



## **CELEP POSITION PAPER ON:**

### **Recognising the role and value of pastoralism and pastoralists**

*We, the Coalition of European Lobbies on Eastern African Pastoralism (CELEP), regard pastoralism as a rational and viable economic land-use system able to generate significant returns in the dryland areas of Eastern Africa. Widespread misunderstanding about pastoralism has left it often under-protected, undervalued and an unintended victim of uninformed policies. However, this traditional livelihood system, which evolved as an adaptive strategy for thriving in some of the world's harshest regions, is ideally suited to the climatic and economic uncertainties of our turbulent century. Therefore, informed and supportive policies need to be developed and implemented to realise the tremendous potential of pastoralism.*

The above-mentioned significant returns and the total economic value (TEV) of pastoralism consist of a number of assets and several direct and indirect values:

#### *The direct values of pastoralism are:*

*The economic values:* Pastoralism contributes significantly to economies in East Africa. In Kenya, data show that the total annual marketed value of pastoralists' livestock is close to €50 million and, in very good years, it can go up to €80 million. In Uganda, the livestock sector contributes 7.5% to total GDP and 17% to agricultural GDP. Pastoralists own up to 90% of the national herd, providing meat, hides, skin and milk for domestic and international markets. In Ethiopia, pastoralists and agropastoralists produce 14% of cattle meat, 12% of goat meat and 7% of sheep/lamb meat, and leather exports provide 12% of national export earnings. In Tanzania, approximately 1.18 billion litres of milk are produced, of which 70% comes from the agropastoral and pastoral systems. Furthermore, pastoralism supplies goods and raw materials to other (formal/informal) supply chains. Examples are: timber/non-timber forest products, butchers, restaurants, traders and transporters.

Studies show that pastoralism is a productive system for drylands and is generally considered to be the most profitable way to use marginal lands. A study comparing productivity of traditional livestock systems and ranching in Eastern Botswana found that, having considered a number of different outputs from both systems, traditional systems can be considered 95% more productive in terms of liveweight production equivalents than ranching systems on a per hectare basis.

Subsistence and livelihood values for up to 20 million people in East Africa: Examples of such values of drylands are:

*Provision of milk, meat, blood, firewood, honey, fruits and medicine to individuals, families and communities.*

*The herd as a form of insurance, savings and risk management:* Investment in the herd is the best and often only opportunity available to rural people without access to a reliable banking system.

#### *Social cultural values and the development of social capital*

*Human capital values:* The key values here are employment and indigenous knowledge. In arid and semi-arid rural areas, pastoralism and agropastoralism are often the only form of employment, and provide employment to up to 20 million people in Eastern Africa. Pastoralists who lose their cattle face unemployment (since there are hardly any alternatives) and go to urban areas, often creating a very tangible cost to the national economy.

Pastoralists are highly specialised livestock herders and breeders and have skills and indigenous knowledge of direct national value. They rely on scarce natural resources under shifting conditions, demanding considerable knowledge of animal husbandry, sustainable rangeland management and informal livestock markets. Pastoralists also possess a sophisticated understanding of livestock genetic selection processes. As climate change brings greater environmental, social and economic uncertainty, harnessing pastoral knowledge and experience in livestock management in an environmentally sustainable manner will prove invaluable in the overall management of Africa's drylands.

#### *The indirect values of pastoralism are:*

*Economic input values:* Agriculture is a key beneficiary of pastoralism, which helps raise agricultural productivity by providing manure, animals for agriculture and transport, seasonal labour, and technical knowledge for the rising number of farmers now investing in livestock. Crop farmers also help pastoralists by providing crop residues as fodder potentially crucial in drought years. These reciprocal exchanges help reduce conflict and promote peaceful relations. In tourism (see also Table 3), a vital input from pastoralism is the maintenance of grazing reserves, which provides critical dry-season habitats for wildlife. In Tanzania, more than one third of protected areas have traditionally belonged to pastoralists and, in Kenya, 92% of protected areas fall within pastoral lands. Northern Kenyan tour operators also market trips using images of pastoralists, while pastoralists' cultural performances and handicrafts have clearly helped spark interest in the region. As a form of land use, pastoralism has also helped protect the many national parks that East African tourism depends on. Unlike agriculture, pastoralism is one of the few land uses able to coexist with wildlife, as domesticated and wild animals exploit different ecological niches. Maasai pastoralists, for example, also directly protect the Ngorongoro black rhino from poachers.

*Environmental values:* A number of studies (e.g. Thébaud 2004) have shown that, when livestock mobility is assured, pastoralism benefits rangeland management. Grazing animals eat dead grass and other biomass at the dry season's end, paving the way for new growth in the rains and preventing bush fires and the spread of unpalatable grasses and shrubs. Grazing livestock disperse plant seeds that stick to the animals' bodies, and aid the germination of other seeds by eating and excreting them. Herds break up hard soil crusts, allowing water to filter through and seeds to sprout. Livestock also provide plant nutrients through their manure. More significantly, the shared management of pooled resources practised by pastoralists prevents the need for costly fencing, surveillance and land clearance. Walker *et al* (1981) suggest, too, that pastoralism damages the environment less than ranching: pastures in ranches become dominated by palatable but grazing-sensitive grasses that are less resilient to drought and related degradation.

Pastoralists are in a better position to accommodate climate change than those tied to sedentary land uses. Through mobility and the maintenance of reciprocal and negotiated forms of access to natural resources, pastoralists are able to exploit increasing variability in natural resources. Unpredictability and the variable distribution in time and space of nutritious pastures become positive factors of high livestock productivity when mobility is secured. Pastoralists' capacity to adapt to climate change is thus dependent on a favourable policy environment that secures livestock mobility and protects pastoralists' land rights.

## References and background materials

- De Ridder N & Wagenaar KT. 1977. A comparison between the productivity of traditional livestock systems and ranching in Eastern Botswana. ILCA Research Brief. Addis Ababa: International Livestock Centre for Africa.
- Devereux S. 2006. Vulnerable livelihoods in Somali Region, Ethiopia. Research Report 57. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex.
- Hatfield R & Davies J. 2007. Global review of the economics of pastoralism. Nairobi: IUCN ([http://liveassets.iucn.getunik.net/downloads/global\\_review\\_ofthe\\_economicsof\\_pastoralism\\_en.pdf](http://liveassets.iucn.getunik.net/downloads/global_review_ofthe_economicsof_pastoralism_en.pdf))
- Hesse C & Mc Gregor J. 2006. Pastoralism: drylands' invisible asset? London: Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Hesse C & Mac Gregor J. 2009. Arid waste? Reassessing the value of dryland pastoralism. London: IIED.
- Kipuri N & Ridgewell A. 2008. A double bind: the exclusion of pastoralist women in the East and Horn of Africa. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Mortimore M. 2008. Drylands – an economic asset for rural livelihoods and economic growth. Nairobi: IUCN, IIED & UNDP/DDC.
- Omondi SS & Odhiambo MO. 2009. Pastoralism, policies and practice in the Horn and East Africa: a review of current trends. London: Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- PACE-OAU/IBAR. 2001. The livestock revolution and opportunities for Africa. Policy Briefing Paper 2. Nairobi: OAU/IBAR.
- Thébaud B. 2004. Le pastoralisme au Sahel: Module d'animation et de formation. Dakar: ARED / London: IIED.
- Walker B *et al.* 1981. Stability of semi-arid savanna grazing systems. *Journal of Ecology* 69: 473–498.
- Walsh MT. 2007: Pastoralism and policy processes in Tanzania: case study and recommendations. TNRF.

**Table 1: Economic contributions of pastoralism**

| Estimates of contribution of pastoralism to national economies |                 |                 |                 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|  | Kenya           | Tanzania        | Uganda          |
| Contribution of agriculture to GDP (2004)                      | 16%             | 45%             | 32%             |
| Contribution of livestock to agricultural GDP (2004)           | 50%             | 30%             | 19%             |
| % of national milk production from pastoralism (2004)          | 24%             | N/A             | 85%             |
| Export of hides and skins (US\$ in 2000)                       | \$0.11 million  | \$5.68 million  | \$12.98 million |
| Total beef production in metric tonnes (2000)                  | 290,000–320,000 | 181,000–360,000 | N/A             |

Source: Ced Hesse & James MacGregor (2009) Arid waste? Reassessing the value of dryland pastoralism.

**Table 2: Estimated total and proportional meat production from pastoral systems in Ethiopia (millions)**

| Cattle meat                       |                          | Goat meat                         |                          | Sheep meat                        |                          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Pastoral/agro-pastoral production | % of national production | Pastoral/agro-pastoral production | % of national production | Pastoral/agro-pastoral production | % of national production |
| 39,254,569                        | 14%                      | 3,006,528                         | 12%                      | 1,839,164                         | 7%                       |

Source: Ced Hesse & James MacGregor (2009) Arid waste? Reassessing the value of dryland pastoralism.

**Table 3: Numbers of tourists and value of tourism in African countries with drylands**

| Country         | International inbound tourists <sup>1</sup> |      |          | International tourists receipts <sup>2</sup> |      |                           |      |
|-----------------|---|------|----------|--|------|---------------------------|------|
|                 | Thousands                                   |      | % change | \$ millions                                  |      | % of exports <sup>3</sup> |      |
|                 | 2000  | 2006 |          | 2000   | 2006 | 2000                      | 2006 |
| Southern Africa |   |      |          |  |      |                           |      |
| Botswana        | 845   | 1675 | 98       | 234  | 539  | 7.7                       | 10.2 |
| Namibia         | 614   | 833  | 36       | 288  | 473  | 17.9                      | 29.6 |
| West Africa     |   |      |          |  |      |                           |      |
| Senegal         | 369   | 769  | 108      | 166  | 334  | 11.5                      | 13.2 |
| Eastern Africa  |   |      |          |  |      |                           |      |
| Kenya           | 943   | 1536 | 63       | 304  | 1182 | 11.3                      | 19.8 |
| Tanzania        | 459   | 622  | 36       | 739  | 950  | 57.7                      | 29.6 |
| Ethiopia        | 125   | 290  | 132      | 24   | 639  | 2.4                       | 29.1 |

Source: World Bank. 2008. World Development Indicators (in Mortimore, 2008, p20)