Report Number: ICRR0023405

1. Project Data

Project ID P129408	**Project Name** Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience	
Country Eastern and Southern Africa	**Practice Area(Lead)** Agriculture and Food	
L/C/TF Number(s) IDA-53850,IDA-53880,IDA-55450,IDA-H9190	**Closing Date (Original)** 31-Dec-2019	**Total Project Cost (USD)** 178,168,342.87
Bank Approval Date 18-Mar-2014	**Closing Date (Actual)** 31-Dec-2021	

	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	122,000,000.00	0.00
Revised Commitment	197,000,000.00	0.00
Actual	178,168,342.87	0.00

Prepared by	Reviewed by	ICR Review Coordinator	Group
Hassan Wally	Vibecke Dixon	Avjeet Singh	IEGSD (Unit 4)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the Regional Pastoral livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) as articulated in the Financing Agreement (FA, page 5) for Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia was identical to the one stated in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD, paragraph 20) and aimed to:

"enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas of Selected Countries and improve the capacity of the Selected Countries' governments to respond promptly and effectively to an Eligible Crisis or Emergency."

Parsing the PDO. The PDO will be parsed based on the following two objectives:

1. To enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas of Selected Countries.

2. To improve the capacity of the Selected Countries' governments to respond promptly and effectively to an Eligible Crisis or Emergency.

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

No

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

No

d. Components

The PDO was supported by the following five components:

1. Natural Resources Management (appraisal cost: US$29.50 million, actual cost:US$65.03 million). This component aimed to enhance sustainable management and secure access of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to natural resources (water and pasture) with trans-boundary significance. It included the following three sub-components:
1.1. Water Resources Development to design, build and rehabilitate water resources access facilities; and capacity building for communities for operations and maintenance.
1.2. Sustainable Land Management in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, supporting mapping, restoration and management, and harmonization of policies on rangeland management across RPLRP countries.
1.3. Securing Access to pastoral-related Natural Resources, aimed to prevent conflicts and build peace among communities.

2. Market Access and Trade (appraisal cost: US$26.90, actual cost: US$40.59 million). This component aimed to improve the market access of the agro-pastoralists and pastoralists to the intra-regional and international markets of livestock and livestock products. It included the following two sub-components:
2.1. Market Support Infrastructure and Information System, to strengthen national livestock marketing information and integration at regional level; rehabilitation and equipping market infrastructure along trade routes; and to build relevant capacity.
2.2. Livestock Value-Chain Support and Improving Livestock Mobility and Trade, support for research on and the development of selected livestock-related cross-border value chains, specifically in arid and semi-arid areas.

3. Livelihood Support (appraisal cost: US$25.40 million, actual cost: US$38.84 million). This component aimed to enhance livelihoods of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities. It included the following three sub-components:

3.1. Livestock Production and Health, financed region-wide harmonized vaccination campaigns for priority diseases such as Peste des petits ruminants (PPR), Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD), Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP), Contagious Caprine Pleuropneumonia (CCPP), Rift Valley Fever (RVF) and Newcastle disease (ND) and enhanced disease and vector control and surveillance in targeted drought-prone areas.
3.2. Food and Feed Production, improvements in fodder bulking and conservation, establishment of small-scale irrigation and water management schemes for crop and fodder production and dry season grazing; provision of relevant training; and construction and rehabilitation of storage and post-harvest facilities adapted to pastoral conditions and agricultural production.
3.3. Livelihoods Diversification through identification of alternative livelihood opportunities.

4. Pastoral Risk Management (appraisal cost: US$10.20 million, actual cost: US$20.98 million). This component aimed to enhance drought-related hazards preparedness, prevention and response at the national and regional levels. It included the following three sub-components:
4.1. Pastoral Risk Early Warning and Response System to establish and operationalize a region- and nation-wide Early Warning System (EWS) to collect, analyze and disseminate early warning reports and inform decision makers
4.2. Drought Disaster Risk Management (DDRM) including region, nation and county-level training and capacity building on DDRM related key policies and guidelines.

4.3. Contingency Emergency Response to support mitigation, response, recovery and reconstruction in the event of a disaster that affects the livelihood of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in project areas.

5. Project Management and Institutional Support (appraisal cost: US$25.00 million, actual cost:US$30.88 million). This component would support project management including monitoring safeguards mitigation measures and institutional strengthening at national and regional levels for drought resilience. It included the following two sub-components:
5.1. Project Management, M&E, Learning Knowledge Management and Communication to support the implementation of national project coordination units (PCU) in project countries.
5.2. Regional and National Institutional Support to provide technical and investment support to enhance provision of services by relevant national and regional institutions on drought resilience.

e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project Cost. The total project cost at appraisal was estimated at US$122.00 million, including 2% physical contingencies and 3% price contingencies. The actual project cost was US$178.17 million. The increase was from an additional financing that the project received after Ethiopia joined the project (see below). The ICR team clarified that the difference in the project financing (US$197million) and the actual amount disbursed (US$178.17 million) was due to the exchange rate fluctuations against the SDR.

Financing. The project was financed through IDA for the participating countries. The financing for the first phase project was as follows: Kenya (US$77.00 million equivalent); and Uganda (US$40.00 million equivalent). Also, an IDA grant was provided to IGAD (US$5.00 million equivalent) to ensure smooth coordination and harmonization of interventions at the sub-regional level. In October 2014, Ethiopia joined the project with an Additional Financing worth US$75.00 million equivalent. The total Financing amount was US$197.00 million. The Kenya financing disbursed US$70.15 million, Uganda financing disbursed

US$36.30 million, IGAD financing disbursed US$4.56 million, and Ethiopia financing disbursed US$67.16 million. The total amount disbursed was US$178.17 million (ICR, Data Sheet, page 2).

Borrower Contribution. The project was fully financed through IDA financing with no contribution from the Borrowers.

Dates. The project was approved on March 18, 2014 and became effective nine months later on December 15, 2014. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) was conducted on November 13, 2017, which was about three years into effectiveness. While the PAD did not include a specific date for the MTR, this Review finds that the MTR was conducted in a reasonable time after effectiveness. The project closed on December 31, 2021, which was two years after the original closing date on December 31, 2019. The two year extension was needed to "to enable all countries to complete key strategic infrastructure sub-projects and other activities (ICR, paragraph 28)." The project was restructured four times, all Level 2, and received one additional financing as follows:

1. On 27 June, 2018, when the amount disbursed was US$63.92 million, in order to introduce changes to components and cost; and reallocate funds between disbursement categories. This restructuring involved project activities in Kenya.

2. On October 16, 2018, when the amount disbursed was US$72.23 million, in order to revise the Results Framework; and introduce changes to components and cost. This restructuring involved project activities in Ethiopia and Uganda.

3. On November 28, 2019, when the amount disbursed was US$139.93 million, in order to revise the Results Framework; and extend the Loan closing date by 15 months from December 31, 2019 to March 31, 2021. This restructuring involved all three countries and IGAD.

4. On March 4, 2021, when the amount disbursed was US$170.01 million, in order to extend the Loan closing date from March 31, 2021 to December 31, 2021. This restructuring involved all three countries and IGAD.

5. An Additional Financing of US$77.00 million was approved in October 2014 for Ethiopia. This expanded project activities to reflect specific interventions that were targeted for Ethiopia. The project design did not change but the results framework and overall project costs were revised accordingly.

3. Relevance of Objectives

Rationale

Context at Appraisal. At the time of appraisal, arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) in the Horn of Africa (HoA) represented and still are more than 60% of the total area with a pastoral population estimated between 12 and 22 million. In Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda more specifically, ASALs were home to a relevant percentage of the population and livestock herd, contributing about 50% to agricultural Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Despite their considerable economic contributions to African countries, pastoralists lived under enormous stress and constituted the most vulnerable segment of Africa's population. The RPRP aimed to develop regional solutions to the challenges faced by the pastoralists residing in the ASALs of Kenya, Uganda and other countries from the HoA such as Ethiopia, to enhance available opportunities for livelihood development.

Previous Bank Experience. The Bank has had implementation experience in the three participating countries. The Bank also would draw on similar initiatives financed by the Bank and development partners to support pastoralists' livelihood resilience. Most notable Bank-financed projects in the region were Kenya's Arid Lands Resources Management Project (ALRMP), Uganda's Water Management Project and the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP), the Agro-Pastoral and Land Management Project in Cameroon, and the Pastoral Community Development Project (PCDP) series in Ethiopia.

Consistency with Bank Strategies. The PDO aligned with the Bank's Agriculture Action Plan (2013-15) at appraisal. The project was expected to support the Bank's efforts towards aiding clients to define and harmonize early action frameworks and interventions to mitigate key climate-sensitive infectious diseases. The project also was expected to contribute to supporting the global goals of the World Bank of fighting extreme poverty and shared prosperity. At the country level, the PDO aligned with the principal objectives articulated in the national development strategies and policies in the Country Strategies of the three participating countries. The PDO aligned with the Bank's Country Partnership Strategy for Kenya (CPS, FY2010-FY2013) which aimed to deepen regional integration. The PDO was also in line with the Bank's Country Assistance Strategy (CAS, FY2011-FY2015) for Uganda which featured four strategic objectives: to promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth; to enhance public infrastructure; to strengthen human capital development; and to improve good governance and value for money. Finally, the PDO was in line with Bank's Country Partnership Strategy (CPS, FY2013-FY2017) for Ethiopia as the project would contribute to a number of strategic objectives of the CPS, including broad-based economic growth, reduction of vulnerabilities and improved environmental sustainability.

At completion, the PDO continued to align with the Bank’s Country Partnership Framework (CPF, FY2016-FY2021) for Uganda. The CPF's key focus areas and objectives included: improving service delivery by reducing regional gaps in social services, and uplifting the living standards of the most lagging regions. The CPF also supported raising incomes in rural areas through productivity enhancement to generate growth and reduce poverty and vulnerability. The PDO remained in line with the Bank’s Country Partnership Framework CPF (FY2018-FY22) for Ethiopia. The CPF's strategic focus areas included building resilience and inclusiveness and enhancing the management of natural resources and climate risks by addressing land degradation. While the ICR did not report on Kenya's CPF at completion, this Review found that PDO remained in line with the Bank’s CPF (FY2023-FY2028) for Kenya. Specifically, the project would contribute to the CPF's Objective 6 (increase household resilience to, and national preparedness for, shocks); and Objective 7 (reduce Kenya’s water insecurity).

Also, at the regional level the PDO remained in line with the IGAD ’s strategy pillars and the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) priority areas, which emphasized raising the well-being of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. The PDO was also in line with the Africa Regional Integration Strategy (FY18-FY23) which highlighted the importance of regional value chains along key economic corridors and underscores development of functioning regional markets as part of the strategic priorities.

Consistency with Government Strategies/Priorities. At appraisal, the PDO was in line with Kenya's Medium-Term Investment Plan (MTIP) for Growth and Food Security through Increased Agricultural Productivity and Trade (2010- 2015). The MTIP aimed to promote sustainable land and natural resources management; increase market access and trade, and (iii) ensure effective coordination and implementation. The PDO was also in line with Uganda's Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (2010/11-2014/15), and specifically, with sub-programs on production and productivity, market access and value addition, enabling environment, and institutional strengthening. Finally, the PDO aligned with Ethiopia's development policies articulated in the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP1 2010/11-2014/15), which sets a long-term goal for Ethiopia to become a middle-income country by 2023 and aims to develop livestock production and other pastoral resources.

At completion, the PDO continued to align with the Africa Regional Integration Strategy (FY18-23) which highlighted the importance of regional value chains along key economic corridors and underscores development of functioning regional markets as part of the strategic priorities. The PDO also aligned with Uganda's National Development Plan III (2020/21 – 2024/25) whose key strategic objective was accelerating poverty reduction in lagging regions by addressing critical challenges such as climate change effects. The PDO remained in line with Ethiopia's Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP2 2015-2020), which sets a long-term goal for Ethiopia to become a middle-income country by 2023 and aims to develop livestock production and other pastoral resources. Finally, the PDO remained in line with Kenya's Big 4 Agenda that emphasized focusing on food security.

Summary of Relevance of Objectives Assessment. While the term "*enhance livelihood resilience"* in the PDO statement was vague, the PAD (paragraph 21) provided a clear definition of the term. The PDO was pitched at an adequate level of ambition. The PDO was also in line with the Bank strategies for the participating countries at completion. The PDO also remained in line with Government priorities at completion regarding pastoral systems. Addressing issues related to mobility, cross-border trade, drought risk mitigation, climate change and resilience were all expected to continue to be priorities for the participating countries. Therefore, the Relevance of Objectives is rated High.

Rating

High

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective

To enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas of Selected Countries.

Rationale

Theory of Change (ToC). To achieve the stated objective, the project would support three sets of activities: (i) map a baseline of groundwater resources; build and rehabilitate water resource facilities; re-seed degraded areas, build rehabilitate forage structures; provisions to guarantee access to water points and grazing areas, safeguard against encroachment; (ii) build, rehabilitate, equip primary market infrastructure; provide equipment and train stakeholders to use Livestock Management Information System (LMIS); finance, ratify and implement regional policies and regulations and provide appropriate training; and (iii) support region-wide harmonized vaccination campaigns; train Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs) and support them with equipment; support fodder bulking and conservation; and identify and strengthen alternative livelihood opportunities. The expected outputs would be: (i) mapped groundwater resources along cross-border pastoralist routes, infrastructure developed for access to water resources, sustainable land management implemented in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, and access to pastoral-related natural resources secured; (ii) market infrastructure developed, market information system made operational, regulatory framework for the livestock value chain in place, and training on regional and regulatory policies provided to stakeholders; and (iii) harmonized vaccination campaigns for priority diseases carried out, vets and para professional vets trained in disease detection and reporting, fodder bulking and conservation improved, and alternative livelihood opportunities identified and undertaken. The expected intermediate outcomes would be: (i) minimized animal stress/deaths and improved animal health, improved land and water management practices, localized conflicts in pastoral regions minimized/prevented, and peacekeeping initiatives enhanced; (ii) access to economic activities for targeted communities increased, markets' access for livestock improved, quality standards of livestock improved; and (iii) health and productivity of livestock improved, the resilience of livestock improved, and access to economic opportunities and resilience of targeted communities increased. The activities above combined were expected to contribute to achieving the project's objective of enhancing the livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in target areas.

The achievement of the PDO was underpinned by four critical assumptions: (a) Timely delivery of project intervention, (b) Quality of program implementation, (c) Sustainability of Government commitment, and (d) Continuity of Donor Support.

The activities stated in the ToC were directly related to the stated outcomes in a plausible causal chain. Also, the stated assumptions were realistic.

Outputs/Intermediate Results

(Note that not all indicators had revised targets)

1. Number of water infrastructures along cross-border migration routes rehabilitated or newly built under the project that were operational and sustainably managed: In Uganda 102 (original target of 116, revised target: 102) (achievement rate 88%, 100%), in Kenya 118 exceeding both the original target of 95 and a revised target of 78, and in Ethiopia 138 (original target of 174, revised target: 146). According to the ICR (paragraph 38), "At the regional level, 487 boreholes, 250 water pans/dams, 56 springs, and 973 other water-related infrastructures were mapped to facilitate livestock movement during droughts and cross border trade."

2. Percentage of pastoral households with improved access to water through project infrastructures rehabilitation and development: in Uganda, 60% compared to an original target of 70%; in Kenya, 61.20 % exceeding the original target of 50%; and in Ethiopia, 38.68% compared to an original target of 50%.

3. Land area where sustainable land management practices were adopted as a result of the project: in Uganda, 900 hectares (ha) exceeding both the original target of 600 ha and the revised target of 480 ha; in

Kenya, 2,494 ha exceeding the original target of 2,400 ha, in Ethiopia 10,436 ha exceeding the original target of 8,000 ha.

4. Number of platforms solving cross-border natural resources management conflicts formed and operational: in Uganda, 12 platforms compared to an original target of 1 and a revised target of 12 (target achieved); in Kenya, 16 platforms compared to an original target of 16 (target achieved), in Ethiopia 10 platforms compared to an original target of 21 and a revised target of 10.

5. Number of regional or cross-border market infrastructures rehabilitated or newly built under the project that are operational and sustainably managed: in Uganda 12 markets compared to an original target of 12 (target achieved); in Kenya, 30 markets substantially exceeding the original target of 16, in Ethiopia 24 markets compared to an original target of 14 and a baseline of 10 (target achieved).

6. Twenty one regional protocols about sanitary and phytosanitary standards were ratified by the participating countries exceeding the target of 12 (target exceeded).

7. Number of suspicions of outbreaks of selected diseases of regional importance (PPR and FMD) reported and tested in central laboratories: in Uganda 2,439 cases compared to the original target of 2,412 cases (target achieved); in Kenya 109,439 cases compared to the original target of 87,304 cases and a baseline of 14,300 (target achieved), in Ethiopia 90 cases compared to an original target of 55 cases (target exceeded).

8. Percentage households targeted by the project satisfied with livestock health services: in Uganda, 79%, Kenya 86% compared to an original target of 70% for both countries (target exceeded), and in Ethiopia, 70% compared to an original target of 90% (target not achieved).

9. Number of new technologies demonstrated in the project area: in Uganda, 6 compared to an original target of 5; in Kenya, 9 compared to an original target of 8; in Ethiopia, 6 compared to an original target of 5 (targets exceeded for the three countries).

10. Number of alternative livelihood sub-projects realized and sustainably managed two years after initial investments: in Uganda 4 sub-projects compared to an original target of 3 (target exceeded); in Kenya 5 sub-projects compared to an original target of 5 (target achieved), in Ethiopia 11 sub-projects compared to an original target of 10 (target exceeded).

Outcomes

The following elements are discussed under the stated objective with achievements for each participating country:

1. Enhancing Livelihood resilience of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. This was achieved through improved disease control and surveillance, and availability of infrastructure and other livestock services that reduced the incidence of livestock deaths and strengthened the livestock value chain, enabling them to realize higher returns.

- In Ethiopia community access to veterinary drugs was higher in project intervention areas (35%) compared to control areas (31%). Throughout the life of the project, more than 7 million (cattle and goats) were vaccinated. The construction of water infrastructure also minimized the travel time to livestock water points. According to the ICR (paragraph 35) a project survey showed that 54% of communities in intervention areas traveled on average one hour or less to reach their closest water sources compared to 51% in control areas. Also, the livestock death rate (PDO-1) was reduced to 0.25% for cattle and 0.35% for goats (below the 1.8 and 2.2 targets, respectively for cattle and goats), which exceeded end of project targets.

- In Kenya the construction of water infrastructure for livestock reduced distances to access points and reduced water-induced stress of animals. At baseline, pastoralists walked an average of 13.7 km to access water resources, which was reduced to 7.0 km by project completion (ICR, paragraph 36). Also, the average queuing time at watering points for intervention groups was found to be 4.5 minutes less than the average queuing time for control groups. The livestock death rate (PDO-1) was reduced to 1.6% for cattle and 4.3% for goats (below the 7% and 8.4% targeted, respectively for cattle and goats), which exceeded end of project targets (ICR, paragraph 36).
- In Uganda, accessibility to vector control services was higher when compared to baseline (52% percent compared to 43% at baseline). Also, 37,900 households directly benefitted from water infrastructure and reduced distances for their livestock (less than 5km). The impact evaluation survey showed that 79% of households reported satisfaction with accessibility of animal related services compared to 27% at baseline. The livestock death rate (PDO-1) was reduced to 0.075% (below the target of 0.3%) in Uganda, exceeding end of project targets (ICR, paragraph 37).

2. The Development of market infrastructure and Livestock Market Information System (LMIS). This resulted in higher access and participation in the market and diversified income sources for pastoralists and agro-pastoralists thereby contributing to enhanced livelihood resilience (ICR, paragraph 38).

- In Ethiopia, the development of market infrastructure translated into higher participation rates for communities in project areas compared to control areas. For ruminant trade 91% of goat sellers participated in the markets in intervention areas compared to 88% from control areas. Also, market participation for cattle traders reached 59% in project areas compared to 56% in control areas. Overall, households in project areas showed a marked increase in market access and participation compared to baseline results (52% at the end of the project compared to 47% at baseline). The survey also showed that 50% of households in project areas had access to livestock price information compared to 37% of households in control areas, making selling livestock at competitive prices easier. Market infrastructure investments reduced the role of middlemen and contributed to better pricing and a higher share of income benefits that went to pastoralist communities. The survey showed that the number of cattle and shoats (young pigs) traded in selected markets (PDO-2) was 829 and 2,186 (above targets of 758 and 2,093) while the real value of animals traded (PDO-3) exceeded the targeted increase by 163% and 209.4% for cattle and shoat, respectively (ICR, paragraph 39). Overall, the achievements of both the volume and value of livestock traded exceeded the end of the project targets set.
- In Kenya, 90% of households reported having access to livestock market information with the improvement of LMIS by the end of the project compared to a baseline of 71%. By project completion, the volume of cattle and shoats (PDO-2) traded in selected markets was 1,102 and 2,661, above the project targets of 1,061 and 1,908, respectively. The real value of livestock (PDO-3) increased by 116.6% percent and 229.2% which exceeded end of project targets for cattle and shoats (ICR, paragraph 40).
- In Uganda, the average monthly collection at markets increased to UGX7.6 million from UGX3.4 million per month following infrastructure upgrades. The increase in cattle and goat trade also increased trade and its related products of meat and milk. Livestock volumes and values (PDO-2 and

PDO-3) were exceeded. According to the survey, cattle and shoats increased by 7%, above the end-of-project target of 5%, while the value of cattle and shoats increased by 22.6% above the target (ICR, paragraph 41).

Summary of Efficacy Assessment. The independent evaluations performed at completion showed that all three countries met and exceeded outcome indicator targets as noted above. The project successfully reduced livestock death rates (PDO-1) by investing in water infrastructure that ensures the availability and accessibility of water for pastoral communities in a sustainable manner. The ICR also claimed that the project strengthened livestock disease control and vector surveillance of FMD, PPR, and CBPP through vaccinations, including synchronized cross-border vaccinations that reduced the incidence of disease among livestock. However, no data was provided on the number of animal vaccination administered under the project in the ICR. Based on the information shared by the ICR team (email dated June 2, 2023), the project interventions facilitated the vaccination of about 49.4 million livestock in the region. The Livestock Management Information System (LMIS) provided information on livestock pricing for different markets across all three countries. This in turn enhanced access to markets for traders based on favorable pricing and reduced the role of middlemen, enabling pastoralists to realize better prices for their livestock. The volumes (PDO-2) and values (PDO-3) of livestock increased over the life of the project due to improved market infrastructure attracting a high number of traders while grading of animals at the markets facilitated attractive prices for different animals. Therefore, the efficacy with which this objective was achieved is rated Substantial.

Rating
Substantial

OBJECTIVE 2

Objective
To improve the capacity of the Selected Countries' governments to respond promptly and effectively to an Eligible Crisis or Emergency.

Rationale
Theory of Change (ToC). To achieve the stated objective, the project would establish and operationalize a region and nationwide Early Warning System (EWS); procure equipment, Information, and Communication Technologies (ICT) platforms, and vehicles; build capacity on Geographic Information System (GIS) and Drought Disaster Risk Management (DDRM) related policies and guidelines, develop contingency plans; reallocate financing from components to cover emergency response partially. The expected outputs included: establishing and operationalizing a region and nationwide early warning system; carrying out country-level training and capacity-building activities on DDRM key policies and guidelines; developing contingency plans; and mitigation, response, recovery, and reconstruction activities carried out following adverse natural event (Contingent Emergency Response sub-component activated). Intermediate outcomes included: preparedness, prevention, and response to drought and other disaster-related hazards enhanced at national and regional levels; and improved and timely response to addressing drought and disaster-related risks. These activities would improve the government's capacity to respond to crises promptly and effectively.

The achievement of the PDO was underpinned by four critical assumptions: (a) Timely delivery of project intervention, (b) Quality of program implementation, (c) Sustainability of Government commitment, and (d) Continuity of Donor Support.

The activities stated in the ToC were directly related to the stated outcomes in a plausible causal chain. Also, the stated assumptions were realistic.

Outputs/Intermediate Results

1. 1,233 stakeholders were trained on policy and regulations in the region exceeding the original target of 1,200.

2. 313 stakeholders were trained on policy and regulations in Ethiopia which was below the original target of 477.

3. Reliable information from Early Warning System (EWS) was disseminated timely for the three participating countries (target achieved).

4. DDRM policies from the participating countries were harmonized and mainstreamed for the three participating countries (target achieved).

5. Contingency plans were in place in the participating countries and IGAD: in Kenya, 15 plans (target achieved); in Uganda, 12 plans (exceeding the original target of 1 and meeting the revised target of 12); and in Ethiopia, One plan was in place (original target achieved).

6. IGAD supported the establishment of a region-wide emergency warning response platform to guide national authorities in their actions based on collected data. Regional hazard maps were developed through the project and used to develop the Kenya Food Security Steering Group biannual food and nutrition assessment reports.

Outcome

- The project activities improved pastoral risk management and strengthened country Governments' capacity to respond and address crises and emergencies effectively. This was achieved through the development of reliable early warning systems and emergency fodder banks that ensured feed availability for livestock during emergency periods.
- In Ethiopia, the completion survey showed that 32% of households interviewed in the intervention areas reported facing major shocks. Of these, 33% reported receiving information that a disaster would happen compared to a baseline start of 22%. The time lapse between early warning and response time (PDO-4) was 6.3 days, below the end of project target of 7 days. The project also rehabilitated 10,437 Ha of rangelands exceeding the target of 8000 Ha, and established 836 Ha of emergency fodder banks (no target provided). An additional 500 Ha of fodder banks were developed to mitigate against drought disasters, where 81,835 hay bales were harvested, stored in hay stores, and distributed to beneficiaries. As a result of these interventions, feed availability was ensured for at least three months during drought periods, which provided sufficient feed for livestock during the emergency periods. M&E data showed that 401,726 individuals benefitted from these facilities. The ICR (paragraph 45) noted that storage facilities contributed to reducing incidences of conflict among communities due to a shortage of feed and water resources.

- In Kenya, the completion survey showed that the time lapse between early warning and response time was reduced to 2 weeks, below the end-of-project target of 4 weeks (PDO-4 target exceeded). The Contingency Emergency Response Component (CERC) was activated in November 2017 to support urgent drought response interventions in Kenya that included the provision of supplementary feeding, disease surveillance, supportive treatment, livestock restocking, and restoration of water resources. US$5.591 million was reallocated for this purpose (ICR, paragraph 46).
- In Uganda, the completion survey showed that districts' responses to emergency mortality outbreaks were 5.6 days on average, significantly lower than the estimated target of 15 days for a response (PDO-4 target exceeded).

Summary of Efficacy Assessment. The evidence provided in the ICR point to the success of the project in improving the capacity of the selected countries' governments to respond promptly to an eligible crisis or emergency. However, the effectiveness of the response could not be adequately assessed due to the lack of relevant indicators to measure this aspect. The project achieved or exceeded the outcome targets for PDO-4 in the three countries. Therefore, the efficacy with which this objective was achieved is rated Substantial.

Rating
Substantial

OVERALL EFFICACY

Rationale
Overall Efficacy is rated Substantial with minor shortcomings. The project achieved or exceeded its objectives of enhancing the livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought-prone areas of the three participating countries and improving the government's capacity to respond promptly to eligible crises or emergencies. However, the effectiveness of the response could not be assessed adequately due to the lack of specific indicators to measure this aspect.

Overall Efficacy Rating

Substantial

5. Efficiency

Economic and Financial Analysis (EFA)

ex-ante

- The analysis estimated the internal rate (IRR) of return for Uganda and Kenya at 17.6% and 16.6%, respectively, and the Net Present Value ranged between US$10.00-15.00 million. According to the Additional Financing paper, the IRR for Ethiopia was estimated at 18.8%.
- Expected project benefits included: the reduction of animal mortality rates and increases in calving and off-take rates, improved access to shared natural resources (water and pasture) between countries, enhanced access to productive infrastructure and livestock-related services, improved availability of animal feeds and breeds, more robust regional systems for surveillance and control of diseases (such as trans-boundary animal diseases), and improved early warning and response mechanisms.
- Positive externalities included institutional strengthening, enhanced capacities of stakeholders, natural resources protection and biodiversity conservation. However, these benefits were not fully quantified due to the difficulty of attributing a monetary value to their contribution to the PDO.
- Sensitivity Analysis. The project was sensitive to changes in some of the project's variables (parturition and mortality rates), but returns are expected to be maintained if the investments aiming to enhance livelihood resilience are sustained.
- The PAD (paragraph 67) explained that the lack of accurate baseline data combined with the need to make numerous assumptions to describe the "with-project" scenario, the ex-ante results should be considered indicative rather than final.

ex-post

- A cost-benefit analysis was conducted following the same approach as done at appraisal to ensure methodological consistency and comparability. The economic internal rate of return (EIRR) for the overall project was estimated at 44.23%, and the NPV at US$197.58 million at a 12% discount rate. The NPV was significantly higher than the appraisal stage because the ex-post analysis used 2022 prices and captured the actual project impacts of improved access to water and pasture and animal health in general.
- The analysis was based on twelve financial models, of which six were for cattle, and the remaining six were for small ruminants (goats), both species for pastoral and agro-pastoral systems. There were four models for each country: (i) cattle in the pastoral system; (ii) cattle in the agro-pastoral system; (iii) goats in the pastoral system; and finally, (iv) goats for the agro-pastoral system.
- Project benefits were the same as mentioned above. According to the ICR (paragraph 52), "all these benefits contributed to increased rural incomes, economic resilience of livestock-based livelihoods and improved food and nutrition security."
- Implementation Efficiency. The project experienced a two-year delay. In Uganda and Ethiopia, there were delays due to security concerns. Procurement challenges also contributed to delays, particularly in remote areas (ICR, paragraph 71). In 2020, delays resulting from conflicts were exacerbated by the impact of COVID-19 and the associated restrictions, which disrupted project operations at regional, national, and county levels (ICR, paragraph 72). In Kenya, financial management was challenging and contributed to implementation delays (ICR, paragraph 90). The ICR (paragraph 57) noted that the project was implemented using project existing government systems and procedures, which was a cost-effective option in comparison to developing parallel implementation structures.

Summary of Efficiency Assessment. While the ex-post overall EIRR of 44.2% was lower than the appraisal estimate at 53%, it was significantly higher than the 12% discount rate. The ex-post analysis did not provide the

EIRR estimate for each country. While the project faced implementation delays, those were mostly beyond the project's control. Overall, Efficiency is rated Substantial.

Efficiency Rating

Substantial

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal	✓	44.23	0 ☑ Not Applicable
ICR Estimate	✓	53.00	0 ☑ Not Applicable

* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome

The Relevance of Objectives was rated High. Overall Efficacy was rated Substantial with minor shortcomings. The project achieved or exceeded its objectives of enhancing the livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought-prone areas of the three participating countries and improved the government's capacity to respond promptly to eligible crises or emergency. However, the effectiveness of the response could not be assessed adequately, and relevant indicators could have been clearly defined to measure this aspect. Efficiency was rated Substantial. While the ex-post EIRR at 44.2% was slightly lower than the 53% appraisal estimate for the three countries combined, it was significantly above the 12% discount rate.

Based on the assigned ratings for the three criteria, the Outcome is rated Satisfactory.

a. Outcome Rating

Satisfactory

7. Risk to Development Outcome

The following risks could potentially impact the development outcome:

1. Financial risk. There is a risk that after the project closes, the budget for maintaining the upgraded infrastructures and various platforms might be inadequate. This needs close cooperation between the national and regional authorities, the private sector, and local beneficiaries on appropriate and acceptable approaches to ensure they can fully cover operation and maintenance (O&M) costs. In Kenya, user fees

are charged for the maintenance of developed water infrastructure, communities pay fees for the use of facilities, and revenues generated are invested in sustaining infrastructure operations (ICR, paragraph 98). In Ethiopia, additional support has also been sought through other Bank-financed operations that are currently working in the space, such as the Lowland Livelihoods Resilience Project, to continue critical activities such as the support for water user associations to strengthen their capacity to sustain water resource infrastructures (ICR, paragraph 99).

2. Government ownership/commitment risk. The sustainability of market infrastructure was likely through a co-management model of revenue sharing between community associations and local governments. Given the increased revenues generated through livestock trade, this model demonstrated clear incentives for both parties to maintain and manage the facilities. These partnerships between community associations and local governments need to be supported and formalized through legal contracts with clear roles and responsibilities for the parties involved (ICR, paragraph 101). In Kenya, the project signed an agreement with the Kenya Livestock Marketing Council to promote a co-management model of markets with farmers and county governments to improve the management of the livestock markets. The co-management model facilitated the development and implementation of revenue-sharing legislation between farmers and counties based on contractual agreements. Also, management committees were established and linked to relevant county government service providers for all project investments. For example, water user associations were linked to the Department of Water and Irrigation, which will facilitate their access to continuous training and resources to maintain water resource investments for which they have responsibility (ICR, paragraph 98). In Ethiopia, all project activities were implemented through existing government structures, so resources have continued to be dedicated to ensuring the continuation of investments (ICR, paragraph 99). In Uganda, all infrastructure developed by the project has been taken over by the District Local Governments and integrated into district plans and annual budget cycles (ICR, paragraph 100). However, resources for complete operations and maintenance plans of water infrastructure may not be sufficient (ICR, paragraph 100).

3. Institutional support risk. While the regional strategies have been adopted, their implementation varied in the three countries. The Livestock information system (supported by the project) is fully institutionalized in all three countries. The regional SPS Strategy (developed under the project) is fully adopted by all IGAD countries in the region. Harmonization of cross-border animal vaccination, grading of live animals, and meat standards have continued as a core function of the IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD). The Organization of African Standards has taken up harmonized livestock grading and meat standards introduced by the project to scale up as a tool for the African Continental Free Trade Area agreement for implementation (ICR, paragraph 102).

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

- **Strategic relevance and approach.** The project was strategically relevant to the three countries as it sought to develop regional solutions to challenges faced by pastoralists who reside in the ASALs of Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia and to enhance opportunities for livelihood development available to them. The PDO aligned with Bank strategies and Government priorities (section 3 provides more details). The project featured a regional approach and ensured coordination with a trusted partner, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), which was mandated to coordinate regional interventions to build drought resilience in the Horn of Africa.

- **Technical, financial, and economic aspects.** The project aimed to support a comprehensive package of investments and services to targeted cross-border clusters across Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia, which joined later. The project design supported collective and coordinated regional investments in shared natural resources and sub-regional infrastructure networks and sought to enhance knowledge and information exchange, monitoring and response to shocks and conflicts on transboundary and zoonotic diseases, shared rangelands, and water resources. The design also aimed to improve market information and cross-border trade. The economic analysis in the PAD provided enough evidence to justify the project investments in Kenya and Uganda.
- **Poverty, gender, and social development aspects.** The project was expected to minimize the impact of drought on pastoral and agro-pastoral communities through key infrastructure investments and support for early warning systems. Investments supporting alternative livelihoods enabled female beneficiaries to actively participate in project activities and earn incomes to address many social constraints.
- **Environmental and Fiduciary aspects.** The reporting on environmental and fiduciary aspects in the ICR indicated that those were adequate at appraisal.
- **Implementation arrangements.** The project coordinated with IGAD as a regional partner. It was to be implemented using existing government systems and procedures, which was expected to be a cost-effective option compared to developing parallel implementation structures.
- **Risk assessment.** Seven risks were identified at appraisal relating to three main areas: stakeholder, implementing agency, and project-related risk. The overall project risk was rated substantial. The PAD (annex 4) included detailed risk mitigation measures.
- **M&E arrangements**. Data collection was decentralized, collected at the community and sub-national levels, and aggregated at the national level every quarter. The Results Framework included adequate indicators to capture the project outcomes and track activities. However, there were shortcomings related to the lack of definition for some indicators, for example, the number of suspicions of outbreaks or adoption of alternative livelihood. Overall, M&E arrangements were adequate.

Summary of QAE Assessment. The project was strategically relevant, with a sound design tailored to each participating country. The design also ensured cooperation with IGAD to strengthen its coordination role through the Regional Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Platform (ICR, paragraph 91). Environmental arrangements and fiduciary aspects were adequate at appraisal. Risk assessment identified potential risks and included relevant mitigation measures. Implementation arrangements were adequate and built on existing country systems. Finally, M&E arrangements were adequate but had minor shortcomings. Overall, QAE is rated Satisfactory.

Quality-at-Entry Rating
Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

- The project faced a challenging security situation in Ethiopia nd Uganda during implementation. Also, in Uganda prolonged drought conditions hampered the project activities in some areas. The project also had to deal with COVID-19 and the associated restrictions and disruptions.
- In total the Bank conducted 15 supervision missions, which according to the ICR were carried out twice per year. Bank missions reflected an adequate skill mix and mobilized international expertise when required (ICR, paragraph 93). In the last two years of implementation, supervision missions were conducted virtually to accommodate COVID-19 restrictions. The ICR noted that "the quality of supervision and support to the client was constrained by the pandemic (paragraph 93)." The project experienced a relatively high turnover in task team leaders (the project had seven TTLs spread across the three countries) which according to the ICR (paragraph 93) "hindered long-term relationships and in occasions caused loss of institutional memory."
- The PCU benefitted from additional training provided by the Bank during Interim technical missions, which also helped address implementation constraints (ICR, paragraph 93).
- The Bank team was responsive and proactive in project restructuring to make the necessary changes on time and avoid further delays in implementation (ICR, paragraph 94). The Bank team also established good collaboration with the Governments' and IGA 's teams

Summary of Quality of Supervision Assessment. The Bank addressed implementation concerns and guided the project across three countries under challenging implementation conditions. Despite the high turnover of TTLs, Bank supervision successfully guided the project across three countries towards achieving its PDO. Overall, Bank Supervision is rated Satisfactory.

Based on the assigned ratings, overall Bank Performance is rated Satisfactory.

Quality of Supervision Rating
Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating
Satisfactory

9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

- The PAD did not include a Theory of Change (ToC) as the Bank did not require it at the time of appraisal. Nonetheless, the ICR included a ToC that reflected the relationship between the project activities, outputs, and outcomes in a plausible causal chain.
- The PDO was to be measured through five PDO outcome indicators: (a) Percentage death rate of livestock kept by agro-pastoral and pastoral households targeted by the project (cattle, goats); (b) Number of livestock traded in selected project markets; (c) Real value of livestock traded in selected project markets (local currency); (d) Time lapse between early warning information and response reduced; and (e) Number of direct project beneficiaries, of which female (percentage). These

indicators were indirectly connected to the PDO in terms of measuring the three dimensions of livelihood resilience as defined in the PAD (paragraph 21). The PDO indicators reflected reasonable targets. However, the indicators could have been disaggregated to reflect the two groups of beneficiaries (pastoral and agro-pastoral). Also, the RF lacked any indicators to measure the effectiveness of the government's response to an eligible crisis or emergency.

- The Results Framework (RF) included 16 intermediate results indicators to measure and track the different activities supported by the project. The RF indicators were connected to the project activities, measurable, and reflected reasonable targets. However, the ICR (paragraph 77) pointed out that two indicators (the number of suspicions of outbreaks and the adoption of alternative livelihood) were not clearly defined. Also, the RF could have benefitted from including indicators to track the number of vaccinations administered (disaggregated by the animal) under the project.
- Overall, the M&E design was adequate. However, the M&E design relied on the government systems in the three countries as the sole source of information. The inclusion of other evaluative tools (qualitative evaluations, case studies, and thematic evaluations, among others) could have facilitated triangulation of data, provided more depth to understanding issues including the needs of women/ethnic minorities, further developed lessons learned, and ensured potential scale-up (ICR, paragraph 78).

b. M&E Implementation

- Data collection relied on a decentralized arrangement where data was collected at the community and sub-national levels and aggregated at the national level every quarter. According to the ICR (paragraph 80), "verification mechanisms were in place, and information was updated regularly." The ICR (paragraph 79) noted that "IGAD worked closely with project countries to harmonize methodologies to measure indicators."
- M&E staff in the three countries benefited from project-provided training. The PCU staff conducted regular auditing of data to ensure quality (ICR, paragraph 81).
- At the country level, in Kenya the project team involved stakeholders in participatory monitoring and evaluation of project outputs, used GIS and mapping to guide public investments and monitoring results. It used Pastoral Field Schools to teach communities to monitor the results of investments at the household level.
- Restructuring and revision of the RF. The PDO was not revised throughout the project, but the outcome target for direct project beneficiaries (PDO-5) was revised and clarified for harmonization across the three countries. In addition, the outcome target for the percentage of death of livestock in Ethiopia was revised following the detailed baseline study carried out in the country. Also, 12 intermediate results indicators were revised during the project's life. Most revisions were downward for logical reasons detailed in the ICR (Table 1). All the RF revisions had no implication on the Theory of Change (ICR, paragraph 30)
- While the project planned to develop a management information system or build upon existing systems, it did not create a coherent data ecosystem (ICR, paragraph 78). Also, Ethiopia's security concerns contributed to poor project activity monitoring (ICR, paragraph 69).

c. M&E Utilization

- The M&E data from all three countries were used to identify areas of lagging activities and inform decision-making at national and regional levels. This also informed the revisions to target indicators of key investments such as water infrastructure in Uganda and Ethiopia and capacity-building support in Kenya (ICR, paragraph 80).
- M&E data was used to prepare annual outcome evaluations, thematic studies, annual work plans and budgets, quarterly reports, conduct technical infrastructure audits, and develop case studies (ICR, paragraph 82).
- In Kenya, M&E data were used as inputs into the Kenya Food Security Strategy that the Government later developed. Also, communication and knowledge management strategies were prepared by Uganda and Ethiopia to disseminate key project information more broadly.
- M&E data from the three countries helped in the development and preparation of case studies, policy briefs, as well as regional strategies that were prepared by IGAD (Rangeland Management, SPS, and Animal Health) under the project.
- Resource mapping generated through M&E data was also made available on a web map for future reference and use by other external actors. M&E information helped the participating countries to make timely and well-informed decisions, including, but not limited to, drought response (ICR, paragraph 82).

Summary of M&E Quality Assessment. M&E design was adequate but had minor shortcomings related to the lack of a clear definition of some indicators and the absence of indicators to measure the effectiveness of the government's response to crises or emergencies. While the implementation was acceptable in Kenya and Uganda, it was challenging in Ethiopia. Utilization was adequate as the project data-informed project management, decision-making, and informed IGAD-sponsored studies. Overall, M&E is rated Substantial with moderate shortcomings.

M&E Quality Rating

Substantial

10. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was assigned an environmental Category B since environmental impacts were expected to be significant, primarily site-specific, and could easily be avoided and managed. Four environmental safeguard policies were triggered: Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP 4.04), Pest Management (OP 4.09), and Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50). The project was expected to positively impact the environment by enhancing the capacities of relevant stakeholders to sustainably manage natural resources, especially rangelands and water sustainably, and by rehabilitating or developing water and pasture-related infrastructure and ecosystems. The project also triggered three social safeguards policies: Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12), Physical Cultural Resources (OP 4.11), and Indigenous People (OP 4.10). Relevant documents (Environmental and Social Management Frameworks and Resettlement Policy Frameworks for the three countries, Social Assessments in Uganda and Ethiopia, Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework and the Vulnerable Groups Management Framework, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework in Uganda and Kenya, respectively) were publicly disclosed in the three countries. The ICR did not include an explicit statement on compliance with safeguard policies in any of the three countries.

Compliance with Environmental Safeguards. The ICR (paragraph 85) reported that the Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Finance and Economic Development requested the Bank notify the Governments of Djibouti, Somalia, and Kenya of any potential abstraction from the Awash, Genalle, Wabeshebellie, Omo, and Dawa Rivers. Due to ongoing conflict, establishing community platforms for conflict resolution in Ethiopia's Somali and Afar regions was challenging. In Kenya and Uganda, environmental activities were carried out as planned. Overall, the project had positive environmental impacts by improving natural resources management and reducing pollution levels from animals, including at markets (ICR, paragraph 86). While no major environmental issues arose in the case of Ethiopia and Kenya, Uganda did experience a serious security incident in the Karamoja Region that resulted in a fatality of a visitor at one of the project sites. Although the incident was not directly project-related, "weaknesses in following protocol and security gaps were identified" (ICR, paragraph 87), and "a safeguards Incident corrective action plan was instituted in which security coordination approaches were strengthened, especially information sharing, early warning mechanisms and response under the district security committee."

Compliance with Social Safeguards. A grievance redress mechanism (GRM) was in place in Ethiopia and Kenya. According to the ICR (paragraph 88), "no major social safeguards issues arose during project implementation."

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Financial Management (FM). The project submitted Interim Financial Reports (IFRs) and audit reports on time; there were no outstanding reports (ICR, paragraph 90). Across all three countries, FM had adequate staffing, and annual work plans and budgets were prepared and submitted in a timely manner. However, in Kenya, the project lost a quarter of the financial year every year due to delays by the National Treasury in uploading the development budget into the system, which created implementation challenges (ICR, paragraph 90).

Procurement. Procurement staff in Kenya and Uganda were mostly competent. However, the lack of procurement capacity was "a major bottleneck" in Ethiopia (ICR, paragraph 69), a situation that was exacerbated by conflict and insecurity in some regions. Contract management improved throughout the life of the project. According to the ICR (paragraph 91), "the project did not have any mis-procurement."

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

None.

d. Other

None.

11. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of M&E	Substantial	Substantial	
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

12. Lessons

The ICR included six lessons. The following three are emphasized with some adaptation of language:

1. Having a regional partner in place to provide key oversight, support, and coordinate implementation guidance may enhance the project's potential to address regional pastoralism challenges successfully. The project experience showed that IGAD 's involvement in the project resulted in strong coordination in implementing activities and cohesive results. The regional approach of the project helped address conflict management, harmonized disease control actions, and identification of investments in jointly used cross-border water and market infrastructure.

2. Joint planning and monitoring platforms between participating project countries may facilitate the exchange of information, lessons, and knowledge/skills in regional projects. This facilitated institutional learning across the three countries and facilitated the sharing of successful approaches to key interventions, such as traditional methods of rangeland management, which IGAD documented in policy briefs that were produced. Furthermore, joint facilitation was found to be the most effective way of controlling cross-border disease outbreaks.

3. Diversifying into activities less prone to risk can provide a buffer for pastoral communities to better withstand and recover more quickly from shocks, including conflict. The project could have provided more for additional interventions that could bring about significant returns to investments made in livelihood activities, especially stronger business facilitation and access to markets. While livelihood activities undertaken were viable, more could have been done in terms of assessments of those activities that could potentially yield better returns than livestock and move more communities out of livestock herding given the growing risks, compounded crises and uncertainty faced by pastoralists.

13. Assessment Recommended?

No

14. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR was candid and comprehensive. While the ICR provided evidence of the results achieved, the ICR clarified that the M&E design relied on the existing government systems in the three countries and could have benefitted from the diversification of data sources (data triangulation) to explore some issues in depth and better address the needs of women. The ICR attempted to provide explicit linkage between evidence and findings to the extent possible and used the available evidence base to serve the arguments under the different sections. The ICR reflected useful lessons based on the project experience. that could apply to other operations of similar nature.

The ICR was mostly consistent with guidelines. Reporting on safeguards did not include an explicit statement on compliance with the Bank's safeguard policies. Also, Annex 1 did not include a list of outputs that resulted from the project activities. Overall, the ICR Quality is rated Substantial with minor shortcomings.

a. Quality of ICR Rating
Substantial