

## **BEST Stakeholder Workshop 14 February 2012**

### **Summary of feedback from breakout groups**

Workshop participants were divided into five groups with broadly congruent interests and experience:

1. Policy-makers / funders
2. Community representatives
3. Conservation NGOs / business interests
- 4&5. Researchers (two groups)

Group membership is indicated in the full participant list. Groups were asked to address the following questions:

#### **Question 1**

Are you happy with the broad description of rangeland issues? Do you think we are missing or misrepresenting any important factors?

#### **Question 2**

Please tell us how you think our Phase 1 Research Questions (\*see below) are useful or not useful. Are we missing important questions:

(a) As applicable to the Mara?

(b) As applicable to other areas across East Africa? Would comparable questions apply in other areas where you work (e.g. Tanzania, Ethiopia and northern Kenya)? How should we be re-thinking these questions for other areas? Are there more important issues we should be addressing?

#### **Question 3**

What are the policy or management scenarios you would like to see addressed?

\*Phase 1 Research Questions:

- How are pastoralist households' decisions on allocating land, labour and capital to different livelihood activities affected by conservancies?
- What are the economic and ecological consequences of these decisions? What are the trade-offs?
- How do the outcomes differ for households which participate in the conservancy and those who do not?
- How can policy and economic incentives encourage more economically and ecologically sustainable livelihood choices?

---

### **GROUP 1: POLICYMAKERS/ FUNDERS**

#### **Q1 Characterisation of rangeland issues**

- Need more in depth policy analysis
  - Laws, institutions, which present and constrain policy options – necessary to capture processes / interpret results in site specific policy context before making policy recommendations
- Capture disconnect between different sectors and their associated policies
  - wildlife, livestock, land, tourism, people, security, minerals, forests each have their own independent policies and act separately – no coordination
- Capture transboundary issues
  - policy contrasts (e.g. Tanzania hunting vs Kenya no hunting)
  - regional integration of policy e.g. on livestock mobility, animal health/disease, security, rustling/raiding
- Household decision making – makes sense in context of private ownership of land but

how does it differ where households are more constrained by higher level decisions / decision-makers?

### **Q2 Phase 1 research questions**

- Broadly these were found to be useful. The group explored various concrete examples – e.g. Mara conservancy displaces people and livestock causing build-up in surrounding areas and increasing grazing pressure on Mara NR. Group felt questions as formulated dealt well with exploring such cases and were transferable to other contexts/cases
- Additional questions:
  - What will land zonation do? What are the implications of for example zoning out the possibility of irrigated or other farming in areas of northern rangeland? Of zoning between farming and wildlife with or without livestock (or in the case of Tanzania, farming versus wildlife versus livestock?)
  - What are the implications of different policy scenarios – particularly the balance between irrigated farming in ASALs (promoted by food security crises and IGAD current action plans) and wildlife / livestock?
  - As above – what are the implications of the land tenure system for the decision making process at household level?

### **Q3 Policy and management scenarios**

In practice, the group focused on the process: when, how, with whom to engage.

- Opportunities
  - Horn of Africa Initiative (IGAD), CBD, NEMAs, Tanzania constitutional review; ASARECA (ABCD project outputs -> Vision 2030 / land use planning and wildlife corridors / connectivity (wildlife with or without livestock?))
- Whom to engage? Champions / representatives of local communities / umbrella groups (legitimacy is an issue) e.g. CSOs, Pastoral forum, TNRF, PINGOs

---

## **GROUP 2: CONSERVATION NGO AND BUSINESS INTERESTS**

### **Q1 Characterisation of rangeland issues**

- Are changes really governed primarily by household-level decisions, or does group decision-making play an important role, for example, in conservancies? How might the household approach be adapted to take account of group decision-making? How exactly do households engage with collective action?
- Who are the key decision-makers? Household heads, or county / national level actors?
- How should wealth be defined? Is it directly linked to livestock numbers? How does the concept evolve over time, especially as conservancies and related land uses become more common?
- May be important to consider politics, cultural identity, clanism and immigration.
- Spatial issues may be important – how does proximity to conservancies / key resources influence indirect affects of conservancies on members and non-members.
- What vision do people have for the future of their landscapes? How might people's expectations and aspirations change over time? Can we anticipate this by consulting the younger generation?
- In the context of community programmes, how is community defined, and how might this change over time?

### **Q2 Phase 1 research questions**

RQ1 Consider opening up to a broader focus than just conservancies – collective land management processes more generally might be useful.

RQ2 Should consider social, as well as ecological and economic consequences, including:

- cultural issues
- health and education
- equitability
- indirect as well as direct consequences
- both short and long term issues

RQ3 Again, should consider broadening this to consider land use change models other than conservancies. Also, what constitutes participation? Need to consider effects on those who are formally registered members of schemes, as well as members.

RQ4 Not considered in detail.

### **Q3 Policy and management scenarios**

Little time devoted to this, but did discuss the issue of relative roles of free market versus government intervention in changing land use.

## **GROUP 3: COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES**

### **Q1 Characterisation of rangeland issues**

- First, need to consider the basis for household decision making in isolation from the conservation / conservancy context – what are the fundamental decisions made by households? Get this right, then add conservancy-related element to model.
- Need to consider the role of both formal and informal / traditional institutions in decision making - how do these influence the household decision-making processes? The group broadly had the opinion that land use systems are mainly driven by community-level structures, rather than household-level.
- Need to understand the social setting to fully characterize the economic system.
- Need for baseline data to triangulate the various current data sources.
- Need to capture trade-offs – social-political versus ecological loss; losing control versus economic gain.
- Need to capture heterogeneity among households – likely to give rise to conflicts in decision making. Wealth would be a key dimension of heterogeneity to capture.
- There is also a high possibility of heterogeneity among pastoral systems across political, geographical and economic borders.

### **Q2 Phase 1 research questions**

Broadly sensible, with some additional suggestions:

- How does the political system affect the decision and its outcome?
- How does access to information or the lack of it affect decision making?
- How do risks of drought and diseases affect outcomes? Particularly important from the perspective of adaptation to climate change
- What are the risks of system failure due to changes in the land tenure systems e.g. rangeland privatization?
- How can ecological consequences be measured? Possible indicators for monitoring and evaluation of ecological consequences:
  - Loss of grazing land
  - Loss of water points
  - Displacement from land
  - Loss of mobility

### **Q3 Policy and management scenarios**

- Address the issue of risk, in terms of drought, access to land and land reform.
- Address the perception of conservancies as limiting access to rangeland by households.

- How do pastoral systems behave towards new interventions?
- 

## **GROUP 4: RESEARCHERS**

### **Q1 Characterisation of rangeland issues**

- Definition and use of wealth as an indicator to assess poverty alleviation.
- Changing land values
- Evolving patterns of land tenure
- Consider strengthening the gender component to ensure equity
- Conservancies can be defined very broadly – what aspects or types of conservancy is the model trying to address? Needs a clear focus.
- Need to consider social, cultural and political, as well as economic and ecological consequences of land use change.
- To what extent are local community dynamics included in the model.

### **Q2 Phase 1 research questions**

Regarding household decision:

- To what extent are decisions made in response to external pressures?
- Will pure payment-based models be considered, or also capacity building approaches (eg training), or payment in kind? The latter can also influence decisions.
- Questions need to address heterogeneity between households, both in terms of whether or not they participate in conservancy agreements, and among participants, e.g. stochastic characteristics such as whether or not people have a camp on their land.
- Need to consider benefits at both household and community level – may have different implications for equity of distribution.

### **Q3 Policy and management scenarios**

- What will be the impact of expanding conservancy area? What if there were no conservancies?
  - How do outcomes differ depending on whether benefits are at the household or community level?
  - What will be the impacts of changing land use opportunity costs / alternative use values?
  - What are outcomes in terms of benefits at different livestock stocking levels?
  - Given geographical variation in context, may be challenging to apply a single model structure widely across East Africa. Contrasting Mara system with elsewhere, it has a very high level of wildlife / conservation interest, and generally lower diversity of livelihoods and approaches.
- 

## **GROUP 5: RESEARCHERS**

### **Q1 Characterisation of rangeland issues**

The group broadly agreed with description of rangeland issues. But had the following question/ remarks:

- What defines livestock in the rangelands? Need to consider the mix of livestock types, and how this varies across the landscape.
- Need to consider heterogeneity among households – this is a significant challenge. Need to consider equity within communities.
- Is the economic focus correct, or are there important non-economic factors in decision making that should also be considered? How can they be incorporated?
- The legal / regulatory framework is important, both formal and customary – e.g. may underpin gender imbalances.

- Issues of drought and livestock diseases, particularly in the context of livestock productivity and climate change
- How are rights distributed within households and what are the bases for such distribution? How do within-household processes affect decision making?
- Rangelands is not only for pastoralists – lots of immigrants now. To what extent are we considering the full possible diversity of land uses and preferences?
- Changing demographic arrangement of households e.g. children increasing getting higher education away from home. How does this influence decisions made by households?
- Changing livelihood strategies e.g. mix of cultivation and livestock.

## **Q2 Phase 1 research questions**

Broadly useful as defined.

- Scaling up from household decisions to economic and ecological consequences is a big leap – there was concern over how this would work in practice.
- Application to Mara
  - Very applicable
  - Need to consider heterogeneity among households
  - Movement of pastoralists out of their land for wildlife and payment for wildlife has a long history
  - The area has high potential for wildlife movement to pastoral rangelands
  - Conservancy versus other land use forms – what are the other possible land uses / economic incentives?
- Application to other areas
  - Possible with some limitations e.g. movement of pastoralist out of their land for wildlife may not necessarily be acceptable in some areas
  - Not all areas will have potential for wildlife to move in – value for investment in wildlife incentives may differ
  - Tanzanian experience points to increasing agropastoralism with profits largely invested in livestock – suggests continued centrality of livestock in life-goals. Cultivation also used to secure de facto land rights. Economic structure of Wildlife Management Areas provides a contrast.

## **Q3 Policy and management scenarios**

- What about hunting as an option? Model structures exist in Tanzania.
- The role of within-community conflict – political, ethnic
- Possible roles for government:
  - Oversight of where conservancies can best work
  - Compensation of livestock losses to predators
  - National scheme (trust fund?) to support initiation of conservancies and / or those with lower potential to generate tourism earnings
  - Land use zoning policies
- Effects of policies increasing share of wildlife revenues to local communities / households
- Effects of developing markets for products (milk, honey etc.)
- Consider alternative approaches to distribution of funds (community versus household level)