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Summary

The national economy of Sudan and the livelihoods of rural producers are both directly linked with livestock and livestock production. This has implications for economics, and also influences the social milieu and the natural environment. Sudan is frequently exposed to natural disasters and also protracted complex emergencies. In such contexts, interventions are needed that provide rapid assistance, and also protect and rebuild livelihood assets. The International Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) are broadly concerned with assessment of livestock and livelihoods, and planning and implementing livestock related interventions. Participatory Impact Assessment is a set of complementary tools to enable a better understanding of the impact of interventions, such as those covered in LEGS. The aims of this workshop were: to promote a wider understanding of the international and national LEGS initiatives; to review LEGS related programmes in Sudan and to introduce the concept, tools, and applications of Participatory Impact Assessment with a view to identifying specific case-studies in Sudan for further review and learning.

This report summarizes the seven expert presentations and discussions during the workshop, and also presents the group work which allowed participants to reflect on what they had heard and consider the relevance and implications for their work and the work of their organizations. First, Dawit Abebe, from the Tufts Africa office in Ethiopia, presented the origins and current status of the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, informing participants of the history and evolution of this international initiative. This introduction was followed by three in-depth presentations of the application of LEGS in Sudan by representatives of three international organizations including; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Vision, and the International Committee of the Red Cross. These well established and highly experienced agencies shared their specific experiences and lessons learned. FAO in particular explained their role in introducing and supporting the adoption of LEGS in Sudan, through Training of Trainers. This was followed by a review by Tufts of the current status of livestock interventions in Darfur, which was complemented by a UNEP presentation reviewing the working of the UN agencies in Sudan with pastoralism.

Dawit Abebe presented on the recent developments with Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA), describing how it can be used as a tool for policy change, as well as assessing impact. Participants had a choice of participating in either of two working groups; one focusing on LEGS and the other on PIA. The level of participation was high and clearly the majority of participants felt that these tools were directly relevant to their work with livestock and livestock producers.

In follow-up to this workshop, Tufts and partners would like to promote more active learning among key national institutions about the use of the LEGS technical standards and guidelines, in order to evaluate and draw lessons from past emergency responses. This practical experience can then help to inform the use of LEGS as a planning and decision-making tool, which together with PIA can be used to facilitate the development of a wider disaster response strategy, that includes mitigation,
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preparedness, disaster response and recovery – all directly linked to ongoing development programmes.

Introduction

Livestock are of crucial importance to the national economy of Sudan, in terms of the size of the contribution to national gross domestic product. Livestock are also a central pillar of the livelihoods of a significant proportion of rural households throughout the country. Sudan is one of the major exporters of livestock in the region, and livestock exports are continuing to grow.

Only recently have livestock interventions featured as a regular component of humanitarian responses, and this has prompted the development of international ‘Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards’ (LEGS) for the implementation of livestock interventions in disasters. Recognizing the value of livelihoods approaches, LEGS aims to promote more long-term thinking and response in emergencies. This approach is particularly important as climatic trends are causing more frequent and varied humanitarian crises with pronounced effects for communities who rely heavily on livestock.

Tufts/FIC initiated the process of developing the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards in early 2006, and this soon developed into a collaborative effort involving multiple UN and non-governmental agencies. A wide range of practitioner experiences and reviews have contributed to the guidance in the final LEGS handbook. An international Steering Committee comprises representatives from VSF (Veterinaires Sans Frontieres) Belgium, the African Union / Department for Rural Economy and Agriculture, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Committee for the Red Cross, and a LEGS coordinator.

In Sudan, working as part of the UNEP Sudan Integrated Environment Project, the Feinstein International Center, Tufts University (Tufts FIC) and SOS Sahel Sudan are supporting a programme of research, combined with policy training, and the promotion of best practice programmes – in particular, best practice emergency livestock programmes, which are based on the wider International Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards.

Two of the first activities as part of this work on livestock programming, are a review of humanitarian livestock programming in Sudan, and related policies, in order to inform and influence national and international stakeholders in the adaptation and adoption of best practice in Sudan. To complement this, a national workshop was convened to bring together national and international actors with a direct interest and engagement in the livestock sector, including agencies implementing emergency livestock programmes.

The aims of this workshop were to:

1 According to Behnke, (2012) livestock has consistently provided more than 60% of the estimated value added to the agricultural sector, and is substantially more important to the agricultural sector than crop farming.
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1. To promote a wider understanding of the international and national LEGS initiatives.
2. To review LEGS related programmes in Sudan (Tufts & UNEP studies).
3. To introduce the concept, tools, and applications of Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA) with a view to identifying & prioritizing the intervention areas and partners for case-studies.

More than 30 participants attended this first national workshop covering both LEGS and PIA, including excellent representation from the State level and Federal Ministry of Animal Resources. Twelve State Ministries were represented, including Director Generals, Pasture Inspectors, and Veterinarians. In addition there was good representation from other government bodies (NDC, Sudan Veterinary Council, MLFR, the Pastoralists Association and the Agricultural Bank of Sudan). National and local NGOs included the Sudanese Red Crescent, Al Massar and Kebkabiya Charitable Smallholders Society. Participants also included national academics and technical experts (for a list of participants see Annex 1). The agenda for the meeting is shown in Annex 2.

This report presents the expert presentations and the group work which allowed participants to reflect on what they had heard and consider the relevance and implications for their work and the work of their organizations. Following each presentation there was a period for discussion, and a summary of this is presented at the end of each section.

**Expectations of Participants**

Following a review of the workshop objectives, participants shared their expectations of the day’s events. Many of these expectations related to their interest in gaining further understanding and practical skills relevant to their work with livestock and livestock producers. Many participants mentioned the importance of having: ‘a framework for intervention’, ‘clear guidelines’, ‘standard practices and tools’, in the event of an emergency, and ensuring such guidelines reflected local realities. Importance was also attached to developing a ‘shared understanding’ as well as the role of government in supporting or adopting the recommendations coming out of the workshop.

**Presentations and Discussion**


*Dawit Abebe, The Feinstein International Center, Tufts University (Africa Office, Addis Ababa)*

The Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards were developed to address wide-ranging concerns about emergency livestock programmes in the nineties. For example, emergencies sometimes produced tensions and even clashes between the developmental veterinary services, and the more humanitarian emergency responses. Generally, these two different approaches were lacking in complementarity. The
Guidelines were produced as a result of an international consultative process, and were finally published in book form in 2009, and are currently available in different languages, including Arabic on the LEGS website. Globally the initiative is guided by a LEGS Steering Committee that includes regional and international organizations.

The LEGS handbook emphasizes the centrality and importance of livelihoods, and recognizes that livestock are a crucial livelihood asset, of importance to both the local and national economy. The guidelines and standards do not focus on control of specific epidemics or on domestic pets. The content is broadly concerned with assessment of livestock and livelihoods, and planning and implementing livestock related interventions. There are eight cross-cutting “Common Standards” (p46 to 58 of the handbook):

1. Participation
2. Initial assessment
3. Response and coordination
4. Targeting
5. Monitoring and evaluation, and livelihoods impact
6. Technical support and agency competencies
7. Preparedness
8. Advocacy and policy.

This is followed by chapters on each of the six technical areas; destocking; veterinary services; feed resources; water; livestock shelter and settlement; and restocking.

Assessment forms an important part of LEGS, and the LEGS Participatory Response Identification Matrix (PRIM) tool was described (p23 of handbook). This matrix includes three livelihood objectives (providing rapid assistance, protecting assets and rebuilding assets), which are considered in relation to the LEGS technical interventions and the assessment findings and phase of emergency (slow or rapid onset; emergency phases – alert, alarm, emergency, recovery).

There are two options for implementing the concepts of LEGS in humanitarian disaster response. These are: the use of LEGS as a planning and decision making tool to facilitate the development and implementation of feasible and appropriate livestock focused disaster response; the use of LEGS standards and specific technical indicators retrospectively to evaluate and draw lessons from past emergency responses, in order to inform and influence policies and programmes.

**Summary of discussion**

Participants asked about the application of LEGS in the context of Sudan, including in Blue Nile province where cross-border migration of livestock was restricted because of the secession (herders were forced to return from the south and there was localized over-grazing). The varying nature of emergencies in Sudan and their protracted nature was raised as an issue, and the speaker emphasized that ‘when working on development they needed to think about emergency response’. In other words the two should be linked.
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The speaker emphasised that the focus of LEGS is on emergencies. Rapid assessments help in choosing the intervention, which should be linked to supporting livelihoods and also linked to sustainability in the future. In a livestock based response, the activities are focused on livestock. The point is that this is a valuable livelihoods based resource that should be protected, by providing support where appropriate. The activities focus on livestock – which kind, depends on the situation, and the assessment. The purpose of LEGS is to give guidance in humanitarian situations.

The LEGS guidelines also help in terms of preparedness planning; ensuring that everything is in place will mean the emergency response is much faster and also timelier in terms of when the response is needed.
PART 2. LEGS, Livestock programmes and Pastoralism in Sudan, Presentations by agencies

2.1. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *Ibrahim el Mardi*

FAO Sudan and partners (NGOs, government and CBOs) were undertaking livestock interventions long before the introduction of LEGS in 2009. Examples of emergency livestock programmes that were commonly implemented included: veterinary services (vaccination, treatment for disease); water; feed; provision of animals - restocking; shelter (e.g. for IDPs in Darfur). FAO also directly supported and were involved in the wider global LEGS initiative.

In Sudan, FAO have committed to mainstreaming LEGS and aligning their interventions with the LEGS guidelines. They have done this in two ways:

1. **Raising awareness** among NGOs, donors, and government at specific meetings, in June 2010, and also Wad Medani Aug 2010 (NGOs and partners) and Nyala (target group 22 veterinarians).

2. **LEGS training workshops;** six training workshops on LEGS were conducted by FAO (two in collaboration with World Vision International (Blue Nile and South Darfur).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training workshop</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damazien</td>
<td>Blue Nile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18-20 Aug 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyala</td>
<td>South Darfur</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20-22 Sep 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassala</td>
<td>Eastern States</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11-13 Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneina</td>
<td>West Darfur</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28-30 Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Fasher</td>
<td>North Darfur</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4-6 Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElObeid</td>
<td>Covering: South Kordofan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far, 137 people have been trained from Blue Nile, South Darfur, East Sudan, West Darfur and North Darfur, of whom 59 were veterinarians. This included: 22 from FAO, 44 from the government, and 71 from NGOs. These trainings have been run by three “LEGS certified trainers”, who have attended a regional Training of Trainers. The feedback from LEGS trainees is particularly relevant to this meeting and included; the need for a more formalized and vibrant network of LEGS trainees; importance of
mainstreaming LEGS and applying it in all livestock emergencies; need for a mechanism to evaluate the training, and more focus in LEGS on cross-cutting issues. A further question raised was whether it would be possible to include real events and emergency interventions in the context of Sudan for learning purposes. More elaboration and examples of monitoring and evaluation was also requested.

The speaker also emphasized the importance of “Disaster Risk Reduction and Management” for food and nutrition security, which represents a paradigm shift in disaster management. DRR emphasizes the need to shift from reactive response to more proactive planning to prevent crisis. This is obviously preferable to waiting for a crisis to happen and animals dying. LEGS apply to all phases, especially preparedness, mitigation and prevention. This builds resilience before being subject to disaster. Resilient livelihoods are crucial for Disaster Risk Reduction.

2.2. World Vision, Blue Nile Program, Sudan, Ali Ibrahim Mohammed
Blue Nile is located in the south eastern part of Sudan, bounded by Ethiopia to the east, and South Sudan to the south. The total population is about 1 million, 75% of which are rural largely depending on agriculture, of which livestock is a major component. The state has 8 million head of livestock, many of which depend on the 8 livestock routes and seasonal grazing areas (including dry season areas in South Sudan) with a total area of 1.7 million feddan. The routes are not functioning well and there are serious conflicts between farmers and herders.

As part of their food security projects, World Vision have implemented restocking projects, through the distribution of female goats to beneficiary households; vaccination of targeted communities’ livestock against prevailing diseases; provision of training to Community Animal Health Workers; provision of husbandry and animal health care awareness trainings to targeted livestock owners; improvement of targeted villages grazing areas through distribution of improved fodder seeds and provision of training; distribution of water troughs to livestock water points in targeted areas.

Since the eruption of the current conflict in Blue Nile, most livestock owners have been pushed out of their normal grazing, and thus large numbers of livestock accumulated in safe localities in the north of Blue Nile. This has resulted in challenges of overgrazing and challenges related to the drinking water. In addressing this current situation, LEGS will be a major tool for planning. Additionally, World Vision is working to raise awareness about LEGS through workshops and distributing publications.

2.3. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Abubaker Mahdi
ICRC has been supporting livestock interventions since 2005, and is currently present in five States in the Darfur region. They started with assessments in 2004, and found problems specific to livestock producers, including: closure of migration routes; concentration of animal herds; scarcity of resources and increased prevalence of diseases. These problems were exacerbated by the destruction and looting of veterinary services.
ICRC’s objectives were to preserve pastoralist livelihoods and to promote access to basic animal health delivery services. They supported strong collaboration with government ministries, with training community animal health workers (CAHWs), animal health auxiliaries, supporting a vaccination campaign (from 2005 to 2011 ICRC covered 3.4 million livestock heads with 3 vaccines in Kutum, Abata, Zalingei, Abata, Mallam, Nyala, Wadi Sallih), and rehabilitation of four veterinary clinics. They are also supporting the ministry at State level with monitoring and evaluation.

They have developed a three month course curriculum for animal health auxiliaries from the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, after several consultations with the University of Nyala, and also refresher courses.

ICRC has supported the LEGS initiative since its inception, and the regional ICRC specialist is a member of the LEGS Steering Committee. ICRC also undertakes LEGS trainings for ICRC partners. There is a training planned for this year in Darfur.

Lessons learned include the need to improve monitoring and evaluation, and also more focus on gender and emergency preparedness. The MOAR currently has only a limited recognition of CAHWs, and there is a vital need for other technical areas to be recognized as well e.g. hafirs, water and fodder. The issue of hafirs is sensitive in relation to land tenure and there is a need for LEGS to elaborate more on that.

2.4. Livestock Emergency Programmes in Sudan; History and current status in Darfur, Adam Salih, Feinstein International Center, Tufts University

Livestock services have a long history in Sudan dating back to 1898 and the British Veterinary Army Corps. Since then there have been government policies, and development of technical institutions and departments (Veterinary Research Laboratory, Veterinary Schools and Faculty of Veterinary Science at the University of Khartoum). Government Veterinary Services focus on the control of animal diseases, and animal production. These have received some international support dating back to 1975.

More recent developments in Sudan have had major implications for livestock production, including for example; an increase in animal and human populations; competition over natural resources; underdevelopment; conflicts; secession of South Sudan, and oil explorations and mining.

In the Darfur region a protracted humanitarian emergency has been on-going since 2004, which has included humanitarian food security and livelihoods programmes. Under the UNEP Sudan Integrated Environment Project, Tufts/FIC commissioned a study of the livestock emergency interventions in North and West Darfur States in 2012. The study identified 26 non-governmental organizations engaged in implementing emergency livestock programmes. Of the six technical LEGS interventions, only three seemed to have gained popularity particularly in North Darfur: restocking, provision of veterinary services and provision of fodder.
Restocking and provision of fodder were mostly carried out among groups of IDPs and returnees, while provision of veterinary services was common to all target groups (IDPS, returnees, rural residents and pastoralists). The review concluded that there is an urgent need for impact assessments for all the LEGS related projects. It also recognized that the LEGS approach is a means to wider livestock sector development, and a tool to support technical staff and policy makers.

2.5. Review of the work of the UN agencies with pastoralists, Magda Nassef, UNEP Sudan

This review was instigated by the UN Steering Group on Pastoralism, a Group formed by request of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT). The membership of this group is largely composed of UN agencies (including WFP, UNICEF, UNAMID, UNDP, IFAD, UNOCHA, FAO, UNEP) as well as a number of national and international partners (such as SOS Sahel, Tufts University, and Sudia).

The Steering Group was created because UN agencies recognize that: a) increased action is needed for pastoralist communities, as they constitute an important segment of rural communities alongside farmers, IDPs and urban populations; b) a coordinated agency approach is needed, which would ensure effective and appropriate action for and with pastoralists; c) there is a need to strengthen the evidence and knowledge base with which to make the most informed decisions on interventions for pastoralists. The objectives of the Group are to improve the UN’s strategic response on pastoralism, and to work towards coordinated and informed agency action on pastoralism.

The review, which forms the basis of this presentation, is an initial output to better understand what agencies are doing for pastoralists, and how they are doing it, with the intention of identifying examples of what practitioners consider good practice. The review was done in the form of a survey, designed with input from Tufts University, the Council for the Development of Nomads, Sudia, SOS Sahel, and others. The survey targeted 24 agencies and institutions including WFP, UNICEF, UNAMID Civil Affairs, National NGOs (SOS Sahel, Al Massar, Nomadic Mobile Organization), the Western Sudan Natural Resource Management Programme (IFAD funded), UNOCHA, FAO, and Save the Children Sweden).

While the survey was intended to be countrywide, the majority of interviewees worked in Darfur, and most had more than five years’ experience. The review found that most activities focused on service delivery for people (with some focusing on livestock) and on peace-building.

There were different interpretations as to who are pastoralists, though mobility was always highlighted as a common strategy in the different descriptions. Most interviewees agreed on the challenges facing pastoralists (conflict, climate change, closure of routes, degradation, secession, and pasture reduction), and that agencies need to engage with pastoralists directly rather than only through intermediaries who are not necessarily representative of the broader range of pastoral groups. It was also evident that most organizations work with those communities who are easiest to reach, potentially missing out the wider pastoralist community.
Agencies highlighted for the purposes of this presentation include WFP and UNICEF. WFP are reaching some pastoralists with their ‘seasonal support’ programme to cover the hunger gap, and also their ‘food for recovery’ (hafirs and dams, nutrition support, and piloting of food for firelines in 2011). They also mentioned that they adjust their approach for pastoralists, including focusing services in migration routes and implementing seasonal activities to accommodate mobility. WFP is also exploring, in North Darfur, putting in place a strategy for engaging with pastoralists.

UNICEF implements the 'child friendly community initiative', coordinating basic social services and social mobilization (water, education, health, child welfare). UNICEF also plans for service delivery in a participatory fashion, recognizing that services have the potential to cause conflict, especially if they are perceived to be inequitable or inappropriate. UNICEF has also adjusted their approach to suit mobile pastoralists, for example through their specialized education programme for nomads. Like FAO, UNICEF accommodates livestock keeping through designing water projects that both animals and people can benefit from. They also noted that they only provide permanent services for nomads in damras (permanent settlements) where there are no land disputes.

Most agencies do some form of monitoring and evaluation to varying degrees, although with a few exceptions there is a lack of longer-term impact assessments to gauge the impact on livelihoods. WFP have shared that they undertake impact assessments on their 'recovery programming'. UNOCHA were not aware of any impact assessments and if they are done they are not shared.

Several common challenges and gaps identified include:
- Insecurity and lack of access
- Land tenure issues which make agencies risk averse in terms of providing permanent services which could cause further dispute.
- Geographically remote communities
- Huge needs, and areas to cover and insufficient funds
- Poor capacity of partners
- Lack of data and information
- Needs are developmental and recovery, less so humanitarian which has funding implications
- Challenge of real representation – who should we be working with?
- Lack of understanding of livelihood rationale and needs.
- Tendency towards knee-jerk responses towards requests for services, which are not sufficiently planned.

Recommendations coming out of the review included the need to increase efforts to work with pastoralists, and in particular to build direct relationships with communities to better understand the context and actual priorities/needs, and to build trust. The next steps for the UNCT Steering Group are to expand the survey to cover a broader target group of implementers (including government and institutions working on behalf of pastoralists), and to review international lessons learned in sectors relevant to the Steering Group members. A further planned activity is to collect grey...
literature during the expanded survey (e.g. available monitoring and evaluation reports, needs assessments and criteria used, studies and situation analyses) in order to query this body of work in terms of relevance for support to pastoralist livelihoods.

Summary of discussion

Questions and comments covered the following areas:

- Responses in protracted crises such as in the Darfur region require consideration of the wider impact of interventions, including on the environment.
- Are there interventions that address the challenges facing pastoralists, e.g. limited access to markets, or access to pastures or the current problems of cross border mobility into southern Sudan? Examples of restocking projects that involve youth?
- Do the LEGS trainees get a chance to apply their skills and knowledge?
- What is the international community’s commitment to supporting LEGS interventions?
- Given the rapid onset of some crises, is there sufficient time for planning LEGS interventions?

Highlighted responses:

- The commitment from donors and government has to be there. It’s about building confidence, and emphasizing saving livelihoods not only lives.
- Timeliness is a crucial issue, for example, regarding the Somali crisis, all the international actors were too late. But drought onset is slow and incremental and so it should be predictable at least 3-6 months ahead. But, we are lacking adequate preparedness activities, and also early warning information needs to trigger a response. The reason it doesn’t is often down to politics.
- We need to focus on more than just emergency interventions. We have to expand and engage earlier. There is now a shift from reactive to proactive mode e.g. early warning, prevention, mitigation response etc. We need to sell this to the donor. This is building resilience before being subject to disaster, promoting access to markets, and supporting livelihoods.
- Note that there is a vast cadre of animal health auxiliaries and CAHWs – this enables us to vaccinate about 5 million livestock. The livestock producers themselves select their own people to go for training, and so they benefit directly once the trainees go back to their communities.
- Security is an issue in implementing livestock programmes in Darfur. There is a lot of banditry, which limits access to the livestock producing communities. We try to support the ministry staff in their work in this situation, for example, if ministry land cruisers can’t go for security reasons, we assist them by providing private vehicles.
- Emergency programmes should not be long-term, despite working in Darfur for up to seven years. Even in this situation it’s about trying to do what’s appropriate.
- NGOs can sometimes operate in areas that are off-limits to government personnel, which might be critical to providing support.
**PART 3. Introduction to Participatory Impact Assessment: A Tool for Policy Change.**

*Dawit Abebe, Feinstein International Center, Tufts University, Addis Ababa*

This presentation started with a question to the participants, asking them to define three terms: monitoring, evaluation, and participatory impact assessment. In summing up the discussion, the following definitions were given:
- monitoring is looking at continuous activity
- evaluation is not as continuous, it’s periodical (given steps or stages in a project)
- PIA is not frequent, often ignored, and requires skills, time and resources.

Local people have their own perceptions of change, and in relation to projects have their own ways of measuring change and analysing project attribution. These local perceptions matter and are critical to impact assessment.

The project cycle includes monitoring and evaluation, as well as needs assessment, design and planning, and of course implementation, but impact assessment is not always part of this, and neither is it always clear how community participation fits into this? Experience and analysis with the Operation Lifeline Sudan livestock programme has taught us much. While monitoring and evaluation are crucial parts of the project cycle, they are insufficient in terms of understanding what impact your intervention is having – the indirect outcomes of the project.

There are practical constraints to impact assessment, for example:
- Logistical and operational constraints to conventional research
- A general lack of baseline surveys
- Action-oriented rather than data-driven programmes

There are eight main steps or stages in PIA:
1. Identify the key questions (most difficult stage). Project objectives can be used to identify the key questions with the community at the beginning.
2. Define the geographical and time limits of the project
3. Identify and prioritize community defined indicators of project impacts
4. Decide which participatory methods to use, and test them
5. Measure changes in the impact indicator
6. Explore project attribution – other projects & influences, for example, project factors, and non-project factors.
7. Triangulation
8. Results feedback and verify with the local community

PIA can be used to influence government policies as it provides solid evidence that supports the efficacy of different interventions.

PIA helps bridge two critical gaps; first, the limited understanding of livelihoods impact; and second, the methodological gap between the ad hoc use of participatory methods.
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Summary of Discussion

Questions, comments and responses covered the following areas:

- **How long does it take to deliver/train PIA methods? How long does it take in that first stage to identify the indicators?** The number of days for PIA training is usually 7 to 10, including field work — this depends on how close you are to the training site. The design and planning also takes time. Often I usually give the generic training, then help them [the participants] design and find questions.

- **What is a proxy indicator?** A proxy indicator is used where you aren’t able to measure the indicator directly, for example improved diet, or sources of income, might be investigated using the proxy indicators; ‘we have more milk’ or ‘more money to buy medicine’, ‘We are selling more animals and use the money for school fees’; ‘There is more peace, so we can move around more easily’

- **What is the difference between PIA and PRA?** There are many different acronyms describing these approaches, but the methods or tools are the same -- what makes a difference is how you and for what you are using a particular tool. They use the same tools, but for different purposes.

- **Most interventions do not take adequate account of local livelihoods, nor are they adapted to the lifestyle of the people. Impacts are therefore usually both positive and negative.**

- **Who should be involved in PIA? How to ensure adequate representation?** Donors and NGOs have their own interests, and areas of specialization or focus. There should be a relevant government ministry responsible for coordinating them and the suggestions for what’s needed (in terms of interventions) should come from the people themselves.

- The international community is concerned with reporting on things, in terms of quantities, which tells us little about impact. Reporting on impact is often problematic, for example, how can we report on sustainability? Similarly it is challenging to report on the impact of capacity building. Yet, there is a big difference between CBOs 5 years ago as compared with today. If we continue to work with the same institutions, capacity will continue to be built. Many engage with pastoralist unions and pastoral commissions. Every organization has its own way of doing things.
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For the last session of the workshop participants divided into the group of their choice; with one group focusing on the LEGS, and the second group focusing on Participatory Impact Assessment. Each of the working groups addressed their specific questions and then reported back in plenary.

**Working Group 1: LEGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is the full range of LEGS interventions relevant to the livestock sector in Sudan? Which sectors, and why?        | - Yes, to some extent most of LEGS interventions are relevant to the Sudan context such as water, restocking, veterinary services...etc.  
- Destocking is the most appropriate intervention in a drought situation, e.g. as found in Gedarif state, which is the usual decision of communities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| What is the Role of line Ministries, and national organizations?                                                   | - Adoption of LEGS approaches by government relative ministries and NGOS and disseminating to all stakeholders in term of training, mainstreaming in improving national strategies  
- Greater preparedness planning and training, linked with a national contingency plan.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| How to promote LEGS approaches within national livestock policies and programmes?                                | - Adaptation of LEGS approach within national livestock policies and programmes  
- Use LEGS tools as guidance and framework during project and proposal preparations.  
- The dissemination of information about LEGS to all stakeholders will promote coherence, i.e. all stakeholders will speak one language.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| How can pastoralists benefit from LEGS approaches?                                                                | - They should benefit to the maximum.  
- Participation: involving communities in assessments, planning, M&E, etc.  
- Targeting: liaising with communities during identification of affected households, needs identification...etc.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

**Working Group 2: Participatory Impact Assessment**

**Question:** Identify potential case-studies for PIA & learning about best practice.

Specific examples suggested by participants included:

- Sennar State, which has a strategic reserve for feed, 2 mobile clinics and restocking of the herd.
- North Darfur, Kebkabiya Charitable Society has carried out livestock projects, and although up to now they have withdrawn from these localities yet they are still present.
- Diraija pasture project, which has been in operation for almost 20 years, and since 1996 is a good example of both positive and negative impact. Note that, some projects make a negative impact because they take by force land away from the citizens, which may create conflicts.
- Blue Nile basin, pasture project, along the western livestock routes. They have constructed 3 dams and 3 hafirs.
- Western Savannah project formerly in Darfur may be worth reviewing.

Some participants commented that this list is rather, and might reflect the small number of national and international NGOs at the workshop.
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Closing Remarks and Next Steps

Participants displayed sustained and genuine interest in the presentations, plenary discussions and working groups. Drop-out or early departure was virtually nil, and was limited to one representative from a UN agency. Levels of participation were excellent as evidenced from the many questions and comments, which could not all be addressed by the speakers. The group of participants from the Ministry of Animal Resources were particularly vocal and engaged, and clearly these tools were of immediate and direct relevance to their work.

Participants appreciated hearing about both the wider global LEGS initiative, alongside more specific examples of emergency livestock programming in Sudan. On review of the participants expectations voiced at the beginning of the day it was clear that they had been met.

In addition to achieving its objectives, the workshop has created enormous interest among the participants on the use of both LEGS and PIA in their programmes, and also as a vehicle to support continuing engagement of government ministries in emergency livestock planning and programmes2.

LEGS and PIA are both practical tools that can promote learning and best practice, strengthen capacity, and promote coherence and better coordination in national emergency livestock programmes. Lessons learned in Sudan can also contribute to both improved practice nationally, and to the wider body of livestock programming experience internationally.

Post Workshop Reflections

On reflection after the workshop, the Tufts team have identified two options for further promoting the LEGS concepts and approach in humanitarian disaster response. These are: the use of LEGS as a planning and decision-making tool to facilitate the development and implementation of feasible and appropriate livestock focused disaster response. The second option is the use of LEGS standards and specific technical indicators retrospectively to evaluate and draw lessons from past emergency responses. In this regard, the following scenarios for implementing LEGS may be considered:

Scenario 1. Emergency livestock response planning: Livestock producers in Sudan face a wide range of hazards, risks and threats. For example, currently most of the Horn of Africa including Sudan has been under climatic stress due to global climate anomalies causing either drought or flood in different parts of the region. Based on an analysis of the relationship between the global climate phenomenon and local climate in Sudan it may be possible to predict how this could influence the different regions in the country or at the very least assess the climatic risks to livestock. A current

2 A subsequent meeting between Tufts and the Federal Minister of the Ministry of Animal Resources in late May, also indicated the growing interest in Sudan in the use of the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards as a planning and coordination tool by government.
example of emergencies affecting livestock in Sudan, include the threats currently facing livestock that would normally move to their dry season pastures in the south but are unable to as a result of the on-going border conflict. Depending on the nature of the potential disaster, (e.g. drought, flood, insecurity, restricted access) in a specific area or region, agencies can prepare a response plan using standards and guidelines of LEGS.

**Scenario 2. Retrospective application:** this involves the use of the Livestock standards and guidelines to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of emergency responses that were implemented in the recent past. The intention is to draw lessons that can be used to improve future planning and implementation of emergency response. This can be implemented in two ways:

- **Desktop evaluation:** humanitarian agencies’ disaster response strategies can be assessed using LEGS standards and indicators as a benchmark. Furthermore, LEGS standards and indicators are useful to assess how agencies conceptualize the linkage between humanitarian and development programmes. The sources of information for this assessment can be project proposals, monitoring and evaluation reports, organizational structures, funding structures and others.

- **Undertake an assessment of specific cases:** implemented emergency response in the livestock sector can be assessed using LEGS standards and guidelines. The intention of this approach is to draw lessons from past interventions that can be used to improve future planning of similar intervention. This facilitates smooth institutionalization of the use of LEGS standards and guidelines.
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<table>
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<tr>
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<th>Organization</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ali Ibrahim Mohamed</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Amna Awad M. Salih</td>
<td>MoAR-Sennar</td>
<td>D.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 El Mardi Ibrahim</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>FAO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hatim Akasha Mohammed</td>
<td>Agric Bank-Headquarter-khartoum</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Almassar Org. Khartoum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Annex 2. Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:00 - 9:15   | Welcome and Introductions  
Review of the agenda & objectives | Tufts/ UNEP                                                            |
| 9:45 – 11:00  | LEGS in Sudan, Presentations by agencies actively supporting the roll-out of LEGS | 2 Ibrahim el Mardi, FAO Sudan  
3 Ali Ibrahim Mohammed, World Vision  
4 Abubaker Mahdi, ICRC                                                      |
| 11:00 – 11:45 | **Fatour**                                                               |                                                                         |
| 11:45 - 12:45 | Current status of livestock interventions in Darfur  
Review of the work of the UN agencies with pastoralism | Adam Salih, Tufts FIC  
Magda Nassef, UNEP Sudan                                                   |
| 12:45 – 1:45  | Introduction to Participatory Impact Assessment: A Tool for Policy Change. | Dawit Abebe, Tufts FIC                                                  |
| 1:45 – 2:15   | **Break for refreshments and prayer**                                    |                                                                         |
| 2:15 – 3:15   | **Group Work, choice of two groups:**                                    |                                                                         |
|               | 1. LEGS  
1. Is the full range of LEGS interventions relevant to the livestock sector in Sudan? Which sectors, and why?  
2. What is the role of the line ministries, and national organizations?  
3. How to promote LEGS approaches within national livestock policies and programmes?  
4. How can pastoralists benefit from LEGS approaches? |                                                                         |
2. Participatory impact Assessment
Identify potential case-studies for PIA & learning about best practice, and consider:
- Types of interventions
- Geographical areas
- Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:45pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 - 5:00pm</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Tufts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrap-up &amp; Closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLINE RESOURCES:

1. LEGS:
   http://www.livestock-emergency.net/
   Downloaded pdf file available from Tufts

2. Participatory Impact Assessment:
   http://sites.tufts.edu/feinstein/2008/participatory-impact-assessment
   Downloaded pdf file available from Tufts

3. LEGS presentations from this workshop:
   http://sites.tufts.edu/feinstein/program/sudan-environment-and-livelihoods
   Downloaded pdf files available from Tufts