

Project Evaluation Series

**Final evaluation of Pursuing Pastoralist
Resilience through Improved Animal
Health Service Delivery in Pastoralist
Areas of Ethiopia**

Project code: GCP/ETH/083/EC

Annex 4. Stakeholder analysis from inception report

KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Specific examples	What role in relation to the PPR project?	How will they use the evaluation?	What might they gain or lose from evaluation?	How and when they should be involved in the evaluation	Questions and areas to explore	Practicalities
Contextual stakeholders with projects in same technical or geographic areas as PPR project	Ethiopian central and state government departments UN agencies EU/SHARE WB USAID	Compete or complement? What coordination mechanisms exist?	Improved synergies	Plus: Improved future project complementarity and effectiveness (esp ref SDGs). Minus: critical reviews.	Essential to understand context, how ultimate aims of the various projects might be affected by complementarities or conflicts.	Factual information about projects in same geographical and technical areas with budgets. What other priority programmes does Ethiopian vet service have? Mechanisms and indicators for stakeholder engagement and impact. Mechanisms for coordination.	Start with key informants in PPR project, then agree priorities.
Active stakeholders with the authority to make decisions related to PPR project. Ex: ✓ FAO project staff ✓ Governmental entities ✓ Funding agency/donor	1. FAO project staff 2. MoA counterparts 3. NVI 4. NGO counterparts 5. EU	1. Implementer 2, 3, 4 Key partners 5. Funder	1. Possible follow-up project formulation 2, 3, 4. Review & refine projects, and working practices 5. Future funding priorities, and project assessment criteria	1. Likelihood of further project shape and funding 2, 3, (4). Want projects and funding to support government (NGO) aims and priorities, but also want control and seamless implementation, so a balance 5. Gain insight and new viewpoints,	1. from start 2, 3. key partners, give permission for work, so need clarity before taking time. 4. as with 2, 3, but have less power 5. from start to check what they want from evaluation	What they want from evaluation? How we can work together to optimize benefits? Any caveats? Exploring sensitive areas? (eg NVI and ILRI technology transfer idea that wasn't wanted, though led to project delay?) Further project detail.	Have limited time so need quickly to identify stakeholder priorities and 'mood'.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Specific examples	What role in relation to the PPR project?	How will they use the evaluation?	What might they gain or lose from evaluation?	How and when they should be involved in the evaluation	Questions and areas to explore	Practicalities
				might lose credibility with government in face of other funders with different attitudes		Epidemiological data, vaccination data, sero-surveillance data. Corroboration. Project practicalities, financial arrangements and accounting processes. Timeliness of inputs. Assessment of outputs and outcomes Agreement on evaluation outputs and priorities?	
Active stakeholders with direct responsibility for PPR project. Ex: <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Funding agency✓ FAO staff (backstopping officers, technical advisers, etc.)✓ Implementation partners	1. EU 2. FAO staff 3. Counterparts in gov't incl NVI 4. VSF Swiss and Germany		Inform future programming	Critical findings might influence future funding decision. Gaining lessons and open reflection on best practices. Greater transparency and integrity from independent assessment	As outlined in the TOR – at all stages of data collection. In commenting on the draft report (FAO and EUD)	Their views. Further detail from implementing partners.	
Secondary stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Partners						Other projects, land use implications, change over time, central and state	

Annex 4. Stakeholder analysis from inception report

KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Specific examples	What role in relation to the PPR project?	How will they use the evaluation?	What might they gain or lose from evaluation?	How and when they should be involved in the evaluation	Questions and areas to explore	Practicalities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Other governmental entities or authorities ✓ Other FAO staff 						government policies and projects	
<p>Stakeholders at the grassroots level who directly or indirectly benefit from the intervention.</p> <p>(Possibly disaggregated between women, men, girls, boys; other as appropriate)</p>	<p>Talk with groups of men and women separately.</p> <p>Possibly talk to children in a school.</p> <p>If key informants identified and available, more in-depth conversations.</p>	<p>The heart of the project.</p> <p>The experts in pastoralism as a sustainable means of production.</p>	<p>Evaluation team must agree how main messages from evaluation are returned at least to the communities that take part in the evaluation.</p> <p>For accountability and feedback.</p>	<p>MTR made statements about pastoralism that suggest significant policy shifts that would severely change their way of life.</p> <p>So finding a way to take into account their knowledge as experts in the way forward for pastoralism and sustainable rangeland use is essential or they could lose out.</p>	<p>The background knowledge needs to be in place before we engage them so that the time they give us can be used most effectively.</p>	<p>Start broad on pastoralism generally, opportunities and threats.</p> <p>Opportunities for pastoralists in education and outside pastoralism.</p> <p>Gradually home in on livestock (which species & why they are kept PRA matrix).</p> <p>Roles of men, women, children in husbandry and decision-making.</p> <p>Other institutions and stakeholders, markets, .</p> <p>Then on livestock health (general health, calendars, diseases/syndromes, rankings, outbreaks, control options).</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there is limited scope for ensuring perfect timing and ordering for this evaluation.</p> <p>Accessing women may be difficult with a male only evaluation team.</p>

KEY STAKEHOLDERS	Specific examples	What role in relation to the PPR project?	How will they use the evaluation?	What might they gain or lose from evaluation?	How and when they should be involved in the evaluation	Questions and areas to explore	Practicalities
						Who, what, where re advice, treatment options? (local experts?) PPR specifically when it comes up (description, identification, when last seen, knowledge/experience of vaccination).	
Stakeholders at the grassroots level, who do not benefit from the intervention. (Possibly disaggregated between women, men, girls, boys; other as appropriate)	Other community members outside pastoralism (eg community-based health service providers, primary school teachers, traders, drug sellers, agricultural suppliers, other business people, markets)					Observations about change, opportunities, threats.	Limited time to build the trust needed to get real answers to socially complex questions.
Other interest groups who are not directly participating in the intervention: - other development agencies working in the area - civil society organizations - other organizations	1, 2 & 3 education services, Alage					General observations and inter-disciplinary perspectives. If household economic data, how can changes up or down be attributed?	Limited time.