RECONCILE

PASTORALIST LOBBY AND ADVOCACY IN EASTERN AFRICA

A REVIEW OF THE PASTORALIST LOBBY AND ADVOCACY CONTEXT

By
Elizabeth Kharono

Nakuru, October 2011

Table of Contents

Acronyms

AU	African Union
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COPACSO	Coalition of Pastoral Civil Society Organizations
CORDS	Community Research and Development Services
EAC	East African Community
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
HoAPN	Horn of Africa Pastoralists Network
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
KLA	Kenya Land Alliance
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty
PASDEP	Plan for Accelerated Development to End Poverty
PDNK	Pastoralist Development Network of Kenya
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PFE	Pastoralists Forum Ethiopia
PFFSPA	Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas
PINGOs	Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Governmental Organizations
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RECONCILE	Resource Conflict Institute
REGLAP	Regional Learning and Advocacy Programme for Vulnerable Dryland Communities
TALA	Tanzania Land Alliance
UCRT	Ujamaa Community Resources Trust
ULA	Uganda Land Alliance

1. Introduction

This report presents the outcome of a review of the pastoralist lobby and advocacy context in Eastern Africa which was undertaken on behalf of RECONCILE to inform the consultative process it is facilitating on how to further improve the organisation and capacity of pastoralists and civil society to influence policy processes at local, national, regional and global levels on an on-going basis. The outcome of this review highlights the need to strengthen on-going pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts due to the fast-changing policy context and increased pressure on pastoralist land and resources in the region. This need provides a justification for setting up a lobby and advocacy facility the nature and make-up of which civil society organisations and other stakeholders involved in pastoral development will need to determine.

This report is divided into four parts. Following this introduction, the second section of the report discusses selected national and regional policy and legal frameworks and the opportunities and challenges they present for the development of pastoralist communities and pastoralism as a production system. The third section presents an overview of civil society lobby and advocacy initiatives, the strategies use highlighting some of the challenges they face. This next part of the report presents feedback on the proposal to set up a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility for Eastern Africa starting with the justification by its proponents. The report ends with a conclusions section.

1.1. Terms of reference and approach to work

The review was done to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. Identify and analyse policies and laws which have a bearing on pastoralist development in terms of the opportunities and challenges they offer for pastoralist lobby and advocacy to provide a rationale and justification for setting up a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility in Eastern Africa

2. Identify and analyse on-going pastoralist lobby and advocacy initiatives in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Ethiopia, highlighting who the key actors are, their level of effectiveness and impact and how they interact,

3. Determine whether there is a shared need, justification and rationale for setting up a pastoralist lobby and advocacy framework, and what form such a facility should take.

The review was undertaken over a period of 20 days and it involved assessment of national and regional legal and policy frameworks, identifying and examining on-going pastoralist civil society lobby and advocacy initiatives which also included a review of a wide range of materials generated by these organisations. Field visits were undertaken to Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Kenya during which discussions were held with key stakeholders in each of the countries and insights about the specific national context and the opportunities and challenges for advocacy efforts to support pastoralism were gleaned.

1.2. Limitations of this review

The terms of reference for this review were far more ambitious than what could be realistically covered in the time available. Inevitably, therefore, a number of trade-offs had to be made. Even though efforts were made to document the many useful initiatives which exemplify good practice and lessons learned, this proved impractical and unrealistic given the time available. The review of policies and legal frameworks which have a bearing on pastoralist development, also had to be toned down to few national and regional policies and legal frameworks given the wide range of such frameworks at the respective national level and also regional and even global level. In this regard, only a few national and regional policy frameworks which have recently come into effect and which should be currently guiding policy action have been reviewed.

2. Pastoral development in Eastern Africa – policy context

The national policy context in Eastern Africa is constantly changing in response to global, regional and national realities and imperatives. These various changes present both opportunities and challenges for pastoralist development, generally, and pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts, specifically. Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda concluded one 5-year cycle of their poverty reduction strategy papers[1] and started another 5-year cycle for the period 2010/11 – 2014/15. Kenya, on the other hand, is implementing the first 5-year medium-term rolling plan under its *Vision 2030* which covers the period 2008-2012. These new over-arching policy frameworks[2] provide the strategic direction for each country to achieve its medium term development objectives.

The policy frameworks give a good indication of the extent to which policy makers in Eastern Africa have come to appreciate pastoralism, the unique development challenges

---

[1] Ethiopia: *Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to end Poverty (2005/6 – 2009/10),* Tanzania: *MKUKUTA I (2005/6 – 2009/10),* and Uganda: *Poverty Eradication Action Plan (2004/5 – 2007/8)*
[2] Ethiopia: the *Growth and Transformation Plan,* Tanzania: *MKUKUTA II,* and Uganda: the *National Development Plan;*

which pastoralist communities face, and the priority it is accorded in the overall policy framework. Recent developments in Kenya have had a significant impact on that country's legal and policy context. More than any other country in the region, Kenya's new legal and policy frameworks[3] provide the most positive considerations for pastoralist development and a good example of how countries in Eastern Africa can overcome change the current perception of providing the least supportive policy environment for pastoralist development compared to other regions in Africa.

Previous reviews of policy and legal trends and the support they provide for the development of pastoralism and pastoralist communities in the countries of Eastern Africa[4] have indicated that, even though governments in the region are beginning to accord recognition to pastoralism, translating policy commitments into practical interventions to support and promote pastoralism and pastoralist livelihoods has proved elusive. This review has found that, while these observations remain largely true for some countries – in particular Tanzania and Uganda – the policy situation for Kenya has dramatically changed and that of Ethiopia has also shown marked improvements in recognising and seeking to address pastoralist development as an integral dimension of overall national development.

This review assesses the various national policy legal frameworks mentioned above to determine the extent to which these challenges persist. Given the fact that the overarching policy frameworks will be guiding policy action for the next couple of years, this review examines what opportunities exist within them for increased lobby and advocacy in support of pastoralist development.

2.1. Pastoral development in the context of national development policy frameworks

Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) have been over-arching policy frameworks for countries in Eastern Africa since the eve of the 21st century. They evolved out of the global consensus building processes which resolved to address global poverty and hunger, and have, since 2000, been the main national level policy frameworks for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). As such, therefore, national policy frameworks aimed at

---

[3] Pastoralist development is well articulated in, for instance, Kenya's *Vision 2030,* its *Vision 2030 Development Strategy for Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands,* its new *Constitution,* its *National Policy for development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands* and its *National Land Policy*

[4] See for instance: Omondi & Odhiambo: *Pastoralism, policies and practice in the Horn and East Africa,* REGLAP, (2009); Marilse Turnbull: *REGLAP Policy Baseline,* REGLAP, (2010)

reducing poverty and hunger, specifically, and achieving the MDGs, broadly, have been important accountability mechanisms for assessing the extent to which governments have kept their commitments to promote wellbeing for the most vulnerable populations in their respective countries.

The requirement that governments ensure that their policy frameworks are developed through participatory processes which involve a wide spectrum of national level stakeholders opened up spaces for civil society and citizens groups to influence policy making processes. Greater participation by civil society organisations made it possible for the poverty eradication strategies to include issues such as pastoralism which had previously been marginalised. Kenya's new policy orientation towards pastoralist development has largely been attributed to this opening up of space in policy making processes to allow for greater participation of citizens groups and civil society perspectives.

The following section looks at the over-arching development policy frameworks for Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda from the point of view of the opportunities and challenges which they offer for pastoralist development.

2.1.1 Opportunities in the overarching policy frameworks

a) Long term development planning

All the countries in Eastern African are now pursuing long term development goals and are committed to transforming their economies and improving the livelihoods of their populations. Accordingly Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda each has a 20 – 30 year vision within which they expect to turn their predominantly peasant national economies into medium income countries. The long term vision is pursued by the respective countries through 5-year over-arching policy frameworks which provide strategic direction and guide annual plans, priorities and budgetary allocations. Kenya's five year medium-term rolling plans have been designed to coincide with the electoral calendar making it possible for the performance of whichever government is in power to be gauged on the basis of the medium term benchmarks of *Vision 2030*.

Long-term development planning policy frameworks are important to pastoral development because they provide a coherent and sustained context within which meaningful investments can be made to address the development needs which pastoralists in all the countries of the region face largely as a result of policy neglect. Opportunity exists within the overarching

frameworks, therefore, to ensure that resources are directed at enhancing long-term and sustainable development in pastoral areas.

b) Agriculture and rural development prioritised

All the three over-arching policy frameworks prioritise agriculture and rural development to enable them to simultaneously reduce poverty and hunger through increased agricultural productivity. This "re-discovery" of the importance of agriculture and rural development and the choice to invest more in these sectors has come as a result of the recent global crises which compelled African governments to design their regional strategies for agriculture-led development to ensure that they enhance economic growth while at the same time ensuring that there is food security in their countries. The advantage of governments re-focusing on investing into agriculture and rural development is that opportunities now exist for policy attention to be focused on addressing the challenges which the majority of the population in these countries, including pastoralist communities, who live in the rural areas, face. Increased investment into agriculture has also been recognised to be the most effective way to reduce poverty.

c) Focus on poverty eradication and enhancing food security

Each country framework indicates that eradicating poverty and enhancing food security are their over-riding policy objectives. This is an objective carried over from previous poverty reduction strategy papers. The fact that each country indicates that they registered a decrease in the levels of poverty and positive economic growth means that issues of poverty and vulnerability amongst pastoralist communities in the respective countries can and need to be kept on the policy agenda. The critical importance of monitoring and providing evidence on the progress being made in operationalizing such provisions needs to be kept in mind.

d) Evidence of increased investments in social sectors and service delivery

The benefits which each country registered as a result of implementing pro-poor policies are also acknowledged by the three policy frameworks. For instance, Tanzania indicates that the country achieved more in terms of provision of public secondary schools in the 5-year period of its National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP 1[5]) than it had done in 34 years of its independence[6]. Ethiopia also reports having achieved high economic growth implementing the Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to end Poverty

---

[5] Popularly known by its Swahili acronym MKUKUTA
[6] United Republic of Tanzania, NSGRP *II*, p. 11

(PASDEP)[7] prior to its current Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP). It also reports having registered above-average performance in the economic and social sectors. For instance it achieved 63% in provision of veterinary clinics and animal health services (2,275) against a set target of 3,600 and surpassed its set target of 3,000 of trainees in delivery of basic veterinary services achieving 4,144 (138%)[8].

The above positive aspects of the national development policy frameworks and the opportunities they provide can, and need to be exploited to realise concrete gains for pastoralist communities in the respective countries. In cases where governments admit having registered success in implementing their strategies, they need to be directly engaged to scale up the successes for more wide-spread and sustained impacts especially amongst pastoralist communities. Prioritisation of agriculture and rural development, and the continued focus on poverty and hunger reduction can be utilised to focus attention on pastoralist regions which tend to be in remote areas, and on livestock based rural development given the fact that for pastoral communities, livestock are the key assets for both livelihoods security and development.

2.1.2. Challenges in the over-arching policy frameworks

The above opportunities notwithstanding, many challenges will have to be addressed if the respective national policy frameworks are to work for pastoralist communities in concrete ways.

a) Lack of specific mention of pastoralist development needs

Some policy frameworks do not pay specific attention to pastoralism, choosing instead to address what might be concerns for pastoralist livelihoods indirectly and within other policy categories such as water development and construction of water dams, irrigation and food security, or livestock management and marketing of animal products. This implicit rather than explicit reference to pastoralism via the products it generates and the services required to make it work is most evident in Uganda's *National Development Plan* and Tanzania's *NSGRP II*. Indeed, the two countries depict the least appreciation and even hostility to pastoralism as a production system. Their approaches seem to be based on the assumption that strategies intended for non-pastoralist communities will apply in pastoralist areas.

---

[7] *Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to end Poverty (PASDEP)*
[8] Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, *GTP, 9.*

This "invisibility" of pastoralism means that its benefits to the economies of the respective countries can continue to be exploited without the obligation to invest into it to address the constraints faced by pastoralist producers. The challenge which pastoralist lobby and advocacy must, therefore, face is to ensure that pastoralists' contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the respective development plans is quantified and made visible and that the specific constraints to pastoralism as a production and livelihood system are addressed.

b) Pastoralist mobility as a challenge

With the exception of Kenya, and to a limited extent Ethiopia, there is a persistent perception of pastoral mobility as a challenge which must be contained. Implicit in the priorities which are likely to benefit pastoralists is the desire to regulate pastoralist mobility in order to permit other land use purposes in regions where pastoralism is practiced. It is evident that the policy thrusts in each case is not to design enabling policy responses to allow mobility, which is so central to the practice of pastoralism, but rather to limit it so that other land users can have access to land.

This presents several challenges to development in pastoral areas. First, it is evident from the desire to restrict pastoralist mobility that the policies have not fully grasped the logic behind mobility which is an essential part of pastoralist production, and understood that it is an integral coping strategy for the dry-land regions inhabited by pastoralists. The second challenge is the continued disregard of the communal land rights of pastoralist communities and the right for them not to be dispossessed of their land without consultation or adequate compensation.

Some governments in the region continue to view pastoralists' land as unutilized or underutilized and to target them for alienation to support other land uses including crop farming for small holder farmers, as is evident in Tanzania and Uganda, or large-scale commercial agriculture, as is proposed by Ethiopia and Tanzania in their *Growth and Transformation Plan* and *NSGRP II*, respectively.

c) The pastoralist reality in agriculture and rural development

Even though prioritisation of agriculture and rural development has been noted above as presenting an opportunity for enhancing pastoralist development, the challenge which has to be addressed is the policy bias towards settled agriculture implicit in the policy frameworks. This bias is evident in the areas which countries indicate will be highlighted for public

investment in order to increase agricultural productivity. Both Tanzania and Ethiopia indicate their desire to promote large scale agriculture, which, in the case of Ethiopia, will include establishing large scale farms to grow crops for bio-fuels. Ethiopia's GTP also indicates that, in a bid to increase agricultural productivity and food security, emphasis will be placed on production of "high value crops" and bringing most farmers to the high performance levels of "model farmer".

Tanzania's *Kilimo Kwanza*[9] strategy, launched in 2009 as a private-sector driven public-private partnership for achieving increased agricultural productivity, focuses on crop farming. Preference for large-scale farming for export and the high appetite exhibited by governments to encourage foreign investment and the penetration of external markets into rural areas, even though it might present opportunities for increased investments which benefit pastoralist development, also present threats as they might, in fact, witness more aggressive appropriation of land in rural areas, particularly of land for pastoralist communities.

2.2. Land Policies and Laws – challenges and opportunities for pastoral development

None of the countries covered in this review have specific laws and policies which address pastoralist tenure security. Pastoralist land rights issues, if at all addressed are covered under broad legal and policy frameworks. Uganda, Ethiopia and now Kenya, either recognise communal land rights or explicitly recognise the land rights of pastoral communities in their constitutions. Land Acts and Land Policies have also in some cases made specific mention of pastoralists and their land rights. This section discusses some of the challenges which pastoralists face in spite of acknowledgement of pastoralism and the rights of pastoralists in these legal and policy documents.

a) *Failure to address pastoralist tenure security and rights*

Lack of explicit protection and safeguards for the land rights of pastoralist communities presents one of the greatest challenges to the practice of pastoralism. The communal land rights on the basis of which pastoralists assert their claims on land are insufficiently developed and are no match when pitted against the more formal statutory claims over land. The fact that communal law is not sufficiently developed has made it relatively easy for governments to alienate pastoral lands for other land use purposes, including activities which are incompatible with the practice of pastoralism.

---

[9] Literally means "Agriculture First" and defines agriculture in its broadest term to include animal husbandry.

In their bid to serve what they perceive to be national development interests, governments are playing a central role in appropriating pastoralists' land ostensibly to encourage local and foreign investments. Pastoralist throughout Eastern Africa are experiencing this ever-increasing pressure as the areas they occupy are targeted because, compared to areas occupied by farming communities, land is seen as being available and under-utilised. Given this vested interest in pastoral land, it is no wonder that policy pronouncements on the land rights of pastoralists tend to either be detrimental to the practice of pastoralism, or where they are positive they remain on paper and are not translated into practice.

Uganda's *National Land Policy*, which has been recently published, while recognising the land rights of pastoralists and guaranteeing government protection for these rights, states that such rights will only be guaranteed as long as they are not exercised at the expense of non-pastoralist communities[10]. Constitutional provisions for the land rights of communities or pastoralists, such as are provided for in the Ugandan and Ethiopian constitutions, are not accompanied by specific legislation to operationalize them. When conflicts between pastoralists and other land users, occur, legislation tends to work in favour of those other land uses (Fiona Flintan, et al, 2011).

Lack of effective legal frameworks to protect the land rights of pastoralist communities presents a major challenge to pastoralist development and survival. These challenges are already becoming evident in some of the countries in the region where pastoralist groups, and civil society organisations acting on behalf of pastoralist communities, are struggling against many odds trying to defend those rights. Countries which are promoting large-scale commercial farming, irrigation and dam projects, and which have openly declared the desire to facilitate the penetration of markets in rural areas, are likely to present the greatest challenge because they target areas occupied by pastoralists where land is not only seen to be available and abundant, but also under-utilised.

b) Kenya – a ray of hope for pastoralism in Eastern Africa?

Recent developments in Kenya confirm the fact that challenges facing pastoralism and the development of pastoralist communities will not simply fade away, and that countries in Eastern Africa will, sooner or later, have to address them either in response to the deepening welfare needs of pastoralists who become destitute because of "falling off the cliff" or having

---

[10] Republic of Uganda, Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development: *The Uganda National Land Policy,* p. 26

to redress the imbalances created as a result of policy neglect and insufficient investment in pastoral regions. Kenya's new legal and policy framework depict a complete reversal of its close-to-fifty year development focus which was not only particularly hostile to the development of pastoralism but also resulted in policy neglect of arid and semi-arid regions in favour of better-endowed parts of the country[11].

Kenya's *Vision 2030* is the country's long-term development blueprint aimed at creating a cohesive, equitable and just society and at turning Kenya into a *"globally competitive and prosperous country with a high quality of life by 2030[12]."* *Vision 2030* is anchored on three Pillars – Economic, Social and Political. Under the Economic Pillar, the country seeks to achieve a 10% per annum growth rate, spurred by flagship projects in every sector over the period of the Vision. The growth realised as a result of this is expected to support the implementation of MDGs on a sustainable basis. Under the Social Pillar Kenya seeks to create just, cohesive and equitable social development, while under the Political Pillar, it seeks to realise an issue-based, people-centred, results-oriented and accountable democratic system.

A *Vision 2030: Northern Kenya and other Arid Land*s has been developed by the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands as frameworks for operationalizing Vision 2030 within the pastoralist areas of the country. The document also seeks to ensure that development projects undertaken in these areas facilitate rather than undermine the practice of pastoralism.

A National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands has been prepared by the Ministry and is presently before Cabinet awaiting approval and release as a Sessional Paper. The National Policy addresses three distinct policy challenges particular to Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands which have to be addressed in order to release the potential of the region. These are: closing the development gap between Northern Kenya and other arid lands and the rest of the country, protecting and promoting mobility and institutional arrangements essential to productive pastoralism, and ensuring food and nutrition security across Northern Kenya and other arid lands.

---

[11] Republic of Kenya, 2011, *Vision 2030 Development Strategy for Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands*, p. 8
[12] Republic of Kenya, 2007, *Kenya Vision 2030*

For its part, the *Vision 2030: Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands* document recognises that different parts of Kenya will move towards the country's *Vision 2030* from different starting points and it highlights the fact that there will be need for accelerated investment in previously neglected regions of Kenya in order to give all parts of the country an equal chance of sharing the promise and benefits in *Vision 2030.* It highlights the unique conditions to which policy and practice must adapt in order to ensure that the desired accelerated development is realised in Northern Kenya and other arid lands. These include: aridity and the challenge this presents to efforts to ensure sustainable food and nutrition security, diversity in economic activity requiring disaggregated policy responses, and pastoralism as a dominant production system which requires appropriate policy responses to protect and support mobility. It also draws attention to what it terms the "untapped potential" within Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands which will be unlocked as a result of increased and accelerated investment in the region. This potential is in the region's strategic location, its domestic trade, livestock trade, tourism, natural wealth, urban development as well as the skills and knowledge it has on climate variability which can be drawn upon to avert the severe impacts of climate change.

Kenya's Land Policy (2009) commits government to, among other things, document and map existing communal tenure in order to incorporate them into broad principles to facilitate orderly evolution of community law. The Policy also places the responsibility on the government to build the capacity of communal land governance institutions and to facilitate their operations. Government is also given the responsibility to facilitate flexible and negotiated cross-boundary access amongst communities. This provision specifically benefits and supports cross-boundary mobility for pastoralists.

It is, no doubt, too early to assess how well the above changes in Kenya will translate into concrete benefits which pastoralist communities recognise. However, Kenya has sufficient experience from its previous policy stance to avoid a situation in which its policy commitments fail to be turned into practice and meaningful gains for communities living in Northern and other Arid Lands, generally, and pastoralist communities, in particular. The current good will and momentum, however, puts the country in a good position to not only make good on its promises, but also be an example to other countries in the region on how to appreciate pastoralism as a production system and the policy responses which create the required enabling environment for pastoralism in this region.

2.3. Regional policy frameworks and pastoral development

Many policy frameworks have been recently developed within the mandates of the different regional intergovernmental agencies including: the African Union (AU), the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the East African Community (EAC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). All these different policy innovations open up new opportunities but also challenges for pastoralist development in the region.

In this section we consider two policy frameworks: the *AU Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa* (October 2010) and the *COMESA Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas* (Draft: 2009) to illustrate this. The AU framework represents the first such continent-wide initiative aimed at securing, protecting and improving the lives, livelihoods and rights of African pastoralists. The COMESA policy framework, on the other hand, is very unique because of its conceptual framework which permits addressing over-lapping issues critical to supporting pastoralist livelihoods – food security, pastoralism as a production system, and vulnerability.

2.3.1. The AU Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa

The underlying objective of the *AU Policy Framework* is to provide the basis for pastoral policy development, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The key elements in applying the framework include initiation of country level pastoral policy development processes which start with the establishment of a national steering committee and a national inter-disciplinary support team of experts. The policy development process is supposed to be highly participatory and interactive and covering the following elements, among others: clarify issues, define roles, including the role of indigenous institutions, consult with pastoralist communities, address legislative, institutional and operational issues, and ensure availability of financial resources.

The objectives of the *Policy Framework* are shaped around two main areas: **a**) addressing generic policy constraints which arise from misconceptions and misunderstandings of pastoralism as a production system and way of life, and **b**) livestock production as a core economic activity in pastoralist areas and approaches to protect and develop livestock assets. The first objective covers issues of pastoral representation, legitimacy of traditional pastoral institutions, commitment to pro-pastoral policies and integration of these policies in national and regional policy frameworks and the role of women. The second objective highlights the

importance of mobility to make efficient use of rangeland resources, and the ecological and economic logic of enabling in-country and regional mobility. This objective also covers the need for risk-based approaches to drought management in pastoral areas, and strategies for protecting core livestock assets during drought as a means to encourage post-drought recovery.

2.3.2. The COMESA Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas (PFFSPA)

The COMESA *Policy Framework* was developed as a framework specific to the vulnerable and food insecure pastoralist populations in COMESA region to achieve **Pillar III** of the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) of *increasing food supply, reducing hunger and improving responses to food emergency crises*. The Framework examines the complex challenges facing pastoral communities within the context of its mandate of promoting free movement of goods, services and people. Accordingly, the framework emphasises the need to view pastoralist areas in terms of cross-border economies and ecosystems and the necessity to put in place appropriate policies to support the practice of pastoralism as a system of production in order to reduce food insecurity and promote economic growth in pastoral areas.

The *PFFSPA* notes that failure to put in place appropriate policies has contributed to the vulnerability and food insecurity witnessed in pastoralist communities. This failure is attributed to the negative perceptions towards pastoralism, and the tendency for policy makers to undervalue the economic contribution of pastoralism and its potential. Policy incoherence between line Ministries, between development and humanitarian policies and strategies also undermine appropriate policy response in pastoral areas. Additional factors include limited implementation of pro-pastoralist policies where they exist, and absence of specific policies to cater for pastoralist rights on land, land tenure, livestock marketing, service delivery and conflicts within pastoralist areas.

The *PFFSPA* challenges the notion inherent in most development interventions that strategies designed for non-pastoralist communities can be applied to pastoralist communities. The COMESA Framework indicates, instead, that to be able to cater for the unique contexts and circumstances of pastoralist communities, policies intended to address vulnerability, enhance food security and achieve growth, must take account of these central factors:

  a) Poverty, vulnerability and economic value of pastoralism,

b) Pastoral production and mobility,

c) Herd growth, vulnerability and pastoral livestock marketing,

d) Livelihood diversification,

e) Cross-border livestock trade and export of livestock and livestock products, and

f) Livelihoods-based responses to drought and risk management.

The *PFFSPA* indicates that reducing vulnerability and ensuring food security amongst pastoralist communities requires adequate provision of at least three basic services:

- Human health services to improve human capital,

- Education services to improve human and financial capital, and

- Veterinary services to protect livestock assets and financial capital.

2.3.3. Opportunities and challenges for pastoral lobby and advocacy

The challenges which pastoralism and pastoralist communities in Eastern Africa continue to face are to a great extent a result of policy failure by successive governments in the region to not only enhance pastoral development, but also deal with the consequences of failed policy prescriptions which has led to a large proportion of pastoralists falling into deeper destitution and vulnerability. It is in view of this that policy frameworks such as the *AU Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa* and COMESA's *Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoralist Areas* have been developed as tools to be used by African governments to not only address the deepening crisis of vulnerability, food insecurity and marginalisation of pastoralist communities, but also avoid making the same policy mistakes.

Both policy frameworks are tools which bring conceptual clarity and convincing arguments on the issues affecting African pastoralism as a whole and the logic behind investing more into this mode of production as opposed to other land use systems in the drylands of Africa. They propose policy options which permit the development of pastoralism in all its complexity. The COMESA policy framework, in particular, focuses on addressing issues of vulnerability and food insecurity in pastoral areas from a long-term and sustainable development perspective.

Both the AU and COMESA are regional inter-governmental entities. These regional frameworks should ideally catalyse the formulation of pro-pastoralist policies and laws in member countries, including the countries of Eastern Africa. The AU framework proposes the steps governments need to take to get this process underway and even suggests the national level arrangements which need to be put in place to ensure that the process is well

informed and draws on the knowledge and experiences of pastoralist groups, communities and their institutions. The spaces offered by these institutions are also open to civil society lobby and advocacy organisations.

The regional policy frameworks are also helpful because they offer a regional approach to policy formulation and reform. Pastoralism is practiced across national borders and many of the issues which need to be addressed in order to protect and enhance its practice are best handled as trans-boundary issues. This presents an opportunity for harmonising policies and legal frameworks across the region for the benefit of pastoralists. Civil society organisations will also need to adopt a regional rather than their predominantly local and national approach to the issues. They will also need to strengthen their capacity to organise themselves regionally.

The above positive possibilities notwithstanding, regional policy frameworks are also fraught with challenges. Because they are inter-governmental agencies, regional frameworks such as the AU and COMESA operate as highly bureaucratic and slow-paced government institutions. Operationalization of the two policy frameworks is, therefore, going to be painfully slow and might even be held hostage by the same constraints which inhibit the implementation of pro-pastoralist policies at the national level. The likelihood that significant effort might be spent in formulating pastoralist policies which fail to be translated into practice is also a real challenge. This challenge has to be addressed if both the AU and COMESA policy frameworks are not to suffer the same fate suffered by similar initiatives and frameworks.

3. Civil society initiatives in Eastern Africa– an overview

This review has been undertaken to provide a basis for reflection amongst civil society organisations and other stakeholders engaged in lobby and advocacy on behalf of pastoralist communities in Eastern Africa on how to further strengthen their efforts and achieve concrete changes which support pastoralism and halt further decline and marginalisation of pastoralist communities. The foregoing analysis of the national and regional policy and legal frameworks has highlighted the challenges which have to be addressed and the opportunities which can be exploited in order to not just sustain lobby and advocacy efforts, but further increase and improve them for greater impact. Implicit in the above analysis of the policy context is the necessity for civil society organisations to be even better organised, more strategic and rational in their lobby and advocacy efforts.

This section provides an overview on some of the on-going pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts in the countries of Eastern African. This overview does not pretend to present and exhaustive assessment of the full range of initiatives implemented by civil society organisations, nor does it provide an in-depth assessment of the effectiveness of the strategies employed by these organisations. The review is intended to provide feedback which informs the reflection process which is intended to ultimately make a decision on whether or not a regional Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility is necessary and feasible, and if so, the form it should take.

3.1 Pastoralist lobby and advocacy – an emerging movement

The above review of the national and regional policy context highlights the challenges facing the development and practice of pastoralism in Eastern Africa and the steep slope which civil society organisations have to continually scale in order to ensure that pastoralist livelihoods are protected and the ever-increasing needs in pastoral communities across the region are addressed. The many challenges not-with-standing, many initiatives at different levels attest to the fact that pastoralists themselves, and organisations and stakeholders supporting their cause are finding spaces and opportunities to ensure that there is increased appreciation of the reality in pastoral areas and the validity of pastoralism as a production system threated by inappropriate policy prescriptions. In each country civil society organisations working on behalf of pastoralists and pastoralist groups and organisations are utilising whatever spaces are available, including opportunities in traditional pastoralist institutions and within the context of decentralised local government, to organise and assert themselves.

It is largely due to these civil society and pastoralist organisations' initiatives that pastoralist issues have become visible both in the public domain and on the national policy agendas of the respective countries. Below are examples of some of the on-going lobby and advocacy initiatives, the key strategies being used and their effectiveness, and some of the challenges civil society organisations are facing within the context of their respective national contexts.

3.1.1. CSO issues – some examples

a) Raising the voice and capacity of pastoralists

Civil society organisations across the region are concerned about ensuring that the voice of pastoralists is raised in order ensure that their issues and concerns receive the necessary policy attention and their rights are protected. Of particular note in this regard are the local

level initiatives amongst pastoralist communities across the region, but most especially in Tanzania, which have started to include capacity building for pastoralists themselves to appreciate the logic and rationale of their livelihood and production system. Awareness raising and capacity building for pastoralist groups and civil society organisations has been aimed at reversing the negative trend whereby pastoralists themselves, most especially the educated elite, have tended to be their own worst enemies because of the negative attitudes towards pastoralism which they have inadvertently internalised.

Awareness raising and capacity building have also been undertaken to debunk the widely held myths about pastoralism and pastoralists most especially amongst policy makers. In Ethiopia, for example, the Ethiopian Pastoralist Day, which was initially started as a civil society initiative, has now become a widely recognised annual event which brings together pastoralists, their traditional institutions, civil society organisations, and regional governments to engage with national level policy makers and political leaders. This forum has been used to highlight issues of particular concern to pastoralists while at the same time creating broad awareness about pastoralist communities through celebration of pastoralist culture, presentations which are given wide media coverage. In recent years, the event has been replicated in Kenya and Uganda, with participation from other countries in the region, providing good opportunities for learning, experience sharing and mutual support.

b) Influencing policy formulation and turning policy into practice

Civil society efforts to influence policy and to turn legal and policy provisions into practice are also evident across the region. Initiatives to influence policy formulation were especially pronounced in the initial stages of the PRSP processes. Starting with the work of the Pastoralist Thematic Group in Kenya that developed a Pastoral Poverty Reduction Strategy that fed into the national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper for 2001-2003, Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia (PFE) and the Coalition of Pastoral Civil Society Organisations (COPACSO) in Uganda followed suit, playing key roles, including undertaking specific studies in pastoralist areas to inform the policy making process, in the formulation of their respective poverty reduction strategy papers – the PASDEP and Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP).

Similar initiatives were undertaken in Tanzania under the leadership of Pastoralists Indigenous Non-Governmental Organizations (PINGOs), which saw to the elaboration of pro-pastoralist provisions in MKUKUTA. It is also in Tanzania where Ujamaa Community

Resource Trust (UCRT) and Community Research and Development Services (CORDS) have taken steps to operationalize both the legal and policy provisions for holding village land and the Land Use Planning by organising pastoralist communities to demarcate and register their lands.

c) Confronting new risks, new challenges

A new frontier of pastoralist lobby and advocacy is emerging in some countries in the region. As a result of increased pressure to access pastoral land and resources, pastoralist communities are organising themselves to directly resist evictions and further appropriation of their lands. Because these pressures are happening in a context where pastoralist customary rights are neither secured nor safe-guarded by formal legal regimes, pastoralists face serious constraints in seeking to assert their rights in the face of demands for their land by more powerful and politically connected other land use interests.

It is in response to these new pressures that pastoralist organisations in, for instance, Tanzania have started to organise themselves to challenge leaders, including pastoralist leaders, and the negative policies which have led to pastoralists losing their land. Significantly, pastoralist grassroots women have been at the forefront of this mobilisation and direct protests against land grabbing and evictions. In Ngorongoro, Tanzania, for instance, a group of women pastoralists is reported to have protested up to the office of the President in Dar-es-Salaam to get government to stop evictions of pastoralists in 2009.

3.1.2. CSO strategies – some examples

a) Changing the negative perceptions and mind-sets

Capacity building to change the mind-set and increase awareness about pastoralism, its logic and rationale through the generic training programmes on pastoralism has been one of the most visible strategies which has been utilised by pastoralist civil society organisations. Alumni of this training within government departments who were met in the course of this review attested to how critical the training was for them as it made them change their own misconceptions about pastoralism and pastoralists. The fact that this positive feedback has not yet translated into effective shifts in policy in support of pastoralism seems to be because a critical mass of technocrats has not gone through similar training. Cascading downwards the generic training programme has been done in Tanzania and Ethiopia but has yet to start in Kenya and Uganda.

Demands for this training to be extended to lower governments in pastoralist regions in Tanzania have been expressed because of its appropriateness in increasing the capacity of pastoralists themselves to articulate the rationale behind pastoralism and express their concerns. Similar moves will be necessary in the other three countries to optimize the benefits of this training.

b) Pastoralists organising and speaking for themselves

After a period when the elite and pastoralist civil society organisations acted as "gate-keepers" to pastoralist communities, speaking and acting on their behalf, evidence that pastoralists are beginning to organise and articulate their interests themselves is emerging. The *"Match to Dar-es-Salaam"* by a group of pastoralist women to protest evictions from their homesteads and land sent a more powerful message about the issues than any "mediators on behalf of pastoralists" could have done. Experiences in Ethiopia also confirm that the government there is more amenable to hearing from pastoralist groups themselves, including their traditional institutions, than civil society organisations. The Oromia Pastoralist Association finds it more effective, therefore, to work with these institutions in order to highlight the issues which need policy attention.

c) Policy formulation coalitions

A strategy which has been used in many countries is for civil society organisations to come together to influence specific policy making processes. Unfortunately, many such coalitions tend to disband once the issue of concern which brought them together is addressed. This has worked against many civil society initiatives largely because they have been unable to follow-through to monitor the next phase of their advocacy efforts. For instance in Uganda a COPASCO, which strongly advocated for inclusion of pastoralist concerns in the the PEAP, appeared to have ground to a halt once the PEAP was adopted. This meant that the organisations in the alliance were unable to engage in the implementation, monitoring and final evaluation of the PEAP. There is a strong likelihood that the new National Development Plan would have been stronger on pastoralism had the coalition been actively involved in its formulation.

The experience of Ethiopia is also instructive. The PASDEP set sedentarisation of pastoralists as one of its objectives. Even though the PASDEP's successor, the GTP, reflects on the lessons and achievements of the PASDEP, no mention is made with regards to the implementation of the strategy to settle pastoralists. Despite this, the new policy framework

carries forward the same policy objective. Absence of evidence of how well or how badly the strategy worked makes it difficult to challenge its being repeated under the new over-arching policy framework.

3.2. Key challenges

a) CSOs initiatives inward looking

Perhaps due to the need to first address the misconceptions about pastoralism from amongst pastoralists themselves, most of the initiatives undertaken by civil society organisations have been in-ward looking. As a result, there is a sense in which the initiatives have been overly focused on, and exclusive to, pastoralists. The limits of this strategy are apparent. Pastoralists' issues are not only perceived, by pastoralists themselves and their advocates, as being unique and deserving special attention, but also issues affecting pastoralists are inadequately understood by other civil society, social movements and networks. It also means that pastoralists' groups themselves are inadequately appreciative of the needs and challenges facing other social groups who may be equally or even more marginalised than pastoralists.

b) Dispersed approaches

Pastoralist communities are dispersed within their respective national contexts. This means that civil society initiatives not only tend to be spread-out but to also limit themselves to issues which are close to them and specific to particular communities, regions and within specific countries. This approach goes against the very essence of the practice of pastoralism and the way that pastoralist communities are organised which is regional and trans-boundary. Lobby and advocacy efforts which are too narrowly focused are not only incapable of addressing the broader pattern and systemic nature of pastoralist marginalisation, but are unlikely to mobilise the necessary critical mass of pastoralists to bring pressure on policy making processes to address their needs.

The fact that this situation in beginning to change is evident in the collaborative efforts which pastoralist organisations in different countries are beginning to undertake. In Tanzania, for instance, the recent confrontations between pastoralist communities and private investors galvanised civil society responses across the country. Arusha-based organisations played a key role not only in bringing together this broader coalition, but in actively supporting and working closely with pastoralist communities in the region.

Experiences in the region are beginning to catalyse the formation of wider coalitions and networks not only to increase the voice of pastoralists, but to also link these to broader concerns including land rights issues. In Arusha, a Pastoralist Livelihoods Task Force has been established to avoid any single organisation being targeted for intimidation to weaken opposition to evictions of pastoralist communities. Other initiatives within Eastern Africa aimed at establishing wider civil society coalitions or networks of pastoralist organisations are evident in the recent formation of the Tanzania Land Alliance (TALA) which is modelled on the Uganda Land Alliance (ULA) and Kenya Land Alliance (KLA), the reactivation of COPACSO, and the Pastoralist Development Network of Kenya (PDNK).

c) *Pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts – swimming against the tide?*

With increased powerful global and national interests in what is considered abundant and underutilised land in pastoral areas, and rising demand for resources found in the regions inhabited by pastoralists, the weight is tilted against pastoralist communities whose production systems is dependent on extensive use of the dry rangelands they occupy. This implies that pastoralist communities have to be even better organised, better informed, and even more resilient than they have been in the past. Pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts must also be clearer on the messages they want to convey and more persuasive in engaging with governments – both at the technical and political level - to appreciate the high cost which will have to be paid as a result of a failure to support pastoralist livelihoods and pastoralism as a production system, in pursuit of more short-term returns on investments which displace whole populations and destroy a production system.

The following questions raised in the course of this review emphasise the necessity for civil society lobby and advocacy efforts to continually reflect on their relevance and refine their messages in the light of the reality within pastoralist communities:

- *Where are the results of our lobby and advocacy efforts to-date?*
- *Is anybody listening?*
- *Are we advocating for the same pastoralism which is in existence or is it something different?*
- *Which pastoralists are we listening to? Men or women?*
- *What are pastoralists themselves thinking about the changes around them?*

4. Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility

This review was undertaken to provide a rationale and justification for setting up a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility for Eastern Africa which can support, strengthen and add value

to on-going pastoralist lobby and advocacy efforts in view of the many challenges pastoral communities in this region are facing and the fast-changing policy context. The above discussion of the broad policy context and the various civil society lobby and advocacy initiatives intended to influence policy in favour of pastoral development has highlighted the challenges which have to be addressed, but also the opportunities, which can be taken advantage of in order to improve pastoral lobby and advocacy efforts in the region.

The proposal to set up a pastoralist lobby and advocacy facility in the region stems from a desire to add value to the on-going efforts to support pastoral development in Eastern Africa. The initiative to engage with civil society organisations on the issue has been done in order to build consensus on the need for such a facility, its feasibility at this point in time, the value it should bring to on-going lobby and advocacy processes, and how it can be operationalized. This section presents a summary of the views gathered in the course of this review which should inform further discussions and consensus building on the facility.

4.1. Justification for the lobby and advocacy facility

The proposal to set up a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility was made as a result of RECONCILE being part of a process which not many civil society organisations in the region were aware, nor a part, of. As part of this review, therefore, it was essential to make this information available to the generality of pastoralist civil society organisations and the stakeholders who will reflect on the need and practicality of the facility. According to RECONCILE, establishing a regional lobby and advocacy facility is justified by the following considerations:

a) Formation of CELEP

The formation of a coalition of European organisations which specifically lobbies the European Parliament on behalf of pastoralist communities in Eastern Africa presents an opportunity to focus global attention on the development challenges facing pastoralist communities in this region. The proposal is to have a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility is to ensure that pastoral civil society organisations in the region establish a common platform from which to engage in a coherent and on an on-going basis with initiatives such as CELEP. Because no such facility exists in the region, the value of setting up such a facility will of necessity extend beyond interfacing with CELEP.

b) Specialised skills needed

Effective lobbying requires specialised skills which many civil society organisations in Eastern Africa do not have. A Lobby and Advocacy Facility if established will ensure that it has the right capacities, and that these capacities are made available to civil society organisations in the region to support their specific advocacy efforts. This type of facility would not be a "typical" NGO or network. It would pool together expertise in the region to lend support to national efforts.

c) Engaging with governments on an on-going basis

For various reasons, including lack of adequate funding, limited human resources, and burn-out, civil society organisations are unable to keep engaging on the same issue for long and on an on-going basis. Because of this, few organisations stay long enough with issues to ensure that policy commitments are turned into practice. Such a facility would, it is proposed, specifically address this weakness.

d) Need for a regional voice

Pastoralists in Eastern Africa do not have a regional voice. This is despite the fact that there have been efforts to bring together pastoralist groups from different countries in the region to share experiences, visit other pastoralist communities across national borders and promote cross-border peace initiatives. A regional facility would harness such ad-hoc regional initiatives into a coherent process of regional engagement, capacity building aimed at achieving concrete impacts on the ground. This also provides opportunities for enhancing a regional approach to issues and increasing voice for pastoralist civil society organisations.

4.2.   Views on Need for a Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Facility

This review sought the views of the civil society organisations and stakeholders met on the need for a regional facility to support development of pastoralist communities in Eastern Africa. There was broad consensus about the need for "something" at the regional level but the nature and form of that "something" was not clear. The most commonly expressed view was the need for increased voice for pastoralists at the regional level. There was also a general feeling that there is need for a "collective" voice on pastoralist issues in the region.

A few of the people met expressed a need for regional linkages and mutual support of pastoralists advocacy groups, particularly for those who are involved in challenging struggles as happened in Ngorongoro. Such local pressures on pastoralist advocacy groups do not only

need support from the entire region, but they might even require legal support and representation.

The need for regional spaces to reflect, conceptualise issues and re-energise as civil society organisations was also expressed. This is especially essential for pastoral civil society organisations which work under environments which are hostile to pastoralism who feel that they are working in isolation.

4.2.1. Views on feasibility of such a facility

An idea of setting up yet another organisation in the region is received with apprehension because of negative past experiences. It is clear that from the outset, it is essential that the feasibility of an idea, however justified and needed is discussed. Questions such as ownership, funding stream, rights and obligations will need to be discussed in greater detail before the facility is established.

The views which were expressed by the stakeholders met in the course of this review indicated the following with regards to the feasibility of a lobby and advocacy facility:

- It should NOT be donor-driven and donor-dependent. As much as possible, civil society organisations in the region should "own" the facility, they should mobilise resources from amongst themselves to support their activities.

- The added value of the facility should be to establish linkages – regional, national, local and ensure that there is impact within pastoralist communities

- It should engage with governments at the highest level possible and with technical personnel in the region on an on-going basis.

4.2.2. Reservations

A number of reservations on the facility were also expressed. Even though there is a need to do more to support pastoralism in the region, not everybody is convinced that that something should be an organisation or facility. The fact that the idea to set up the facility is linked to "donor" initiatives in the North is also worrisome because it gives an impression of being a donor-driven initiative. There were also some concerns about the fact that such initiatives, including the Regional Learning and Advocacy Programme for Vulnerable Dryland Communities (REGLAP) and Horn of Africa Pastoralists Network (HoAPN) tend to be

Kenya-based, and to be "exclusive clubs" which talk about pastoralists but do not have pastoralists themselves adequately represented.

5. Conclusion

Pastoralism in Eastern Africa is facing enormous challenges arising from a combination of factors including a long history of policy neglect, climate change, internal dynamics and contradictions, as well as the various push and pull factors not dissimilar to those which have led to the break-down of traditional systems amongst other African communities. Organisations of pastoralist groups as well as civil society lobby and advocacy groups in Eastern Africa have an up-hill task increasing awareness and appreciation of pastoralism as a livelihood system and persuading policy makers that, in the context of rapid changes, pastoralism and pastoralist life-styles are not only central to the development of pastoral regions, but also part of the solution to halting the further decline of a large proportion of pastoralists into deeper poverty, hunger and destitution.

To assist African governments appreciate that the choice to support pastoralism is a logical and economically rational one to make and pursue, the AU and COMESA have put in place policy frameworks which can fast-track the necessary pastoralist policy formulation and response. The need for these countries to align their national policies and strategies to these regional frameworks is consistent with their commitments to promote agriculture-led development, reduce hunger and increase food security. The fact that the regional policy frameworks target pastoralist communities is an added advantage because this is an area where governments in the region have been least equipped to design appropriate policies. However, experience shows that moving such positive provisions from paper to practice, and from regional level to national level is easier said than done.

Civil society organisations have played a key role in increasing the visibility of pastoralism in Eastern Africa and they have been instrumental in moving pastoralist issues across the region to the national agendas in the different countries. To move the lobby and advocacy agenda to the next level, civil society organisations will need to be "smarter", organise themselves more strategically, establish greater alliances to move them from the current phase of being in-ward looking and narrowly focused on pastoralist issues, and, even more importantly, adopt regional approaches consistent with the reality that pastoralism is, in practice, a regional and trans-boundary livelihood and production system. The proposal to establish a regional lobby

and advocacy facility stems from an appreciation of this potential but also the challenges facing pastoral lobby and advocacy efforts.

With regards to the actual proposal to set up a lobby and advocacy facility, therefore, this review has established that while there is a broad consensus about the need to do more to increase the voice of pastoralists nationally and regionally, it is not clear what form that initiative should take. It is in this respect, therefore, that any decision to move ahead with setting up such a facility adopts a gradual approach, taking "baby steps" from which to learn as it evolves. It is important that such a process continues to mobilise consensus and sense of ownership amongst pastoralists and their organisations through-out the region.

References

1. African U,(October 2010): *AU Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa*;

2. COMESA, (Consultative Draft 2009), *Policy Framework for Food Security in Pastoral Areas;*

3. EAC Secretariat, 2011, *East African Community Food Security Action Plan (2011 – 2015);*

4. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, *Growth and Transformation Plan (2010/11 – 2014/15)*;

5. _____ *Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to end Poverty (2005/6 – 2009/10);*

6. Flintan, Fiona,(2011), *Pastoral Women's Thoughts on "Change": Voices from Ethiopia,* paper presented and the International Conference on the Future of Pastoralism, IDS, Sussex.

7. Marilse Turnbull: *REGLAP Policy Baseline,* REGLAP, (2010);

8. Omondi & Odhiambo: *Pastoralism, policies and practice in the Horn and East Africa,* REGLAP, (2009);

9. Republic of Kenya, 2007, *Kenya Vision 2030;*

10. _____ 2011, *Vision 2030 Development Strategy for Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands (Final June 2011);*

11. _____ *National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands (Version 7, Final Draft, 6 April2011);*

12. Republic of Uganda: *Poverty Eradication Action Plan (2004/5 – 2007/8);*

13. _____ *The Uganda National Land Policy, (January, 2011);*

14. _____ *Land Sector Strategic Plan 2001-2011*

15. United Republic of Tanzania, 2010: *National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP II)*;

16. _____ *The Tanzania Development Vision 2025*

17. _____ *Grazing Land and Animal Feed Resources, 2010;*

18. _____ *The Land Use Planning Act, 2007;*