



Cluster evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub

**Project Evaluation Series
04/2020**

Cluster evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub

**“Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Part 1: Support to
pastoralists in advocacy
and policy matters”
and**

**“Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Part 2: Technical
support to pastoralists livelihood and
resilience”**

**Project codes: GCP/GLO/536/GER
and GCP/GLO/611/GER**

Required citation:

FAO. 2020. *Cluster evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub*. Project Evaluation Series, 04/2020. Rome.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2020

ISBN: 978-92-5-132368-7



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Cover photo credits (top to bottom): ©FAO/Ch. Errath, ©FAO/Benedicte Kurzen, ©FAO/Giulio Napolitano, ©FAO/Seyllou Diallo.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Acronyms and abbreviations	v
Executive summary	vi
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation	1
1.2 Intended users.....	1
1.3 Scope and objective.....	1
1.4 Methodology	2
2 Background and context of the project.....	3
2.1 Highlights of the situation	3
2.2 Premises, context and organization of the project	5
2.3 Theory of change	7
3 Evaluation questions: key findings.....	9
3.1 Relevance and design.....	9
3.2 Effectiveness	12
3.3 Sustainability.....	26
4 Conclusions and recommendations	29
4.1 Conclusions.....	29
4.2 Recommendations.....	31
References	33
Annexes	38

Acknowledgements

The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) would like to thank all those who contributed to this evaluation, especially the FAO Pastoralist Knowledge Hub (PKH) for providing research material, other information and efficient support while preparing this report. OED is also grateful to the lead technical expert Dr Saverio Krätli for his valuable contributions to the evaluation. OED would like to particularly acknowledge the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub partners who were very generous with their time and knowledge in support of this evaluation.

Special thanks also go to the staff of the Animal Production and Genetics Unit (AGAG), Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL), Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP), Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division (FOM), Partnerships and South-South Cooperation Division (DPS), FAO Indigenous Peoples' Team, and the Resilience Programme Management Team (SP5), who supported the evaluation team in building an understanding of the various workstreams, context and priorities of FAO on pastoralism. OED is also grateful for all the support provided by Irene Hoffmann, Gregorio Velasco Gil, Natasha Maru and Serena Ferrari. The evaluation was led by Omar Awabdeh, Evaluation Officer from OED.

Acronyms and abbreviations

CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CIRAD	French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESAPN	Eastern and Southern African Pastoralist Network
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GASL	Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock
GLEAM	Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model
ICR	International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
IYRP	International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralist
LEAP	Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PKH	Pastoral Knowledge Hub
RBM	Réseau Billital Maroobé
SHARP	Self-evaluation and holistic assessment of climate resilience of farmers and pastoralists
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests
WAMIP	World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples

Executive summary

1. *Knowledge about pastoralism* is still today a legacy of misunderstanding and debate within rural development, a highly politicized territory at the regional and national levels. It is also a hotspot in an extensive and evolving discussion within the scientific community in the context of climate change. Navigating safely through such a difficult context entailed constantly refuting the many misconceptions and the misinterpretations of available data generated from inadequate assumptions. The evaluation found that the Pastoral Knowledge Hub (PKH) expected impact and outcome were aimed at improving the functioning of the pastoralist-policy-science interface, and therefore strongly relevant to the context of intervention.
2. With respect to the positioning of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), engaging in pastoral development was highly relevant to FAO's core mandate and strategic objectives. FAO's engagement in pastoral development before 2014 was almost exclusively through technical interventions in animal health and emergencies, and mostly limited to settled and farming communities. The approach to the knowledge-generation activities of the PKH had advocacy value and the merit of maximizing 'pastoralism' connectivity and reflection within FAO. The evaluation recommends the PKH to expand its context of intervention, by reaching out to new constituencies and into 'new territories' of knowledge management and generation.
3. The project was clearly consistent with and contributed to FAO's strategic priorities. It addressed a knowledge gap on pastoralism within FAO that had lasted for over a decade and beyond, producing a multiplier effect on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT). Further, it also helped major programmes to 'think pastoralism' – Global Livestock Environmental Assessment (GLEAM), Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of Climate Resilience of Farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP), Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA), the Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS), Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS) and the Agricultural Stress Index System (ASIS). It will also provide a clear institutional space for connecting and coordinating work on pastoralism previously fragmented under several FAO Strategic Programmes (SPs). The evaluation recommends that a robust process of institutionalizing pastoralism within FAO be supported, including beyond the FAO Resilience Programme Team (SP5). Specific support should be given to the development and running of a pastoralism working group at FAO headquarters and in close connection with the relevant country offices.
4. Overall, the PKH made giant leaps in setting up regional pastoralist alliances worldwide, such as focusing on women and youth. These achievements are broad and still to be strengthened; nevertheless, the evaluation concludes that the consensus among stakeholders, both within and outside FAO, is that the PKH should continue.
5. The work should continue in increasing the visibility of pastoralism and its value, both in order to strengthen pastoralists' voice and to make the policymaking environment more receptive to hear it. This component of the PKH should focus on the systematic identification and pursuit of opportunities. The evaluation notes that PKH activities need consolidating, starting from giving the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP) space and support to recover as the platform for the representation of pastoralist social movements at the global level. National and local representation of pastoralist social movements also needs to be consolidated.

1 Introduction

1. This report presents the results of the Final Evaluation of two projects: “Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Part 1: Support to pastoralists in advocacy and policy matters” (PKH1) and “Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Part 2: Technical support to pastoralists livelihood and resilience” (PKH2) (or PKH when referring to both) managed by the Office of Evaluation (OED) of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
2. PKH1 was implemented from 15 September 2014 to 13 December 2016 with a budget of USD 826 621. Subsequently, PKH2 began on 14 August 2015 with an initial 15 February 2018 deadline and a budget of USD 947 755. It was granted two no-cost extensions – first until 31 December 2018 and then until 30 April 2019. The projects were funded by the German Federal Ministry for Food and Agriculture. Both projects aimed to help pastoralist organizations participate and contribute effectively in decision-making at the national, regional and global policy levels, resulting in improved policies, legislations and programmes related to pastoralism and food security.
3. By the time of the evaluation PKH had 37 partners. The project was also working closely with three parallel projects (ongoing) financed respectively by the Spanish Cooperation (GCP/RAF/464/SPA), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (GCP/GLO/779/IFA) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (GCP/GLO/530/GFF).

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

4. This Final Evaluation serves a dual purpose of accountability and learning. It extrapolates findings and conclusions based on the evidence collected, and identifies good practices and challenges that can inform the design and implementation of the follow-up project.

1.2 Intended users

5. Primary users of the evaluation report will be FAO, the donor, pastoralist alliances and networks, project implementing partners and international partners. Secondary users are regional economic organizations – Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), line ministries in the governments of the various countries participating in the project, and any other concerned local and international organizations, both public and private.

1.3 Scope and objective

6. **Scope:** The Final Evaluation is limited to the two projects funded by Germany, covering all activities undertaken at the global and regional level from 2014 to date.
7. **Objectives (including main evaluation questions):** The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the PKH enhanced the capacity of pastoralist organizations to participate in and contribute effectively to decision-making at the national and global policy level. Secondary objectives aim to: i) assess the likelihood that the PKH will result in improved policies, legislation and programmes related to pastoralism and food security; and ii) establish the extent to which the results can be attributed to PKH (see Terms of Reference).
8. The main evaluation questions were:
 - i. Was the PKH relevant to the needs of pastoralist organizations?

- ii. To what extent did the PKH increase pastoralists' capacity to make themselves heard in decision-making concerning their livelihoods?
- iii. To what extent did the PKH contribute to making the relevant decision-making environments more receptive to the voices of pastoralists?

1.4 Methodology

9. The evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards and the Manual and methodological guidelines and practices by the Office of Evaluation (OED), and was conducted through an inclusive and transparent process. The evaluation team conducted a targeted desk review of documentation provided by the PKH project team, integrated with additional documents that emerged from interviews, and synthesized the PKH website and forum. A total of 48 interviews were conducted with the project team, key informants and collaborators at FAO headquarters (21), partners (13) and regional pastoralist civil society networks (14), either face-to-face or via Skype/phone (Appendix 1). The evaluation team triangulated the information gathered from multiple sources to ensure consistency of the findings and observations.
10. The evaluation team, with active participation by the PKH team, developed a theory of change (TOC) (Appendix 2) to outline and trace the PKH's positioning and contributions. An online survey was run for two weeks over the PKH forum (around 1 200 members). Two main questions focused on: i) whether the PKH had achieved its goal of strengthening pastoralist civil society organizations (CSOs); and ii) which activities, out of a given set,¹ best describe the impact of the PKH. The questionnaire included the possibility of writing a personal comment towards improving the PKH. In the interviews, analysis and presentation of the findings, the evaluation team acknowledged the delicate nature of some of the processes supported by PKH and still ongoing at the time of the evaluation, particularly with regard to the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMI) governance and the institutionalization of pastoralism within FAO.
 - i. **Stakeholder engagement:** Almost all stakeholders interviewed are either from FAO or from organizations partnering the PKH. The online survey had a return of around 5 percent (65 out of 1 200), the low response rate can be attributed to the fact that not all members of the PKH members are active members. While this is considered normal in this kind of survey, it seems to be a rather low return in view of the strong web-based component of the PKH and its focus on knowledge management and networking.
 - ii. **Limitations:** In addition to a mission to FAO headquarters, the evaluation was substantially a desk study based on literature and phone/Skype interviews. The evaluation team talked with representatives from almost all regional networks (except in Central Asia), but not with the local population. This approach, dictated by limitations in time and resources, left relatively little opportunity for cross-checking impressions and information emerging through the interviews. The PKH played a catalyst or collaborative role in a large number of initiatives and activities. The evaluation was only able to consider most of them as reported by the project team.

¹ The set of activities included: facilitating dialogue, networking, providing technical input, supporting participation in national policy processes, facilitating access to regional/global policy processes, producing data, providing access to information or arguments (with a lobbying value/tools), providing access to relevant legislations, and developing capacities.

2 Background and context of the project

2.1 Highlights of the situation

11. The work of a project can only be assessed in light of its context of intervention. This section discusses the situation at its start. Of particular relevance to the project were the state of the knowledge about pastoralism, the landscape of pastoralist social movements, and positioning within FAO. Key points in this regard are: i) *knowledge about pastoralism* was not straightforward - the received wisdom representing pastoralism in a negative light had been formally challenged for decades and the development of an alternative framework was underway; ii) substantial progress had been made by pastoralist social movements since at least the late 1990s, but tensions and contradictions were also present in this landscape; and iii) attention paid to pastoralism within FAO was minimal.
12. *Knowledge about pastoralism* is still today a legacy of misunderstanding and debate within rural development, a highly politicized territory at the regional and national level, and a hotspot in an extensive and evolving discussion within the scientific community in the context of climate change (IIED, 2009); IUCN, 2012; IIED, 2015; IFAD, 2018; Scoones, 2019; and Chapman, 2016).² In 2014, there had already been 20 years of debate following the formal challenge of the old paradigm from within ecology. Identifying, collecting and organizing knowledge for advocacy activities for the pastoral social movement, as PKH was intended to do, was therefore a challenging task. Navigating safely through these troubled waters meant constantly negotiating myths and misconceptions, as well as datasets generated from inadequate assumptions.³
13. *Pastoralist social movements* had closely followed the transformation in the knowledge about pastoralism. National networks of pastoralist organizations had been forming in Africa and India since the 1990s.⁴ By 2014, the Association of World Reindeer Herders (WRH), created in 1997, had held five world congresses and had signed four formal declarations. The World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples, created in 2003, had grown from the vision of a small group of dedicated individuals to a global organization with four gatherings and three formal declarations, including one predominantly by women

²The challenges of working with such a legacy of misunderstanding was acknowledged in the joint evaluation synthesis of *FAO's and IFAD's Engagement in Pastoral Development* (FAO and IFAD, 2016).

³ The legacy of inadequate assumptions in pastoral development includes biases in the methodological tools: off the shelf definitions, spatial and temporal scales of observations, indicators and mechanisms of appraisals. These tools, which were designed to capture what had appeared to matter following from inadequate assumptions, produce a distorted image of pastoral systems (Krätli et al., 2015). Particularly with regard to Africa, this image combines with the general shortcomings in relevant statistics: Jerven (2013); Pica-Ciamarra et al. (2014); the series of studies, *The Contribution of Livestock to the Economies of IGAD Member States*, co-funded by FAO: Behnke (2010); Behnke and Metaferia (2011); Behnke and Muthami (2011); Behnke and Osman (2011); and Behnke and Nakirya (2012).

⁴ Examples are: *Association pour la Redynamisation de l'Elevage au Niger*, founded in 1990; the Pastoralist Indigenous Non-Governmental Organizations Forum and the Pastoralist Women Council, both established in the United Republic of Tanzania, (1994 and 1997); the Samburu Women Trust in Kenya (2006); and the First Pastoral Parliament in Gujarat (2008).

pastoralists,⁵ detailed statutes and an elected council with 22 representatives in eight regions in Africa and Asia (2007).

14. *Pastoralists' formal declarations* asserted their expertise as livestock professionals, called for a fundamental re-thinking of pastoral development, away from the historical bias in favour of large industry, and claimed the right to have a voice in the decisions on their own livelihoods and the direction of their own development. Throughout the world, pastoralists' had consistently prioritized calls to reverse the undermining of pastoral mobility and the conversion of rangelands to other uses. The 2010 Mera Declaration by women pastoralists also stressed women's role *as producers in pastoral systems*. Connections with broader social movements via the 'food sovereignty' entry point were being explored.⁶
15. In 2014, WAMIP claimed 200 members in 48 countries, an open channel with the International Land Coalition (ILC), and representation in the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the Indigenous Peoples Forum (IFAD), the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL) and the Steering Committee of the World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP, 2014). In 2013, the congress in Kiserian, Kenya, voted for some fundamental changes to the governance structure, including extending executive power to a new body of 'regional coordinators'. Operations followed the new structure, but the changes in governance had not been ratified in a declaration.
16. Pastoralist social movements did not occur in isolation. A loose network of supporters across the world, in national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), university departments, research institutes and United Nations agencies, had accompanied them in various ways, generating and disseminating relevant evidence and advocacy arguments, unearthing misconceptions and methodological barriers, and engaging in programmes specifically aimed at supporting pastoral civil society.⁷ By 2014, the impact of this work had reached policy level and legislation.⁸
17. With respect to FAO's positioning, engaging in pastoral development was highly relevant to FAO's core mandate and strategic objectives. FAO's engagement in pastoral development in 2014 was weak; however, almost exclusively through technical interventions in animal health and emergency, and mostly limited to settled and farming

⁵ A large meeting on the back of the Global Pastoralist Gathering in South Omo, Ethiopia (2005). WAMIP declarations were produced by more formal congresses held during the World Gathering of Nomads and Transhumant Herders in Segovia, Spain (2007), the Global Gathering of Women Pastoralists in Mera, India (2010) and the Global Pastoralists Gathering in Kiserian, Kenya (2013).

⁶ The Wilderswil Declaration (2007) and the Kiserian Pastoralist Statement (2013) include references to 'food sovereignty', a concept introduced by La Vía Campesina and formalized in 1996 in the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (Desmarais and Nicholson 2013). In 2017, the Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa published a study on pastoralism under their project 'Strengthening Pastoralist and Civil Society Voices in the EAC and IGAD regions' (AFSA, 2017).

⁷ From 2001 to 2005, IIED and RECONCILE ran the project 'Reinforcement of pastoral civil society in East Africa'. From 2005 to 2010, the Pastoralist Communication Initiative (PCI) organized several large pastoralist gatherings, including a global gathering in partnership with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) published an inventory of the 'myths about pastoralism' (UNDP-GDI 2003), and held a 'Global Pastoral Programme Formulation Workshop' in Nairobi in 2004.

⁸ Some examples are: African Union *Policy Framework on Pastoralism* (2010); the Kenyan first *National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands* (MDNKOAL 2012); the Pastoral Code in Niger (République of Niger, 2010); and the international declarations of N'Djamena (2013) and Nouakchott (2013); followed by the launch of the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project (PRAPS) by the World Bank.

communities.⁹ Attention to pastoralism was unsystematic and fragmented, limited to the personal interest of particular individuals, and exclusively focused on specific sectors. A working group under the then Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) have been particularly active in pastoralism during the 1990s, but the momentum was lost as key people retired. As of 2014, pastoralism had been low on the agenda for over a decade, and dedicated projects were hard to find.¹⁰ Some of the broad policy and advocacy processes, however, had a bearing on pastoralism, for example, the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock and the Strategy for Partnerships with Civil Society Organizations. Of particular relevance was the process of developing the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (FAO, 2012) and the follow-up activities in support of their implementation. This is indeed one of the areas in which the PKH was engaged continuously throughout the life of the project.

2.2 Premises, context and organization of the project

18. The PKH was set up to:

allow representatives of the pastoralist constituency to bring their knowledge, views, and experiences, to a consultative platform of dialogue in order to advocate the particular views and needs of their constituency, to influence policy dialogue on issues related to their important role in food security, to exchange lessons learned and best practices, and to further develop the knowledge and capacities of policy makers and pastoralists alike in an effort to further support the development of much needed pastoralist policies, in particular at national level.

19. Within this general programme, PKH1 covered support to pastoralists in advocacy and policy matters, and the establishment of the web platform of the Hub. PKH2 added technical support to knowledge generation and improved livelihood strategies and resilience of pastoralists. The expected impact of PKH was improved policies, legislation and programmes related to pastoralism contributing to food security, poverty reduction and resilience. The expected outcome was increased capacity of pastoralist organizations to participate in and contribute effectively to decision-making at the national and global policy level. According to the project's own narrative, plans for the PKH were made in response to a request by the pastoralist constituency (i.e. WAMIP) in the Civil Society Mechanism of the Committee on World Food Security (CSM-CFS) in late 2012. The request was reiterated in a formal statement produced during the pastoralist gathering in Kiserian in 2013 (also the third WAMIP congress meeting). In 2014, the plans for the PKH were then also supported by other stakeholders, for example the African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR), IFAD, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
20. PKH1 was to set-up and start populating the interactive web portal, and running 'policy and training workshops' with pastoralist CSOs at the regional level. PKH2 was to continue the development and management of the web portal, and step-up the work with pastoralist CSOs, including national workshops with pastoralists 'for outreach and education', and activities for the 'institutional strengthening of pastoralist organizations', especially WAMIP,

⁹ Examples of ongoing improvement from this situation, provided in the Management Response to the 2016 FAO-IFAD Joint Evaluation Synthesis (JES), referred consistently to the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub (FAO-IFAD 2016).

¹⁰ The JES found that there was a "lack of a coherent conceptual framework and systematic direction' and 'considerable confusion between pastoral development and livestock development, and no clear understanding of pastoral systems" (FAO-IFAD, 2016).

and support their participation in policymaking at the international and national levels. This second stage of the project also aimed to help close the knowledge gap on pastoralism, particularly with regard to socio-economic data, methods and tools considered relevant to food security and resilience.

21. In the course of implementation, this initial set of activities was gradually organized in what the PKH website described as the 'three pillars giving pastoralists the necessary knowledge, networks and partners to participate in global policy dialogue i) creating a knowledge repository on pastoralism; ii) supporting pastoralist CSOs in networking, organizing and voicing their concerns at the appropriate policy fora; and iii) fostering alliances among key partners in view of sharing information and promoting pastoralist-friendly interventions and policies.
22. The PKH aimed to work with pastoralist CSOs worldwide. At the global level, the PKH has worked with the WAMIP. At the regional level, the PKH has worked with pastoralist civil society networks in Eastern and Southern Africa, Western and Central Africa, North Africa and Near East, Latin America, Central Asia, South Asia, High Asia, Europe and recently, the Arctic. Most of these networks were established under the PKH initiative.
23. Between 2014 and 2018, the PKH was coordinated by three coordinators, which caused some loss in the institutional memory. The PKH1 team consisted of two people (one full-time consultant and the project coordinator) and had a budget of USD 826 621. The PKH2 team consisted of two people and had a budget of USD 947 755. An additional consultant was hired to work on the collaboration with the project funded by IFAD. The overall management arrangements were lean and efficient.
24. PKH started with a handful of partner organizations working towards sustainable pastoralism. At the time of the evaluation, there were 37 partners. PKH had linkages with three ongoing projects financed by, respectively, the Spanish Cooperation (GCP/RAF/464/SPA), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (GCP/GLO/779/IFA) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (GCP/GLO/530/GFF).¹¹ Collaboration with these projects secured PKH's additional resources to work towards its outcome, both directly, because the projects' expected outputs were consistent with the PKH expected outcome, and through economies of scale, such as the hiring of a full-time consultant as an additional PKH team member under the IFAD project. The PKH also played a role in other projects and initiatives such as *Appui à la mise en œuvre des Directives volontaires pour une gouvernance responsable des régimes fonciers applicables aux terres, les pêches et les forêts* (GCP/GLO/347/MUL), the Global Rangeland Initiative of the ILC, World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT),¹² and the preparations for the United Nations International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralism. There was close collaboration with the World Bank from the conception of the project, resulting in, *inter alia*, the PKH side event during the CFS, which included World Bank work on conflict prevention and resolution.
25. Within FAO, PKH liaised with several units dealing with animal production and health, plant production and protection, forest management, partnerships and South-South cooperation, climate change and emergencies.

¹¹ Only in-kind, no direct financial contribution.

¹² The project 'Rangelands – Guidelines to good practices in sub-Saharan Africa' was part of the WOCAT Sustainable Land Management database. The study has just been published (Liniger and Mekdaschi Studer, 2019).

26. The project was designed to be highly relevant to FAO's strategy to improve the governance of food security and aligned to ensure the achievement of FAO's five Strategic Objectives, particularly Strategic Objective 1 ("Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food security and malnutrition"); Strategic Objective 2 ("Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner"); and Strategic Objective 5 ("Increase the resilience of rural livelihoods to threats and crises"). The project design linked the pursuit of these objectives to the expected impact and outcome of the PKH by strengthening pastoralists' voice and participation in the formulation and implementation of public policies related to the four pillars of food security, i.e. availability, access, utilization and stability. This was to be achieved by building pastoralists' capacity and opportunities to make themselves heard in the relevant policymaking processes while promoting an enabling environment in policymaking contexts. This would make policymakers more receptive to pastoralists' voices. Increasing the knowledge base about pastoralism, including exploring innovative tools, was part of this design.

2.3 Theory of change

27. Pastoralism is a set of territorial management practices developed over thousands of years by mobile and nomadic people in different ecosystems across the world. Ultimately, the expected impact of the PKH was improved policies, legislation and programmes related to pastoralism contributing to food security and resilience. The logic behind pursuing this goal rested on an understanding that pastoral systems play an important role in ensuring food security and resilience in their respective countries, and at the regional level. It also rested on an understanding of policies, legislation and programmes related to pastoralism as falling short of supporting pastoral systems and, consequently, of effectively promoting food security and resilience. The PKH also seized the opportunity of the growing interest in pastoralism at the global level. Since the PKH is concerned with pastoralism as a food production system, 'pastoralists' refers not only generally to a cultural identity, but also particularly to people who make their living as primary producers in pastoral systems.
28. The entry point chosen by the PKH towards its expected impact was pastoralists' capacity to make their voices heard in policymaking/decision-making concerning their livelihoods (including reversing mechanisms of exclusion and marginalization). The main assumption here was that such processes could become more effective if the voice of those directly involved could be heard, leading to improved policy, legislation and programmes.
29. Strengthening pastoralists' voice was pursued from two directions: increasing their ability to voice their positions by supporting their CSOs, facilitating their access to policymaking processes and building their capacity for effective participation (e.g. by increasing access to evidence-based arguments for advocacy); and increasing their chances to be heard by making the relevant decision-making environments more receptive to pastoralists' voices and their arguments, reducing the knowledge gap, invisibility and misconceptions about pastoral systems (i.e. working towards a more enabling environment).
30. The project documents illustrated this logic as follows:
- i. *The importance of pastoralism.* People in pastoral systems are a significant constituency from both an economic and an ecological point of view; therefore, they should be a core concern of development and poverty reduction efforts. Pastoralism represents a substantial economic contribution from a considerable number of mostly small-scale producers, including to food security, especially in areas where

other modes of production are difficult. Moreover, pastoral systems consist in a large land basis with poverty-environmental degradation nexus, but also specialist knowledge in national resources management and environmental services. At the global level, both the dynamism of pastoralist organizations and the interest in pastoralism by policymakers and development actors are gaining momentum.

- ii. *Pastoralists' voice*. Pastoralist CSOs are still at an infant stage, relatively isolated, with low capacity and poor visibility. Pastoralist representation in the arena of politics and development is weak at all levels. Policies favourable to pastoralists, when produced, have not been implemented.
 - iii. *Knowledge gap* is at the root of an unresponsive development environment. The understanding of pastoral systems is poor, and many old misconceptions about pastoralism are still at work. Lack of relevant data and poor/inadequate policies are barriers to pastoral development and the goal of increasing production and resilience. Pastoralists' livelihoods and production are constrained by national policies seeking to settle pastoral communities and turn them into modern livestock keepers.
31. The PKH also aimed to create a space for working specifically on pastoralism within FAO, consistently relevant to and in line with most of FAO's Strategic Programmes, especially SP1, SP3 and SP5. Hosting the PKH at FAO was also seen as having the added value of meeting 'pastoralists need [for] the intergovernmental dimension that FAO can especially provide'.
32. Thus, PKH's theory of change was as follows:

Conditions to be changed

Pastoralists' voice in decision-making concerning their livelihoods is weak, which is one of the causes of inadequate policies, legislation and programmes related to pastoralism, contributing to food security.

Process

- | | |
|------|---|
| IF | Pastoralists' capacity to make themselves heard in decision-making processes concerning their livelihoods, is increased: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. pastoralist CSOs including women, are mobilized and networked in a united front; ii. pastoralist CSOs' network of supporters and partners increases at national, regional and global level; iii. pastoralist CSOs' capacity for accessing, using and generating new knowledge relevant to their agenda is increased; iv. pastoralist representatives secure a voice in the relevant policymaking processes at national, regional and global level. |
| AND | Developing partnerships and alliances make the relevant decision-making environments become more receptive to the voice of pastoralists (a more 'enabling' environment): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. the knowledge gap on pastoralism is reduced, especially concerning its economic and ecological rationale and value; vi. pastoralist CSOs' work in advocacy and representation of pastoralists voice is supported through partnerships, coordination and cooperation mechanisms; vii. the visibility of sound knowledge about pastoralism is increased in the development arena. |
| THEN | Pastoralists' voice in decision-making processes concerning their livelihoods is strengthened (at the national, regional and global policy level), <i>resulting in improved policies, legislations and programmes related to pastoralism and food security.</i> |

3 Evaluation questions: key findings

3.1 Relevance and design

EQ1. Was the PKH relevant to the needs of pastoralist organizations?

EQ1.1. Were the PKH's expected impact and outcome relevant to the context of intervention?

Finding 1. The PKH's expected impact and outcome were aimed at improving the functioning of the pastoralist-policy-science interface, and therefore strongly relevant to the context of intervention.

33. As seen above (Section 2.2), the context in which PKH was to intervene was characterized by serious and persistent malfunctioning in the interface between pastoralists, science and policy. This was partly due to a legacy of misunderstanding of pastoral systems and their operating environment, starting from some of the underlying assumptions in the scientific models of representation commonly used in pastoral development. This was partly due to entrenched misconceptions about the low intrinsic value of pastoral systems, which prevented giving pastoralists' voice due consideration. Finally, this was partly due to poor communications across the interface and the often very practical challenges faced by pastoralists in trying to bring their voices to policy processes (timely information, travel costs, language and access), even when such processes had a direct impact on their livelihoods.
34. The focus on food security, especially when understood by the four pillars of availability, access, utilization and stability, is general enough to work as a valuable entry point for the concerns that had been voiced by pastoralists in their formal declarations: exclusion from representation in the decisions concerning the future of their livelihoods; undermining of mobility as a right and as a strategy of production; and loss of rangelands to land-use conversion programmes. Stakeholders' feedback was unanimous in finding the PKH's expected outcome highly relevant.

EQ1.2. Were the activities planned for PKH1 and PKH2 relevant to the expected impact and outcome?

35. PKH1 activities clustered around creating an interactive web portal and strengthening and broadening pastoralist civil society. PKH2 activities concerned improving knowledge and increasing the participation of pastoralist organizations at the technical and policy levels. The goal of strengthening pastoralist civil society was effectively shared between the two phases of the project: PKH1 focused on the initial mobilization of pastoral civil society, while PKH2 focused on the use of technical work under its Output 1 to develop capacity in pastoralist civil society networks.

Finding 2. The design of the PKH placed WAMIP in a central position, overlooking WAMIP's governance problems, which were later addressed by PKH2.

36. The FAO Indigenous Peoples' Team in the Advocacy Unit provided WAMIP with advice and indications to prevent a global umbrella organization like WAMIP from disappearing. This is part of the work carried out by the FAO Advocacy Unit, not only with WAMIP, but also with other umbrella networks engaged in areas of work related to FAO's mandate. There are several other examples of how global umbrella organizations on the verge of disappearing have been supported by the FAO Advocacy Unit in different ways without interfering in their internal issues, which would be beyond FAO's mandate.

37. WAMIP had a central position in the design of the PKH, although more pronounced in PKH1.¹³ A detailed explanation of the plan of action for the regional meetings in the PKH1 project document clearly indicates that these activities were directed to strengthening WAMIP. PKH1 found that the outcomes of these meetings in Segovia (Spain), Mera (India) and Kiserian (Kenya), as well as other activities of the WAMIP Secretariat and other pastoralist NGOs raised greater interest in pastoralist representation. This greater space requires better organization and a higher involvement capacity; WAMIP has thus strengthened the regionalization process of its strategy, which implies *setting up regional WAMIP platforms to allow active involvement of WAMIP members in each region. It is therefore a key milestone to organize regional meetings in all WAMIP constituencies in order to further launch the WAMIP process of pastoralist representation* (FAO/GCP, 2014: 17, emphasis added). The PKH also acknowledged the experience of WAMIP and other pastoral NGOs concerning the need for face-to-face meetings in order to set regional processes in motion.
38. Despite this focus on strengthening the WAMIP, the design of PKH1 did not acknowledge the weaknesses with WAMIP governance, and indeed showed some confusion about its structure. The Hub was actively engaged in discussions with WAMIP for a year and a half before the signing of the Letter of Agreement (LOA) with the International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR). PKH1's planned meetings 'to further launch the WAMIP process of pastoralist representation' included 'a WAMIP Council meeting during the 41st CFS in Rome. In this meeting, the state of global consultations will be followed up, and a new WAMIP executive board will be elected (FAO/GCP, 2014: 18). Technically, WAMIP Council post-2013 consisted of 54 representatives,¹⁴ but the project document budgeted for around 10. The project document effectively calls the WAMIP Council the group of regional coordinators. This took for granted the new 2013 governance structure; indeed, by planning to fund a meeting to elect a new executive board, the design of the PKH effectively committed the project to its implementation. Checking the credentials of the 2013 WAMIP governance structure would have revealed that it had never been ratified (see above 2.2). The design for PKH2 had placed greater emphasis on the governance of WAMIP and dedicated to it activity 2.2.2 a desk study to 'develop guidelines around pastoralist representation'.

Finding 3. The plan for a knowledge repository was highly pertinent. To be more reliable, this repository could have defined clear explicit boundaries for the database to provide systematic and objective criteria on what was to be included.

39. A main task of PKH1 was to set-up the web portal. This aimed to facilitate access to information (the 'Knowledge Repository') and serve as a forum for dialogue and networking between users. The Knowledge Repository was to be initially populated from a desk review to collect and analyse relevant research and project documents from FAO and other organizations – e.g. FAOLEX, African Union –AU-IBAR, WISP, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), IFAD, World Food Programme (WFP) and ILC, including national and international policy documents and regulation. This was to allow the identification of gaps and opportunities. Given that sound information on pastoralism is particularly scattered, and given the difficulties involved in identifying it among the much

¹³ The PKH1 project design mentions WAMIP 35 times; PKH2 mentions WAMIP 16 times.

¹⁴ There were to be six councillors per region. Nominally, there were ten regions but one, North America, had no councillors (ICR, 2018a).

larger legacy of works produced from outdated assumptions, the plan for a knowledge repository was highly pertinent.

40. The Knowledge Repository was conceived as a thematic library where it would be possible to find a range of materials, from magazines to classic texts. However, the project design omitted to define clear boundaries for the repository/database, providing systematic and objective criteria as to what was to be included.

Finding 4. The approach in the knowledge-generation activities of PKH2 had advocacy value and the merit of maximizing pastoralism connectivity and reflection within FAO.

41. All activities under PKH2 Output 1 aimed at producing information on pastoralism or pastoralism-related topics. The PKH2 project document presents these activities clustered under three headings: i) improving information on and mapping of pastoralist systems; ii) understanding drivers of resilience and providing early warning systems; and iii) developing methods and tools to support pastoralist rangeland planning and pastoralist-managed natural resource regeneration. The other nine headings are clustered under three other sub-headings: 1.1, Assessing feed resources availability; 1.2, Improving the gathering and availability of pastoralist socio-economic data; 1.3, Validating and upscaling mobility patterns; 1.4, Mapping breed distribution, feed rations and livestock productivity; 2.1 Understanding drivers of resilience; 2.2, Expanding ASIS to rangelands (early warning system); 3.1, Developing a tool kit for participatory rangeland planning; 3.2, Assessing and mapping restoration potential of agro-sylvo-pastoral landscapes; and 3.3, Developing tablet-based dissemination tools.
42. The activities, relatively small, rested on ongoing projects and required the added 'pastoralism' dimension and tools designed with other uses and other contexts in mind (GLEAM, SHARP, LADA, GIEWS, DAD-IS, ASIS).¹⁵ This approach had the merit of connecting the PKH, with its unique focus on pastoralism within FAO, to a large portfolio of potentially relevant programmes, either increasing the visibility and coverage of pastoralism, or introducing it where absent.
43. In view of the FAO teams directly involved in these activities, the knowledge-making component of the PKH is best understood from the perspective of its advocacy value. Several dimensions have emerged during this evaluation, some of which are more obvious, such as when the information to be produced is expected to support advocacy arguments, or when a process aimed at producing aggregate information (e.g. regional or global estimates) exposes gaps or weaknesses in the primary data. Other dimensions are less public but also important, such as engagement in pastoralism knowledge raises awareness among professionals about pastoralism, instils in the minds of professionals the importance of pastoralism and pastoralism-related knowledge, or when it triggers a reflection on standard approaches and methodologies, and dialogues on their limitations.
44. Beyond this advocacy-value framework, the sequence of PKH2 knowledge-generation activities was exposed to a logical problem, but this risk was considerably reduced during

¹⁵ Global Livestock Environmental Assessment (GLEAM); Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of Climate Resilience of Farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP); Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA); Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS); Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS); Agricultural Stress Index System (ASIS). SHARP had only been used in farmer field schools; DAD-IS had been populated with information provided by governing bodies whose knowledge or even interest in pastoral systems would have required case-by-case close monitoring that was not possible; GIEWS provided crop market prices but had ignored live animals; GLEAM provided global environmental assessment for livestock but, as observed only recently, struggled to capture seasonality.

implementation when the project took the initiative to move beyond the traditional developmental paradigms. Indeed, the declarations from pastoralist CSOs up to the launch of the PKH had called for rethinking development involving their livelihoods. Since FAO was admittedly not progressing in its engagement with pastoralism (FAO-IFAD, 2016), it is fair to consider that such a call included FAO's pastoral development work. Whenever PKH2 is used to promote FAO initiatives with pastoralist CSOs (activity 1.3), this could be perceived as short-circuiting the overall goal of helping pastoralist CSOs to make their voice heard.

Finding 5. Overall, the scale of the task and the challenges with respect to the resources and level of specialization being mobilized, as well as FAO's internal demand were higher than expected at the time of the design of the PKH.

45. This is manifest in three important aspects of the project. First, state of pastoralist civil society (e.g. in organization or in the capacity to speak with one voice) was weaker than expected; in particular, there was confusion between representing weakness as a primary target of intervention (strengthening pastoralist civil society) and overlooking it, or representing it as external to the scope of the project (within an approach that constructs pastoralist CSOs as partners responsible for the success of specific project activities). Second, the structure of the knowledge repository and more broadly of the knowledge management component of the project were not as detailed as necessary in light of the exceptional difficulties associated with the state of knowledge on pastoralism and the competing interests around it. Third, the global scope, the large number of heterogeneous activities to be conducted and the potential for demand within FAO were greater than project resources – a team of two or at most three, and a spendable budget of around USD 100 000 per year.

3.2 Effectiveness

EQ2. To what extent did the PKH increase pastoralists' capacity to make themselves heard in decision-making concerning their livelihoods?

EQ 2.1. To what extent did the PKH succeed in mobilizing pastoralist CSOs and networking them at the national, regional and global levels?

Finding 6. The PKH kept the mobilization of pastoralist CSOs active, even expanded it, during years when WAMIP's capacity for constructive action was minimal.

46. Through the PKH, the regional pastoralist alliances that were decided during the 2013 meeting in Kiserian were systematically established. Under PKH1, this programme was implemented through Letters of Agreement between FAO and a selected organization from each region. Seven regional meetings prompted and funded by the PKH, of which three in partnership with *Vétérinaires sans Frontières* (VSF)/IFAD, were attended by a total of 360 participants from 64 countries, an increase by around 30 percent over the number of countries reached by WAMIP in 2014.¹⁶ In some cases, such as for the Latin America meeting that the PKH supported in 2015, it was the first time that pastoralist CSOs in the region "had a chance to meet and start thinking of themselves as a group with shared interests and problems" (From the stakeholder interviews). Support from the PKH is considered to have been determinant in the creation of the Arabian Pastoralist Communities Network (APCN), the Eastern and Southern Africa Pastoralist Network

¹⁶ A new region, Artic, joined WAMIP in 2018.

(ESAPN), the World Yak Herders Association (WYHA), and the South Asia Pastoralist Alliance (SAPA), as well as in the expansion of the European Shepherds Network.¹⁷ Representation from some areas of the world was still weak in 2016, for example in Southern Africa where pastoralism was found to be more disjointed.¹⁸ Formal declarations produced by each pastoral regional network added a chapter to the history of pastoralist social movements and moved forward towards meeting the need for organizing into a united front at least around a core of strict minimum consensus.¹⁹

Finding 7. The PKH secured significant participation of women pastoralists in its activities, and in High Asia, enabled the creation of a new network of women pastoralists (Ladakh Yak Herders Association); however, explicit action to follow-up on the Mera Declaration would have further enhanced their participation.

47. In agreement with regional and local pastoralist CSOs, the PKH established and followed clear inclusion criteria for women and youth, guaranteeing the participation of at least 50 percent of women and youth in the regional workshops and the community dialogues. Representation as focal points for regional pastoralist networks included women. One of the two PKH community dialogues held in Central Asia in 2016²⁰ led to the creation of a new network of women pastoralists, the Ladakh Yak Herders Association. The PKH organized two side events on empowering pastoral women at the CFS 2017 (an all-women panel) and the European Development Days in 2018. Only two of the formal declarations produced by the regional meetings mention women (the Western and Central Africa network and the Eastern and Southern Africa network) and only as vulnerable targets for help. An opportunity was missed there to follow-up on the Mera Declaration that had called for the “recognition of the work of women pastoralists as a valid profession and as a fundamental component of pastoralism”.²¹
48. Since 2015, a key email-based forum set-up by the PKH has generated substantial activity.²² Community dialogue meetings also contributed to some mobilization at the national level, especially in Africa and in High Asia, where a series of ten community dialogue workshops in yak-herding communities organized by YURTA led to the establishment of the World Yak Herders Association, the first network of this kind. Information on pastoralist CSOs was collected worldwide and organized into a public database on the PKH website. By the end

¹⁷ A proposal for the creation of the Arabian Pastoralist Communities Network (APCN) was first made by the Arab delegation attending the gathering in Kiserian in 2013. The proposal was then relaunched by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Jordan at the 1st ‘Hima’ Conference in Amman in 2014. The APCN was officially launched in the context of the 2nd Regional Forum on ‘Hima’ in Amman in October 2016.

¹⁸ A Focal Point for the Civil Society Mechanism Southern African subregion was finally elected in April 2019.

¹⁹ The Declarations were: Hustai Declaration 2015; Koblenz-Ehrenbreitstein Declaration (2015); Déclaration de Bamako (2016); Déclaration d’Hammamet (2016); Lukenya Pastoralist Declaration (2016); and Déclaration du Réseau Européen des Berger (2018).

²⁰ Organized jointly by Yurta Association, the South Asian Pastoralist Alliance (SAPA) and the Indian pastoralist civil society organization (CSO) MARAG (which was the WAMIP Secretariat at the time).

²¹ The role of women in pastoral households was considered in the side project funded by the Spanish Government (GCP/RAF/464/SPA). Four studies under the title ‘Analyse Diagnostique du Rôle de la Femme en Milieu Pastorale’ were produced between 2016 and April 2017 in Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal, but none of them make reference to the Mera Declaration, and at least three of them were still in draft at the time of the evaluation. Searching the Knowledge Repository with the string ‘rôle de la femme en milieu pastoral’ returns no items. The string ‘role of women’ returns a 2016 policy note by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) on gender and pastoralism in Tajikistan.

²² At the time of the evaluation, the email forum had 1 210 members from 64 countries and had generated over 700 discussions on topics such as pastoral land tenure, animal trade, animal health and policy processes.

of the project, all regional alliances were in place, even if most of them were still 'thin' in their structures and roots.

Finding 8. Support to resolve WAMIP's internal difficulties was provided by PKH2. Yet, given the centrality of WAMIP in the PKH1 project design, and more broadly, the PKH's overarching premise and justification, it would have been preferable to provide this support before.

49. In the second half of 2018, WAMIP began the revision of its own governance structure, facilitated by a member organization, the International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry, with coordination and financial support from the PKH. The ICR held a meeting with WAMIP representatives from all regions in Brussels in September 2018, the first formal meeting of WAMIP since 2014. From the first steps, the process confirmed the challenges of helping WAMIP recover, but also a general agreement that "there is a need for WAMIP, because there is not an organization like WAMIP at the international level".²³
50. Throughout its existence, the PKH pushed forward WAMIP's 2013 organizational plans for regional networks. For the best part of PKH's life, since 2015–2016, WAMIP's capacity for constructive action was at a historical minimum. Given the centrality of WAMIP to the PKH project and given that the weaknesses in its governance structure were already evident in 2013, when they had led the Congress to vote on fundamental changes (see above, 2.2), PKH support to strengthen WAMIP with respect to its internal problems should have been at the forefront, rather than implemented in the final phases of the project.²⁴ A relatively high turnover of staff within the PKH and a change of director within the ICR contributed to the delay. The ambiguity in project design on the rules of engagement with the weakness of pastoralist civil society [EQ1.2] was not fully addressed in implementation. Engaging with WAMIP's governance weakness was seen as a condition to its demands and timelines, whereas implementing WAMIP's 2013 governance structure by setting up regional networks was not. *Ex post*, the creation of regional networks is represented in the PKH's own narrative as building WAMIP through a 'bottom-up' approach seen as preferable. However, by the same logic, if by starting from the regional networks PKH was trying to build the global level 'bottom-up', it was simultaneously building the regional level 'top-down'.²⁵ Thus, the reasons to prefer the former for the global level may be controversial.
51. To date, many stakeholders find the relationship between the PKH and WAMIP confusing. This confusion is visible in some of the reports of the meetings supported by the PKH, or even in some of the declarations, in contrast to the description of the regional meetings as

²³ ICR (2018a: 6): "All the informants have expressed that there is a need for WAMIP, because there is no organization like WAMIP at the international level."

²⁴ According to the PKH2 Progress Report covering the period from July to December 2018, "WAMIP, the global pastoralist network established in 2004, was facing some governance issues in the past few years." In August 2015, in Activity 2.2.2, 'Develop guidelines around pastoralist representation', and including that "WAMIP institutional strengthening will be supported by the project win an institutional development expert", PKH2 already started showing awareness that there was a problem with the WAMIP's governance (FAO/GCP, 2015).

²⁵ Regional networks were supported and built on works already completed by other partners of pastoralist CSOs, as IUCN-WISP and IFAD.

WAMIP centred in the design of PKH1 [EQ1.2].²⁶ This point also emerged from interviews with stakeholders, carried out by the ICR as part of the process to find a new governance structure for WAMIP.²⁷ From the PKH's perspective, by introducing the regional coordinators, the project was merely helping WAMIP implement its new governance structure. Unchecked at design, the credentials of WAMIP's governance structure (the 2007 Statutes) came to the attention of the PKH only in 2016, when a division within WAMIP eventually emerged, highlighting that the Statutes had never been updated with the 2013 changes and that these changes had not been recorded in any other way. Feedback from stakeholders indicates that this was also the first time that the PKH engaged with the 2007 Statutes, although their existence was known at least to all participants in the Segovia gathering.

52. The 2007 Statutes had not been used within WAMIP, and some WAMIP members were as surprised as the PKH when they emerged again. This can explain, but not excuse, why in 2014 the PKH did not start its active engagement with WAMIP's governance from where it would have been most logical and safe, i.e. from the Statutes - even if only to assist WAMIP in changing them permanently. While it is now in everyone's best interest to move forward, it is important to take on board that, despite the good will, some confusion did arise concerning the rules of engagement with WAMIP's governance weakness. This resulted in the PKH's inability to support WAMIP as effectively and directly as initially planned, and possibly in exacerbating the problems within WAMIP between 2015 and 2017. The stakeholders' view in this regard, shared by this evaluation, is that the process of 'healing' WAMIP, eventually initiated in 2018, does correct this initial faux pas and sets both WAMIP and the PKH on a good course.
53. The online survey carried out for this evaluation with the 1 200 members of the PKH email forum, returned 65 responses. The main question was: "*Based on your experience with the Hub, would you say that its goal of strengthening pastoralist civil society organizations has been achieved?*" Around 69 percent *agreed or strongly agreed* that it had been achieved (evenly distributed). Around 26 percent *partially agreed* and 4.7 percent (three people) *disagreed*. However, according to the breakdown of the respondents by affiliation, only 12.5 percent (eight people) were from pastoralist CSOs. Most responses came from people who identified themselves as members of an 'NGO' (36 percent), 'academia' (close to 33 percent) or of an 'international development organization' (close to 19 percent). Only four responses (just over 6 percent) were from people who identified themselves as having a 'government' affiliation.

EQ2.2. To what extent did the PKH contribute to enlarge the pastoralist CSOs' network of supporters and partners at the national, regional and global level?

Finding 9. The PKH portal has 250 records of pastoralist CSOs or organizations working with pastoralists, almost 4 000 users annually and links to 37 partners. PKH global mapping and

²⁶ Asian Regional Consultation with Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders' Organizations in Asia, Mongolia, 24–26 January 2016, the two representatives of the Central Asia pastoral network, the Pastoral Assembly of Central Asia (PACA), were mentioned respectively as the FAO Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Focal Point and the FAO PKH. The Hustai Declaration (Central Asia) concludes: "We support the constitution of the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub and wish to contribute to it through this Declaration". The Lukenya Declaration (ESAPN) refers to the "Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Regional Meeting for Eastern and Southern Africa" and concludes, "We appeal to other partners to join and coordinate their work within the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub." Neither declaration makes reference to WAMIP.

²⁷ ICR (2018b: 4): "Some informants have mentioned that the involvement from the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub with their introduction of regional coordinators or regional focal points [...] caused a lot of misunderstanding."

open access digital database of pastoralist CSOs was the first exercise of its kind and have substantially increased the global visibility of pastoralist CSOs and facilitated contact between potential partners.

54. The PKH website provides considerable information on pastoralist CSOs as well as PKH partners. Pastoralist CSOs networks are shown by region, with contacts and links to the networks' websites. In some cases, these websites were created with support from the PKH. The database of organizations includes around 250 records on pastoralist CSOs and organizations working with pastoralism nationally and internationally. The database can be searched by country, region, area of work and type of organization, and by a free-text search. The website analytics have recorded almost 7 500 users to date, nearly half of which during 2018. The 'Partners' section (37 at the time of the evaluation), includes United Nations agencies and high-level policymaking platforms, national and international NGOs, research institutions, conservation organizations, lobbying networks, donors and some pastoralist CSOs, including WAMIP. Overall, the PKH website is visited on average by 750 new users per month. In 2016, the PKH helped set-up a Facebook group on pastoralism; although not an official PKH/FAO channel, the group is managed by two administrators and seven moderators, all pastoralist representatives from different regions. Pastoralist CSOs networking opportunities have also been increased by their participation in international events, supported by the PKH. The successful preparations for the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralist (IYRP), with all pastoral regional networks and WAMIP represented in the International Support Group, together with United Nations agencies and other international organizations, has opened up major opportunities for enlarging the pastoralists' network of supporters.

Finding 10. The mapping of some regions may be a difficult task and needs a thorough approach. The database of organizations should be updated more frequently.

55. Stakeholders pointed out that mapping pastoralist CSOs based on a rapid assessment is likely to have resulted in substantial gaps. In particular, in countries where the pastoralist civil society landscape is unstructured and heterogeneous, a rapid assessment might ignore the reality closest to the grassroots. The output of the mapping exercise initially envisaged by some of the primary stakeholders was to be a dynamic map, hosted on the PKH portal and showing signposts for pastoral CSOs in each country, and with increasing level of detail as the user zooms over an area; however, this was not possible due to United Nations restrictions on mapping.
56. The PKH database is not up to date. For example, none of the 17 pastoralist CSOs that signed the Koblenz Declaration are included in it, nor the ICR, which is in charge of facilitating the restructuring of WAMIP governance. According to the PKH2 project document, there were plans to "develop mechanisms for pastoralist organizations to maintain it up to date", but this was not achieved.²⁸ Searches to test the functions of the database returned some incoherent results. The category 'Areas of work' lists standard development topics but excludes top priorities in pastoralist CSOs declarations, such as the right to mobility (including transboundary), sedentarization and 'resettlement', and conversion of pastoral rangelands to other uses.

²⁸ According to the PKH2 project document, "The database will be publicly available and be kept up-to-date under the project; it will allow for fast information dissemination. Part 2 will keep the database updated and will develop mechanisms for pastoralist organizations to maintain it up-to-date" (PKH2-PD: 18).

EQ2.3 To what extent did the PKH increase pastoralist CSOs' capacity for accessing, using and generating knowledge relevant to their agenda (i.e. especially on the rationale and value of pastoralism, and on the rights of pastoralists)?

Finding 11. The PKH has increased pastoralist CSOs' access to relevant knowledge through several channels: the Knowledge Repository (including the database on legal documents); exchanges and discussions in dedicated fora; support for specific studies; and the organization of training and research. It also increased access by acting as a sounding board for the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT). The level of analysis for the identification, organization and dissemination of relevant knowledge should be strengthened.

57. The Knowledge Repository contains around 400 items, which can be searched by 'free text' or by predetermined categories of descriptors under five groups: organization, language, geographical coverage, topic and type of document (if technical, scientific, maps, videos, newsletters, etc.). The website is available in six languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish, although only the descriptors of an item are translated, not the abstract or the title.
58. In 2016, a collaboration with FAOLEX led to the creation of an additional database of 400 'pastoralism-relevant' legislative and policy documents, which has increased to 700. The database can be searched by year, country, geo/economic region (e.g. Africa, European Union), type of text (legislation, regulation, agreement or policy) and language. By the end of 2018, this service had been visited by over 500 users. It is a highly effective tool not only for accessing, but also for identifying pastoralism-relevant legal documents while bypassing the more cumbersome FAOLEX.²⁹ Before the collaboration with PKH, 'pastoralism' was not a searchable key in the cataloguing system of FAOLEX. The FAOLEX unit working on the legislation database is exploring options for adding an analytical relationship between documents, including 'principles' for cross-relevance. Whenever possible, summaries are provided in different languages, but FAOLEX is not equipped, for example, for optical character recognition to scan Arabic, which is a precondition for automatic translation.
59. The volume of discussions on the PKH email forum has already been mentioned [EQ2.1]. The forum is also used to collect information and data from pastoralists across the world and to disseminate publications, including the PKH *Weekly News Review*. The latter focuses predominantly but not exclusively on Anglophone and Francophone media on Africa and on some Spanish media. The *Weekly News Review* was used in an assessment of the perception of pastoralism in the media in the context of a collaboration of PKH with the World Bank's project Pastoralism and Stability in the Sahel and Horn of Africa (PASSHA). The actual media coverage of pastoralism is often poorly informed and biased against pastoralism.³⁰ Showcasing pastoralism media coverage is useful when within an analytical framework that is explicit about its nature and limits. In the absence of this framework, the PKH *Weekly News Review* is exposed to the risk of providing an authoritative platform for the dissemination of misconceptions. This is exacerbated by the fact that the *Review* is

²⁹ Despite this fruitful collaboration with the PKH, 'Pastoralism' has not made it among the search 'domains' on the FAOLEX website.

³⁰ See for example, IIED (2013). The NGO Acting for Life, a partner to PKH, has developed a 'pastoralism training' for journalists; workshops have already been held, the first in Ouagadougou in April 2018 in partnership with the World Bank-funded Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project (PRAPS), and the second in Lomé, Togo, in February 2019 in partnership with CILSS.

signed "Pastoralist Knowledge Hub bringing pastoral voices to the global stage". When this problem was raised on the PKH forum over a year ago, PKH's solution was to add a disclaimer: "*The Pastoralist Knowledge Hub is a neutral forum and does not endorse all the news shared through this newsletter. Reader discretion advised.*" While there might have been little that the PKH team could do in this regard with the available resources, in the current troubled landscape of the knowledge about pastoralism, this 'hands-off' approach is controversial for a knowledge management service.

60. The PKH acted as a sounding board for the dissemination and operationalization of the VGGT (FAO, 2012), helping the VGGT team reach out to the pastoralist constituencies quickly and coherently. Two technical reports were produced in collaboration with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN): the VGGT Technical Guide, Improving Governance of Pastoral Lands (FAO, 2016); and Crossing Boundaries: Legal and policy arrangements for cross-border pastoralism (Davies et al., 2018). The PKH organized and ran community dialogue meetings to disseminate information and provide training on the use of the technical guide for the implementation of the VGGT in the rangelands. In collaboration with the FAO Partnerships and South-South Cooperation Division, the PKH organized a training of pastoralist representatives from Eastern and Southern Africa on the VGGT technical guide on improving the governance of pastoral lands. This activity targeted pastoral representatives of 14 countries. A case study on the application of the VGGT in the context of pastoral land tenure in Kenya and an information pamphlet in Kiswahili was developed in partnership with the Eastern and Southern African Pastoralist Network; stakeholders found this initiative particularly helpful and hoped that it could be replicated in the other major languages in the region. When the Technical Guide was translated into Mongolian and training for its use began, some partners found it too difficult to absorb. A team in FAO is now working on a simplified 'learning guide' focusing on the CSOs sections of the technical guide and particularly the contextualization of the concept of 'tenure'.
61. As an additional activity (one of the parallel projects), the PKH collaborated in the IFAD-funded Pastoralist-Driven Data Management system project in Argentina, Chad and Mongolia, implemented by the French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD) and aimed at improving the capacities of pastoral civil society to generate their own data. Feedback from stakeholders highlighted the need to adapt the methodology for the training of enumerators to local conditions. Feedback was also positive concerning the opportunity to gain direct experience in data collection, which could be applied beyond the context of the project. The regional network Réseau Billital Maroobé (RBM) and their Chadian member COPAFIB are now in conversation with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) on carrying out a new study, this time more directly linked to their strategic concerns.³¹
62. Stakeholders' feedback (including from some pastoralist CSOs) on the PKH's management of pastoralism-related knowledge hinted at a need to refine the scientific understanding of pastoralism and to analyse contexts related to pastoralism and pastoral development. Some even suggested the need for a scientific advisory board. Specifically on the knowledge repository, stakeholders highlighted poor coordination with similar services offered by other organizations, including partners, and that the language barrier remains significant even despite the efforts made by the PKH to include three non-European languages. There was a proposal to add regional branches to the PKH forum.

³¹ The proposed study looks at transboundary issues between Chad and RCA, associated with the movement of pastoralists and returnees.

63. In addition to the standard development topics available in the research section (e.g. gender and youth, livestock, finance, value addition, but not land grabbing, mobility or sedentarization), the Knowledge Repository does not offer any analysis of its content functional to the expected use by pastoralist CSOs. Searching the Knowledge Repository for issues relevant to the pastoralist advocacy agenda – for example, ‘right to mobility’, ‘mobility as a strategy of production’, ‘market failure’, ‘land-use conversion’, ‘women pastoralists’, ‘value of pastoralism’, ‘barriers in methodology’ and ‘technical exclusion’,³² or any variation on the motive of sedentarization³³ – will only find the items that have the search string in the title, abstract or descriptors. The level of knowledge management remains, at best, within the limits of a basic library catalogue. Options for adapting the identification and organization of knowledge to the advocacy strategies and agendas of pastoralist CSOs have yet to be explored, for example, ‘smart’ connections and thematic collections of referenced arguments and critical data. The conclusion in the PKH1 Terminal Report that “the lack of information and diffusion of pastoral issues was resolved through the creation of information exchange spaces, such as the Hub Repository” (FAO/GCP 2017: 19) was not realistic.

EQ2.4 To what extent did the PKH help pastoralist representatives secure a voice in the relevant policymaking at the national, regional and global levels?

Finding 12. The PKH used its position within FAO to facilitate access for representatives of pastoralist civil society to a range of high-level policymaking processes.

64. Either as direct participation or through the organization of side events, often in collaboration with partners, the PKH supported the representation of selected pastoral regional networks in global policy dialogues, such as the 13th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD-COP13), the 13th meeting of the Coalition of Parties of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD-COP13), the 2nd United Nations Environmental Assembly (UNEA-2), the 43rd and 44th meeting of the FAO Committee on Food Security (CFS43 and CFS44, respectively),³⁴ the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) in 2016 and 2018, as well as the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock and the related Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) partnership.
65. Significant outcomes in this regard were: ‘The Cancun Statement’ presented at CBD-COP13;³⁵ the UNEA-2 resolution on ‘Combating Desertification, Land Degradation and

³² IFAD (2018: 10): “Technical exclusion is exclusion *in practice*, often unintentional and unmonitored, simply resulting from the inadequacy of classifications, bureaucratic procedures, mechanisms of appraisal, and systems of statistical representation” (FAO-IFAD, 2016).

³³ The search could continue with even more finetuned categories, for example, highlighting relationships: ‘linkage between Sahel and coastal countries’, ‘linkage with crop farming’, or ‘linkage with urban economy’. Categories could be crowd-sourced, then consolidated and organized by their relevance to the key advocacy arguments as they emerge.

³⁴ The two side events were: at CFS43 on ‘Pastoralism, conflicts and food security in Africa under climate change conditions’, organized in collaboration with FAO’s SP5, World Bank, Coalition of Pastoralist Civil Society Organizations (COPACSO) and RBM; and at CFS44 on ‘Women empowerment for better resilience in pastoral communities’.

³⁵ The Cancun Statement (2016) was globally endorsed by 46 institutions (eight pastoralist CSOs) and 11 individuals from 28 countries, which called upon all sectors of society “to take action to protect grasslands and rangelands. The first two actions in a list of 11 priorities were ‘Increase investment in pastoralism as a sustainable land use and livestock-production system’, and ‘Stop or reverse all efforts to sedentarize mobile pastoralist communities, whether forced or induced.’”

Drought, and Promoting Sustainable Pastoralism and Rangelands';³⁶ the 8th GASL Global Multi-Stakeholder Partnership Meeting in Mongolia in June 2018;³⁷ and the proposal by the Mongolian Government for an International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralism, at the COAG meeting in October 2018 (to be discussed in COAG 2020). At CFS45 (2018), H.E. Mohammad Hossein Emadi, Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to FAO and Chair of COAG 2020, advocated for the recognition of pastoralists' rights.

66. Some initiatives focused specifically on women and youth. The PKH supported two events on women pastoralists, one as a side event to the 44th CFS in 2017³⁸ and one as a side event at the European Development Days (EDD) in 2018, run by ESAPN and co-organized with VSF and the Coalition of European Lobbies for Eastern African Pastoralism (CELEP). The PKH supported the organization of a meeting of pastoralist youth during the 'Terra Madre Giovani – We Feed the Planet' event in Milan, Italy, in October 2015, and the preparation of a study on youth migration in pastoral areas, which is being carried out by the Animal Production and Genetic Resources (AGAG) Branch.

Finding 13. Support to pastoralist CSOs' participation in policy dialogues needs a clearer mechanism. There should be more investment in consolidating existing global and regional platforms by building representation from the grassroots.

67. Pastoralist representatives had been involved in the CFS and GASL, and the LEAP partnership, even before the start of the PKH, as part of the Civil Society Mechanism of the CFS.³⁹ Pastoralist CSOs' active representation in GASL is still weak, mostly limited to one regional perspective as down to only one individual. Participants in GASL meetings have to pay for their travel costs. Participation by pastoralist CSO representatives depends on external funding, providing such funding on a case-by-case basis rather than through a set mechanism. The same challenge applies to virtually all other forms of support and invitations to events. Stakeholders' feedback highlighted the need for a clearer and more systematic mechanism for supporting the participation of pastoralist CSOs in policy dialogues, with a stronger investment for reaching the regional and national level, and for connecting the process to the grassroots.
68. The PKH supported the creation of spaces for dialogue in West and East Africa. In collaboration with the *Club du Sahel* (CSAO/OECD), the PKH supported pastoralist CSOs in Western and Central Africa (RBM) through an inter-ministerial meeting for a peaceful transhumance, part of a broader process of better defining and operationalizing the concept of *biens publics communautaires* (common public goods) in the context of ECOWAS. Stakeholders' feedback highlighted this as a major step forward in efforts to securing peaceful transhumance and livestock mobility between Sahelian and coastal countries in West Africa. The PKH also supported efforts in the *Programme régional d'investissements et de développement de l'élevage dans les pays côtiers* (PRIDEC, Regional

³⁶ The resolution (UNEA, 2016) urges Member States to increase investment in the pastoral sector; encourages continental and regional intergovernmental bodies to support joint and cross-border development programmes for neighbouring pastoralist and other communities; and calls upon the UNEP to contribute to raising global awareness of sustainable pastoralism and rangelands.

³⁷ The chosen topic for the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL) Global MSP Meeting was "livestock on the move".

³⁸ The two WAMIP representatives in the main CFS sessions, as part of the Civil Society Mechanism, were also women.

³⁹ In 2014, the LEAP partnership was chaired by WAMIP president Lalji Desai. The contribution by WAMIP representatives was acknowledged in the LEAP 'Review of indicators and methods to assess biodiversity' (Teillard et al., 2016), co-authored by Pablo Manzano before he became PKH's first coordinator.

Investment Programme for Livestock Development in Coastal Countries.). In East Africa, the PKH supported the newly formed ESAPN in their participation in discussions with IGAD regarding the regional transhumance protocol.

EQ3. To what extent did the PKH contribute to making the relevant decision-making environments more receptive to the voices of pastoralists?

EQ3.1 To what extent did the PKH contribute to reducing the knowledge gap on pastoralism, especially concerning its economic and ecological rationale and value?

Finding 1figure4. The PKH has been directly or indirectly involved in a number of studies with advocacy value. It also contributed by providing contacts on the ground and facilitating communication with pastoralist CSOs as well as between teams working on different projects within FAO.

69. The evaluation examines the PKH's involvement in knowledge-generation activities, specifically with regard to their contribution towards making relevant decision-making environments more receptive to the voice of pastoralists. A number of studies conducted with the support of the PKH have advocacy value. Their results are now presented in various fora in order to: advocate for the importance of collecting data on pastoral systems; show how estimates can vary greatly depending on the kind of data being used; and explain the challenges of identifying and generating the right kind of data.
70. The background to the knowledge-generation activities by the PKH is a process started in 2014, when the World Bank asked FAO to work on drought scenarios in the drylands of Sub-Saharan Africa. During the study that followed (de Haan et al., 2016), a number of limitations were identified. The PKH was then asked to contribute with a targeted analysis on strategic areas of missing information: animal numbers, feed deficit/excess and the qualification of production systems in relation to their specific breeds. The process integrated data from existing studies – an information system for monitoring pastoral dynamics in the Sahel (SIPSA) – in the FAO Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model (GLEAM), and explored the potential for integrating GLEAM with FAO's Domestic Animal Diversity Information System. The PKH contributed by providing contacts and facilitating communication with pastoralist CSOs and between teams working on different projects within FAO, providing feedback, helping with data collection and the dissemination of results and, in some cases, directly supporting particular studies.
71. The work on feed balances is a good example of how these synergies unfolded and evolved over time. In 2017, the combined work on people/animal numbers in pastoralist systems and on feed rations supported by the PKH was tested to estimate the potential impact of the drought in the Horn of East Africa, leading to discussions with the team developing the Predictive Livestock Early Warning System (PLEW), as well as inputs for the development of an improved methodology for feed balances in West Africa. Another input to improve the methodology came from combining maps of possible feed deficit with data on seasonal transhumance (from SIPSA), to test the modelling of feed balances against observed livestock movements. Hence, new layers of complexity were identified; for example, mobility patterns in pastoral systems are not determined exclusively by feed availability, but also by the existence of other drivers or barriers, i.e. insecurity. The PKH also contributed by directly supporting a study on the livestock-feeding value of bushes and trees used in Sahelian pastoralism, in collaboration with the Italian National Research Institute on Food and Nutrition (INRAN) and the FAO Drylands team under Actions Against Desertification (AAD). As a result of this work, a focus on seasonality and the different

nutritional content of forages was included in the methodology for assessing feed balance, currently used in three projects of a FAO regional initiative in West Africa.⁴⁰ The studies directly supported by the PKH (feed rations, seasonality and tree forages) are also seen within the FAO Animal Production and Health Division as a contribution to an upcoming European Union-funded project on improving the accounting for the carbon footprint of pastoral systems in *Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel* (CILSS) states.⁴¹

Finding 15. PKH's work on improving methodologies is also relevant to addressing the more fundamental issue concerning the biases in the methodological legacy of pastoral development.

72. Some of this work on improving methodologies is also relevant to the more fundamental problem concerning biases in the methodological legacy of pastoral development. The issue here is not about perfecting a methodology by adding new elements, but rather about reconsidering its underlying assumptions, and perhaps developing parallel methodologies and mechanisms for bridging them to take into account the incommensurable differences across the context of observation. For example, the FAO-CIRAD team working on estimating animal requirements to be used in GLEAM, identified several limitations in existing methodologies for feed balances when applied to pastoral systems in the Sahel (Mottet and Assouma, 2018).⁴² The need to adapt the methodology was also given consideration by the CIRAD team in Chad, during the finetuning of the questionnaire used in the Pastoralist-Driven Data Management project. Developing harmonized metrics as part of the concerns of GASL and LEAP is indeed working in this regard, developing frameworks beyond the common, industry-centred life-cycle assessment (LCA). The work with pastoralists through the PKH helped to produce evidence that reducing livestock mortality in these contexts also helps reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Latin America pastoralist network Pastoraméricas, in collaboration with the University of Salta, Argentina, produced a study on sustainable pastoralism in the Argentinian Chaco Province. This study then informed the work carried out by LEAP on measuring and modelling soil carbon stocks in livestock production systems. Complementary to the LEAP assessment, Pastoraméricas' technical guidelines for integrated landscape management in the Chaco dryland region were developed together with the University of Salta, *Instituto nacional de tecnología agraria* (INTA) and *Instituto de Desarrollo Rural* (IRD).
73. Another example concerns the work with FAO's Indigenous Peoples Group, where the PKH facilitated the study of pastoralist food systems in the Arctic and in Mali, and the participation of pastoralist representatives at the High-Level Expert Seminar on Indigenous Food Systems in 2018. The PKH also supported the development of the Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of Climate Resilience of Farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP). Despite its name, SHARP had never been used by FAO with pastoralists. Developed to be used in

⁴⁰ The 'Global Network against Food Crises Programme' in the Sahel (Pro-Act Sahel, GCP/RAF/516/EC) in Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger; the Technical Cooperation Programme on assessing feed resources in Niger (TCP/NER/3603), and the feed balance project led by AGA in Niger and Chad (GCP/RAF/510/FRA).

⁴¹ Carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in agro-sylvo-pastoral ecosystems in CILSS states, 2020–2024 (CASSECS). FAO-AGA will work in partnership with several other organizations.

⁴² Mohamed Assouma has recently led a paper on the carbon footprint of a pastoral system in the Sahel. The paper points at shortfalls with mainstream methods for measuring agricultural C balance, in particular focusing exclusively on human impact and overlooking temporal and spatial variability, therefore failing to capture the effects of the link between herd production and mobility in pastoral systems (Assouma et al., 2019).

farmers' field schools, SHARP had only been used in projects working with farmers and agropastoralists, yet focused on their crop-farming activities. The PKH helped the team hone the SHARP questionnaire to be used with pastoral communities, above all by acknowledging the role of livestock in their economies, and the fact that they might not live in settlements. Given the limited awareness of pastoralism at the start, this represented substantial progress.

74. For partners and pastoralist CSOs, the PKH is identified with the web portal and, at most, the regional meetings. PKH work on improving methodologies is not very known, except in FAO headquarters and among the few partners who were directly involved in knowledge-generation activities.

EQ3.2 How effective was the PKH in forging partnerships and in coordination and cooperation mechanisms in support of the work of pastoralist CSOs in advocacy and in the representation of pastoralists' voice?

Finding 16. The PKH was highly successful within FAO and, to a certain extent, in its work with CSOs, especially in West Africa and High Asia. The PKH's connections with the international network of pastoralism specialists relate to the technical dimension of specific activities.

75. There are two main dimensions on how the PKH contributed to forging partnerships, coordination and cooperation mechanisms in support of the work of pastoralist CSOs, which effectively correspond to the two sides of PKH's portfolio of activities: *external*, with partners and other organizations on specific initiatives, and *internal*, within FAO.
76. By the time of the evaluation, the PKH had 37 partners. Liaising with these external organizations, it has created opportunities for pastoralist CSOs on several occasions. For example, it was through the PKH that RBM was able to liaise with the ILC, and through them, with the Rangelands Observatory. For the 'Pastoralist-Driven Data Management system' project, the PKH became RBM's technical and administrative interface with IFAD. The PKH also helped RBM mobilize funds from the Spanish Government for working on milk value chain and the role of women in milk collection for local consumption, particularly through the *Projet d'Appui au renforcement des Capacités des Femmes pasteurs dans la promotion de la chaine de valeur du lait local au Sahel* (PACAFEL, Project to support women's capacity reimbursement for the development of the local milk value chain - RBM, 2017) to support the competitiveness of the dairy sector, covering Mali, Niger and Senegal. According to the feedback from ESAPN, it was through the intervention of the PKH that the network was able to liaise with IGAD regarding a transhumance protocol. In High Asia, PKH's support to the World Yak Herders Association enabled the participation of pastoralists in the 6th International Yak Conference, normally only attended by scientists and industry. The PKH built capacity to use the Association as a platform for producing standards for the international commercialization of yak milk. In addition, PKH's support to holding the regional yak festival substantially increased breeders' opportunities to exchange genoplasm across otherwise closed boundaries. The annual PKH partners meetings (three to date) also offered pastoralist CSOs opportunities for forging new partnerships and for coordination. Further, the PKH contributed to the preparation of the IYRP, which has been one of PKH's best achievements in building partnerships.
77. PKH's connections with the academic world and more generally with the network of pastoralism specialists who are from various university departments, research institutes and consultancy firms throughout the world have been minimum and limited to the technical

dimension of specific activities. There seems to be awareness of this shortfall within the larger team of PKH collaborators, and it is hoped that measures will soon be taken to address this.⁴³

Finding 17. Advocacy work would benefit in efficiency and effectiveness by securing more coordination between partners.

78. Another issue emerged from the interviews with PKH partners is limited coordination with regard to the advocacy work, especially securing pastoralists' voice in international events in a comprehensive and more efficient manner. Some meetings are overcrowded with side events, which results in duplication and competition, while others are uncovered. There is a tendency for all to converge into the major meeting while overlooking the interim periods. This was described as a general problem, although not attributable to the PKH, but one that the PKH should address with partners.

Finding 18. The institutionalization of pastoralism within FAO is being pushed forward. However, the increased attention is unmatched by a comparable financial contribution for operational capacity. 'Pastoralism connectivity' provided by the PKH needs to be extended from FAO headquarters to FAO country offices.

79. The work within FAO was less visible from the outside but perhaps most effective in this regard. Through the knowledge-generation activities under PKH2, work on pastoralism became a virtual space for experimenting with a systemic approach across Strategic Programmes and disparate teams within FAO. Given that to date FAO is still lacking a clear position and policy on pastoralism⁴⁴ and that the work on pastoralism is fragmented within several SPs, the PKH is the only shared point of reference on this matter. Discussions for establishing a pastoralism working group with regular meetings were underway at the time of this evaluation, and SP5 had just produced the first paper on pastoralism since 2002 (FAO, 2018; 2002). Overall, despite the 'floating' role of the PKH across SPs, the new focus on pastoralism is predominantly from the perspective of resilience and emergencies, with SP5 having the largest representation in the working group.⁴⁵ In 2018, as a result of a collaboration between SP5, SP2 and the PKH, a new position was created. A veterinarian, was selected, mostly to respond to the growing demand for technical specifications, thus releasing the PKH from some of this pressure.⁴⁶ The difference in the initial conditions, now with much more attention given to pastoralism outside FAO than inside, allows for greater recognition of the PKH outside FAO, but the role it played as a catalyst of change with regard to pastoralism inside FAO might be even more important.
80. Stakeholders' feedback also highlighted that although there is a significant increase in the attention given to pastoralism within FAO, there was a lack of a comparable financial contribution for operational capacity. The connectivity and consequent opportunities for

⁴³ The only ongoing action at the time of this evaluation consisted in SP5 developing a Memorandum of Understanding with Tufts University, which also includes work on the different aspects of pastoral livelihoods systems.

⁴⁴ See FAO Management response to Recommendation 1 of the 2016 Joint Evaluation Synthesis (FAO-IFAD 2016).

⁴⁵ 'Pastoralist livelihoods' was made one of the seven priorities of FAO-SP5. This led to a dramatic increase in the collaboration between PKH and SP5. The PKH did not, however, play a role in this prioritization process.

⁴⁶ Around 50 percent of technical specifications are medical-related (drugs and vaccinations) and another 50 percent are related to emergency livestock feed inputs. In 2017, FAO spent around USD 70 million on livestock-related products. Around USD 20–25 million are spent annually in purchasing and distributing livestock feed in emergency situations. Since many regions and countries do not have FAO livestock officers, all the livestock-related requests from the governing bodies come directly to FAO headquarters. Requests from Eastern and Southern Africa have increased in frequency.

synergy being developed in FAO headquarters has yet to reach out to the country offices where pastoralism-related programmes under different Strategic Programmes are without coordination or even adequate specialist backup. To date, the capacity of the PKH to support FAO offices at the country level has been very limited by the lack of sufficient resources. For pastoralist CSOs in countries where pastoralism advocacy is seen with suspicion by the authorities, the mere existence of the PKH within FAO is helpful in negotiating a political space.

EQ3.3 To what extent did the PKH succeed in increasing the visibility of pastoralism and its positive value in development at the national, regional and global levels?

Finding 19. The PKH made a substantial difference with regard to the visibility of the value of pastoralism in development, especially at the global level. The difference in the consideration for pastoralism and its value in the High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) 2016 when compared to a similar report in 2012 is impressive.

81. Increasing the visibility of pastoralism has been a direct or indirect effect in virtually all of PKH activities. Some of the activities that had a direct effect have already been discussed, such as the creation of the PKH portal within the FAO website [EQ2.1], supporting pastoralist representation in high-level policy dialogues [EQ2.4] and supporting the inclusion of a 'pastoralism component' in pre-existing processes of data collection, both within FAO and with FAO partners [EQ3.1].
82. Pastoralist representatives were participating in the CFS, which requested and produced – through the HLPE – the report on *Sustainable Agricultural Development for Food Security and Nutrition: What roles for livestock?* (HLPE, 2016). During the consultation on the V0 Draft of the report, WAMIP and other PKH partners produced substantial contributions. The feedback from the Civil Society Mechanism refers to the problem with "overlooking market failures" and "the misguided narrative of aggregating the impact of industrial production with pastoral systems" (HLPE, 2015). The final report refers to pastoralism 191 times, more than twice as often as in its V0 draft. Shortcomings in the methodological legacy, when measuring production efficiency across vastly different systems, are highlighted.⁴⁷ The final recommendations include a five-point subsection (12) dedicated to 'Recognize and support the unique role of pastoral systems'. Point five calls for "enabling the mobility of pastoralists, including transboundary passage, through appropriate infrastructures, institutions, agreements and rules". By comparison, the 2012 HLPE report *Food Security and Climate Change* referred to pastoralism six times and only to emphasize vulnerability (HLPE, 2012).
83. The PKH also contributed to the recent publication *World Livestock: Transforming the livestock sector through the Sustainable Development Goals* (FAO, 2018a), which refers to pastoralism 68 times. In this case, however, the positive understanding of pastoralism achieved in HLPE 2016 is at times side-by-side with older frames.⁴⁸ Stakeholders acknowledged the substantial improvement compared to the 2006 report, especially regarding the beneficial role of pastoralism in carbon sequestration and the adaptive value

⁴⁷ HLPE (2016: 73): "efficiency assessments are often based on narrow metrics, which may not include non-food outputs (such as manure and draught power), animal welfare, or non-tangible social assets that are often generated at higher levels in systems with lower economic efficiency."

⁴⁸ For example, the section 'Livestock and quality education' acknowledges that "among traditional livestock-raising communities, sending children to school conflicts with pastoral lifestyles" (p. 41 and Box 6 on p. 39), but also considers that "[c]hanging attitudes towards formal education ... represents an opportunity for increasing school enrolment in livestock-dependent communities" (p. 40).

of mobility; however, it also pointed out that “there is still work to be carried out towards differentiating industrial intensive livestock management systems and pastoralism regarding carbon emission calculations”. Nevertheless, the scale of these achievements becomes evident when contrasted with similar processes within FAO, even if immediately outside the reach of PKH's activity. In the 2018 GASL report *Dairy Development's Impact on Poverty Reduction*, there was one passing reference to pastoralism and one reference to the gender dimension of dairy production, but unrelated to pastoralism (GASL 2018). Similarly, the substantial report *The Future of Food and Agriculture Alternative Pathways to 2050* was published in 2018 without mentioning to pastoralism.

84. The promotion of the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralism is another major channel that is increasing the visibility of pastoralism at all levels. The PKH is member of the IYRP International Support Group (formerly Steering Committee) together with several close partners,⁴⁹ and supports the representation of WAMIP and its regional networks. The IYRP Steering Committee supported the presentation of the proposal by the Mongolian CSO JASIL to the Government of Mongolia, which then presented it to FAO at the 26th session of the Committee on Agriculture, backed up by the Ethiopian delegation. The mere existence of an active IYRP International Support Group is a major asset for pastoralism visibility. If approved, the IYRP might be held in 2026 (the first available slot), which would entail five years of preparations and thus offer many opportunities for supporting dialogues with pastoralists.
85. The online survey for this evaluation (section 1.3) found no significant disparity in the perceived impact of the PKH across its portfolio of activities. ‘Networking’ was ranked top and ‘Supporting participation in national policy processes’, ranked last.

3.3 Sustainability

EQ4. How sustainable are the achievements of the PKH?

Finding 20. Sustainability was embedded into the PKH design mainly in the form of developing capacity within pastoralist CSOs and building a dynamic network of partners.

86. Capacity development with pastoralist CSOs focused on delivering training: ‘technically, to better manage their resources’; and ‘organizationally, to contribute to and influence national policies and programmes on land, pastoral production and emergency preparedness’. Networking with partner created opportunities to increase economic sustainability through additional projects consistent with the PKH's goal. Partnerships was also fostered between PKH partners and pastoralist CSOs across regions (e.g. between RBM and CIRAD/IFAD), aiming at establishing networks for further collaboration and knowledge sharing beyond the duration of the project. Finally, a degree of sustainability was also secured by embedding the ‘common denominator’ of PKH achievements – namely, ‘increased visibility of pastoralism’ – into long-term processes and permanent results, whether high-level policy dialogues, relevant United Nations publications, or the development of complex modelling and data collection systems.

⁴⁹ These partners are CELEP, IFAD, IUCN, ILC, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), IFAD; they also include several pastoralist CSOs: RBM, MARAG, PFE and the International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR).

Finding 21. The future of the PKH in FAO is linked to the former's structure and position, and the demand within FAO.

87. A key dimension of the PKH programme consisted in expanding its context of intervention, both by reaching out to new constituencies and by reaching out into 'new territories' of knowledge and knowledge-making. In addition, the PKH engaged with interventions that were both highly relevant and largely silent within FAO. A project of this nature can only be expected to outgrow its horizons. In four years, the needs of a global knowledge repository on pastoralism, which now includes the important 'legislation database', would be evidently greater than had been assumed at the start. The mapping of pastoralist CSOs has only just begun. The requirement for higher scientific standards in the identification, analysis, organization and dissemination of relevant knowledge on pastoralism has become impelling. To date, growing knowledge about pastoralism within FAO has been met by the PKH on an extemporary basis, but at the cost of overstressing all the available resources. The network of partners is expected to further expand and help stakeholders capitalize on the opportunities of collaboration that it could potentially generate. However, already at the time of the evaluation, the network had outgrown PKH's capacity to sustain it.

4 Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

Conclusion 1. The project was clearly consistent with and contributing to the strategic priorities of FAO. It addressed a gap on pastoralism within FAO that had lasted for over a decade, and went beyond, producing a multiplier effect for the VGGT, helping major programmes such as GLEAM, SHARP, Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA), Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS), Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS) and Agricultural Stress Index System (ASIS) ‘think pastoralism’, and providing a clear institutional space for connecting and coordinating work on pastoralism otherwise fragmented under several Strategic Programmes.

88. The PKH was highly relevant to FAO’s strategy to improve the governance of food security and was aligned to FAO’s five Strategic Objectives, particularly SO1, SO2 and SO5. It was the only initiative focusing on pastoralism within FAO headquarters. The project acted as a sounding board for the dissemination and operationalization of the VGGT, helping the VGGT team reach out to the pastoralist constituencies quickly and coherently, through the organization of training and the production of information in local languages.
89. The knowledge-generation activities under the PKH added value to important programmes such as GLEAM, SHARP, LADA, GIEWS, DAD-IS, ASIS and Actions Against Desertification. increasing the visibility and coverage of pastoralism, or introducing it where still absent. Some of the work on improving methodologies is relevant to the more fundamental problem concerning the biases in the methodological legacy of pastoral development. All this work had advocacy value and the merit of maximizing pastoralism-related connectivity and reflection within FAO.

Conclusion 2. The PKH has an added value. Its portal has succeeded in establishing itself as a source of information on pastoralism and a point of reference for authoritative advocacy. There is a strong consensus among stakeholders that the PKH should continue.

90. Communication and understanding across the pastoralists-science-policy interface should be enhanced. Pastoralists face great challenges to voice their right for representation in the decisions concerning the future of their livelihoods, starting from concerns over the undermining of their mobility as a right and as a strategy of production, and the loss of rangelands to land-use conversion programmes. Having the PKH backed by FAO is seen by all stakeholders as a clear advantage in the race to help policymakers understand the actual value and functioning of pastoralism before it is too late.

Conclusion 3. Overall, PKH’s achievements are clear and substantial, especially when considered with regard to project resources, the challenging environment, and the project’s vast and diverse scope. The PKH made giant leaps in setting up regional pastoralist alliances worldwide, particularly including women and youth. The network is broad but should be broader. It needs consolidating, including its connection at the global level, starting from giving WAMIP space and support to resume its role as the global platform for the representation of pastoralist social movements. National and local representation of pastoralist social movements also needs to be consolidated.

91. The PKH has either established or strengthened pastoralist networks in seven regions, mobilizing some 360 pastoralist representatives from 64 countries and increasing WAMIP coverage by around 30 percent. Two new subregional networks were created through support from PKH, one by women pastoralists.
92. There are still areas of unclarity with regard to the relationship between PKH and WAMIP, between the regional networks and WAMIP, between the regional networks and PKH, and between the regional networks and their representational base. The central element in the global organization of pastoralist social movements, WAMIP, only started reviewing and consolidating its governance structure in late 2018. The new regional networks need to consolidate their positions in relation to the national and local levels.

Conclusion 4. The PKH has strengthened pastoralists' voice in the policymaking arena, both by strengthening the pastoralist CSOs voice to make themselves heard, and by making the decision-making environment more receptive to hear them.

93. The PKH portal has almost 4 000 users annually, links to 37 partners, around 400 items in the knowledge repository and a database of more than 700 legal documents, 250 records of pastoralist CSOs or organizations working with pastoralists, and digital fora. The PKH used its position within FAO to facilitate access by representatives of pastoralist civil society to a range of high-level policymaking processes. Some initiatives focused specifically on women and youth.
94. Outstanding achievements were the process of better defining and operationalizing the concept of *biens publics communautaires* (common public goods) in the context of ECOWAS by RBM; the substantial consideration for pastoralism and its value in key publications such as the HLPE *Sustainable Agricultural Development for Food Security and Nutrition: What roles for livestock?* (2016), and a key role in the promotion of the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralism. Liaising with its partners, the PKH created opportunities for pastoralist CSOs, for example, the collaboration in the IFAD-funded Pastoralist-Driven Data Management System project aimed at improving the capacities of pastoral civil society to generate their own data.
95. Given the large number of partners and the minimal size of the PKH team, building partnerships created more potential opportunities than it could exploit. Despite all best efforts, relationships often remained on the surface, limited to what was functional to the programme of PKH. In many cases, the only way partners were engaged by the project was through an invitation to the annual meeting.

Conclusion 5. While recognizing all the achievements, there is strong consensus among stakeholders that the PKH needs to be reviewed thoroughly with regard to its structure and implementation, and in particular: i) increasing the level of analysis when engaging with pastoralist civil society, especially in interpreting the context, roles and boundaries; and ii) raising the quality of standards when engaging with pastoralism-related knowledge (e.g. identification, analysis, organization, dissemination).

4.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Keep the PKH operating and with a clear link to FAO.

96. FAO should secure resources to guarantee PKH 'life-support' activities: maintaining the web portal; facilitating coordination between partners; and facilitating connectivity between FAO and pastoralist CSOs, and between FAO programmes under different Strategic Programmes.
97. In collaboration with partners, FAO should also secure funding from external sources. Here, it should enable the development of specific components of the PKH, including the institutionalization of pastoralism at FAO. Options for flexible funding should be explored.
98. The work of bringing pastoralism into large FAO programmes and engaging in knowledge-generation activities with advocacy value should expand. The institutionalization of pastoralism within FAO, including beyond SP5, should be supported. Specific support should be given to developing and operating a 'pastoralism working group' at FAO headquarters and in close connections with relevant country offices. The work of the PKH should be extended to country offices, and the PKH team strengthened to cope with the additional workload that this will generate.

Recommendation 2. FAO should expand the PKH by adding some specialist modules that can be operated through partners who have the necessary specialization or are able to secure it more cost-effectively than FAO can. These modules may include knowledge generation, pastoralism visibility, capacity and representation of pastoralist CSOs, and scientific advice.

99. The PKH expanded its context of intervention by reaching out to new constituencies and into 'new territories' of knowledge and knowledge-making. Expansion, including in the group of partners, has eventually outgrown the limits of the project. In addition, partners have shown interest in playing a more direct role, including providing suggestions for associate pastoral CSOs and partners since project formulation. Being created at FAO has given PKH1 and PKH2 unique advantages, which should be retained. In contrast, specialized modules associated with the PKH operated by a partner could now grow and evolve much faster and more cost-effectively, adapting more easily to the variability of contexts in which it operates. This would also allow the 'new model PKH' to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by its legacy of partnerships and networking in an environment where other players have proven experience in pursuing substantially the same objective as the PKH. The following five recommendations concern the components to be developed through partnerships.

Recommendation 3. Grow the knowledge management dimension of the PKH.

100. The set of knowledge services provided on the PKH web portal and through digital dissemination need both correcting and expanding. The need for correction relates to: i) the first framework currently reached through clicking the 'Knowledge repository' tab, with the document search; ii) the 'Database of organizations' under the tab 'Pastoralist networks'; iii) the mapping of pastoralist networks, which is currently limited to incomplete information at the regional level; and iv) the media review and 'News' section.
101. Expanding the knowledge services must entail, *inter alia*: i) integrating in all knowledge services smart functions for strategic analysis and organization (e.g. highlighting evidence and arguments with advocacy value, but also contradictions, misconceptions, negative framing and triggers of technical exclusion); and ii) supporting innovation for securing

timely and effective dialogue and flow of information within pastoralist networks at all levels, in conversation with partners and pastoralist CSOs (in particular, sustainable solutions are needed for enabling the work of the larger governing bodies that allow for grassroots representation, such as councils and congresses).

Recommendation 4. Grow the knowledge-generation component of the PKH.

102. The knowledge-generation activities supported by the PKH need expanding. This should cover, *inter alia*: i) pushing further and deeper the mapping of knowledge gaps; ii) mapping misconceptions, misunderstanding and negative 'framing' in current pastoral-development narratives including, for example, the current framing around farming-herding relationships and issues of conflict; iii) supporting the meaningful inclusion of pastoralism in relevant knowledge-generation programmes outside FAO; iv) engaging in the systematic production of evidence that is strategically relevant for supporting the agenda of pastoralist CSOs; and v) identifying and setting methodological barriers and 'technical exclusion' in knowledge-making processes.

Recommendation 5. Develop the work of developing capacity and representation in pastoralist CSOs as an integrated component.

103. There is a general consensus on the need for WAMIP, but also about its present weakness. Coverage by the new regional networks is still weak. It is crucial to support WAMIP in resuming its role, as a united front on its core principles and purpose, and with a functioning governance structure. In parallel, the work of building organizational and advocacy capacity in pastoralist CSOs, and supporting measures that allow them to remain connected with the grassroots should continue and expand. Opportunities for dialogue between pastoralists and governing bodies at the national and regional level should be fostered and pursued.

Recommendation 6. Develop the work of increasing pastoralism visibility in policymaking as an integrated component.

104. The work should continue to increase the visibility of pastoralism and its value, both to strengthen pastoralists' voice and to make the policymaking environment more receptive to hear it. This component of the PKH should focus on the systematic identification and pursuing of opportunities. The current central role of the PKH in preparing the United Nations International Year for Rangelands and Pastoralism should be supported. A priority should be the development and implementation of a mechanism for coordinating strategic participation and advocacy initiatives, both between partners and with pastoralist CSOs.

Recommendation 7. Provide the PKH with a permanent mechanism of relevant scientific advice, namely an advisory board, with strong and proved expertise in pastoralism and supporting pastoralism civil society.

105. There is a strong consensus among stakeholders that the level of analysis and scientific standards behind the PKH is due for an upgrade with specialist knowledge on pastoralism and the context of pastoralism-related development.
106. The new PKH should be supported by a scientific advisory board with strong and proven expertise in pastoralism and in supporting pastoralist civil society. Integrated within the PKH modular structure and networked with all relevant constituencies through the PKH fora, the scientific advisory board should be dedicated to facilitating the identification of core principles and ensuring adequate level of analysis and strategic coherence within and across the PKH components.

References

- African Union (AU).** 2010. Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, protecting and improving the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoralist communities. Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture, African Union, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA).** 2017. Pastoralism, Policy and Law in the EAC and IGAD Regions (East African Community and Intergovernmental Authority on Development Regions). AFSA, Kampala.
- Assouma, M.H., Hiernaux, P., Lecomte, P., Ickowicz, A., Bernoux, M. & Vayssières, J.** 2019. Contrasted seasonal balances in a Sahelian pastoral ecosystem result in a T neutral annual carbon balance. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 162: 62–73.
- Bassi, M.** 2017. Pastoralists are peoples – key issues in Advocacy and the Emergence of Pastoralists' Rights. *Nomadic Peoples* 21(1): 4–33.
- Behnke, R. & Metaferia, F.** 2011. The contribution of livestock to the Ethiopian economy - Part II, IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 2–11, Djibouti.
- Behnke, R. & Muthami, D.** 2011. The contribution of livestock to the Kenyan economy, IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 3–11, Djibouti.
- Behnke, R. & Nakirya, M.** 2012. The contribution of livestock to the Ugandan economy, IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 02–12, Djibouti.
- Behnke, R.** 2010. The contribution of livestock to the economies of IGAD Member States. Study Findings, Application of the Methodology in Ethiopia and Recommendations for Further Work, IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 02–10, Djibouti.
- Behnke, R. and Osman, H.M.** 2011. The contribution of livestock to the Sudanese economy, IGAD LPI Working Paper No. 01–12, Djibouti.
- Chapman, K.** 2016. Complexity and Creative Capacity. Rethinking knowledge transfer, adaptive management and wicked environmental problems. Routledge, London and New York.
- Chatty, D.** 2012. Dana Declaration +10, 11–13 April 2012, Wadi Dana, Jordan. Workshop report Dana Declaration 2002. Dana Declaration on Mobile Peoples and Conservation. Wadi Dana Nature Reserve, Jordan, 3–7 April 2002, The Dana Declaration Committee, Dana.
- Davies J., Ogali, C., Slobodian, L., Roba, G. & Ouedraogo, R.** 2018. Crossing Boundaries: Legal and policy arrangements for cross-border pastoralism. FAO and IUCN, Rome.
- de Haan, C. & Cervigni, R. with Mottet, A., Conchedda, G., Gerber, P., Msangi, S., Lesnoff, M., Ham, F., Fillol, E. & Nigussie, K.** 2016. Vulnerability and resilience in livestock systems in the drylands of sub-Saharan Africa. In: de Haan C. (ed.) 2016. Prospects for Livestock-Based Livelihoods in Africa's Drylands, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank, Washington.
- Déclaration d'Hammamet.** 2016. Déclaration des participants à l'atelier régional sur la «Construction d'un environnement propice au développement durable du pastoralisme en Afrique du Nord et en Asie Occidentale», organisé à Hammamet, Tunisie, du 14 au 16 Janvier 2016, Hammamet, Tunisie.
- Déclaration de Bamako.** 2016. Déclaration des participants à l'atelier régional sur la construction d'un environnement propice au développement durable du pastoralisme en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre. Bamako.

Déclaration du Réseau Européen des Berger. 2018. Déclaration du Réseau Européen des Berger, Le Réseau Européen des bergers, met in General Assembly in Oloron-Sainte-Marie on 15 September 2018.

Desmarais, A.A. & Nicholson, P. 2013. La Via Campesina. An historical and political analysis, La Via Campesina's Open Book: Celebrating 20 Years of Struggle and Hope.

FAO. 2002. Pastoralism in the new millenium, FAO Animal Production and Health Paper 150. Rome.

FAO. 2012. Food security and climate change. High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). Rome.

FAO. 2012. *Voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security.* Rome. 47 pp. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i2801e.pdf>).

FAO. 2014. Pastoralist Knowledge Hub. PART 1: Support to pastoralists in advocacy and policy matters, Rome.

FAO. 2015. Pastoralist Knowledge Hub. Part 2: Technical support to pastoralists` livelihood and resilience. FAO Internal document. Rome.

FAO. 2015a. HLPE consultation on the V0 draft of the Report: Sustainable agricultural development for food security and nutrition, including the role of livestock. From 2 to 31 October 2015. Extended to 16 November 2015. HLPE. Rome.

FAO. 2015b. Sustainable Agricultural Development for Food Security and Nutrition, including the Role of Livestock. V0 Draft Report 2nd October 2015. Submitted by the HLPE to open electronic consultation until 31 October 2015. HLPE. Rome. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/fsnforum/cfs-hlpe/discussions/Sust-Agr-Dev-Livestock-V0>).

FAO. 2016. Improving governance of pastoral lands. Implementing the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. Governance of Tenure Technical Guide No. 6. Rome. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5771e.pdf>).

FAO. 2016. *Sustainable agricultural development for food security and nutrition: what roles for livestock?* HLPE. Rome. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5795e.pdf>).

FAO. 2017. *Pastoralist Knowledge Hub. Project Findings and Recommendations.* Terminal Report (AG: GCP/GLO/536/GER), FAO/Government Cooperative Programme. Rome.

FAO. 2018. Pastoralism in Africa's drylands. Rome. 52 pp. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/CA1312EN/ca1312en.pdf>).

FAO. 2018. *World Livestock: Transforming the livestock sector through the Sustainable Development Goals.* Rome. 222 pp. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/CA1201EN/ca1201en.pdf>).

FAO-IFAD. 2016. FAO's and IFAD's Engagement in Pastoral Development (2003-2013). Joint Evaluation Synthesis. IFAD, Rome. (also available at: https://www.ifad.org/documents/38714182/39720979/pastoral_dvp.pdf/fb6ba30f-f919-4946-834d-1f622de7ab9b).

- Global Dairy Platform (GASL).** 2018. Dairy Development's Impact on Poverty Reduction. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Global Dairy Platform and IFCN Dairy Research Network, Chicago.
- Hustai Declaration.** 2015. Hustai Declaration on Pastoralism and Nomadic People for Central Asia.
- IIED & SOS Sahel.** 2009. *Modern and Mobile. The future of livestock production in Africa's drylands.* Edited by Helen de Jode, International Institute for Environment and Development, and SOS Sahel International UK, London. (also available at: <https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/12565IIED.pdf>).
- International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR).** 2018a. World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples – Governance challenges. The summary of the governance structure. International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry, Kautokeino, Norway.
- International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR).** 2018b. World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples – Governance challenges. The summary of interviews. International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry, Kautokeino, Norway.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).** 2018. How to do note: Engaging with pastoralists – a holistic development approach. Rome.
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).** 2013. Following the Herd: Why Pastoralism Needs Better Media Coverage, Briefing: Climate resilient drylands development, by Mike Shanahan. International Institute for Environment and Development, London. (also available at: <https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10039IIED.pdf>).
- International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).** 2012. Supporting Sustainable Pastoral Livelihoods: A Global Perspective on Minimum Standards and Good Practice. Second Edition March 2012 (published for review and consultation through global learning fora). IUCN ESARO office, Nairobi.
- International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).** 2014. *Global Pastoralists Gathering report on 'transitioning to the green economy'.* Nairobi. (also available at: https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/global_pastoralists_gathering_report.pdf).
- Jåhkåmåhkke Declaration.** 2017. Jåhkåmåhkke Declaration on the Occasion of the 6th World Reindeer Herders' Congress, Jåhkåmåhkke/Johkamohkki, Sweden, 16–20 August 2017, Association of World Reindeer Herders (WRH), Johkamohkki, Sweden.
- Jerven, M.** 2013. Poor Numbers: How we are misled by African development statistics and what to do about it. Cornell University Press, New York.
- Khawaldeh, K.** 2016. Building the Arab pastoralist communities Network. *Farming Matters* 32(4) – Special Issue: Listening to Pastoralists.
- Kiserian Pastoralist Statement.** 2013. Statement of Pastoralist Leaders Gathered in Kiseria, Kenya, 15 December 2013.
- Koblenz-Ehrenbreitstein Declaration.** 2015. European Pastoralists Assembly organized by ESN in Koblenz, Germany (26-28 June 2015), European Pastoralists Assembly, Koblenz-Ehrenbreitstein.
- Kräkli S., Kaufmann, B., Roba H., Hiernaux P., Li W., Easdale M.C. & Hülsebusch C.** 2015. A House Full of Trap Doors; Identifying barriers to resilient drylands in the toolbox of pastoral development, Discussion Paper, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). London. (also available at: <https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10112IIED.pdf>).

Krätli, S. 2015. *Valuing variability: New Perspectives on climate resilient drylands development*. IIED. 92 pp. (also available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/10128IIED.html>).

LDF. 2007. Wilderswil Declaration on Livestock Diversity, Livestock Diversity Forum: Defending Food Sovereignty and Livestock Keepers' Rights. Wilderswil.

Liniger, H.P. & Mekdaschi Studer, R. 2019. Sustainable rangeland management in Sub-Saharan Africa – Guidelines to good practice. TerrAfrica; World Bank, Washington D.C.; World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT); World Bank Group (WBG), Washington DC, USA and Centre for Development and Environment (CDE), University of Bern, Switzerland.

Lukenya Pastoralist Declaration. 2016. Pastoralist Knowledge Hub Regional Meeting for Eastern and Southern Africa, in Lukenya (Kenya) on 21–22 January 2016, Lukenya, Kenya.

MARAG. 2011. Summary Report and Global Action Plan: Women pastoralists 2011–2013. Outcomes and Next Steps from the Global Gathering of Women Pastoralists. Mera, India, 21–26 November 2010.

Mathez, A. supervised by V. Ancey. 2019. The Institutionalization of Pastoralism at FAO. A focus on the Sahel Region. Understandings, circulation of ideas, and mobilization of capacities. Working paper, AGAG, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

Mera Declaration. 2010. Declaration of the Global Gathering of Women Pastoralists in Mera, Gujarat, India, 20 December 2010.

Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands (MDNKOAL). 2012. Sessional Paper No. 8 of 2012, on National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands, 'Releasing Our Full Potential'. Republic of Kenya, Nairobi.

Mottet, A. & Assouma, M.H. 2018. Feed balances in the Sahel – Methodological note. AGA – Animal Production and Health Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

N'Djamena Declaration. 2013. N'Djamena Declaration on the Contribution of Pastoral Livestock to the Security and Development of the Saharo-Sahelian Areas, Colloque Régional et Conférence Ministérielle, 27–29 May 2013, N'Djamena.

Nouakchott Declaration. 2013. Nouakchott Declaration of West Africa artisanal fisheries sector organizations. 29 October 2013.

Pastoralist Communication Initiative (PCI). 2005. Rain, Prosperity and Peace. Reporting from the Global Pastoralist Gathering, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)-Pastoralist Communication Initiative, Addis Ababa.

Pica-Ciamarra, U., Baker, D., Morgan, N., Zezza, A., Azzarri, C., Ly, C., Nsiima, L., Nouala, S., Okello, P. & Sserugga, J. 2014. Investing in the Livestock Sector. Why good numbers matter: A sourcebook for decision makers on how to improve livestock data. World Bank Report Number 85732-GLB, World Bank, Washington.

Pimbert, M. (ed.) 2017. Food Sovereignty, Agroecology and Biocultural Diversity: Constructing and contesting knowledge. Routledge, London and New York.

République du Niger. 2010. Ordonnance 2010-029 Relative au pastoralisme, Présidence de la République, Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage, Niamey.

Réseau Billital Maroobé (RBM). 2017. Gestion des connaissances, renforcement des espaces de dialogue et amélioration du plaidoyer et de la sensibilisation dans les régions de l'Afrique de

l'Ouest et du Centre dans le cadre du Système de gestion des données piloté par les éleveurs pasteurs». Rapport Final, Convention GCP/GLO/611/GER, Réseau Billital Maroobe, Niamey.

Scoones, I. 2019. What is uncertainty and why does it matter? STEPS Working Paper 105, STEPS Center, Brighton.

Teillard, F., Anton, A., Dumont, B., Finn, J.A., Henry, B., Souza, D.M., Manzano P., Milà i Canals, L., Phelps, C., Said, M., Vijn, S. & White, S. 2016. A review of indicators and methods to assess biodiversity – Application to livestock production at global scale. Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership. FAO, Rome.

The Cancun Statement. 2016. Promoting Sustainable Pastoralism and Livestock Production for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Grasslands and Rangelands. CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) COP 13, 14 December 2016, Cancun, Mexico

Toure I., Ickowicz, A., Wane, A., Garba, I. & Gerber, P. (eds). 2012. Système d'information sur le pastoralisme au Sahel. Atlas des évolutions des systèmes pastoraux au Sahel 1970–2012, CIRAD, FAO, Rome.

United Nations Development Programme- Global Drylands Imperative (UNDP-GDI). 2003. Pastoralism and mobility in the drylands. GDI Challenge Paper Series, The Global Drylands Imperative (GDI). United Nations Development Programme, Drylands Development Centre, Nairobi, Kenya.

United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA). 2016. Combating desertification, land degradation and drought and promoting sustainable pastoralism and rangelands. Second session of the United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, 23–27 May 2016. United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi.

Upton, C. 2013. The new politics of pastoralism: Identity, justice and global activism. *Geoforum* 54(0): 207–216.

WAMIP. 2007a. First Congress, La Granja, Segovia, Spain, 15–18 September 2007, WAMIP Secretariat, Segovia.

WAMIP. 2007b. Statutes, 18 September 2007, World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP), Segovia, Spain.

WAMIP. 2014. WAMIP in 2013 and 2014, World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples, Ahmedabad, India.

WISP. 2014. Steering Committee Report. March 2014. IUCN, Nairobi.

Weiler, A.M., Hergesheimer, C., Brisbois, B. Wittman, H., Yassi, A. & Spiegel, J.M. 2015. Food sovereignty, food security and health equity: A meta-narrative mapping exercise. *Health Policy and Planning* 30: 1078–1092.

Annexes

Annex 1. List of stakeholders interviewed

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca8007en/ca8007en.pdf>

Annex 2. Theory of change

<http://www.fao.org/3/ca8009en/ca8009en.pdf>

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy