

Review Report

on

Irish Aid Support to Pastoralism in Tanzania

December 2016



© Peadar Brehony

Eamonn Brehony,
P.O Box 3124,
Arusha,
Tanzania.
Tel: +255 754 092127.
Email: ebrehony@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	6
Methodology	6
Limitation of Review	7
Programme Achievements	8
Transparent Mechanism to Support Pastoralist CSOs	8
Evidence Based Advocacy for Influencing and Implementing Policy and Laws	9
Achievements Related to Land	10
Increased Participation of Pastoral Women in Decision Making Processes and Ownership and Control of Land and Cattle in the Program Area	11
Increased Capacity and Responsiveness of Local Government Institutions to Provide Timely and Quality Services to Pastoralists	13
Improved National and Local CSOs Service Delivery in Addressing Pastoralists Men and Women Practical and Strategic Needs	13
Documentation on Lessons Learned	16
Achievement of Programme Purpose and Goal	16
Effectiveness in meeting Priority Needs of Male and Female Pastoralists	18
Claiming Attribution	19
Programme Design Including Appropriateness of Approach used by Irish Aid to select the partner	21
Appropriateness and effectiveness of the overall management arrangement of the programme	24
Monitoring	26
Record Keeping for PPSC	30
Challenges	31
Issue of Targeting	31
Challenge of working through Pastoralist CSOs	32
Challenge of Design of Programme Intervention	32
Challenging Policy Context	32
Lack of Strong Gender Analysis	33
Lessons Learned to Inform Future Programming	35
Knowledge Gaps	37
Conclusion	38
Recommendations	38
Bibliography	39
Appendices	40

Acronyms

ASDP	Agricultural Sector Development Programme
BFGC	Basket Fund Governance Committee
BFMT	Basket Fund Management Team
BRN	Big Results Now
CCWT	Chama cha Wafugaji Tanzania
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DANIDA	Danish International Development Assistance
IA	Irish Aid
IGAs	Income Generating Activities
IGWIA	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
LGAs	Local Government Authorities
MoLFD	Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid Term Review
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
ODA	Organizational Development Assessment
PAPOT	Pastoralist Platform for Tanzania
PAYE	Pay As You Earn
PBFP	Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme
PP	Pastoralist Programme
PPSC	Pastoralist Programme Steering Committee
RCC	Regional Consultative Committee
RS	Regional Secretariats
SDL	Social Development Levy
SIDA	Swedish International Development Assistance
TNRF	Tanzania Natural resource Forum
TPCF	Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum
VEO	Village Executive Officer
VICOBA	Village Community Banks
VLUMP	Village Land Use Maps and Management Plans
VSL	Village Savings and Loan

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to all who helped with this review:

- To staff of Irish Embassy, Dar es Salaam who offered invaluable advice and comments on the review as well as organising a very fruitful discussion with CARE;
- To staff from CARE spoken with and participated in a very fruitful discussion with IA staff;
- To staff from Central and District Government spoken with;
- To representatives of NGOs and CSOs spoken with;
- To Alais ole Morindat who assisted in carrying out this review

Eamonn Brehony, Ph D.,
Chief Reviewer

Executive Summary

In team sports one often talks of a game of two halves. The same expression could be used for this pastoralist programme. While it was a programme with two phases – one from 2007 to 2011 and a second one from 2011 to 2017, this review found that a refocusing exercise in 2014 gave much greater direction and focus to the programme. One could say that there was a pre 2014 programme and a post 2014 programme. While there were some key achievements before 2014 it was hard to assess the impact of these achievements or the extent to which the programme achieved its goal and purpose due to a lack of appropriate and useful indicators. Two baseline surveys were carried out but it was difficult to see how they contributed to measuring the achievements of the programme. The review relied largely on documentation supplied by the programme included annual reports, mid term reviews and an end of term evaluation.

Achievements include the building of capacity of some participating CSOs, increased awareness on pastoralism as a way of life, better service delivery for pastoralists in some districts, reclamation of some land and livestock routes for pastoralists, resolution of some conflicts, greater involvement of women in the pastoralist community and some strategic and practical needs of pastoralist men and women being addressed. However, there is a question as to the longer term impact of some achievements. For example, there was little indication of land reclaimed being titled or cattle routes being legally secure. The fact that programme management saw a need to refocus the programme in 2014 indicated a general dissatisfaction with achievements. It is too early to say what impact the refocused programme has had but at least it provided greater geographic and activity focus as well as a clearer focus on the results to be achieved.

While Irish Aid initiated the programme they commissioned CARE to implement it. CARE in turn worked through a number of pastoralist CSOs to implement the programme on the ground. This was a very challenging approach in the light of an earlier study in 2002 which claimed that many pastoral CSO groups are unrepresentative and unaccountable and have difficulty in establishing a common front with each other.

There was an issue with attribution of some programme achievements whereby an achievement was claimed but in fact there were other influential actors that contributed but were not acknowledged. There was also an issue about robustness of some of quantitative data used. CARE admitted that they did not verify the accuracy of some information collected. The steering committee of the programme (PPSC) and Irish Aid were also concerned about the issue of attribution and the realism of information collected. There were challenges in the processes used to manage the whole programme from Irish Aid down to CSOs working at community level. Monitoring systems until 2014 were weak as they were not linked to good baseline information and were not systematic in collecting information. There was a general lack of analysis in the whole programme. This was best exemplified in gender interventions whereby the focus was on numbers rather than on understanding roles of men and women in the whole pastoralist system.

A number of studies were carried out in 2015 – 2016 to gather lessons learned from programme interventions. Some valuable lessons were learned to guide future programming. A number of recommendations were made that may be of benefit to bring the programme to a fruitful conclusion as well as assist in future programme planning.

Introduction

1. Irish Aid (IA) has been supporting pastoralists through a Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) since September 2007. The programme to date has had two formal phases. Phase 1 namely Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme started in September 2007 and forty-six Civil Society Organisations in ten regions were funded. Phase 2 started in 2011 and will close in June 2017. From 2011 to 2014, twenty-five local CSOs were supported to carry out different projects at local level. Following a Mid Term Review at the end of 2013 a refocusing of the programme took place in 2014. This refocusing led to substantial changes in both the design, the approach and the monitoring of the programme. In reality one could say that there was the pre 2014 programme and the post 2014 programme. The intervention logic of the programme evolved over the period of the programme. The logic proposed for the two phases of the programme and the changed programme deliverables from 2014 are presented in appendix 1. Essentially the programme was aiming to reduce poverty and vulnerability of pastoralist communities in Tanzania through the advancement of pastoralist men and women's right to a sustainable livelihood. There was a focus on four results/outcome themes:
 - Influencing policies that respond to the needs of pastoralists;
 - Having Government Agencies and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) deliver quality veterinary and extension services to pastoralists;
 - Increasing adoption of climate adaptation and mitigation strategies and/or practices among pastoralist;
 - Increasing participation of pastoral women in decision making processes and ownership and control of land and cattle in the program area.

Methodology

2. Irish Aid wanted to undertake a review of its support to pastoralism in Tanzania to generate learning for potential future support that might be undertaken to build and strengthen increased resilience for vulnerable and marginalized communities potentially including pastoralist communities. The review was to cover the period 2007 – 2016. A terms of reference was developed – see appendix 2. The focus of this review was to:
 - Assess the extent to which programme contributed to its overall goal including the identification of key achievements and challenges;
 - Document lessons from the programme implementation, which can inform future programming by IA in building and strengthening resilience of marginalized communities and women in particular; and
 - Assess and identify the need for further analysis that may be required to meet knowledge gaps.
3. Two consultants were contracted to carry out the review. The main methodology was a desk-based assessment of key programme documents. Appendix 3 is a list of all the documents that were made available for the review. The review relied almost entirely on documentation. There was not much emphasis on triangulating what was found in reports as it was assumed that before information was provided in annual reports, mid term reviews and evaluations that this information was triangulated and cross checked. There were interviews with National Government and two district Government officials. There were also interviews with some

implementing programme partners including IA, CARE and TNRF. Appendix 4 is a list of people consulted.

Limitation of Review

4. The review had three limitations:

- A) There was a time limitation as the proposed start of the study was delayed. While the study was supposed to have an inception report ready by May 2nd this report was delayed by one week thus putting a time constraint on the consultants;
- B) Given that the key methodology for the review was a desk-based assessment of key programme documents including reports, the consultants experienced challenges:
- Getting relevant reports. Some reports were not available e.g. CARE annual reports 2008 – 2011. Appendix 3 is a list of all 101 documents and reports that were made available. Some reports were in draft form with comments from other commentators. Other reports were titled draft but when the document was opened it appeared to be a final document;
 - There was duplication on some documents and these documents had to be screened to see if they contained something different. For example, in the action plan for 2012 there were 2 action plans – one had action and operational plan and had 23 action points and four comments while the second one had 25 action points. Some of the action points were different and there were no comments.
 - There was also a time delay in getting some key documents. In fact one of the consultants had to contact the Irish Embassy to get their help in soliciting documents from CARE one week into the review. Therefore what is written in this report is based on the documentation which was made available to the consultants as well as those met as part of the review in appendix 4. If there are key issues overlooked it is due to a lack of documentation available e.g. minutes of some Governance Committee meetings.
 - The last report given to the review team was the six monthly report for 2015. In the light of this the review covered the period 2007 to June 2015. This meant that it was difficult to make any assessment on the impact of the refocused programme in 2014.
- C) There was a lot written in reports especially the mid term reviews and evaluation with some good qualitative information but much less quantitative information. One had to read and re read to try and decipher what exactly were the core messages. There was also an issue about the accuracy and clarity of the information in CSO reports which the 2010 Mid Term Review noted. Under weaknesses it was stated “*Poor documentation and filing by the implementing CSOs was noted as one of the weaknesses. It was, for example, not possible to get accurate number of beneficiaries from most of the CSOs visited. It was equally difficult for them to even trace some of the documents in their possession*”. Two years later the 2012 Pastoralist Programme highlights noted this as a challenge. In the summary achievements they produced where they stated that ‘*a particularly significant challenge during implementation in 2012 was the capacity of all implementing CSOs in the area of documenting best practices for wider sharing*. In the Pastoralist Programme 2013 highlights it was stated that ‘*weak documentation of sub grantees has led to inaccurate reporting leading to delayed disbursement...*’. Pastoralist Programme Steering Committee (PPSC) minutes also had queries about TAGRODE’s strategy missing some facts and data (PPSC Minute of November 2012).and about the ‘realism’ of the information collected (PPSC Minute of March 2015).

Recommendation

That good and appropriate documentation is kept and available when one wants to do a long term review of a programme.

Programme Achievements

5. The programme has had a number of achievements since it started operations in 2007. Most of these achievements have been documented in the Mid Term Reviews of 2010 and 2014 and the end of phase 1 evaluation of 2011. These achievements have been summarised and presented in some detail in appendix 5. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) were commissioned to carry out three case studies and these studies also documented achievements.
6. In the light of these various reports and studies this review focuses mainly on achievements from 2013 to June 2015 based on the annual reports of CARE¹. Appendix 6 is a timeline of key events in the evolution of the programme. Appendix 5 gives the key achievements from the previous years as identified in the MTRs and the 2011 evaluation report.
7. This section is laid out in accordance with the outputs and outcomes developed by the programme since 2007. Some have been slightly modified to make the reading of this report easier without compromising the intent of the output or outcome. PPSC also had some problems understanding what outputs and outcome were achieved. According to the minutes of their meeting of June 2014 it was stated:

Irish Aid has invested almost €2.2 million in PP, what results have the programme achieved worth investment? Looking at the presentation, there is a mixture between activity, outputs and outcomes. Contrarily, “there is need to capture a few concrete outcomes”. ...PRIORITISE the top list of achieved outcomes based on logical framework and try to concretize them to justify the €2.2 million investment. Outcomes should be rated in terms of QUANTITATIVE measurements and not just BLANK statements. It is critically important to link the achieved OUTCOMES with the INDICATORS in the log frame at purpose level and see HOW can these help in measuring the achieved outcomes?
8. The newly refocused programme of 2014 addressed the concerns of the PPSC that the outcomes and outputs be more appropriate for the achievement of the programme purpose and goal.

Transparent Mechanism to Support Pastoralist CSOs

9. One of the key planks of this programme has been the efforts to build the capacity of local CSOs so that they can empower the communities they serve to enable them secure their livelihoods. Appendix 7 gives a list of all NGOs/CSOs supported from the start of the programme including the district/region of operation and the number of times supported. The table shows that for both phases 51 CSOs from 12 regions in the country were supported as follows:
 - Arusha region - 12 CSOs;

¹ Achievements from the CARE 2013 annual report are included here as the fieldwork for the 2014 MTR was carried out at the end of 2013 so it may not have noted all the achievements for 2013. The last report provided to the reviewer was for January to June 2015.

- Manyara region – 12 CSOs;
 - Morogoro region - 10 CSOs;
 - Mara region – 5 CSOs;
 - Tanga region – 3 CSOs;
 - Iringa region and Simiyu region - 2 CSOs in each region;
 - Mwanza, Geita, Shinyanga, Kilimanjaro and Dodoma regions – 1 CSO each region.
10. In terms of number of times funded, 32 CSOs (63%) got once off funding, 11 (21%) received funding twice and 8 (16%) received funding three times. The CSOs which were funded three times were TAGRODE from Iringa region, HUDESA from Kilosa district, Morogoro region, CODERT from Geita region, EMAYO from Kiteto district, Manyara region, TPCF from Arusha region, NAADUTARO from Kiteto district, Manyara region, WODSTA from Arumeru district, Arusha region and UMWEMA from Kilosa district, Morogoro region.
11. From 2013 the technical capacity of a number of Pastoralist Programme (PP) CSO in writing project proposals and accessing financial support was built and/or strengthened. Appendix 8 is a table giving a list of CSOs involved in the Pastoralist Programme (PP) who received some support from other donors. It shows that between the 8 CSOs they accessed a total of \$1,041,370USD with three CSOs accessing money from USAID through Africare. One CSOs accessed over \$450,000 from Africare and another – PINGOs accessed \$227,985 from SIDA. As well as those listed in the table in appendix 8, eight pastoralist CSO members of MACSNET in Kiteto (KIREWODEEP, Kiteto Paralegal Unit, KIWOCOA, AJAT Foundation, WILAC Kiteto branch, WASHEHABIKI, KIPU, and MWANASATU) each received \$4,148 from the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS) for the purpose of enhancing organizational capacity of their members with a focus on addressing pastoralist strategic needs on land rights and climate change. NAADUTARO has also received \$829 from FORUM Climate Change in order to address climate change issues particularly awareness creation and promotion of tree planting for climate change mitigation. According to the IIED study on “Assessing the sustainability of Pastoralist Programme Capacity Building” the table is only a list of some of the grants awarded to PP CSO’s from other donors. The report also stated that ‘Major donors with strict fiduciary standards have awarded significant sums for a wide range of projects – including research, food security, government oversight and resilience building’.
12. There is some evidence of improved CSO capacity to manage funds. According to the annual report of the Pastoralist Programme 2015 the growth in financial management capacity was demonstrated through internal and external audits conducted whereby the findings indicated that most of the audited PP partners with exception of LIVES demonstrated a level of capacity improvement in financial management.

Evidence Based Advocacy for Influencing and Implementing Policy and Laws

13. There has been increasing budgetary allocations to Government organs supporting pastoralism.
- The Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MoLFD) for the financial year 2014/15, allocated \$3,382,475 for livestock infrastructure rehabilitation and construction, water, surveying of pastoralists grazing areas and for demarcating grazing areas in Geita, Busega, Kiteto, Kagera, Mvomero, Kilindi, Igunga, Iramba and Lindi.

- There was increased budget allocation for livestock sector for financial year 2014/15 in a number of districts - by 1% in Mvomero district; by 5% in Kiteto district; by 14% in Hanang' and Simanjiro Districts.
 - In 2015/2016 annual budget, the MoLFD allocated \$5,377 for developing a Grazing Land Management Plan for Partimbo village and \$172,535 for expansion of charcoal dam at Olpopong village in Kiteto district. In Babati for budget year 2015/16, 15% of the District Council's own source revenue collection has been allocated to support livestock and agriculture sector.
14. In Babati district, COSITA trained village government leaders, traditional leaders, extension officers, community representatives' men and women in all 21 wards on the need and importance of Village Land Use Maps and Management Plans (VLUMP). There were no data given in the 2015 annual report on the numbers trained. The report claimed that these efforts have contributed to establishment and/or strengthening of village tribunal and environmental committees with the ability to resolve conflicts and document case proceedings. However the minutes of PPSC March 2015 noted that 'there is a clear evidence for the re-emergence of disputes over the areas reallocated or demarcated for pastoralists. This could either be attributed to lack of pastoralists' participation in the decision-making meetings or lack of representation for the leadership positions. It can also be due to lack of adherence to the laid down procedures and involvement of the Land Department for the procedural and legal entitlements of their grazing lands'.
15. The African Union Framework for Pastoralism Policy was translated from English into ki-Swahili with a view to using it in future advocacy work. Pastoralist CSOs also played an active role in the Katiba Initiative which was supported by the programme. The Katiba Initiative enabled regular engagement and alliance building with non-pastoralist groups, (such as agricultural and mining groups), seeking common ground in order to support mutually beneficial constitutional changes in the proposed new constitution².

Achievements Related to Land

16. Between 2013 and 2015 a total of 3,589,761 hectares of grazing land has either been recovered or allocated for pastoralists in the programme area (in Kiteto, Simanjiro, Mvomero, Bunda, Serengeti and Kilindi Districts according to KINNAPA)³ according to the annual report of the PP 2015 Some specific instances include:
- Babati pastoralist unions working hand in hand with Babati District Council recovered over 800 hectares of the grazing land from Tarangire national park in 2014. In Babati district in Ayamango village, the Village Executive Officer (VEO) reported that the village managed to save an area of 2,000 hectares of land from encroachment. In Ayamango and Mwinkantsi villages, a total of 51.4 hectares of grazing land has been recovered in 2015. COSITA influenced Ngoley Village Council, Babati to allocate and demarcate 9,000 acres in the Land Use Plan. Processes to survey this area for inclusion in village land use map are underway. In Qarbu village, Babati 350 acres have been allocated for grazing and in

² Source: Sam Greene, Case Study on Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania p. 38.

³ This is approximately the size of Arusha region as the region has an area of 15,508 mi² which is the equivalent of 3,757,554 hectares.

Basutu village, 200 acres have been allocated. In Nadonjuki village, Simanjiro district, which is 95% pastoralist, community leaders changed the use of 240 hectares that were used for other activities in favour of rangeland following awareness raising to them and to crop growers.

- There is some evidence to show that where formal land use plans have been established, such as in Kiteto, pastoralists feel relatively confident about their ability to practice customary production strategies. Some communities reported that land use planning was beginning to make a difference to the health and productivity of their herds (IIED, Best Practice Study, p. 50 - 52)
 - Through LIVES 50,000 acres of grazing land have been restituted at Losinoni village, Oldonyosambu ward in Arumeru District. As a result of LIVES intervention, pastoral communities in Olkokola, Oldonyosambu and Engikaret wards of Arumeru District have raised concern to Arusha District Council for demarcating 580,000 hectares of grazing land for tenure assurance and protection from being grabbed by private investors.
 - Through WODSTA 3,500 acres has been allocated for grazing at Ngabobo village in Arumeru District.
 - Through the efforts of MACSNET 50 hectares of grazing land has been allocated for grazing at Hanang' District - Dirma, Mureru, Mugitu, Gehandu and Gidamond villages and some are in the process of getting title deeds.
17. Local Government institutions are resolving conflicts. Through the work of HUDESA, there is a decreasing trend of conflicts from 33 in 2011 to 6 in 2013 in Msingisi, Mamboya and Idibo wards in Gairo District. Msingisi and Mamboya villages have agreed to allow free movement of cattle from Msingisi during drought periods to a mountainous grazing area belonging to Mamboya village unlike before where this was seen as a cause of conflict between the two villages. The minutes of the Pastoralist Programme Steering Committee of February 2014 stated that the committee visited the work of UMWEMA in Mvomero district and it was noted that less conflicts were being reported. The District Executive Director told the committee that UMWEMA contributed greatly to peace-making efforts in the district as there had been a number of meetings between the district council on the one side and farmers and pastoralists on the other, aiming at seeking peace in the district.
18. There is more effective use of Land Tribunals to resolve land problems. In Babati, Ayamango village at least 31 cases were filed at land tribunals in relation to community members from outside the villages invading grazing areas. Twenty-one cases were resolved by the village land council and the remaining 10 forwarded to the district Housing and Land Tribunal. The revival and strengthening of 12 UMWEMA village land council committees and 4 UMWEMA Ward Tribunals in Mvomero district, in understanding their roles and responsibilities, technical skills in conflict resolution including case handling and keeping records of cases proceedings was supported.

Increased Participation of Pastoral Women in Decision Making Processes and Ownership and Control of Land and Cattle in the Program Area

19. Pastoral women are increasing their participation in leadership and decision-making. Women now have the confidence and courage to contest for various leadership positions.

- Thirty-six pastoralist women have been elected in leadership positions at village, ward and district levels in WODSTA project areas.
- Two pastoralist women and one man have been elected as members of Ward Council in each of Melela, Mvomero and Hembet wards in Mvomero district through UMWEMA initiatives. Before the UMWEMA intervention, only one ward, Dakawa had a pastoralist women representation at Ward Council. Something similar was experienced at village level where pastoralist men and women were elected as members of the village land council.
- In WODSTA project areas, 28 women were elected as ten cell leaders and village council members. According to the 2014 annual report, 5 women were from Ngongongare village, 4 from Kitefu, 4 from Lemongo, 3 Oldonyowas and 1 each from Olkungwado, Ngabobo and Losinoni villages. However this makes 19 women rather than 28.
- In Babati district, seven pastoralist women have been elected as treasurers of pastoralists union at village level, 11 as secretaries of the union at ward level and 2 as members of pastoralist union at District level.
- There is increasing pastoral women's participation in decision-making processes and ownership and control of land and cattle in Arumeru District where 37 farm plots are reported (but not verified) to be owned and controlled by pastoralist women as a result of WODSTA training on land rights and extensive awareness creation. Fifteen self-organized women of Ngarennyuki and Ngabobo villages in Arumeru district have registered their claims at village land council committees demanding for access to and ownership of land. Thirteen members of MWEDO in Nyamalulu village, Simanjiro district now own 10 – 15 hectares of land.
- In Kiteto district where NAADUTARO operates, the traditional and village land tribunal committee cannot be opened in the absence of an agreed women's quorum. Traditional leaders in Meru district commonly known as 'Mshili' have included women's rights into their constitution in response to CEDESOTA's training, thus acknowledging the growing importance of women's rights.
- Awareness creation on women land rights and resources carried by UMWEMA in six pastoralist and farmers villages of Mvomero enhanced women pastoralist and farmers voices in demanding their land rights. The documented increase in the number of women owning land has increased from 2 in 2001 to 11 in 2015 with 8 women at Wami-Sokoine and 3 at Kibaoni villages. Before the project intervention only 2 out of 12 villages i.e. (Wami and Kambala) had pastoralist representatives in their village land council. But later after intervention all villages except Hembeti had pastoralist representatives in village land council.

20. There is evidence of change at household level whereby some community members have admitted to making collective decision around the selling of cattle that previously was the domain of men.

In Dibamba village, Mvomero district one pastoralist stated that 'before UMWEMA intervention in the area, I used to sell my cattle as I wished without consulting my wives as they had no right to question my decision and expenditure of the money acquired from cattle sales. Following training on gender and women rights conducted by UMWEMA I was enlightened on women's rights and the importance for participatory planning and decision-making at community and household level. I cannot now sell my cattle without consulting my wives and I now sit together

with my wives to plan on how we can better spend the income gained for the benefit of the household and we have now managed to construct a 'modern house' built of burnt bricks and iron roofed' (PP Annual Report 2014).

Increased Capacity and Responsiveness of Local Government Institutions to Provide Timely and Quality Services to Pastoralists

21. The following are some of the successes:

- In Babati district, COSITA reported that 3 water dams, 1 water trough and 4 dips have been constructed or renovated. In 2014, Babati District Council constructed one water trough at Mwinkatsi village, 8 water dams and 6 strainers at Ayamango as well as improving extension services.
- In Arumeru district, WODSTA reported that 3 water dams, 3 cattle troughs and 3 dips were constructed and/or renovated at Losinoni, Oldonyowas and Lemongo villages.

Improved National and Local CSOs Service Delivery in Addressing Pastoralists Men and Women Practical and Strategic Needs

22. The establishment of pastoralist unions at district and lower levels helped pastoralists to articulate their strategic and practical needs at local community level. These unions were established from village to district level in Babati through COSITA initiatives. According to the minutes of the PPSC meeting of March 2015 it noted the good collaboration with the district in facilitating the establishment of these unions but it was also noted that it was clearly evident that 'such kind of ties weakens as you go down to village level'. In the minutes there was a statement of surprise that COSITA was not informed that some village leaders are threatening the existence of the established pastoral unions.
23. LIVES and MACSNET influenced the formation of Mukulat Enaboishu Livestock Keepers Association (MELIKA) in Arumeru and Mureгаа coalition in Hanang', respectively. The formed pastoralist organs have been instrumental in reducing land conflicts and enhancing LGAs support to pastoralists. According to a TNRF summary sheet 2013 pastoralists in Migor village, Iringa organized themselves and raised more than Tshs 4million to finance demarcation of their village boundary to avoid frequent frictions with Ruaha game reserve authorities.
24. The opening of livestock routes was one practical need that the programme helped to address. COSITA reported that a total of 107 livestock routes that were opened and/or re-opened in 2014 at different wards of Babati comprising 5 routes at Magara, 30 at Nkaiti, 9 at Riroda, 54 at Duru and 9 Dabil are still in use playing a pivotal role in providing access to grazing land, auctions, watering and salt licking points. Forty-eight livestock routes (not stated where) were opened and/or re-opened and 2 widened. These routes have not only reduced inter-village and other actors' conflicts, but also contributed to increased access to grazing land, auctions, watering and salt licking points.
25. Support for alternative or improved Income Generating Activities (IGAs) is another strategy that addressing pastoralists men and women practical and strategic needs.

- Through the work of HUDESA, 90 individuals (40 men and 50 women) from an agro-pastoral community at Msingisi village in Gairo district, are now engaged in alternative IGAs particularly beekeeping and making charcoal saving cooking stoves.
- Entrepreneurial training at Wami-Sokoine village, Mvomero district contributed to the revival and strengthening of 9 Village Community Banks (VICOBA).
- WODSTA interventions in Meru District has facilitated pastoralists' adoption of different IGAs including small scale agriculture, forming VICOBA and selling of beads both within and outside village markets with a total number of 2,100 members, 150 men and 1,950 women. Information obtained through data collection tool filled by all partners indicated that a total of 235 men and 5,300 women pastoralists have adopted different sources of income diversification in the project area.

26. Pastoralists have adopted different sources of income diversification.

- UMWEMA training on climate change and the need for income diversification, including rearing exotic cattle, led to the adoption of exotic cattle at Wami Sokoine village in Mvomero district. Almost each of 30 Maasai pastoralist households existing in the area own two or more improved cattle depending on each ones financial capacity.
- WODSTA trained women in Ngabobo village, Ngarenanyuki ward in Arumeru District on entrepreneurship which led to the revival and strengthening of Village Savings and Loan (VSL) groups earlier formed through CARE WEZESHA programme in 2012. Pastoralist women members of VSL reported that they have now successfully established IGAs through borrowing from VSL groups. There are 48 VSL groups at Oldonyosambu ward with members engaging in different IGA interventions mainly selling grain, tomatoes, vegetables, beads, poultry and beekeeping.

27. Other successful income generating groups include NADUPOI with 20 members and ENYWATA with 15 members and NAMAYANI with 21 members in Engedeko village. They have 4 beehives each while BATURUMAN group has 16 beehives. NADUPOI group has harvested 60 liters of unrefined honey worth \$166. They sold 40 liters for \$88.51. With the income gained through selling of honey, they mobilized each of the group members to raise chickens.

Selina Robert is one VSL member of AMANI group. She stated that her VSL group started with a share contribution per week of \$2.77 in 2012 but by 2014 it had grown to \$5.53 per week. This enabled her to have enough money to borrow for a tomato business for which the capital grew to \$1,659.57. It enabled her to buy 2 cattle, 10 goats, pay fees for her secondary school child whilst meeting other basic domestic needs. She also managed to build an improved house.

28. Discussions with Government officials showed appreciation of the efforts of IA to support pastoralism as it complements Vision 2025, MKUKUTA and other sectoral policies like land, water, livestock and natural resources. The programme also addressed some governance issues. It tried to involve some Government officials especially those in the MoLFD. Government officials also acknowledged that capacity had been built through the programme in relation to pastoralism and understanding the science of pastoralism. They also stated that some parliamentarians from pastoralist and agro pastoralist communities were involved in workshops and conferences – they noted particularly a meeting in Mwanza in July 2014. They

also observed some challenges and inconsistencies noted by Government officials. They stated that there was no consistency in relation to issues that the programme was addressing or advocating about e.g. one time the programme spoke about land, another time it was speaking about livestock, another time it was speaking about the constitution. A second challenge was that Government is large and there were no efforts to bring other Government ministries on board (apart from Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development) and develop cross sectoral issues. Government officials stated that women's engagement was very poor. There was no expertise in the programme and Government officials spoken with said that the programme did not use good quality specialists on women's development issues. They also noted the absence of the involvement of regional secretariats in the whole programme given that the Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) is the forum which brings together all development programmes for the region to harmonise them. In the minutes of the PPSC March 2015, following a field visit to COSITA in Babati, it was noted that 'there is a weak link between DED's Office and Regional Secretariats (RS) as CSO reports are not submitted to the RS'. While the Government officials spoken with noted the absence of the private sector it is fair to say that the private sector was not a key focus or stakeholder in the programme although the programme was involved for example through private media.

Increased adoption of climate adaptation and mitigation strategies and/or practices among pastoralist men and women

29. There were capacity building initiatives to empower pastoral community members and local institutions on climate adaptation and mitigation strategies. For instance, HUDESA reached directly a total of 26,156 (14,647 men and 11,509 women) and WODSTA reached 154 (81 men and 73 women) through training of village traditional leaders, village council members, village land tribunals and women group leaders. Indirectly, HUDESA reached a total of 457,904 (270,551 men and 187,353 women) while WODSTA reached a total of 2,850 (1,621 men and 1,229 women) through awareness creation and use of trained community-based Training of Trainers (TOT) in village and sub-village meetings.
30. Some LGAs are now responding to climate change by integrating climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies into their District Development Plans. Babati District Council has established pasture demonstration plots at Dadil, Dareda and Bashnet villages to educate pastoralists on possible options for livestock feeding particularly during the dry season. The district council is constructing cattle troughs to reduce water wastage via surface run-off in Diffir, Gedamar, Kisanga and Mwantkasi villages. Gairo District Council has called for each household to plant at least 5 trees. IIED carried out a study that documented lessons learned on approaches for supporting pastoralists groups facing climate change in Tanzania. The lessons learned are included as appendix 9.
31. Monduli Pastoralists' Women Council (BAWAKIMO) planted 350 trees in dry land areas namely Meserani Ward, Duka Bovu, Nanja secondary School and Engarukato with a view of addressing climate change issues.

Documentation on Lessons Learned

32. Five studies have been carried out in 2015 - 2016 – three by IIED, one on ‘Emerging Best Practices from Ongoing Pastoralist Programme’, a second study on ‘Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania’ and a third on Assessing the Sustainability of Pastoralist Programme Capacity Building. A fourth study was completed in 2016 – ‘Situational Analysis on Land Based Conflicts’ and a fifth –a Case Study of Pastoralism Programme: The Influence of Women Socio-economic Empowerment in Pastoral Community. TNRF also publish a short one-page flier on the yearly achievements of the programme which are succinct, easy to distribute and read. Apart from one-page flier on yearly achievements, there are number of policy briefs published by different partners⁴.

Achievement of Programme Purpose and Goal

33. While there have been a number of achievements it is more difficult to say the extent to which the programme achieved its purpose and goal as the indicators of success for the programme were not used as a tool to measure success. The purpose of the programme was the advancement of pastoralist men and women’s right to a sustainable livelihood. In the two mid term reviews and the end of phase 1 evaluation there was little if any use of the indicators of success developed for the programme. In appendix 1 the indicators of goal and purpose are put in bold but there was no coherent information provided to measure the extent to which these indicators were achieved.
34. The evaluator of phase 1 had the following to say:
The evaluation exercise exposes good management of grants as one of the main strengths of the PBFP....There is no doubt that the programme has had significant positive impact on the partner CSOs and the pastoral communities. ... The impact is more on capacity building of CSO officials, and sensitization and awareness creation among pastoral communities on land rights and various policies that affect their livelihoods....(but) necessitates the need for more capacity building especially in lobbying and advocacy for land rights and quality services. Although the PBFP has made a lot of progress in fostering a good working relationship between the CSOs, LGAs and pastoral communities, there is need to strengthen the capacity of the LGAs to enable them discharge their duties more efficiently and effectively.
35. The MTR 2014 had the following to say in relation to the extent to which the purpose and goal had been achieved:
The PP through TNRF and sub-grant recipient organizations have delivered a number of outputs....In all cases, delivery of outputs to the point of the MTR have exceeded end of programme targets. According to programme beneficiaries, these efforts have contributed

⁴ The following are some examples - Policy brief: Pastoralism and Land Issues in Tanzania (2015); Policy brief: Investment legal regime; Policy brief: Land legal regime; Information brief: AU Policy Framework for pastoralism in Africa: Key lessons and Significance for Tanzania; Demystified copy of proposed national Constitution; Katiba kwa Lugha Nyepesi; Analysis of Village Land Act No. 5 of 1999, CAP 114 R.E 2002; Pastoral Women’s Rights Violation; Finding on specific cases relating to Pastoralist men and women human rights violation; Environmental Benefits for Socio-economic Well-being of Pastoralists and Agro-pastoralists in Tanzania –A Discussion Note; Relevance of Mobility in a Disequilibrium Environment; Proposed amendments of the Village Land Act, Act # 5 of 1999 CAP 114 R.F 2002; Initiation of amendment of Village Land Act, No. 5 of 1999, CAP 114 R.E 2002

to achievements in the programme purpose. There is now evidence that LGAs and pastoralist CSOs are beginning to appreciate and be more responsive to practical and strategic needs of pastoralist men and women that contribute to secure their livelihood. All PP sub-grant recipient organizations said they feature gender and women rights in their programme. Indeed this was a criteria for proposal to receive funding from the PP. As a result, the programme purpose for increasing the number of local CSOs that address gender issues in pastoralist communities has increased from a baseline of 2 to 18 (all those who received PP grants) against a target of 5 by the end of the programme.

36. In an assessment template for the 2013 MTR, the reviewer gave the achievement of project purpose a score of 3 out of 5 with the following comment ‘Somewhat satisfactorily achieved in some and unsatisfactorily in others’. In the light of all the reports, studies, reviews and evaluation made available, an effort is made here to extrapolate the extent to which the achievements of the programme contributed to the purpose and goal;
- While there were commitments from national and district Government to increase expenditure in departments concerned with pastoralists there was no evidence provided to show that the promised increased expenditure actually happened.
 - Capacity building of village councils has improved their ability to function, manage conflict and include communities in decision making. The formation of pastoralist associations is a step forward, as pastoralists are uniting to learn about their rights and engage government through formal channels at village and district level e.g. Babati district. Associations, where formed, have had a role in reducing conflict with farmers by formalizing conflict and encouraging different groups to sit together and negotiate or work together for their mutual benefit. Kilindi Pastoralist Network is a good example it raised 60m Tshs and funded construction of their own dam, with the government providing technical support. Some programme achievements have benefited women. Some women have become involved in leadership and have increased their income through income generating activities. The allocation of 0.5 acre of land to women in one village in Kiteto may be due to the influence of women in the village. There is also some evidence that when women received some extra income it has helped their families e.g. the work of WODSTA in Arumeru District and some work of Kiteto district.
 - Some CSOs have benefitted from capacity building. The ability of a few to seek and attract funding from other donors to continue projects has significantly improved, demonstrated by the sizeable sums some CSOs attracted from major donors such as USAID and Africare. Their ability to demonstrate fiduciary standards that satisfy international donors will prove important in seeking funds in the future. On the other hand there were comments in reports from TNRF and the 2010 Mid Term Review noting the inability of CSOs to document accurately and share the information that they had. The evaluation of 2011 (p.46) noted the fact that the “unwillingness of some CSOs to change has had negative impact on the programme, and sometimes forced the programme to terminate funding to CSOs prematurely such as was the case with PAICODEO in Mvomero, Musoma Anglican Diocese and SEFA in Serengeti”. There were also challenges for CSOs to discharge their fiduciary responsibilities to Government. The annual report of CARE for 2015 noted that due diligence conducted to both local and national level partner CSOs revealed that all PP partner organizations except PINGOS had some tax incompliance issues marked with late submission of Pay As You Earn (PAYE) and failure to submit Social Development Levy

(SDL) as statutorily required. The report states that these pose a risk to penalties and the ongoing work of these organizations.

Recommendation

CARE to look at CSOs who have the capacity to continue this work to see what needs to be done to strengthen their capacity through processes such as mentoring and socialised capacity development if needed.

Effectiveness in meeting Priority Needs of Male and Female Pastoralists

37. The programme has contributed to meeting some priority needs of pastoralists. As already noted, the voice of pastoralists especially women has increased in some places and some women have become involved in income generating activities and seem to make enough money to support their families. It has helped in some cases to unite pastoralists at local level and speak with one voice through pastoralist unions and associations. There has been some attempts to improve the environment through tree planting activities as a result of sensitisation on climate change effects. There is better service delivery in some districts – vaccination services, technical advisory support, construction or renovation of livestock infrastructure particularly dips and watering point, dams, water troughs, opening and expansion of livestock routes. Some pastoralists have been able to improve the quality of their herd (IIED Study on Best Practice p. 29).
38. Most of the achievements and the effectiveness of the programme have been at local level – in some villages, in a few districts e.g. Babati, Kiteto and Kilindi. The evidence of effectiveness of the programme at national level is:
- The involvement in the process of developing the new constitution which is now on hold;
 - The emergence of a few national level advocacy CSOs as well as supporting existing ones;
 - Engagement in national debate on reviewing the needs for pastoralists and land policies with respective ministries.
39. In the early 2000s there were two national level advocacy CSOs – PINGOs and TAPHGO. It was never clear which one was the voice of pastoralists. There were also attempts to have a national level forum to speak for pastoralists but from reports read this did not materialise. Through the Pastoralist Programme some new CSOs have emerged. CEDESOTA is one but it's main work is in Arumeru district. Chama cha Wafugaji Tanzania (CCWT) is another that claims a national mandate for pastoralists but it was not funded by the programme⁵. Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum (TPCF) is a third organisation that claims a national mandate.

⁵ CCWT means Chama cha Wafugaji Tanzania – Pastoralist Organisation Tanzania. PP has built their capacities on advocacy and lobbying. Although it applied to the PP, they were not recommended for funding. The review committee stated that CCWT had made some changes in the leadership, but there is a misunderstanding in which the old leadership was resisting to hand over the office keys to newly elected leaders. It was concluded that it wouldn't be wise to fund them at this time despite the fact that some of its members are potentially committed in addressing pastoralists' problems. In this regard, the committee advised the Secretariat to look on how to build its members capacity and even linking and engage them in advocacy issues at national level without directly injecting funds to their account

It is difficult to see the logic of encouraging more national level advocacy organisations as Government officials have regularly complained that pastoralists do not speak with one voice⁶.

40. There was also concern about CSOs trying to claim space that belonged to other organisations. This concern was expressed at a stakeholder meeting of a task force for the formation of pastoralist platform organised by CARE in September 2013 (see page 9 of minute of meeting). An example was given to the reviewers to illustrate this point. PINGOs is a long standing NGO claiming a mandate to represent pastoralists nationally. TPCF is a more recent organisation which has received funding three times from the PP. PINGOs had wanted to have a national pastoralist day based on an idea they picked up on a visit to Ethiopia. They did not have money to carry out the idea but TPCF with funding from the PP held the first national pastoralist day in Arusha in 2013 – they entered space which PINGOs saw as their domain and it created a lot of tension.

Claiming Attribution

41. In the course of the review the consultants came across a number of examples where the achievement of a task was attributed to the programme but in fact there were other influential actors that were not acknowledged. One relates to building the capacity of CSOs to write proposals and access donors. In the annual report of CARE and TNRF on the Pastoralist Programme for 2015 it is written '*Capacity building initiatives conducted by CARE particularly in project management enhanced partner CSOs' capacity in proposal writing which ultimately enabled them to access funds from other sources apart from PP..... This implies for the CSOs' organizational growth particularly in the areas of proposal development and/or financial management*'. While this may be true, PINGOs – one the the NGOs met as part of the review, contested the statement. The PP annual report 2015 states that PINGOs received \$425,671 from Swedish International Development Assistance (SIDA), Oxfam and International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IGWIA). This information was crossed checked with PINGOs. They said that it was incorrect. It was pointed out by PINGOs Forum that they have been receiving funding from these three organisations for many years.
42. Another relates to an achievement stated under governance and representation in the summary of achievements for 2013 produced by TNRF. The summary paper claimed that '*members of parliament, local and traditional leaders, LGAs and other development partners in Monduli, Longido and Ngorongoro teamed up and engaged their respective districts in discussing about the inclusion of climate change issues that affect pastoralists in drylands in the district budgets for 2013/14*'. This was an achievement of the IIED/Haki Kazi climate adaptation programme. Maybe some members of the Pastoralist Programme were involved but the work was that of IIED/Haki Kazi and it was not acknowledged. In 2014 the PP acknowledged the role of IIED/Haki Kazi as it was stated in the 2014 annual report that the PP supported 18 pastoralist women leaders participation in pastoralist women leaders' conferences on climate change and leadership event organized by IIED in collaboration with PP HakiKazi Catalyst, PWC, UCRT and TAMISEMI.

⁶ This reviewer had discussions in 2004 with senior Government officials when doing a study for DANIDA/ERETO with a view to Setting up a National Pastoralist Forum in Tanzania. These officials complained about the lack of one national and common voice for pastoralists.

43. In the Mid Term Evaluation 2010 (p. 18) under a heading ‘ability of pastoralists to exercise their rights and influence policies’, it is stated that *‘similarly, a group of Maasai women from Loliondo staged a sit-in at the state house demanding dialogue with the president. The women showed their understanding of the policies that affect them by citing sections on land laws in their arguments, and succeeded in blocking their eviction to give way for investors’*. It is written as a claim of the PBFP but the chief organiser of this ‘sit in’ was Pastoralist Women’s Council (PWC) and they are not acknowledged.

Robustness of Quantitative Data

44. There are questions related to the robustness of some of the quantitative data used. For example, in relation to land the annual report of CARE and TNRF for 2014 it states that *“in FY 2014 alone, a total of 605,565 hectares of grazing land were allocated or re-allocated by the government to support pastoralists as a result of PP partners’ efforts thus exceeding the FY 2014 target by 604,565 hectares. Nonetheless, extra efforts are still required to support the pastoralists to secure land tenure for protection of all restituted grazing lands through survey, beaconing and certification”*. In the 2015 annual report it states that *‘a total of 2,984,145 hectares of grazing land allocated to pastoralists in Kiteto, Simanjiro, Mvomero, Bunda, Serengeti and Kilindi Districts had been recovered and these together with 605,565 hectares reported in FY 2014 make a cumulative total of 3,589,761.40⁷ hectares of grazing land that have either been recovered or allocated for pastoralists in the programme area’*. It does not state from whom it was recovered – given the size of land involved. In relation to training, for 2009 it was stated that *‘a total of 86,369 were trained of whom HUDESA trained 58,376 people (68%)’*. According to the baseline survey of 2012 under annex 5.2 it is stated that *‘803, 608⁸ have been trained by the programme from 2008 through awareness meeting, training of trainers and ‘pastoralists trained’*. KITUMUSOTE trained 65,572 of these i.e. 8%. In the TNRF summary sheet for 2013, it was stated that 69,863 pastoralists and agro pastoralists participated in meetings, dialogue and capacity building sessions. For climate adaptation and mitigation strategies in the 2014 annual report of CARE (p. 36) it is stated that HUDESA reached directly a total of 26,156 and indirectly, a total of 457,904 through awareness creation and use of trained community-based TOTs in village and sub-village meetings.
45. In the annual report of CARE and TNRF 2014 (p.17) there was a claim that one CSO called LIVES had helped to restore 50,000 acres of grazing land at Losinoni village and ‘have raised concern to Arusha District Council for demarcating 580,000 hectares of grazing land for tenure assurance and protection from being grabbed by private investors’ in Olkokola, Oldonyosambu and Engikaret wards of Arumeru District. This is approximately 15% of the land mass of the whole region of Arusha.
46. As part of the review, these issues were raised with CARE about claiming attribution and the robustness of quantitative data. CARE admitted there were difficulties with the issues of attribution from partners. In relation to quantitative information collected they said that they

⁷ This is almost the total land mass of Arusha region.

⁸ This number would represent almost 50% of the entire population of Arusha region - 1,694,310 according to the 2012 census.

presented what their data collection system presented and they did not verify the accuracy of some information collected. The PPSC were also concerned about the realism of information collected. For example in the minutes of their meeting of March 2015 it was written that ‘the secretariat should conduct verifications of reported results and document the achievements on year basis. Moreover, it would be important to consider monitoring as a critical element in the programme implementation so as to establish whether reported information from partners is realistic’. They gave the following advice – ‘the Secretariat should ensure on-site follow up to verify the results being reported by implementing CSOs.

47. Irish Aid were also concerned about the lack of attribution of programme achievements as well as accuracy of quantitative data. In an email in February 2015 CARE and TNRF were reminded to acknowledge the contribution of other actors. They were also requested to strengthen quantitative data collection.

Recommendation

That CARE is requested to revisit and verify achievements and impacts of the programme especially those that can be quantified and report on them in final programme report in 2017.

Programme Design Including Appropriateness of Approach used by Irish Aid to select the partner

48. A number of organisations including Oxfam, PINGOs, TAPHGO, DANIDA and IA held at least three meetings in Mapambazuko Training Centre in Ngaramtoni⁹, Arusha in 2003 -2005 on issues related to pastoralism. Two IA staff, both of whom had an interest in pastoralist issues attended these meetings.
49. Whether as a result of these meetings or other factors IA decided to further their interest and involvement in pastoralism. They commissioned a study in 2005 on the ‘Need and Possible Entry Points for Development Cooperation Ireland (DCI) to Support Civil Society to Actively Engage in the Areas of Land Rights, Pastoralism and Conflict Resolution in Tanzania’. The study made a number of key points.
- DCI should focus on addressing the marginalisation of pastoral communities; building their capacity and empowering them (p. vi);
 - Many pastoral civil society groups are unrepresentative and unaccountable; have difficulty in establishing a common front with each other or strong links with other groups (p. 10);
 - DCI efforts to bring together pastoral NGOs to try and formulate an apex national pastoral forum were not very successful (p. 10);
 - Among the international NGOs, Oxfam is emerging as one of the most active actors in trying to facilitate the integration of pastoral priority issues into the national policy framework and some modest but important gains have been made in terms of statements about pastoralism in the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) official drafts such as the unprecedented statement in the final draft that a strategy will be to: Promote pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood system (p. 11);

⁹ This was a centre owned by the Medical Missionaries of Mary. It had run a number of courses for pastoralist organisations among others to build their capacity in planning and managing their projects. It had contact with all the organisations who were involved in pastoralism and the centre became a point of meeting.

- Four options were given as to how DCI could implement its support to civil society: (a) through the Embassy Local Governance Advisor; (b) through the Foundation for Civil Society; (c) outsourcing a competent firm or NGO; and (d) through a University-based institution.
50. The next documentary evidence available was a terms of reference for bidding to set up and manage a basket fund for support to civil society organisations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism. It was a call for reputable organisations to submit expressions of interest/proposals to IA. The scope of the proposal focused on qualities of grant management as seven of the eight points specified in the terms of reference related to the ability to manage the funds rather than on their experience and ability to engage with pastoralists. CARE was given the contract and they submitted a proposal to IA in 2007 to manage the fund. The selection of CARE caused surprise among pastoral civil society groups especially in Northern Tanzania and alienated a number of NGOs and CSOs who had some track record and some experience of working with pastoral communities and in advocacy work.
51. This was a concern for the final evaluation of the programme in 2011. The evaluator noted that it is important for CARE to pay attention to opinions of the umbrella organizations and opinion leaders among the pastoral communities, especially those from Northern Tanzania where there was initial stand-off between the PBFP and pastoral CSOs. This is important because their cooperation is very critical to ownership and success of the programme (see page 52 of evaluation. It was also a concern for the Basket Fund Governance Committee (BFGC). Some key pastoralist representatives were on the BFGC but did not attend governing meetings. The concern of non attendance of representatives of Northern CSOs was noted at two BFGC meetings. CARE implicitly acknowledged that there was a problem as in the 2011 proposal to IA it was stated that a new approach is required to make better links to the pastoralist organisations in the (northern) area and to build new ways of working with them.
52. CSOs were meant to be a means enabling pastoralists to improve their livelihoods. According to a report from the start up workshop on the PBFP in 2009, the programme was designed on the assumption that *‘Civil Society Organizations who are selected and who enter into partnership with the programme, are the agents for addressing pastoral concerns.....Since these CSOs normally live with pastoralists, and are part of pastoralists communities and some are managed by pastoralists they are the experts of their problems, and hence would normally develop projects that are a reflection of the pastoralist community in the identified areas’*. The qualities CARE brought to the programme appeared to be a strong track record of grant management – they had managed 7 similar funds before the PBFP. The same meeting outlined the selection criteria for implementing CSOs - not one related to working with pastoralists¹⁰.

¹⁰ Selection criteria were divided into two categories. The first category was used during assessment of concept notes as follows: That the applying CSO is a local NGO/CBO/FBO/Umbrella Organization; That the applying CSO is at least either based in or operating in the district it aspires to make its intervention; That the applying CSO should be existing legally i.e. registered CSO; That the applying CSO should be able to develop an action that is within the three identified areas of the PBFP; That the CSO should be ready to share information and collaborate with district council during development of projects and during implementation; That the CSO should be able to address at least one of the cross cutting issues when implementing their projects. The second category addresses components that are necessary when developing a concept note or proposal.

53. Given CAREs experience in grant management there was a strong emphasis on how the fund would be managed and less on how the CSOs would help communities secure their livelihoods. In fact, the conclusion to the evaluation in 2011 affirmed this when it stated that *‘the evaluation exercise exposes good management of grants as one of the main strengths of the PBFP.....but there is need to strengthen the capacity of the LGAs to enable them discharge their duties more efficiently and effectively’* (2011, p. 51). The second phase (PP) responded to this through a joint proposal between CARE and TNRF.
54. A number of studies were carried out early in the programme as follows:
- A participatory baseline situation analysis study to map potential pastoral CSOs in the area and assess their current status, especially areas where their capacity needs to be strengthened to improve their performance. The study also assessed capacity gaps in the local government institutions. A baseline survey was carried out in 2009. It gathered some good information especially on the pros and cons of various Government policies and laws related to pastoralism. It gathered some information on issues related to agro-pastoralists but baseline information collected related very scarcely if at all to any programme indicators. The BFGC at a meeting in September 2009 commented on the baseline and asked that the baseline include questions such as ‘What policies do exist? What are they saying in relation to Pastoralism?’
 - A stakeholder analysis – this was carried out and a one-page document was produced;
 - A separate Organizational Development Assessment (ODA) of short-listed pastoral CSO partners was also to be carried out as part of CSO partner selection process. It focused on organizational governance; technical expertise, management/capability; and institutional management capabilities.
55. A second proposal was made in 2011 for a Pastoralist Programme (PP)¹¹. This proposed further geographical expansion to other regions. It had two major changes from the first one. Work was to be managed by a partnership between TNRF and CARE linking CARE’s experience in grant making and project management with TNRF’s networking and advocacy and important links to pastoralist communities. The proposal contained a staged move to devolved grant-making so that pastoral CSOs could gain experience in grant management. There was no documentary evidence provided to show that this devolved grant-making actually happened.
56. A second baseline survey was carried out in 2012 and it stated that *‘overall the findings of the baseline data confirm a strong desire and commitment from CSOs to the objectives of Pastoralist Programme of CARE Tanzania’*. While it gave some good information about services available in different districts and budgetary allocations to district livestock offices it was not linked to the indicators of the programme. Overall it did not give information to measure the impact of the programme. It talked about resource use plan rather than land use plan (LUP) as the baseline study indicated that LUP alone might not be a panacea to land use conflicts in villages. The study stated that *‘resource use planning allows flexibility in land use*

¹¹ The name of the second phase was changed from Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme to Pastoralist Programme. The first phase envisaged other donors coming on board and contributing to the basket whereas the second programme was focused on pastoralists with Irish Aid as the sole donor.

where pastoralists will be able to access other lands such as wildlife reserve, village forest and reserve forest during critical conditions in well stated agreements’.

57. In the light of the mid term review in early 2014, a refocusing strategy was developed. It was an attempt to get greater shape and focus on the whole programme. It suggested stronger focus on land rights, advocacy, gender and climate change as well as a strategic selection of partners and geographic focal areas. The major changes included in the refocused strategy included:
- Explicitly spelled out geographical focus of the programme;
 - Suggested grant size, its objectives and focus;
 - Revised partner selection process and criteria;
 - Clarified advocacy and information flow ;
 - Suggested improvement of the relationship between sub-grantees and CARE on financial and contractual matters;
 - A revised theory of change and how to strengthen the national advocacy component and
 - Revised programme governance and staffing.
58. A set of programme deliverables were developed from the refocused strategy with outcomes, output(s) for each outcome, output level deliverables, activities and partner contribution. This refocused strategy guides the programme in 2016. It was a significant turning point in the programme as it put much greater focus on results and programme deliverables. This changed focus was also evident in the minutes of PPSC meetings as committee members started to ask tougher questions about the results and impact of the programme.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of the overall management arrangement of the programme

59. IA was the initiator of the programme. They commissioned the implementation responsibility to CARE Tanzania. There was a contract between IA and CARE for both phase 1 and phase 2 of the programme. CARE Tanzania implemented the programme through pastoralist CSOs or CSOs working with pastoralists on the ground. CARE had contracts with these selected CSOs.
60. Article 6 of the 2007 MoU between IA and CARE outlined the relationship between IA and CARE in terms of planning, monitoring, review and evaluation. In 2011 CARE was treated like a consultant and signed an MoU for consultancy services. Article 20.1 of the contract states that the Minister may undertake post project evaluation of the impact and cost effectiveness of projects or programmes which it funds and the consultant should give reasonable access to records held by the consultant in connection with the contract.
61. In phase 1 there was a Basket Fund Governing Committee (BFGC) later changed to Steering Committee for phase 2 of the programme. This committee was to have ultimate decision making over the fund. It was to comprise members from Government¹², IA, CARE, pastoralist

¹² The chairperson of the BFGC was from the MoLFD. She is now the deputy permanent secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries.

CSOs and the media. According to the minutes of the meeting of the BFGC January 2008 it was agreed that the roles of the BFGC should be: -

- To provide overall strategic and policy direction/guidance for the management of the fund.
- Authorize major changes in the basket fund programmes strategy and approve basket fund policies and procedures.
- To provide advice on strategies for generating a wider pool of potential donors to fund the programme.
- To participate in the field visits as may be scheduled by the programme management at least once in a year. Such a trip will expose participants to realities on the ground, influence members personally to do some advocacy at their office level and verify whether funds disbursed have reached the targeted CSOs for operating with pastoralist communities.
- Review the progress of the programme.

62. At the same meeting it was stated that ‘programme update with achievements accomplished were listed’. There was no evidence from the minutes if these achievements met the set targets. Similar statement of achievement were made in subsequent minutes but there was no evidence of the basis of these achievements.

63. The BFGC used to visit CSO projects as part of their meeting. They had three questions:

- What inspired members from what they saw in the field regarding the two activities?
- How the field visit influenced or changed member's minds or perception about the programme?
- What members think the CSO visited needs to do more or do better?

64. While these questions were a useful framework it was not clear how the answers to them helped the BFGC to assess the progress of the pastoralist programme – one of the roles of the BFGC. There was no evidence from the minutes that the members visited CSOs with copies of the action plans and budgets for example.

65. It was not clear how systematic the BFGC was in following up on resolutions. When the resolutions from one meeting were compared to what was achieved at the next meeting there was no clear link. When resolutions made in agenda no 6 from the BFGC meeting of March 2008 were compared with matter arising for agenda 6 in the following meeting it was not clear what was actually achieved. While it was stated in the minutes of BFGC Sept 2008 that matters arising were prepared and shared in advance in a tabular form, from reading minutes of meetings it was not clear the link between some resolutions and actions taken.

66. Something similar happened at the next meeting. There were a number of resolutions from the meeting of September 2008 which were of interest to this review:

- Need to find out a better way of presenting fund expended and those requested to be clear and convince the donor to disburse all funds for the second year.
- Need for CARE and Irish Aid to meet and clear out the gap existing.
- Next year the budget needs to be more elaborate indicating each item in each category.

67. There was no evidence from the minutes of the following meeting if these resolutions had been carried out. There was also confusion re follow up as the language used in the minutes

were ‘matters arising’. In the minutes of June 2013 it was stated ‘feedback from resolutions of the previous meeting were presented and status of implementation given’.

68. In phase 1 the fund was managed by a Basket Fund Management Team (BFMT) housed in CARE Tanzania’s Country Office with a team of three staff comprising a full time Program Manager, the Director of Programs (part-time) and the Director of Finance and Administration (part-time). The BFMT was to manage the fund which included the identification of potential CSO partners, the screening and submission of proposals to the BFGC for approval, disbursement and monitoring of grants, sub-grantee organizational capacity building, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and liaison with Irish Aid. The BFMT was to advise the BFGC on the day-to-day activities of the PBFP.
69. For phase 2, CARE Tanzania and TNRF worked together as partners submitted a joint proposal but as per signed contract CARE was a lead agency. CARE Tanzania took responsibility for all financial and reporting aspects of the management relationship. CARE commissioned TNRF as expert/technical service provider. TNRF and CARE were to work together in terms of design and reflecting on and modifying project work as learning emerges from the initial stages of the work. A summary of the terms under which CARE and TNRF operated are included as appendix 10.
70. For phase 2 a Pastoralist Programme Steering Committee was established with IA, relevant Government ministries, TNRF, CARE and representatives of pastoral CSOs as members. The key role of the Steering Committee was to provide strategic and policy guidance and directions to the program. IA was to discharge its management responsibilities in direct contact with CARE and use its presence on the Steering Committee to facilitate the sharing of learning and good practices, as well as providing strategic advice.

Monitoring

71. One important role of CARE was to monitor the implementation of the proposal and plans. According to the 2007 proposal from CARE to IA, there was to be a results-based monitoring and evaluation approach in which priority was to be given to tracking the results of project interventions rather than reporting on completion of activities. A program performance monitoring and evaluation plan was to be developed during the first six months. Monitoring results were to be analyzed to highlight the contribution of the PBFP to the Tanzania MKUKUTA and IA Country Strategy Programme goal. It was also proposed that when deemed necessary, special studies were to be conducted to provide deeper understanding of emerging issues from program implementation. Monitoring results and lessons learned were to be documented and disseminated in multiple forms to suit the targeted audience, for example, progress reports, publications, case/human interest stories, posters and radio programs in English, Kiswahili and the local dialect of pastoral communities. At the national level, experiences from the program were to inform CARE Tanzania’s engagement in national policy dialogue. At the international level, experiences gained were to feed into CARE Tanzania’s engagement with other Country Offices.

72. It was proposed that a situational analysis/baseline study be conducted within the first six months of project inception. The 52-page survey was conducted 18 months after the start of the programme in March 2009. It was not linked to the indicators of the first proposal.
73. There was no documentary evidence that a results based tracking system was developed and utilised. In the start up workshop held in 2009 the approach to monitoring was less specific and seen as operating at three levels.
- Project staff implementing the project do their own monitoring and reporting quarterly.
 - Programme staff from the programme office visiting implementing partners on quarterly basis.
 - Basket Fund Governing Committee visiting a project site and assessing implementation and progress.
74. In the 2010 MTR (p.8) in relation to monitoring, it stated that CARE relies on quarterly reports submitted by the CSOs and physical visit to project sites to monitor the progress of the programme. This review goes on to state that the programme targets vast areas therefore putting a lot of pressure on its human and financial resources, which may finally compromise monitoring efficiency of programme activities (p.27). The evaluation of 2011 noted that the PBFP does not have enough technical staff to follow up on the progress of the numerous projects going on in different parts of the country at the same time. There was little more information on the monitoring system except in the evaluation of 2011 where the consultant said that changes have taken place as evidenced in the monitoring and evaluation reports. Reference was also made in the MTR and evaluation to training in monitoring and evaluation that took. The word baseline was used four times in the evaluation of 2011 but three of the references were for a baseline survey conducted by ENVIROCARE in Kilindi district – there was no reference to the 2009 baseline carried out for the programme and the information contained does not seem to have been used as a reference point for progress made in phase 1.
75. In the 2011 proposal it was proposed to recruit a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Officer. It proposed monitoring the effectiveness of capacity strengthening as a first level of achievement. It also proposed to monitor access to local services as a measure of success and to use baseline information from the results of Phase I to track changes. The next level of monitoring proposed would be the capacity of CSOs to engage at local levels with land issues and with LGA provision of services. It also proposed to monitor networking exchanges between CSOs and between CSOs and other agencies as an indicator of changes in CSOs' capacities to engage at national level as the highest level of success in advocacy is in changes in policy documents or in the interpretation of policy.
76. In 2013 a monitoring and evaluation matrix was developed. It was linked to the indicators of the logical framework. It had twelve columns. From documentary evidence it was not clear the extent to which it was used and how useful it was. The MTR 2014 had little to say on monitoring.
77. **There was a noticeable change in 2014.** With the refocusing of the programme, a more systematic approach to monitoring was used. It noted that individual site visits are required to support monitoring processes. It recommended a review of reporting templates including

impact reporting and the development of a tailor-made approach to monitoring, review and evaluation as well as the improvement of reporting to national level stakeholders. The intervention logic and the data collection tools were revised. A new set of concrete deliverables for the programme was developed for 2015 with outcomes, outputs, output indicators and activities with the party responsible for the achievement of each activity. The format of the annual reports also took on board the information coming from this newly designed monitoring framework. There was a great focus on the achievement of outcomes using the indicators identified for each outcome in reports from 2014 onwards.

78. These statements of intent from the refocusing strategy would indicate a lack of satisfaction and confidence in the previous monitoring and reporting system. There was also a change of tone and emphasis in relation to monitoring in PPSC meetings following this refocusing strategy.
79. In the minutes of the PPSC meeting of June 2014 it was stated that
If there is '**good monitoring**' of what is going on the ground and '**documentation of evidence-based practices**' in form of case studies or solution stories for shared learning and dissemination. The reason behind this is that, M & E is critically important as it enables the capturing of what is realized in line with higher level results expected at the project goal and objectives, thus validating worth investment of the programme...Conversely, lack of documentation brings understanding that a horrible work is done making it difficult to report and link with higher level results.
80. One of the means used by both the BFGC and the PPSC to monitor was the visitation of projects as part of their meeting. Usually one day was allocated for site visitation and then a discussion was carried out at the meeting on the second day. Some very constructive comments were shared according to the minutes of meetings especially PPSC meetings post the refocusing strategy. Two examples help to illustrate this point. In the minutes of the PPSC meeting of June 2014 members commented that WODSTA did a good work on the ground only that DOCUMENTATION, PACKAGING and DISSEMINATION still need remarkable attention (p. 5). In the minutes of the PPSC meeting of March 2015 following a visit to COSITA it was stated that there was clear evidence of COSITA's good work and the fact that it has been able to address the real needs of the beneficiaries, good cooperation with local government both at village and the district level. They also advised COSITA of a 'need to strengthen the monitoring with vigilance on the results for quality assurance'. However there was no evidence of the use of the programme proposal or action plans in monitoring visits to see the extent to which the programme and the implementing CSO was achieving what it set out to achieve.
81. There were two baseline surveys carried out – one in March 2009 and another in August 2012. It was not clear how useful the surveys were and the extent to which they were used as a tool for monitoring.
82. After the refocusing of the programme, there was a definite change in attitude to baseline information. For example in CARE/TNRF annual report 2014 it was recommended that a 'quick and dirty' baseline study would be necessary to establish baseline information for

comparison with revised logical framework indicators. It was noted that the addition of some indicators may require acquisition necessary baseline information which at this moment might be lacking. There was a revised logical framework in October 2014.

Case Study: Management of Reviews and Evaluation.

One of the mechanisms established in the MoU between IA and CARE to establish the outcomes of the partnership and to recommend how the outcomes of this programme can be sustained and further developed in subsequent years was an evaluation. MTRs and evaluation are critical mechanisms used by governing bodies to get independent evidence as to the extent that project objectives and outputs have been achieved.

There were two MTRs and one evaluation carried out. The first MTR in 2010 and the end of phase 1 evaluation were carried out by the same consultant with different assistant consultants within a ten-month period. It was not clear to what extent the objectives of the MTR 2010 review were achieved and evidence from minutes of BFGC meetings indicated that no one asked questions about it either. The MTR was discussed at the meeting of the BFGC in November 2010 but the comments related more to how the review was conducted e.g. Criteria used to select areas visited in the MTR, threats not addressed etc? However more challenging questions do not appear to have been asked e.g. why was most of the focus on supporting the capacity building of CSOs rather than on actions to help pastoralists secure their livelihood; why had the programme such a wide span both geographically and numerically with CSOs and targeting agro-pastoralists as well as pastoralists when it was a basket fund for pastoralists.

There was no documentary evidence to show the impact of the 2011 evaluation on the programme. From the documentary evidence provided there was no BFGC meeting after the evaluation of 2011 and there was no documentary evidence of any questions being asked in relation to the evaluation by either the BFGC or any other stakeholder.

A second MTR was carried out in 2014. In the minutes of the PPSC meeting of June 2013 it was stated that this review should give evidence of impact realized. The copy of the MTR provided for this IA review was a draft with comments still on the report so it is not clear if this report was ever finalized. This seems to have been a review that provoked responses from both the Pastoralist Programme Steering committee and IA. There were a number of substantial questions asked by the steering committee. In the minutes of the Steering Committee meeting February 2014, members stated that the report should show how the PP has contributed to address vulnerability and governance? The Steering Committee also asked questions such as: Have the services required by pastoralists to improve their livelihood improved? Has the pastoralism policy been developed? Has the impact of the training been observed? Have conflicts between pastoralists and farmers or among them been reduced? It also stated that the report needed to have case studies that will provide some evidence of impact made. According to these minutes in February 2014 there was no question asked about evidence of impacts of the programme. In the light of these questions 'A Strategy for Refocusing of the Pastoralist Programme in line with Mid Term Review Recommendations' was developed. This was the most important achievement of the 2014 MTR. From the evidence provided it was the first time that a review or evaluation was converted into a set of concrete actions that seriously addressed issues arising in a review or evaluation.

83. IA was concerned about the lack of a monitoring matrix and the lack of clearly defined targets with CARE. In an IA, CARE partnership meeting of February 2012 the issue was discussed. It appears that there was some progress. At a subsequent partnership meeting in September 2013 it was stated that reports were activity based and less on results. It stated that ‘reports were given against work plans but work plans did not always relate to proposals and indicators. The minute of the meeting also noted the need for more accuracy in reports and the need to revise the M&E framework and sharpen indicators.
84. CARE had an agreement with TNRF and other implementing CSOs – a copy of the agreement with TNRF was analysed – see appendix 10 for the key points of the agreement. While there were clearly defined reporting requirements and dates as well as financial verification requirements, there were no clear deliverables in relation to the achievement of outputs and outcomes for CARE to monitor the performance of TNRF. CARE carried out due diligence on its implementing partners e.g. TNRF, there was no documentary evidence provided to show that IA carried out due diligence on CARE.
85. Overall, there are areas for improvement on the processes for managing the whole programme from Irish Aid down to CSOs working at community level. Baseline surveys were lengthy but contained little useful information for measuring the progress of the programme. Monitoring systems while very aspirational in the proposal were weak as they were not linked to good baseline information and were not systematic in collecting information. From the documentation provided, there was no evidence provided to show that CARE had an appropriate monitoring system until after the refocusing exercise in 2014. It appears from information presented in reports that there was little validation of information. In general, there was poor reporting and apparently little documentary evidence of analysis of reports and the level of detail was generally weak.
86. However this has largely been addressed in the refocused programme where there are clear agreed outputs and outcomes with SMART indicators and a monitoring plan clearly linked to the indicators. The reports post the refocusing exercise are clearly linked to the achievement of the indicators. IA also noted this in an email of September 2014 where they noted the improvement in reports.

Record Keeping for PPSC

87. The PPSC were not happy with how minutes of previous meetings were read. At their meeting of November 2012 a suggestion was given that ‘the secretariat should ensure all members get relevant meeting documents in advance. Members also have responsibility to read and understand them before the meeting’. Issues also arose in relation to documentation for PPSC meetings in June 2015.
88. There was a change in tone in the minutes of meetings from June 2014 onwards after the refocusing strategy. For example in the minutes of June 2014 it was stated that the secretariat was advised that the minutes will be signed by the chairperson as approved minutes after the corrections are done and confirmation of the minutes was left pending subject to incorporation of the corrections made. There was also clearer reference made to the achievement of resolutions. The same meeting also passed a resolution that ‘the progress report was accepted,

BUT should be reviewed and re-written with focus on the outcomes'. The PPSC was also placing an increasing focus on the achievement of outcomes. For example in the minutes of PPSC meeting of August 2015 the PPSC advised the Secretariat to get information on the number of women holding leadership positions at various levels during the Local Government election held in November, 2014.

89. Irish aid was also concerned about the lack of implementation of resolutions from meetings of the PPSC. In a partnership meeting of March 2015 it was noted that resolutions from previous meetings need to be incorporated into CARE's action plan and its implementation to be reported back to the next PPSC meeting..

Challenges

90. The programme had a number of challenges. Some have already been noted – the lack of use of indicators of success meaning it was hard to measure the success of the programme; the lack of attribution of some achievements; the lack of acceptance by some pastoralist NGOs/CSOs of CARE as a grant manager; and the weak design of the initial programme which led to the need to refocus the programme in 2014.

Issue of Targeting

91. There were other challenges that affected the programme:
- The title of the programme was Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme, later renamed Pastoralist Programme. However what was meant by a pastoralist was never adequately defined. The 2007 proposal from CARE to IA noted that 'traditionally, pastoralism has been described as a mode of production where livestock keepers move their animals for the search of pasture, water and land' and it further stated that 'pastoralist livelihood depends heavily on livestock and it noted the key role of mobility in the system'.
 - From reports read there was no analysis of the key pillars of the pastoral system – the pastoralists, the herd and the resources like land, water and grass. While there was some reference to improving livestock herds, or livestock routes or water availability it was never presented in the context of addressing the whole pastoralist system. The policy environment was also complex and sometimes contradictory. Many policies favoured livestock development as distinct from pastoralism. Policies favoured settlement rather than mobility. Some policies and laws contradict e.g. land belongs to villagers but wildlife belongs to Government meaning that wildlife is trespassing on village land. The proposal was very expansive and spoke of pastoralists and groups who also keep large herds of animals, but also practice agriculture farming and are more sedentary in nature. The 2007 proposal stated that '*priority will be given to those areas where there are high unmet needs and areas where CARE is already operational*'. However the proposal did not state where CARE was already operational. Pastoralist activists in 2007 did not perceive CARE as operational where there was a high proportion of pastoralists e.g. Arusha and Manyara etc.
92. IA also was not clear on the specific target group. According to the minutes of the BFGC meeting in September 2008 the IA representative in his closing remarks said that '*the programme is covering most of the major areas with concentrated population of*

pastoralists and agro-pastoralists; Eastern, Lake zone and Northern’ and he went on to ‘*encourage members to share more information related to pastoralism and appreciated the chairperson's exposure of issues in pastoralism and emphasized the role of media in giving information on pastoralism’*. These comments indicated that the programme covers pastoralists and agro pastoralists – something not mentioned in the title of the programme. From the minutes of the PPSC meeting of 2012 it stated that TAGRODE’s project addresses practical needs of pastoralists and crop farmers. There was no question asked in the light of TAGRODE targeting crop farmers even though it was a pastoralist programme.

Challenge of working through Pastoralist CSOs

93. Another challenge was the route chosen to implement the programme. The programme opted to work through pastoral CSOs which is particularly challenging. Many pastoral CSO groups are unrepresentative and unaccountable; have difficulty in establishing a common front with each other or strong links with other groups; and have limited financial resources and poor management skills. Hesse and Odhiambo (2002) further noted:

...many of these groups have been set up by well-educated urban elite that does not necessarily represent or defend the interests of the pastoral community, and there is concern that as they proliferate these associations are used to secure funding for individuals rather than to serve the needs of those they are supposed to represent. To a certain extent, Northern donors and development NGOs are contributing to this process by funding such organisations (p. 5).

Challenge of Design of Programme Intervention

94. There were problems with the intervention logic. The proposed program was addressing IA’s overarching objective of “Poverty reduction, to reduce vulnerability and increase opportunity” by contributing to sustainable rural livelihoods and growth. The outputs for phase one were not very robust for the achievement of the stated purpose and goal. In fact, **it was when the programme was refocused in 2014 that the outcomes and outputs were more appropriate for the achievement of the programme purpose and goal**. Indicators selected for phase 1 and phase 2 were also very weak and they were not tracked in reports. For example, in the proposal for phase 2 one output was ‘Effective evidence-based advocacy to influence policy and implementation with one of the indicators being ‘number of CSOs with advocacy strategies and addressing pastoralist community issues/concerns’. There was no tracing of this indicator or no update given on progress to achieving this in any report provided. A second output was ‘representation of pastoralists at local and national levels, leading to greater respect of their rights’ with one indicator being ‘*pastoralists organizing appearing in governance meetings at multiple levels*’ but no update was ever given in any reports provided. Indicators were greatly strengthened in the refocused strategy of 2014.

Challenging Policy Context

95. The design did not appear to take sufficient cognizance of a changing policy environment for pastoralists given that the programme had a strong policy component. A Cordaid

commissioned study was carried out in 2008¹³ on ‘Options for Pastoralists to Secure Their Livelihoods in Tanzania: Current Policies, Legal Issues and Economic Prospects’. This study outlined how policy is formulated in Tanzania yet no reference was made to the study and some pastoralist CSOs including TAPHGO were involved in the study.

96. There were a number of newly created policies that in principle had impact on pastoralism – ‘Kilimo Kwanza’ which put modernisation and expansion of crop production at the centre of government agricultural policy, the focus on ‘Big Results Now’, the ‘National Climate Change Strategy’ to name but three¹⁴ but the programme did not take cognizance of the implications of these. The MTR 2014 states that pastoralism as a livelihood is not reflected in the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP), Kilimo Kwanza, Big Results Now (BRN) and National Climate Change Strategy (p. 77).
97. Given that advocacy was a key element of the programme there is need for flexibility as one has to be able to respond to particular situations and opportunities as they arise. The strong focus on grant management greatly reduced the flexibility that is required for good advocacy work. The 2014 MTR (p.64) stated that a balance had to be found between grant control mechanisms and flexible programme mechanisms.

Lack of Strong Gender Analysis

98. According to IUCN, interventions that attempt to support gender equity and pastoral women’s empowerment need to start with pastoral women themselves. Empowerment is more sustainable and facilitating when it comes from within. Women’s place and role in the pastoral unit and community needs to be understood and acknowledged (IUCN, 2013).
99. Men and women in pastoralist communities have very differentiated roles. While men have overall responsibility for the household (boma) and in particular for the herd, women have responsibility for the provision of food, care of the children, sick and elderly, maintaining the house structure, looking after land around the homestead and looking after small animals.
100. There were weaknesses in gender analysis at the design stage and this continued into the implementation stage. There was no evidence provided that any robust gender analysis was done as part of the programme. The study of 2005 did not analyse the benefits or drawbacks of a proposed programme on women or point out that there may be need to do a gender analysis to ensure that women gain benefits from the programme. This study only noted the increasing workload that pastoralist women are experiencing (p.54). If such a study had been carried out it would have helped the programme to see how and where best to intervene in order to help secure the livelihoods of both the male and female pastoralists.

¹³ Pastoralist CSOs/NGOs involved in the study included PWC, CORDS, TAPHGO, UCRT, IIED and OXFAM.

¹⁴ For more details on the various policies see Sam Greene ‘Case Study on Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania’ and Brehony et al 2013: 2013: ‘Study on the Rights of Pastoralist Women to a Livelihood and to Property: A Case Study of Empowering Women through Women’s Solidarity Bomas in Ngorongoro and Longido Districts’.

101. For the Pastoralist Programme Phase II, mainstreaming gender and climate change were to form an integral part of the programme. The proposal noted that there are some important issues in gender relations within pastoralist communities that are very specific in addition to the gender issues that affect all human societies. These include resource ownership, decision making and participation, girls' education and some harmful traditions like female circumcision and early marriage. From reports provided the programme does not appear to have addressed some of these gender related challenges especially resource ownership and decision making.

Recommendation

That IA and CARE ensures that interventions in specialised areas/issues such as pastoralism, land issues, gender related issues are carefully researched and any planned interventions are well designed making sure to select implementing partners with the most appropriate knowledge and skills in that technical area.

That good gender analysis based on robust research is carried out before intervening in marginalized communities – in this programme from the little evidence provided it appears that women played a key role in ensuring the economic stability of the household.

102. There were a few other challenges.

- There was **no serious interest to support PBFP from potential donors** besides IA¹⁵. DANIDA had shown interest but no commitment of funds was made. The European Union also had some initial interest but no commitments were made. However the programme wanted to attract other donors. From the minutes of the BFGC January 2008 it was stated that 'the programme will try to attract other donors through excellent implementation, sharing information of successes to other donors and CARE trying to develop other programmes'. The evaluation of 2011 noted this as one of the major weaknesses that threaten the sustainability of PBFP. There were also efforts to involve Oxfam, who have been a very active and respected supporter of pastoralists for many years. According to the minutes of PPSC of June 2014 it was stated that 'despite the failure of past initiatives taken to engage Oxfam, there is a need to still find the reason why they did not participate and find best way to invite them'.
- **Changes of leadership after capacity has been built.** According to the IIED study 'Assessing the Sustainability of Pastoralist Programme Capacity Building', the elections in 2014 and 2015 saw quite a change in leadership at local level. Many individuals from village level to district level who received training from the PP have been replaced or relocated. This is a critical problem for village councils, who have been major driving forces in creating positive outcomes on the basis of receiving capacity building training. There is a risk that the loss of these skills, and the replacement of councilors with new individuals, may undermine changes taking place so far.
- **Lack of a Robust Framework for Advocacy.** The refocusing strategy of 2014 noted '*the limited opportunities for knowledge, best practices, and problems identified at the CSO level to feed up and inform policy and legal discussions at the national level. To address*

¹⁵ International Land Coalition (ILC) did offer some support to a Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP 1) in Kiteto district in Manyara region and Kondoa, Chamwino and Bahi districts in Dodoma region and funded by International Land Coalition (ILC) in conjunction with International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

the “gap” between local level CSO actions and priorities and national advocacy processes, the programme will engage with national level, pastoralist NGO networks. These NGOs will jointly develop and implement a coherent advocacy strategy, supported by TNRF and link directly with local level CSOs as part of this strategy’. A pastoralist programme advocacy strategy was developed and it envisaged working through a number of national advocacy CSOs. The IIED study on ‘Assessing the Sustainability of Pastoralist Programme Capacity Building’ stated that policy-makers are dependent on robust evidence and experience of what is happening on the ground. Gathering evidence to this effect, and communicating it to advocacy CSOs, is a key role that pastoralist groups and associations can play. The study found that this system of communication is not currently strong enough to channel local perspectives to the national level and none of the CSO’s appear to have a systematic approach to gathering and channelling information, which makes presentation of current experiences to MP’s and others difficult (IIED, Sustainability Case Study, p. 29). The advocacy strategy did not come up with a strong framework to address the challenges noted in the IIED study.

- **Lack of Real Understanding of the Implications of Cross Border Mobility for Pastoralists.** While the two proposals from CARE to IA acknowledged the importance of mobility to pastoralists there was no mention or action proposed in relation to cross border issues e.g, the movement of livestock from Kenya to Tanzania in times of drought and how to address this challenge.
- **Lack of Knowledge on the Role of Traditional Institutions.** There was little or no mention or focus on elders and traditional institutions and local knowledge in either proposals or reports – it was not clear if CSOs and CARE were lacking in knowledge of the key role they play or they did not see them as important institutions in the delivery of the programme.
- **Understanding Resilience.** Resilience is the ability to become strong, healthy, or successful again after something bad happens¹⁶. According to IIED (2015) resilience is typically associated with ownership of productive assets such as livestock, land, access to water and good water management, access to markets, supportive policies at national and local level like land use planning, the enactment of suitable bye laws supported by district councils. Local/indigenous knowledge and existing adaptive strategies also plays a key role in resilience. In the light of potential support from IA for programmes addressing resilience in the future some lessons learned from the programme have been identified.

Lessons Learned to Inform Future Programming

103. A few key lessons were learned over the span of the programme period that can inform future programming in building and strengthening resilience of marginalised communities and women in particular. These are documented below. For a more detailed lessons learned from the work of three different programmes including the Pastoralist Programme see case study on ‘Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania’¹⁷.

¹⁶ www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilience

¹⁷ This is a study of three projects in Tanzania that seek to enhance climate risk management: 1. A programme to establish a “devolved level climate finance mechanism” implemented by the International Institute for Environment

- 104. Enabling Marginalised Communities have control over resources is very important.** Many of the CSOs supported reported on their work of either helping pastoralist to reclaim back land or have routes for livestock to pass or have water available for their livestock. The critical lesson here is that communities like pastoralists want to have access to and if possible control over the resources that are critical to their way of life. Despite the efforts of CSOs to help pastoralists reclaim back some land there is no evidence that this will be a long term solution as no evidence is provided to show that these communities have security of tenure over these resources.
- 105. Women if Supported are Key to Transforming Local Communities.** When communities and village councils in pastoralist areas are trained on women's rights to own assets such as land, livestock or businesses, women actively seek these rights in many communities (Brehony et al, 2013, IIED, 2015). A number of CSOs worked with pastoralist women especially in the second phase of the programme. They trained women on issues such as land rights for women, leadership and income generation. Some women were financially empowered and increased their say in household and communal decision making. In a few situations women who knew their rights were able to get village governments and local leaders to give them land for their own use. When women are empowered to establish or run income generating activities it benefits everyone in a household. Examples were given where women used financial resources to support children in school and improve the health of their family.
- 106. CSOs are best at advocacy work at local community level.** Most of the work of the CSOs took place at village level and some at district level. CSOs seemed to have more influence at village level. It is productive to focus on issues of interest to the government as well. There were some examples where some CSOs were able to influence district Governments to allocate resources – personnel and in some cases district Government constructed infrastructure for pastoralists at community level. While Government claims policy making as its domain (Brehony et al, 2004), Government staff have shown a willingness to listen to evidence generated by CSOs and to incorporate them into budgetary or other discussions. Advocacy has been most effective when it has focused resources on strategic moments such as during the parliamentary government budget sessions or constitutional review process.
- 107. Need to be Clear on Entry Point for Engagement with Policy Makers.** One needs to be clear on what is the most appropriate and strategic entry point to engage with Government in terms of policy making, planning and advocacy work. One needs to ask who are the best people/departments to involve, how best to involve them, why involve them, what improvements are you looking for and what are the potential benefits to beneficiaries. The district authority is an effective entry point for planning and resource allocation as decentralisation places the district as the driver of socio-economic planning. The Village Assembly is another key institution to bring change. Experience from the programme showed that one can change perceptions of the village assembly on gender, land rights, care for the

and Development, funded by the UK's Department for International Development. 2. A "Pastoralist Programme" focusing on community support and national advocacy managed jointly by Tanzania Natural Resources Forum and Care Tanzania, implemented by local and national Civil Society Organizations. 3. A Pastoralism Programme, also focusing on community support, national and international level advocacy managed by Oxfam Tanzania and implemented by national CSOs in Tanzania.

environment and communal empowerment and this can lead to positive change in the lives of community members. For example, training local land tribunals in appropriate land laws and operating procedures reduced local conflict over boundaries of individual plots of land and disputes between pastoralists and farmers. The village government seemed to be the entry point for most CSOs supported by the programme.

108. The importance of alliance building and inclusiveness. The success of the Katiba Initiative demonstrated the impact that broad alliances can have. PINGOs Forum pointed out that regular meetings with representatives of farmers, hunter gatherers and mining groups played an important role in developing a common position in relation to issues like security of tenure over resources. It is noted that while there was some engagement with central Government there was little if any engagement of the private sector in the whole programme.

109. Base Interventions on Solid Research. One of the weaknesses of the programme was the lack of solid research to lay good foundations for the programme – lack of gender analysis, lack of understanding how policies are made, lack of understanding of the role of different pastoralist institutions are just a few examples whereby better understanding of these issues would have strengthened the programme and guided appropriate training. It is only in 2015 - 2016 that a number of studies have been undertaken, which if carried out earlier would have strengthened programme interventions e.g. studies on best practices, gender etc.

110. Need for Gradual Approach and Longer Term Investment. Linked to the need for solid research is the need to gradually develop a programme which has time to validate findings of research, consult key stakeholders and allow time for change. The PP had a one-year cycle. Many CSOs at annual stakeholder meetings complained about the short project cycle.

Recommendation

That for any future programme to build and strengthen resilience that appropriate and effective entry points to the community are selected. The district seems to be a very effective one as it is half way between the national level and villages where communities seek out their livelihoods on a day by day basis.

That in the planning of programmes to build and strengthen resilience there is need to help marginalised communities have access to and if possible control over the resources that are critical to their way of life

Knowledge Gaps

111. There are some knowledge gaps that a future programme based on resilience can address. The following are a few areas where more knowledge could enhance a programme:

- The role of local/indigenous knowledge, organisation and practice and how it can enhance resilience;
- The role of women in production systems and how their role can be enhanced in the light of cultural constraints;
- The impact of land titling and land use planning on securing livelihoods;
- The impact of resource conflicts on farmer pastoralist livelihoods;
- Knowing how change comes about and the role and influence of culture especially within marginalised and traditional societies e.g. role of elders, traditional leaders etc.

Conclusion

112. While it was a programme of two phase - phase 1 from 2007 to 2011 and phase 2 from 2011 to 2016, in reality there was a pre 2014 programme and a post 2014 programme. Until 2014 there has been some achievements around land and livestock routes but there is a question as to the impact of some achievements according to the documentation available. Some few districts e.g. Kiteto, Kilindi and Babati, pastoralists seemed to have gained some tangible benefits but there is a question as to the longer term impact as there was little indications of land reclaimed being titled or cattle routes being legally secure. Pastoralist CSOs have been major short term beneficiaries but few are sustainable. At national level little has changed and not much seems to have been achieved to advance pastoralist men and women's right to a sustainable livelihood. The fact that programme management saw a need to refocus the programme in 2014 indicated a general dissatisfaction with the achievements till then. It is too early to say what impact the refocused programme has had but at least it provided greater geographic and activity focus to the programme as well as a clearer focus on the results to be achieved. At the time of this review it was too early to see the impact of this refocusing. There was generally a lack of analysis in the whole programme – from analysing who exactly was the target group was to understanding how the pastoralist way of life is organised and how best to engage with this way of life.

Recommendations

The following is a summary of consolidated recommendations made in the report:

- That good and appropriate documentation is kept and available when one wants to do a long term review of a programme.
- That CARE looks at CSOs who have the capacity to continue this work to see what needs to be done to strengthen their capacity through processes such as mentoring and socialised capacity development if needed;
- That CARE is requested to revisit and verify achievements and impacts of the programme especially those that can be quantified and report on them in final programme report in 2017.
- That Irish Aid ensures that interventions in specialised areas/issues such as pastoralism, land issues, gender related issues are carefully researched and any planned interventions are well designed making sure to select implementing partners with a good track record and appropriate knowledge and skills in that technical area.
- That good gender analysis based on robust research is carried out before intervening in marginalized communities – in this programme from the little evidence provided it appears that women played a key role in ensuring the economic stability of the household.
- That in the planning of programmes to build and strengthen resilience there is need to help marginalised communities have access to and if possible control over the resources that are critical to their way of life;
- That for any future programme to build and strengthen resilience that appropriate and effective entry points to the community are selected. The district seems to be a very effective one as it is half way between the national level and villages where communities seek out their livelihoods on a day by day basis.

Bibliography

Apart from the documents listed in appendix 3 the following articles were used as part of the review:

Brehony, E, B, Ole Nangoro and Z. Mattee, 2004: Study for DANIDA/ERETO Policy Component with a view to Setting up a National Pastoralist Forum in Tanzania

Brehony, E and A. Morindat, 2013: Study on the Rights of Pastoralist Women to a Livelihood and to Property: A Case Study of Empowering Women through Women's Solidarity Bomas in Ngorongoro and Longido Districts

Hesse, C. and M.O. Odhiambo, 2002. In search for the future of pastoralism in East Africa: Developing an alliance and strategy in support of pastoral self-determination. Discussion paper. IIED, London

IIED, 2015: Valuing Variability: New perspectives on climate resilient drylands development

IUCN, 2013: Women pastoralists' empowerment: Supporting positive change. A briefing note.

PEM, 2005: Report on the Need and Possible Entry Points for DCI to Support Civil Society to Actively Engage in the Areas of Land Rights, Pastoralism and Conflict Resolution in Tanzania

Tenga, R, A. Mattee, N. Mdoe, R. Mnenwa, S. Mvungi and M. Walsh 2008: A Study on Options for Pastoralists to Secure Their Livelihoods in Tanzania: Current Policies, Legal Issues and Economic Prospects

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Intervention Logic of the Programme 2007 - 2016

Table 1 column 1 shows the original goal, purpose and outputs in 2007 when the first proposal was developed. Column 2 shows the logic developed for a reformulated proposal in 2011. Column 3 shows the intervention deliverables for a refocused programme 2014 using the language of outcomes and outputs. Indicators are in bold and evidence of achievement are in normal print.

Table 1: Intervention Logic in 2007, 2011 and in 2014 – 2016		
Intervention Logic 2007	Intervention Logic 2011	Programme deliverables 2014 with specific numbers and targets – too early to assess degree of achievement
<p>Goal: Improved quality of life of pastoral communities in Tanzania – talked of ability to exercise land rights</p>	<p>Goal: Reduced poverty and vulnerability of pastoralist communities in Tanzania % increase of pastoralist community members perceiving changes in their quality of life disaggregated by sex Increase in area of grazing land accessible to, and under control of pastoralist communities. MTR stated 74.08% (officials) 51.47% (beneficiaries) Pastoralist community perception of changes in the quality of basic social services (health, education etc) delivery by the Government</p>	<p>Impact: Improved livelihood of Pastoralist men, women and children Indicators % increase of pastoralist community members perceiving changes in their quality of life disaggregated by sex % of pastoralist under the national basic needs poverty line % of pastoralist under the national food poverty line</p>
<p>Purpose: Improved livelihood security of pastoral communities through the development, application and dissemination of effective strategies for support to civil society organizations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism in Tanzania Talked of awareness raising but not of security of livelihoods Hard to see</p>	<p>Purpose: Advancement of pastoralist men and women's right to a sustainable livelihood. Indicator – No. of LGAs and CSOs addressing priority needs, concerns and demands of pastoralist men and women livelihoods - 90.75% 65.86% of CSOs (beneficiaries)</p>	<p>Outcomes: Improved policies and laws that respond to the needs and demands of pastoralists Indicators Number of evidence based advocacy events organized by National level CSOs Types of resources allocated or re-allocated by the government to support pastoralists in the programme area Area of grazing land, Livestock routes availed; and % of budget Number of Local and central government institutions responding¹⁸ to the needs and demands of pastoralist men and women in the programme area</p>

¹⁸ Increase in budgetary allocations, extension services delivery –livestock infrastructure improvement (dams, dips etc), integration and mainstreaming of pastoral needs into development plans.

<p>how the questionnaires related to the indicators as stated in the report</p>	<p>Indicator: No. of local CSOs addressing gender issues in pastoralist communities – response 100% - 18</p>	<p>Pastoral needs and demands included in the national reviewed constitution. Existence of national Pastoralism Policy establishing and protecting social, economic and land rights for pastoralists men and women</p> <p>Increased responsiveness of National Government Agencies and LGAs to deliver quality veterinary and extension services to pastoralists</p> <p>Proportion of pastoralists’ household reliably receiving good quality veterinary services in the program area</p> <p>Number of pastoralists reached with increased veterinary and extension services uptake by pastoralists in the program area</p> <p>Reduced incidences of reported land conflicts in the program areas</p> <p>Improved national and local CSOs service delivery in addressing pastoralists men and women practical and strategic needs</p> <p>Number of local and national level CSOs accessed funds from other sources and implemented/implementing interventions addressing pastoralists men and women practical and strategic needs</p> <p>Number of national and local CSOs that effectively manage and implement projects to address pastoralist practical and strategic needs</p> <p>Increased adoption of climate adaptation and mitigation strategies and/or practices among pastoralist men and women</p> <p>Number of pastoralist men and women adopting different sources of income diversification in the programme area</p> <p>Number of pastoralists groups, men and women engaged in climate adaptation and mitigation.</p> <p>Number of LGAs integrating Climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies into their plans to secure pastoralists livelihood in the program areas</p> <p>Increased participation of pastoral women in decision making processes and ownership and control of land and cattle in the program area</p>
---	---	---

		<p>Number of pastoralist women selected or elected in leadership positions at village, ward, district, region and national levels.</p> <p>Number of pastoralists women participating in decision making processes at different levels</p> <p>Proportion of pastoralist women admitting to have decision, ownership and control over household's assets¹⁹ previously owned and controlled by men alone mainly in the program area</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>A transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania developed and implemented; Not addressed</p> <p>Number of pastoral CSOs accessing funds (at least 6-8 CSOs in Year 1, 12-15 CSOs in Year 2 and 20-25 CSOs in Year 3 and 4)</p> <p>Number of key stakeholders organizations in which relevant Senior and Mid level staff (i.e., pastoral CSOs and relevant local and national government authorities) aware of Basket Fund Program, its policies, strategies, procedures and progress</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Effective evidence based advocacy to influence policy and implementation;</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>National level pastoral CSOs strengthened capacity in networking, identification of evidence based advocacy information and advocating for improved quality service delivery, laws and policies to support pastoralists livelihood system;</p> <p>Number of advocacy and lobbying actions²⁰ taken by pastoral national and local level CSOs, coalitions and networks to influence change in laws and policies</p> <p>Number of coalition/platform and networks formed and engaged in lobbying and advocacy for pastoralist rights at various levels</p> <p>1.2 Local and national government institutions are knowledgeable and aware of pastoralism dynamics, needs and demands through strategic engagement of CSOs in advocacy and lobbying</p> <p>Number of advocacy events²¹ organized and conducted to influence and create awareness of national and local government officials in pastoralism dynamics</p> <p>Number of policy briefs and info briefs produced and disseminated to influence decisions</p>
<p>2. Increased capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities; List of training given but no</p>	<p>2. Representation of pastoralists at local and national levels leading to greater respect for their rights</p> <p>No. of pastoralist male and Female (facilitated/trained by the programme)</p>	<p>2.1 National Government Agencies and LGAs officials in the program area are knowledgeable and aware of needs and demands of pastoralist men and women</p> <p>Types of extension services (water dams/troughs, dips, strainers...) availed to pastoralists in the program area</p> <p>2.2 National and local Pastoral CSOs demanding accountability for LGAs delivery of quality</p>

¹⁹ Mainly:- Land and cattle

²⁰ Lobbying & advocacy action include:- policy brief production, discussions and dialogues, campaign, media and press release

²¹ Events include:- dialogues, TV talks, media news, meetings, training

<p>evidence as to how it addressed output 2 (Comment Stacks of policy documents were evident at most CSOs visited, and there was no doubt that the officials understood the various provisions in them) Number of pastoral CSOs with increased knowledge of, and understanding of policies and issues affecting pastoralist livelihoods Number of pastoral CSOs with advocacy strategies and action plans for addressing pastoral community issues/concerns</p>	<p>selected or elected in leadership positions (village, ward, district, national, social service boards) – response - ,681 (approx 1, 400 per district) M: 5,382 (62%) F: 3,299 (38%) Good one - No. of pastoralist networks/ groups/platform formed by your organization for representing pastoral rights at: (a) District level - 23 (b) Regional level - 0 (c) National - 1</p>	<p>veterinary and extension services delivery to pastoralists Number of LGAs with established system and resources for delivery of veterinary and extension services delivery to pastoralists in the programme area</p>
<p>3. Increased capacity of relevant local government institutions to respond to the demands of pastoralists for quality services; and (Comment – stated that lots of officials trained) Number of local government institutions with increased knowledge and understanding of policies, strategies and issues affecting pastoralist livelihoods Evidence of district sectoral plans integration into District Strategic Plans with increased focus on livelihood security for pastoral communities</p>	<p>3. Increased capacity of local government institutions to provide timely and quality services to pastoralists; and No. of local government officers with increased knowledge and understanding of pastoralist dynamics, policy framework, laws, strategies and gender issues affecting pastoralist livelihood Evidence of local government institutions with increased focus on livelihood security and climate change adaptation for pastoralist communities</p>	<p>3.1 Increased organizational and institutional capacity of national and local pastoral CSOs in project management, good governance and in addressing needs of pastoralists men and women Number of national and local CSOs with improved institutional management capacity and project management skills Number of national and local CSOs addressing pastoralists men and women needs and demands in the program area 3.2 Pastoral CSOs enhanced knowledge and understanding of pastoralism dynamics and defending pastoralism as a sustainable system Number of pastoral CSOs defending pastoralism as a sustainable system in the program area Number of pastoral CSOs with strategic initiatives for promotion of pastoralism as a sustainable system in the program area</p>
<p>4. Learning from Pastoralist Basket Fund Program generated, documented and disseminated to influence development policy at local, national and international levels – talk of number of documents disseminated but....</p>	<p>4. Increased capacity of pastoralist CSOs to manage projects and support pastoralists practical and strategic needs. No. of LMAs/ Intermediary Grant Making CSO disbursing</p>	<p>4.1 Pastoralist men and women and LGAs officials skilled and aware of climate change, adaptation and mitigation strategies Number of pastoralists that are aware of and understand climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies Number of self-organized pastoralist men and women groups working on climate change</p>

	<p>funds (and among disbursed) No. of CSOs accessing funds and among accessed No. of other projects by pastoralist CSOs designed to support practical and strategic needs of men and women - 10 (approx 2 per district)</p>	<p>adaptation and mitigation initiatives in the programme area Number of LGAs engaged in promotion of climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies adoption in the programme area 4.2 Pastoral CSOs equipped with knowledge on climate change, adaptation and mitigation strategies Number of Pastoral CSOs with plans and strategies to support pastoralists adoption of climate change, adaptation strategies in the programme area</p>
		<p>5.1 Pastoralist men and women, village and traditional leaders trained on gender, women's rights and responsibilities to enhance their capacities in addressing practical and strategic gender needs Number of pastoralist men and women, village and traditional leaders trained on gender aspects in the program area Number of pastoralist women trained on their rights and responsibilities in the program area</p>

Appendix 2: Terms of Reference for Review of Irish Aid Support to Pastoralism in Tanzania

Background Information

1.1 Introduction

Ireland has been working in Tanzania since 1975. The core of the programme over the past ten years (2007-2016) has been support to nationally driven initiatives and the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGPR). Support has been focusing on four sectors: Health & Nutrition, Rural Livelihoods and Growth, Governance and General Budget Support– and is fully in line with the Joint Assistant Strategy in Tanzania (JAST) and commitments made in the Paris (2005) and Accra (2008) Declarations on aid effectiveness.

Under the Rural Livelihood component, Irish Aid has been supporting a Pastoralism Programme since 2007. The overall goal of the programme is improved livelihood of men and women pastoral communities in Tanzania. The ten-year support to pastoralism through CARE International in Tanzania is divided into two phases where Phase One was on Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) that was managed by CARE International in Tanzania and implemented through Tanzania Civil Society Organisations for four years (2007-2010) period. Phase Two is a Pastoralist Programme (PP) that is jointly managed and implemented by CARE and Tanzania Natural Resource Programme (TNRFP) for the a period covering six years (2011 – 2016). The PP is implemented through partnerships with registered Tanzania civil society organisation (CSOs) that work to improve the capacity of pastoralist communities to overcome poverty, reduce vulnerability and strengthen the rights of men and women pastoralist for sustainable livelihood.

This document presents the Terms of Reference to guide potential consultants to submit a proposal to review Irish Aid’s Support to pastoralist communities in Tanzania. The review report findings will be used as an input to guide future Irish Aid programming to address needs of vulnerable and marginalised communities with a particular focus around building resilience.

1.2 Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (2007- 2010)

The PBFP began in October 2007, initially in eight districts, with funding from Irish Aid. The International Land Coalition subsequently provided funding to the PBFP. The overall goal and purpose of PBFP was improved livelihood security of pastoralist communities through the development, application and dissemination of effective strategies for support to Civil Society Organisations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism in Tanzania. Funds for the PBFP were disbursed annually to CARE, who in turn disbursed these through a transparent and competitive process to pastoralist CSOs working to build the capacity of pastoralist communities for annualised projects.

During the period of 4 years, the PBFP funded 46 CSOs in the ten regions where more than 100,000 pastoral community benefited from capacity building initiatives. The total budget spent for the four years was € 1.7 million. The key interventions by the pastoralist CSOs include capacity building of pastoralist communities on: (1) Policy analysis and advocacy; (2) Land rights awareness and advocacy (Land Act number 4, 1999 and Village Land Act No. 5, 1999); (3) Land conflict resolution processes; (4) Lobbying and advocacy for pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood; (5) Improved livestock husbandry (disease control and livestock breeding); (6) Livelihood diversification (entrepreneurship skills, poultry farming, and crop production); (7)

Village Savings and Loans (VSL); Village Community Banks (VICOBA); and (8) Environmental management.

An independent evaluation of PBFP was completed at the end of July 2011. Findings from the evaluation noted the progress on a number of key objectives of the PBFP. Lessons from the review 3 helped to shape Phase II of support to pastoralism which was renamed as Pastoralist Programme (PP).

The findings of the evaluation shows that PBFP achieved numerous of outcomes and outputs such as:

- Developing and implementing a transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania. Through capacity building trainings in project designing, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (DIMER); policy analysis and advocacy; land rights; leadership and governance; and conflict resolution, CSOs improved service delivery that was responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities. This also increased the ability of pastoralist to exercise their rights and influence in various intervention areas.
- Other achievements of PBFP include: decline of livestock losses due to diseases as a result of the training on livestock diseases control practices and improved access to extension services; pastoralists increasingly got involved in alternative economic activities as means of diversification of income sources; as a results of conflict resolution and participatory land use planning training, testimonial from stakeholders revealed a decline in land based conflicts between farming and pastoralist communities in the programme area.

Some lessons from PBFP include:

- One of the main weaknesses of the PBFP was the failure to attract more donors to contribute to the basket fund. Only International Land Coalition (ILC) in conjunction with International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), contributed to the fund. The ILC/IFAD funded the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) in Kiteto district in Manyara region and Kondoa, Chamwino and Bahi districts in Dodoma region.
- Despite the engagement of the government livestock sector in the implementation of PBFP, the involvement of decision makers at all levels and participation of the programme in policy formulation processes at national level was still weak. The programme also needed to improve the collection and dissemination of the best practices and success stories to influence policies.
- The PBFP promoted a good working relationship between the CSOs, LGAs and pastoral communities. However, there was still a need to strengthen service delivery capacity of the LGA's capacity. In addition, PBFP was unable to identify or form a local organization to manage the grants upon CARE's exit. Another shortcoming of the programme was the short project cycle and limited funding that did not allow the CSOs to fully realize their objectives.
- The final evaluation of PBFP also revealed increasing gender awareness and women participation in local level decision-making organs. However, it was necessary to give more support to pastoral women to engage in alternative economic activities to ensure sustainable income and food security. Conspicuously missing in the agenda of implementing CSOs were activities that supported and promoted climate change adaptation among pastoral communities.

1.3 Pastoralist Programme (2011 – 2016)

The second phase of Irish Aid support to pastoralism is the current PP that contributes to the present Irish Aid's Tanzania Country Strategy Programme for the period 2011-2015/6. The overarching goal the current CSP is inclusive growth and reduction of poverty and vulnerability. The PP builds on the lessons from the PBFP. The implementation of the PP is through grants to pastoralist CSOs to implement projects that contributes to the advancement of pastoralist men and women's right to a sustainable livelihood. CARE in collaboration with Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF) play the role of grant management and capacity building of the pastoralist CSOs. The focus is in particular three areas: (1) Land Rights and land use conflicts in pastoral areas; (2) Advocacy for pastoralism and the rights of Pastoralists including livestock extension services; (3) Environment and Climate change considerations within the sector; (4) in addition, there is specific output around gender equality being mainstreamed throughout the programme.

Since 2011, the 25 local CSOs have been funded to carry out different projects at local level and creation of awareness and understanding of pastoralism at community, district and national level. The total of € 2.2 million will be spent during the 5 years of implementation.

In January 2014, the Mid Term Review (MTR) of Phase II/PP was conducted to take stock of the extent of implementation and lessons of the programme during the first half of implementation of the Programme. The MTR findings showed that the efforts of the PP have contributed to increase responsiveness of local pastoralist organizations and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) to respond to practical and strategic needs of pastoralists in ways that they can secure their livelihoods. It was further established that the quality of life has improved since the PP and its predecessor PBFP have been undertaking advocacy activities at various levels. Quality of life has improved more in raising household income and access to education for pastoralist children in comparison to access to health and clean and safe water supply. The MTR also observed that the grazing land under the control and ownership of pastoralist has also increased. This demonstrates that there has been progress in respect to the programme purpose of advancement of pastoralist men, women and children's right to a sustainable livelihood. The revealed achievements are evidence of the PP contribution to reduced poverty and vulnerability of pastoralist communities in Tanzania.

While the MTR findings showed good achievements at local level, the recommendations gave greater emphasis on integrating lessons from the programme to national policies and strategies so that they can achieve scale of impact. The MTR recommended a substantive revision of the present programme document and log frame to update the situation analysis threatening pastoralist rights to a secured livelihood. The proposed revisions included taking climate change effects and adaptation strategies at the core (not as a crosscutting issue) of the PP. In addition, to take into account internal migration dynamics of pastoralists based on agro-ecological and administrative zones; and the programme to seek and identify and develop "strategic partnerships" with national level, advocacy and networking NGOs with a proven track record in supporting pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and hunter-gatherers. It was further recommended the programme to develop a short, concise but clearly focused advocacy strategy that defines the key advocacy messages, desired policy outcomes and proposed tactics for the pastoralist programme. Also called upon taking into account and prioritise "hot-spots" of conflicts that facing pastoralists and smallholder farmers. The

MTR further recommended the improvement of the synergy with other programmes such as CARE Our Land (Ardhi Yetu) Rights Programme (AYP) and Oxfam Pastoralism Programme.

In April 2014 the refocused strategy was developed to shape the direction and focus of the Pastoralist Programme (PP) to respond to MTR findings. The need for refocusing also took into consideration the changes within CARE Tanzania as an organisation. The refocused strategy 5 suggested stronger focus on land rights, advocacy, gender and climate change as well as a strategic selection of partners and geographic focal areas. The refocused strategy provided explicitly what is required to be changed in the programme following the MTR recommendations and other factors. The major changes included in the refocused strategy include: (1) explicitly spelled-out the geographical focus; (2) suggested the Grant Size, its objectives and Focus; (3) revised Partner selection process and criteria; (4) Clarified advocacy and information flow (5) suggested improvement of the relationship between sub-grantees and CARE on financial and contractual matters (6) revised the Theory of Change and how to strengthen the national advocacy component and (7) revised programme governance and staffing.

In 2014 and 2015 the number of funded CSOs was also revised to national advocacy NGOs and local level. In 2014 the programme maintained 8 local level CSOs. In 2015, four (4) national level Advocacy NGOs was funded as part of refocused strategy to carry out national level advocacy under coordination of TNRF and creating the link with local level initiatives; and 5 local level CSOs funded covering hotspot districts that link local issues to n national advocacy initiatives.

In 2015 programme done three key studies, including Climate Change case study by IIED commissioned by Irish Aid, Documentation of PP Best Practices (2012-2015), and Assessment of Sustainability of Impacts of Pastoralist programme. In the following section the details of Climate Change Case Study is provided. The details of other case studies and documentations will be available to a consultant during the implementation of the assignment.

2. Climate change case study by IIED commissioned by Irish Aid

As part of Irish Aid's Learning Platform on climate change which seeks to build capacity of its' staff and partners to incorporate climate change into development planning and improve tracking and reporting of climate change activities. IIED was commissioned to undertake a number of case studies to assess how climate change is being integrated into development planning by governments or development agencies in countries where Irish Aid has programmes. In Tanzania, IIED was commissioned to undertake a study of three projects that seek to enhance climate risk management. The case study aimed to generate evidence from case studies on effective methods of mainstreaming climate risk management into development planning. The case study draws on the experience of programmes implemented by Care, Oxfam and IIED to identify effective methods of climate mainstreaming.

The objectives of the case study were:

A programme to establish a "devolved level climate finance mechanism" implemented by the International Institute for Environment and Development, funded by the UK's Department for International Development.

A “Pastoralist Programme” focusing on community support and national advocacy managed jointly by Tanzania Natural Resources Forum and Care Tanzania, implemented by local and national Civil Society Organizations.

A Pastoralism Programme, that also focusing on community support, national and international level advocacy managed by Oxfam Tanzania and implemented by national CSOs in Tanzania.

The study used an Appreciative Inquiry approach to draw out the strengths and learning from each programme, in order to channel these findings into future programming. The analysis of the study’s findings was guided by the Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) framework. TAMD provides a method for gauging the quality of climate risk management and the resilience building and development impacts of interventions.

Key Findings

Village land use planning has a rapid impact. The facilitation of land use planning to support access to key resources (grazing land, water etc.) for pastoralists is an effective method of improving natural resource governance. Land use planning segregates areas for farming, grazing, settlements and other uses. In doing so, it designates areas in which pastoralists can manage and plan resource use using customary institutions. Land use planning serves as a basis for enactment of by-laws that can prevent further loss of land to smallholders. It also strengthens rural land administration and management.

Land use planning coupled with legal ownership can be a powerful combination. Development of village land use plans backed by formal communal rights of ownership offers a stronger legal basis for preventing land grabs or encroachment from both large and small scale investors. This approach seeks to merge customary and formal institutions to provide security of resource access, ownership and control. However, risks to this process lie in the ability of governments to divide villages, undermining the legal basis for continuity of customary rights of occupancy held by pastoralists and smallholder farmers.

Raising awareness of women’s rights transforms gender dynamics. When communities and village councils in pastoralist areas are trained on women’s rights to own assets such as land, livestock or businesses, these rights are quickly enforced. Consequently, women are empowered to establish or run income generating activities that benefit everyone in a household. This is bringing equity in decision making and empowering some to seek formal representation in various decision making forums such as village and ward councils and village committees.

Dialogue and strategic engagement targeting current issues are key to advocacy. Advocacy for pastoralist rights has been most successful when representatives of both government and non-governmental institutions are engaged in dialogue. Broad based coalitions of different groups with similar perspectives have opened the potential for constitutional change. Government staff have shown a willingness to listen to evidence generated by Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and to incorporate them into budgetary or other discussions. Advocacy has also been most effective when it has focused resources on strategic moments such as during the parliamentary government budget sessions or constitutional review process.

The district authority is the most effective entry point for climate risk management. The largest strides in mainstreaming climate change and developing climate risk management have been made when the district council has been included. Capacity building of district officials through training, dialogue, or facilitation of discussions about resource use has enabled district councils to provide improved services to pastoralists. It has also made districts willing to develop

planning processes that incorporate resilience building into the planning and budgeting process. **The community as an entry point offers quicker positive outcomes with less climate integration.** Working at the level of the community has delivered modest, positive outcomes regarding gender equity, security of resources, reducing environmental degradation and communal empowerment.

3. Purpose of the Review

Irish Aid now wishes to undertake a review of its support to pastoralism in Tanzania to generate learning for potential future support that might be undertaken to build and strengthen increased resilience for vulnerable and marginalized communities potentially including pastoralist communities. The review will cover the period of 10 (2007 – 2016) years. The purpose of this review is twofold:

- (1) Provide Irish Aid and its partners with an independent assessment on the extent to which programme contributed to the overall goal over the programme period including the identification of key achievements as well as the challenges; and
- (2) Document lessons from the programme implementation, which can inform future programming by Irish Aid in building and strengthening resilience of marginalised communities and women in particular.

4. The scope of the Review

This review will take account of the experience of programme implementation over the past 10 years. Below are some guiding questions that the review will address. These questions provide a guiding framework to help the consultant to develop precise review questions as needed. It is expected that the questions will be refined and agreed upon between Irish Aid and the consultant during the planning phase of the assignment.

- i. Comment on the degree to which the programme design was based on sound analysis including gender analysis and an understanding of the contextual challenges facing pastoralist communities.
- ii. Comment on the extent to which the programme was effective in targeting and meeting priority needs of male and female pastoralist in Tanzania.
- iii. To what extent was the programme responsive to contextual changes over the programme period?
- iv. To what extent did the programme evolve and respond appropriately to the lessons learnt and recommendations from various evaluations, reviews and case studies undertaken? How appropriate was the programme approach in supporting pastoralist adaptation to climate change and weather variability?
- v. Review evidence of the contribution of the programme in addressing land issues in particular reducing land conflicts and access to land for pastoralist men and women.
- vi. Assess the appropriateness of the approach used by Irish Aid to select the partner and the appropriateness and effectiveness of the overall management arrangement of the programme.

5. Methodology of the Review

The review will consist primarily of a desk-based assessment of key programme documents including reports. This will be complemented by interviews and meetings including focus group discussions with programme implementing partners and key stakeholders including

where appropriate participating communities. It is recognised that this is not an evaluation but the exercise that may identify gaps in knowledge, which will require further analysis.

6. Expected Deliverables and Timeline

Following the award of the contract the successful consultant will be expected to produce following:

- i. An Inception report outlining approach, scope of the assignment and key review questions based on initial reading of documents within 5 days after awarding of contract.
- ii. A draft report will be produced within 20 days for review and comments shared and validated with Irish Aid and partners. Final report to be produced at the end of the exercise to include: - Review findings; - Conclusions and recommendations on programme design, management and strategies to Irish Aid and partners as appropriate;
- iii. Lessons learnt that can inform potential future support for building and strengthening increased resilience for vulnerable and marginalized communities; In addition, the consultant will assess and identify the need for further analysis that may be required to meet knowledge gaps.

7. Requirements to undertake the assignment

- i. The successful consultant should have good and wide knowledge and understanding of issues impacting on pastoralist communities and specifically women in Tanzania.
- ii. Understanding of policy contextual aspects in Tanzania as it relates to pastoralism
- iii. Evidence of sound analytical and strategic thinking skills including experience in undertaking similar review.
- iv. Fluency in written English and evidence of excellent report writing skills.

8. Submission of Proposal:

Proposals should include:

- i. A section outlining an understanding of the assignment based on the Embassy's requirements.
- ii. Set out the methodology for undertaking the review including a framework for interrogating the documents available and proposed stakeholders to be consulted.
- iii. A proposed draft timeline.
- iv. Details on individual / individuals who will deliver the services including a CV/CVs that demonstrate relevant experience. If more than one consultant is proposed in a single bid, the proposal must provide clear details of the team composition in relation to key tasks.
- v. Fee proposal (based on daily consultancy fee rates, and including all costs, including travel if applicable). If more than one consultant is proposed, the proposal must provide a clear split of individual consultants' daily rates and proposed day allocation per task.
- vi. A report from a relevant evidence review or similar assignment, as an example of written work of the consultant(s). Proposals should not exceed 7 pages, excluding CVs, budget and evidence of written work.

9. Selection criteria:

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the proposals:

- i. Understanding of assignment;
- ii. Quality of proposed methodology of the review;

- iii. Skills, knowledge and track record of a proposed team meeting above criteria;
- iv. Availability to undertake the assignment within timeframe
- v. The cost of the assignment

10. Timeframe

The consultancy is for a maximum of 20 days and is expected to be completed by 30th May 2016, with the following indicative timeline:

- Inception Report by 2nd May
- Submission of draft report by 31st May 2016
- Submission of final report by 14th June 2016 Agriculture Advisor/Programme Manager within the Embassy will manage the assignment.

11. Application

A proposal (no more than 7 pages) including the elements described under paragraph 4 above should be submitted by email to the Head of Administration at the Embassy of Ireland, Dar es Salaam on Stephen.simbila@dfa.ie by Friday 15 th April. A short cover letter should indicate the candidate's availability to undertake the assignment.

12. Key reference materials The documents include:

- i. Report on the Need and Possible Entry Points for DCI to Support Civil Society to Actively Engage in the Areas of Land Rights, Pastoralism and Conflict Resolution in Tanzania (September 2005)
- ii. TOR for bidding to set up and manage a Basket Fund for Support to Civil Society organisations involved in Land Rights, Conflict Resolution and Pastoralism in Tanzania (September 2006)
- iii. Proposal for managing a basket fund for support to civil society organizations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism in Tanzania (August 2007)
- iv. PBFP Final Evaluation Report (June 2011).
- v. TOR for Management Agency for PP in Tanzania (November 2011).
- vi. Proposal for Management Agency for PP in Tanzania 2012- 2015 (November 2011).
- vii. The PP Mid-Term Review (January 2014).
- viii. PP Refocused Strategy (April 2014).
- viii. Case Study on Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania (June 2015).
- ix. Study Report on Best Practices of the Pastoralist Programme 2012-2015(November and December 2015).
- x. Study report on Assessing the Sustainability of Pastoralist Programme Capacity Building (November and December 2015).
- xi. Film documentaries of beneficiaries from project areas (2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015)
- xii. Annual Work-plans and Reports (for the entire period). Embassy of Ireland Dar es Salaam

March 2016

Appendix 3: Documents and reports Read for Review

Major reports read for Inception report

2011 CARE Tanzania's PP Proposal FINAL PROPOSAL TO Irish aid.pdf
2010 PBFP Annual Review meeting 2010 Report11FINAL.pdf
2005 Civil Society Report 09 05.doc
2014 Final PP MTR Report_January_2014.doc
2011 Draft Final Evaluation of PBFP report 1.pdf
2006 TOR PASTORALIST BASKET FUND
2011 PROPOSAL CONCEPT NOTE TNRF CARE TO IRISH AID DRAFT NOV.doc
2010 CARE Concept note for IA PBFP 100510.doc
2014 Refocus document - Final Draft 160414.docx
2007 CARE IAPBFPMainProposalFinal12 09 07.doc
2010 CARE MTE PBFP FINAL REPORT 2010.doc

Basket Fund Governance Committee Meetings

BFGC minutes 12Sept08 (2)doc.doc
BFGC minutes 27Feb09 - Arusha ME.doc
BFGC minutes 071009 -Handeni final.doc
BFGC minutes 190308 Cyard.doc
BFGC minutes 250108 Cyard.doc
BFGC minutes 231110 - Paradise Mwanza.doc

Steering Committees Minutes

2nd PPSC meeting - minutes Nov 2012.doc
3rd PPSC meeting - minutes June 2013.doc
4th PPSC meeting Minutes- Feb 2014FINAL.doc
5th Arusha Fifth PPSC meeting Minutes-June 2014.doc
7th PP Seventh PPSC meeting Minutes-MARCH 3 FINAL.doc
8TH PPSC Meeting Minutes FINAL.doc

Annual Stakeholder Meetings

2014 Apr Summary Report- Stakeholders Dodoma.doc
2011 Final Review report-CARE-Dodoma meeting.doc
Stakeholders meeting report-PP 18th - 19th 2012 (FINAL).doc
2013 PP Stakeholders Meeting Report September 2013 - FINAL.pdf
2009 PBFP summary presentation-stakeholders Dodoma.doc
PBFP Annual Review meeting 2010 Report11FINAL.pdf
Stakeholders meeting report-PP 2015.doc

Reports

2015 JUNE SEMI ANNUAL DRAFT REPORT.
JUNE SEMI ANNUAL REPORT ANNEXES.
05-10-15 2016 DELIVERABLES.pdf
29-6-15 Resubmitted FY 2014 PP ANNUAL REPORT FINAL.doc
29-10-14 PP DATA COLLECTION TOOL.doc
29-10-14 PP REVISED LOGFRAME WITH TARGETS.doc

29-10-2014 PARTNERSHIP MIX.pdf
Annual Financial Report-PP 2013 Submission.pdf
PP 2015 DELIVERABLES.pdf
PP 2014 July MIDYEAR REPORT.doc
PP FY 2015 March ANNUAL REPORT SUBMITTED.doc
PP REVISED LOGIC MODEL (2) Accepted by IA.doc
WPB 2016 & 2017.doc
PP Annual Progress Report -Final Jan-Dec 2012.doc
PP FY 2015 ANNUAL REPORT SUBMITTED.doc
PP Biannual Narrative progress Report - Jan-June 2014.doc
PP Annual Progress Report Jan-Dec 2013.doc

IIED Studies

Sustainability Study.docx
Best Practice draft .doc
IA CRM Case Study Final.docx

MoU with Different Organisations

Annex 3: 4 List of CSOs (2).doc
PBFP Funded CSOs.doc
CARE Tz and CEDOSOTA 2015 Contract.pdf
CARE Tz and KINNAPA 2015 Contract.pdf
CARE Tz and PINGOS 2015 Contract.pdf
CARE Tz and TAPHGO 2015 Contract.pdf
List of CSOs funded 2012-2013.doc

CSOs Assessments

CSOs ODA and DDA report 2013 final draft.doc
ODA Report 2010 Mtwara and morogoro (2).doc
ODA Report 2010 Mtwara and morogoro.doc
PASTORALIST BASKET FUND PROGRAMME Funded CSOs
NATIONAL LEVEL ADVOCACY CSOs APPRAISAL REPORT.doc
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FORM FOR PP PROPOSALS 2014- PINGOs ACTUAL.doc
NATIONAL LEVEL ADVOCACY CSOs Review Processes.ppt
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FORM FOR PP PROPOSALS 2014- CCWT.doc
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FORM FOR PP PROPOSALS 2014- KINNAPA ACTUAL.doc
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FORM FOR PP PROPOSALS 2014- CEDESOTA.doc
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FORM FOR PP PROPOSALS 2014- TAPHGO.doc

Contracts/MoU CARE and IA

EMBASSY OF IRELAND-EXTENSION OF CONTRACT.pdf
Changes Made in PP in Response to MTR & RS.pdf
PBF Extension to 31 12 2011 copy.pdf
PBFP - MoU copy.pdf
PBF Extension to 31 12 2011.pdf
PBFP - MoU.pdf 2007

MOU scanned copy -IA -CARE 2015.pdf

Financial Budgets and Reports

07-10-15 PP SEMI-ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT.pdf

Mini Financial Jan - June 13 Report.pdf

PP Financial Report Jan -June 2014 (2).pdf

FY 2015 Revised Budget.xls

Baseline and Other reports

DD Report-summary report 2010.pdf

CSOs ODA and DDA report 2013 final draft.pdf

06-05 Strategic Plan for Pastoralism in Tz Final Dec 2010 2010.pdf

PBF ANALYSIS-strategic plan.pdf

STAKEHOLDERS ANALYSIS-strategic plan.pdf

PP Baseline Study Report Final Version - 2012.pdf

PBFP Baseline-Final Report May 2009.pdf

Work plans

FY 2015 Revised Workplan.xls

PP FY 2016 WORKPLAN.xls

PP Work Plans for FY 2014 2015 2016.xls

PBFP WORK PLAN - PBFP & SRMP.doc

Jan-Oct 2011 work Plan.doc

PP2 Jan-June 2012 Work plan - Revised 27022012.doc

PP2 July -December 2012 Work plan - Revised 01082012.doc

Work plan Oct 13 - Sept 14.xls

Oct 2013 - Sept 2014 W- Plan Notes - Fl June 2013 submission.doc

Work plan July-December 2013.doc

Oct 2013 - Sept 2014 work Plan Notes - 2.doc

Other documents

MoU between CARE & TNRF 2012.pdf

PP2 M&E info matrix - Reviewed with gender Indicators Aug 2013

Strategic Plan for Pastoralism in Tz Final.doc 2010

PP Advocacy Strategy Document.doc April 2015

Appendix 4: People Met as Part of the Review

The following were met as part of this review:

- Mama Mashingo MoLDF (Now Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries)
- Joseph Rutabingwa, Monduli District Council Economist and Planner
- Ally Msangi, Longido District Council Economist and Planner
- Kain Mvanda, Irish Ai
- Zakaria Faustin, TNRF Pastoralist Programme
- Marcely Madubi, Programme Co-ordinator of CARE Pastoralist Programme
- John Lafa, Former CARE/PBFP Staff
- Kosyando, NAADURATO CSO – a brief discussion was held with him
- Daud Haraka, Director TNRF
- Jackson. Muro, CEDESOTA
- Edward Porokwa and his accountant, PINGOS FORUM
- Joseph Parsambei and Amani, TPCF
- Makko Sinadei, UCRT.
- Meeting with Irish Aid staff (Maire Matthews, Kain Mvanda and Niall Morris) and CARE (Thabit Masoud, Marcely Madubi and Monitoring Officer)

Appendix 5: Achievements Noted in Mid Term Reviews and Evaluation of 2011

The Mid Term Evaluation of 2010 did not record the achievements of the programme in line with the four outputs which had been developed in 2007. In the light of this, the review has extracted the key achievements as stated in the 2010 MTR and the Evaluation of 2011 – not as proposed in the intervention logic of 2007 as the two reports used only some of the indicators developed for each output.

Expected Results for Phase 1: 2007 - 2011

The following relates to Output 2: A transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania developed and implemented;

- Indicators: Number of pastoral CSOs accessing funds (at least 6-8 CSOs in Year 1, 12-15 CSOs in Year 2 and 20- 25 CSOs in Year 3 and 4)
- Number of key stakeholder organizations in which relevant Senior and Mid level staff (i.e., pastoral CSOs and relevant local and national government authorities) aware of Basket Fund Program, its policies, strategies, procedures and progress

The following relates to Output 2: Increased capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities;

- Indicators: Number of pastoral CSOs with increased knowledge of, and understanding of policies and issues affecting pastoralist livelihoods
- Number of pastoral CSOs with advocacy strategies and action plans for addressing pastoral community issues/concerns

The following relates to Output 3: Increased capacity of relevant local government institutions to respond to the demands of pastoralists for quality services; and

- Indicators: Number of local government institutions with increased knowledge and understanding of policies, strategies and issues affecting pastoralist livelihoods
- Evidence of district sectoral plans integration into District Strategic Plans with increased focus on livelihood security for pastoral communities

The following relates to Output 4: Learning from Pastoralist Basket Fund Program generated, documented and disseminated to influence development policy at local, national and international levels

- Indicators: Evidence of documentation and dissemination of good practice from PBFP to key stakeholders
- Evidence of stakeholder interest in lessons and good practice disseminated by PBFP

Achievements

PBFP activities and links to Tanzania's national policies

Besides furthering the few national policies that support pastoralism, the PBFP has particularly been engaged in addressing the policy gaps and empowering both CSOs and pastoralists to influence policies in their favor and claim their civic and land rights. Other than funding, the PBFP is involved in capacity building of the CSOs and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) through training in proposal development; project design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (DIMER); financial management; policy analysis; advocacy for favorable policies; sustainable pastoralism; and conflict resolution. The programme has up-scaled its activities since its inception in 2007. It initially covered eight districts, extended to five and then two more districts in 2009 and 2010, respectively to bring the number of districts served by the programme to 15.

The programme has funded a total of 31 CSOs between October, 2007 and April, 2010. The CSOs are directly involved in implementing the objectives of the programme of improving livelihood security of pastoralists through increasing capacity of pastoral communities to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to their needs and priorities. CARE relies on the quarterly reports submitted by the CSOs and physical visit to project sites to monitor the progress of the programme.

Selection criteria for the PBFP partner CSOs

The PBFP followed the guidelines for selection of partner CSOs as stipulated in the programme proposal. An interview with the programme manager and the CSOs officials reveal an interactive, meticulous and transparent approach. The participating CSOs admitted to have received adequate support during the design phase of their projects.

Engagement of government authorities by pastoralist CSOs

All the PBFP partner CSOs engage the government authorities in addressing pastoralists' issues, though at varying degrees. The programme has reconciled otherwise two parties that were always at loggerheads. The CSOs have realized that they can not advance their agenda without the support of government authorities. Likewise, the government authorities have acknowledged the role of CSOs in augmenting their work. Although the government authorities have never shown satisfactory support for pastoralism, the CSOs for example EMAYO engage them in training pastoralists on sustainable land-use; ENVIROCARE has been working with DALDO in Kilindi in needs assessment and lobbying the government to built cattle dips and provide veterinary services. There are, however, no clear sectoral plans in the district strategic plans with focus on pastoralism. This is also reflected on the National Livestock Policy, 2006 and the recently enacted Grazing-Lands and Animal Feed Resources Act, 2010, which despite having chapters on pastoralism, lack proactive strategies for improving pastoral livelihoods.

An interview with the government authorities indicate that the CSOs have lobbied them together with the law reform commission to correct deficiencies in the current policies and formulate new ones that favour pastoralism. For example, in February, 2010, the Director of Pastoral Systems Development (DPSD) invited 45 pastoralist CSOs to discuss strategy on sustainable range management (personal communication with DPSD). In Mvomero, the DALDO testified that TAMPRODA involves the Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries (MoLDF) in their activities, which complement their regular work. In Simanjiro district, the district authority, under UVMASHA/PBFP Project, provided 38 community groups with improved breeding bulls to upgrade their indigenous livestock. All the DALDOs indicated that the pastoralist CSOs have made extension work easy as they normally find organized and receptive groups on the ground. In Kilindi district, EMAYO has integrated its activities into the District programme for the MoLDF. The review team was impressed by the existing partnership between the CSO (EMAYO) and Kilindi district council, where the district and the CSO jointly identify the community needs, plan together and both have a clear understanding of the planned activities including the budget. It was further noted that, Kilindi district council take charge of implementing PBFP interventions and the designated officer submit activity report to both the CSO and the District Executive Director. This was found to be the best partnership model which needs to be adopted by other CSOs. The government authorities were, however, quick to point out that more often than not service delivery is hindered by limited funds.

Impacts of the PBFP on the CSOs

Through the PBFP, capacities of the pastoralist CSOs have been tremendously built in proposal development; reporting; policy analysis and advocacy for civic and land rights; and conflict resolution. This has been possible due to the participatory approach employed by the programme. The PBFP ensures that all the implementing CSOs stick to a standard reporting format with constant quality control to discourage complacency by CSOs. Several success stories attest to the positive impacts of the PBFP on both the CSOs and the pastoralists. In Serengeti, through awareness creation on land rights, TACODEF empowered the pastoralists to appeal against the allocation of their grazing land to investors. In Iringa, training by TAGRODE on civic rights has led to increase of pastoralists' representation in the village councils. To ensure procedural mode of operation, all the CSOs visited have developed pastoralism development plan/strategies, with support from the PBFP. The plans have been shared with government authorities at district level for input in the past annual general meeting.

An interview with 167 persons from four regions visited showed a high awareness of the PBFP existence and its activities among pastoral communities in Tanzania. Most (62%) of the respondents were aware of the existence of the PBFP. The PBFP is best known for its efforts in creating awareness on land rights and policies (46%), followed by training on livestock husbandry (19%). Only an estimated 19% of those interviewed had no idea on the activities of the PBFP. The interviews also showed that a majority (78%) of the respondents were aware of the CSOs supporting pastoral communities through awareness creation on rights and livelihood diversification. EMAYO (100%), KCS (68%) and TAGRODE (64%) scored the highest in their respective regions of intervention.

Testimonies from the pastoral communities indicate immense positive impacts of the PBFP on pastoralists with respect to increased ability of pastoralists to question policies affecting them; claim their civic and land rights; representation in village councils; and diversification of asset portfolios. Most (57%) of the respondents testified in relation to their ability to exercise their civic and land rights that their understanding and ability to exercise their rights and influence policies in their favor has increased as a result of PBFP's intervention. Level of awareness of civic and land rights and participation in policy was found to be highest (74%) in Usolanga/Malenga Makali in Iringa. Those interviewed attribute these results to PBFP's awareness creation on land rights and policies (53%), while 44% ascribed the change to general education and awareness by the CSOs and PBFP. Pastoralist in Iloilo Mpya and Malenga Makali in Iringa have benefited from the awareness creation and trainings on civic rights by TAGRODE. They are now well represented in the village councils, and in some cases in leadership positions in the council, and therefore have been able to influence local policy in their favor. This has contributed to decline in conflicts as the farmers and pastoralists' representatives in the council are able to negotiate for cattle corridors to allow pastoralists access to critical grazing areas and watering points. In all the visited districts, government officials provided several evidences indicating that pastoralists have been empowered to exercise their rights.

Conflict resolution

Substantial gains have been achieved in reducing conflicts between the farmers and pastoralists. Responses from most (67%) respondents show that such conflicts are on the decline. This was

mainly (61%) ascribed to the intervention by the pastoralist CSOs and the PBFP through trainings on land-use planning and management, civic and land rights, peaceful conflict resolution, and the collective bargain through pastoral unions. Majority of the responses from the FGDs and key informants indicated reduced cases of conflict. The theatre group and anti-conflict banner in Kilindi District attest to EMAYO's work in educating the pastoralists as well as farmers against conflicts over resources. In Kibirashi village, after training on land rights and land-use planning by EMAYO, the communities have demanded creation of livestock routes by the LGA to allow pastoralists access to water sources. Following their demand, the government has issued instructions to the village councils to oversee the process of establishing stock corridors.

Grazing land accessible/under control of pastoral communities

It was evident from the study that lobbying the LGAs, and training on land-use planning and peaceful resolution of conflicts between farmers and pastoralists have led to negotiated access rights to pastoralists to grazing and water sources outside areas that they currently occupy. They mainly (59%) attribute these results to efforts by the CSOs. This has, however, not translated into increased control over grazing lands as testified by 47% of those interviewed. FGDs revealed that pastoralists are often allocated less productive areas by the village councils and that pastoralism is yet to be recognized by the LGAs as an equally important production system as crop farming.

Diversification of livelihoods by pastoralists

This study has revealed that out of their own conscience and as a result of awareness creation by PBFP through partner CSOs, a number of pastoralists are now pursuing alternative livelihood activities. Majority (79%) of the pastoralists have been involved in alternative livelihoods in the past three years. The highest (91%) level of diversification was reported in Usolanga in Iringa. The respondents associated this trend to increased awareness and education by CSOs and PBFP (58%), promotion of crop farming by CSOs (26%), and provision of loans by CSOs (15%).

Following training on entrepreneurship conducted by PBFP in Magu, pastoralist women have embraced various income generating activities. The pastoralist women in Kilindi and Iringa districts, for example, are increasingly getting involved in selling beadwork, leather handicrafts; and operating food kiosks as away of diversifying their income sources. In Geita village, pastoralists have formed income generating groups locally known as Village Savings and Loans (VSL), where they consolidate funds and offer loans to members and purchase dipping drugs. A number of Maasai pastoralists in Parakuyo are involved in real estate development including hotel industry, public and commercial transport industry. The latter is, however, as a result of the pastoralists' own response to both climatic and socio-economic change dynamics and was not attributed to PBFP's work. As is the trend elsewhere in the region, more and more pastoralists are getting involved in crop cultivation, small business enterprises, and seeking wage employment in urban centres.

Poverty, gender and livestock diseases

The FGDs and individual interviews revealed divergent opinions regarding how the BFPF has addressed gender issues. Responses from individual interviews show that poverty, gender and livestock diseases have not been adequately addressed by the PBFP. About 87% of those interviewed indicated their dissatisfaction with the attention given to poverty and gender issues, while 42% indicated that the CSOs are not doing enough to address the problem of livestock

diseases. They suggested extension of education and support of women to form groups to address poverty and gender issues, and lobbying of government to provide veterinary services and training on diseases to address livestock healthcare. During the FGDs, it was noted that most of the pastoral communities were aware of women rights, although this varied from one community to the other. It was apparent that some changes, little as they may be, have been noted since the PBFP partner CSOs started working in the area. For example, it was reported in Kibirashi village, Kilindi district that after community training on land rights, two women sued their husbands for selling parts of family land without their consent. They won the cases in the ward tribunal and the land was reverted to them. A significant achievement was noted in Naberera village, where gender equity in land ownership rights is gaining recognition. One pastoralist community leader in Naberera told the review team that “we now recognize the need for gender balance. After the training on land rights conducted by EMAYO, we asked our village government to allocate land to all adults in our community regardless of their sex, and each person was given 20 acres”. It was further reported that women could now attend village assemblies and village councils meetings unlike in the past.

Overall, it was observed that although poverty and gender mainstreaming have been addressed indirectly by the PBFP and pastoralist CSOs as cross-cutting issues, there is need for more proactive empowerment of women. This can be achieved through training on alternative sources of income and formation of groups to enable them benefit from credit facilities to start small business enterprises as away of addressing both poverty and gender disparity in pastoral areas.

Documentation and dissemination of information to stakeholders

Reports, learning from the programme and other forms of information are disseminated by PBFP to its stakeholders in form of brochures. These documents are normally distributed during trainings organized by PBFP, through email, as well as picked by partner CSO officials whenever they visit CARE office.

Institutional and financial sustainability and exit plan of the PBFP

In all the visited districts, it was evident that the programme has created a critical mass of people at district level with sufficient knowledge on land policy analysis, land rights and conflict resolution. It was interesting to note that most district councils have incorporated pastoral activities in their plans albeit at varying degrees. For example, eight out of twelve planned activities for the year 2010 by the Agriculture and Livestock departments in Mvomero district were addressing pastoral issues. In Kilindi district, two activities on land use planning and management were planned during the same fiscal year in 30 villages. Likewise, Kiteto district council is implementing four pastoral activities including construction of three charcoal dams, construction of three dip tanks, rehabilitation of veterinary center in Lesoeti village and training pastoralist on improved animal husbandry practices.

The program has managed to improve the capacity of pastoral CSOs in all aspects of their work enabling them to operate effectively as development organizations. These include their ability to design and implement quality projects. Based on detailed needs assessment, the pastoral CSO have been trained on organizational management (financial, physical, human), external relations, organizational learning (systems for reflection, learning and documentation, monitoring and evaluation systems and translation of learning into action). All visited CSOs admitted having benefited from capacity building sessions planned by the program. The trainings have enabled the

PBFP partner CSOs to sustain the interventions initiated under the PBFP. It was interesting to note that pastoralist communities in Naberera village where the program ended its activities in 2008 were still implementing some of PBFP interventions by the time the evaluation team visited their village in June 2010. In addition, the partner CSOs have been linked to the National NGO Policy Forum, which is an independent body representing over 50 CSOs. This has enabled the CSO partners to engage in national policy dialogue and influence policy processes based on their experiences when working with pastoral communities.

Key Achievements according to the Terminal Evaluation of the PBFP 2011

In 2011 a terminal evaluation was carried out of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP). According to the Evaluation Report the following are key impacts of the programme.

- There is evidence of growing capacity to resolve local conflicts among livestock keepers themselves and between livestock keepers and farmers. Having established and strengthened village conflict resolution committees, most conflicts are resolved locally. This is evident in Kilosa and Kilindi, Iringa and Magu.
- There has been growing awareness on land rights after pastoral communities have been trained on Land Act and Village Land Act, 1999. Communities in Sengerema (Serengeti) have been able to present their grievances to relevant authorities thereby saving big portions of grazing land that would have been leased to investors.
- Training of the pastoral CSOs has led to improvement in reporting and general management of projects as compared to their ability at the beginning of the programme.
- There has been increased network among pastoral CSOs as more CSOs join the PBFP. The northern pastoral CSOs, which were initially reluctant to apply for funds from the PBFP have realized the importance of working with other CSOs. About 70% of the new entrants are CSOs from the north. This has been recognized and emphasized in the development of a Pastoralist Strategy for the CSOs.
- Pastoralists are fast accepting improved breeds of livestock introduced by the Pastoral CSOs to upgrade their indigenous herds. Projects implemented by UVIMASHA in Simanjiro have demonstrated this fact. In some cases, pastoralists have contributed funds to buy improved breed of bulls for cross-breeding with their local breeds to get better breed in milk and meat production.
- Gender awareness and involvement is increasing. Women are becoming more active and speaking in public meetings where men have been dominating. In a few cases some women have been brave enough to aspire for leadership positions. Examples from Kilindi and Iringa districts attest to this.

Specific achievements reported are:

- Up to 70% reduction in calf mortality has been achieved as a result of deliberate efforts to sensitize pastoralists on good livestock husbandry and their rights to claim veterinary services from the government agencies.
- Since its inception, the PBFP has supported up to 46 pastoral CSOs engaged with pastoral communities and creating awareness on their civic rights and responsibilities relevant policies and providing livelihood diversification support. All the pastoralist communities and CSOs interviewed are aware of the importance of land -use plans, village land certificates and title deeds as away of averting conflicts and ensuring ownership security.

- A number of pastoralists are engaged in various alternative activities to livestock production as
- a result of training on entrepreneurship skills and livelihood diversification.
- All the CSOs visited were found to work directly with the district authorities in implementing their projects. Although, none of them, with exception of one, received financial support from the government, they benefited from technical expertise of the government officials.
- It was also evident that most of the government departments were willing to harmonize their work plans with that of the CSOs in order to ensure coordinated operations, budgeting and consolidation of resources for implementation of their activities.

In relation to the achievement of output 1 it was reported that

- There was a well managed a basket fund with a transparent mechanism for selecting partners CSOs and allocation of funds. Forty-six CSOs received funding according to a table in the report. The preparation for implementation included an elaborate process of consultation with and direct involvement of stakeholders in livestock production especially in pastoralism sub-sector. The selection of partner CSOs involved a participatory and transparent process that involves advertisement of call for project concept notes from CSOs. This was followed by a pre-award workshop for short-listed CSOs to train them on proposal development and requirements for the grant. Upon submission of satisfactory proposals by the CSOs, a memorandum of understanding was signed between successful CSOs and CARE. CARE offered a number of trainings in issues such as project design, implementation; monitoring; evaluation and reporting (DIMER); financial management; policy analysis; advocacy for favourable policies; sustainable pastoralism; and conflict resolution.

In relation to the achievement of output 2 it was reported that CARE conducted trainings on:

- Land Policy and Land Acts with respect to Pastoralist livelihoods for CSOs and Local Government Authorities (LGAs);
- Training on pastoralism and policy options in Tanzania conducted for CSOs and LGAs in order to build participants' capacity to actively and positively take part in formulation of policies, strategies and plans for improving access to resources and livestock services necessary for improving pastoral livelihoods in Tanzania;
- Pastoralist policy analysis and advocacy training for 15 CSO representatives in order to enhance participants understanding of the policy environment in Tanzania in relation to pastoralism; provide common understanding and perception on pastoralism as a livelihood system as indicated in MKUKUTA. In the light of this training TPCF officials clearly explained how the existing village land Act, 1999 and investment policy give a lot of leeway for sequestration of pastoral land. They gave an example of the proposed land-use for the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) and how it will lead to eviction of pastoralists from their grazing lands. Armed with the land-use plan, they embarked on the awareness creation on the impending eviction among the pastoralist communities in the area;
- Testimonies from the umbrella organizations such as Tanzania Natural Resource Fund (TNRF) and Pastoralists Livelihoods Task Force (PLTF) and their member CSOs reveal concerted efforts to lobby parliamentarians to raise and address problems facing pastoralists in parliament. These include attending 21 parliament sessions on pastoralism and frequent meetings with members of Parliamentary Group on Pastoralism (PGP) to lobby them to consider policy actions that would favour pastoral livelihoods;

- Between 2007 – 2009, 9 direct beneficiary workshops were held on various topics like land rights two times, policy analysis and advocacy two times, pastoralism and policy options, start up workshops three times and pre award workshop once attended by 262 of whom 49 (19%) were women;
- In 2009 14 CSOs held workshops on awareness raising for 61,222 community members, training of 413 community members, VCRC 638, training that is not specified 15,302 for 8 CSOs. A total of 86,369 were trained of whom HUDESA trained 58,376 people (68%).

In relation to the achievement of output 3 it was reported that

- All the government and CSO officials interviewed indicated a better working relationship between the pastoral CSOs, government authorities and pastoral communities than before the PBFP. This is attributed to the transparency exhibited by the pastoral CSOs in sharing their action plans with the government authorities.
- The Directorate of Pastoralist System Development (DPSD) has been very proactive in involving CSOs on important sector policy review meetings. Government departments involved and trained by the PBFP include officers from the Vice President's office in charge of Environment; Ministry of Land; Ministry of Water; and District Agriculture and Livestock Development officers. Testimony from Kilindi shows the nature of partnership between the CSOs and LGAs at local levels. The Kilindi District council together with ENVIROCARE conducted baseline survey which identified problems and assessed available opportunities for working together to solve the same. The district has since incorporated into its action plan activities address some of these problems identified during the survey. The council normally invites different development partners during planning process so as to harmonize each others plans to consolidate resources and avoid duplication of efforts. As required by CARE, for all partner CSOs, ENVIROCARE on the other hand shares its proposals and action plans with the district focal person and district council for comments before submission to CARE. Some of the problems identified in the baseline survey which were critical were land conflicts, shortage of water boreholes, dips and poor veterinary services. Some of these problems have been addressed by PADEP project that used the same information from the survey. It was also evident that, there were frequent land conflicts as a result of poor understanding of the village land Act of 1999. The district in collaboration with EMAYO and ENVIROCARE has been able to sensitize the community on the land Act and conflict resolution. Arrangements are normally made where the CSO provides funding to implement the activities while the district council provides the technical support. This partnership has gone a notch higher with a member of EMAYO, Jeremiah Simon has been selected to be in the Constituent Development Fund (CDF) committee.
- A number of contact persons and CSOs, indicated that there is need for more sensitization of the decision makers, other senior civil servants in the line ministries and village authorities to ensure their support. Some CSOs, for example, UVIMASHA have responded to this need through their capacity building efforts to train the animal health assistants and Community Based Animal Health Workers(CBAHW)/Wahudumu wa Afya ya Mifugo wa Jamii (WAMIJI) for their herd improvement projects to assist specifically in artificial insemination.

In relation to the achievement of output 4 it was reported that

- The PBFP has distributed a number of learning documents and policy briefs and reviews with the aim of sensitizing the pastoral communities and influencing development policies. A total

of 5033 learning materials have been disseminated to stakeholders since the inception of the programme.

Interviews were carried out with with pastoral communities to determine the visibility of the PBFP among the pastoral communities. The results of the interviews indicated that the PBFP is most recognized for its efforts in creating awareness on land rights and policies (71%); and training on sustainable livestock husbandry that involve disease control and management (48%). Out of the 101 pastoralists interviewed, 86% indicated that their ability to exercise their land rights has increased as well as an increased ability to participate and influence policies (79%). Responses from the pastoralists also indicate that diversification of livelihoods has increased among pastoral communities as a result of sensitization and training by the pastoral CSOs. Most of the respondents (87%) are now engaged in alternative economic activities. Majority (90%) of them are women involved in either small business enterprises. Although still considered as one of the main constraints to pastoralism, livestock losses due to diseases, has decreased following intervention by the CSOs. As a result of training on conflict resolution by received from the CSOs, 85% of the respondents reported less conflicts over resources. Due to the increased ability of pastoralists to exercise their land rights and participation in village land-use planning, they have been able to access grazing lands initially out of their reach. The respondents were, however, quick to point out that the increased accessibility of grazing may, however, be short-lived in the absence of commitment of the government and lack of policies and legislation to enforce the ownership rights.

Achievements According to the 2014 Mid Term Review

The findings of the MTR show the efforts of the Pastoralist Programme have contributed to increase responsiveness of local pastoralist organizations and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) to respond to true, practical and strategic needs of pastoralists in ways that they can secure their livelihoods. It has further been established that quality of life has improved since the PP and its predecessor PBFP have been undertaking advocacy activities. Quality of life has improved more in rising household income and access to education for pastoralist children in comparison to access to health and clean and safe water supply. Grazing land under the control and ownership of pastoralist has also increased, surpassing the Pastoralist Programme (PP) end-of programme target. This demonstrates there has been progress in respect to the programme purpose of advancement of pastoralist men, women and children's right to a sustainable livelihood. Such activities are evidence of the PP contribution to reduced poverty and vulnerability of pastoralist communities in Tanzania. Overall, the MTR finds the PP to the programme mid-point evaluation, has been implemented somewhat satisfactorily in some areas and unsatisfactorily in others. The PP has most-satisfactorily implemented its strategic output on increasing capacity of pastoralist CSOs to manage projects and support pastoralist's practical and strategic needs.

Main Achievements

Enabled Pastoralist Households Secure Livelihoods through Adopting Adaptation Strategies

The programme has helped to sustain pastoralism as a livelihood system although in a mutated state. The review gave a score of 3 out of 5 with the comment 'Somewhat satisfactorily achieved in some and unsatisfactorily in others'. Climate change condition was beginning to make pastoralism as a way of life unsustainable, putting at risk millions of girls, boys, women and men who are dependent on pastoralism as a mode of livelihood. Adaptation strategies conducted by CARE, TNRF and pastoralist organizations with support from Irish Aid have significantly contributed to conflict reduction, harmony and peaceful co-existence with smallholder farmer communities. This has facilitated violent free integration of pastoralists, especially girls and women, with surrounding communities of smallholder farmers. As a result of peaceful co-existence promoted by CARE, TNRF and pastoralist organization, pastoralist girls are now more secured against Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) when going to school in neighbouring villages, often during early morning hours, going to fetch water, often at long-distance and in morning or evening hours, or women and girls traveling to markets. Adaptation strategies have contributed to increased access to food and nutrition among pastoralist beneficiary households. Introduction of new hybrid livestock varieties and consequent increased in milk production has contributed to increase in income and basic needs. Increased income has been transformative to lives of pastoralist men and women. Increased milk production has had a double-effect of increasing household income while placing that income in the hands of pastoralist women, who control milk production in traditional pastoralist household economy. The MTR found evidence of pastoralist women who used increased income from milk production to support pastoralist children including girls to access education, increased households food security, nutrition; and participation in trade with smallholder farmers.

Pastoralist Rights to Livestock Movement Secured Through Restored Stock-Routes

Lack of awareness on the part of LGAs, village councils, smallholder farmers, conservation authorities and investors has led to blockage of traditional stock-routes. The PP has conducted

sensitization and skills training on how to negotiate, restore and demarcate stock-routes. This has led to not only restoration, but also securing pastoralism as a form of livelihood, thus preventing poverty and vulnerability to children, women and men who depend of pastoralism as a means of livelihood. The measure has also contributed to reduction of conflict that would have results from pastoralists “trespassing” over land that has been put into other use.

Conflict Reduced and Peaceful Co-Existence Achieved

Conflict reduction has perhaps been the most important achievement of PP. Increasing cattle and human population due to improved service delivery has led to land and resource scarcity. This has led to often violent conflict between pastoralists themselves, and pastoralists and smallholder farmers. LGAs responsible for peace and security have tended to side with smallholder farmers and definitely foreign investors who come-in as large-scale commercial farmers, tourism and conservationist groups. This has led to arrest and imprisonment, violent deaths, fines and/or confiscation of cattle, limitation of movement for pastoralist families and cattle, and pastoralist turning into protracted internally displaced persons (IDPs). PP has imparted conflict mediation skills to pastoralist organizations. Action-plans and mediation meetings have been conducted with demonstrable results. Main elements of conflict mediation strategies seen by the MTR include de-stocking to sustainable level on the past of pastoralist land and resource-use plans, village mediation meetings and binding resolutions, resource sharing, opening-up and demarcation of stock-routes and enactment of village by-laws that control against actions that provoke conflict and enforcement against offenders.

Improved Gender and Women Rights

The PP has however creatively navigated itself through this sensitive area to promote gender rights. The first strategy observed by the MTR is economic empowerment of pastoralist women through Village Saving and Loans (VSL) committees. VSLs have targeted widows who experience shocks and vulnerability upon bereavement as they are traditionally not allowed to inherit cattle owned by their deceased husbands. Married women have also benefitted from VSL to improve their small-livestock (sheep, goats, chicken), diversify into non-livestock activities (cultural tourism, bead-making) and milk production and sales. Women through VSLs have also been pioneers of hybrid animal husbandry “as men see hybrid cattle for the milk of women”. As a result of the foregoing, PP has empowered women financially. Women have used economic empowerment to gain voice and change the balance of gender relations, particularly at household level. Such support targeted at women is transformative both in terms of diversification of the pastoralist economy, therefore making it more susceptible to shocks, and responsive to development of quality of life at household level. The MTR has been told there is a positive correlation between increased income in the hands of pastoralist women and improved health and nutrition of children in particular. Women have also been inclined to use the income they control to pay for education of their children, both girls and boys. Education of pastoralist children contributes to long-term capital development and transformation of pastoralist communities, including diversification, improvements in livestock keeping and adaptation to climate change.

LGAs have become More Responsive to Practical Needs of Pastoralists

The last seven years (2007-2011 and 2011-2013) of Irish Aid/CARE support to pastoralist organizations to undertake dialogue and advocacy has started to yield results at LGA level. In the past, services were not taken to pastoralist villages on the premise that they are not “officially

recognized/gazetted villages” or they are “in the bush.” As a result of the PBFP and PP, LGAs have increasingly allocated budget resources to improve quality of life in pastoralist villages. All villages visited had a primary school and each ward had at least one secondary school. 40 percent of villages visited had access to safe drinking water. Veterinary services are increasingly becoming accessible especially vaccinations, deworming and control of epidemics. Private veterinary entrepreneurs have emerged to fill the gap of unresponsive and under-funded LGA veterinary services. They have repaired and use dilapidating cattle dips and offer diagnosis and treatment. The MTR finds delivery was practical and action-oriented. The trainings offered were not an end in themselves, but a means to implementation of demonstrative micro-projects.

Progress to Purpose Review

PP through TNRF and sub-grant recipient organizations have delivered a number of outputs.

- 85 different events including training;
- Reached 8,681 pastoralist men and women through the said training and events;
- 18,880 communication materials on pastoralist rights have been distributed;
- 85 evidence-based events have been organized.

According to programme beneficiaries, these efforts have contributed to achievements in the programme purpose. There is now evidence that LGAs and pastoralist CSOs are beginning to appreciate and be more responsive to practical and strategic needs of pastoralist men and women that contribute to secure their livelihood. All PP sub-grant recipient organizations said they feature gender and women rights in their programme. The programme purpose for increasing the number of local CSOs that address gender issues in pastoralist communities has increased from a baseline of 2 to 18 (all those who received PP grants) against a target of 5 by the end of the programme.

MTR has also established values against indicators of progress-to-date towards contribution to the programme goal (outcome) of “reduced poverty and vulnerability of pastoralist communities” in the programme areas.

- 69.75 percent of programme beneficiaries in targeted pastoralist communities said they perceive there have been positive changes in their quality of life compared to a baseline of 10 percent and end-of-programme target of 15 percent;
- Perception of increase of quality of life was proportionally higher among men (70.1 percent) compared to women (29.9 percent). This suggests there are prevalent gender inequalities in human development conditions.
- 70.66 percent of programme beneficiaries said they have experienced positive changes in access to food security. Others are education literacy (reading and writing) (73.43 percent), access to health services (66.97 percent), access to safe water (39.67 percent) and access to a toilet (49.45 percent). With respect to income poverty, 43.73 percent of households perceived positive changes in their household incomes during the period under review. It can be seen that quality of life has been achieved more in access to education and literacy compared to health indicators.

Programme beneficiaries said the PP has contributed to an outcome of increasing area of grazing land that is accessible and under the control of pastoralist communities by 51.47 percent compared to programme target of 14.4 percent.

Although the MTR has found evidence of ToT training that went to train other people, the majority of the trainings were conducted as one-off events, which served as an end-in themselves. The relative lesser implementation of programme Output 1 on “effective evidence-based advocacy to influence policy and implementation has overlooked the potential for influencing LGAs and national programmes that are implemented through the national budget (ASDP) to achieve scale. This is likely to be positively influenced by adoption of an evidence-based pastoralist rights monitoring system to influence advancement of pastoralist men and women rights to a sustainable livelihood.

Programme Effectiveness in Achieving Planned Outputs

This section provides an assessment of PP’s effectiveness in achieving planned outputs of the programme.

In relation to output 1 ‘effective evidence-based advocacy to influence policy and implementation’, the assessment gave a score of 2 out of 5 and found it to be ‘somewhat effective to translate in advancement of pastoralists rights to secured livelihood [given key policy documents have still to be influenced to explicitly address pastoralist needs]’. The MTR has established the programme did successfully and satisfactorily provide grants and technical support to pastoralist CSOs to conduct training to CBOs and pastoralist community members. The trainings that have been provided have been on:

- Village Land Act of 1999;
- Climate change and adaptation strategies;
- Conflict analysis and resolution techniques;
- Gender and women rights;
- Guidelines for development of land-use plans.

A total of 27 different types of training have been provided by 18 different organisations including CARE, and reached 15 different types of target beneficiaries ranging from CSO, CBO, and LGA staff to direct programme beneficiaries from pastoralist communities. A total of 12, 791 people have been trained by PP, 8,559 among these were men (66.99%) and 4,232 females (33.1%).

TNRF has been providing training for upstream policy stakeholders. A total of 6 different types of training have been provided by TNRF to 6 different types of beneficiaries ranging from members of parliament, directors of Ministries, LGA and pastoralist network staff. A total of 354 people have been trained by TNRF. 274 among these are male (77.7%) and 79 females (22.3%).

The MTR has found evidence that the training provided by PP sub-grant recipient organisations had an animative effect. It inspired action through post-training action-planning, agreed benchmarks and timelines on the part of the participants, and implementation of demonstrative micro-projects to pilot innovative ideas and best-practices by CBOs.

All 18 sub-grant recipient CSOs and TNRF, the PP implementing partner had all either got an explicit advocacy strategy and/or a strategic plan with an explicit advocacy strategic objective embedded in it. The MTR inspected the strategies and found them to be of acceptable and/or satisfactory condition. The MTR established that the advocacy strategies have been implemented in various ways. One way was through preparation and dissemination of advocacy materials. The

strategies were translated into production and dissemination of 18,880 advocacy materials. These materials range from posters, flyers, books on the Land Act, and T-shirts. The advocacy materials produced translate to approximately 3,100 copies per district.

Advocacy work conducted by sub-grant recipient organizations has been acknowledged by the programme beneficiaries. 27.86% and 21.22% of beneficiaries said sub-grant recipient CSOs conducted advocacy work to a sufficient and average extent respectively. 18.82% of programme beneficiaries said advocacy work conducted by CSOs influenced LGAs to address general pastoralists practical needs and 18.08% led to increasing grazing land. Despite these achievements, the MTR shows there is still unmet demand for advocacy services to advance the rights of pastoralist men and women to a secured livelihood. This is reflected by 24.54% and 33.21% of beneficiaries who said advocacy-work that has thus far been conducted to access pastoralists practical needs and increasing grazing land respectively is insufficient.

The unmet demand for increasing grazing land is higher compared to general practical and strategic needs of pastoralists. The level of perceived beneficiary knowledge on land, conservation and commercial agriculture laws, policies and national strategies and their effects of pastoralist livelihoods still remains below average indicating an unmet demand for knowledge and skills, which determine change of attitude and practices.

In relation to output 2 ‘representation of pastoralists at local and national levels leading to greater respect of their rights’, the assessment gave it a score of 2 out of 5 and found it to be ‘somewhat effective to translate in advancement of pastoralist rights. Pastoralist community members have been trained in leadership skills but there is no evidence they have been elected into leadership position as there has not been elections since 2012 when the training were offered. Even if elected, representatives are likely to be only somewhat effective if they do not have evidence which they can use to advance pastoralist rights’.

Programme beneficiaries told the MTR that pastoralist security and influence on district plan and budget in places like Kiteto, Mvomero and Iringa (Rural) were not being reflected in district-level decision-making and resource allocations because of lack of effective representation. Lack of representation and voice has caused pastoralists in Mvomero to be labelled by the district government as invading “aliens” who destroy the environment and disturb peace. As a result, following their evictions from Ihefu wetlands, the two districts of Mvomero and Kilosa undertook “a coordinated operation” to drive-out pastoralists from the two districts. This was done by chasing them from Mvomero while blocking them to enter Kilosa, thus creating a corridor for them to go into an unknown destination. As a result, the pastoralist and their herds have become unwelcomed Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in their own country.

In Kiteto, a predominantly pastoralist district, there has been conflict between smallholder farmers and pastoralists over resource-use rights, especially around Emboley Murtangos reserve. The interests of smallholder farmers from Kongwa districts in neighbouring Dodoma region have been powerfully advocated for by the Deputy Speaker of Parliament while pastoralists have been less successful in having a single voice to handle a case regarding an eviction order from the Court of Appeal and to influence district and regional authorities. As a result, the situation has gone out of hand and over 10 people have been killed and 50 left homeless.

Programme beneficiaries informed the MTR that the main reason why pastoralists were not being elected into decision-making positions/or when elected, not serving their full-term as being caused by their tendency to move out of villages, ward and district with their cattle for prolonged periods of time. When they return, they find their leadership positions have been replaced, in many cases with villagers in other occupations (agriculture or non-agriculture). PP sub-grantee organizations have successfully provided training and awareness building for election of pastoralist in leadership positions. The number of people trained in leadership positions and other skills is 8,681. Among these, 3,299 (38%) are women and 5,382 (62%) are men. This is a commendable milestone testified by self-assessment of sub-grant recipient organizations themselves. 31.48% of sub-grant recipient organizations said they have prepared representatives and leaders from pastoralist communities to a satisfactory extent and another 35.18% to a big extent. The majority of programme beneficiaries said they are now capable of vying for elected positions now that enough training and sensitization on electoral and political skills has been provided. The programme should continue to leverage on this investment and prepared programme beneficiaries to run for elected positions in the forthcoming village government council elections in 2014.

Within pastoralist communities, representation has been taking place through traditional age-set systems. This is a patriarchal system that is dominated by elder men. It does not provide for leadership space to neither young adults nor females. Young adults, females and progressive men have forming CSO networks, task-forces and coalitions in-order to enhance their representation and voice leading to greater respect of pastoralist rights. The MTR has ascertained that 23 pastoralist district networks have been formed in the MTR districts. One national pastoralist network, the Pastoralist Platform has been formed to respect pastoralist rights on a national level.

To enhance voice and presence, pastoralists CSOs based in and/or around Arusha have formed an informal pastoralist rights abuse surveillance mechanism. The networks monitor and respond to rights abuses by forming action-oriented task forces. These leading pastoralist CSOs are TPCF, TAPHGO, PINGOs, KAI, and TNRF. A section of these pastoralist organizations have successfully conducted campaigns to advocate for pastoralist rights. The first campaign was the Pastoralist Livelihood Task Force and the second the Loliondo evictions Task Force. The organizations have also used a similar approach to constitute a Pastoralist Constitution Forum known as KAI. The task forces have in the past teamed-up with specialized organizations such as the Legal and Human Rights Centre (LHRC) to conduct monitoring of human rights abuses, and have them documented in national human rights reports and human rights shadow report. Most recently, collaboration between pastoralist organizations within the Task Force framework has conducted a media and community campaign against eviction of pastoralist from Loliondo wetland area and raising awareness about human rights violations during the controversial Tokomeza Initiative. As a result, an independent parliamentary inquiry commission was formed leading to resignation and dismissal of four Ministers. The pastoralist networks coalition presents a framework where pastoralist human rights can be monitored, swift response and representation monitored leading to greater respect of pastoralist rights.

In relation to output 3 ‘increased capacity of local government institutions to provide quality and timely services to pastoralists’, the assessment gave it a score of 4 out of 5 and found it to be ‘somewhat effective in advancing pastoralist rights to a secured livelihood. There is evidence of

improved services in education but access to veterinary services, water supply and health remain low and inaccessible to the most vulnerable’.

Programme beneficiaries in Bunda complained livestock and veterinary extension workers do not visit them and are not accountable to pastoralist clients. They said they are only visited when there are vaccinations, epidemics or the need to impose quarantine and/or control epidemics. Extension officers tend to go to villages because pastoralists pay for the vaccinations. Otherwise, if they are not paid, they waste time being drunk and chasing after women (a description of their lack of accountability).

Programme beneficiaries in Bunda and Geita say when their cattle are sick, they visit the veterinary officer at the district township and describe the sickness, and then he/she issues them with a prescription even without seeing the sick cattle. This has led to wrong diagnosis, improper prescriptions and poor disease control. This situation has led to preventable epidemics and deaths. In Geita, Bunda and Kiteto, pastoralists said they had to collect funds to repair leaking cattle dips in their villages after going unrepaired after being abandoned by the district council. As a result, programme beneficiaries in Bunda and Geita say they have been relying on private veterinarians. They have however cautioned that private veterinarians dilute medications too much such that cattle are not properly treated. They say “the cattle only get the smell of the medicine but the treatment is not effective.” Pastoralist CSOs in Bunda and Serengeti have given-up to follow on district veterinary extension workers. The level of unaccountability presented by veterinary and livestock extension workers is perceived to present low chances of success from efforts to engage them to be more accountable.

The perception of programme beneficiaries indicates there is still capacity for LGAs to improve in providing basic services to pastoralist communities. The majority of beneficiaries gave low assessment in terms of improvements of services provided by LGAs. An exception can be seen with regard to education where 13.84% of beneficiaries said their access to education as a service provided by LGAs had improved to a big extent compared to 5.35% of health. Access to health, water and sanitation still rank low in pastoralist communities. Only 39.67% of programme beneficiaries said they accessed clean and safe water supply. This has meant women have to travel long distances, often up to 2 hours to fetch for water.

Higher proportion of improvements in education services is attributed to implementation of Governments Primary School and Secondary School Education Programmes (PEDP and SEDP). The programmes have established primary schools in every village and secondary schools in every ward. Programme beneficiaries said taking education facilities closer to pastoralist villages has expanded school enrolment for both pastoralist girls and boys. Access is secured since the MTR did not find evidence of whole pastoralist households shifting seasonally from one place to another in search for pastures. It is important to note that pastoralism as it has been traditionally known has itself mutated. Families have become sedentary save for intermittent shifts arising from various push and pull factors. What routinely happens is young adult males leave their homestead with cattle for three to six months to pasture them in unoccupied grasslands deep in the wooded savannah grassland areas. For the majority, whole families no longer follow them as pastoralists have increasingly become dependent on markets and services around their current settlements. Except for the pastoralist IDPs, children, adolescent youth, women and the elderly remain almost

permanently in their homesteads. One of the reasons for staying behind is to protect their land from being taken over by other competing interest groups while they are away. This has and continues to be the way pastoralists loose range land. Push factors that were cited to force families to leave inhabited land are climate change effects, its effects on depleting water resources, growth of herd-size relative to available grazing land (land carrying capacity), and evictions driven by conservation activities and allocations of pasture-land to investors. Pull factors mainly involve moving to areas where there is more open land, fertile soils for grass and water.

In relation to output 4 ‘Increased capacity of pastoralist CSOs to manage projects and support pastoralist’s practical and strategic needs’, the assessment gave it a score of 5 out of 5 and found it to be ‘mostly effective to advancement of pastoralist rights to a secured livelihood. Has prospects of being highly effective if it is backed by evidence and directed to increasing LGAs capacity to plan and budget for true, practical and strategic pastoralist needs’.

The main focus of the PP for the period under review has been to provide capacity strengthening support to pastoralist CSOs. The MTR has established that a total of 8,681 pastoralists men and women have been trained by the PP in the districts under review. Among these, 3,299 (38%) are women and 62 percent is 5,382 (62%) are men. This reflects an average of 1,400 pastoralist men and women for each district. 85 community awareness and sensitization events (reflecting an average of 4 events per districts) have been organized. A total of 18,880 communication materials (approximately 3,100 per district) on pastoralists rights have been published, printed and/or distributed). This shows the programme has not only had a strong focus on training as a dimension of capacity strengthen during the period under review, it this area has been its strongest performance during the period under review. In terms of organizational development, the MTR finds sub-grant recipient organizations have attained satisfactory level of organizational capacity development to address pastoralist’s practical and strategic needs. LIVES (Longido), UMWEMA (Mvomero), KINNAPA and NAADUTARO (Kiteto) and SHIMWAJAWA (Bunda) have stood-out in demonstrating evidence of capacity development to address pastoralists practical and strategic needs. The MTR further established that all sub-grant recipient organizations in the districts under review have strategic plans. Not surprisingly as this was a requirement for accessing funds from the PP. Pastoralist CSOs in the districts under review have formed 23 district networks and one national platform aimed at coordinating pastoralist’s organizations so as to have common voice and achieve higher impact in policy advocacy.

Overall, the MTR concludes the PP has somewhat satisfactorily achieved some outputs expected to be achieved by the programme mid-term and somewhat unsatisfactorily achieved others. The programme has most satisfactorily achieved its planned outputs in providing capacity strengthening to pastoralists CSOs and somewhat satisfactorily achieved increasing capacity of LGAs to provide quality and timely services to pastoralists. It has somewhat unsatisfactorily achieved its programme outputs on evidence-based advocacy to influence policy and promoting representation of pastoralists at local and national levels leading to greater rights respect of their rights. The MTR concludes increased attention to the programme output on evidence-based advocacy conducted to influence policy and implementation has stronger prospects for attaining the programme purpose on advancement of pastoralist men and women rights to a sustainable livelihood.

Appendix 6: Timeline for Evolution of Pastoralist basket Fund Programme 2005 - 2016

Year	Event	Comment
Sept 2005	Report of a study on the Need and Possible Entry Points for DCI to Support Civil Society to Actively Engage in the Areas of Land Rights, Pastoralism and Conflict Resolution in Tanzania	Four options were given as to how DCI could implement its support to civil society: (a) through the Embassy Local Governance Advisor; (b) through the Foundation for Civil Society; (c) outsourcing a competent firm or NGO; and (d) through a University-based institution.
2006	Terms of Reference for bidding to set up and manage a Basket Fund for Support to Civil Society organisations involved in Land Rights, Conflict Resolution and Pastoralism in Tanzania	The bidding document should be presented to Irish Aid by the 8th of September, 2006. A committee of stakeholders will be set up to evaluate the tenders and to act as in an advisory role for the establishment of the fund.
Sept 2007	CARE made a Proposal for “Managing A Basket Fund For Support To Civil Society Organizations Involved In Land Rights, Conflict Resolution And Pastoralism In Tanzania”	There is no information as to how the bidding process worked or as to how CARE was selected. There was some controversy as one of the weaknesses identified by the Mid Term Evaluation (p. 27) was that “pastoralist CSOs were not adequately involved in the development of proposal to Irish Aid. This led to resentments in the early stages of the programme implementation, where some CSOs from northern Tanzania declined to apply for funds claiming that the funds should be managed by pastoralist CSOs themselves”. A number of recommendations were made.
2007	CARE to carry out (a) participatory baseline situation analysis study; (b) stakeholder analysis; and (c) Organizational Development Assessment (ODA) of short-listed pastoral CSO partners	Were these ever carried out as there has been no evidence provided in any report on the outcome of these studies.
2008	12 CSOs selected for the first year of the programme	
March 2009	Baseline survey	The survey was carried out by Austroproject Association (APA) but the target of the survey was agro pastoralists. It was carried out in seven districts - Serengeti, Rorya, Musoma Rural, Magu, Geita, Kilolo and Iringa Rural

2009	11 CSOs selected for the second year	
November 2009	Annual Review Meeting of Stakeholders to the PBFP held at Usambara Safari Lodge, Morogoro. It was attended by 37 participants.	A Draft Pastoralist Strategic Plan was discussed at the meeting and mention of ‘strategies for adaptation to climate change should be explored’.
2010	17 CSOs selected for the third year	6 of the CSOs funded in 2010 had received previous funding and by the first three years 32 CSOs had been funded
2011	14 CSOs selected for the fourth year	The 14 CSOs funded in 2011 had not received any previous funding
May 2010	CARE International submitted to Irish Aid a Concept Note for ‘Managing a Basket Fund for Support to Civil Society Organizations Involved In Land Rights, Conflict Resolution And Pastoralism In Tanzania	The concept note proposed a new five year project with two distinct features: a) expanding the geographical focus to 14 regions – up from 10; b) focusing on introducing new project components in districts that have been implementing the project in the first phase
August 2010	A Mid Term Evaluation of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) was Carried out for CARE International by Oliver Vivian Wasonga and Yosh Kasilima	The report was 32 pages long and concluded that the PBFP has largely achieved most of its objectives stipulated in the programme’s proposal and testimonies from the pastoral communities reveal general acceptance of the programme by the pastoralists, as well as several positive impacts on pastoralists.
2010	The Pastoralist Livelihood Task Force A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR PASTORALISM IN TANZANIA 2010-2014	The plan was developed with finding from TPBF and it also made recommendations for adjustments to the TPBF.
June 2011	A Terminal Evaluation of the PBFP was Carried out for CARE International by Oliver Vivian Wasonga, Francis Juma and Eligad Massawe	This 50-page evaluation report made a number of recommendations especially in relation to mainstreaming activities into Local Government Authorities (LGAs). The recommendations also stated that it is important for CARE to pay attention to opinions of the umbrella organizations and opinion leaders among the pastoral communities, especially those from northern Tanzania where there was initial stand-off between the PBFP and pastoral CSOs.
2011	A Draft of what was termed a concept note was made to Irish Aid called 2011 Proposal Concept Note	It noted that while climate change was a challenge pastoralists had developed adaptation mechanisms. It also noted that the grant making mechanisms used in Phase I worked well and allowed CSOs to be selected and helped to manage grants and have impacts on their target groups. It also stated that there would be two changes

		from the phase 1 proposal. The work will be managed by a partnership between TNRF and CARE which will make a strong team linking considerable experience in grant making and project management with powerful networking and advocacy and important links to pastoralist communities. Secondly, the proposal contains a staged move to devolved grant-making so that pastoral CSOs can gain experience in grant management which would make them more able to act as conduits for funding and make support to pastoralist CSOs and pastoralist communities more sustainable.
November 2011	CARE made a proposal to Irish Aid for ‘A Management Agency for a Pastoralist Programme in Tanzania 2012 – 2015’	The proposal expanded on the concept note sent earlier in 2011 with a more focused goal, purpose and outputs. The geographic focus was to be in the Northern, Lake and Central zones with later expansion to coast and southern zones.
December 2011	Annual Review Meeting of Stakeholders to the PBFP held at St Gaspers Conference Centre and Hotel, Dodoma. It was attended by 52 participants.	It noted that training on land use and governance has significantly empowered pastoralists over proper land use and its management and the issue of having a pastoralist forum was discussed and “CARE should not hesitate to collaborate with any Pastoralist CSO that indicate strong willingness to-do so”.
November 2012	Pastoralists Programme (PP) Final Baseline survey report by Dr. Victor Kekengi and Pius Kavana, TAWIRI	Districts visited were Kondoa, Hanang, Arusha/TNRF, Simanjiro, Geita and Singida
2012	The programme gave grants to ten CSOs	
2013	The programme gave grants to eight CSOs	
January 2014	Pastoralist Programme Mid term review carried out by Dr Christopher Awinia.	This 74 page review made a number of recommendations including the need to concentrate the geographic focus of the project, the need to consider grant size and objectives, the need to review how partners are identified and selected, the need to review the relationship between CARE and grantees and programme governance arrangements and staffing.
April 2014	CARE and TNRF Pastoralist Programme propose a ‘Strategy for Refocusing of the	The strategy document was a direct response to the MTR recommendations and organisational changes within CARE Tanzania. The document sets out a strategy and future direction for

	Pastoralist Programme in line with Mid Term Review Recommendations.	the programme for the remaining period of implementation, up to December 2015.
2014	The programme worked with 9 sub grantees in seven districts in the regions of Morogoro, Manyara and Arusha	
2015	A Case Study on Approaches for Supporting Pastoralist groups facing climate change effects in Tanzania was commissioned	Study was commissioned by Irish Aid Learning Platform on climate change and was carried out by IIED
2015	Documentation of Pastoralist Programmes Best Practices (2012 – 2015)	The study was carried out by Sam Greene, IIED, Zakaria Faustin TNRF and Jane Nkinga TNRF. The purpose was to see what best practices are emerging that can guide organisations looking to create positive development impacts in pastoralist communities.
2015	Assessment of Sustainability of Pastoralist Programme	The study was carried out by Sam Greene, IIED, Zakaria Faustin TNRF and Jane Nkinga TNRF. The purpose was to assess how capacity building activities have impacted on the sustainability of Pastoralist Program interventions since 2012.

Appendix 7: List of all CSOs supported by the Programme by District/Region and Number of Times Funded									
			District/Region		Phase 1	Phase 2			
					No of times funded				
No	Name of CSO	Acronym	District/Region	Category	2007+	2013	2014	2015	Total
1	Tanzania Grass Roots Oriented Development	TAGRODE	Kilolo/Iringa		2	1			3
2	Environmental, Human Rights Care and gender Organization	ENVIROCARE	Handeni/Tanga	LR	2				2
3	Tanzania Pastoralists, Hunters and Gatherers Organization	TAPHGO	Arusha, Ngorongoro & Same/Arusha	NW	1	1			2
4	Southern Highland Livestock Development association	SHILDA	Iringa/Iringa	Adv	2				2
5	Rural Initiatives and Relief Agency	RIRA	Magu/Mwanza	NW	2				2
6	Community Development and Relief Trust	CODERT	Geita/Geita	LR	2	1			3
7	Kisesa Development Fund	KDF	Meatu/Simiyu	LR	1				1
8	Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF) / for Pastoralist Livelihood Task Force	TNRF	Arusha/Arusha	NW	1	1			2
9	Sunya Ward Education and Training	SWEAT	Kiteto/Manyara	LR	1				1
10	Ereto Maasai Youth	EMAYO	Kiteto/Manyara	Adv	2	1			3
11	Tanzania Women - Focused Afforestation Organization Trust Fund	TWAO	Mvomero & Morogoro/Morogoro	NW	1				1
12	Human Development Strategies Association	HUDESA	Kilosa/Morogoro	CR	2		1		3
13	SHIDEPHA+ - Kahama Programme	SHIDEPHA	Kahama/Shinyanga	LR	1				1
14	Tanzania Network for Indigenous Pastoralists and Environment	TANIPE	Kilosa/Morogoro	P/L	1				1

15	Kiteto Civil Society Organization	KCS	Kiteto/Manyara	NW	2				2
16	Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum	TPCF	Ngorongoro/ Arusha	LR	1		1	1	3
17	Serengeti Farmers Association	SEFA	Serengeti/Mara	P/L	1				1
18	Anglican Church of Tanzania -	ACT-Mara	Musoma/Mara	P/L	1				1
19	Tanzania Home Economics Association	TAHEA	Rorya/Mara	ADV	1				1
20	Tanzania Milk Producers Association	TAMPRODA	Mvomero & Kilosa/Morogoro	NW	1				1
21	Ngorongoro Network	NGONET	Ngorongoro/Arusha	NW	1				1
22	Taturu Community Development Foundation	TACODEF	Serengeti/Mara	LR	2				2
23	Morogoro Paralegal Center	MPLC	Mvomero/Morogoro	LR	1				1
24	Action for Relief and Development Assistance	AFREDA	Kilosa/Morogoro	CR	1				1
25	Parakuiyo Pastoralist Indigenous Community Development	PAICODEO	Kilosa/Morogoro	LR	1				1
26	UNGO-Morogoro	UNGO	Kilosa/Morogoro	P/L	1				1
27	Special Development Organization	SDO	Simanjiro/Manyara	P/L	1				1
28	Huruma Concern and Care	HACOCA	Mvomero/Morogoro	LR	1				1
29	Umoja wa Vikundi vya Maendeleo Shambarai	UVIMASHA	Simanjiro/Manyara	P/L	1	1			2
30	Women Wake Up	WOWAP	Handeni/Tanga	LR	1				1
31	NAADUTARO (PASTORALIST SURVIVAL OPTIONS)	NAADUTARO	Kiteto/Manyara	LR	1		1	1	3
32	UMWEMA Group Morogoro Trust Fund	UMWEMA	Kilosa/Morogoro	LR	1		1	1	3
33	Maasai Pastoralists Foundation	MPF	Monduli/Arusha	LR	1				1
34	DINKWA women Development Organization	DIWODEO	Mbulu/Manyara	P/L	1				1
35	Tanzania Women of Impact Foundation	TAWIF	Handeni/Tanga	P/L	1				1

36	Women Development for Science and Technology Association	WODSTA	Arumeru/Arusha	LR	1		1	1	3
37	KITUMUSOTE - Small Agro-Pastoralist Farmers Development Initiatives Organizations	KITUMUSOTE	Meru/Arusha	LR	1				1
38	KINNAPA Development Programme	KINNAPA	Kiteto/Manyara	LR	1	1			2
39	Peoples' Unity for Development in Africa	PUFDIA	Same/Kilimanjaro	LR	1				1
40	Community Development Support	CDS	Meatu/Simiyu	LR	1				1
41	Hadzabe Survival Council of Tanzania	HSCT	Mbulu/Manyara	LR	1				1
42	Longido Community Development Organization	LCDO	Longido/Arusha	P/L	1				1
43	Esiangiki We Ndito Trust	EKWET	Monduli/Arusha	P/L	1				1
44	Community Economic Development and Social Transformation	CEDESOTA	Arumeru/Arusha	P/L	1	1			2
45	UMOJA WA MAENDELEO KWA MTORO	UMAKWA	Dodoma/Dodoma	LR		1			1
46	Maasai Women Development Organization	MWEDO	Simanjiro/Manyara	Adv		1			1
47	Shirika la Maendeleo ya Wafugaji Jamii ya Wataturu	SHIMWAJAWA	Serengeti/Mara	LR		1			1
48	Livelihood Initiatives Support	LIVES	Longido/Arusha	P/L			1		1
49	Community Support Initiatives – Tanzania	COSITA	Babati/Manyara	LR			1	1	2
50	Manyara Region Civil Society Organization Network	MACSNET	Manyara	Adv			1		1
51	Pastoralists Indigenous Non Governmental Organisations Forum	PINGOs Forum	Arusha					1	1

LR = Land Rights; NW = Networking; P/L = Pastoralism Livelihood; Adv = Advocacy.

Appendix 8: CSOs involved in PP and Receiving Funding from other Donors

Name	Amount Accessed	Donor	Purpose
WODSTA	\$18,912	DKA Austria	Food security pilot project, Arumeru
COSITA	\$70,000	Farm Africa	Household Resilience building through income generating activities in 2015
COSITA	€90,000	USAID	Nutrition Programme – 2014 - 2016
MACSNET	\$47,201	USAID/ Africare	Nutrition Programme for women and children
UMWEMA	\$57,737	TACOSODE	Citizens engaging in government oversight programme
UMWEMA	\$452,334	Africare	Nutrition Programme for women and children
PINGOS	\$227,985	SIDA	Fact finding on pastoralist human rights violations
NAADUTARO	\$30,000	World Bank	Research on impact of large scale investors on smallholders
MACSNET	\$47,201	USAID Africare	Nutrition Programme for women and children

(Source: IIED Study on “Assessing the sustainability of pastoralist Programme Capacity Building, p. 31)

Appendix 8: Some Lessons Learned according to IIED Studies on Climate Change Adaptation

The following are some lessons learned based on the achievements of the Pastoralist Programme, the work of Oxfam and the work of IIED.

- **Land use planning coupled with legal ownership can be significant impact.** Development of village land use plans backed by formal communal rights of ownership offers a stronger legal basis for preventing land grabs or encroachment from both large and small scale investors. It serves as a basis for enactment of by-laws that can prevent further loss of land to smallholders as well as investor “land grabs”. Care/TNRF projects facilitated land use planning at village level. With training, village assemblies enacted by-laws and placed demarcations to protect the land use plan. Communities from both Care and Oxfam funded projects reported that land use planning was beginning to make a difference to the health and productivity of their herds. However, land use planning has risks as Government divides villages, which undermines the legal basis for continuity of customary rights of occupancy held by pastoralists and smallholder farmers. Having established land use plans, often in collaboration with other villages to maximise the resources available, communities were supported to obtain communal, traditional rights of ownership of the land. Such an approach aims to ensure that the commons maintains its current state, and serves as a legal defence against encroachment by large-scale investors.
- **Raising awareness of women’s rights transforms gender dynamics.** Through the work of the Pastoralist Programme women were empowered to establish or run income generating activities that benefit everyone in a household. bringing equity in decision making and empowering some to seek formal representation in various decision making forums such as village and ward councils and village committees. However it can create conflict. HUDA in Gairo found that training on gender and land rights in the community led to conflict as women claimed land from unwilling clan leaders and individuals tried to use the new knowledge to their own advantage. As a result, training of tribunals became necessary to properly settle disputes. In Kiteto, the village assembly has allowed each adult within the village to obtain 0.5 acres of land within settlement and farming areas of the village. In effect, this has given everyone in the community the opportunity to maintain a basic income. Either they can farm the land themselves and sell produce, or rent it out for a season at a cost of TSH30 000 per acre per season. This is a powerful way of improving the adaptive capacity of everyone in the village. In particular, women who are divorced or widowed benefit immeasurably, gaining some independence from relying on charitable giving of family or clan members.
- **Using an inclusive approach at key Strategic Moments especially for policy making and advocacy.** Advocacy for pastoralist rights is most successful when representatives of both government and non-governmental institutions are engaged in dialogue. It is productive to focus on issues of interest to the government as well. Broad based coalitions of different groups with similar perspectives have great potential e.g Katiba Initiative There was regular engagement and alliance building with non-pastoralist groups, (such as agricultural and mining groups), seeking common ground in order to support constitutional changes that could be mutually beneficial. Pastoralists, farmers, fisher-folk and small miners would all secure guarantees rights if the constitution is accepted. A further success has been an increase in the budget allocation for livestock development. Budget allocations for the livestock sector in

Mvomero and Kiteto were increased by 1% and 5% respectively for 2014/15. Hanang' and Simanjiro District's livestock budget allocation for FY 2014/15 has risen by 14%.

- **The Importance of Changing Perceptions** - The pastoralism training course by TNRF and IIED in particular has been credited with “starting a fire” among key decision makers about the value and sustainability of pastoralism. Interviews with district extension officers also pointed out the way in which their understanding of pastoralism had changed, affecting the way they went about their jobs. This has also been the case at national level, where it appears that dialogue and inclusion of MP's has led to broader support for funding for livestock development and land use planning. The progress achieved demonstrates that many government staff and elected representatives are willing to engage with the issues and act on them if they believe they will support local economic development. The support of district leaders, District Executive Directors and District Commissioners has been instrumental in driving acceptance of new planning tools within the districts. Concepts such as pastoralist mobility and sustainable production systems are gaining a much fairer hearing, particularly at district level.
- **Need to be Clear on Entry Point** - One needs to be clear on what is the most appropriate and strategic entry point to engage with Government in terms of policy making, planning and advocacy work. One needs to ask who are the best people/departments to involve, how best to involve them, why involve them, what improvements are you looking for and what are the potential benefits to beneficiaries. Care/TNRF and Oxfam have focused at both the level of the village and the level of national government. If the aims are to deliver improvements to local livelihoods in a short time period of time, then the entry level of the community is more appropriate. Interventions at village level are likely to generate modest improvements to local productivity after a less than a year. Focus on the village as entry point also leaves one ultimately tied in to the limits of village boundaries, which limit the impact an intervention can have. Care/TNRF and Oxfam have tried to balance this problem with advocacy at national level. It is clear that they have experienced some successes in this regard. Experience from IIED case study has show that **The district authority is an effective entry point for planning, resource allocation and policy making** as decentralisation places the district as the driver of socio-economic planning. Capacity building of district officials through training, dialogue, or facilitation of discussions about resource use has enabled district councils to provide improved services to pastoralists. It has also made districts willing to develop planning processes that incorporate resilience building into the planning and budgeting process.
- **Need for a Gradual Approach.** IIED starting with one years preparatory training before developing into activities under the four outputs. District leaders in particular pointed out the advantages of the gradual approach taken. Taking time to validate findings of research, consult all stakeholders as well as pause and allow time for changes to become embedded was greatly valued. The CARE PP had a short one-year cycle and many CSOs complained about the short project cycle.
- **Gender Empowerment** - The significant successes seen in Care/TNRF and Oxfam's work on gender demonstrate that there is a latent and unexploited willingness within communities to empower women. Based on the work of the Pastoralist Programme training leads women deciding to run for formal positions of office on village councils. They also seek for their rights when trained. Empowered women can raise household incomes, increase the economic productivity of communities and drive towards improved children's education and food security. Incorporating gender rights training, particularly with respect to women's individual

rights to land, should be key in any future programmes, given the positive potential this can have. Training on gender rights under the law and the concept of equity for women in terms of income generation is quickly accepted by communities. As a result, women report increased independence and parity of decision-making within their households. This in turn is leading to increased spending on girls' education, domestic needs, and food supplies. Empowerment was enhanced further when gender training was explicitly linked to individual land rights, entrepreneurship and representation. Such training has empowered women to claim land from their clans to generate their own income and to contest for leadership positions. This has benefitted widows and divorcees in particular.

- **Incorporating District Staff has a positive influence** – The use of district staff in climate change awareness of training, or supporting land use planning or resource mapping, brings pastoralists into contact with district planners. This is beneficial for increasing understanding of pastoralist requirements. Government workers in Kiteto reported beneficial experiences to their own having learnt from training activities.
- **Supporting Dialogue and Training** - Facilitating dialogue between multiple actors from different perspectives on issues surrounding pastoralism helped to lay the foundation for increased influence. Facilitating this dialogue may require actors with a strong reputation for neutrality and fairness. TNRF, in its dedicated and reputed role as a forum, was able to create this environment, overcoming disagreements between various pastoralist lobby groups. This has enabled a stronger and united voice on pastoralist issues.

Appendix 10. Some Points from Agreement between CARE and TNRF

To achieve the objectives and desired outcomes of this collaborative project, the Pastoralist Program Initiative, CARE and TNRF agree to the following program of planning and meeting:

- Annual internal reviews of work to develop annual reports and to develop annual work plans and budget
- Quarterly review and planning of implementation over the remainder of the year
- Regular monthly meetings to review and plan the implementation of work

Specifically, TNRF will be responsible for: (i) capacity building of local CSOs partners, LMAs and LGAs on policy analysis, evidence based advocacy, networking/alliance building, improved coordination and communication, including production of appropriate advocacy and communication tools/materials; (ii) providing technical assistance to CARE and LMAs in vetting proposals received from local CSOs partners for accessing funds and participation in the Pastoralist Program; (iii) technical monitoring of the CSO sub-grantees; and (iv) consolidation of a learning/good practices generated from the work of all participating CSOs and other programs and formulation into a policy feedback and advocacy agenda for the Pastoralist Program in Tz.

The total estimated funds required for the activities required hereunder is EU454,906 (over 5 yr)

Monitoring and Reporting Program Performance (a) Periodic Reports. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the end of each quarter, Sub-recipient shall timely submit in electronic form, narrative progress reports to CARE, in a form and with content satisfactory to CARE that succinctly presents the following information:

- (1) Explanation of quantifiable output of the programs or projects compared against those described in the Project Description to be accomplished in any period specified, if appropriate and applicable,
- (2) Reasons why established results were not achieved, if appropriate; and,
- (3) Analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs.

(c) Monitoring. Sub-recipient consents to any sub-recipient monitoring that CARE may reasonably require, including site visits, periodic reviews, audits, and other monitoring activities or requirements. The logistic and staff costs of such visits will be borne by CARE. TNRF will be responsible for addressing and covering the costs of any findings which may arise from these visits or audits. TNRF has the incumbency to monitor the impacts of the program in terms of understanding the impact of the initiative in changing the behavior and practice of boundary partners that work toward achievement of the objectives of the collaboration between CARE and TNRF. Therefore, TNRF will use Outcome Mapping as a tool for monitoring change, and TNRF and CARE staff involved in the project will actively participate in the program of monitoring as set out by TNRF. TNRF and CARE agree to discuss revision of plans and strategies if the results of outcome monitoring show a documented need to revise strategies in order to achieve the objectives of the project.

Financial Reports (a) Periodic Reports. Within fifteen calendar days after the end of each quarter, Sub-recipient shall timely submit to CARE in electronic form, a completed Financial Status report or some other format which may from time to time be approved by CARE, together with any other financial reports requested by CARE or required to comply with Donor requests. Each financial

report should analyze spending for the preceding period as compared to the line-items established in the Budget. Each report must indicate:

(1) the amount budgeted for each major and sub-line item, the amount expended against each major and sub line as of the date of the report, and the resulting balance remaining in each major and sub-line; and

(2) Grant funds received during the period of the report, the amount of expenditures against such funds, the purpose of expenditures of such funds, and the balance of funds remaining and unspent.

(b) Final Reports Within forty-five (45) calendar days after the expiration date of this Agreement, Sub-recipient shall timely submit to CARE a final report describing final financial status and a detailed summary of Sub-recipient's portion of the Project. The report shall be in a form and contain the content acceptable to CARE, including without limitation a description of the Sub-recipient's activities and results, an assessment of progress made towards accomplishing the results, the significance of these activities, any important research findings, and any comments and recommendations.

Termination by CARE. CARE may terminate or suspend this award at any time, in whole or in part if

(1) Sub-recipient materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of this Agreement;

(2) the Donor, fails to fund;

(3) the Sub- recipient is unable to carry out the purposes of this Agreement in a satisfactory or timely manner in the reasonable judgment of CARE; or

(4) any act or omission of Sub-recipient exposes CARE to liability for personal injury or property damage in the reasonable judgment of CARE. CARE will notify the Sub-recipient in a letter that will indicate the reason for termination or suspension, effective date and in case of partial termination, the portion to be terminated or suspended thirty days prior to effective date.