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Recap – evaluation questions

1. To what extent were the project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant?

2. To what extent did FAO successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical agency and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining GASL?

3. To what extent did GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner?

4. To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?
**Overview**

- **1999**: Livestock's Long Shadow (FAO)
- **2009**: Livestock in a changing Landscape (Island Press)
- **2011**: Pro-poor Livestock Development (FAO)
- **2013**: MSP in Cefalù, 165 participants working on full sustainability
- **2016**: MSP in Panama
  - 190 Participants; Link between livestock and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of UN 2030 Agenda and launching of a sustainability framework that addresses the SDGs.
  - MSP in Nairobi, Kenya
    - Refine programme actions and operating modalities; establishment of initial agenda
  - MSP in Phuket, Thailand
    - Focus Area Groups; Route of Phuket; next steps
  - MSP in Ottawa, Canada
    - Incorporation of all dimensions of sustainability

**Livestock in 2020**: The next food revolution

Delgado et al.
Overview

GASL Member growth per cluster

- Public Sector
- Private Sector
- Academia & Research
  - Dec.15
  - Dec.16
  - Dec.17
- Donors
- NGOs
- Social Movements
- Intern. Org.
## Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Action Networks</th>
<th>Main Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Brasilia Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phuket Roadmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Programme revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Governance Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sustainability approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Panama Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consolidation, sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions – Question 1

1. To what extent were the project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant?

• GASL has demonstrated to be relevant to the objectives of its members and FAO, evolving over time to incorporate new trends (e.g. focus on new areas, SDGs)

• Its uniqueness as a livestock-focused global MSP makes it an important contributor to partnership and consensus building
Conclusions – Question 2

2. To what extent did FAO successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical agency and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining GASL?

• Despite a number of structural and operational challenges of hosting GASL in FAO, the benefits provided overall outweigh the costs. The challenges should be addressed by FAO, to better manage MSPs (see recom 1)
Conclusions – Question 3

3. To what extent did GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner?

• Representation is quite broad, and has been growing. Members join for various reasons, and have either benefited or expect to benefit in the future.

• The AST has been appreciated for its support, but has limited resources for some important functions such as collecting lessons and achievements and communication (see recom 2).
Conclusions – Question 4

4. To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?

- Establishment of membership, partnerships and process
- Contributions to adoption of good practices and evidence based policies, in the form of evidence based (e.g. CODEGALAC, Mongolia Agenda for Sustainable Livestock, Regional Livestock MSP in Eastern Europe and Central Asia) – but more clear theory of action, and evidence collection are needed (see recom 3)
- Gender considerations were not sufficiently mainstreamed in GASL’s work (see recom 4)
Recommendation (1 of 5)

To FAO: FAO’s Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) Management and Partnership Division should draw lessons from GASL and other Multi Stakeholder Partnerships and provide guidance on their functioning to enable them to achieve concrete results.
Recommendation (2 of 5)

To GASL and FAO: GASL should prioritize the establishment of monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to collect lessons and results from members and facilitate reporting to current and potential donors.
Recommendation (3 of 5)

To GASL and FAO: In its Action Plan 2019-2021 GASL would benefit from developing a shared and explicit theory of change of how it intends to contribute to policy and practice change. This should also include further development of the links to regional and country levels.
Recommendation (4 of 5)

To GASL and FAO: GASL should strengthen its efforts to incorporate a gender perspective given its crucial importance in sustainable livestock production. This can be done for instance by actively promoting a gender analysis in the policies and practices discussed in GASL or by disseminating FAO technical training material on gender in the livestock sector.
Recommendation (5 of 5)

To GASL: Broadening the donor base will be critical for GASL’s future, and additional communication and outreach efforts should be pursued to ensure its activities continue. Leveraging funds from its members has been effective and should be further expanded. Furthermore, GASL should consider organizing donors’ presence in a different form, by possibly eliminating the donor cluster and distributing the donor organizations among the other clusters.
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