

Minutes of 1st Regional Research Coordination and Planning Meeting of *Developing Sustainable Livelihoods of Agropastoral Communities of West Asia and North Africa (M&M III)*

Tunis, December 19-20, 2005

The meeting was attended by (i) Dr. Abdelmajid Slama, IFAD representative; (ii) delegations from the 8 countries (Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia) composed by two scientists from each national team, the national coordinator and the coordinators of the development projects; (iii) ICARDA invited scientists, namely Dr Ahmed Sidahmed, Director MP Knowledge management and dissemination, Dr. Richard Thoms, Director MP Combating desertification, Dr. Kamel Shideed, Director MP on Poverty Livelihood Analysis and Impact Assessment, Dr. Ahmed Amri, Regional Coordinator West Asia Regional Program; (iv) Dr. Nasri Haddad as a resource person; (v) Dr. Emmanuel Tillard, CIRAD representative; and (vi) Dr Mohammed El Mourid, Regional coordinator North Africa regional program.

1. Opening

ICARDA statement by Dr El Mourid, M&M regional coordinator

In his introduction, Dr El Mourid, on behalf of Professor Dr Adel El-Beltagy welcomed Professor Abdelaziz Mougou, President IRESA and expressed his appreciation to Tunisia, host of this meeting. He welcomed Dr Slama, IFAD representative, and thanked AFESD who could not attend, Dr. Emmanuel Tillard, CIRAD representative, Dr Nasri Haddad, former M&M regional coordinator. This is probably the last phase of M&M. We are happy to have two women scientists in the group, and our objective is to have 30 % for the next meeting and 50 % the third meeting. We have evolved from barley/livestock system to agropastoral system. This project brings a lot of new opportunities, more partnership with development agencies, NGOs, and other stakeholders. I am pleased to have representatives from development projects; this is a condition for the success of our project.

IFAD statement by Dr Abdelmajid Slama

In his statement Dr Slama expressed his satisfaction of joining the meeting, his satisfaction of the new research teams and the sites selected, which are making the program more challenging and more difficult, because risk is high and notion of common resources is full.

IRESA statement

Professor Mougou welcomed all participants, invited resources persons, coordinators and scientists attending the meeting. He added that Tunisia selected Tataouine as a target site, which is difficult place and where strong research input is needed. He also stressed the importance of women in scientific society and as example he mentioned the case of Tunisian universities were women represent about 56 %.

2. Presentation of M&M III by Dr El Mourid, Project regional coordinator

M&M III presentation emphasised the project areas as being the low rainfall areas (LRA - that receive less than 250 mm per year) in M&M region. As stated in the project document, all project areas must be attached to IFAD or any other on-going rural development project, like for example a state funded project, an NGO funded project or an initiative of the community to invest for the improvement of its livelihood. The M&M III is a research initiative fostering the successful implementation of a community development plan (CDP) at the level of the community.

The approach of this new M&M phase also calls for some requirements clearly defined in the project document that were stated by donor institutions but that emerge as a logical need following the previous two phases. Some of these requirements are to:

- Scale out the project so as to cover a wider geographic area and a large number of communities in pastoral and agropastoral environments. The aim is to enlarge the area so several layers of stakeholders can interact,
- Facilitate integration and interaction of all stakeholders (researchers, communities, development project, policy makers...),
- Give the project a regional dimension by networking. The idea is to consider M&M one regional project rather than 8 different projects,
- Fully adopt the participatory and community approaches giving empowerment to the community and reinforcing the concept of ownership within all partners,
- Privilege aspects of comparative advantage and excellence ; not all activities are to be implemented in all countries.

The new MM III project mainly aims to undertake three thematic research areas:

- Institutionalization of the community approach and the community development plan;
- Knowledge generation and dissemination (research and develop methodologies and approaches for improved and sustainable livelihood of agropastoral communities; and
- Development of participatory, social, economic, environment and poverty indicators and impact assessment in agropastoral systems (Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation for result oriented Impact Assessment).

In presenting the M&M III project, Dr El Mourid, highlighted:

- The successful example developed in Tataouine by Tunisia M&M team in collaboration with PRODESUD.
- Also, applied and adaptive research themes will come out of the CDPs.
- He indicated among important issues, the evaluation of the return in the dry areas, because up to know most of investments were done in favourable areas, but IFPRI showed that the return in dry areas is even higher than in favourable areas in many countries.

- Development of participatory SEE indicators and where we need to produce easy indicators that can be used; during M&M II we worked on partial budgeting, now we are moving toward impact on natural resources.
- The regional integration and capacity building are very important, and we are one project and one team and not 8 countries.

We need to develop:

- (i) New TIPOS covering the following areas:
 - Water harvesting;
 - Alternative cropping systems in some niches with scarce water sources;
 - Livestock health, and added value from small ruminants products;
 - Identification of market opportunities.
- (ii) Options for communal rangeland resources management;
- (iii) Risk management and drought mitigation, including drought coping strategies and drought management policies.

In relation to implementation arrangements, monitoring and evaluation, and in addition to IFAD and AFESD grants, and NARS contribution, still the project needs to raise about 1,450 \$ US that can come from multilateral, bilateral or development projects. Countries are encouraged to investigate especially the last option, because most of development projects include an item line related to research development and backstopping.

Among stakeholders, special mention is dedicated to policy makers, which are important and should be involved at all levels.

The approach of the project is innovative and challenging, it includes:

- wider geographical area,
- Integration and interaction of all stakeholders,
- The project is built on networking,
- Knowing the capacity of all teams, the time and the budget limitations, all activities will not be implemented in all countries; comparative advantage and excellence will be favoured.

3. Key note papers

3.1. Development of integrated crop/livestock production systems in low rainfall areas of the Mashreq and the Maghreb regions (M&M phase I and II): achievements and lessons learned by Dr Nasri Haddad

During phase I and II of M&M project, lot of emphasis was put on barley, and barley will remain important during the current phase.

Impact of the Project Approach

- The M&M project implemented a multidisciplinary team approach within countries, with inter-country exchange of material and results, which encourages complementarities and efficiency of research.

- The networking concept has been the main foundation of the project, which has established a multinational, multidisciplinary network among researchers and extension workers from the eight countries participating in the project
- Network activities have included information exchange, training, regional study tours and workshops
- The personal and professional relationships that have been established among scientists have enhanced the institutional linkages generated by the project activities
- Over three years during phase II, 870 farmers participated in demonstrations; 5682 farmers and technicians attended field days; 854 farmers engaged in training courses; and 4445 farmers were interviewed during socio-economic and policy studies.

The Community Approach: Holistic, Multi-disciplinary, Community-centered, and Action-oriented

- Successful organization technique for participatory planning of activities and for accelerating diffusion at the village level.
- Facilitated closer links with local and central governments and institutions.
- Started to enhance the bargaining power of the community in input purchases and output marketing.
- Gave confidence to members that they can organize and manage such activities as range management, cooperatives and processing with little or no support from the government.
- Potentially, the growth of communities would most likely lead to the creation of pressure groups who should be able to achieve and gain more.
- Enabled some communities to qualify for loans by offering collective guarantees and securities which they would not be able to obtain individually.

Successful Technologies

- Alternative feeds
- Demonstration of Full-Package to improve small ruminants' productivity
- Feed blocks
- Rangeland and marginal land rehabilitation (Introduction of spineless cactus and fodder shrubs to rehabilitate natural rangelands and marginal cereal cropping lands, cactus and atriplex established in alley cropping system on communal rangeland and private lands)
- Rangeland Management Options (Best-Bet Technical and Institutional Options have been Identified by the project and are being evaluated in some countries)

Spillover technologies between Countries

- Cactus from Tunisia
- Feed block privatization and machine from Iraq
- Synchronization of breeding, early weaning, increasing profligacy from Jordan

- Agro-ecological innovation from ICARDA and Morocco.
- Improved vetch and barley parents from ICARDA

Main achievements of the Policy and property rights research

- Development of community models to evaluate the effects of different policy reforms and technologies on community welfare and resource allocation.
- The models were built for three communities: Sidi Frej (Algeria), Mkaifteh (Jordan) and Ait-Amar (Morocco).
- The property rights research focused on rangeland policies and the different management options that were tested under each policy framework.
- On the rangeland common access problem there is evidence that technological changes will not be possible without first resolving this problem
- Power to control rangeland management be returned to the communities
- Successful technology introduction appeared to be an enabling environment for agricultural policy changes
- Creation of a network of economists in the region
- Close collaboration and integration of technologist and economist
- Research results from the three countries (Jordan, Morocco and Syria) showed that present land tenure systems provide enough incentives to farmers to invest in enhancing the productivity of their land

Contribution of M&M concepts

- IFAD rangeland projects in Central Asia and Pakistan (Barani)
- IFAD project proposal in central Tunisia (Tataouine)
- NARS reviewing concepts of public ownership and legal approaches to the rangeland

Many technologies developed have not been adopted because of inappropriate policies, and land tenure issues. Among the lessons learned need to mention the sustainability of the project, the conflicting goals at community level, marketing and credits issues.

More emphasis is needed on:

- Native rangelands,
- crop diversification with high value crops linked with water harvesting techniques,
- Value added opportunities, especially for livestock products, and
- Income generation activities.

Dr Nasri ended his presentation by two comments. The first one is that without the support of IFAD and AFESD and especially Dr Abdelmajid Slama, Dr Ahmed Sidahmed, and Mr Samir Jarrad, this M&M phase will not have been possible; they believe in working in harsh environments and we are grateful to them. The second comment is on the huge information related to M&M on internet, which need to be reinforced.

3.2. Strengthening the community approach of the M&M project by Dr Richard Thomas

This contribution focused on comparing the M&M project approach and the CGIAR's INRM approach, and on what INRM can bring and on how to operationalize collaboration between M&M III and INRM?

The methodology used by INRM was then thoroughly developed with its 11 cornerstones with the content of each of them.

The INRM Framework is an approach that :

- integrates research of different types of natural resources
- into stakeholder-driven processes of adaptive management and innovation.
- in order to improve livelihoods, agro-ecosystem resilience, agricultural productivity and environmental services
- at community, ecoregional and global scales of intervention and impact.”

Integration is not

- Spatial scale of operation (e.g. catchment) without considering the linkages of different components.
- Several simultaneous activities, while keeping the sectoral approach intact (the “stapler approach”).
- Centralization of administration of varied activities in a given sector or zone.

These interpretations of “integration” are not affective and actually against the spirit of integration!

INRM principles: 3 principles

- i. What type of science to do where? or Integrating and balancing hard and soft sciences
- ii. Learning and adapting
- iii. Culture and organization of science: Conventional scientific setup and culture: Generally not favourable for achieving INRM. There is a need to change incentive systems within institutes, to seek leaders who can synthesize and focus, to establish new modes of organization, and to invest in scaling up.

The example of partnership cornerstone was then detailed. Elements of this cornerstone are:

- Assess need for partnership, then identify and assess potential partners
- Maximize synergies and complementarities with clear roles and balanced competencies
- Establish shared ownership and identify common values and principles
- Establish and maintain conditions and processes for decision-making and reaching agreements that are fair and equitable, and for monitoring the partnership

Lessons learned from INRM projects

- Training early on in the project cycle is more effective with inter-disciplinary groups
- Out-scaling of INRM approaches needs institutionalization of the INRM within NARSs
- More exchanges of experiences of INRM training strategies and tools among practitioners is required
- There is a need for joint training courses among CG centers on INRM approaches, using the guideline and the importance of energizing CG networking with NARSs to improve the latter's capacity for impact assessment and INRM approaches.

In conclusion:

- 11 operational cornerstones:
 - *As a frame to design new programmes*
 - *As a frame to monitor & evaluate on-going programmes in a strategic way*
 - *As a knowledge management tool*
 - *As a tool to create a common understanding and vision*
- A way to remind us of what we need to consider
- Complex – yes, but need to focus on the weak cornerstones

3.3. Developing sustainable livelihoods of Agropastoral communities of WANA: a framework for impact assessment by Dr Kamel Shideed

In his presentation, Dr Shideed discussed the issue of participatory impact assessment, the process, the methodology, impact indicators and difficulties in measuring them, impact pathway, ex post impact assessment of INRM, and the issue of valuation. The example of alley cropping technique based on atriplex/cactus was then discussed to illustrate the theory developed. Also, we need to keep in mind that indicators will be identified in a participatory manner during the CDP. Indeed, some indicators are at household level and other at community level, and some are qualitative and other are quantitative, and we need to merge them. Also, the evaluation of natural resources degradation's impact, which has no market value is quite difficult.

The Impact Assessment Process

Method

- Establish a set of impact indicators: a set of variables, conditions, and/or perceptions that both farmers and scientists expect to change with the adoption of a certain new technology or practice.
- Establish a baseline: to generate a baseline to which changes can be compared.
- Establish a monitoring system: systematic follow-up to collect information on the impact indicators.

- Carry out a final assessment: after a new technology or practice has been introduced and adopted an assessment should be done.

Impact Assessment Indicators

- Financial Capital: income, employment, and savings
- Physical Capital: assets, soil improvement structures, infrastructures
- Natural Capital: water, land, common pool resources
- Social Capital: migration, collective action, institutional strength, equity and gender
- Human Capital: health, education, skills

Difficulties in Measuring Indicators

- Some of the SRL indicators are measured at the household level and some at the village or community level
- Integrating quantitative and qualitative aspects is difficult as quantification is not possible in all cases
- Measurement of changes in some of the variables such as collective actions and gender is difficult as is attributing the changes to the NRM technology

Impact Pathway

Distinguish between outputs and outcomes:

- Activities are the work that generates outputs
- Outputs are the products of project activities
- Outcomes are the adoption, use or influence of those products

Ex Post Impact of NRM/INRM

- Ex post impact of NRM/INRM needs to examine:
 - Adoption rates, patterns and reasons
 - Economic analysis of more direct, tangible innovations
 - Impact on social, natural and human assets
 - Different indicators will need to be identified and measured for the different stakeholders and impacts
- Attribution will remain a problem
 - To find realistic, practical methods for the valuation of different types of goods and utilities of different stakeholders
 - Resource valuation
- Good data gathering and analytical skills are needed to analyze impacts

Impact Assessment of NRM/INRM

- It is more process oriented than IA of GP related innovations
- Essential elements of INRM research are:
 - Participation by different stakeholders
 - Consideration of impact at different scales and time frames

- Not only economic, but environmental, social, and institutional impacts must be considered in any holistic IA
- The rate of return to NRM research is significantly lower compared with other categories of research (Attribution and Valuation)

Main Approaches used for IA of NRM

- Econometric Approach: uses primal and dual functions. It includes biophysical indicators as variables/factors in the specified functions.
- Economic Surplus: economic surplus (=CS+PS) is taken as a measure of the gross benefits from research investment
- Bio-economic Models: link economic behavior models with biophysical data to evaluate potential effects of new technologies, policies, and market incentives on human welfare and the environment.
- Mixed Approaches

Impact Assessment of NR

- IA for NR management technologies must deal with these complexities and multi-dimensional changes.
- An important step in impact assessment of NRM/INRM is to develop methodologies/approaches for resource valuation (e.g., water, NRM technologies/practices)

What is Valuation?

- Valuation is an attempt to put a monetary value to a certain asset, which can be tangible or intangible.
- When a resource has a market, its value is reflected in its price.
- Not all resources have markets for trading. Therefore, a resource that has economic value may not have a price (e.g., Water).
- Valuation has to do with economic value

Valuation Technique of NR: Five general classes of valuation techniques

- Market-based techniques, which rely on historical information on market prices and transactions to determine resource values
- Non-market techniques that rely on indirect estimates of resource values
- Non-market techniques that are based on direct estimates of resource values
- Cross-cutting valuation techniques, which combine elements of one or more of these methods
- Ecological valuation techniques used in the emerging field of ecological economics

3.4. The participatory community approaches by Dr Ali Nefzaoui

Dr Ali Nefzaoui presented excellent and informative topics, e.g. the M&M approach was meant to reverse the past experience with participatory approach, which was not based on local demands, and often responded to the requirements of donors. Refinements of the participatory approach (PA) were a result of the development

paradigms emerging from the international conventions e.g. Our Common Future, The CCD, and Biodiversity Conservation. The overriding purpose of the PA and community development plan (CDP) approaches is to allow the communities to practice their rights in designing the development initiatives and in the decision making processes. The PA is framed in a way that the communities effectively contribute to the development planning process and to the CDPs in cash, kind and by accepting and adopting the development paradigm. The benefits include strengthened and self governing local institutions.

The Participatory Planning (PP) is a central instrument for CDPs and describes the territorial domains, the common needs etc. The approach needs patience and negotiation as it requires careful identification of objectives, diagnosis and analysis. The steps for PP include: learning phase such as participatory characterisation; planning and programming; identification and promotion of local organisations; implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The requirements for PP are: organisation, skill, group animation, official recognition and regulation of local organisations. The advantages are: democratization and awareness building mutual sharing and learning of local and modern knowledge, team work, moral and formal obligations, and empowerment of the local communities through ability to make decisions.

The strengths and weaknesses of the major player in CAs and CDPs were identified as follows:

The communities: Provide the know-how, reliable partnership and solidarity; but they need to overcome assistance mentality, and are constrained by need (the very poor and the hungry can not think in advance or for the future).

The policy makers: They enjoy authoritative presence and the capacity to raise funds; but they have tendencies to generalise, to take centralized decisions, and avoid dialogue with other actors.

The administrators and local professionals: They are the implementing agencies and enjoy technical experience, but they tend to make centralised decisions, are conservative, unwilling to participate or to allocate funds to human capacity building, and do not easily accept use of new innovations.

The donors: They enjoy the advantage of driving and participating in project design, and the wider experience. However the major weakness is the tendency to impose top down details and requirements during, formulation, implementation and backstopping.

NGOs: Always have the advantage of being close by and autonomous> however they are competitive and self serving.

Participatory M & E / Result Oriented Impact Assessment: Low attention was paid to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) at the conceptualization and design stages of MMI and MMII. The reason for lack of interest in M&E was generally due to concentration on having it as a management tool, on quantitative aspects as an auditing device etc. This undermined the value of M&E which should be a tool for measuring impact, and accordingly M&E indicators need to be developed in a participatory fashion with the communities. The indicators should be those of importance to communities rather than to project management.

3.5. Unleashing international public goods (IPGs) for impact on pro-poor growth: ICARDA's knowledge management model by Dr Ahmed Sidahmed

In his presentation Dr. Sidahmed discussed the benefits from capitalising on the new phase of M&M project to develop and implement *publishable research results of the project* (at the national level that include national scientists and graduate students) investigating approaches and methodologies for development of TIPOs and for dissemination of knowledge.

Discussion took place following these key note presentations and focused on (i) the need to produce condensed documents capitalizing on available information from M&M phase I and II; (ii) the need to conduct impact studies on natural resources and their difficulties of implementation.

4. Presentation and discussion of workplans

Following the presentations made by the 8 teams, the characteristics of the sites selected are summarized in table 1. The country presentations focusing mainly on sites selection are summarized as follow.

Aarsal (Lebanon)

Long discussion took place about Aarsal, site selected by Lebanese team. There is obviously some controversy about that site, and caution should be paid by the team, before starting the implementation of the project, and this for the following reasons:

- Aarsal is overworked, most of the projects have been implemented there, and we need to capitalize on what have been already done, this one of the most output of the project.
- Aarsal community has already a CDP, developed by M&M phase II and ICARDA agrobiodiversity project, what is the content of the existing CDP and what is the comparative advantage of doing another one.
- The GTZ is a livestock oriented project (sectorial) and does not follow into the definition that we are giving for a development project.
- M&M phase I and II was implemented in Aarsal and it is a positive factor, if the CDP developed will be funded.
- The workplan developed is mainly technology oriented.
- Several NGOs are working in Aarsal, especially cooperatives and their efficiency need to be seriously addressed within the framework of community institutional set up.
- If there is no choice to move to another community, the entry door will not be livestock, but rangeland. This issue needs to be investigated with LARI in order to help them to develop rangeland skills.

Jabal El Akhtar (Libya)

Jabal El Akhtar site is challenging and presents some advantages:

- There are two big projects, an university and a team from ARC.

- Institutional set up for rangeland management is the main research trust, and the Libyan team need to focus on that.
- There is a strong need to convince Shabias, which are more interested in long-term actions, and to involve population in order to guarantee sustainability.
- Plant cover enhancement is a national priority, but the main issue remains the right to graze because rangelands are not communal anymore in Lybia.

Oujda (Morocco)

This is considered as very good site, and for many reasons it is challenging:

- Rangeland is shrinking because of ploughing land for appropriation.
- INRA Oujda has done an excellent job in characterization, using agroecological tools.
- The IFAD funded development project is open minded and will fully collaborate with M&M.
- The issue will be how M&M with its participatory approaches and within the current policy in Morocco can improve the situation and sensitize the population in order to prohibit the cropping of the rangeland. We got to come up with a “prototype” allowing the empowerment of local population. The only problem is that people are scared to loose the land.
- A lot has been done and there is a need to capitalize on the available information. The real input of M&M will be the participatory approach, the institutional set up of rangeland, the drought mitigation.
- The area is in transition and can be compared to Sidi Bouzid or Kasserine in Tunisia and experience accumulated here should be used.

Sheikh Hlal (Syrian Badia)

The site chosen by Syrian team fits well with project objectives, indeed:

- The IFAD funded Badia project is interesting for some other North Africa countries where the ban on barley cropping put by Syrian Government might be followed by Algeria or Morocco to protect rangelands from degradation;
- The Badia project is built up on participatory approach, but M&M III may bring methodological support to have a better consideration for local population involvement;
- Nevertheless, the team is requested to avoid duplication and to make use of other projects currently implemented as the Swiss funded project on mechanical water harvesting where already a 300 households survey has been done and the Agha Khan project.

Ain Maabed and Bouiret Lahbeb (Djelfa, Algeria)

Herders of these sites are well known for their skills on sheep production. Attention should be paid to collective management of communal rangelands. There is also a need to harmonize methodologies, especially for baseline data and for CDPs development. The team has to be realistic and to scale down the number of activities, which should be generated by CDPs and not by top down procedure as it has been presented.

Hatra and Mahalabia (Iraq)

Hatra is the continuation of Mahalabia community and is the heart of the steppe area in Iraq. Mahalabia was covered by M&M II, which is an advantage.

Iel, Zaitooneh, El-Eas (Tafeleh, Ma'an area, Jordan)

- What is common with all countries is the community approach, and we need to speed up with the training on CA. We are shifting from CA to CDP, which is quite different matter. We are linking in partnership with development project.
- Also, we have to be selective, keeping in mind sustainability; it is not true for all countries. Don't wait to the end of the third year to start selling the results.
- We know what the development project ARMP development can do and it can't do. The problem is that M&M will be using a methodology and ARMP another one.
- The workplan is over ambitious and technology oriented and has to be revised according to results obtained from CDPs.
- The team is mainly from NCARTT, to what extent this very large team can be effectively released from NCARTT?
- In addition, there are some issues that still require development of some TIPOS, which is not the mandate of the development project.

Zorgane, Chénini (Tataouine, Tunisia)

The IFAD funded development project "PRODESUD" was built up with the full support of M&M II team. Thus the design is completely based on participatory and community approach. In addition, guidelines developed by M&M team and used by PRODESUD will be disseminated to other countries within sub-regional training framework. The communities selected fits well the M&M III objectives. Therefore, this case can be considered as an example to be reached by other countries.

Table 1: Main characteristics of M&M III target areas and communities

Country	Project area	Total surface	Area characteristics			Development projects	Main constraints
			Agroecology	Population	Production systems		
Libya	Eastern region, back of Jabal Akhdar Taknis and Mrawa from the North, Kharouba and Therwa from the South	90,000 ha	100-250 mm/y), erratic with drought periods, Scarce water resources	600 HH, agropastoralists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agropastoral production system - Rangelands are highly degraded, subjected to desertification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected Pasture Project, - National Committee for Combating Desertification, - South of Jabal Akhdar Grazing Project, - Development of Vegetation Cover in Jabal Akhdar, - Mapping of Natural Resources for Agriculture Use and Planning, - National Program for Plant Cover Development. 	
Morocco	Oujda, Oriental Zone : Taourirt (Gteter-Tancherfi Mestegmer ORMVAM + - DPA-Oujda)	71539 ha, 71 % communal; Rangeland (93165) Irrigate crops / plantations (7082 ha)	Low rainfall, high variability (average 290 mm); Water deficit over year	5900 inhabitants	Agropastoral, 124000 heads of small ruminants, large feed deficit (65 %)	Rural Development Project of Taourirt-Taforalt (USD 49.4 million, duration : 8 years (1998 – 2006 + 2 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rangeland decrease and deterioration of the pastoral base; - Threat of drought and desertification; - Irrational use of water; - Problems of local organization;
Jordan	Tafeleh - Ma'an area (Iel, Zaitoonah, El-Eas)	Iel: 550 km ² total area. 400 ha under irrigation, 3100 ha rain fed and 6000 ha rangeland Zatooneh: El-Eas: 8600 ha rangeland	200 mm (Iel)- 250 mm (Zaitounah, Eas)	Iel: around 970 HH 3 tribes settled in this community (Nuaimat, Huwaitat and Bani Laith) Zeitounah: 50 HH; Al-suade tribe El-Eas: 470 HH	rangeland-livestock dominant production system Iel: 28000 sheep, 5000 goats. Zeitounah: 12000 sheep & goats, El-Eas:27000 heep & goats	development project (ARMP2) is recently started and has around 8 years duration (2005-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low crop and small ruminants' productivity, - Limited marketing channels. - High level of poverty. - Degraded rangeland. - Lack of investment projects. - Limited role for women in agricultural activity.

Developing Sustainable Livelihoods of Agropastoral Communities of WANA (M&M III)
Minutes of 1st Regional research Coordination and Planning Meeting. Tunisia, 19-20 December 2005

Iraq		Mahalabia, Hatra	230 mm at Mahalabia, 150 mm rainfall at Hatra Access to water (wells)	Semi sedentary at Halabia, transhumant at Hatra	Barley-based system at Mahalabia, rangeland-based system at Hatra	SI Project extension system at Mahalabia and Extension system at Hatra	Frequent drought
Algeria	Djelfa (3.1 million ha rangeland, 0.97 million inhabitants, 4.5 million sheep)	Bouiret Lahbab (38000 ha mainly rangeland), Ain Maabed (12000 ha	Bouiret Lahbed: Ground water potential Ain Maabed: dense irrigation network	Bouiret Lahbeb (3 communities, 9700 people) Ain Maabed (1 community, 1300 HH	Bouiret Lahbeb (livestock-based production system (22000 sheep); collective rangelands) Ain Maabed (sheep-based system, 60000 heads, private land use)	05 integrated projects for rural development and fight against desertification within the national program of agricultural and rural development (PNDAR): Rangelands management, Water harvesting and groundwater mobilization, Forrage production, Improvement of basic needs, Farm modernization)	Bouiret Lahbeb and Ain Maabed: drought, rangelands degradation, high unemployment, poverty.
Lebanon	Aarsal (750 km ² , 100,000 people)	Jord	Elevation: 500-1400 m; Ra'ayan river	1500 HH, livestock main income source Large number of NGOs (Aarsal Rural Development Association, Guidance Association, Herders Cooperative, Food Processing Cooperative, Public Agriculture Cooperative)	Crops (fruit trees, barley, wheat chickpea; 40 % of land is range); 75000 sheep & 49000 goats	GTZ Project	- Lack of extension services, Expensive veterinary services, Monopoly of milk collecting and market, access to credits, Poor infrastructure, land tenure & property rights.

Syria	Hamma Governorate	Sheikh Helal Community	150-200 mm rainfall; poor soils, medium slopes	300 HH (8-10/HH) living in Government owned 30000 ha land, in clay made huts, 40 % of population government employees	38000 sheep	IFAD funded Syrian Badia Development Project (Restoring the productivity capacity of the Badia resources over 3 millions of hectares using participatory approach with beneficiaries)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High rate of unemployment and immigration, - Degradation of rangeland, - Low prices of animal products , - Wide spread of SR diseases , - High prices of concentrates and medicines
Tunisia	Extreme South-East of Tunisia (Total area : 3,9 millions de Km ² , Population: 144,000 people, 6675 farmers, 9 %)	Zorgane (68120 ha) Chénini (38000 ha)	Lower arid to Saharian (80-175 mm rainfall, frequent droughts)	Zorgane (3590 people) Chénini (820 inhabitants)	Zorgane : Steppic pastoral system (32000 heads SR) Chénini: Moutain agropastoral system (5700 heads SR)	IFAD funded Project Program of agropastoral development and promotion of local initiatives at South East Tunisia « PRODESUD » (2003-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate and relief : - Mobilization of water resources : run-off water, salinization, groundwater) - Rangeland development (Transhumance, Management of watering points, Supplementation, Limited experience of rural institutions in rangeland management, Encroachment of trees on marginal lands (regulation), Inadequate cropping technique, Local genetic resources not valorized)

Collaboration with CIRAD

Dr. Emmanuel Tillard, Livestock scientists and epidemiologist from CIRAT-EMVT, France was invited to attend the meeting as a representative of CIRDA. During M&M phase II a successful collaboration was achieved with CIRAD through Dr Véronique Alary. During the current phase, ICARDA is willing to keep up this collaboration. Moreover, Dr. Céline Dutilly from CIRAD/ICARDA will join M&M III activities.

Starting by thanking ICARDA for inviting him, Dr Tillard developed the following statements.

- i. CIRAD is not familiar with working at community level or with participatory approach and community development plans, therefore I learned a lot during these two days.
- ii. Three potential areas of collaboration between ICARDA and CIRAD can be highlighted.
 - Reproduction in sheep and goat where the comparison of performances across countries may lead to a better understanding of economic impact.
 - Dynamic of dry zones pastoral system using the CIRAD Pole located in Senegal.
 - Economic impact assessment using dynamic models. These models simulate at the flock level different scenario, as it has been done by Veronique. Now it is better to develop new approach using multi-agent tool, it will be particularly interesting.

1st Regional Research Coordination and Planning Meeting



Hotel Mélia Mouradi, Gammarth, Tunis
 December 19-20, 2005



Draft Agenda

Monday, December 19, 2005		
8.30-9.30	Opening: IRESA, ICARDA statements	
9.30-10.00	Presentation of the Project	<i>Dr. Mohammed El Mourid</i>
10.00-10.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
10.30-13.00	Key thematic papers	
10.30-11.00	M&M I and II Main achievements and lessons learned	<i>Dr. Nasri Haddad</i>
11.00-11.30	Integrated Natural Resources Management toward halting land degradation in the rangelands	<i>Dr. Richard Thomas</i>
11.30-12.00	Impact assessment for natural resources	<i>Dr. Kamel Shideed</i>
12.00-12.30	Participatory approach applied to agropastoral systems	<i>Dr. Ali Nefzaoui</i>
12.30-13.00	Knowledge development and dissemination	<i>Dr. Ahmed Sidahmed</i>
13.00-13.30	Discussion	
13.30-15.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
15.00-18.30	Country presentation : Plan of work	
15.00-16.00	Algeria	<i>Mr. Farid Herda</i>
16.00-16.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16.30-17.30	Iraq	<i>Dr. Salah Bader</i>
17.30-18.30	Jordan	<i>Dr. Amer Al-Nsour</i>

Tuesday, December 20, 2005		
8.30-13.00	Country presentation of plan of work (ctd. 1)	
8.30-9.30	Lebanon	<i>Dr. Khaled Houchayme</i>
9.30-10.30	Libya	<i>Mr. Adnan Sbeita</i>
10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11.00-12.00	Morocco	<i>Mr. Abdelmajid Bechchari</i>
12.00-13.00	Syria	<i>Dr. Mohamed Mouafak</i>
13.00-14.30	<i>Lunch</i>	

Developing Sustainable Livelihoods of Agropastoral Communities of WANA (M&M III)

Minutes of 1st Regional research Coordination and Planning Meeting, Tunisia, 19-20 December 2005

14.30-15.30	Tunisia	<i>Dr. Ali Nefzaoui</i>
15.30-16.30	Regional activities	<i>Dr. Mohammed El Mourid</i>
16.30-17.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
17.00-18.00	Regional activities (ctd.)	<i>Dr. Mohammed El Mourid</i>

List of participants

1st RRCP meeting M&M III

Hôtel Mélia Mouradi Gammarth, December 19-20, 2005

Country	Name	Function	Address
Iraq	Dr. Saleh M. Bader	Director General of State Board for Agricultural Research	Baghdad, Abu Graib, P.o Box 21025 Phone : ++ 964 1 511 22 00/511 0465/51118 96 Mobile: ++ 964 790 191 66 96 Email: drsbader@yahoo.com
Jordan	Dr.Amer Al-Nsour	Director of the Socio-Economic Studies Program (NCARTT)	NCARTT P.O.Box 639 Baqa 19381 Jordan Tel: (+ 962) 64725411/ 6672 Fax: (+ 962) 6 5356495 Mobile: (+ 962) 777226163 Email: amer1jo@yahoo.com
	Mr. Faisal Salem Al Barakeh	Director of the Livestock and rangeland research program.	NCARTT. P.O.Box 639 Baqa 19381 Jordan Tel: (+ 962) 64725411/ 071 Fax: (+ 962) 6 4726099 Mobile: (+ 962) 777745506 Email: Faisal_barakeh@yahoo.com
	Ms. Malak Hattar	Extension officer and Manager Assistance of Agricultural Resource Management project ARMPII	ARMPII P.O. Box 29 Rabba - Jordan Tel (+962) 32322813 Fax (+962) 32322875 Mobile(+962) 795216087 Email: malak_Hattar@yahoo.com
Lebanon	Dr. Khaled Houchayme	Director of the Torbel Station for Animal Production Research Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute	Tal Amara – Riak ; P.O. Box Zahla ,278 Lebanon Phone : ++ 961 8955296/7/8 Home :+961 8511591 Fax : ++ 961 8955128 Mobile:+96170955448 Email: khouchaymi@hotmail.com
	Mr. Hassan Astitie	Consultant for the GTZ small ruminant projects in Semi Arid Areas. Small ruminant producers in Semi Arid Areas in Lebanon	P.O.Box Ben Suhail Sahet Al – Ghoubiery-Beirut Lebanon. Phone : ++ 961 3614159 / 3497385 Email C/O : khouchaymi@hotmail.com
	Mr. Rabih Adel Kabalan	Assistant Researcher plant Breeding departs. Lebanese Agricultural Research Institute (LARI)	P.O.Box 287 Zahle (LARI) Tel- Amara – Rayak Lebanon. Tel:++ 961 3344077 Email: rkabalan@lari.gov.lb
Syria	Mr. Mouafak Mohamed	Assistant Director, Socio economic Studies Management	General Commission for Scientific Agricultural Research Douma, Damascus, Syria Tel: + 963- 11- 5743037/8 Fax: +963-11-5757992 Mobile: +963-98-640881 Email: mouafakm@mail.sy mouafakm@maktoob.com
	Mr. Ayman Daba	Head Department Animal Breeding Research	General Commission for Scientific Agricultural Research Douma, Damascus, Syria Tel: ++963 11644521 Fax:++963 11 644520 Mobile: ++96393533244 Email: aimandaba@hotmail.com

	Mr. Haitham Hajali	Chief of Extension & media section Badia development Project in Syria	Damascus Syria Ministry of Agricultural Badia Development Project Tel: ++2211968 / 2212876 Home: ++2213671 Fax: ++5616168
Algeria	Mr. Herda Farid	Scientist at INRAA Bioclimatology Laboratory	INRAA. 2 Av, des Frères OUDEK. BP N° 200 Hassen-Badi – 16200 – El Herrach. Alger Algérie Tel: (+213) 21 82 37 34 Fax: (+213) 21 82 37 33 Mobile: + 213 76 04 96 56 Email: f_herda@yahoo.fr
	Mr. Mohamed Kanoun	Scientist, Unit Research in pastoralism Djelfa, INRAA, Algeria	Unit of Research of Pastoralism B.P 300, Djelfa Algeria Phone/Fax : ++213 27 87 01 63 Mobile: ++ 213 72 18 91 98 Email: a_kanoun@yahoo.fr
	Mr. Lakhdar Brouri	Ing. Chef de Service on H.C.D.S Djelfa, Chargé du Service du programme de Lutte contre la Désertification;	HCDS, BP 381 Djelfa 17000 Algérie Phone/fax : ++ 213 27 87 53 04 Email : lakhbrouri@yahoo.fr
Libya	Mr. Adnan Sbeita	Agronomist ARC	ARC, Agricultural Research Center –Tripoli B.O Box 2480 – Tripoli Libya Phone : ++ 218 21 3616 866 Mobile : ++218 925589006 Fax : ++ 218 21 36 14 993 Email : adnansbeita@lycos.com
	Mr. Slimane Rahil	Director of South Jabel project.	Tel: 0021867824807 Mobile: 0912114380 – 0925490966 Fax: 0021867625566 Email: sulimanRheel@yahoo.com
Morocco	Mr. Bechchari Abdelmajid	Unit Research : Sustainable Management of pastoral resources. Coordinator Oujda center INRA - Morocco	INRA Oujda B.P. 428/ 60000 Oujda Phone: ++ 212 56 50 02 10 Mobile: ++ 212 67 24 10 34 Fax: ++ 212 56 50 02 11 Email: bechchari@yahoo.com bechari@inra.org.ma
	Mr. Noureddine Bounouh	Ingénieur Zootechnicien Membre de l'unité de gestion du PDRTT (UGP), chargé de la composante agro-pastorale	ORMVA de la Moulouya Berkna Service de L'élevage Tel : ++212566125-32 Mobile : ++21261647433 Fax: ++21256612928 Email : nbounouh@yahoo.fr
	Mr. Jamal Mimoun	Dr. Es Science Agro-climatology; Scientist at INRA	INRA Oujda, BP 428/6000 Ojda Mobile : ++ 212 727 39 641 Email: mimouni@awamia.inra.org.ma jmimouni@yahoo.com
Tunisia	Dr. Ali Nefzaoui	Director of Research, Head of Animal Production and Forage Laboratory. FAO-CACTUSNET General Coordinator	INRA Tunisia, Rue Hédi Karray, 2049 Ariana Tunisia Mobile :++ 216 22 347 149, Fax: ++ 216 71 231 592 Email: nefzaoui.ali@iresa.agrinet.tn
	Mr. Ali Bouaïcha	Coordinator of PRODESUD Project	Phone: ++ 216 75 870 401 Mobile : ++ 216 98 941 120

Developing Sustainable Livelihoods of Agropastoral Communities of WANA (M&M III)

Minutes of 1st Regional research Coordination and Planning Meeting, Tunisia, 19-20 December 2005

		CRDA Tataouine, Tunisia	Email: alibouaichaa@yahoo.fr
	Mrs. Sonia Bedhraf Romdhani	Animal Breeding researcher INRAT	Phone : ++ 216 71 230 024 Mobile : ++ 216 22531 662 Email : romdhani.sonia@iresa.agrinet.tn
IFAD	Dr. Abdelmajid Slama	Consultant for IFAD	Via Calcutta 21 Rome 00144, Italy Phone: ++ 0039 06 52 96 278 Mobile: ++ 00 39 320 851 95 47 Email: magid.slama@fastwebnet.it
CIRAD-EMVT	Dr. Emmanuel Tillard	Researcher in Zootechnics and epidemiology CIRAD-emvt	UMR ERRc-ENSAM 2, place Pierre Viala, 34060 Montpellier, Cedex1 Phone : ++ 0033 (0)499612265 Email : tillard@cirad.fr
University of Jordan	Dr. Nasri Haddad	Faculty of Agriculture University of Jordan Plant breeding and Plant Genetic Resources	Faculty of Agriculture, university of Jordan, Amman, Jordan Email: nasrih@nets.com.jo Phone: 0096265153772 Mobile : 00962111480895
ICARDA	Dr. Ahmed Sidahmed	Director: Knowledge Management and Dissemination	International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA) P O Box 5466 Tel Hadya Aleppo, Syria Phone: + 963 21 2213433 – extension 431 (Assistant 429) Fax: +963 21 2213490 (official) Cell: +39 3336345362 (personal); +963 95245777 (Official) email: a.sidahmed@cgiar.org
	Dr. Richard Thomas	Director MEGA Project 3	ICARDA, P.O Box 5466 Aleppo, Syria Email: r.thomas@cgiar.org
	Dr. Ahmed Amri	Regional Coordinator West Asia Regional Program	International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA). P.O Box 111xTehran, 19535 Iran Phone: ++ 98 21 22 4000 94 Fax: ++ 98 21 22 4018 55 email: a.amri@cgiar.org
	Dr. Kamel Shideed	Director ICARDA MEGA Project on Poverty Livelihood Analysis and Impact Assessment	ICARDA, P.O Box 5466 Aleppo, Syria Phone: ++963 21 22 13 433 Email: kshideed@cgiar.org
	Dr. Mohammed El Mourid	Regional Coordinator NARP	ICARDA – Tunis North Africa Regional Program, n° 1 rue des Oliviers - El Menzah V - 2037 Tunis – Tunisia. Post Office Box : 435 El Menzah 1- 1004 Tunis – Tunisia. Phone : ++ 216 71 752 134/099 Fax : ++ 216 71 753 170 GSM : ++ 216 98 464 104 Email : secretariat@icarda.org.tn m.elmourid@cgiar.org