Against the Loss of Their Lands*, Speaking Tour of England and Scotland - March/April 1997

### Haramata

Issues No. 17-31 (September 1992 - June 1996)

### Issue papers

Each issue of Haramata is accompanied by an Issue Paper addressing specific issues. Those dealing with land issues which have been published since 1992/93 are as follows:

*Nomadic pastoralists in Kenya: human ecology aspects of the East-Pokot* - Ute Reckers, Issue Paper No. 73, 1997

*Pastoralism in a changing world: patterns of adaptation among the Rabaris of Kutch, Gujarat*, Archana Choksi and Caroline Dyer, IIED Issue Paper No. 69, 1996

*The involvement of nomadic and transhuman pastoralists in the rehabilitation and management of the Logon Flood Plain, North Cameroon*, Paul Scholte, Saidou Kari and Mark Moritz, IIED Issue Paper No. 66, 1996

*Post drought migration and technological innovations among Fulani herders in Senegal: the triumph of the tube!* Kristin Juul, IIED Issue Paper No. 64, 1996

*Resisting change? Adaptations by traditional pastoralists to the Rajasthan Canal Project*, Saurabh Sinha, IIED Issue Paper No. 62, 1996

*Water conflict in the Senegal River Valley: implications of a "no-flood" scenario*, Muneera Salem-Murdock and Madiodio Niase, IIED Issue Paper No. 61, 1996

*Participatory planning with pastoralists: some recent experiences*. Ann Waters-Bayer, Wolfgang Bayer & Annette von Lossau, IIED Issue Paper No. 58, 1995

*Land tenure, environmental degradation and desertification in Africa: Some thoughts based on the Sahelian example*. Brigitte Thébaud, IIED Issue Paper No. 57, 1995

*Recognising the effectiveness of traditional pastoral practices: Lessons from a controlled grazing experiment in Northern Senegal*. Brigitte Thébaud, Hermann Grell & Sabine Mieke, IIED Issue Paper No. 55, 1995

*Conflicts and alliance between farmers and herders: A Case Study of the 'Goll' of Fandène village, Senegal*, Mamadou Bara Guèye, IIED Issue Paper No. 49, 1994

*Dealing with risk and uncertainty in Africa's drylands: The social dimensions of desertification*, Yvette D. Evers, IIED Issue Paper No. 48, 1994

*Environment, Population Growth and Productivity in Kenya: A Case Study of Machakos District*, Mary Tiffen and Michael Mortimore, IIED Issue Paper No. 47, 1993

*The State and Rangeland Management: Creation and Erosion of Pastoral Institutions in Mali*, Trond Vedeld, IIED Issue Paper No. 46, 1993

*Waiting for the Rural Code: Perspectives on land tenure reform in Niger*, Christian Lund, IIED Issue Paper No. 44, 1993

*Pastoralism, crisis and transformation in Karamoja*, Joe Oloka-Onyango, Gary Zie & Frank Muhereza, IIED Issue paper No. 43, 1993

*Getting it right: Linking concepts and action for improving the use of natural resources in Sahelian West Africa*, Thomas Painter, IIED Issue Paper No. 40, 1993

*Wetlands in drylands: Key resources for agricultural and pastoral production in Africa*, Ian Scoones, IIED Issue Paper No. 38, 1992

*From woodlands to village land management in the Sahel*, Ibrahim Guèye & Peter Laban, IIED Issue Paper No. 35, 1992

*Land degradation and rehabilitation research in Africa 1980-1990: Retrospective and prospect*, Michael Stocking, IIED Issue Paper No. 34, 1992

*Rethinking range ecology: Implications for rangeland management in Africa*, Roy Behnke & Ian Scoones, IIED Issue Paper No. 33, 1992

*Pastoralists and planners: Local knowledge and resource management in Gidan Magajia Grazing Reserve, Northern Nigeria*, M.A. Mohamed Salih, IIED Issue Paper No. 32, 1992

*Decentralising common property resources management: A case study of the Nyaminyami District Council of Zimbabwe's wildlife management programme*, James Murombedzi, IIED Issues Paper No. 30, 1991

*Mbegué: The disingenuous destruction of a Sahelian forest*, Karen Schoonmaker Freudenberger, IIED Issue Paper No. 29, 1991

### ANNEX 3. ITINERARY AND PERSONS MET

DG - (and partly with BC and KG ) Sweden/UK/ Kenya/ Tanzania/Uganda

**1997**

10<sup>th</sup> June

Meetings in SAREC with **Bruce Campbell, Karin Gerhardt and Anders Hjort**

11<sup>th</sup> June

DG and BC meeting with OSSREA team **Professor Abdel Ghafar Ahmed and Dr Tegegne Teka** at SAREC

8<sup>th</sup> July

DG . Meeting with IIED. **Charles Lane and Ced Hesse** in London.

29<sup>th</sup> July

Meeting with **Idrisa Maiga** and **Salamana Cisse** - (IIED link to Mali Programme) at ODG, Norwich

11<sup>th</sup> - 15<sup>th</sup> Aug.

Reading of PINEP,EPOS, DHP and IIED publications and preparation

16<sup>th</sup> -17<sup>th</sup> Aug.

To Nairobi. Arlanda-Gatwick-Nairobi. Met by **Frederick Onyango** (PINEP Administrative Officer) and driver. Accom. at Fairview Hotel

18<sup>th</sup>

1000-1400

Meeting with PINEP /DHP staff. At Univ. Nairobi.

**Wellington Ekaya**, (Senior Technical Officer- Operations) **Irene Maeri** (Information Officer), **Abigael K.Kibisu** (secretary)

**Dr Nashon Musimbe** National Cood. DHP Member of Range Management Dept. Introductions to Department of Range Management and University of Nairobi

**Dr Kassim Farah Coordinator, PINEP**

Meeting with Principal, **Daniel Mukunya and Deans J.M. Gathuma (Vet Science) and J.K. Imungi (Acting Dean, Fac. of Agriculture).**

**Mr David Mbuvi** (“Deputy Chairman “? in RM Dept.)

2330 hrs

Arrival of **Karin Gerhardt** at Fair View. Brief discussions.

19<sup>th</sup>

0800-1000

Kabete. Meeting with MSc students. **Emmanuel Kyagaba, Idle Omar Farah, Hamid Mammad, Mohammed Eisa, and Osman Abrar**

20<sup>th</sup>

0900

Collected **James M Kumanzia** (Divisional Livestock Extension Officer from Kbwewe Division Offices. Arrived at Institute of Dryland Research Development and Utilization (IDRDU). Met by Director, **Professor J.P.Mbuvi**. Nashaon Musimbe and **Charles Ikutwa** (Senior Technologist. Diploma Range Management, Egerton). Introduction and briefing.

Multipurpose tree nursery. Introduced by Technician **Nyale Davies.**

Community No 1. **Ngulu Rock Catchment**, Makueni County.

Met by 10 women and 6 men. Problem of uncertain water supply for domestic purposes. Also water supply only lasts for 2 months into dry season. Then need to walk long distances for water (15 - 20km) for several months.

Community No.2. Silanga (a dam) Ngomano (meeting point)  
Introduction by chairman, Mr **Kilunda**. Introduced 9 committee members  
Group formed in 1996 from National Youth and Development Fund. Now has 36  
members , young and old, men and women.  
Activities. No. 1 is water as nearest permanent point is 20km away.  
Village has 1221 house holds who need access to water for 3 months 7326 people

Community No. 3. Wasya wa Kinguutheni. Women's group with small stock.  
Discussion with animal health para-vet. He has had training programme on health care  
and treatment on stock. Most of treatment is with manufactured drugs. When asked  
about the use of local materials and remedies he said that they were not very effective.  
Drugs were better.

1610 Quality Motel for lunch  
**Mr Erik Nissen Petersen** ASAL Consultants (Affordable water supply in Dryland)  
Water engineer who works on diversion schemes and sub-surface dams to improve the  
reliability and longevity of domestic and livestock water supplies.

21<sup>st</sup>  
0630 Return to Nairobi  
1300 Meeting with **Dr John Mugabe** and **Mrs Catherine Mwangi** Executive Director  
and Deputy Executive Director (Finance and Administration) of African Centre for  
Technology Studies (ACTS). This is an IIED link.

1600 Brief final meeting with **Kassim Farah**

1615 **Joseph Simel**, Secretary, Iloodoariak Community , Kiserian. (80 km SW of Nairobi,  
Kajado. One of many Maasai communities threatened by land alienation. Link to  
IIED.

1800 Meeting with Swedish Embassy representatives - **Tom Anyonge**- Programme  
Officer, Natural Resources Management. **Anders Karlsson** - Counsellor,  
Development Cooperation.

22<sup>nd</sup>  
0835 Travel to Arusha. Arr. 2145

1430 **Ben Lobulu**, Lawyer Human Rights Monitoring Group (HURIMOG)

1530 PINGO's. Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Governmental Organisations. FORUM " To  
facilitate the reintegration of indigenous peoples into Tanzanian society as citizens with  
full rights and responsibilities like other citizens" 12 member organisations.  
Met: **Anna Mghwira** - Young Lawyer, **Edwin Kerea**, **Soloman Lengaram** -  
Information Officer.  
**Elaine Ward** Lawyer, CUSO

23<sup>rd</sup>  
0930 Bruce Campbell arrived from Dar. Discussions and briefings.

24<sup>th</sup>  
1100 Second visit to PINGOs. DG. Meeing with **Jacob Kauderi Ole Toroge**, Director  
KIPOC Pastoral Group. P.O.Box 22, Loliondo, Tanzania. Meeting with **William**  
**Sikirari** - Chairman, PINGOs

1700 Report writing

25<sup>th</sup>  
0800 Writing  
1400 Bus to Nairobi DG, KG, BC  
1930 Meal with Tom and Christine Anyone

26<sup>th</sup>  
0800 Meeting with **Dr Iba Kone**, Senior Programme Officer. African Academy of Sciences. Link with IFS.

26<sup>th</sup>  
1500 Kampala  
KG and BC visited Makerere Univ. Met **Samuel Mugasse** MSc student working in Dry areas near Mbarara. Planning field trip

1600 DG visited Centre for Basic Research. **Dr John Barya**, Executive Director. Met **Frank Emmanuel Muhereza** - Land research in dry areas.  
Wednesday Field trip to DHP site  
Met **Stanley Mwanguzi** the Deputy Headmaster.  
Returned to Hotel at Mubwezi ? for night.  
Next day to Kampala. Met **Dr Felix Bareeba**. Dept. of Animal Science.  
Brief discussions on the programme.  
He had arranged for us to meet **Dr Mbuza** - Commissioner for Animal Production MoA and **Mrs Kabyetsiza** - IGAD Desk Officer MoA both based in Entebbe. BC met Mrs Kabyetsiza on Friday

1700 Plane to Nairobi- Gatwick and Arlanda. DG and KG

**In addition, Bruce Campbell travelled to:**

Ethiopia (BMC)  
18th-20th Mekelle University College, Mekelle  
21st-22nd Addis Ababa: OSSREA, PENHA, Department of Extension (Ministry of Agriculture)

**and met the following persons:**

Abdel Ghafar M. Ahmed, Prof. OSSREA, Addis Ababa.  
Ahmed, Ms. S. Research Associate, PENHA, Addis Ababa.  
Ato Alemayehu Boka, Extension Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa.  
Arsano, Mr. Y. Research Associate, PENHA, Addis Ababa.  
Bareeba, F. Dr. Head, Department of Animal Science, Makerere University and Project Manager, DHP (Uganda).  
Beruk Yemane, Extension Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa.  
Headmaster, Kazo Village, DHP project site (Uganda)  
Kabyesiza, Mrs. IGAD Desk Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Uganda.  
Kyangungu, A. Mr. Senior Paravet (trained by DHP (Uganda)).  
Merha Zerabruk, Mr. Lecturer, Department of Animal and Range Science, Mekelle University College.  
Mitiku Haile, Dr. Dean, College of Dryland Agriculture and Natural Resources, Mekelle University College and National Co-ordinator DHP (Ethiopia).  
Mugasi, Mr. S. Research Assistant to DHP (Uganda) site, Department of Agricultural economics, Makerere University.  
Schie, Mr T. van. Contract Lecturer, Mekelle University College  
Scoones, Dr. I. Lecturer, Institute of Development Studies, formerly IIED.  
Seyoum Gebre Selassie, Prof. Professor of Sociology, Addis Ababa University and Research Fellow, PENHA.  
Simonsen, Dr. G. Researcher, Agricultural University of Norway, Researcher in the study area of DHP (Ethiopia).  
Tafessa Mesfin, Dr. Department of Extension, Ministry of Agriculture, National Co-ordinator, PINEP (Ethiopia) and Member, NSC, DHP (Uganda).  
Tegegne Teka, Dr. OSSREA and Regional Co-ordinator, DHP

## APPENDIX 4 COMMENTS FROM OSSREA, PINEP AND EPOS

### **Comment on: The Three SAREC Supported Dryland Research Programmes in East Africa.**

Tegegne Teka  
Regional Project Co-ordinator  
Dryland Husbandry Project (DHP), OSSREA

12.1.98

OSSREA would like to thank Professors David Gibbon and Bruce Campbell for their evaluation on: **The Three SAREC Supported Dryland Research Programmes in East Africa**. OSSREA is also pleased in that its efforts have been recognised by the evaluators when they stated that ‘... *the administrative role played by OSSREA was excellent*’ (p. 17). They have also suggested OSSREA to be the facilitator of the Dryland Research Programme in Africa (p.7). Needless to mention, OSSREA is aware that a lot more could be done to make DHP more effective and efficient.

First and foremost, OSSREA looks at the evaluation report in a positive way. Moreover, as DHP Regional Office provided information about the activities, strengths and limitations of DHP and the country projects, it is not new to some of the issues raised in the evaluation report. Although most of OSSREA’s comments on the draft evaluation report have been incorporated in the final report, we still want to make the following observations and remarks.

**1. Too much interrogation into project performance:** . There appears to be a great desire by the evaluators to see immediate results. DHP in general and the country projects in particular have been looked at by the evaluators as if they have been in operation for a decade or so. If the evaluators want to see DHP meet its objectives in a year and half; it certainly will not be possible and would make the evaluation unrealistic. We would rather prefer to work on the weaknesses that the evaluators identified as future tasks and challenges of DHP. We strongly think that DHP is a project that is in the making.

Projects like DHP want to be participatory and aim to work on action research that will have policy relevance. Yet, DHP has been criticised for not drifting away from the conventional approach. Although it is fair to comment on DHP’s performance, the evaluation does not seem to appreciate the difficulties of implementing participatory and action research on the ground. The evaluation assumes that there is a smooth and clear cut way of implementing the above. This, we think, is too theoretical and hardly recognises what is out there in the real world.

**2. On DHP budget and structure:** The country projects have taken shelters in institutions or departments whose hands are full, may be with the exception of the Sudan. Though this was not intended nor looked into at the start of the country projects, this is what we find on the ground. Therefore, there is a need to reassess institutional base of DHP and strengthen its field staff and its budget that could give full time commitment to project objectives and implementation, particularly the action research and the field trials.

DHP does not have budget to compensate for the time that the national co-ordinators put into the project. There is no budget for the project manager. There is no incentive or any compensation for those engaged in DHP either from their national institutions or DHP. The Dean is invariably the national co-ordinator of DHP in all the country projects, a project which demands a lot of time. Most of the times the priorities in the faculties and departments override those of DHP. Despite these, the goodwill and the interest of the staff of the different university departments kept DHP in the scene.



**3. International Publications:** Again the evaluators have become too conventional and presented international publications as a measure for the success of projects like the DHP. Though the idea of publishing in a reputable international journal is positive, the objective of DHP is to build capacity in Africa. The idea is to support the local and the indigenous. Our primary concern would be to focus on the national, regional and continental publications in Africa and show the international research community that interesting materials can originate and be published in Africa.

**4. On NGOs:** The evaluators, we think, have overstated the competence of some NGOs like PENHA. This may be because they looked at things from the surface and probably echoed the views of some whom they interviewed. We shall leave the judgement on these NGOs to those who know the region and the operations of regional research institutions. For DHP, it will try to utilise wherever the competence exists, in Africa or outside, to fulfil its objectives.

Secondly, the scale they have used to compare the activities and achievements of a European NGO like the IIED with DHP activities is not acceptable both by age, objective and infrastructure base. Moreover, DHP did not know whether IIED was working on similar issues and did not have information that IIED was financed by Sida. To criticise DHP for not developing working relations with IIED is a critique that is misplaced. The lack of similar information may also be true for IIED because they came to Addis Abeba and did not call on OSSREA. Now that we know, we would rather take the idea as a suggestion to develop future relations with IIED.

In conclusion, OSSREA is of the view that what has been performed by DHP country projects is OK. Yet, it believes that there is a room for improvement that all must recognise and strive for, and looks at the Dryland Husbandry project in the context of the learning process approach.

**Comments on Evaluation of three SAREC supported dryland research programmes in East Africa: EPOS  
Anders Hjort af Ornäs 2.1.98**

The preparations of the report "Evaluation of three SAREC supported dryland research programmes in East Africa" has involved me twice; at an introductory meeting at Sida and when asked to comment on a draft version of the report. In the latter case I wrote a personal letter to the desk officer at SAREC, Dr Karin Gerhardt, who has shown it to the evaluators. Since that has had only limited impact on the text I account for principal parts of it below.

The report is still focused on paper writing as a prime indicator of activities. Since this misrepresents the design aiming at competencebuilding and use of existing structures rather than forming new ones, a brief background is called for.

**Background**

PINEP is designed to be an intra-university applied training, research and information dissemination activity in the region. The initiative comes from Dr. Kassim Farah, and discussions between him and me especially on follow-ups of the regional ambitions in the Somali Camel Research Project that never were accepted by the donor.

DHP was originally thought of by SIDA (this acronym at that time) as based at IGADD (this acronym at that time) and focussed on raising applicable research issues for policy discussions (especially not research). The SAREC/SIDA division of responsibilities was at the time one between applied research and policy formation. The project took shape at a presentation at SIDA when the issue of policy applications was raised.

The design was later stopped by SIDA after a negative evaluation of IGADD, and so instead OSSREA was approached and accepted the node function. EPOS and OSSREA were recruited on a partnership basis as service support to the two nodes, at OSSREA and DRM. The emphasis was on keeping initiatives in the region in order to avoid Northern dominance in problem formulation and pace setting.

Given the priority to training, PINEP was to operate within conventional university structures. The circumstances for PINEP to function were difficult from the onset. A distinct strategy was formulated; firstly to put the Master training in operation (paralleled by very minor research in the form of small scholarships in reality intended for national network members); then to get the research information dissemination going, and finally to improve the research level. The first two of these steps have been achieved (the second one delayed with a build-up of APF manuscripts as result of the murder of the editor). The third step, a major research project, is prepared to the point of being finalised for a dryland project (node in Northern Kenya), and identified for an agro-pastoral project if a semi-arid focus is chosen (based at Kibwezi).

The operation of DHP became delayed i.a. because of the move away from the IGADD intention and the continued. The harmonisation with PINEP and the operation of national activities are still at an early stage.

**Principal comments**

I. Perspective: training and information. PINEP has so far been primarily a training and information activity, with limited research. This is primarily due to the fact that the funds for national research were lifted out by SAREC a few weeks before the onset of Phase 2. DHP has in the SIDA instructions been prohibited to devote too much energy to research. Yet, the evaluation is formulated as one concerning pure research programmes.

Neither of these constraints to research cooperation are mentioned in the evaluation. EPOS contribution has been towards capacity building and research information plus planning for research activities for the next period.

II. Research indicators for training. The evaluators see progress in current activities in the form of printed products and not education of persons potentially important for policy formation. This means using a set of indicators for research on evaluating something else, i.e. training and capacity building. The report does not give credit to the fact that what we deal with is capacity building through training in the South, and that this implies a process approach with all its long-term thinking, patience and tolerance.

III. Competence building and not purchasing good reports. The strong request for research reports is a sign of the misunderstanding. The mode of operation is not to purchase good reports through short-term assignments but to build capacity (institutional, educational, research, production) in the South. Indicators that should have been used are for example recruitment profiles, turnover of students (time and numbers), how many have returned to original employment in the case of PINEP, the degree of local involvement, impact on policy, number of interactions at grassroot and policy-making levels of DHP. The EPOS support has primarily been towards research information dissemination.

IV. Systems perspective. The evaluators request more of social science. In the revised version of their report, now published, this has been only slightly modified (into seeking proper combinations of natural and social science). For those who have followed dryland projects over the past 20 years the message from an overwhelming sequence of impact studies is that in order to reach beyond, and community participation, the concern is with a combination of natural resource management, socio-economics and cultural systems. One must be clear about what kind of social science (systems orientation). The principle must be interdisciplinarity in combination with problem orientation. This is formulated with EPOS input as back-up when regional capacity is limited.

V. Applied target for report writing. As mentioned, the report does not account for the fact that PINEP has primarily been an education undertaking, with a minor research component but with an information dissemination ambition. Again, the evaluators have missed out on process, and not comprehended the step-wise approach, at the moment leading up to proposals for more full-fledged research activities. The target for African Pastoral Forum has primarily been to provide information and findings of practical relevance in the region. It is a working paper series. EPOS contribution has been to comment on such papers. Under the partnership formula some of the papers are currently upgraded and published internationally. The international research community is only a secondary target for Phase 2, though.

VI. Work through existing structures. The evaluators have not accepted the basic design; to work through existing university structures in the case of PINEP, and for EPOS not to get involved at project level (as part of the capacity building effort). This design, with EPOS as facilitator but the initiative power in the South, is a corner-stone for proper partnership. The emphasis on participation and interaction in field studies can not be forced upon people as a concept (for centralised decentralisation) but has to grow out of the interaction between equal partners with different perspectives.

VII. Facilitator versus leadership roles. Basic to the design for the partnership between EPOS and the two networks is to cooperate on a partnership basis. This means that EPOS is ascribed a facilitating role, and not that we have assumed a "leadership role" (as alas is called for from EPOS and OSSREA in the evaluation /only indirectly, though, in the revised version/). We have in the design sought to avoid precisely that top-down approach that the evaluators favour, i.e. to use a commando style at project level to generate short-term output in the shape of concrete products (the evaluators seem to think predominantly of research reports).

Furthermore, the partnership involving EPOS is concentrated to the nodes of PINEP and of DHP. The intention has never been for EPOS to get involved at project level. This distinction is mentioned once in passing in the report but its implications have by and large been missed by the evaluators. Yet, it is a cornerstone for the mode of operation between equal (in terms of power) but different partners.

VIII. Partnership and levels of non-interference. The agreed philosophy has been that cooperation is not intended at project level but at the level of nodes of networks. We had much discussion about the application of this principle when a former EPOS employee (now a doctorate student of one of the evaluators) tended to move into project level, thus creating a work style that was not acceptable by the partners. Patience and respect should be key words when working through partnerships; the danger is otherwise to create an atmosphere of centralised decentralisation, i.e. that the partner in the North should set up conditions for decentralised cooperation.

IX. No visit to EPOS. No evaluator has visited EPOS and, yet, the report contains opinions about its operations. The evaluators fall back on partial information. One implication is a misunderstanding of roles, another that the entire field of information training has been completely omitted in the evaluation report; the information officer at EPOS in charge of this has not even been contacted.

X. Budgets and expenses. The budget implications of North/South cooperation are generally that a large proportion remains in the North due to high costs. In an earlier evaluation of a mostly SAREC financed programme in Somalia the proportions 1/3 in the North, 1/3 for equipment and 1/3 in the South was seen as a success. In the current activities proportions are at least as favourable. The evaluators have not even bothered to look into the matter of expenses, merely at budgets, at EPOS. The decisive implications of (a) Swedish Krona devaluation and (b) last minutes budget cuts are not discussed at all.

XI. Integration of the two projects. The evaluators have justly underscored that there are intentions for combined efforts between PINEP and DHP. (a) Personnel in the latter will be a resource for training in the former. (b) Field stations within DHP will be assets for future PINEP research. Such relationships should be strengthened, but again as i.a. the internal SAREC evaluation after Phase 1 shows this is a built-in design; it is a matter of management and patience to establish sustainable forms. Once more, however, the evaluators have stepped into a process with a project, not process, expectation. This means that they have counted isolated activities instead of concentrating on the directions of the cooperation processes.

COMMENTS ON EVALUATION OF THREE SAREC SUPPORTED  
DRYLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAMMES (DEC.1997)

by

DR. KASSIM O. FARRAH, *Regional Coordinator, PINEP*

I was given the opportunity, for which I am very grateful, by SIDA/SAREC (specifically Dr. Karin Gerhardt) to comment on an earlier version (Oct.1997) of the above mentioned report. My written comments were submitted to Dr. Karin Gerhardt, Senior Programme Officer, SIDA/SAREC, Stockholm in November, 1997. It was then my belief, that the same would be forwarded to the evaluator(s) in order for them to utilise it for their revision as deemed fit.

Unfortunately, and I find this eventuality difficult to comprehend, the revised version of the evaluator(s) report ignored my comments, in toto, much as they were central to shedding light on some fundamental aspects e.g. evolutionary history, conceptual and philosophical under-pinnings, organizational framework, and mode of operation of the PINEP Programmes. In this regard, the evaluator(s) seemed pre-determined to operate in ignorance, (reality in their perception) inspite of the background information and that relating to the situation on the ground which was readily availed to them! Alas, it brutally dawned on me that in the scheme of things, again from the evaluator(s) perspectives, my reality as one of two originators and key implementers of the PINEP Programme, and to a much less but significant extent the DHP Project, did not count. The implication of such a scenario, in the current vogue rural development paradigms (as typified by Chambers 1997), is that the evaluator(s) approach in the exercise of the above mentioned evaluation was highly TOP-DOWN. There was no room for participatory process in interacting with key players in the aforesaid programmes yet the team leader not only inundatingly professed embracement of such (participatory) approach but also used the same as a basis of criticism for all the three programmes.

Given the above, I believe that it becomes absolutely vital that I respond to the evaluation report a second time. I must thank Dr. Karin Gerhardt, SIDA/SAREC for affording this opportunity once again.

Following are my comments on second version (December 1997) of the above evaluation report:

**1. FACTUAL ERRORS.** These *inter alia* include the following:-

- 1.1. The title of the evaluation report "Evaluation of THREE SAREC SUPPORTED RESEARCH.....". To the best of my knowledge the Dryland Husbandry Project (DHP) as it stood during the evaluation in August, 1997 could not be described as a research project both in its' original design by Prof. Anders Hjort and Prof. Michael Stahl (formerly head, RSCU, SIDA Nairobi, Kenya) as well as its' implementation through to the end of 1997. This situation may nonetheless change in the upcoming phase.

- 1.2 Table 2, P.9 of the report indicates that PINEP was initiated in 1991. The correct position is that although PINEP was conceived and formulated by myself and Prof. Anders Horv as early as 1991, it was approved for funding by SAREC in late 1992 and actual programme implementation started in Jan; 1993.
- 1.3 On P.11, Para.1, the evaluator(s) state thus "PINEP was established with support from EPOS and links to DHP...". This is the height of falsehood. PINEP started approximately 2 1/2 years before DHP and one wonders how it could have linkages with a non-existent project!!! On the same page, Para 2, the comment that the Department of Range Management at the University of Nairobi is a key part of the training" is absolutely incorrect. The Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi is fully responsible for the training of PINEP ofcourse with a regional orientation (students are recredited from the IGAD Sub-region). The evaluator(s), contrary to allegation the sentence following the above one did wish to listen to background information on PINEP including Phase I (July 1992 - June 1994) and the outcome of the internal evaluation carried out by SAREC in December, 1993. The evaluator(s) showed least interest in my attempts to give a systematic outline of PINEP activities in Phase I and the substance of the internal evaluation. The repeated and invariable response was that and I quote "I have had enough of that information".
- On Page 2, Section 2.5, the evaluator(s) state "The minimal use of regional lecturers in the M.Sc. Programme and irregular contacts between co-ordinators (Presumably National Co-ordinators)....."
- This represents the epitome of misunderstanding of the training component of PINEP which I tried in vain to clarify to the evaluator(s) thus reinforcing my earlier argument that a scenerio of an *a priori* and fixed judgement was operative in the evaluator(s)' ken of reality. My clarification on this point is simple and straightforward - i.e. firstly, the Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi is technically competent to undertake training at MSC level in Range Management. It has been doing so long before PINEP came into existence. The question of multi-disciplinarity in a Range Management course at MSC level was already taken into account by the curriculum which was approved by the University of Nairobi (UON) Senate (Supreme Academic Body in the UON). As for lack of co-operation with National coordinators and allocation of the bulk of financial resources, I have explained *ad infinitum* that when PINEP submitted its application for funding for phase two, SAREC cut out the budget for National co-ordination in-country. The phase two agreement, put prime implementation of PINEP squarely on the shoulders of University of Nairobi in close collaboration with EPOS, Linkoping University, Sweden.

In the same vein the budget for project activities to be implemented by the secretariat at the Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi was cut by more than forty percent (40%) which severely constrained project input-output functions. I have explained this to the evaluator(s) in addition to detailing it in my first set of comments and yet nothing has been mentioned about this reality in the revised version of the evaluation report. Why did such a situation obtain?

1.4 "The MSC in Range Management has become established and is producing ....." Page one sec. 2.4. This gives the explicit impression that the MSC (Range Mgt.) at the Department of Range Management, University of Nairobi was founded through the PINEP programme in 1993. The correct position is that the DRM, UON established its masters programme in 1989. Between the time it was launched and the initiation of the PINEP programme the Department had produced two groups of graduates (twenty one in number) based purely on internal i.e. Government of Kenya financing. This fact also makes nonsense of the remark "A critical concern about the sustainability of the PINEP programme was expressed due to Department of Range Management's extreme dependency on external funding." Sec. 2.6. p. 13 attributed to Dr. John Mugabe, Director ACTS, Kenya.

1.5 "The literature reviews, both for the M.Sc. dissertations (and for some of the collaborative papers.....)" section 2.4, p. 1. Why would the evaluator(s) want to dilute the fact some major papers by senior PINEP staff have as their main thing recent paradigmatic shifts in the field of pastoral ecosystem dynamic in Africa??? Some of these papers (at least three APF) have been quoted world wide!!!

## 2. PROFESSIONAL DEFICIENCY:

In a serious scientific exercise such as an external evaluation of donor funded project, it is expected that facts are gathered as they are on the ground. Secondary information is often used for reinforcement or rejection of gathered information and/or evidence. Again, as in scientific write-up all statements and arguments in an evaluation report of the kind under review should be backed by hard facts. However, it is my considered opinion that both the October, 1997 and December, 1997 version of the evaluation report is highly anecdotal, fairly superficial, and reports on project activities that were not visited. As an example, the in-country activities of DHP Project for Sudan and Eritrea are in the evaluation report yet no evaluator visited these projects. Is this professionally acceptable? I will give just two additional examples among many; (i) EPOS was not visited by any member of the evaluation team but nevertheless the evaluator(s) found it fit to, unfairly in

my view, to heap much criticism regarding its (EPOS) failure to fulfill its' stated objectives and role; (ii) The evaluator(s) make extremely damaging remarks about the University of Nairobi based on what amounts to a rumour . The only way such a serious statement can be made to dent the **image** and **integrity** of an Institution like the University of Nairobi is to quote from an evaluation report with had facts on the same institution.

### 3. LOGICAL FLAWS/INTERNAL INCONSISTENCIES

The report is replete with internal inconsistencies, contradictions, and tautological arguments. To illustrate this I will use one example. In the December, 1997 version of the evaluation report a section 5.3 (p.7) titled "FURTHER RECOMMENDATION FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME" is added only in the summary and recommendation section. I have raised the logical demerit of this section in an earlier correspondence to Dr. Karim Gerhads dated 24th February, 1998. However, further analysis of this section brings out fully that the evaluation report is highly circular in its' flow of ideas. The said section recommends that PINEP be merged with DHP and the resultant one programme be implemented by OSSREA, yet the same report has the following to say about DHP, and by extension OSSREA:

- (i) Individual country projects have weak technical leadership from the regional Node i.e. OSSREA though administrative support is good. In the same vein, though DHP is decentralized to the extent that project activities are fully implemented by country lead institution with National co-ordinators having full control, in their regard, (of course with a pre-determined and fixed budgets whose formation they did not participate in and also under close supervision of NSC), horizontal interaction between country project activities is minimal except during regional workshops during which time the regional Node (OSSREA) uses the forum to lift all country project progress reports and merge them into one report which they put between covers.
- (ii) DHP activities have weak socio-economic inputs and are deficient in interdisciplinary research, yet OSSREA, the regional node for DHP is the "mother" of social sciences in the eastern and southern Africa sub-region.
- (iii) Two (s) of DHP country projects (Eritrea and Uganda) have performed so badly that the evaluator(s) recommend that they be discarded.
- (iv) The evaluator(s) observe that all internal evaluation of DHP country projects undertaken by OSSREA prior to their own August 97 external evaluation are very uncritical. Implications of this observation is that OSSREA is hopelessly incompetent in selecting suitable evaluatos.

The aforementioned clearly states that OSSREA has implemented (or overseen the implementation of DHP)



in a far less than satisfactory manner. One wonders how within the same report, the evaluator(s) could recommend that OSSREA, in addition to the DHP project also be given PINEP to implement!!!!

#### 4. COST-EFFECTIVENESS

I find the evaluator(s) unnecessary harsh and unfair to EPOS with respect to performance in relation to the proportion of financial resources allocated. A very cursory look at a budget analysis of DHP shows as follows: Out of an annual budget allocation of SEK3.4M, the Southern Node (OSSREA) got SEK1.7M (79.42%) while EPOS the Northern Node got SEK. 0.7M(20. 58%). To me, EPOS is underfunded to undertake its' required role contrary to what the evaluator(s) are pointing out given the high operational - costs in the North. But of more interest, is the fact that of the SEK1.7M that came to OSSREA SEK1.05M, (39.0%) is retained for regional co-ordination which the evaluator(s) have termed as only administrative support while a mere SEK1.65M (61.5%) is allocated for project activities in all countries. compared to PINEP the corresponding figures are SEK2M for the Southern Node (80%) and SEK0.5M (20%) for the Northern Node i.e. EPOS. For PINEP, of the SEK2M allocated to the South, only SEK0.3(15%) is used for regional secretariat and co-ordination while SEK1.7M (85%) is used for project activities. How come the evaluator(s) have not questioned the substantial funds used by OSSREA for regional co-ordination and underfunding for PINEP's regional co-ordination and that for EPOS as an Institution operating from the expensive North???

## Recent Sida Evaluations

- 98/3 Swedish Labour Market Projects in Lithuania 1995-1997. Susanne Oxenstierna, Henrik Huitfeldt  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 98/4 Den mänskliga faktorn. Samarbete mellan svenskt postväsende och den regionala posten i St Petersburg, Ryssland. Lars Rylander  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 98/5 Apoyo de Asdi al Programa Nacional de la Mujer en Bolivia. <mstins Dunitsyd, Åsa Westermark  
Department for Latin America
- 98/6 Sustainability and Partnership. Sida supported cooperation between Swedish and Baltic Non-governmental Organisations. Peter Winai  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 98/7 Sewerage and Water Sector Projects in Egypt. Nigel Nicholson, Nemat Guenena  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 98/8 Sida Support to ten Projects at the Geological Surveys of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Torsten Toksvad, Janis Prols.  
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 98/9 Programas de MCED/DERECHOS del Niño de UNICEF en América y en el Centro Internacional para el Desarrollo del Niño de UNICEF(ICDC). Benno Glauser, Eva Lithman, Riccardo Lucchini  
Department for Latin America
- 98/10 Swedish Support to the Power Sector in Vietnam. Bo Sedin  
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 98/11 Public Auditing in Southern Africa. Kathy M Higgins, Matsobane Putsoa  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 98/12 The Asian Regional Research Programme in Energy, Environment and Climate. J M Christensen, G A Mackenzie  
Department for Research Cooperation SAREC
- 98/13 Selected Aspects on the University System of Nicaragua. Yolanda Rojas, Jörgen Dahlgren  
Department for Research Cooperation SAREC
- 98/14 Expanded Programme on Immunization in Zimbabwe. Per Anders Björkman, Davies Gordon Dhlakama, Birger Carl Forsberg  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 98/15 Community-based Rehabilitation Programme in Zimbabwe. S Chidyausiku, J Munandi, M Marasha, D Mbadzo, F Mhuri, H Ooppelstrup, C Nleya  
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 98/16 SAREC Supported Dryland Research Programmes in East Africa. David Gibbon, Bruce Campbell  
Department for Research Cooperation SAREC

**Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:**

Infocenter, Sida  
S-105 25 Stockholm  
Phone: (+46) 8 795 23 44  
Fax: (+46) 8 760 58 95

**A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:**

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm  
Phone: (+46) 8 698 5133  
Fax: (+46) 8 698 5610





SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY  
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden  
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64  
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9  
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>