

ANNEX 9:

Independent Assessment of FAO Emergency Livestock Interventions in Ethiopia: The Use LEGS as a Framework of Good Practice

Beruk Yemane

Independent Consultant

Addis Ababa

October 2010

Commissioned by the Office of Evaluation, FAO Rome.

Table of Contents

Acronyms	i
Summary	ii
Introduction	1
Background	1
Objective	1
Methodology	2
Common Standards as applied to the FAO funded drought emergency interventions	2
Minimum Standards as applied to the FAO funded drought emergency interventions	9
• Livestock Supplementary Feed	9
• Provision of Water	11
• Animal Health	12
Lessons learned	13
Use of LEGS as drought preparedness tool/standard	15
Annex 1: Measurement of Common Standards	
Annex 2: Measurement of Minimum Standards	
Annex 3. Methodology	
Annex 4: Terms of Reference	

Acronyms

AFD	Action for Development
AHA	Animal Health Assistant
CAHW	Community Animal Health Worker
CBPP	Contagious Bovine Pleuro Pneumonia
CCPP	contagious Caprine Pleuro Pneumonia
CF	Contingency Fund
CP	Contingency Plan
Ella	Traditional Deep Well
Et cal	Ethiopian Calendar
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (Ethiopia)
HHs	House Holds
Kebele	The lowest Administrative Unit
Konfi	Owners of the Ella
LoA	Letter of Agreement
LEGS	Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PAandRDB	Pastoral Agriculture and Rural Development Bureau (Region level)
PAandRDO	Pastoral Agricultural and Rural Development Office (woreda level)
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
SORDU	Southern Rangeland Development Project
TVET	Technical Vocational Education Training
Woreda	District
W-PDO	Woreda Pastoral Development Office

Community perception on the effect of drought

"The negative effect of drought on an individual is deeply felt when you migrate for long distance of about 150 Kms away from your family and village. At that critical and stressful time while you strive and put all your efforts in search of pasture and water to save your livestock you will have little time to think about your families back home".

Focused group discussion members, Dire woreda, Borena zone:

"At times of severe drought most able family members will move out of their village to save their lives and livestock while no one will remain behind to attend funeral ceremony and bury the dead ones".

Elder from Gewane woreda, Afar region:

Summary

The development of the livestock emergency guidelines and standards (LEGS) which is a companion document linked to the SPHERE Standard has involved the participation of key organizations and was launched in 2009. The LEGS as tool is expected to improve the design, quality and impact of livestock emergency interventions.

FAO as member of the Steering Group played important roles in the design and implementation of LEGS. As co-chair of the agriculture cluster in Ethiopia it has facilitated coordination amongst humanitarian agencies, supported the Livestock Working Group and has participated in the Livestock Policy Forum. It has also channeled financial resources to several emergency livestock operations in pastoral/agro-pastoral areas of Somali, Afar and Oromia Regions.

The objective of this assessment is to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes, and impacts if feasible, of FAO's work in support of emergency livestock responses in Amibara, Chifra and Gewane woredas of Afar region and Borena zone of Oromia region. The evaluation focuses on livestock feed, animal health and provision of water interventions.

In undertaking this evaluation both secondary and primary data sources have been employed. Primary data sources focused on participatory group discussion with pastoral community representatives in the study woredas and kebeles as well as target household beneficiaries using measurement indicators for common and minimum standards for each of the three interventions.

The measurement indicators used for the 8 common standards are **participation, initial assessment, response and coordination, targeting, monitoring, evaluation and livelihoods impact**, technical support and agency competencies, preparedness and advocacy and policy.

Findings from the assessment indicated that participation and initial assessments were mainly carried out by community representatives with little outside support. Response and coordination was facilitated by woreda and zone administration and pastoral development offices. FAO has contributed in the assessment, response and coordination process. However, implementation of response interventions was delayed by 3-4 months. Selection of activities and livestock types for the response has been done in participatory manner. Monitoring of activities was done by assigned technical staff from woreda and zone government offices with support from FAO field and Addis office.

Major benefits from the interventions included awareness creation, knowledge and skills acquired from the improved feeding and water rehabilitation works. The interventions with technical support from the relevant government offices and FAO have enabled community members to consider preparedness activities. Though FAO is one of the lead and capable institutions, no advocacy and policy work has been done as regards to the emergency interventions.

The 3 minimum Standards used for the evaluation are **livestock supplementary feed, rehabilitation of water points** and **animal health interventions**. The supplementary feed interventions focused on provision of multi-nutrient blocks (MNB) and baled hay in Afar and concentrate feed mix and baled hay in Borena.

Technical and logistics support from the woreda offices, technical and financial support from FAO field and Addis office have enabled the intervention to be more appropriate and beneficial. Target beneficiaries' involvement and participation and technical support and training from technical offices and FAO have enabled community to benefit from the supplementary feed intervention.

Provision of water is in the form of rehabilitation of traditional wells "ellas" in Borena and construction of new large size ponds in Afar. Participation and involvement of community members and target beneficiaries in Borena was high and very low in Afar. The support provided from technical government offices in Borena was highly appreciated and motivated community members from the adjacent kebeles to take proactive initiative in their respective kebeles. On the other hand, the big size ponds in Amibara and Gewane were constructed using heavy duty machineries with very little involvement from the community. This has resulted in very limited community participation. Besides, high seepage and evapo-transpiration has made water availability very minimal in the ponds.

The third intervention which is on animal health focused on vaccination for CBPP, CCPP and treatment for internal and external parasites. In Borena with the exception of shortage of CCPP vaccine the support from FAO has enabled CAHWs and private drug shop owners to work in harmony. In addition, allocation of fund for purchase of veterinary drugs by the Oromia pastoral development commission (OPDC) on revolving basis has encouraged CAHWs and private drug shop owners to work in close collaboration besides minimizing the shortage of drugs.

In Afar, the treatment of internal and external parasites was not properly implemented. The link between the cooperative drug shops and CAHWs both in Amibara and Gewane is weak. The only involvement of CAHWs was during vaccination for which they were paid per diem to provide the service. Currently, FAO's contribution to sort this problem is minimal and plan is underway for more engagement of CAHWs in animal health service delivery.

In the assessment process both important lessons that can positively contribute and lessons that were considered as challenges are extracted. In addition, with the aim of making best use of LEGS as drought preparedness tool/standard important issues worth of considering are highlighted in the text for future improvement.

1. Introduction

The Ethiopia Country Evaluation aims at improving the relevance and performance of FAO interventions, providing accountability and deriving lessons for better formulation and implementation in the future. The evaluation will focus on all interventions undertaken by FAO in Ethiopia over the period 2005-2010. Prominent within FAO's emergency response programme has been interventions addressing the particular needs of populations in the mainly pastoralist regions of Afar, Somali and Oromia, in which livestock play crucial livelihoods roles; 16 projects have had livestock themes, totaling approximately US\$ 10 million and accounting for about 15% of FAO's budgetary allocations to Ethiopia.

2. Background

The LEGS with the aim of improving the design, quality and impact of livestock interventions and its application as a tool for assessing adherence to the guidelines took over 5 years and was launched in 2009. The development of the livestock emergency guidelines and standards (LEGS) is linked to the Sphere project and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response (the Sphere handbook) involved high level of participation by a number of organizations.

As member of the Steering Group, FAO played important role in the design and implementation of LEGS. FAO is also co-chair of the agriculture cluster in Ethiopia, facilitated and coordinated information sharing and planning amongst humanitarian agencies. It has supported the Livestock Working Group, has participated in the Livestock Policy Forum and channeled financial resources to several emergency livestock operations in pastoral/agro-pastoral areas of Somali, Afar and Oromia Regions.

Therefore, this specific study focused on assessing the extent to which LEGS has been incorporated in the following livestock-based emergency projects namely,

OSRO/ETH/909/NOR in Amibara, Chifra and Gewane woredas of Afar region,
OSRO/ETH/803/CHA in Dire woreda, Borena zone of Oromia region and
OSRO/ETH/804/EC in Dire woreda, Borena zone of Oromia region.

Selection of the project interventions by FAO and its partners from needs assessment to implementation phases focused on livestock feed, animal health and provision of water.

3. Objective

The general objective of this assessment is to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes, and impacts if feasible, of FAO's work in support of emergency livestock responses in Ethiopia, using selected projects in the Afar and Oromia (Borena zone) Regions. The assessment specifically focused on ascertaining adherence to LEGS principles, practical applicability, impact on livestock

and livelihoods as well as drawing lessons for future improvement of LEGS to FAO and its partners

4. Methodology

In undertaking the evaluation both secondary and primary data sources have been employed (refer to Annex 3 for detail methodology).

4.1 Secondary data sources:

These included reference materials in the form of proposals, progress/ review/ evaluation reports, letter of agreements (LoA) and correspondences between partners/stakeholders.

4.2 Sources for the primary data included the following:

Two representative focus groups for each intervention type in animal health, Supplementary feed and water point rehabilitation in Amibara, Chifra and Gewane woredas of Afar region and Dire woreda of Borena zone, Oromia region of Ethiopia.

Both narrative and participatory techniques were used to obtain key information from woreda and zonal level partner agencies as well as focus groups in Amibara and Gewane woredas of Afar region, Dire woreda of Borena zone and FAO staff in Addis and the field.

5. Common Standards as applied to the FAO funded drought emergency interventions

5.1 Participation:

In the project intervention Kebeles of Dire woreda in Borena zone and Amibara and Gewane woreda of Afar region community members through the respective Kebele administration, elders, CAHWs and woreda veterinary personnel (for animal health interventions) have actively participated in supplementary feeding, animal health and rehabilitation of water points. According to community representatives there was little participation in pond construction in Andido kebele of Amibara woreda. Community members in Dire woreda in their Sunday regular meetings (no regular meetings in Amibara and Gewane) chaired by the respective kebele administrators have actively participated in analyzing the magnitude of the drought vis-a-vis, kebeles and community groups most affected; community coping mechanisms; government support and types of activities and resource required to respond to the drought. In Amibara and Gewane woredas of Afar region, community members organized by the respective kebele traditional elders met and discussed on the impact of the drought and on the types of drought response interventions that could be taken by the communities and woreda government administration. Compared with Dire woreda, the level of participation by communities in

Amibara and Gewane woredas was limited due to the little support from woreda administration and FAO. However, ideas proposed by community representatives were incorporated during the assessment phase.

The existing traditional system in Dire woreda has enabled good participation of women, youth and the disabled through their representatives. Vulnerable and affected HHS participated by reporting on the effect of drought that affected their livestock and livelihoods. Target HH beneficiaries have participated by providing ideas about construction of shelter for (centrally located feeding), feeding and watering breeding cows/ heifers. Using indigenous knowledge and skills, representative of community members in Dire woreda have participated in the design and site selection of pond and traditional wells (ellas) rehabilitation.

CAHWs in Dire woreda actively participated in assessing animal health risks, targeting HHs and livestock for vaccination and treatment of animals for internal and external parasites. However, in both pond construction and animal health intervention participation of community members and CAHWS in Amibara and Gewane was very limited. In general terms level of participation of communities in Dire woreda is strong compared to communities in Amibara and Gewane. This could be due to regular weekly meetings and strong leadership role by traditional and kebele administration in Dire woreda.

Contribution from the woreda pastoral development office (PDO) in Borena and Pastoral Agriculture and Rural Development Office (PA&RDO) in Afar) during the initial participation phase was limited. However, once information was communicated and reports submitted technical staff from the woreda offices provided facilitation support by deploying technical staff to enhance the participation in the assessment process. NGOs namely, Accord, AFD, Care, Gayo in Borena and FARM Africa in Afar) have participated by providing technical support and facilitating the participatory process in the respective area of operations. Contribution of FAO branch offices in Borena and Afar during the initial participatory phase was minimal.

5.2 Initial Assessment:

Community members (except those who migrated with livestock) through their respective kebele administration in Dire woreda took the initiative to undertake the initial assessment using the Sunday regular weekly meetings. In Amibara and Gewane woreda traditional elders with support from the Kebele administration took the initiative to conduct meetings and reach decision. In both areas communities with support from kebele administration discussed and made assessment on prevailing key humanitarian issues.

The assessment included, situation of pasture, water, animal health and the effect of drought on livestock and livelihoods, coping mechanisms, prevailing support from government and non-government actors and types of response interventions required. The assessment report compiled by the respective kebele administration was submitted to woreda administration and

woreda pastoral development office. In return, the respective Woreda offices sent subject matter specialists to verify the situation and report back to the woreda office. The technical staff in consultation with the kebele administration, representative of elders, youth and women groups and CAHWs made detailed assessments on the situation and identified priority drought response interventions.

Based on the urgency the woreda PDO in Borena and PAandRDO in Afar reported to the Zone Administration and PDO and PAandRDO for action. Depending on the severity the key response interventions requested by the community were provision of water, animal health and supplementary feed. The Zone Administration in collaboration with the Zone PDO and PAandRDO evaluated the report and organized partner and stakeholder meetings for action. FAO as secretariat of the emergency task force provided support in organizing regular stakeholders meetings, designing proposal for funding and availed technical staff for identified interventions to work closely with the woreda PDO and PAandRDO.

The average time gap from the initial request made by the community to the time of the assessment by woreda administration, the PDO and PandARDO ranged between 21-30 days. Likewise, it took one month for the zonal technical team to carry out an additional assessment following the submission of woreda report. Delay in finalizing the assessment process both at the woreda and zonal level is associated with poor coordination and resource limitations for logistics and technical staff arrangements.

5.3 Response and Coordination:

Led by the respective woreda and zone administration and facilitation by FAO branch office in Borena and Afar (Awash) timely response plan that included identification of specific Kebeles, number of affected HHs, type of interventions and resource required has been prepared. FAO in collaboration with NGOs facilitated harmonization of geographic location and activities.

In light of the progressing drought and response intervention delays by about three months, community members started taking action on their own. Key community actions included collection of dry grass and acacia tortilis pods for feeding to calves, weak and lactating cows; migrations to areas where pasture and water were relatively available; sell mature male, barren cows and shoats to generate cash for the purchase of food grains.

As secretary to Federal, regional and zonal emergency task forces, FAO in collaboration with relevant government and NGOs played active role in response and coordination that included organizing and leading the assessment team, designing sound emergency response proposals and submission to potential donors. The delay was due to poor coordination role played by government institutions, time taken to secure funds from donors and FAO procurement regulations at country level.

In implementing emergency responses, NGOs operating in Dire woreda of Borena zone and Amibara and Gewane woreda of Afar region used their own structures while FAO used the existing government structures from Federal to Woreda levels.

Prior to implementation of the drought response projects FAO has signed 7 different types of LoA with the relevant Federal, Regional, Zonal and woreda level government offices. This included, the National Veterinary Institute, Oromia Pastoral Development Commission and Afar Regional Water Development Bureau, Southern rangeland development project (SORDU) in Borena, PDO and PAandRDO at zone and woreda level in Borena and Afar respectively.

The response interventions supported by FAO and implemented by Dire Woreda PDO in Borena and PAandRDO in Amibara and Gewane in Afar included provision of veterinary drugs and vaccination, provision of supplementary concentrate feed and baled hay straw. For the rehabilitation of *ell*as and construction of ponds, financial support was provided to SORDU in Borena and the Regional Water Bureau in Afar respectively.

Regular coordination was provided by technically assigned focal persons at kebele levels (for supplementary feed, rehabilitation of water points and CAHWs), woreda PDO and PAandRDO (animal health and supplementary feed), SORDU (rehabilitation of water points) and regional water development Bureau in Ayssayta, capital of Afar region. Technical staff from the woreda regularly visited the kebeles on weekly basis. Overall coordination of the FAO supported projects was by FAO national livestock consultants in Addis and national livestock consultant in Borena zone and FAO representative in Afar. Other supports included capacity building for government offices in proposal development, fund raising, and training, provision of inputs such as veterinary drugs, supplementary feed.

5.4 Targeting:

Identification of activities, selection of vulnerable groups and targeting beneficiary HHs was done using the local Kebele structure. Kebele administration, representatives of elders, women and youth participated in selection of beneficiaries. Both in Dire, Amibara and Gewane the poor, women headed households and the disabled were given priority.

In both supplementary feed and animal health interventions attention was given to vulnerable and poor HHs, women headed HHs as well as HHs who can't look after their livestock due to old age and disability were given priority. For supplementary feeding target HHs were given the priority to select weak, lactating cows with calves and pregnant cows/heifers. In agro-pastoral Kebeles, target HHs were given equal opportunity to select breeding and farming bulls for supplementary feed intervention. Cattle seriously affected by internal and external parasites and CBPP were targeted for treatment and vaccination.

As targeting was one crucial area that required due attention, FAO in collaboration with the woreda PDO, kebele administration and traditional institution has played active role for fair targeting of the needy and the poor both in Dire Borena and Afar emergency projects.

5.5 Monitoring, Evaluation and Livelihoods Impact:

As part of the implementation process monitoring was undertaken by kebele administration, target HHs (animal health and supplementary feeding), and assigned focal persons in the respective kebeles. Technical staff from woreda PDO and PAandRDO, animal health technician from woreda veterinary office and technical water advisor from SORDU and Regional Water development Bureau have been monitoring progress on weekly basis. Target HHs both in Borena and Afar monitored implementation of project activities. FAO technical staffs from Yabello, Awash and Addis have been closely monitoring the projects on monthly regular basis.

During the participatory community discussion with target beneficiaries it was indicated that community members through the regular weekly meetings chaired by the Kebele administration In Dire woreda have made their own assessment on the outcome of the different interventions in terms of strength, limitations and draw lessons for future actions. The conclusion they reach was the different interventions have been useful and created awareness among the vulnerable target community in terms of preparedness for the future.

The benefits from the three focused livestock emergency interventions included, creating awareness and skills among target beneficiaries in commercial livestock feed and rehabilitation of improved *ellas* (Dire) and construction of large sized ponds (Amibara and Gewane). The livestock interventions collectively have impacted on survival of the breeding stock, enhance production in terms of milk, improved traction power for the bulls, reproduction (calving), and generate income from sale of milk and grain. However, according to community representatives participated in the interview no significant benefit obtained by the community from construction of large size ponds in Amibara and Gewane.

Improvement of *ellas*” has made access to water for animals easy, enabled pregnant and old women to move freely to access water with less difficulty and changing cattle trough and reservoir from mud to concrete cement, separation of sections for human and livestock water usage has made water more hygienic.

5.6 Technical Support and Agency Competencies :

One of the key areas of strength that has contributed to smooth implementation of the FAO funded projects was the training provided to technical staff in the application of LEGS. With the exception of SORDU staff in Borena and relevant government staff in Afar region the FAO national livestock consultants based in Addis and in their respective regions of operations (except newly recruited FAO staff in Afar) have participated in 2 days orientation training in

Awassa, Awash and Jigjiga. Government staffs in Yabello Zone and Dire woreda have participated in the training. One FAO staff has also participated in LEGS-ToT for 7 days organized by LEGS in Addis Ababa. Such chance has given the staff to acquaint themselves with the overall principles of LEGS in emergency project implementation and understand the links and historical transition from SPHERE to LEGS.

CAHWs in their respective kebeles (39 in 19 kebeles) of Dire woreda were closely supported by animal health technician of the woreda PDO who is currently working as private drug shop owner, trainer of CAHWs, and at the same time provider of vet drugs to CAHWs. With exception of vaccination programme there was no linkage between the CAHWs and woreda veterinary offices in Amibara and Gewane and hence no technical support to CAHWs.

The SORDU technical in collaboration with FAO staff provided support to the construction /rehabilitation of ponds/cisterns and traditional *ellas*. As a result, cattle troughs and reservoirs that were built out of mud were constructed with concrete cement that made separate sections for human and livestock water usage.

5.7 Preparedness:

The different emergency interventions taken by the community, NGOs, government and FAO have contributed in reducing the negative effect of drought on livestock and livelihood of the community. Some of the major preparedness measures the community and woreda level government offices have taken into account are the following:

I) Awareness created by community members on the possibility of future response interventions that could save their livestock. This included rehabilitation of ponds and use for calves and weak animals during the dry period, improvement of “*ellas*” as well as underground cisterns that can hold water for dry and drought period.

II) Most communities in the different kebeles of Dire woreda have increased the size of community pasture enclosures *Kalo* conserved during the rainy season to be used by calves, weak and milking or pregnant cows? ones during dry and drought period. Most community *Kallos* cover large areas up to 500 ha of communal land while privately enclosed *Kallos* in agro-pastoral homestead farms cover about 0.25 ha.

III) In agro-pastoral Kebeles of Dire woreda crop residues that used to be burnt after harvest to avoid tick infestation are currently collected and kept to for use as dry season feed supplement for livestock. Since collection of crop residues as source of supplementary feed for dry period is recent practice further assessment is needed on the relationship between burning crop residues and ticks infestation in the area.

IV) Though not representative of the whole pastoral/agro-pastoral community some individuals have sold few unproductive animals to buy concentrate feed, baled hay straw and water to save their precious breeding female animals. They indicated to follow the same in future drought.

Contingency plans: In Dire woreda community members led by the kebele council and elders have agreed and planned to rehabilitate non-functional ponds, improved “ellas” and construct additional underground cisterns where appropriate. In addition, with the aim of reducing pressure on the existing water points, some kebeles are watering their livestock by trekking 15-20 kms and use ellas owned by their clan.

The initiative taken by the Oromia regional state to institutionalize Woreda level contingency plan and contingency fund as component of the productive safety net programme (PSNP) could be cited as exemplary.

FAO’s contribution to drought preparedness at community and woreda level in Borena includes, promoting privatization of the veterinary service through establishment of private drug shop and linking them with CAHWs. In addition, technical support for the conservation of natural pasture and promotion of the use of supplementary feed that can be used during drought could be cited as encouraging move.

However, as recommended in the drought management cycle, linking the early warning phase with the actual implementation of emergency preparedness and response is not practiced at all.

5.8 Advocacy and Policy:

This indicator of the common standard has not been touched and looked in the implementation of the emergency drought response interventions. FAO as one of the lead institution has not acted on advocacy issues with the relevant government institutions or with donors on the following issues: i) cost recovery vet. drug supply, ii) institutionalizing LEGS in the pastoral regions, iii) consideration of principles human rights in emergency interventions.

(Score 1-10) 1 being the lowest and 10 the highest

As shown in the summary table above the overall score for the common standard for Borena in livestock feed, animal health and water is 5.04, 4.8 and 4.6. For Afar it is in the order of 4.8, 3.41 and 2.8 respectively (refer to Annex 1 for detail scores).

6.0 Minimum Standards as applied to the FAO funded drought emergency interventions

6.1 Livestock Supplementary Feed

Community representatives reported the depletion and shortage of pasture to the respective kebele and Woreda administration and W-PDO at the Alert phase of the drought cycle. Based on the recommendations of the assessment distribution of concentrate feed and baled hay was given to the poor who could not manage feeding livestock and women headed HHs. Since the amount of concentrate feed was limited the poorest of the poor and women headed HHs were given priority. Each targeted HH was allowed to feed one breeding female cow, or breeding/bull used for farming (agro-pastoral Kebeles). Each HH was provided supplementary feed (2 kgs of concentrate and 4 Kgs of baled hay/animal/day) freely for 90 days. Total of 1,773 female animals (1,773 HHs) were provided with 3,256 baled grass hay and 40 tons of concentrate feed in Dire woreda; in addition, a total of 4,889 cows and 2,445 she goats (1,629 HHs) were provided with 14,668 kilogram of MNB and 19,556 baled grass hay of 15/kgs for 90 days in Amibara and Gewane. Animals were either fed at home (such as in Medacho Kebele, Dire and Amibara and Gewane of Afar) or in feed camps (Haralo Dire).

FAO assigned field personnel to monitor distribution and proper usage of the feed. Since the number of malnourished animals was many beneficiary HHs admitted sharing the feed to other animals. Beneficiaries that fed their animals in central feed camps participated in construction of sheds, feeding and water troughs as well as keeping the animals at night from predators. This was too tasking for beneficiaries and they suggested that the home-based approach is better.

Monitoring was done by beneficiary HHs supported by focal person assigned by FAO in each feed distribution sites. For home based feeding the distribution was one qt/animal/month while daily group feeding took place in central location sites. However, most of the discussants have admitted that due to shortage of feed in the area they have shared the feed to non-targeted animals which they have found it justified and beneficial (this has been mentioned above). The main benefit of the supplementary feeding intervention was survival of the breeding stock. Convinced by the benefits of the supplementary feed few individuals from Dire woreda (with little self motivation from Amibara and Gewane pastoral community) bought concentrate feed and fed breeding stocks in their respective kebeles.

Preparedness options community have deployed included: identifying supply sources for concentrate feed and baled hay; selling more barren cows and old bulls compared to previous year; hay making and conservation of crop residues and byproducts and the conservation of pasture in kallos for the dry period.

Case Stories	
i)	A bull owned by Shuno Hallake from Medacho kebele, Dire woreda got broken and couldn't move. Shuno bought 50 kg of concentrate feed ETB 70 and fed the bull for two weeks. The bull that was fed acacia pod earlier refused to take the pods and got used to the concentrate feed and got well on the third week.
ii)	Tune Huike, 52 years of age, married and with 8 children is residing in Harralo kebele, Dire woreda. He was one of the beneficiaries that fed his poor conditioned breeding bull for 90 days until the next rainy season that saved the life of his bull. At the onset of the rain the body condition of the bull improved and sold the bull for ETB 4,000 to cover the wedding ceremony of his eldest son.

6.2 Provision of Water

With exceptions of Andido and Gewane kebele in Afar, all water construction and rehabilitation activities have given due consideration to community participation. In targeting for traditional well ella users all community members through their respective kebele administration, representatives of elders, women and youth groups actively participated in the assessment including types of intervention for sites identified. In the construction of new ponds or rehabilitation of 3 old ellas in Dire woreda poor men and women HHs were given priority to work as laborers. Men participated in digging during the night while women cart the soil during the day. Technical support was provided by SORDU and FAO staff in the form of developing work norm and leadership guidance. In addition, huge improvement has been made to increase the water yield from the ellas, increasing the width and reducing the slope to ease access for livestock and humans. On the other hand, participation of target communities in the construction of 4 new large sized ponds (2 in Amibara and 2 in Gewne) was only limited to site selection. Actual construction was done by government institution with supervision by the regional Water Resources Development Bureau. Even though, the Afar regional PARD bureau strategy and priority is for large sized ponds in zone 3 of Afar the four ponds that were constructed are below standard and made little effort for the application of common and minimum standards of LEGS. Currently, there is no water in 3 of the 4 ponds, the basement soil is prone to seepage and the inside and outside of the ponds have cracked and are in bad shape requiring immediate maintenance work.

Priority of the water use from improved *ellas* in Dire woreda is given to the owners *Konfi* of the well and their clan members. With the aim of reducing the pressure on the existing water points at times of critical water shortage weak animals, lactating cows, pregnant females and calves will be given to use the nearby ponds and ellas with in the kebele. Mature male animals will move to areas where water availability is relatively better covering a range of 12- 15 kms outside the kebele. In addition, other clans coming from other areas will negotiate and get permission to access water from the wells.

Case example
In Higo kebele of Dire woreda during 2008/09 pasture was available while water shortage was critical. The rehabilitation of 2 “ellas” made water and pasture available in the area and as result over 132,000 heads of cattle that migrated from Northern Kenya in search of water and pasture benefited from the resources and saved the lives of their cattle.

Cognizant of the severity of the drought and its negative consequences communities are engaged in di-silting of old and construction of new ponds, improving old ellas using better skills and sanitation work. Based on the technical skill acquired from SORDU and FAO staff the Dachitu clan in Higo kebele, Dire woreda have already contributed 40 cattle to cover the labor work for the rehabilitation of the old ella.

6.3 Animal Health

Initial reporting was done by individual pastoral HHs reporting to the Kebele CAHWS (total 39 in the Woreda of which 5 are women) on the disease situation in the respective sites in Dire woreda. In return, CAHWs report to the woreda PDO for further assessment and action. In Amibara and Gewane woreda active engagement of CAHWs was limited at initial stage. Assessment was done with community representatives of Kebele chairperson, elders, women and youth groups during the alert and alarm phases of the drought cycle where analysis of the drought situation compared to the previous droughts was done in participatory manner including severe droughts” Berchina” in Borena. Assessment in both Dire and Amibara and Gewane included types of diseases triggered by drought in particular, internal and external parasites, outbreaks of CBPP and CCPP, types of animals affected, disease distribution in each of the Kebeles.

Source of vaccine for CBPP and CCPP was delivered free of charge by FAO from the National Veterinary Institute, Debre Zeit to the woreda PDO and PAandRDO. In return W-PDO distributed to each kebele and CAHWs with supervision from the animal health technicians undertook the vaccination. In Amibara and Gewane involvement of CAHWs was only limited to vaccination and were not involved in treating animals. Mortality of goats was accounted on shortage of CCPP vaccine creating dissatisfaction among the owners. Goats that died from CCPP were skinned and consumed by the respective owners. Even though eating of goats died of CCPP should be discouraged, when asked discussant groups in Samaro and Haralo Kebeles in Dire woreda replied that they are well aware on the types of diseases that are transmitted to human from infected dead animals.

Drugs were supplied from different sources including the OPDC of Oromia region, regional PAandRDB of Afar, FAO and NGOs operating in the respective woredas. Drugs mainly provided by Afar regional PAandRDB and NGOs were given free of charge while the drugs from FAO and OPDC were on cost recovery basis. Provision of free drugs creates dependency among the pastoral community and demoralizes CAHWs who are providing the service on cost recovery

basis and creates inconsistency among humanitarian actors. The money generated from sale of the drugs in Dire woreda is collected and deposited in the woreda government account GOV-674 and the money generated from sale of drugs provided by OPDC amounting to ETB 30,000 is deposited in government account GOV-AC0171640583200 for future use on revolving basis.

The procurement and delivery of vaccines and drugs was relatively fast. However, implementation was slow due to logistics and shortage of operational expenses at woreda level. The key challenges associated with animal health interventions in Dire, Amibara and Gewane woreda include absence of deep freezers for storage of vaccines, shortage of CCPV vaccines, and lack of earmarked contingency fund at woreda level.

Encouraging result has been observed through the provision of veterinary drugs to CAHWs in different Kebeles of Dire woreda. Availability of drugs has been possible with the fund allocated by the OPDC. Currently, ETB 30,000 is allocated for purchase of drugs for each woreda on revolving basis. On the contrary, the CAHWs in Amibara and Gewane woreda are not given due attention and only engaged in vaccination campaigns. There is no linkage between CAHWs and private/cooperative drug shop owners in Amibara and Gewane woredas.

Summary of scores for the three minimum standard interventions (Score 1-10) 1 being the lowest and 10 the highest.

Intervention	Adherence to LEGS		Contribution of FAO	
	Borena	Afar	Boerne	Afar
Livestock supplementary feed	5.5	5.5	8	8
Provision of Water	6.1	3.7	6	2
Animal health	5.5	3.8	5	3
Overall Score	5.7	4.3	6.3	4.3

As shown in the summary table above the overall score for the minimum standard in terms of adhering to LEGS for the three interventions in Borena is 5.7 while that of Afar is 4.3. The over all contribution of FAO to the three interventions in Borena is rated at 6.3 and for Afar 4.3 respectively (refer to Annex 2 for details).

7.0 Lessons learned

The section is divided into lessons from the positive contribution and lessons from challenges:

7.1 Lessons from the positive contribution

7.1.1 Rehabilitation and Improvement of traditional Ellas: With the aim of facilitating the rehabilitation work, save time and monitor daily work strong and energetic young men were selected to do the rehabilitation work and digging was done by men at night while carting of the soil was done by women during the day. Such arrangement besides allowing more beneficiaries to participate and benefit from labor work, increase work efficiency and allow women to stay and work at home.

7.1.2 Allocation of contingency fund: Cognizant the fact that drought is recurring in the pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of Borena zone the regional government has institutionalized the setting aside of contingency fund as integral component of the woreda PSNP in Borena zone. Access to the emergency fund will primarily focus on drought preparedness, public works such as maintenance of roads, bush clearing, new pond and ella construction, soil conservation, animal health and cash grants to elderly and disabled HHs. The woreda council is the governing body for the approval and release of the contingency fund. Budget is already earmarked and the contingency fund will be put in action in 2010/11(2003 ET-Cal).

7.1.3 Home based supplementary feeding: The lessons learned for supplementary feeding of livestock has shown that home based approach is preferred to feeding at centrally located sites. Key justifications given were time saving, reducing work load, and avoidance of conflict among livestock and proper attention for feeding individual animals.

7.1.4 Self Initiated response interventions: At times of critical drought and delay in response intervention by government, organized individuals and groups take their own response measures. Groups from the kebele (Hodod samaro, Dire woreda) bought water tanker of 12,000 lts capacity from Ramso kebele at ETB 1,000 (ETB 800 truck rental and ETB 200 for fuel). The water was filled in individual underground cisterns and also in plastic Roto containers for drinking purpose. Such community based initiative should be encouraged and those taking the lead should be recognized as role models and need to be motivated.

7.2 Lessons from Challenges

7.2.1 Delay in response interventions: Assessment to project implementation phase took between 4- 6 months. The time from assessment to securing funding from key donors took about three months while the implementation process involving staff recruitment, office setting, signing of agreement with regional and woreda government offices as well as provision of inputs to the project site took on the average additional 2-3 months.

7.2.2 Tight rules and regulations in procurement process by FAO: The FAO procurement process at country level with budget ceiling of up to USD 150,000 takes an average of 1 to 1 ½ months. On the other hand, the procurement budget ceiling above USD 150,000 that requires approval from Rome will take more than 2 months which delays timely implementation of drought response projects.

7.2.3 Limited capacity and lack of ethical compliance by local suppliers: Some of the local bidders that were awarded the supply of veterinary drugs and equipment and concentrate feed don't comply with the agreed standards and meet delivery time. Non-ethical compliance besides affecting timely implementation of LEGS compromise with quality and standards of drugs, feeds and also lack of trust by beneficiary community on implementing agencies.

7.2.4 Consumption of goat meat died of CCPP disease: Discussant groups in Dire woreda have indicated that they eat goat meat that died of CCPP. They have also indicated that they are aware of the danger of eating meat died of other infectious diseases that can be transmitted to human. Despite this fact, no action was taken either to burn or bury the carcass. This could be partly due to lack of awareness by the community but implementing agencies should have acted differently.

7.2.5 Advocacy in human rights and humanitarian principles: FAO as one of the lead UN body is not strong in advocate on the subject. As key role player and emergency task force secretariat at Federal, Regional and zonal level should have strong voice on the right issues and humanitarian principles. With other international humanitarian, development and advocacy agencies FAO can lobby for the realization of more disaster risk management (DRM) strategies, programmers and projects. Even though it is difficult to raise and lobby key humanitarian principles in the current country context issues related to safety, standard, gender equality, timely preparedness and response need to be raised and advocated.

7.2.6 Free vs cost recovery emergency inputs: Free supply of drugs by NGOs has created inconvenience among animal health service providers in particular CAHWs and private drug shop owners. Likewise, though not widely practiced free distribution of supplementary feed in the form of concentrate feed and hay has been raised as an issue by private feed suppliers. FAO

in collaboration with government and NGOs has the experience and capacity to address this issue.

7.2.7 Different payment system: the approaches followed by different agencies namely, FAO, SORDU, NGOs, PCDP and government supported PSNP in Borena zone for the same type and volume of work has created inconvenience to implement certain types of activities. As an example, FAO pays ETB 8.00 for the actual work of 0.31 M3/day for digging and clearing the soil from the ellas while PCDP pays ETB 12.00/day, PSNP pays ETB 12.00/day and SC-US pays ETB 15/day for the same amount and volume of work. Harmonization of payment for similar types of activities will facilitate smooth implementation of drought response projects and FAO in collaboration with the relevant government and NGO actors can address the issue.

8.0 Use of LEGS as drought preparedness tool/standard

8.1 Training on LEGS: The training provided for ToT on LEGS has enabled trainees to understand the key principles and on how to apply them in pre, during and post drought scenario. However, with the view of meaningful and practical application of LEGS, those who are given the training have indicated that those who will be involved as ToT should have good background with practical field experience in the respective minimum standards.

8.2 I Private sector engagement in drought response interventions. With the aim of timely response and ensuring future preparedness interventions LEGS should give due attention to private sector engagement in specific areas of the minimum standards. Valid experience can be drawn from the current interventions in animal health, supplementary feeding and rehabilitation of water points. Provision of capacity support that strengthen the linkage between the private sector and community based institutions would promote self reliance and enhance timely preparedness and action at local level.

8.3 The need to simplify the LEGS indicators and focus on key and few indicators: Based on the practical field level experience in 12 kebeles in Dire, Amibara and Gewane woreda with over 125 community discussant groups the average time the groups will discuss actively is about 2 hours. Discussion that took more than 2 ½ hrs was not productive in that either some member left the meeting or felt bored for active participation. Given this fact the key indicators both under the common and minimum standards need to be simplified with few questions to be discussed with community groups so that the total discussion time should not exceed 2- 2 ½ hrs/day.

8.4 Institutionalize LEGS in government institutions: Relevant government and NGO staffs who are working in drought response and preparedness interventions require more exposure and training in project designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In order to realize this, TVET colleges and government offices in Afar and Borena need exposure training in LEGS

linked to drought cycle management and SPHERE standard. National institutions contracted by FAO can provide the training.

8.5 Engagement of the private sector: The support in terms of providing technical and financial means by FAO to CAHWs and private drug shop owners and linking them to ensure sustainable animal health delivery service is encouraging. Likewise, support and linkage private commercial feed processing agencies with OPDC, W-PDO and research center will contribute to the improvement of livestock production.

Annex 1.

Measurement of Common Standards 1: Participation

Indicators	Borena Zone)			Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water provision	
Participation of vulnerable groups in assessment	6	5	5	5	3	3	
Documentation of indigenous knowledge and pre-existing livestock services	N.A	5	5	N.A	3	3	
Recognition of social or cultural norms	4	5	6	3	4	2	
Dialogue around implementation options	6	6	6	5	4	3	
Overall score	5.3	5.3	5.5	4.3	3.5	2.8	

Common Standard 1: Participation: All specific sub-sets and vulnerable groups in a population are identified, informed that an assessment and possible intervention(s) will take place, and encouraged to participate in the assessment process (see guidance notes 1 and 2).

- Key indigenous livestock production and health knowledge and practices, and pre-existing livestock services are documented and used to ensure the sustainability of inputs (see guidance note 3).
- Interventions are based on an understanding of social and cultural norms (see guidance note 4).
- Provisional programme inputs and implementation approaches are discussed with community representatives and/or community groups representing the range of population sub-sets and vulnerabilities (see guidance note 5).

Measurement of Common Standards 2: Initial Assessment

Indicators	Borena				Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision		Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water provision	
Systematic participatory inquiry using trained workers and triangulation	4	5	5		3	3	2	
Findings disaggregated by populations subsets & vulnerable groups	6	6	5		6	3	2	
Protection issues covered	5	5	5		5	N.A	2	
Strategy for involvement of local service providers defined, with exit strategy	4	4	5		N.A	3	2	
Possible policy or regulatory constraints identified	N.A	3	3		N.A	2``	2	
Overall score	4.75	4.6	4.6		4.6	2.75	2.0	

Common Standard 2: Initial Assessment

- The assessment covers the key topics outlined in Chapter 2, uses systematic, participatory inquiry conducted by trained workers; and triangulates findings with pre-existing technical data when available (see guidance note 1).
- Findings are disaggregated by population subsets and vulnerable groups.
- The assessment reviews the capacity of relevant authorities to protect populations in the territory under their control, and includes an analysis of the operational environment and the protection implications of different livestock interventions (see guidance note 2).
- The assessment clearly describes existing local service providers, explains if and how the interventions will work with these actors, and defines an exit strategy intended to maximize the sustained use of local services and markets (see guidance note 3).
- The assessment includes a rapid analysis of national policies and regulations which may prevent certain interventions, and reviews the capacity of local regulatory bodies to enforce official rules and regulations (see guidance note 4).

Measurement of Common Standards 3: Response and Coordination

Indicators	Borena					Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision			Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Livestock inputs don't hinder direct human life saving support	5	5	5			5	4	3	
Livestock interventions coordinated and harmonized	6	5	5			5	3	2	
Agencies without livestock expertise invite livestock agencies in	6	5	5			5	3	2	
Integration of livestock inputs with non-livestock support	5	5	4			5	3	2	
Coordination of emergency and development initiatives	5	5	5			5	3	3	
Overall score	5.0	5.0	4.8			5.0	3.2	2.4	

Common Standard 3: Response and Coordination

- Where people's lives are at risk, livestock interventions do not hinder life-saving humanitarian responses (see guidance note 1).
- Livestock interventions are coordinated to ensure harmonized approaches between agencies, and according to agreed implementation strategies (see guidance note 2).
- When an agency cannot conduct a livestock assessment or respond to livestock needs, it makes these deficits known to other agencies which may have the capacity for livestock responses (see guidance note 3).
- Where possible, livestock interventions are integrated with other types of humanitarian assistance to maximize impact and ensure efficient use of shared resources (see guidance note 4). & Coordination is prioritised by all stakeholders, including the harmonisation of donor and government approaches, for both emergency response and longer term development initiatives (see guidance note 5).

Measurement of Common Standards 4: Targeting

Indicators	Borena					Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision			Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Targeting according to vulnerability, & criteria defined & disseminated	7	6	6			7	4	3	
Targeting approach agreed with community	6	5	5			5	4	5	
Overall score	6.5	5.5	5.5			6.0	4.0	4.0	

Common Standard 4: Targeting

- Targeting criteria are based on an understanding of the actual or potential uses of livestock by vulnerable groups, and the criteria are clearly defined and widely disseminated (see guidance note 1).
- Targeting mechanisms and the actual selection of beneficiaries is agreed with communities, including representatives of vulnerable groups (see guidance note 2).

Measurement of Common Standards 5: Monitoring, Evaluation and Livelihoods Impact

Indicators	Borena					Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision			Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Rapid, early set up of an M&E system	5	5	4			5	3	2	
M&E is participatory	5	5	4			5	N.A	N.A	
Frequency of monitoring is appropriate	5	5	4			5	N.A	N.A	
Monitoring uses both process and impact indicators	4	4	N.A			4	N.A	N.A	
Evaluation is conducted	5	5	N.A			5	N.A	N.A	
Livelihoods impact is assessed	5	4	N.A			5	N.A	N.A	
Coordination body has programme-wide M&E system	5	4	N.A			5	N.A	N.A	
M&E facilitates learning	5	4	4			5	N.A	N.A	
Overall score	4.9	4.5	4.0			4.9	3.0	2.0	

Common Standard 5: Monitoring, Evaluation and Livelihoods Impact

- A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system is established as soon as possible during implementation (see guidance note 1)
- M&E systems are based on participation by the beneficiary communities as much as is feasible and appropriate (see guidance note 2)
- Monitoring is conducted with sufficient frequency to enable rapid detection of required changes and modification of implementation (see guidance note 3).
- The monitoring system combines both technical progress indicators, and impact indicators identified by beneficiaries; impact indicators are measured by beneficiaries working with agency staff (see guidance note 4).
- An evaluation is conducted with reference to the stated objectives of the project, and combines measurement of technical indicators and community-defined indicators (see guidance note 4).

- Impact is assessed according to changes in the livelihoods of the affected communities (see guidance note 5)
- When multiple agencies are involved in livestock interventions, M&E systems are standardised to allow programme-wide progress and impact to be measured; M&E reports are shared with all relevant actors, including community groups and coordination bodies (see guidance note 6).
- M&E systems facilitate learning by all stakeholders (see guidance note 7)

Measurement of Common Standards 6: Technical Support and Agency Competencies

Indicators	Borena					Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision			Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Livestock workers have both technical knowledge & participatory skills	6	6	6			6	6	4	
Livestock workers are familiar with human rights & humanitarian principles	5	4	3			4	4	2	
Livestock workers are familiar with livelihoods-based programming	6	6	5			5	5	4	
Overall score	5.3	5.3	4.7			5.0	5.0	3.3	

Common Standard 6: Technical Support and Agency Competencies

- Livestock workers possess relevant technical qualifications, and the knowledge and skills to conduct rapid participatory assessments and joint planning of interventions with all relevant population subsets and vulnerable groups (see guidance note 1).
- Livestock workers are familiar with human rights and humanitarian principles, and their relevance to livestock interventions (see guidance note 2).
- Livestock workers are familiar with the principles of livelihoods-based programming (see guidance note 2).

Measurement of Common Standards 7: Preparedness

Indicators	Borena				Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision		Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Use of DRR	5	5	4		5	3	2	
Reviews of disasters	4	5	5		4	3	3	
Contingency plans & triggers	5	5	5		5	4	4	
CP anticipates admin & procurement issues	5	5	3		5	3	3	
For drought, the CP uses drought cycle management	3	3	3		3	2	2	
Community preparedness	6	5	5		6	2	2	
Overall score	4.6	4.6	4.2		4.6	2.8	2.6	

Common Standard 7: Preparedness

- Disaster risk reduction (DRR) informs and forms part of agencies' emergency planning and implementation (see guidance note 1)
- Agencies with long-term development programmes conduct regular reviews of past disasters in their operational area with regard to the type of disaster, frequency, severity and lessons learnt from disaster response, if any (see guidance note 2).
- Based on this information, agencies develop contingency disaster plans with clearly-defined triggers for action and the subsequent release of funds and other resources (see guidance note 2).
- Contingency plans take into account the agency's procurement and administrative procedures and any obstacles to potential future emergency responses are addressed (see guidance note 3)
- Contingency plans for drought are based on the principles of drought cycle management and early response, with appropriate sequencing of interventions (see guidance note 4).
- Communities are encouraged to prepare for future emergencies (both rapid and slow onset) (see guidance note 5)
- All emergency intervention plans are accompanied by an exit strategy which links with post-disaster recovery and long-term support to livelihoods (see guidance note 6)

Measurement of Common Standards 8: Advocacy and Policy

Indicators	Borena					Afar			
	Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision			Livestock Feed	Animal health	Water Provision	
Policy constraints identified	4	5	4			4	3	3	
Policy constraints are addressed	N.A	3	3			N.A	3	3	
Policy analysis & action respond to vulnerability	N.A	N.A	N.A			N.A	N.A	N..A	
M&E provides evidence for policy dialogue	N.A	3	3			N.A	3	3	
Overall score	4.0	3.6	3.3			4.0	3.0	3.0	

Common Standard 8: Advocacy and Policy

- Policy constraints affecting the protection, use or rebuilding of livestock assets are identified (see guidance note 1)
- In coordination with other stakeholders, and as appropriate in the context, policy constraints are addressed through advocacy or other activities at the relevant (local, national, regional, international) level (see guidance note 2)
- Policy analysis and action considers the underlying causes of vulnerability to disaster (see guidance note 3)
- Monitoring and evaluation systems provide evidence which contributes directly to policy dialogue and advocacy (see guidance note 4)

ANNEX 2: MEASUREMENT OF MINIMUM STANDARDS

Livestock feed, Water Points Development and Animal health Interventions

Measurement of Livestock Feed: Standard 1 Assessment

Indicators	Borena	Afar
The status of the feed resources during pre-disaster are assessed (see guidance note 1)	6	5
Indigenous mechanisms for livestock supplementary feed management are assessed (see guidance note 2)	4	3
The social and cultural aspects of livestock supplementary feed and suitability to target beneficiaries are considered (see guidance note 3)	6	5
Water and veterinary services provisions are assessed side by side with supplementary feed	6	4
The probable impact of the purchase of supplementary livestock feed from local market sources is assessed (see guidance note 5)	6	4
The cost-effectiveness of supplementary livestock feed (i.e availability of raw materials, cost of production and transportation) from outside sources is assessed in comparison with other possible interventions (see guidance note 4)	5	5
The potential risks & not to discourage local feed producers are assessed (see guidance note 8)	N.A	N.A
The feed ingredients and residual effect of supplementary feed impacting on livestock and the environment is assessed (see guidance note 7)	N.A	N.A
The impact of the livestock supplementary feed on improving body condition, milk and weight gain assessed.	6	6
The security implications of the provision of livestock as assessed and livestock provision only takes place when the security of the stock and the beneficiary populations can be assured (see guidance note 10)5	5	5
Overall score	5.5	4.6

Measurement of Livestock feed: Standard 2 Definition of the package

Indicators	Borena	Afar
The design of supplementary livestock feed interventions takes account of indigenous systems of supplementation (see guidance note 1)]	5	5
Is the supplementary livestock feed interventions the first of its kind in the area?	5	5
Selection of beneficiaries is based on need, local participation and practice (see guidance note 2).	7	7
The type and quantity & quality of supplementary livestock feed provided are appropriate to support maintenance of livestock and adapted to local conditions (see guidance note 3)	5	5
The supplementary feed is distributed at appropriate locations and times (see guidance note 4)	5	5
Overall score	5.4	5.4

Measurement of Livestock feed: Standard 3 Credit, procurement, transport & delivery

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Procurement is based on local purchase where possible (see guidance note 1)	4	7
Procurement takes place according to agreed criteria, and in accordance with legal procurement procedures (see guidance note 2)	6	6
Quality inspection takes place at the time of purchase, delivery and feeding (see guidance note 3)	4	4
Supplementary feed are provided under critical feed shortage where it doesn't discourage local production and that will encourage future self reliance by building capacity of the household to meet future needs as opposed to provided free gift (see guidance note 4)	6	6
Transport is planned in advance to minimise risk of losses in transit and based on conditions that ensure the well-being of the stock (see guidance note 5)	6	6
Overall score	5.2	5.8

Measurement of Livestock feed: Standard 4 Additional support

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Quality control is provided prior to the supplementary feed distribution (see guidance note 1)	N.A	N.A
Training and capacity building support is provided to beneficiaries in livestock supplementary feed based on an analysis of skills and knowledge of animal husbandry (see guidance note 3)	6	6
Training and capacity building includes preparedness for future shocks and disasters (see guidance note 4)	5	5
Food security needs are identified and met according to the Minimum Standards in Food Security, Nutrition and Food Aid (Sphere Handbook), in order to prevent early off-take of livestock (see guidance note 5)	N.A	N.A
Storage and distribution sites/locations are similarly identified and met according to the Minimum Standards on Shelter, Settlement and Non-food Items (Sphere Handbook) (see guidance note 6)	N.A	N.A
Water and veterinary service & other economic activities provided simultaneously with the supplementary feed to the target livestock to enable independence from such support (see guidance note 7)	7	7
Overall score	6.0	6.0

Measurement of Water Intervention: Standard 1 Assessment

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Status of water resources during pre-disaster are assessed	7	7
Indigenous mechanisms for emergency water interventions are assessed	6	6
The social & cultural aspects to livestock water interventions are considered	7	7
Water, feed and veterinary service care are assessed and considered side by side with water intervention	6	6
Cost effectiveness of the water interventions (i.e availability of local materials, production and transpiration) as compared to other possible interventions and sources	5	3

The impact of water intervention on environment and security of the user groups are considered	6	3
Sanitation and hygiene aspects during and post water interventions are considered	6	3
The impact of the water interventions on livestock and humans	6	3
Overall score	6.0	3.9

Measurement of water intervention: Definition of the Package

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Design of the water interventions takes account of indigenous water systems	8	3
Is the water intervention the first of its kind	3	7
Selection of beneficiaries is based on need, local participation and practice	7	4
Involvement & participation of women, disabled & other disadvantaged groups	6	3
The water interventions are located in appropriate site and times	7	3
Amount and quality of water provided are sufficient to support both human and livestock needs	5	3
Overall score	6.0	3.8

Measurement of Water intervention 3 Public Health & Security

Indicators	Borena	Afar
The water interventions designed and implemented ensuring public health concerns	7	3
Water intervention usage and management considers human and livestock needs and hygiene and sanitation aspects	7	3
Involvement of government institutions in the training and future follow-up of the water interventions	6	4
Water interventions considered intra & inter clan conflict sensitivity	6	4
Quality inspection takes place during water interventions at different intervals on regular basis	5	3

Overall score	6.2	3.4
----------------------	------------	------------

Measurement of Veterinary Care: General Standard

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Rapid participatory assessment and prioritisation of veterinary needs is conducted involving all relevant subgroups within a disaster-affected population, and in partnership with local veterinary authorities and service providers, if present (see guidance note 1).	7	5
All existing veterinary service providers are mapped within the disaster-affected area and analysed in terms of current capacity, and potential capacity if assisted by aid agencies (see guidance note 2).	5	N.A
The assessment includes analysis of service providers before the disaster with regard to payment for services (see guidance note 2).	5	N.A
The assessment includes a rapid analysis of policy or legal factors which may hinder or enable specific implementation strategies (see guidance note 3).	5	3
Overall score	5.5	4.0

Measurement of Veterinary Care: Primary Clinical Veterinary Services

Indicators	Borena	Afar
The service design process follows on directly from the initial assessment, uses the information and analyses of the assessment, and is based on the active participation of the disaster-affected population, including vulnerable groups (see guidance note 1).	6	4
The design of the service includes specific elements to reach vulnerable groups and in particular addresses challenges of accessibility and affordability (see guidance note 2).	6	3
Service design considers the need for rapid procurement and availability of relevant veterinary vaccines and medicines, and the need for appropriate quality of products and proper storage at field level (see guidance note 3).	5	3
Service design includes provision of rapid training to local service providers as necessary (see	5	4

guidance note 4).		
Service design is based on local social and cultural norms, particularly in relation to gender roles (see guidance note 5).		
Service design maximises the security of local people, veterinary service providers and aid agency staff (see guidance note 6).	5	3
The roles and responsibilities of all actors are clearly documented and where appropriate and necessary, form the basis of written agreements (see guidance note 7).	6	4
Overall score	5.5	3.5

Measurement of Veterinary Care: Veterinary Public Health (Rift Valley fever vaccination)

Indicators	Borena	Afar
An assessment of zoonotic diseases and their prioritisation is included in the initial assessment of animal health problems (see guidance note 1).	N.A	N.A
Zoonotic disease control measures are designed and implemented either in conjunction with the provision of clinical services, or as stand-alone activities (see guidance note 2).	N.A	N.A
Overall score		

Measurement of Veterinary Care: Sanitation and food hygiene (in relation to slaughter destocking or carcass disposal)

Indicators	Borena	Afar
Sick or injured animals requiring euthanasia are euthanized humanely and safely, and disposed of to ensure good hygiene (see guidance note 1).	N.A	N.A
In protracted crises, slaughter slabs are constructed (see guidance note 2).	N.A	N.A
Meat inspection procedures are established at slaughter slabs and abattoirs used by the disaster-affected population (see guidance note 2).	N.A	N.A
Overall score	N.A	N.A

ANNEX 3: METHODOLOGY

Both secondary and primary sources that were employed to undertake this evaluation are:

Secondary data sources: These included reference materials in the form of proposals, progress/ review/ evaluation reports, correspondences between partners/stakeholders etc that are used to gather information on:

- *Background of the projects;*
- *Establishing timeline between needs identification/assessment and implementation phases vis-à-vis the stage of the drought cycle*
- *Speed of implementation as related to provision of key emergency inputs including finance to project sites/implementing partners*
- *Level of coordination between FAO and implementing partners*
- *Technical capacity of partner agencies*
- *Identification of major constraints as identified by FAO or partner agencies (e.g. policy, logistics, local politics, delays in the delivery of inputs...etc)*
- *Key benefits derived (from monitoring and evaluation reports)*
- *The relative application of the eight common and the three specific (water, health and feed) standards from needs assessment through implementation phases*
- *Lessons to be drawn*

Primary data sources included the followings:

Two representative focus groups interviewed for each type of intervention¹
Woreda and zonal level partner agencies, and FAO staff were also interviewed.

Both narrative and participatory techniques were used to obtain key information from focus groups in the following areas;

- *Narratives on their representation and participation levels in needs assessment, targeting, implementation, agency competencies and preparedness for the future;*
- *Views on appropriateness of timing, effectiveness and adequacy of the specific intervention;*
- *Perceived strengths and drawbacks of implementation modalities and suggested improvements for the future;*
- *Ranking of benefits derived through proportional piling (including those that could be specifically linked to LEGS);*
- *Lessons for LEGS/FAO*

¹ Selection and composition of focus groups was based on criteria to be developed in collaboration with FAO

Interviews organized with woreda and zonal level staff for obtaining information on:

- *Level of participation in the specific project including specific roles played as related to the common and the three specific standards;*
- *Level of technical competency in the specific intervention;*
- *Level of familiarity with LEGS;*
- *Implementation modality (process)*
- *Key issues that have facilitated / delayed project implementation;*
- *Other partnership issues with FAO;*
- *Lessons for LEGS/FAO*

Interviews with FAO field and Addis staff conducted for obtaining information on:

- *The extent to which LEGS was incorporated in needs assessment, project design and implementation;*
- *Staff familiarity level with LEGS;*
- *Key strengths and weaknesses of partner agencies;*
- *In-house factors that have in positive / negative ways impacted the application of LEGS;*
- *Other external factors that have influenced project outcome (policy issues, etc)*
- *Key lessons for LEGS and FAO*

Analysis

Findings from primary and secondary sources are triangulated and standardized to assess and establish:

- *The level to which the eight common standards were applied in the three interventions in general (animal health, water and feed) and the relevant minimum standards in the three specific interventions in particular.*
- *Identification of elements that have contributed to conformity with or variance from LEGS;*
- *Rankings of benefits derived as perceived by focus groups including those that could be specifically attributed to LEGS, and;*
- *Compilation of key lessons to be drawn (i) on key issues and (ii) for further refinement of LEGS as an evaluation and standards tool.*

ANNEX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent evaluation of FAO's programmes and collaboration in Ethiopia

Impact Study of FAO emergency livestock interventions

Introduction

Ethiopia has been selected as the focus of an evaluation of FAO's programmes and collaboration during 2010. The Ethiopia Country Evaluation aims at improving the relevance and performance of FAO interventions, providing accountability and deriving lessons for better formulation and implementation in the future. The evaluation will focus on all interventions undertaken by FAO in Ethiopia over the period 2005-2010. The Ethiopia programme over the last five years includes US\$ 65 million worth of extra-budgetary project funding (94 Ethiopia dedicated projects). Almost half of these interventions have been to respond to emergencies, such as droughts and floods, while others have focused on development of the agricultural sector.

Prominent within FAO's emergency response programme has been interventions addressing the particular needs of populations in the mainly pastoralist regions of Afar and Somali, in which livestock play crucial livelihoods roles; 16 projects have had livestock themes, totally approximately US\$ 10 million and accounting for about 15% of FAO's budgetary allocations to Ethiopia. Those which are ongoing are shown in Annex 1.

Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)²

The development of LEGS took over 5 years with a high level of participation by a number of organizations and specific oversight by a Steering Group comprising FAO, ICRC, African Union, VSF Europa and Tufts University. LEGS is linked to the Sphere project and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response (the Sphere handbook). Training materials are currently being finalized to complement the guidelines.

After several years of collaboration and field testing by the involved agencies, in early 2009 the *Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards* (LEGS) were formally published as a set of international standards for improving the design, quality and impact of livestock interventions in humanitarian crises. One important use of LEGS is as a tool for the evaluation of livestock projects, and assessing the extent to which a particular agency and project followed the LEGS standards and guidelines. Such assessment can relate to the LEGS guidance on needs assessments, the LEGS common standards and the LEGS standards on specific interventions such as market support, veterinary care or livestock feed supplementation.

² <http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>

Review of FAO Ethiopia Emergency Livestock Interventions

FAO is co-chair of the agriculture cluster in Ethiopia, supporting coordination, information sharing and planning amongst humanitarian agencies working in the agriculture sector. FAO has also played an important role in facilitating the Livestock Working Group and has participated in the Livestock Policy Forum. Through letters of agreement, FAO channels financial resources to a large number of implementing partners (principally regional governments but also civil society organizations) for relief and rehabilitation interventions in a number of locations in the country. Most of the emergency livestock activities have been undertaken in lowland areas (the Somali, Oromia and Afar regions).

This study will look at the extent to which LEGS is currently being used as normative guidance on good practice in humanitarian effort in the livestock sector by FAO and its partners, and review the past performance of selected emergency livestock interventions using the LEGS.

Key questions will include:

- *'To what extent are FAO & FAO's partners' staff (both in Addis and at the field level) familiar with LEGS?*
- *How are the LEGS guidelines and standards being used in practice? How does the performance of FAO and its implementing partners measure up against the minimum standards, from needs assessment to the implementation phase?*
- *In each of the projects evaluated, has LEGS been used in programme design and implementation?*
- *What evidence exist that FAO livestock interventions resulted in improved outcomes at household level? Who benefited? Did the use of LEGS result in additional benefits?*
- *What constraints/limitations and strengths are there to the application of the guidelines and standards on the selected interventions?*
- *How could FAO & partners' approach (such as identification of project & activities, identification of implementing partners, working relationship with relevant government institutions, target communities, coordination modalities) to emergency livestock work be improved?*
- *Can good practices and learning for future planning and decision making at the policy level be extracted and documented?*
- *What practical recommendations can be made that will help LEGS as a programme and evaluation tool?*

The LEGS standards have recently been used as part of an evaluation framework in pastoralist areas of northern Kenya affected by drought and subject to humanitarian livestock interventions. It is proposed to use LEGS as a framework for evaluating the effectiveness and impacts of FAO's work in emergency

livestock responses, while at the same time helping to validate LEGS as a tool for programming and M&E in Ethiopia.

Objective of Assessment:

To evaluate the effectiveness/outcomes, and impacts if feasible, of FAO's work in support of emergency livestock responses in Ethiopia.

Description of Activities

A senior consultant (SC1) will be commissioned in Addis Ababa to supervise and backstop a systematic review of selected emergency livestock interventions implemented under the FAO in two pastoralist areas of Ethiopia. The consultant will guide and provide support to a field consultant (FC) to undertake the field review. The final report is the responsibility of the SC1, with written input from the FC. LEGS will be used as the criteria for review. The review will include a qualitative assessment of the extent to which both common and specific LEGS standards and guidelines were applied (depending on the intervention in question). The consultant will interview a sample of project beneficiaries and triangulate the information gathered from other sources (e.g. interviews with FAO staff, partners, other stakeholders) to assess the effectiveness/outcomes and likely impacts of the interventions.

Outputs

- Inception report of 5-10 pages on the design, including regions and specific projects selected, based on a dialogue with the FAO Livestock Expert in Ethiopia, and taking into consideration both representativeness and the need to deliver a final report in September, to be submitted by the SC1 to the Evaluation Team Leader and the Office of Evaluation by 30 July.
- A high quality draft report of 15-20 pages to be submitted by the Field Consultant to the Senior Consultant.
- Terminal report of 15-20 pages including findings, conclusions and recommendations to FAO on emergency livestock interventions in Ethiopia, and on suggested revisions to future editions of LEGS based on these findings to be submitted by the SC1 to the Evaluation Team Leader and the Office of Evaluation by 27 Sept.

Duration and Timing.

The review will begin in August 2010 and a final report will be presented by 27th September 2010.

Consultants will receive when-actually-employed (WAE) contracts covering the period 1 Aug -30 Sept 2010. The Senior Consultant will have a contract of 10 days while the Field Consultant is expected to work a total of 34 days.

Projects to be evaluated

The review will focus on emergency interventions which have included the core components of animal health, animal feed and water point rehabilitation. It will focus on projects with these core components in two distinct pastoralist regions of Ethiopia, namely Afar and Borena.

On the basis of these criteria, candidate selected projects have been identified as:

Afar region: OSRO/ETH/909/NOR and its precursors

Borena region: OSRO/ETH/803/CHA and associated activities

Confirmation of project selection will be made in the Inception Report.