



FAO KE OSRO/RAF/913/EC- 003

Pastoral Field Schools in Northern Kenya

Assessment Report



October 2010

Compiled by:

FFS Promotion Services

Godrick Khisa

Gertrude Buyu

Masai Masai

Humphrey Khakula

Deborah Duveskog



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	3
Summary	4
Introduction	5
Assessment procedure and methodology	6
Status and Observations	8
<i>Implementation status.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>PFS management by implementation actors.....</i>	<i>9</i>
Recommendations	11
<i>PFS learning process and functioning</i>	<i>12</i>
Recommendations	15
<i>Training of PFS facilitators</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Project partnerships</i>	<i>19</i>
Recommendations	19
<i>Sustainability.....</i>	<i>20</i>
Recommendations	21
<i>Impact at individual and community level.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>SWOT analysis of PFS.....</i>	<i>23</i>
Key Lessons Learned	25
General Recommendations	27
Annex 1: Stories of significant change: PFS impact	29
Annex 2: List of PFS groups in Northern Kenya	31
Annex 3: Terms of Reference.....	38
Annex 4: Itinerary and Timetable.....	43

List of Acronyms

ABCD	Asset based community development
ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
CBTD	Community Based Targeting and Distribution
CDF	Constituency Development Fund
COOPI	Cooperazione Internazionale
DMI	Drought Management Initiative
DLPO	District Livestock Production Officer
ECHO	European Commission – Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFS	Farmer Field School
IPs	Implementing Partners
KCB	Kenya Commercial Bank
MTs	Master Trainers
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OXFAM	Oxford Committee for Famine Relief.
PESA	Pastoral-eco system analysis
PFS	Pastoralist Field School
REOA	Regional Emergency Office for Africa
SNV	Netherlands Development Organisation
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats
TOF	Training of Facilitators
VICOBA	Village Community Banks
VLUP	Village land use planning
VSF	Veterinaries Sans Frontiers

Summary

The purpose of this assessment was to take stock of the implementation of Pastoralist Field Schools (PFS) in Kenya, including impact at individual and community level, challenges and opportunities in implementation etc. Apart from review of existing literature and reports field visits were undertaken to most of the implementation sites in Northern and North-eastern Kenya, followed by a workshop among implementation partners to discuss the findings.

Results from the assessment show that PFS provide an excellent entry point and platform for improved livelihoods among pastoral communities and has provided an innovative and ground breaking step towards a more participatory and beneficiary driven support system. Impacts observed include uptake of improved technology options especially related to animal (sheep, goats and cattle) health, feeding and management and to a lesser extent alternative livelihood options such as crop farming, poultry etc. PFS has also contributed to empowerment especially among women including increase self-confidence, group cohesion and a collective spirit.

In relation to the management and implementation modalities of PFS there are big differences observed between various actors and a strong need to harmonise and coordinate activities across sites and partners, particularly in relation aspects such as group grants and payment of PFS facilitators. Too little backstopping at field level, low level of expertise on PFS among project managers, low funding for group activities has jeopardized quality of implementation. Training of Facilitators has often been rushed and not adequately covering some key aspects of the approach leading to weaknesses in implementation, for example in terms of lack or weak comparative experimentation and application of tools such as the PESA.

Recommendations include more exchange and coordination among actors, re-thinking of the TOF process and selection / remuneration of facilitators, increase of the PFS learning duration, mainstreaming of PFS group grants, increased diversity of learning topics applied, particularly increased attention to HIV/FGM etc., more attention to gender dynamics generally, exchange and networking among groups and improved coordination and harmonisation of the approach among implementation actors.

Introduction

Pastoral Field School (PFS) approach was first introduced in ASAL areas by VSF-B and ILRI in 2004 with FAO providing technical assistance in terms of training the facilitators. The primary aim was to improve the capacity of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW) so that they could serve as facilitators for learning platforms for livestock keepers. This CAHW had already been recognised as distributors of veterinary supplies. Since then a number of partners including VSF Germany in West Turkana and Marsabit, Oxfam in North Turkana, VSF Suisse in Wajir, ACTED in North Pokot, VSF Belgium in Central, South, and East Turkana, East Pokot, Central Pokot and Samburu, CODES in Samburu, DLPO Garissa, DLPO Mandera, FH in Marsabit, Vetaid TZ in Tana river, and COOPI in Mandera, and SNV in Isiolo and Samburu have been implementing Pastoral field schools funded under different programmes ranging from the RDD, DMI and the EC food facility. In all the areas of implementation of the pastoral field schools, FAO has taken the coordinating role and also conducted the training of the trainers for PFS facilitators. FAO has also undertaken the role of monitoring and follow up of the PFS implementation amongst implementing partners and provided mentoring and feedback services to the implementing partners and groups to ensure that standardized harmonized methodology of PFS implementation is in place.

The PFS approach is an adaptation of the Livestock- Farmer Field School (FFS) for use in pastoral communities. The idea behind the approach is to provide pastoralists with a means of testing different innovations against their own indicators of success (which are commonly as much social as economic). In its application, the PFS concept is envisaged to contribute to improved livelihoods of the pastoral communities through creating unity, poverty reduction and strengthening of pastoral institutions thus leading to improved preparedness and reduced vulnerability to drought and other crises like flooding etc. According to FAO, PFS approach would usher in a new chapter of development in the pastoral areas. As an educative process it would also empower the pastoral communities to improve their livelihoods strategy such that they can better cope and withstand the effects of shocks and floods and drought. PFS would not be a panacea for all problems but become the platform where innovative mechanism for boosting livestock production and participation of producers in value addition process would be established.

Despite this level of interest, there has not been an external evaluation to assess the impact and relevance of the approach on the beneficiaries (the PFS group members as well as other members of the community in which PFS groups exist). Therefore FAO Kenya decided to put in place an assessment of the PFS work carried out over the last few years in Northern Kenya.

Assessment procedure and methodology

The assessment aimed at looking at the impact of the PFS amongst group members and the number of people benefitting from the approach through trickle, observation or other effects. The overall purpose of this was to contribute to a more detailed understanding of the current and potential impact of PFS and to also advice and give way forward on the effectiveness and efficiency of PFS in addressing pastoral production issues whilst contributing to improved disaster risk reduction and improved pastoral livelihoods. The assessment also aimed at giving a way forward through which challenges affecting PFS can be better addressed and how the concept can be better modified so as to fit and be more efficiently used in pastoral communities. It also assessed the way several partners coordinated by FAO have applied the principles of PFS to develop a suitable learning and action approach.

The assessment checklist that was used as reference to guide the process included aspects such as:

- Document lessons learnt and any best practices observed by implementing partners so far;
- Analyze the mode of harmonization of implementation of PFS amongst the different partners;
- Examine the modes of collaboration/networking/sharing amongst the different partner organizations, the relevant government departments, MFIs and FAO;
- Examine the extent of formation of PFS networks the birth and growth of other farmer/pastoralist led PFS;
- Examine the opportunities available for enhancement of the PFS concept in the different pastoral set ups and the challenges facing implementation and how these could be overcome with specific reference to mobility, also document challenges addressed so far;
- Examine the gender issues /gender integration in the PFS groups;
- Analyze the usefulness practicability and efficiency of the methodology in addressing the pastoralists concerns and how and where it fits in the drought cycle and its applicability in drought risk reduction.
- The use of the methodology in reducing pastoral conflicts through the sustainable use of natural resources;
- The use of the methodology in addressing issues of increased pressure on available resources due to population global warming and climate change;
- The use of the methodology in solving social cultural issues such as FGM, and also HIV AIDS;
- The use of the methodology in promoting traditional innovations / technologies in the light of modern technologies that may be expensive and inaccessible to the rural poor.
- Examine the implementation modalities of the PFS, length of the learning cycle to graduation, and learning intervals in the different pastoral set ups and provide recommendations.
- Examine the interrelationships between PFS, VICOBA, ABCD and LUP and give necessary advice.
- Advice and give way forward on the effectiveness and efficiency of pastoral field schools in addressing pastoral production issues whilst contributing to improved disaster risk reduction and improved pastoral livelihoods;
- Give recommendations on resource materials already distributed, manuals produced and other essential resource materials needed for the future;
- Collect data on the following:
 - Number of PFS existing and planned.

- Number and types of PFS according to pastoral set ups
- Number of trained trainers and their positions;
- Number of trained facilitators and their roles/position;
- Number of initiated PFS per organization their status and locations;
- The type of enterprises the PFS are undertaking;
- PFS that have received learning grants and those that have not received.
- PFS that have opened bank accounts or are linked to VICOBA
- Number of PFS that have graduated and how long it took to graduate.
- Number of members per PFS men against women.

Based on the above checklist, a field mission assessment tool was developed to help capture the information required. Since many of the PFS participants involved in this study were semi- or non-literate, participatory processes of collecting data were used. Focus group discussion and documentation of the most significant change are some of the qualitative tools that were employed. An effort was made to compare cases representing scenarios of with and without or before and after PFS intervention.

The assessment interacted with all relevant PFS implementation partners and visited 15 PFS groups. It involved a team of 4 consultants divided into 2 teams for effective field work. Initially the assessment started with a desk review of relevant documents provided by FAO and implementing partners, followed by field visits to PFS groups and implementing partners and concluded by a feedback workshop. Since many of the PFS participants involved in this study were semi- or non-literate, participatory processes of collecting data were used. Focus group discussion and documentation of the most significant change are some of the qualitative tools that were employed. An effort was made to compare cases representing scenarios of with and without or before and after PFS intervention. The assessment steps were thus:

- I. Desk review of relevant documents provided by FAO and implementing partners.
- II. Field mission carried out by 2 mission teams. The PFS regions were divided into the North East and West of Kenya. During the field missions, visits to IPs and PFS groups were carried out as well as facilitators meetings held and discussions with key informants.
- III. A final workshop was held in Nairobi among PFS partners to discuss and analyse the field mission findings and to develop conclusions in a participatory manner. Over 30 participants attended this workshop

Table 1: Field assessment schedule

Country / Region	Mission dates	PFS Specialist
Garissa, Isiolo, Wajir, Mander	9-21 August 2010	Gertrude Buyu Masai Masai
Turkana Central, North, West & North Pokot	9-20 August 2010	Godrick Khisa Humphrey Khakula

Status and Observations

Implementation status

In total more than 63 PFS groups are being undertaken in the project sub-region, distributed in the sites as seen in the table below. IPs implementing PFS are not at the same knowledge level. Some started as early as 2006 (VSF-B), while others only towards the end of 2009. Looking at the figures below it appears that a large number of facilitators have been trained for a relatively low level of PFS groups for which reasons are unclear.

More details about the various groups can be found in Annex 2.

Table 2: PFS implementation status in the sub-region

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>Trained facilitators</i>	<i>Graduated PFS</i>	<i>Ongoing PFS</i>
VSF Belgium	Turkana central	8	8	
	Loima	4	2	
	Turkana South	12	5	5
	East Pokot	2		2
	Central Pokot	2		2
	Total	28	15	9
Practical Action	Loima	8		2
	Total	8		2
Oxfam	Turkana North	10		5
	Total	10		5
VSF Germany	Turkana West	8		3
	North Horr	2		2
	Total	10		5
ACTED	North Pokot	18		9
	Total	18		9
DLPO Garissa	Garissa	4		4
	Total	4		4
VSF- Suisse	Wajir	2		2
	Total	2		2
COOPI	Mandera	3		5
	Total	3		5
CODES	Samburu	3		2
	Total	3		2
VetAid	Tana river	2		2
	Total	2		2
FH	Marsabit	2		2
	Total	2		2
SNV	Isiolo	3		1
	Total	3		1
	Grand Total	93	15	48

PFS management by implementation actors

The numbers of implementation actors, most of which are NGOs, undertaking PFS activities have gradually increased since 2006 up to present date. Reasons for adopting of the approach vary, with some of the mentioned motivating factors including; improving capacity of animal health workers, the participatory and ownership elements embedded in the approach, based on lessons learnt from VSF-B pilot groups, the need for a resource planning process tool etc. Lately some actors such as the livestock department in Garissa use the approach for fodder production. The PFS is used alongside other participatory approaches applied in the pastoral settings (and has inspired to further expansion of participatory tools) such as: PRA, community dialogue, Participatory integrated community Development (Garissa), Community Based Targeting and Distribution (CBTD) – OXFAM, Participatory impact assessment (Mandera COOPI), village land use planning committees, village community banking associations, village water users association and participatory peace negotiations (VSF-B).

Generally the PFS approach has only been implemented within the context of FAO or ECHO-RDD & EC related programmes and funding. No implementation partners (IPs) have institutionalised the approach within their organisations and sourced additional fund for expansion of PFS outside of FAO related collaboration.

One challenge is that some PFS are located far away from the IPs offices (for example in the case of DLPO Garissa, Oxfam and VSF-B with office in Lodwar but some PFS groups as far as East Pokot). The distances challenge backstopping and M&E efforts of the implementers in terms of cost and accessibility. Targeting of some groups also seems to have been based on clans of the political class rather than suitability for PFS, which is an unfortunate case.

Management staffing

PFS activities are generally managed through the head and field offices of IPs. Some organisations carry out PFS regionally. For example VSF-B's regional office in Nairobi provides managerial, administrative and technical support to country offices which implements PFS activities amongst the pastoral regions of Kenya, Uganda and South Sudan.

Some organisations have made attempts to institutionalise the approach and develop their own PFS Master Trainers (MTs) teams such as VSF-B. However due to lack of consistency and vision these efforts have not been sustained. Generally TOFs continue to be run with support from FAO or external MTs.

All IPs use community members, CAHWs, or local government officials to assist in running the activities and to act as group facilitators. In VSF-B for example the facilitated introduction of PFS to communities expressing interest is initiated by a community facilitator trained in the methodology by VSF-B. VSF-Belgium also provides ongoing support, on the job training/refreshers to facilitators and the overall supervision of facilitators' activities within the communities.

Generally existing project staffs in the IPs are charged with the responsibility to support and supervise PFS activities. These staffs are often overwhelmed by other duties, and don't have sufficient time to adequately support PFS activities. There is need for PFS specific staff to give more impetus to the growth and development of PFS groups.

In VSF-G two staffs are directly managing the day to day implementation of PFS (Animal health officer & field veterinary officer). They visit the groups once a month for backstopping, supervision and M & E. In Oxfam PFS is implemented under the Livestock programme and is managed by two staff (Livestock project & Livestock community mobilising officers). Their main roles are training of facilitators, backstopping and mentoring of facilitators and providing linkages. ACTED is among the few NGOs that have a designated PFS officer. Here three staffs (PFS officer and two field staff) are directly involved in managing the day to day implementation of the PFS. They visit the groups two times a month for backstopping, supervision and M & E.

Most project staffs charged with PFS duties have attended some kind of training in the approach, however some have not. For example in Practical Action the Assistant Project officer is responsible for the PFS implementation and supervision although he has not been trained in the PFS methodology. His knowledge is only from reading PFS/FFS literature and manuals. A similar case is apparent in VSF-B especially with new staff.

FAO support to the IPs includes training of facilitators & staff, technical backstopping, mentoring, coordination and provision of training manuals.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Level of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) vary among IPs. In Oxfam M&E is mainstreamed within Oxfam activities. First Score cards and questionnaires are used to collect information which is then analysed and shared with others internally. Secondly strategic fit assessment is done regularly for groups and involves assessing capacity of PFS, formation, registration, management of funding, membership, linkage with others etc. Thirdly backstopping and field visits take place by the two program managers every second weeks. In VSF-G no specific tools have been developed for M& E. However they collect reports from PFS groups, and carry out field visits & observation. In Practical Action M&E is routinely done (monthly) by their own staff and regularly by donors and other partners. ACTED use tools developed by the M&E department and focus on performance of PFS, progress of group, challenges, attendance etc. Questionnaires are also used to collect information on progress, gender, challenges and frequency of meetings on monthly basis. There are visits to each group by programme staff twice per month to backstop by attending some of the PFS training sessions. VSF-B conducts joint evaluations of its work, involving FAO and the local government as participants in the monitoring, evaluation and impact assessments. Donors are encouraged to conduct field monitoring visits, and final evaluations of projects are generally conducted by impartial independent consultants.

Funding to PFS groups

Despite continued advice by FAO and the PFS consortium to use a grant system to groups and to harmonise facilitators' allowances this is not implemented by many IPs. Together with the practical challenges of channelling funds direct to rural pastoral communities there seem to also be a lack of understanding of its value among staff, especially on higher level. Currently funding arrangements vary widely across actors. Some actors use a grant system and other not. However, in most cases some kinds of inputs to the groups are distributed. Some examples are;

- VSF-S: No funds given to the PFS for learning purposes.
- CODES: One of the first IPs to give out grants. About KSh 100,000 per group.
- Practical Action: No input and no grant given

- VSF-G: Funding of PFS groups is through grants of Kshs 120,000 per PFS group to support learning experiments, stationary, payment of facilitators etc.
- ACTED: No grants have been given to groups but funding is through provision of materials and inputs. So far groups have been supplied with shoats & poultry for experiments, inputs (seeds e.g. maize, beans, sorghum, groundnuts & green grams), materials (jembes, axes, rakes, machete & iron sheets for animal sheds) & stationary.
- OXFAM: Funding of PFS groups is through grants of Kshs 240,000 per PFS group. Grants are used for learning experiments, purchase of animals for experiments, payment of facilitators etc.
- COOPI: grants of Kshs 120,000 has been provided to each of the 5 groups

Groups who have received grants have generally received it to their own bank accounts in commercial banks in nearby large town, such as KCB Turkana, Loki etc.

In some cases PFS groups have been able to access additional funding through other sources, e.g. Njaa Marufuku, CDF, Arid Lands resource management project, ALLPRO etc

Mode and rate of motivation of facilitators vary across actors. For example in VFS-G and VSF-B there is no structured way of paying the facilitator and motivation depends on goodwill of the group, while in Oxfam the main facilitator is paid an allowance of Kshs 500 per PFS session. In groups that have two facilitators only the main facilitator has normally been paid an allowance and not the assistant one. Further there have been complaints by facilitators that the rate of Kshs 500 is not adequate to make up for the work load. CODES have had a system in place where a set amount out of the grant is to be used for the facilitator, and the facilitator has also received a bicycle.

Generally there is much confusion in relation to PFS funding, lack of transparency and low community knowledge of what funds are available. The organisations that do use a grant system have often experienced long delays in disbursement of grants to the groups, sometimes as late as one year or more after PFS start. This despite the fact that grant modalities have been discussed and agreed upon among actors during several previous meetings and events.

Recommendations

- There is a strong need to harmonise the management of PFS across IPs. Particularly there is a need to establish a uniform grant system with a standardised amount and agree on a standard process for training of facilitators (duration and content). Also PFS session schedule needs to be harmonised. To help PFS coordinators in IPs guidelines and checklists should be developed describing and guiding the recommended tasks/processes.
- The high number of trained PFS facilitators against relatively low levels of groups in place needs to be analysed. It appears as the retention level of facilitators is low and thus wasting of resources in training of facilitators that are not involved in implementation after. Better identification of suitable facilitators is needed alongside appropriate motivation of them on-job.
- Each IP (implementing more than 10 groups) should ideally have their own Master Trainer designated to give mentoring, backstopping support and training to the community PFS facilitators. If there is no MT of their own they should regularly secure mentoring and

advisory support by external experienced master trainers. In general there need to be local “champions” of the PFS approach who can push and work for quality and correct implementation of PFS. Mentoring and advisory support by experienced PFS/FFS specialists will be needed for some time in order to firmly institutionalize the approach within existing led programs and partners. This support should to a higher extent be sourced by the IPs directly rather than arranged for by FAO.

- Training of Master Trainers is something that needs to be planned and budgeted for collaboratively since it’s a long-term investment in human resources. This should be led and guided by FAO and would typically involve holding a season long training that include the set-up of PFS groups alongside residential training blocks and in field mentoring of participants.
- A discussion among IPs, based on experience, would be useful for coming up with a guideline for matching of IPs capacity with a realistic no of PFS groups to support. I.e. how many groups can be run under existing staff and funding levels?
- Some partners see PFS as a stand-alone process which then cause high expectations from the community and PFS members given the low level of resources and time PFS is allocated. It’s better to link PFS activities with regular or other emergency/development support.
- PFS implementing staff should be released from other responsibilities in order to better focus only on PFS, and provide the supervision needed. All project managers responsible for PFS should also be trained in the approach in order for them to be able to mentor the activities undertaken.
- Initial effort by VSF-Belgium to create a consortium among PFS partners has been very useful. There should be continuous efforts to create local level coordination and harmonisation structures.
- It might be useful to select one or a few of the IPs with much PFS experience to assist other IPs and to take the lead in training, documentation, development of guidelines, testing of field manuals and field backstopping. Modalities of doing this need to be developed with good and inspiring results coming from the PFS groups under the IP.
- The main funding agencies such as EC-ECHO and SDC need to be brought onboard more strongly for supervision and follow-up of field activities.
- There are need to develop some specific M&E tools for PFS, just as there are specific tools available for CAHW & VICOBA. Effort should be made to ensure also a Participatory M&E component inbuilt in the PFS approach.

PFS learning process and functioning

Group organisation

The group organisational and group dynamic aspect generally is one of the strength of PFS implementation in the country. The type of group set-up that PFS provide, with leadership structures, transparency, gender balance, structured schedule etc. form a new and welcome way of working together among pastoralists. In most PFS the group dynamics aspects have been well implemented and generally PFS organizational aspects well internalized. Groups appear strong and cohesive. Most groups had set up a favourable PFS learning environment with

characteristics such as a group learning venue, slogans, group norms and/or constitution, leadership structure, financial contribution, registration with relevant local authorities etc. This is positive since it provides a good basis for sustainability and self reliance. However the aspect of sub-groups and host teams were missing in some groups and generally should be strengthened. It was noted that most groups visited were meeting regularly and frequently, once per week on a designated day. However in some cases there are variations in frequency of meetings depending on the security situation, with fewer meetings during periods of insecurity. Due to their organisational asset PFS groups form a valuable entry point also for other interventions to be undertaken in the localities. It has been shown that the initial sensitisation in the community is very important, where the formation of PFS groups is well explained as to ensure that members don't expect too much from the IP. Also the process of bringing on board existing groups for PFS interventions need to be done well. A checklist has been developed for this by one of the IPs.

Gender dynamics

Membership in PFS groups is generally equal in terms of gender balance except in North Eastern Kenya where there are more men in groups. Women and men generally integrate well in the groups and participants appreciate the new form of working across genders. However in group leadership positions men are dominating, but there are some cases



A group session in Jin PFS, Mandera district.

of women officials. In some Muslim areas special religious influences are limiting participation of women in PFS activities. Effective Participation by women (not just attendance) in PFS is also constrained by household responsibilities and illiteracy (especially in Wajir, Garissa). Among community members selected and trained as PFS facilitators most are men. For example among VSF-Bs facilitators only 3 are women among the 24 total facilitators. Similarly only 1 of Oxfam's 9 facilitators is a women. Stronger efforts are needed to involve more women as facilitators.

Learning methodology

Some learning aspects of the PFS approach such as special topics and group discussions and participation by all are well integrated in PFS activities in most sites. However the key pillars of comparative experimentation and Pastoral Eco-System Analysis (PESA) are generally not well covered. Close to all the PFS visited in this study did not have comparative learning experiments in place and if present they were poorly/inadequately designed. IPs who to some extent have tried (but still with weaknesses and little variety) to implement comparative experiments and PESA include VSF-G, VSF-B and Practical Action. Experiments in place include for example,

animal health, feeding or management of most often sheep/goats but sometimes also on camel or cattle. Among sheep for example free ranging only is compared to supplementation of feeds. Animals with or without treatment for ticks or worms were also compared. In most cases such experiments included only two animals, one with treatment and the other one without. Only in one case (VSF-G group) did the PFS have replications of treatments with 6 animals in total. In PFS groups under Oxfam, Acted or VSF-S the experimentation aspects is basically non-existing. One group under CODES had made attempts to experiment on protection of range land by enclosing a certain area of grazing land with acacia improvement and comparing it to non-protected land.

PESA which provides the format and process to evaluate comparative trials was not conducted at all or poorly done. PESA is the cornerstone of the PFS methodology and the main learning tool, without it the quality of learning in PFS is compromised. No groups appeared to carry out PESA with specific pre-defined parameters to monitor, and with its usual cycle of observation-analysis-presentation/discussion-development of recommendations. In cases where PESA was undertaken participants were for example asked to generally observe an animal and discuss what they see, but without clear indicators, subgroup discussions and record taking. There have also not been attempt to use the PESA tool for monitoring of changes on landscape or larger herd level. Since several actors use Land Use Planning and Community (LUP) and Disaster Risk Management approaches these experiences could be built upon for the expanding the PESA tool to landscape level.



PFS facilitator leads a discussion at Turkwell PFS, Loima District.

Due to the lack of concrete experimentation many/most groups resemble what is sometimes nick-named “special topic PFS”, where various technical topics are covered but there is no longer term experimentation and participatory evaluation of technologies going on. This should be seen as a serious problem, since experimentation normally is the strong point of FFS/PFS and is what distinguish PFS to other participatory learning approaches, and also particularly useful in

illiterate settings. Learning through comparative experiments empowers

participants (both facilitators and farmers/livestock keepers) with observational & analytical skills to investigate the cause and effect of major production problems. From discussions and analysis it seems that the weakness on this aspect is not related to the inappropriateness of these tools but the lack of skills/knowledge among facilitators to well implement experimentation and PESA in a pastoral context which provide an additional complexity as opposed to farming contexts. Apart from the need for technical support, Lack of funding also hamper experimentation since setting them up usually requires some level of inputs.

There is further a need for implementing partners and facilitators to differentiate between comparative experiments and learning exercises in PFS. Comparative experiments usually involves farmers/pastoralist comparing two or more solutions in order to decide which is a better option such as feeding one group of goats with supplements and another group no

supplements. Learning exercises usually involve single studies such as an experiment to understand the life cycle of ticks, hay making etc. The concept of comparative experiments was in most cases lacking and currently mainly single learning exercises were somewhat implemented.

Stationary and other teaching aids for the facilitator and PFS group such as flip-charts, marker pens, drawing materials etc which are the most basic learning support is not provided to most PFS groups. Without these materials the facilitators rely mainly on oral teaching instead of use of visuals and drawings which could greatly enhance the learning experience. This strongly prohibits effective learning and level of motivation among groups and facilitators.

In groups where facilitators had access to the PFS manual and guidelines activities appeared to be carried out in a more systematic manner, thus demonstrating the need and importance of guideline documentation.

Learning curriculum

Most IPs applies (in theory) a learning cycle of 40 weeks, which ideally should mean that graduation takes place about a year after start-up. However due to drought, insecurity, lack of facilitators and other crises etc. most groups tend to go on longer than a year and so far only 15 of the 63 total PFS groups have graduated. In most of the places where the PFS groups had not graduated there was no sign that this would happen in the near future despite some groups being more than 2 years

The enterprise focus in a majority of groups is on goats and sheep while some groups focus on cattle or camel production. Technical entry points include feeding in terms of supplementation and dry season feeding, animal health especially treatment of worms, ticks and so on and housing of small stock, including poultry. Other groups that are located in a more agro-pastoral setting may include crop or fodder production. In Garissa for example some groups are based on farms with irrigation facilities and can produce fodder fairly intensively. Broader aspects such as water management, pasture management, business skills, and environmental conservation are also frequently covered. Practical Action also includes climate adaptation activities.

Most PFS groups cover some social-cultural or cross-cutting aspects in their learning curriculum such as; HIV, environment, public health, gender, conflict & conflict resolution issues, leadership skills, hygiene & sanitation. Anti-alcoholism are being taught as special topic and often mainstreamed in other topics as well. HIV being a bit of a sensitive topic, especially to cover in a age-mixed group, facilitators are uncomfortable handling and is generally insufficiently covered. A way of handling this is in collaboration between JFFLS teams and PFS groups, as is the case in Garissa- based on which a curriculum has been started.

Recommendations

- The PFS regular/daily session schedule should be enforced to ensure that each session include all the building blocks of the approach, i.e. comparative experiments, PESA, topic of the day and group dynamics.
- Efforts are needed to use more visual facilitation tools, since most members are illiterate. Drawing and pictures should be used rather in facilitation rather than writing. AESA should be done completely in pictorial form .

- Each group should develop a plan of action at the onset of PFS based on the seasonal calendar in more detail in order to guide the implementation and to ensure that most of the important curriculum elements and topics are covered. This becomes even more important for community facilitators as they are technically weak and not very innovative on their own. It was observed that some of them were repeating topics due to lack of alternatives.



Group dynamic session at Lomekwi PFS , Kataboi, Turkana North District.

- There is need to increase the length of the PFS learning cycle as the 40 weeks are not sufficient. Possibly the learning cycle should be increased to 2 years (minimum 1.5 years) for adequate coverage of curriculum given the dynamics of pastoralists and nomadic lifestyle.
- Comparative experimentation and use of the PESA tool needs to be strengthened in all PFS sites. The PESA could also be used innovatively to generate advice on resource use and landscape level. There is the need for the experiments done by the PFS groups to be seen being replicated from the experimental level to the herd/landscape level. The way this is to be done needs to well explained to the group members.
- A catalogue on possible comparative experiments in PFS should be developed and availed to facilitators to act as a guide in deciding on comparative experimentation in their respective PFS. This catalogue should contain diversity of experiments so that PFS groups have options. A follow up to the Turkana workshop where sample comparative experiments were developed is needed. Training on experimentation is needed among facilitators. Materials that have already been developed on special/thematic topics should also be integrated into the PFS curriculum.
- There should be a stronger marketing focus in PFS, i.e. focus on experimentation and activities on enterprises that are economically viable. Further there is a need to expand technology solutions that may ease the workload for women, for example animal traction by donkeys.
- Documentation of indigenous technologies needs to be done and comparisons vis a vis the modern technologies with a view of making choices.
- As regards cross cutting issues more emphasis on topical aspects such as HIV/AIDS needs to be given more attention. HIV and other aspects such as FGM, gender based violence, socio-cultural issues needs to be mainstreamed in the TOF and training curriculum. A solution could be to provide voice recorded lessons for thematic areas where finding a thematic facilitator is difficult to come by. This could be further expanded to broadcasting in local FM stations.
- There is need for all the leaders in PFS to be given further training on business skills, record keeping, financial management, group management and leadership skills.

- All groups should be encouraged to register with the relevant local authorities. This is an important step towards recognition and eventual access to government funding and other emerging opportunities. There is also the need to invite staff from the ministry of culture and social services to PFS training so that they have a picture of what PFS groups are all about and be able to distinguish them from other groups.
- Exchange visits among both facilitators and group members between different PFS and Partners would be highly beneficial in improving methodological and technical aspects of the implementation, since this would facilitate peer-to-peer learning and spread the success of some and correct weaknesses among others.
- Field days & graduations needs to be organized to create more awareness on the PFS approach and enhance diffusion of the learning that has taken place in the group to other communities in the locality.

Training of PFS facilitators

PFS facilitators include a combination of project staff and community facilitators, with the community facilitators being the one charged with the day-to-day operation of groups. In most cases two facilitators from each PFS group are selected and trained in the PFS approach. Most of these are men, with very few female facilitators. In some cases government staffs from the DLPO office have been used as facilitators. While these have been valuable in ensuring technical strength of field activities they tend to have too high regular workload to effectively operate as PFS regular facilitators.

Quality training of facilitators is key in ensuring sub-sequent quality of PFS implementation. Yet due to lack of qualified Master trainers, rush in implementation or logistical challenges running quality Training of Facilitators courses has been difficult. Most IPs have been running 2-week trainings on PFS methodology. Since this is short in time, especially when dealing with illiterate participants, post-TOF support and mentoring of facilitators is



Presentations in Holwathang PFS, Mandera district.

crucial, an aspect that has been lacking in most cases and among most IPs. In some cases the 2-week TOF has also included technical topics or training on VICOBA methodology etc. and in these cases the PFS training has not been adequate to equip facilitators with all the necessary skills. The Training of Facilitators process has also been miss-understood in some cases and project staffs have been trained in the comprehensive methodological training rather than the actual PFS facilitators who have received a shorter and more compact training, while it should rather be the opposite scenario.

Recommendations

- The actual PFS group facilitators (most of which are community members) are the ones to be thoroughly trained in the PFS approach. In other words all actual group facilitators should be trained by a PFS/PFS expert (somebody with long and extensive PFS/PFS experience)

directly. Coordinators and project staff who will have more of a supervising role should also be exposed to the approach, either by attending the full TOF or by a special shorter "exposure" TOF. No participants of the TOF should carry out sub-sequent trainings of field facilitators on their own, until they have themselves implemented PFS activities.

- In cases where the local level group level facilitators only speak the local language and/or are illiterate with very low technical skills it might not be possible to train these in a longer TOF training since they may not comprehend the training well and not be able to break the language barrier through proper interpretation of terminologies. In these cases group facilitators may need to undergo a more like on-the-job training, i.e. building up their skills while assisting a TOF graduate. I.e. training facilitators in TOF from the community who further train the group facilitators through a mixture of on-the-job support and shorter refresher trainings. However, in this scenario it is important that the intermediate facilitators actually do initially facilitate the weekly group sessions alongside the group level facilitators and not let them take over full responsibility too early (as often has been the actual case among many IPs).
- Facilitators to undergo TOF should be a) somebody who is local and can be able translate technical concepts into the local language; b) somebody who can easily understand the concept in a training and further translate it to the community easily and effectively; c) be dynamic personalities with a participatory mindset.
- Since most Facilitators are community members and often illiterate and technically weak the generally applied 2-week methodology training is sometimes not enough and there might be need to look at options for expanding this training to 3-4 weeks or season long to include more practical experience on FFS exercises/tools and also to include some technical aspects. Feedback from IPs indicate that it is difficult to get community facilitators together for a longer period of time, for TOF training it is thus better to divide up the training in various blocks of 1-2 weeks duration spread out over longer periods of time.
- When putting in place a more comprehensive TOF process of longer duration collaboration across actors will be important as to draw participants for long-duration TOF across IPs. This calls for collaborative PFS coordination meetings amongst partners in similar localities.
- The TOF further needs to be linked to post-TOF support and mentoring, possibly through regular (monthly / bi-monthly) follow-up training events with facilitators. The PFS groups and facilitators need more frequent backstopping and mentoring and on-spot assistance in problem solving. The mentoring support is particularly important during times of group start-up, setting up of experiments, trial evaluation and for organisation of field day events etc.
- Refresher trainings on need basis should be held regularly (preferably after every 3 months) to further build capacity of the facilitators and address any shortcomings observed during the monitoring and evaluation of the facilitators performance and needs assessment. Refresher trainings should also be extended to project staff.
- Strict selection criteria (should be developed at either consortium level or partner level) need to be put in place so that only good and competent individuals are chosen as facilitators. Efforts also need to be made among IPs to attract and train more female PFS facilitators.

- If IPs doesn't have their own PFS Master Trainers within their organisations they should source external assistance to run their TOF courses in order to ensure quality. FAO can advice on where and how to source the MTs.
- The PFS guide developed by FAO/VSF and partners is generally considered useful and appropriate. However an additional guide fully in pictorial form is needed for community facilitators' level to serve as a facilitator-guide. The current guide would also benefit from inclusion of a range of broader pastoral livelihood issues and also revised to make it clearer. For example salt lick making is mentioned as an experiment when in actual sense it is a learning activity. The PFS experiential options catalogue seeks to categorize these issues.
- The manner in which technical or cross-cutting topics are delivered should be improved to deliver such topics more through experiential exercises rather than through "teaching".

Project partnerships

In Turkana a consortium among IPs has been established that provides a very useful forum for discussion and harmonisation of field interventions. The consortium includes VSF-Belgium, OXFAM GB, VSF-Germany, Practical Action and ACTED. Additional collaborators include TUPADO, RIAM RIAM, Ministry of Livestock Production, Ministry of Agriculture and ALRMP.

The ABCD approach is used by some partners which makes it possible for the communities to accept that development is possible through their own participation in utilization of resources within their own means. Village land use planning (VLUP) carried out under facilitation of some IPs further makes it possible to implement certain activities in the community at certain designated places as per the community plans. VICOBA initiatives supported by a number of IPs provide a system for community based savings. VICOBA provide basic savings and loans facilities to all of its members. For example when livestock's' body condition is good, PFS members can sell their livestock and bank their proceeds with the VICOBA. Some members of PFS are also members of VICOBA and VLUP.

For example in Oxfam three PFS groups under DMI are implementing PFS and VICOBA separately although some members of PFS are also members of VICOBA. In the two new PFS groups PFS and VICOBA are being implemented together with the same membership. In VSF-G PFS and VICOBA are implemented as separate activities although some members of PFS are also members of VICOBA. In ACTED PFS are interlinked completely with VICOBA. Five members from each PFS are co-opted in the Village land use planning (VLUP) committees. VLUP committees oversee all implementations and act as a peace committees while ABCD is introduced as a special topic.

Apart from activities by COOPI and CODES who work directly with the DLPOs office there are weak relationships with Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock among PFS actors. Sometimes linkages with other relevant government departments are done for the delivery of special topic sessions in PFS.

Recommendations

- For purposes of harmonization and enhancing the concept, PFS coordinating committee should be set up at District level comprising all partners in that district to standardize

approaches & quality assurance. It would be useful to formalise a similar consortium of actors in Easter / north-eastern zones as the one in Turkana.

- Include government officials in TOF training to expose them on PFS methodology and also involve them in the regular supervision and monitoring of PFS activities. By ensuring stronger collaboration between NGOs and the Government accountability will increase.
- VICOBA, VLUP, ABCD provides valuable complements to PFS activities, but should ideally be introduced at a slightly later stage in order not to divert the focus on learning among PFS participants. These other approaches should be inbuilt within the PFS so as not to overshadow PFS as has been the case with most IPs.
- Strengthening of partnerships is needed in general. In particular there is a need to work with microfinance institutions for groups to access loans for equipments needed in PFS and especially for certain income generating activities. Or link with similar initiatives in MOA, Livestock department etc
- Many of the other commonly applied participatory approaches also use community facilitators just as PFS. In order to avoid negative competition among projects it is important that motivation/payment levels of community facilitators are harmonised among projects/actors. This was suggested in a feedback workshop in Lodwar some partners implemented it while others did not.

Sustainability

Networks of FFS groups is generally seen in the FFS global community as a main aspect contributing to sustainability after learning interventions. However among the assessed PFS groups there seem to be little exchange and networking among groups. No formal networks exist at the PFS group levels. However there exist PFS networks at the organizational level. The Fodder project which is FAO funded has started creating networks amongst the PFS groups e.g. Turkwel PFS group is to sell Napier seeds to other PFS groups. There are also regular meetings amongst the DMI partners and facilitators where issues regarding the entire project are discussed including PFS. Also there is close collaboration within VSF-B as an organization e.g. regular exchange of technical information between Lodwar, Garissa, Uganda PFS trainers and Rumbek PFS trainer.

Income generation activities and involvement in savings and credit systems also increase the potential for sustainability of group activities. For example PFS groups in Samburu have engaged in trading of sheep/goats and women in tobacco trading, while in North Turkana some PFS have been involved in trading of sugar. Many of the PFS groups are linked to VICOBA savings systems which thereby provide a good base for sustainability and exit strategy by IPs.



AESA session at Mogilla PFS, Nanam, Turkana west District

There were some indications of pastoralist led PFS groups emerging from the some graduated PFS groups. However these did not appear to take off due to lack of external support or mentoring.

Recommendations

- IPs should ensure networking amongst all the PFS groups in a locality in order to enhance sustainability and the continued sharing of information and collective action.
- Bigger efforts should be made among IPs to ensure clear exit strategies while still maintaining groups' sustainability and continuity.
- The formalised network among actors for PFS fodder production could be increased to also include other organizations which are using PFS approach for other technical aspects. Also the creation of community associations [such as Yabello] to oversee resource use are to be encouraged.
- Due to the high poverty levels among participants group and individual income generating activities should also be encouraged and developed. One way of doing this is to encourage a group commercial activity/enterprise.
- To ensure a landscape approach and collective actions at watershed/village level it is important to involve the local leaders in PFS groups.
- Need to encourage and strengthen the use of community facilitators and where possible identify groups that can be easily accessed. PFS approach can also be sold to the CDF committee for funding so as to balance out on clans.
- Improve market access among PFS groups for example through the development of the capacity among members to use sms systems of getting livestock sale prices and use the PESA system to get good data on animals and also by involving PFS members in setting up drug stores.
- Strengthen government's involvement with the PFS groups for sustainable monitoring after NGO'S exit and for institutionalisation in the public extension system.

Impact at individual and community level

Impact has been observed both in relation to technical skills and social aspects and both at individual and community levels.

Technological change

- Most beneficiaries involved in the PFS groups feel that the approach is assisting them in addressing their key needs and major livelihood problems especially in relation to food security issues. The approach has helped empower them since they have gained knowledge and skills that have proved valuable in their daily life.
- Generally there is increase in knowledge and practices among PFS members in terms of animal nutrition, disease diagnosis & treatment (ethno vet is very strong in Turkana and Pokot though it is going down in Wajir due to loss of plant biodiversity). Most PFS farmers

have shown to be particularly empowered with knowledge in disease diagnosis and drug administration and hence livestock as the main livelihood asset is secured. PFS members apply a good mix of ethno veterinary and modern remedies in managing animal health challenges. It was observed that PFS groups are more equipped at treating animals at household level including de-worming, treatment of skin diseases, control and prevention of common livestock diseases through improved hygiene and castration. This has led to improved diary production and ultimately improved human health.

- Technically the groups have done fairly well and in most cases the PFS participants have gained considerable technical skills through the learning process. Key among these is recognition and treatment of livestock diseases, ethno-veterinary, salt lick block making, Fodder conservation, cross breeding of goats and sheep's, basic animal health care, basic animal production, saving and loan scheme (VICOBA) etc. It is noted that technical aspects related to animal health is generally well covered due probably to the fact that many facilitators are CAHW.
- There has been improved knowledge and capacity by the PFS participants to handle local problems. Pastoralists are increasingly able to “take informed decisions relating to local problems and challenges”. PFS has a key role to play in terms of giving pastoralists the opportunity to learn to make informed choices on use of drugs and to correct common errors and mistakes in the treatment of animals and drug administration.
- According to Practical Action their PFS program has been well adopted by the community with increased awareness on environmental protection, Community Asset management, and topical issues discussions (HIV & AIDS), peace and conflict management. Deforestation for charcoal burning has also been reduced with community planting adaptable trees in their areas and cultivating crops such as aloe for processing.
- A number of PFS were observed to be involved in alternative livelihoods activities. Some are involved in beekeeping (honey production), commercial livestock rearing, production, marketing and sales, poultry farming. This has improved their livelihood base by diversifying it and by spreading the risk for hunger in times of disasters
- PFS member have shown increased attention to the survival and productivity of acacia trees as drought tolerant forage. Also the grazing system is more strongly informed and protected by the traditional knowledge and laws.
- Some communities have developed grazing plans that are protected by by-laws and penalties) and have come up forage enclosures (pad docking) systems to help regeneration of pastures (for example in central Turkana, Mandera and Samburu).
- In Garissa fodder has become a commercial enterprise following the increase in fodder production realised by PFS members.
- PFS groups have stimulated formation of marketing groups, for example among youth in CODES supported PFS groups in Garissa.



Fodder marketing, a commercial opportunity in Northern Kenya.

- There is interest among PFS members in commercialization of livestock keeping where they are using mobile phones to track prices in different markets.
- Members have shown to be able to negotiate selling prices for their animals at farm gate using estimated live-weights, a skill they learnt through the PESA exercise.
- Creation of new local markets within PFS community contributes to destocking by improving link between buyers and sellers to facilitate off-take and reduce pressure on feed resources.

Socio-economic change and empowerment

- Participants recognise that their recognition and status in the community have often risen as a direct impact of their participation in the groups.
- PFS approach has contributed to a change in attitudes in the pastoral settings of target communities. Gender relations/roles are



Women members of Turkwell PFS follow discussion

starting to change among PFS members. It was noted that women are now being allowed to sit with men and contribute ideas equally something that was culturally not permissible. They are increasing holding key leadership positions in groups. Women are also now able to diagnose and treat animals, a task that previously was done by men only. They are able to take loans and engage in IGAs (negotiate prize of goats).

- PFS providing peace building platform through exchange visits where communities visit each other and build friendships.
- Many members of PFS are now in the forefront of promoting peace between the neighbouring communities and majority appreciates the importance of not engaging in cattle rustling. Some warriors have joined the PFS and are no longer participating in raids.
- The members in the PFS groups are also positive and stated that they appreciated that their own indigenous knowledge was being respected.
- There is better planning for grazing areas unlike before. PFS groups have also proved to be far more effective at integrating new knowledge with traditional knowledge where applicable.

SWOT analysis of PFS

An analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats was conducted involving ten facilitators of VSF Belgium Turkana and among four facilitators in Garissa.

The results of the SWOT analysis are presented below:

Strengths

1. Imparts technical as well as social skills among members
2. Helps groups to solve local problems
3. Provides information about disasters

4. Gives skills and unity in livestock management and reduce drought risks
5. Improves skills among facilitators and community workers
6. Maintains high motivation among facilitators and community
7. Enhances collaboration amongst stakeholders
8. Enhances entrepreneurship skills among members
9. Is less expensive as learning done in the field, with local materials and in local language
10. Challenges pastoralists to improve management of livestock production resources at specific stages of the drought cycle.
11. Challenges local perceptions and believes esp. in relation to natural resources.
12. Stimulate whole farm or landscape approach rather than crop or livestock polarised type of land use.
13. The PFS becomes a platform where the agro-pastoralists make enquiries on any enterprise



Group dynamic session at Oropoi PFS, Turkana west

Weaknesses

1. Experimentation is sometimes costly & options limited at the moment
2. Difficult to sustain leaning sessions in migration/nomadism settings
3. Challenged by Illiteracy
4. Slow learning by members hence 40 weeks not adequate
5. Absenteeism by members hampers learning
6. Sometimes lack of proper follow up mechanism after graduation
7. The requirement that the PFS learning sessions should last 2-3 hours doesn't augur well with Pastoralist way of life (they are highly mobile hence, impatience)
8. PFS inputs may encourage "Handout syndrome"
9. Women participation cost is high as they had other chores
10. socio cultural issues may hamper learning
11. Language barrier, if IPs staff are outsiders it becomes difficult to explain issues to the community.

Threats

1. Cattle rustling among the pastoralist communities cause insecurity
2. Climate change/natural calamities & disasters
3. Lack of water/Drought (Water problem)
4. High expectations for handouts
5. Distance, terrain and lack of transportation
6. Misuse of funds by officials
7. Resettlement
8. Livestock diseases
9. False/unfulfilled promises by management and visitors

10. Administrative and political interference.
11. Community level based facilitators are committed to several other programs
12. Water conflicts as more groups start irrigation
13. Departmental conflicts as farmers who previously planted only mango and bananas begin to adopt fodder production under irrigation

Opportunity

1. Support from local leaders
2. Cooperation among PFS members
3. Good linkage with other projects i.e. VICOBA
4. Linking PFS with income generating activities
5. Sharing of experience between PFS groups
6. Other existing groups opportunity for networking
7. Existence of legal framework
8. Support from NGOs/Govt
9. Opportunity to access funds
10. Strong traditional institutions that can be used as entry points.
11. Good knowledge of the NRM use and management by the community through traditional institutions.
12. Availability of good ethnovegetation knowledge and understanding of the terrain and environment.

Key Lessons Learned

- The PFS approach has provided an innovative and ground breaking step on the way towards more participatory and beneficiary driven support system that addresses the specific needs of the pastoralist.
- Generally PFS provide an excellent entry point and platform for improved self confidence and feeling of dignity among pastoralist. The group cohesion developed, collective spirit and sense of belonging had assisted individuals much in improving their lives and livelihoods.
- The PFS contribute to drought risk reduction and adaptation to climate change in a number of ways. A change of attitude from carrying out land/livestock management practices in a haphazard way to more emphasis on longer-term planning makes the community less vulnerable to shocks. Also the diversification of enterprises, i.e. uptake of poultry, income generating activities etc. provides important means for survival in tough times such as during drought. The PFS has also shown to be useful in mitigation and preparedness stages. This is particularly true where disasters are recurrent phenomena, for example in drought prone and/or extremely poor areas. Here, PFS provide a greater degree of resilience and faster recovery from the past emergency.
- Due to the dynamics of the pastoralist and nomadic lifestyle meeting are not frequent and therefore a 40 weeks cycle with weekly meetings is not realistic. Officially the learning cycle is 40 weeks but many groups which started as early as April 2009 have not yet finished their cycle and are yet to graduate.

- Nearly all the PFS visited were not observing the typical learning session schedule involving the four core learning activities of PFS. The four core learning activities for PFS are Experimentation, PESA topic of the day and group dynamics. Any given days learning activity should always include these four core learning activity. Most groups were only doing group dynamics and topic of the day making the learning process resemble more of conventional training with weekly “topic of the day” sessions with a consequence of little or no development of analytical problem solving skills among members.
- Choice of facilitators is very important for the successful implementation of PFS. It is therefore necessary for the IPs to take time and identify the right type of facilitators especially when using community facilitators. A strict selection criteria needs to be developed and harmonized across the partners.
- Competent and well trained PFS facilitators with enough time available to prepare and run weekly PFS sessions are crucial for quality implementation. Training of community facilitators is not adequate given their level of formal education. A two-week TOF training without hands on experience in actual PFS sessions (as currently applied) is not sufficient to develop competent facilitators. The implementation has proven that too short duration of methodological trainings and lack of follow up trainings have a direct negative impact on all PFS activities that follows and cause problems which are difficult to correct at later stages.
- There is need to differentiate the PFS methodology training between technical officers & community facilitators. For technical officers the two week training might be sufficient but more time is needed for community facilitators, especially since many of these are illiterate.
- Regular backstopping and mentoring of facilitators and the start-up and running of PFS groups by PFS specialists is crucial in order to ensure quality of implementation following the initial TOF trainings.
- It is challenging to fit PFS with its long-term developmental mode within emergency settings and short-term projects, i.e. difficult for IPs to plan for longer term support to groups when funding comes in short-term bunches. Also communities are used to emergency interventions and take time to reorient themselves towards self-development. Insecurity/movements affect consistency of meetings and the harsh environment with food-insecurity also leading to occasional absenteeism due to other commitments among members. Therefore PFS interventions can not be rushed and require a spirit of long-term thinking. There is a need to make donors and policy makers better aware of the contradictions and possible linkages between emergency and development.
- Involvement of local leaders and ensuring their acceptance of PFS interventions are crucial in order to ensure goodwill and support to PFS activities. Local leaders also are important in terms of providing an enabling environment for making rules to govern grazing zones and setting up new markets.
- Many locations include agro-pastoralist systems, and agro-pastoralism is on the increase with an ongoing shift among pastoralist to engage in more crop production. Their access to resources such as rivers and fodder markets open up space for agro-pastoral activities in PFS which for example may involve fodder production. This shift needs to be recognised and PFS training materials updated accordingly.
- Implementing partners grasped the PFS approach with different perceptions. Those who demonstrate more success have focused on piloting PFS and its main pillars especially timely

and direct release of learning funds to groups, supervising experimentation and PESA and exchange visit to appropriate areas. Their success is exhibited by having groups that are confident to show better knowledge /technology that they are testing, lessons and challenges they are experiences, profits they have made from livestock income generation.

General Recommendations

- In order to ensure quality implementation the process of training of community facilitators needs to be revised and improved, in order to ensure that all PFS facilitator are adequately trained and skilled in the PFS approach. Most of the community facilitators are technically weak with low literacy levels and thus require more time in training to become effective. The 2-week period of TOF training (commonly applied) is only adequate for technically strong facilitators that only need training on methodological and facilitation aspects. Therefore there is need to extend this trainings to 3-4 weeks in order to adequately include more practical experience on PFS exercises/tools, necessary technical aspects, development of experiments with corresponding PESAs, coverage of broader pastoral livelihood issues, facilitation skills, leadership skills etc. In addition to the above training a community facilitator should run a PFS alongside a professional facilitator for one cycle as part of further training and mentoring before they can be left on their own to run PFS groups. This will enable the facilitator to have hands on experience and be more competent. It should be noted that internalizing the core values of PFS is a slow process that must be nurtured.
- More diversity is needed in terms of learning topics/scope in order for PFS to serve the role of a learning platform for holistic pastoral development. While technical topics related to livestock management is relatively well covered much more attention is needed to address broader pastoral livelihood issues, cross cutting issues, socio-cultural issues etc. Example of additional learning issues that would be beneficial are; climate change adaptation, water management, drought management and adaptation, gender dynamics, community organization, leadership skills, peace-building component, agricultural component, and review of traditional methods and their strengths, etc. A stronger focus on landscape and large herd level is also needed rather than focus on single animal units.
- The motivation of facilitators needs to be discussed and harmonized among the different partners in order to ensure that the capacity being built in terms of community facilitators is sustainable. The rates need to be standardized across the different partners to avoid a situation where facilitators move from one implementing agency to another or get de-



Happy members of Kokuro PFS, Turkana North

motivated and drop off along the way. Some facilitators absented themselves from some session due to lack of motivation and hence not committed fully.

- FAO Support to IPs should include quality control of training of facilitators, technical backstopping and mentoring and development of training manuals. FAO should also organize a master trainer's course every 2 years in venues close to pastoralists. In relation to this there is also need for a certifying body for PFS Master Trainers.
- Each IP should have at least one trained master trainer who should be responsible for the day to day running of the PFS/FFS activities and should be made more readily available in the field to ensure that follow-up trainings can be initiated where necessary and do mentoring and back stopping of field activities.
- Learning grants should be provided to PFS groups to assist with the learning process including experimentation such that if a group decides on a particular experiment they have resources to access the necessary learning inputs. The learning grants should be given directly to the groups to manage. This has the effect of helping in the strengthening of financial management skills in the groups, thereby facilitating the access to formal bank credit by graduated groups. Sustainability could greatly be enhanced if all implementation partners emphasized the use of direct learning grants to the groups instead of project level management of funds.
- There is need to form PFS Networks bringing together several groups in a given geographical area/ locality to act as a local institution to ensure continuation of activities and continue with the dynamics generated by the implementation process after graduation. These networks should eventually take over the coordination role being done currently by the partners and for advocacy purposes. There is also need for more PFS to be established given the high demand and consolidation of existing ones to build a critical mass for greater impact and advocacy purpose.
- It might be useful to review and adapt the PFS approach with anthropologists to make it more gender sensitive and to fully grasp some of the gender dynamics that currently are playing out in the PFS groups and communities. Particularly there is a need to ensure that the objectives of women in PFS are addressed.

Annex 1: Stories of significant change: PFS impact

An adaptation of the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique was used to collect stories of the most significant changes among PFS participants. This exercise was carried out during the facilitators meeting in Lodwar. Some selected stories are provided below:

Fodder production in Turkwel PFS: Paul Etabo, PFS facilitator

Turkwel PFS is a school initially established from two FFS groups (Tende and Umoja) that were there before dealing with date palms and horticulture respectively. When the idea of starting PFS was floated, members of these two schools happily joined the new PFS totalling with 45 members. At the start of the PFS sessions members did not know how to establish and conserve fodder and pastures. However, during the PFS sessions they were taught how to establish and conserve Napier grass and other pasture varieties. VSF Belgium provided the group with harvesting tools i.e. sickles, wheel burrows, machetes and hoes. All members cut the grass and baled it using hay boxes. To date a total of 1670 bales of hay have been produced. Members have also adopted the practice on their own land. For example Mr. Andrew Lokeno, a member of the PFS has already sold two of his bales at 500/= each while others are still scouting for a markets.

Sheep Fattening in Lotubae PFS: Apuyo James, PFS facilitator

After training of the facilitator, one of the comparative experiments that were conducted was sheep fattening. The group bought 2 sheep of 1-year age. One was left to roam and scavenge on its own while the other was restricted and supplemented with feeds. During the PFS learning sessions the two sheep were brought to the learning site for experimental analysis. After some time it was realized that the sheep being supplemented at home grew fat faster than the other and weight increase was also recognized. Later on the two sheep were sold. The one supplemented at home fetched more money than the other i.e. KSH 8,000 as compared to KSH 1,500 for the free range. The members were amazed by the results and now each member has adopted the practice. Members of the community have also adopted the technology with about 90% of the community households keeping at least one sheep at home for fattening.

Diversification by Kakong PFS: Peter Ewar, PFS facilitator

Mr. Robert Diangorot depended substantially on livestock production for his livelihood. Whenever things could not add up he reverted to charcoal burning to make his ends meet. When he joined the PFS group he learned about crop farming and has this year harvested 10 bags of maize, a total of 500 Kg each from his plot, a major additional income for his family.

Shelter by Nakukulas PFS: Aule Solomon, VICOBA/ PFS facilitator

There was a woman who was desperately poor. When she migrated inside the camp she found PFS and VICOBA groups operating in the area. She requested the facilitator to let her join the VICOBA group. After 3 months of regular saving she was allowed a loan of Khs 3000 from VICOBA to start income generating activities. By using this opportunity she has now her own iron sheet house and doing well in other small businesses and taking care of her household.

Lending to Support Education by Lokwamosing Vicoba: Shadrack Lopukei, VICOBA/ PFS facilitator

This is a group that started in February of 2009 at a time when community members had developed apathy towards groups due to earlier mismanagement by group signatories. During this time one of the VICOBA members had a problem with his child joining form 1 for lack of school fees. He approached VICOBA for a loan. The group sat down and analyzed his case and decided to loan him 8,000/= repayable at an interest rate of 10%. So the member's child joined form 1 school and it became a good example for the community around as they realized the importance of working in a group. This has helped regain community's confidence and promote existence of the groups in the area.

IGAs - a case of Annah Lopese Kakongu: Peter Lokeun, VICOBA/ PFS facilitator

Annah Lopese is 36 years old and stays at Kakong sub-location. She was used to fetching firewood from the nearby shrub trees and sell to the local mini hotels. When DMI came with the PFS/VICOBA project, she joined the group and started contributing. She later asked for a loan of Kshs 3000 and started selling tobacco. After raising some money she bought six iron sheets and built her shelter. She also took her Form 4 boy to school and paid for his fees. Now she is selling hides and skins and has promised to go on and open her own premises. She is so grateful to DMI for the knowledge that has really changed her living standard.

Annex 2: List of PFS groups in Northern Kenya

1. Implementation Partner: VSF Belgium

Site Location (distri/div.)	Group name	Membership M / F	Start year /month	Graduation Year / month	Name/type of Facilitator/s	Learning focus	Comments
Turkwel, Turkana central	Turkwel PFS	15M + 15F=30	April, 2006	June, 2008	Paul Etabo	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Turkwel, Turkana central	Kotela PFS	9M + 21F=30	April, 2006	June, 2008	Esther Ekeno	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Turkwel, Turkana central	Kangalita PFS	20M + 8F=28	April, 2006	June, 2008	Ikai Lokorikeju	Goat Meat Production	graduated
Turkwel, Turkana central	Naipa PFS	5M + 25F=30	April, 2006	June, 2008	Anna Akiru	Sheep Milk Production	graduated
Kerio, Turkana central	Kakimat PFS	15M + 15F=30	April, 2006	June, 2008	Michael Echoto	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Kerio, Turkana central	Nadoto Pfs	9M + 21F=30	April, 2006	Aug, 2008	Peter Mzee	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Kerio, Turkana central	Nakurio PFS	12M + 18F=30	April, 2006	Aug, 2008	James Kouriotong	Sheep Milk Production	graduated
Kerio, Turkana central	Nakitony PFS	7M + 23F=30	April, 2006	Aug, 2008	James Lokitelesio	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Loima, Loima District	Lobei PFS	7M + 23F=30	April, 2006	Aug, 2008	Maraka Anapet	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Loima, Loima District	Lochor-Edome	5M +25F=30	April, 2006	Aug, 2008	Lopeyok Logiele	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Katilu, Turkana South	Kanaodon		Aug, 2008,	N/A	John Tioko	Sheep Meat Production	graduated
Katilu, Turkana South	Lokapel		Aug, 2008,	N/A	Esther Ngiran	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Katilu, Turkana South	Katilu		Aug, 2008,	N/A	Zakayo Emuria	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Kainuk, Turkana South	Kakuse		Aug, 2008,	N/A	Robert Ewar	Sheep Meat Production	graduated

Kainuk, Turkana South	Nawoiyaregae		Aug, 2008,	N/A	Joshua Nupe	Goat Milk Production	graduated
Lokori, Turkana South	Lokwamusing	12M + 22F=34	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Eli Ekalale	Goat Meat production	Yet to graduate
Churo, East Pokot	Amaya	15M+ 10F=25	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Joseph Cherindis	Sheep Milk production	Yet to graduate
Chemolingot, East Pokot	Akoret	23M + 8F=31	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Omari Kukat	Goat milk production	Yet to graduate
Lokori, Turkana South	Lotubae	22M + 8F=30	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	James Apuyo	Sheep meat production	Yet to graduate
Koloa, Central Pokot	Ngaina	17M + 13F=30	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Daniel Lomkereng	Goat meat production	Yet to graduate
Chesekon, Central Pokot	Nyangaita	20M + 10F=30	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Atodongiro Akiriam	Goat milk production	Yet to graduate
Kainuk, Turkana South	Nakwamuru	14M + 11F=25	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Alfred Esegon	Goat milk production	Yet to graduate
Kochodin, Turkana South	Nakukulas	3M + 25F=28	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Solomon Aule	Goat meat production	Yet to graduate
Kainuk, Turkana South	Kakong	11M + 20F=31	April, 2009	Learning is ongoing	Peter Ewar	Goat meat production	Yet to graduate

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 15 Total ongoing PFS: 9 Total planned PFS: 10

2. Implementation Partner: Practical Action

Site Location (distri/div.)	Group name	Membership M / F	Start year /month	Graduation Year / month	Name/type of Facilitator/s	Learning focus	Comments
Lokiriama Loima District	Ata-lokamusio	16M + 22F =38	March 2009	Not yet	Ezekiel Ekale Stephen Lorot	Goat, cattle & Camel Enterprises	Grant not accessed. Yet to register with social services
Namurpus, Loima District	Lochor Emeyan	5M + 30F=35	April 2009	Not yet	Trained community facilitators	Goat, cattle & Camel Enterprises	Grant not accessed Intends to register with social services

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 2 Total planned PFS: 0

3. Implementation Partner: Oxfam

Site Location (distri/div.)	Group name	Membership M / F	Start year /month	Graduation Year / month	Name/type of Facilitator/s	Learning focus	Comments
Lokamarinyang, Turkana North	Lokamarinyang PFS	7M + 33F =40	April 2009	Planned Feb 2011	James Elias	Goat Enterprises	Grants received
Napak, Turkana North	Napak PFS	13M + 27F =40	April 2009	Planned Feb 2011	Jacob Ekaale Willaim Lomuria	Goat Enterprises	Grants received
Kokuro, Turkana North	Kokuro PFS	6M + 39F =45	April 2009	Planned Feb 2011	Francis Ekiru Andrew Nangolekeng	Goat Enterprises	Grants received
Lomekwi, Turkana North	Lomekwi PFS	8M + 7F = 15	March 2010	Planned March 2011	Lawrence Lokeris Isaac Edor	Camel Enterprises	Grants not yet received
Kataboi, Turkana North	Kataboi PFS	7M + 8F =15	March 2010	Planned March 2011	George Lokaale Josephine Kamar	Camel Enterprise	Grants not yet received

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 5 Total planned PFS: 0

4. Implementation Partner: VSF Germany

Site Location (distri/div.)	Group name	Membership M / F	Start year /month	Graduation Year / month	Name/type of Facilitator/s	Learning focus	Comments
Nanam, Turkana West	Mogilla PFS	12M + 23F =35	March 2010		Peter Pedo Lomongin Namuge	Goat Enterprises (Female)	Group 1 st formed in April -09 but deserted by facilitator and restarted again in March -10 with a set of new facilitators
Oropoi, Turkana West	Oropoi PFS	22M + 18F =40	Feb 2009		Marko Epeny Lokirioko Ekai	Goat Enterprises (Male)	Nomadic PFS where PFS members keep on migrating and so PFS has no fixed learning site.
Loteteleit, Turkana West	Loteteleit PFS	20M + 21F =41	March 2010		Dismas Adou John Ekitela	Goat Enterprises	Moving ahead slowly

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 3 Total planned PFS: 0

5. Implementation Partner: ACTED

Site Location (distri/div.)	Group name	Membership M / F	Start year /month	Graduation Year / month	Name/type of Facilitator/s	Learning focus	Comments
Kacheliba, North Pokot	Kopulio	10M + 10F=20	Oct, 2008	Not yet	Samwel Nyangalem Albastar powon	Shoats & garden	Grants not given
Kacheliba, North Pokot	Loremo	10M + 17F=27	Nov, 2008	Not yet	Wilson ripole Joseph Leuro	Shoats	Grants not given
Alale, North Pokot	Sincholol	11M + 11F=22	Nov, 2008	Not yet	Samson Lopusongor Samwel Riongoitor	Shaots	Grants not given
Alale, North Pokot	Katapoy	12M + 13F=25	March, 2009	Not yet	Armandos Tolelio Lucas Kolie	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Alale, North Pokot	Kakou	10M + 10F=20	March, 2009	Not yet	Longolechuba L Akwadom Opetole	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Kasei, North Pokot	Kangoletiang	10M + 12F=22	Dec, 2008	Not yet	Chepokatap Lotidong James Lodomo	Shoats, Garden & bee keeping	Grants not given
Kasei, North Pokot	Chepurwo	10M + 11F=21	March, 2009	Not yet	Charles Lokomol Samwel Ngura	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Kasei, North Pokot	Kasei	10M + 12F=22	Feb, 2009	Not yet	Solomon Nangoria James Etirwar	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Kasei, North Pokot	Ompolion	10M + 10F=20	March, 2010	Not yet	Millian Nakomol Lomongura Lotodo	Shoats	Grants not given
Amudat, Amudat	Tany Chemangany	10M +18F=28	Aug, 2008	Not yet	Yarakori Longorialem Lomwatsiwa Joseph	Shoats	Yarakori replaced by members with Lokwaese Chorian
Loroo, Amudat	Aran Skany kany	15M + 31F=46	Aug, 2008	Not yet	Lobot Angirotum Logwat Thomas	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Karita, Amudat	Mogh po tany	14M + 6F=20	Aug, 2008	Not yet	Cholia Domokwang Nancy Chebet	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Amudat, Amudat	Aran Marbel Mpur	10M + 11F=21	Dec, 2009	Not yet	Philip lokkiakong Samson Remoi	Shoats	Grants not given
Lorengedwat, Nakapiripirit	Neremit mee	10M + 10F=20	Dec, 2008	Not yet	Lotee sisto Auda Peter	Shoats	Grants not given
Nabilatuk, Nakapiripirit	Losimit/Akomion	11M + 9F=20	Aug, 2008	Not yet	Paul Koriang Adiaka Max	Shoats	Grants not given

Moruita, Nakapiripirit	Lemsui	10M + 10F=20	Aug, 2008	Not yet	John Omet Pamela Joseph	Goats	Facilitators left the group
Moruita, Nakapiripirit	Hellen gyet	10M+ 10F=20	Nov, 2009	Not yet	Joachim Lotee Josephine Leese	Goats & Garden	One facilitator deserted the group and another joined formal school
Kakomongole, Nakapiripirit	Kotann	10M +10F=20	Nov, 2009	Not yet	Mathew Lokalei Emma Lohoro	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given
Namalu, Nakapiripirit	Ekeunos Obara	13M + 11F=24	Nov, 2009	Not yet	Tom Oloka Lucy Angolere	Shoats	Grants not given
Lolachat, Nakapiripirit	Toiunai	14M + 16F=30	Nov, 2009	Not yet	Philip Iriama Paul Logir	Shoats & Garden	Grants not given

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 20 Total planned PFS: 0

6. Implementation Partner: VSF-S

Site location District/div.	Group name	Membership M/F	Start year /month	Graduation Year month	Name /type of facilitator	Learning Focus	Comment
	Diff Dadajabulla			Not clear	Project staff	Health and marketing	
	?						

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: Total ongoing PFS: 2 Total planned PFS:

7. Implementation Partner: DLPO – Garissa

Site/ Location (district/div)	Group Name	Member -ship M/F	Start year /month	Graduation Year /Month	Name /type of facilitator	Learning focus	Comments
Garissa/ Central	Holwadag group farm	53 (49M:4F)	2010/ August	2012/Feb	Patrick Mutua/Extension Officer Mohamed Abdi Mahow/Group member Abdullahi Mohamed Madobe/Group member	Fodder production. Experiments on seed types, different methods of production and utilization of feeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PFS groups are established & group facilitators identified. • Identify host team to be done and PFS activities be planned and implemented. • Community facilitators to be trained by end of august. • Holwadag group is split into two classes due to the high no. of participants.
Garissa/ Sankuri	Leheley group farm	52 (34M:18F)	2010/ August	2012/Feb	Irene Koki/Extension Officer Hussein Dubow Abdullahi/Group member	Fodder production. Experiments on seed types, different methods of production and utilization of feeds	
Garissa/ Balambala	Kone Group Farm	48 (33M:15F)	2010/August	2012/Feb	David Cheruiyot/Extension Officer Mohamed Durrow Gure/Group member	Fodder production. Experiments on seed types, different methods of production and reseeding trials	
Garissa/ Balambala	Sigale Bura Dansa group farm	30 (22M:8F)	2010/August	2012/Feb	Patrick Mutua/Extension Officer Hussein Dubow Abdullahi/Group member	Fodder production. Experiments on seed types, different methods of production and utilization of feeds	

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS:

Total ongoing PFS: 4

Total planned PFS:

8. Implementation Partner: DLPO & COOPI

Site location District/div.	Group name	Membership M/F	Start year /month	Graduation Year month	Name /type of facilitator	Learning focus	Comment
Mandera	Sharif PFS		March-10	Not clear		Fodder production, preservation commercialisation	
Mandera	Iftin PFS					As above	
Mandera	Wadahjir PFS	12M/8F	May-10			As above	
Mandera	Jin	20			Jeremiah Akumu	As above	
Mandera	Holwathag PFS						

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 5 Total planned PFS: 0

9. Implementation Partner: CODES

Site location District/div.	Group name	Membership M/F	Start year /month	Graduation Year month	Name /type of facilitator	Learning focus	Comment
	Sessia		2008	2010	CAHW	Improving productivity through animal health and natural pasture and leguminous shrub management	
	Ngilai			2010	DLPO staff		

Summary numbers:

Total graduated PFS: 0 Total ongoing PFS: 2 Total planned PFS: 0

Annex 3: Terms of Reference

1. Background

The Pastoral Field School (PFS) concept, derived from the FAO farmer field school approach, was first initiated in Turkana in 2006 by VSF Belgium; FAO provided technical assistance in terms of training the facilitators, who later implemented the first pastoral field schools in Turkana. The funding for the initiation of the pastoral field schools was provided by DFID through ILRI. VSF-Belgium initiated around 26 Pastoral Field Schools out of 50 that were initially targeted. In collaboration with partners and stakeholders, FAO also initiated the drafting of the initial Pastoral Field School manual for Karamoja, Uganda, under the ECHO funded Drought Preparedness Programme.

In 2008 the ECHO RDD programme (OSRO/RAF/801/EC) had a number of partners implementing pastoral field schools in North Pokot, Marsabit, Samburu, and Wajir. Also under the DMI programme of the EC a number of pastoral field schools were being implemented in North Pokot, East Pokot, Turkana, and Samburu. In all the areas of implementation of the pastoral field schools, FAO took the coordinating role and also conducted the training of the trainers for PFS facilitators. FAO also undertook the role of monitoring and follow up of the PFS implementation amongst implementing partners and provided mentoring and feedback services to the implementing partners and groups to ensure that standardized harmonized methodology of PFS implementation is in place.

The PFS concept has therefore been implemented by partners under the RDD and DMI programmes since the year 2008 and under the EC funded food facility in 2009/2010 and has therefore gained a wider scope of coverage through implementing partners situated in the different pastoral areas of Kenya.

The partners currently implementing the pastoral field schools are VSF Germany in West Turkana and Marsabit, Oxfam in North Turkana, VSF Suisse in Wajir, ACTED in north Pokot, VSF Belgium in central, south, and East Turkana, East Pokot, Central Pokot and Samburu, CODES in Samburu, DLPO Garissa, DLPO Mandera, FH in Marsabit, Vetaid TZ in Tana river, and COOPI in Mandera, and SNV in Isiolo and Samburu. In the mentioned areas of implementation the PFS are funded under different programmes ranging from the RDD, DMI and the EC food facility.

Since 2005 FAO Kenya has carried out four trainings of trainers/facilitators for the various partners, one sensitization workshop in Nairobi (2008) for partners wishing to implement the Pastoral field schools, one monitoring and mentoring mission with the FFS foundation Netherlands, three monitoring missions, one feedback session for partners, and one experiential options write shop for PFS implementing partners from Kenya and Uganda.

As can be seen the PFS concept has gained wide recognition and acceptance as evidenced by the several partner organizations that are implementing the pastoral field schools under different programmes in different pastoral localities. A lot has been learnt and documented regarding the /PFS concept, which in itself is unique, and its application in pastoral areas quite challenging. In this regards it is necessary that the PFS concept undergoes an evaluation in order to further

understand its usefulness and practicability of application in pastoral set ups and how it contributes to the improvement of pastoral livelihoods.

The PFS approach is an adaptation of the farmer field school and livestock farmer field school approach for use in pastoral communities. The idea behind the approach is to provide pastoralists with a means of testing different innovations against their own indicators of success (which are commonly as much social as economic).

In its application, the PFS concept is envisaged to contribute to improved livelihoods of the pastoral communities through creating unity, poverty reduction and strengthening of pastoral institutions thus leading to improved preparedness and reduced vulnerability to drought and other crises like flooding etc

Despite this level of interest, there has not been an external evaluation to assess the impact and relevance of the approach on the beneficiaries (the PFS group members as well as other members of the community in which PFS groups exist).

These terms of agreement therefore seek to guide an assessment of the PFS approach with a view of contributing to a more detailed understanding of the current and potential impact of PFS. Advice and give way forward on the effectiveness and efficiency of pastoral field schools in addressing pastoral production issues whilst contributing to improved disaster risk reduction and improved pastoral livelihoods. The evaluation should also give a way forward through which challenges affecting PFS can be better addressed and how the concept can be better modified so as to fit and be more useful and efficient for use by the pastoral communities.

2. Terms of Reference

2.1 Description of Activities/Services

Farmer Field School Promotional Services will conduct a detailed assessment of the PFS approach. This will involve travel to Turkana, Pokot, Samburu, Marsabit and Garissa where PFS groups have been established. The assessment will evaluate the impact of the PFS approach on the livelihoods of group members, it will go further to investigate the knock on effects of PFS in order to calculate the actual number of people benefiting from the approach. One of the core assumptions of PFS is that, even though the target group is relatively small, other members of the community will benefit through a) observation and b) the potential start up of farmer lead field schools. FFS promotional services will assess to what extent this has happened and provide an opinion of the cost effectiveness of the approach in order to inform its future use.

The FFS promotion services will use the following checklist of key issues to guide this process:

- Document lessons learnt and any best practices observed by implementing partners so far;
- Analyze the mode of harmonization of implementation of PFS amongst the different partners;
- Examine the modes of collaboration/networking/sharing amongst the different partner organizations, the relevant government departments, MFIs and FAO;

- Examine the extent of formation of PFS networks the birth and growth of other farmer/pastoralist led PFS;
- Examine the opportunities available for enhancement of the PFS concept in the different pastoral set ups and the challenges facing implementation and how these could be overcome with specific reference to mobility, also document challenges addressed so far;
- Examine the gender issues /gender integration in the PFS groups;
- Analyze the usefulness practicability and efficiency of the methodology in addressing the pastoralists concerns and how and where it fits in the drought cycle and its applicability in drought risk reduction.
- The use of the methodology in reducing pastoral conflicts through the sustainable use of natural resources;
- The use of the methodology in addressing issues of increased pressure on available resources due to population global warming and climate change;
- The use of the methodology in solving social cultural issues such as FGM, and also HIV AIDS;
- The use of the methodology in promoting traditional innovations / technologies in the light of modern technologies that may be expensive and inaccessible to the rural poor.
- Examine the implementation modalities of the PFS, length of the learning cycle to graduation, and learning intervals in the different pastoral set ups and provide recommendations.
- Examine the interrelationships between PFS, VICOBA, ABCD and LUP and give necessary advice.
- Advice and give way forward on the effectiveness and efficiency of pastoral field schools in addressing pastoral production issues whilst contributing to improved disaster risk reduction and improved pastoral livelihoods;
- Give recommendations on resource materials already distributed, manuals produced and other essential resource materials needed for the future;
- Collect data on the following:
 - Number of PFS existing and planned.
 - Number and types of PFS according to pastoral set ups
 - Number of trained trainers and their positions;
 - Number of trained facilitators and their roles/position;
 - Number of initiated PFS per organization their status and locations;
 - The type of enterprises the PFS are undertaking;
 - PFS that have received learning grants and those that have not received.
 - PFS that have opened bank accounts or are linked to VICOBA
 - Number of PFS that have graduated and how long it took to graduate.
 - Number of members per PFS men against women.

2.2 Definition of Outputs

The outputs of this evaluation will include the following:

- An inception report detailing the results of a desk review and an activity plan which has been agreed with the various organizations implementing the PFS approach.
- A final report (no more than 20 pages – with the exception of annexes) detailing:

- The impact of the PFS approach on group members, their families their food security and their ability to prepare for and cope with drought
- The impact of the PFS approach on other members of the community (those that are not group members)
- The relevance of the PFS approach – is it a relevant approach for mobile pastoralists or do the majority of schools concentrate on sedentary communities?
- The report will form an opinion of the PFS approach and its future use in both development and emergency programmes
- The report will provide a list of key recommendations in support of the above opinion.
- The report will be presented to a workshop of key stakeholders prior to finalization; the findings of the workshop will be incorporated into the evaluation report.

2.3 Duration and Timing

The evaluation will start in June 2010 and end before the end of August 2010. The following are key time bound targets:

- The inception report will be submitted no more than two weeks after signature of the agreement
- The first draft report will be submitted by the 14th of August
- The workshop will be held by the 21st of August
- The final report will be submitted (along with a detailed financial report) by the 31st of August.

2.4 Monitoring and Progress Reporting

This is an Evaluation which will be conducted by FFS Promotional Services. FAO will monitor the progress of the evaluation against the above time bound targets.

3. Inputs to be provided free of charge by Recipient Organization *(to be completed only if significant to the execution of the Agreement).*

3.1 List of Inputs

- a) use of premises and facilities/installations;
- b) provision of expertise and support personnel;
- c) use of equipment and provision of materials/supplies.

3.2 Timing of Inputs

The above inputs are currently in place.

4. Inputs to be provided in kind by FAO *(to be completed only if significant to the execution of the Agreement).*

4.1 List of Inputs

- a) FAO will support bookings on ECHO flights where necessary, all other transport arrangements will be made and paid for by the RO.
- b) Passing information to partners about the evaluation.
- c) Provision of literature review materials.

4.2 Timing of Inputs

Support will be provided to access ECHO flights based on the planning in the inception report.

5. Monitoring/Certifying Officer

The monitoring and certifying officer for FAO will be the International Livestock Consultant

Annex 4: Itinerary and Timetable

Date	Activity
5-9 July	Desk review of relevant documents
12-17 July	Development of Field mission assessment tools
19 July	Submission of inception report
9-21 August	Field mission
	<u>Team A</u>
9 August	Travel to Lodwar
10 August	Meeting with VSF Belgium staff Visit to Kerio PFS in Kerio Division, Turkana Central District
11 August	Visit to Turkwell PFS in Turkwell Division, Loima District Meeting with Facilitators in Lodwar
12 August	Meeting with Practical Action staff Visit to Ata lokamusio in Loima Division, Loima District
13 August	Meeting with Oxfam staff Visit to Iomekwi PFS in Kataboi division, Turkana North district
14 August	Visit to Kokuro PFS in Kokuro Division, Turkana North District Travel to Lokichoggio
15 August	Reading & Report writing
16 August	Meeting with VSF Germany staff Visit to Orupoi PFS in Lokichoggio Division, Turkana West District Visit to Mogilla PFS in Nanam Division, Turkana West District
17 August	Travel Lodwar to Kapenguria
18 August	Visit to Katapoy PFS in Alale Division, North Pokot
19 August	Meeting with Acted Staff Wrap up session
20 August	Departure from Kapenguria
	<u>Team B</u>
9 August	Travel to Garissa by road
10 August	Meet DLPO staff and PDLP Mbalabala PFS

- 11 August Visit Holwadag PFS
Meet facilitators
- 12 August Travel Garissa to Dada jabulla
Meet members and Community's facilitator
- 13 August Travel to Wajir through Diff
Meet Diff PFS
Night in Wajir
- 14 August Wajir
- 15 August Travel Wajir to Mandera
Meet COOPI and DLPO staff
- 16 August Visit Jin PFS
Meet Sherif PFS, visit the PFS farm
Fly from Mandera to Nairobi to connect to Samburu
- 17 August P.M-Travel Nairobi to Isiolo
- 18 August Meet Sessia PFS
Night in Maralal
- 19 August Travel to Ngilai PFS and back to Maralal
- 20 August Travel Maralal to Isiolo
Night in Isiolo
- 21 August Travel Isiolo to Nairobi

- 13 September Submission of draft report

- 17 September Feedback workshop at Jacaranda Hotel, Nairobi

- 29 October Submission of final report