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1. Executive Summary

Introduction
This Report presents findings of a desk review that was commissioned to provide an understanding of the prevailing operating environment of pastoralists around the Kidepo valley area of Northern Uganda. Based on the prevailing situation, the assessment proposes recommendations for VSF-Belgium and other development partners to improve service delivery and suggestions for policy entry points and development interventions.

Overall purpose of the assessment
This Assessment was an attempt to document the prevailing production environment of mobile pastoral communities around the Kidepo valley area, the support systems in place to improve the livelihoods therein and the extent to which herders (a considerable number of whom are women and children) are impacted by the existing policy and investment environment plus environmental changes going on there.
From its findings, the review aims to inform future interventions and policy. Presently, there is inadequate evidence of policies in place specifically geared towards a sustainable development future for pastoralist communities as a category around Kidepo valley.

Mobility: a herder’s strategy for livelihood sustenance
Mobile herders around Kidepo valley seasonally move to other locations in search of pastures and water sources for their animals. Mobility is a rational livelihood strategy, and a naturally designed mechanism, to cope with the harsh ecological realities in the region. This livelihood necessity pulls herders away from fixed social infrastructural arrangements, whose design does not for the most part cater for their mobility.

As a rational response to reach natural resources, herders have impressively clearly developed route-networks. Up until recently, herders’ mobility patterns could be traced even far beyond the region’s borders. However, due to the pressing need to control armed cattle rustling — which is both a security nightmare and an immense roadblock to the area’s development path — herders’ movements have, as one of the consequences, been confined within the area. What’s more, movements for certain herding groups have been constrained even within the area itself, thus presenting pastoralists with newer and greater challenges.

Kraal-based Security Services
While the security situation has generally improved over the last one year especially along the highways as a result of security responses, mobility as a livelihood system is yet to be adequately supported with basic social services to boost the livelihood security of these pastoral communities.

By 2008 there were an estimated 38 protected kraals by the UPDF in the area — eight (8) in Kaabong, seven (7) in Kotido, nine (9) in Moroto and fourteen (14) in Nakapiripirit. There are other Kraals in the area that are free range; and not protected by the army. Following the disarmament process that has seen 26,988 guns withdrawn from the public in the area out of an estimated 40000, security measures have been put in place to provide security to mobile herders and their livestock.
However, given the herders’ unilateral control on decisions pertaining to mobility prior to the disarmament process, there are mounting concerns on — who exactly (i.e., the herder or the Army) should have the final decision on determining access, location, freedom of movement to new Protected Kraal locations and movement of livestock to pasture and water locations.
Community Animal Health Service

There have been efforts by development partners in the area to build the capacity of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW) to enable provision of animal health services to the kraals. This Assessment was able to establish that there was a total of 307 CAHWs (180 in Kotido and 127 in Kaabong) were trained with support from Oxfam. An extra fifty-four (54) CAHWs were trained by the SCIUG; and spread across twenty-one (21) kraals in Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, and Nakapiripirit.

While 127 CAHWs were trained for Kaabong, this assessment was able to establish that many of these CAHWs have dropped out for various reasons and only less than half of this number (57) is actually active. Secondly due to the vastness of the District, multiple areas are not adequately served.

The CAHW structure has been in place since 2005. NGOs, such as, Oxfam and Save the Children in Uganda, have supported the capacity building in partnership with the district veterinary departments of targeted districts — on disease identification, treatment, control and modern animal husbandry practices. However, from the current need, it is necessary to train more.

Highlights of key challenges faced by herders

Negative attitudes by policymakers and service providers towards mobile herders: Many times, mobility is neither appreciated nor understood as a viable livelihood system. This attitude is shaped by many factors including for example: association of mobile herding to the negative practice of cattle raiding and theft; a history of marginalization; and a multitude of myths and misunderstandings.

A cycle of armed cattle raids and insecurity: A considerable amount of livestock— even in the protected kraals — is still being lost to both internal (area) and cross-border raids. Raiders attack an often defenseless and unarmed pastoralist community and make away with large numbers of livestock which are sometimes not recovered and returned to owners. This has greatly contributed to the diminishing numbers of livestock, raising serious concerns about food security and the future of the pastoralist communities. Due to recurrent droughts attributed to climate change, herds (and pastures that they rely upon) are not able to recover implying that over the years, per-capita herd holdings have contracted. This calls for means to support some of these communities through multi-pronged approaches; bolstering the herds of some of the communities on one hand while also facilitating new business opportunities around the livestock sector on the other. Further, those who are ready to exit the pastoral livelihoods need to be supported by providing them with avenues for alternative livelihoods (both livestock and non-livestock based).

Threatened livelihoods and coping mechanisms: Mobility patterns of pastoralist communities have been greatly interfered with — partly due to security related restrictions. Gradually, this may have an impact on land resource management as well as on the long term livelihood strategies and coping mechanisms of the herding communities. Security-related restrictions imposed on animal movement have had serious implications on animal health as well. Animals move longer distances for pastures and water — leaving them with not enough grazing time. This has tremendously reduced their productivity. Over-congestion in security kraals also exposes animals to diseases — such as, East Coast Fever, goat plague and Contagious Bovine Pleuro Pneumonia. Death of animals due to diseases poses a threat to the food security of the pastoralist communities who depend on animal products (milk, blood, butter, etc.) for food. Cows in the area are decreasing in number; and cannot adequately support the population. The animals are malnourished due to recurrent incidences of drought; and therefore cannot produce
enough milk. There is also concern that concentration of livestock in one area compresses the soil — causing destruction of the soil and vegetation and general environmental degradation.

**Highlights of key recommendations**

The review findings point to key programmatic and contextual issues that should be addressed if future programmes targeting mobile herding communities are to succeed. There is a need to:

- Intensify peace building initiatives
- Encourage interventions aimed to sustain the livelihoods of livestock keepers by incorporating alternative livelihoods
- Expand, strengthen and enhance provision mobile health services
- Enhance security to create a favorable environment delivery
- Establish committees for land resource management
- Setup more and re-invigorate existing pastoral field schools and encourage participation of women
- Improve internal mobility in the area’s fertile areas through peace dialogues
- Gazette and manage emergency grazing areas and emergency water sources
- Improve market infrastructure and information
- Work with authorities to resolve human-wildlife conflict
- Build capacity and support the development of new enterprises among livestock keepers
2. Introduction

This desk review was commissioned by VSF-Belgium to provide and understanding the prevailing operating environment of pastoralists around the Kidepo valley area of Northern Uganda. Due to the importance of livestock in Africa and recent multi-donor initiatives to address adaptation to climate change in the region, it is essential to inform the development agenda regarding livestock-specific adaptation strategies ranging from technical options (feeds, breeds, food/feed crops, water management, etc.) to enabling policies that can support technical options and buffer the effects of climate variability. The main outputs of this activity provides information that can guide future development interventions for supporting the implementation of priority adaptation options in pastoral systems to be identified and discussed with key policymakers.

Objective of the assessment

The study’s objective was to gather relevant information regarding the status of pastoralists’ livelihoods, institutional and legal framework around pastoral issues and natural resource management issues around the Kidepo Valley Park area of Uganda and its environs. At the core of this initiative is the search for policy entry points for supporting the implementation of priority adaptation options in these pastoral and agro-pastoral systems.

Methods and tools for Data collection

The main methodology for conducting this work involved desk review of secondary data and literature, a brief field data collection trip using focus group discussions, Key informant interviews, transect drives and field observations. This rapid study was accomplished for areas surrounding the Kidepo Valley Park. The actual areas visited included all sub-counties of Kaabong district of Uganda including Kapedo, Kathile and Karenga in a visit that lasted three days.

Focus group discussions were conducted with one cluster of cultivators in Lokori parish while key informants’ interviews were conducted with Local council chairpersons (LCII), pastoral leaders, government officials in the ministries of livestock production and environment and natural resources, and with local (DADO) and international organizations operating in the area. Secondary data was collected from literature review of reports, the internet and publications. Physical assessment of the environment was done though transect drives to determine the natural resource use, environmental impacts and landuse types. A physical visit to a settlement camp was also undertaken.

Background of the Karamoja region

Karamoja region is located in northeastern Uganda covering a total land area of over 27,900 square kilometers with a population of 1,062,000 (estimated for 2009) and population density of 48 people per square kilometer. The region’s five administrative districts and inhabitants are: Abim (54,900), Kaabong (316,600), Kotido (188,100), Moroto (276,000) and Nakapiripirit (226,700). The complex livelihood zones in Karamoja make it difficult to clearly delineate them at parish and village level. However, three main livelihood zones can be delineated: agricultural, agro-pastoral and pastoral that cut across the districts.

Karamoja has grown at an average of 7.2% from 370,423 in 1991 to 966,245 in 2002 with the highest population growth rate in Kotido District of 9.7%. In 2008, the human and livestock population in Karamoja was estimated to be 1,107,308 humans, 1,100,000 cattle and 2,070,000 sheep and goats, 960 donkeys and 32,030 camels and minimal pigs. (OCHA, 2008a). Knaute and Kagan (2008) reported that 50% of this human population was less than 18 years of age.
Karamoja inhabitants comprise predominantly cattle keeping groups leading a semi-nomadic lifestyle mixed with crop cultivation (Jie, Bokora, Dodoth, Pokot and Matheniko) and settled agricultural communities (Labwor) and mountain tribes (Tepeth, Kadam, Ik, Nyangia and Mening). The central role that livestock play in social and economic life of the Karimojong makes pastoralism more popular than cultivation in the region. The prevalence of livestock diseases, droughts leading to scarcity of water and pasture as well as famine have increased competition for livestock. Livestock keeping has become the centre of conflict in the region. Karamoja Districts have the highest human Poverty Indices (HPI) with Nakapiripirit (0.24), Moroto (0.271) and Kotido (0.231) compared to the national average of 0.4888 (UNDP, 2007). The region is characterized by a combination of acute poverty, vulnerability to drought, poor infrastructure and basic social services delivery, limited marketing opportunities, especially for livestock, natural resource degradation, social and cultural marginalization, long-standing dependency on external aid and most importantly, chronic insecurity.

The climate is generally harsh as the area covers Arid and semi-arid agro-ecological zones with rainfall ranging between 350-1000 mm per annum, variable in space and time. Precipitation is usually sporadic and falls between June and October, leaving the desert winds and the hot dry season to take over from November to March. In recent years, drought has become more frequent and severe and Karamoja remains more vulnerable to the effects of climatic shocks, principally drought, than any other region of Uganda.

The rocks underlying most of Karamoja area are those of basement complex. Numerous rivers and streams rise in hills and mountains in East Karamoja and flow towards the south and west according (OCHA, 2008). The region is mostly a semi-arid plain, largely savannah, covered with seasonal grasses, thorny plants, and shrubs. Karamoja has a harsh climate, low annual rainfall and has been experiencing drought in the last 3 years.

Due to the aridity, extensive livestock keeping is the principal economic activity within the region, though there is significant agro-pastoralism being practiced here too. Livestock are kept primarily to sustain livelihoods through milk, meat and barter with the sale of livestock being seen only as a secondary importance. Mobility, a livestock keeping system, which is exceptionally well adapted to the disequilibrium environment, is hindered primarily by the chronic insecurity of the area, poor access to water in the dry season, poor quality of available forage, high incidence of contagious diseases and limited access to veterinary services; all which limit productivity. Due to the heightened insecurity, the government of Uganda set-up protected kraals in early 2008 in the Karamoja region. There are currently an estimated 38 Protected Kraals in Karamoja, including eight in Kaabong, seven in Kotido, nine in Moroto, and 14 in Nakapiripirit.

In summary, the situation in Karamoja Region is generally characterized by pockets of insecurity, lawlessness, underdevelopment of social infrastructure and inadequate provision of basic social services to especially the rural communities.

The Karamojong cluster
The term 'Karamojong cluster' was introduced by the British colonial administration in order to define a set of distinct ethnic groups from a shared origin and with similar dialects, living in the territory that had been divided by the borders of Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia and Sudan. Early
surveys gather under this definition the Dodoth, Jie, Karamojong and Turkana (Gulliver, 1952), and Teso (Lawrance, 1952). Although these groups used the land in different and complex ways, they all kept livestock as an important aspect of their economy. The table below gives an overview of these groups based on their home areas. It is a highly heterogeneous collection, with deep political divisions, different production strategies and historical as well as recent conflicts. Nevertheless, all groups share an interest in keeping open the possibility to access areas normally controlled by some of the others, at times across national borders. Although census figures in these remote rural areas are typically only indicative, an estimated 1.4 million pastoralists and agro-pastoralists can be classified as part of the Karamojong cluster in 2007 (Akabawi and Ateyo, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Kaabong district: Dodoth</th>
<th>Kotido and Abim districts: Jie</th>
<th>Moroto district: Karimojong Matheniko Karimojong Bokora Teperth</th>
<th>Nakapiripirit district: Karimojong Matheniko Karimojong Pian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Turkana district: Turkana</td>
<td>West Pokot and Trans-Nzoia districts: Pokot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Kisoro Woreda, South Omo (SNNPR): Dassanech Nyangatom (Toposa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Bodi &amp; Kapoeta counties, Eastern Equatoria Region: Toposa (Toposa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies, Processes and Institutions in Karamoja cluster

With respect to policies, processes and government institutions, policies governing the various countries are different and so are the governance systems. Kenya has a centralized system, Uganda a devolved system, Ethiopia and Southern Sudan, federal systems. Thus when addressing conflict across international borders, these different systems prove to be impediments as the policies and structures that deal with conflict are different. For example the military is involved in Ethiopia, Uganda and Southern Sudan when it comes to livestock recovery. But in Kenya it is the Police and not the military that are involved. In Uganda the military protect the cattle of the Karimojong in protected kraals during the disarmament process but in the other countries this is not the case.

In addition disarmament processes are not taking place in all the countries at the same time or are being implemented in different approaches. Even within countries some communities have been disarmed more than others thus bringing about more animosity between communities. In Uganda due to the failure of the equitable disarmament of communities, cattle rustling in on the increase again and communities are rearming themselves.

Development programmes by the three governments in the Karamoja cluster are geared towards provision/enhancement of basic services such as water and food. In Uganda the Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme and in Kenya the Arid lands Resource Management Programme have been specifically designed to address development issues in areas that fall within the cluster.
The Kidepo Valley area

The Kidepo valley is to be found in the Kaabong District which is located in the extreme north-eastern corner of Uganda. The district borders in the North and East by Republic of Sudan and Kenya respectively. It also shares borders with the Districts of Kitgum in the West and Kotido in the South. Physically the district lies between latitude 2 degrees and 30’ and 4 degree 15’ Longitudes 33 degrees 30’ and 35 degrees 00’ east. Kaabong was split from Kotido District, in 2005.

Administration

Kaabong district has one county (Dodoth) with a total of eight sub-counties, one Town council, 44 Parishes, and 277 LC I Villages. The district headquarters are located in Kaabong Town Council. Other growing centres include, Kapedo, Kathile and Karenga, all located north of the district. The table below shows the administrative units by land area.

Table 1: Kaabong District Administrative Units by Land area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>area (km square)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodoth</td>
<td>Karenga</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathile</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidok</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyoro</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaabong Town Council</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaabong Sub-county</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalapata</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lolelia</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapedo</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kotido Baseline survey 1994

Population

According to the UBOS revised figures (2009), Kaabong had a population of 316,600 with a populated area of 5,888 square kilometres out of a possible 7,220 square kilometres, the rest of which is covered by the park and other reserves. The district had an overall population density of 53.78 persons per square kilometre with the majority of the population found in Kaabong Sub County and Kaabong Town council (Fig.1). The population is estimated to have reached 345,300 people by 2010.

Table 2: Kaabong district Population Density by sub county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub county</th>
<th>Population Density (ppsqkm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong S/C</td>
<td>284.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong T/C</td>
<td>1,489.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapata</td>
<td>122.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapedo</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karenga</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathile</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyoro</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidok</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolelia</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UBOS, Population density figures for Kaabong District 2009-Population density is calculated based on Parish area derived from UBOS 2006 boundary information.
Figure 1: Kaabong District Population Density (2009)

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pop per SqKm in Parish</th>
<th>Landuse Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=50</td>
<td>Forest Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 100</td>
<td>Game Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 200</td>
<td>National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 12,777</td>
<td>Rangeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>Lakes/Water Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IMU/UNOCHA, Kampala; Dec 2009
Economic activities

Agriculture is the main occupation of the population with 95% living in the rural areas and earning their living through agriculture (crop and livestock). The district is divided into three ecological zones; the semi-arid east, the fairer middle and the wetter western belt. The predominant crop in the semi-arid areas is sorghum, maize, finger millet, cow-peas, pumpkin and cucumber. In the middle zone in addition to the above bulrush millet, tepary beans, cassava, sweet potatoes, sun-flower, simsim and groundnuts are grown while in the western wetter belt all crops are grown including cotton, wheat and Soya-beans.

Every family (of five people) in Kaabong district grows at least two and a half acres of crops. Once every four years Kaabong experiences food shortages and once every ten years famine. This is mainly due to rainfall patterns and other factors such as wars, post harvest losses, declining land fertility, poor soil and water conservation techniques. The main crops grown are maize, beans, peas, sorghum, finger millet groundnuts and sunflower. In northern parts of the district, subsistence farming is dominant while the rest of the district is semi-nomadic. Among the semi-nomads, crop production is left to women and the elderly while the able bodied male and young children traverse the wilderness-herding animals. Ownership of livestock and commercial transactions form the highest legal source of income.

Table 3: Main Sources of Livelihood in Kaabong district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of household livelihood</th>
<th>% of total Household</th>
<th>% Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence farming</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial farming</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trading</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal trading</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage industry</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property income</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment income</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kaabong District Development Plan

Key Livelihoods in the Kidepo Valley area

Kaabong district borders Kidepo valley park on the Ugandan side. The district is characterized by rocky mountainous landscape with moderately low rainfall. The majority ethnic group is the Dodoth though other minority groups like the Ik are also found. The key livelihood strategies in this area are both agro-pastoral and pastoral. The three main livelihood zones found here are the North-East Karamoja Pastoral Zone, the Karamoja Livestock Sorghum Bullrush Millet Zone agro-pastoral zone and the North-East Sorghum-Simsim Maize Livestock agro-pastoral zone (Figure 2).
Livelihood activities in the Region have some striking similarities especially among the Pastoralist communities — albeit with some variations for the agro-pastoralists. Herding communities in Kaabong, Kotido and Moroto to a larger extent practice livestock keeping except in the villages where these herders come from. In the villages, there is also crop husbandry where ecology permits. Livestock reared include: cattle, goats, sheep, donkeys and camels. In the past, there was usually no crop husbandry at the kraal locations — however, with the introduction of protected kraals, this traditional pattern is changing in many significant ways. Based on intelligence reports about impending raids, kraals have inevitably been forced to
locate sometimes closer to the villages or farming areas. While relocation has been in the best security interest of herders and their property (largely, animals), it has been a source of unwarranted tensions between herders and farmers.

The agro-pastoral and crop cultivation based livelihood zones on the other hand largely practice a subsistence system of cultivation; although animal husbandry is also practiced. For crops, they mainly grow maize, sorghum, beans and pumpkins with simsim, groundnuts and sunflower. These crops are however susceptible to diseases, such as sorghum smut, maize steak and groundnut rosette. Provision of community agricultural services, a modality already being implemented in some areas, is worth exploring further — as a way of sustaining crop husbandry as well as increasing crop production for income and food security in the area. As a modality towards hunger reduction, the answer lies in shifting away from food aid towards medium to long-term solutions. Currently, fast yielding maturing crops are being introduced to kraal communities to enable production of crops.

The locations in this area experiences a mono model rainfall regime (April to September) and a prolonged drought (October to March). However, the trend is highly variable in time and space. Although abundant quality pastures grow during the rainy season, livestock diseases like tick borne diseases, helminthes, ephemeral fever and diarrheal also become abundant. The rainy season does not start and end at the same time in all zones, and this encourages mobility in search for production resources, which often increases stress on land and causes degradation as a result of overgrazing.

Figure 3: Seasonal Calendar in Kidepo area

On the average, this area and the Karamoja region in general experiences long droughts — with short and sometimes late annual rains, ranging between 500-700 mm. frequent famines that hit the region are largely attributed to these drought spells. Owing to the global climatic changes, the region (and other parts of the country in the East and the North) is experiencing correspondingly drastic weather changes with unpredictable patterns of rainfall. These have had adverse impact - in terms of droughts, floods and livestock diseases -on especially the pastoralist communities living in the predominantly arid and semi-arid areas of the area.

These dry seasons often leaves the soil bare and exposed. This leads to severe environmental degradation as soil erosion takes place due to soil compaction and limited vegetation. This soil erosion and run-off causes silting of rivers and valley dams leading them to dry out fast during the dry seasons, and causes floods downstream which devastate road infrastructure and wash
away crops. This however presents an opportunity for small scale irrigation for crop production, livestock and domestic use if this water could be harvested and stored efficiently.

Karamoja region in general is covered in a savanna grassland ecosystem characterized by widely spaced trees that leave the canopy open. The open canopy allows sufficient light to reach the ground to support an unbroken herbaceous layer consisting primarily of C4 grasses. This group includes a wide range of savannah woodland and tree savannah. Much of Kaabong, Labwor and western Jie are covered by dry Combretum and Acacia savannas. These savannas are usually interspersed by perennial grasses such as Setaria setulos and Andropogon gayanus. Man has had a considerable bearing on the development and maintenance of these savannas through the use of fires as a means of promoting grass. Where overgrazing has caused burning to be discontinued, there is degeneration from savannah to steppe. Flooded savannas are flooded seasonally or year-round which occurs mostly in the valley plains especially in mountainous areas. Few spots of montane savannas exist in Karamoja especially along the national borders with Kenya. Currently, grasslands are becoming more susceptible to woody plant encroachment due to loss of large herbivores in the region and the reduction in cattle population and this is expected to drive more changes in the open savanna grasslands (Nalule, 2010).

The communities living in these areas practice a unique dual settlement system that has been developed over time by the agro-pastoralists as a means all overcoming vulnerability to weather conditions and aftershocks. The majority of older men and women, children and the elderly, live in Manyatta that are almost permanent homesteads and are usually near to the areas used for cultivation. Alongside this, the Karimojong use mobile kraals for following available grass and water over the year and these support the adolescent males and females and mainly the stronger men. Certain areas are kept for grazing during the dry season and watering points that have perennial supplies of water are well known to all Karimojong and are associated with these pastures.

Traditionally, the rangelands here are managed to maximize socio-cultural benefits through a council of elders. The rangelands are used for grazing livestock for subsistence and prestige and emphasize mobility to sustain its production value. The rangelands currently provide the livelihoods of the Karimajong communities in form of food production, firewood, charcoal, brick-making, medicine, minerals, water for domestic use and livestock, pasture/fodder, honey, quarrying, fencing and building materials, commercial raiding and commercial firewood collection.

Some of the new uses of these rangelands that include charcoal, mineral mining, and quarrying, brick laying and crop production began as coping mechanisms to failing rangeland productivity and have now evolved into fully fledged alternative livelihood strategies with concomitant consequences to both the environment and communities. Some of these livelihood activities have been triggered by ecological changes taking place on Karamoja rangelands that include changes in vegetation types due to overuse, extreme climate events like drought and floods, anthropological activities like mining, deforestation and inappropriate land use (browsers for grazers and the reverse).

Firewood collection and food gathering is the domain of girls and women. They collect both firewood and fruits, and vegetables for domestic use as well as for sell. However, due to environmental destruction near settlements or manyatta, the trees/forest resources have been depleted. The girls and women move an equivalent six hour journey to collect these resources.
Communal Customary Tenure: Grazing Lands

At present, customary tenure has evolved into individualized and communal sub-tenures, each with distinct characters and resource rights embedded therein for the individuals, households and the community at large. Within communal customary, two sub-tenure types are distinguished; the grazing lands and the shrine areas, while within individualized customary sub-tenure, there is the arable land and land used for homesteads, where kraals are constructed.

Grazing lands are open access areas that are communally held and constitute the stock of land that is continuously being alienated into gardens and settlements. Individuals and communities are users and not owners of this kind of land. On grazing, land authority rests with elders and kraal commanders regarding resource use and regulation. Communal grazing land is shared by everyone and therefore centrally owned and managed. No one person can claim ownership over grazing land or a dam; these are community resources in a pastoral society. However, for agricultural land and settlement; land is owned by a family and it therefore manages its land. The elders’ major responsibility is to determine pasture use patterns including pasture banks for dry and wet season grazing, while kraal commanders decide herd numbers and day to day grazing locations.

Grazing lands do not hold definitive borders as they straddle across local government administrative demarcations and communities. There are no fixed boundaries between the gardens and grazing land; there are instances when what was formally grazing land is converted into land for gardens. The access rights to pasture and water resources are mainly based on group membership, history and opportunistic behaviour. The concept of access security determines the legitimacy with which one is able to move herds freely within the tribal boundaries and occasionally beyond; based on customary right of history of usage, and the accepted strategy of opportunistic tracking which guarantees secure access for the herd-owners.

Settlement and their effects of on rangeland natural resources

There is a long history of migration and resettlement within and without the region stemming from a series of shocks at the household and community level, as well as in broader security-related trends that are occurring within Karamoja as a whole. These movements are usually driven by socio-economic factors such seeking for employment and seeking for fertile land in addition to social issues such as problems within a household or community and for security reasons.

The main underlying causes of migration and resettlement are insecurity, widespread loss of livestock, loss of grazing land due to agriculture extension and gazettement for wildlife conservation. Livestock holdings underpin nearly all traditional coping mechanisms of Karamojong communities, and the loss of livestock profoundly affects the food security and human security of households and Manyattas.

Increasing trends in insecurity and reduction in livestock herds has led to the break-down of tribal relations, institutions, increased attacks in the mid 1970s through 1980s and, more recently, the wide-scale disarmament in 2001/2002 and 2006/2007.

Grazing land conversion to crop production is the main land use change infiltrating these fragile ecosystems. The specific causes of environmental degradation in these areas include: commercial and domestic wood extraction, crop cultivation, overgrazing, subsistence agriculture, and fuel wood extraction for domestic use. Brick laying is another recent activity carried out in some areas of Karamoja especially near trading centers or where roads are improved.
3. Livestock and Pastoralism

Pastoralism in this region produces milk, meat and blood for domestic consumption although some modification presently occurs involving market participation as a coping strategy to aid the purchase non-livestock food. This market participation involves direct sales or barter trade where meat hides & skins or, ghee is exchanged for grains. In essence, livestock for pastoralist communities are both financial and social assets, whose lifeline particularly hinges on mobility. As a financial asset, livestock provides food and incomes; while as a social asset, it plays a key role in building and consolidating social relationships and networks. Dependency on livestock as a livelihood means is key to the pastoralist communities in the Kidepo valley area. Traditional alliances also provide mutual safeguards for groups (clans, sub-clans) to manage their vulnerabilities. These are established on the basis of trade, security guarantees, intermarriage, financial exchange and other activities of mutual interest.

Policies on pastoralism

Pastoral groups are presently governed by a diverse array of partially overlapping and frequently incompatible regulations relating to land use/land tenure, forestry, water management and customary law. Uganda has a local government system of Districts, Counties and Sub-Counties with executive and legislative powers. These local governments are mandated by the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) and the Local Governments Amendment Act (1997). However, the management of natural resources is prerogative of the central government in Kampala, leaving local administrations with no decision-making power on the matter, and limited room for policy implementation. A Land Act (1998), designed to deal with the many land disputes across the country, offers some legal basis for pastoral land rights. On paper, the Land Act provides for the establishment of Communal Land Associations (CLAs) that would fit well into the social and economic relations of the Karimojong. However, implementation has so far been disappointing (Wantsusi, 2008; Aciro-Lakor, 2008). The constitution of Uganda does not have specific provisions on pastoralism and pastoralists. There is however growing recognition of pastoralism in policy and legal documents such as of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) - the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) - of Uganda. Decentralization policies in Uganda provide opportunities for pastoralists to influence decisions at the local level for the benefit of their livelihoods. The extent to which pastoralists are able to take advantage of these opportunities ultimately depends on their capacity for self-organization and mobilization to make local institutions of governance accountable.

Policies on land and natural resource management

Access to and security of land tenure is critical for productive and sustainable pastoralism, but land laws and policies have hindered the development of pastoralism. Failure to recognize communal and pastoral land tenure in laws and policies, and the little regard paid to customary land laws in both land administration and management and within the judicial system, have led to governmental abuse of the land rights of pastoralists through the appropriation of their lands for other uses. On this front, positive steps are also beginning to be made in recognition of pastoral land rights. Uganda captured the issues of land tenure security through the provision of community land in the 1998 Land Act and the Land Sector Strategic Plan of 2002 which identifies pastoralists as a vulnerable group with insecure and uncertain land rights. The Land Sector Strategic Plan (LSSP) is designed to remove barriers to increased land utilization, broaden land services to rural areas and customary land, address inequality, tenure insecurity, inequitable systems and
processes, strengthen land rights of the vulnerable groups and women, empower local
governments and communities to make and implement their own policies and plans for their
land, and provide an appropriate and supportive framework for sound environmental and natural
resources management. The LSSP recognizes the need to secure land rights for rural farmers
in order to ensure sustainability of livelihoods. Pastoralists constitute a category recognized to
be among the poorest and most land-insecure. The LSSP proposes specific measures to
enhance the land rights of vulnerable groups. Rights to land in gazetted areas and desire for the
community management of gazetted areas are becoming great concerns in Karamoja. Both in
Kenya and Uganda, the law does not effectively protect pastoralists’ land tenure due to
pastoralists’ mobility. Government policies promote privatization of rangelands through
certification in these countries.

**Policies on CAHWs**

In the livestock sector of Uganda, constraints abound in the delivery of both private and
government veterinary services. Veterinary services are not readily available for livestock even
in times of drought. District veterinary departments are poorly facilitated and severely
constrained by lack of adequate human resources and transport to effectively monitor activities
of private service practitioners. The NAADS “demand-driven extension service delivery”
framework targets mainly crop production; but it could be more effective if it integrated
veterinary extension service delivery as the livestock sector is crucial to the livelihood of millions
of people. The government has yet to develop a NAADS-like framework for the livestock sub-
sector. Livestock extension service delivery is yet to be integrated into the unified extension
services delivery system. Planned training of private enterprises involved in provision of
extension services under NAADS program has mainly targeted crops and not livestock.

A number of NGOs working in Karamoja Region have been advocating for the promotion of
community based animal health care services which are more appropriate to the needs of
remote pastoralists. This approach, combined with decentralization of government provision of
such services within a number of new policy frameworks, has led to a change in the contextual
environment for the programme. The current Government of Uganda policy on animal health
service providers allows CAHWs to operate in Karamoja Region in recognition of the
remoteness and mobility of many of its people, the limited coverage of the government DVD and
the lack of any other qualified animal health service providers. The Karamoja Region is unique
since CAHWs are not allowed to operate in other regions of Uganda and this makes it all the
more important that lessons from the CBAH services in this region should be learnt and
disseminated as a means of influencing future policy.

**Livestock management**

Karamoja contributes a big share (19.8%) to the national herd with the Kaabong district having a
stated livestock population of 180,000 cattle, 380,000 sheep and 280,000 goats as of 2009
(Livestock Production Office, Kaabong District). The district livestock production office however
indicated that this figure is currently (2011) lower than stated due to livestock deaths attributed
to droughts, disease and raids. Karamoja contributes all camel population and majority of small
ruminants in Uganda. All these animals are kept on natural pastures and on communally
managed grazing lands. Although the region has high livestock population, it has the least milk
sold. Milk production is generally low due to poor pasture, diseases, lack of water and long
distances travelled by the stock looking for fodder and water in addition to household
dependency on milk for home consumption. Livestock is owned by men though management is
by both sexes; the men take full responsibility and power to spend the money got from livestock
selling. Poultry is limited due to lack of grains.
The traditional approaches to rangeland management that have sustained the range ecosystems here include such practices as migration (mobility)/ transhumance, and mixed grazing and burning. Herd movement has been the principle method employed by pastoralists to exploit the environmental heterogeneity. These practices have promoted rangeland productivity and conservation of the environment. For instance, mixing livestock species has not only ensured maximization of range utilization, efficient labour utilization but also lessened the risk of total livestock failure in cases of environmental stresses such as droughts. Other advantages have been a reduction in susceptibility of the livestock to pests and diseases and a better use of the environment where the combination of species kept had different feeding habits (grazers, browsers and intermediates). This traditional grazing resources control is done by council of elders through kraal leaders. The leaders sit and plan for water, pasture and security. The animals are driven to these resources as a community herd. A community in this context is used to mean a village or Manyatta which is based on a clan. In the government administrative system a community is equivalent to Local Council 1 (LC1). As water and pasture resources reduce, the community elders monitors and re-establish new plans for next movement. They send surveyors to identify the appropriate place for the next move. In case of diseases outbreak, the committee holds a meeting and plan for the solution that may call for services of extension work of a herbalist expert. This may also call for migration to another settlement by the whole community (village). The committee is also responsible for disciplinary actions on wrong doers, constructing and managing watering sources like the ponds.

The grazing land is divided into wet season and dry season grazing land. The wet season grazing land is mainly controlled by the clan leaders while the dry season grazing land belongs to all Karimajong irrespective of ethnic grouping. There is no leadership claiming control of such land. This has subjected dry season grazing land to overgrazing and land degradation.

Traditionally, livestock is divided into different herds according to the prevailing resources and health status. The main herd categories are the healthy herd, milking and calves herd and the sick herd. During the rainy season, livestock graze near manyatta while migration of some stock would take place in mid dry season to avoid damage to local habitats. The grazing of pasture is determined by the needs of each herd. For instance the sick herd, some milking cows and the calves would remain close to homestead under the care of women and children while the healthy herd would graze far away pastures. The herds remain near homesteads would provide the food for the remaining members of the family (women, elderly and young children). In the agro-pastoral zones, the crop straws/residues provide supplementary feeding to animals remaining close to manyatta. Cattle normally have specified routes they would follow in search of water and pastures though grazing would be confined on ranges belonging to a particular clan with exception of severe droughts when the animals would migrate beyond clan or regional boundaries into Turkana (Kenya) and Southern Sudan.

Currently, two types of herds are recognized: the herds in the protected kraals/herds and the small herd that remain near homesteads. The Protected kraals were introduced by the government in response to rising insecurity,. The system entails protection of livestock by government forces in the field during the day while grazing and taking all livestock to protected kraals at night. These kraals established in every sub-county are situated beside military barracks and are meant to protect livestock from raiders

The difference between the current livestock management under the protected kraals system and the traditional grazing approach is in extent of grazing/mobility. The extent of mobility has been reduced due to the introduction of protected kraal system. This therefore means that there is less access to grazing resources than there was previously as animals cannot travel further
from the kraals than where it is possible to make the return journey to the designated kraal where they will spend the night. Even though Protected Kraals had been successful in reducing incidents of massive cattle raids, some raids have continued despite the security provided in these protected kraals.

The community is however not quite satisfied with the way animals are handled as they believe animals are congested in the protected kraals, attract diseases, have limited access to good pastures and water, limited veterinary care, calves are not well managed in addition to the disappearance of some animals in the kraals. This scenario has further led to limited access to livestock products like milk, a primary source of food for these pastoralists.

In summary, the analysis of herders’ mobility patterns based on the seasonal calendar fundamentally reveals that mobility is a necessary part of a herder’s livelihood strategy. This strategy draws from age old mechanisms to cope with the ecological realities of the drought-prone area that they live in. In the end, this traditional livelihood strategy also aims to increase productivity, food security and wealth (incomes). Movement allows herders to use a variety of pastures, water points and resources such as salt licks, and is a sophisticated adaptation to the challenges of risky environments. Using indigenous knowledge of the seasonal changes and mastery of the vast terrain, pastoralists know for example the exact mobility route to a specific destination, where to find salty grass and plenty of water for their animals; and when (season/month) to de-silt ponds/wells. A pastoralist’s mobility pattern is a crucial planning tool that can be used to map out service delivery implementation strategies. For effective service delivery, there is therefore need to establish the exact location of mobile pastoralist at a particular point in time. Interplay of factors, e.g., security, weather conditions, availability of pasture and water, etc. determine the amount of time spent in a location and the next destination point.

On the other hand, where protected kraals exist, the Army — which lacks this indigenous knowledge — now plays a significant role in determining mobility routes. The Army’s decision on mobility is largely influenced by intelligence reports on the security situation and not livestock needs and or grazing resource availability. This may in the long run have serious implications on pastoralists’ livelihood strategy that has been in place for generations and ultimately on animal health, productivity and food security. The restrictions on mobility — imposed on pastoralist communities since 2001 when the first disarmament exercise was launched in Karamoja — have considerably undermined local livelihood systems, hence increasing vulnerabilities among pastoralist communities. Seen in this light, it is may be more beneficial for any policy framework on livelihood interventions or otherwise in the Region to safeguard and sustain the local livelihoods of livestock keepers as a way to minimize their vulnerabilities, such as, to food or financial or other insecurity.

The preservation of herd movement requires legal recognition of existing customary tenures arrangements especially those which provide for seasonal use of a wide variety of ecological resources.
Protected Kraals

There has been growing interest over the use of Protected Kraals in the sub-region, particularly their impact on affected communities (kraal, host, and livestock owning families at the manyattas), and on the environment. Additional concerns relate to the question of responsibility for determining access, location, freedom of movement to new protected Kraal locations and movement of livestock for pasture and water. The concerns outlined above prompted Kaabong District and partners, including the local government, NGOs, UN agencies and the UPDF, to conduct an inter-agency assessment on Protected Kraals in April 2009. Key findings were based on discussions with Protected Kraal, host and livestock-owing communities, as well as with local leaders, security officials and district and opinion leaders.

Generally, interviewed communities acknowledged that Protected Kraals had been successful in reducing incidents of massive cattle raids, improving access to veterinary services, inputs and regulated grazing. However, several points of concern were raised, notably increased stress on existing grazing corridors, gazetted areas and water points due to the restricted movement of animals with longer distances to pasture/water and decreased grazing times. In addition, the over-concentration of large herds in small areas was compacting soils in fields where animals regularly grazed, resulting in environmental and land degradation and leading to increased run-off and difficulties in cultivation. Impacts on human communities were found to include a reported displacement of over 150 people and deprivation of land for agricultural production. Communities whose livestock were kept in Protected Kraals reported being deprived of animal products that they needed most (meat, ghee and milk) because only specified individuals were allowed to enter the kraals under UPDF orders for security reasons and, in some cases, due to the distance involved. Moreover, large numbers of children working in the Protected Kraals are not attending school; over 60 per cent of school-aged children in visited communities were not enrolled in schools, while between 35 per cent and 45 per cent were forced to drop out in part because they have to take care of the animals. On average, attendance rates in assessed communities were a lowly three per cent. An added point of concern for the large numbers of children in the Kraals, attracted by the availability of animal products like milk and butter, is their vulnerability in the event of clashes or raids on the Kraals or at grazing areas Livestock health related impacts of Protected Kraals were found to be even more pronounced. Due to livestock congestion and long distances to water and pasture points, high mortality rates, particularly of calves and culled animals, were being registered. A majority of Kraals with large livestock populations estimated losing an average of 100 animals a month since November 2008 due to starvation and diseases. The incidence of diseases such as East Coast Fever, goat plague, Contagious Bovine Pleuro Pneumonia (CBPP) and mange was reported to have increased since the Protected Kraals were established. For Kraals located near Kidepo National Park, the risk of cross-spreading of vector-borne diseases such as Nagana was also cited, given the sharing of grazing areas with wild life.

Recommendations from the assessment include decentralizing of livestock protection involving carefully regulated and trained youth to guard smaller kraals at the village level. Such youth would be better able and motivated to pursue livestock raiders given their knowledge of the terrain and their vested interests in the community’s livelihood. Decentralization of kraals would also enable access to animal products for a wider number of children, the elderly and other vulnerable groups at the village level, as well as increase food production as a result of the availability of oxen to farmers for animal traction. Additional recommendations included the recruitment of local defence unit personnel (LDUs) to complement the UPDF; provision of transport to military detaches to facilitate the pursuit of raiders; and, improvement in channels of communication between brigade headquarters and communities in regard to reporting raiders’ movements. Furthermore, the presence of the Uganda Police Force in the region currently includes 1,100 officers, which could be further strengthened to ensure expansion of regularized civilian protection to meet the national standard police-to-civilians ratio of 1:500.
Pastoral coping mechanisms:

Among the pastoralists, drought affects a broad-spectrum of society and impacts people’s daily lives. A number of characteristics that manifest themselves in a pastoralist community hit by drought include, but are not limited to poor or no harvests in the agro-pastoral zones, reduction of natural resources (pastures and surface water), reduced milk production, death of livestock and people due to food shortage, migration of people in search of food to towns or to zones where some harvest was realized, escalation of raids, aggravation of livestock and human diseases due to shortage of food.

Coping strategies during drought

Due to the vulnerability inherent to this pastoral system; pastoralists have developed complex strategies of mitigating the effects of environmental uncertainty. Some of the forms through which the people in the Kidepo valley try to cope with drought are:

1. Engaging in day-labor as a livelihood strategy in towns such as Kaabong, and/or to organizations such as OXFAM/GB in road construction (e.g. Kamion-Oropoi road) and desilting of dams
2. Reducing the number of meals per day - this is especially among the pastoral communities since pastoralists are not willing to sell their animals to buy food stock
3. Increased bush product collection and sale including hunting and gathering of honey, wild fruits, and vegetables. The sale of firewood and charcoal is intensified in bad periods and years. Charcoal is exported out of this area to other regions within the country. The environmental implications of this strategy are likely to be damaging
4. Migration to places where harvests were more productive
5. Increased livestock sales – Households from the better off wealth group sell additional livestock to cover food and other essential purchases in bad years. Even for the better off, however, the extent to which this strategy of increased livestock sales can be pursued without damaging future livelihoods is quite limited
6. Treatment of livestock diseases – Better off households sometimes purchase livestock drugs to treat their herds. The government and its development partners have been providing free vaccinations
7. Appeal to government/NGO for emergency food relief
8. Brick making.
9. Stealing and raiding livestock from other clans.
10. Sending children to Universal Primary Education schools to survive. Enrolled girl children are given take-home rations by World Food Program (WFP) to make parents develop a positive attitude towards girl education. This ration has become a fortune in food scare households.
11. Increased consumption of wild foods – Most households collect and consume wild foods in normal years. In bad years, households increase the amounts collected and consume them over a longer period of time.
4. Conflict & Security

Conflicts in this region and the whole the Karamajong Cluster of Kenya and Uganda are endemic. They often have profound impact on the livelihoods of the people living in the area. They are influenced by climatic variations and consequent drought and food crises, as well as cultural traits of pastoralists. In general, various previous studies (FEWSNET, 2005) have found that there were direct links between the changing climatic conditions, natural resource and livelihoods shrinkage and conflict in the cluster. Drastic change in climate has affected the availability of resources, leading to food deficits, and food insecure populations resort to conflict as a coping strategy against food shortage. One reason that the conflicts have intensified is due to environmental deterioration that invariably resulted in the decline of land productivity. Frequency of drought (aggravating pasture and water scarcity and forcing pastoralists of a particular section to seek for pasture and water outside their own territory) and changing consumption patterns are other causes conflict.

Restriction of access and migration to some of the traditional dry season grazing areas as a result of the creation of game reserves, forest reserves, large-scale agriculture, private land ownership, the creation of national boundaries, and the intrusion of a cash-based economy have also played a role in aggravating pastoral conflicts. Other factors include: proliferation of illicit arms; intensified cattle rustling; inadequate policy and state security arrangements; competition over control and access to water and pastures; diminishing role of traditional governance systems; increasing levels of poverty; and idleness amongst the youth.

The key types of pastoralist conflicts spilling over into this region and experienced within much of the Karamajong Cluster take place within several levels and manifest themselves in the following forms:

1. Intra-clan conflicts, the most common type, characterized by sections of one community (clan) or one Sub-county (Sub division) fighting with one another. In Kaabong the Dodoth and the Ik (Teuso) and Jie clash over suspicion for various reasons. Since 1987, inter-clan clashes have become more violent and regular and involve all different clans of Karamoja confronting each other.
2. Interdistrict conflicts bring the Karamajong against other tribes/communities living in the districts neighboring the Cluster, possibly within the same country.
3. Cross border conflicts take place across the international borders of the Karamajong cluster groups where conflict exists between one tribe in one country against another tribe in the neighboring.

Scarcity of natural resources and a poor economic environment seem to be the main cause of insidious conflict in this area. The bio-physical complex arising from long term environmental changes in the cluster characterized by worsening climatic conditions (such as low and erratic rainfall and prevalent prolonged drought) has increased competition over diminishing scarce resources.

Dwindling resources compel pastoralist communities to fight with one another. The frequency of drought has increased the speed and degree at which surface water dries up, reducing water availability for human and livestock consumption. At the same time, the grass cover becomes scarcer and unable to sustain livestock populations. Consequently, disputes over access to and control of these resources develop among pastoralists. Subsequently, the need to monopolize the utilization of resources in a particular place degenerates into conflict when a particular group trying to force competing groups out of the region. This obliges groups to move with their
livestock away from highly contested areas as a protection against being raided. Sometimes, allies are sought as a strategy to scare away the rival group from accessing the resources.

Abject poverty and underdevelopment in the region is yet another cause of conflict among pastoralists.

Another reason for the persistence of conflict in the Cluster results from a shift in raiding targets. Originally livestock raiding was purely for restocking depleted stocks or for marriage. It was taboo to sell stolen livestock because such livestock was a safety net to help others to also restock when the need arose. Nowadays, raiding has become the cheapest way of quickly accumulating wealth.

In the area around Kidepo, there has been some remarkable improvement over the last two years especially along the Region’s highways; although the situation can sometimes be very unpredictable. Currently, there are waves of insecurity (largely small scale animal and other property theft) affecting mostly the communities in the villages and — most surprisingly — the security kraals. This has raised serious concern about the security of the largely disarmed communities and their property. In spite of the Government-led disarmament campaign in the Region, some individuals in the population are armed — and still regard the gun as a strategic possession.

Inter-ethnic conflicts have caused considerable insecurity to human life and property, with spill-over effects in the region’s neighbouring districts and countries. The recently established Anti Stock Theft Unit (ASTU) stationed along the region’s borders and notorious cattle corridors has however led to a lessening of this spill-over effect into the neighbouring districts.

Issues of conflict have been comprehensively addressed in a preceding report in this series (see Karani, 2010)
5. Livestock Health and Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW)

This review established that the three most important diseases of livestock in the Kidepo valley areas are CBPP, ECF and anaplasmosis and currently foot and mouth disease. Trypanosomiasis was considered a problem around the Kidepo game park where there was closer contact between wild animals and livestock, and more tsetse flies present.

The pastoralists chiefly rely on ethnoveterinary knowledge (EVK) to control common livestock diseases and conditions. The pastoralists have sustained their livestock in circumstances of limited extension services through this mechanism. The most used medicinal plants for treatment of human and livestock diseases from Karamoja rangelands are *Balanites aegyptiacus*, *Aloe sp*, *Carissa spinarum*, *Warburgia salutaris*, *Azadiracta indica* and *Harrisonia abyssinica* for bacterial and protozoan diseases and *Albizia anthelmintica* for helminthes control. All the medicinal plants are collected from the wild; very few like *Azadiracta indica* are being promoted for their value near settlement following sensitization and facilitation by some NGOs and CBOs.

In the prevailing situation where livestock are kept in protected kraals, there is a challenge in use of ethno-veterinary knowledge since the animals are away from the healers. The calves are not receiving the care they deserve, their mortality is high and growth rates are tremendously reduced. The protected kraals need support of professional veterinary personnel to assist in more complicated cases.

The complete picture of the number of existing CAHW in the Kidepo valley is not very clear. This Assessment was able to establish that there were a total of 127 CAHWs trained in Kaabong district in 2009 with support from Oxfam and SCIUG (Save the Children in Uganda) but there presently only 57 active ones. At that time, the number is said to have been short by 73 CAHWs because of the vastness of the District. With the active number standing at 57, there is clearly shortage in number of CAHWs within the district.

CAHWs have with support from Oxfam formed district-based associations for community animal welfare, e.g., DOCAWA in Kaabong. The associations have also been supported to establish Veterinary Drug Shops (housed in permanent buildings) and given initial start-up capital for purchase of animal drugs. These district based drug shops have now been decentralized to the sub-county level. For example, Kaabong district has three Veterinary Drug Shops, in Sidok, Kathile and Kalapata sub-counties.

Key challenges to provision of animal health services include poor accessibility of communities, uncoordinated animal health service delivery by partners, drop-out on CAHWs mostly due to lack of compensation by the communities, limited numbers in CAHWs among others.
6. Status of Pastoral Field Schools/Farmer Field Schools and Village Saving and Loan Scheme (VSAL) / Village Community Banking (VICOBA)

The introduction of Pastoral Field Schools/Farmer Field Schools is a relatively new concept in Kidepo valley and the general Karamoja cluster. It is based on FAOs commonly known Farmer Field School, but adjusted to a pastoral setting. The concept was introduced to stakeholders including consortium members in various trainings held by FAO in the region, and several organizations (e.g. VSF-B, Oxfam, ACTED, C&D; KADP; Save The Children, CARE, FAO etc) have been experimenting with the concept over the last 2-3 years. PFS/FFS creates room for mutual learning and exchange of experiences among community members and it aims to bring in new knowledge and information through experiments and exchange visits between different field schools and other stakeholders. Depending on the livelihood zones of Karamoja, the focus for the groups usually varies between Farmer-field-school and Pastoral-field-school approach. In total 77 PFS (as at December 2009) have been or are being undertaken in North Pokot and Karamoja region, distributed in the sites as seen in the table below.

Number of PFS established and membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>No. of PFS</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTED</td>
<td>Pokot North (Kenya) &amp; Nakapiripirit (Uganda) Districts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakapiripirit &amp; Moroto Districts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>Kaabong District</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF</td>
<td>Moroto District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESVI</td>
<td>Kaabong District</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% gender breakdown</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to FFS, a total of 75 FFS have been implemented in Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto and Nakapiripirit Districts with a total participation of 2,292 with women constituting 50.5%.

Number of FFS established and membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>No. of FFS</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>Kaabong District</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Moroto &amp; Nakapiripirit Districts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARITAS</td>
<td>Kotido District</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% gender breakdown</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2010, C&D established 28 Agropastoral field schools in Kaabong District & CESVI 40 Agropastoral field Schools also in Kaabong District. The agro- pastoral field school approach
results from the adaptation of the Farmer Field School methodology and the Pastoral Field Schools. It draws from the observation that few populations of Karamoja are exclusively pastoralist and that many communities derive their livelihoods from a mixed approach of cropping and herding.

One of the most innovative activities that has been introduced into PFS/FFS are the Village Saving and Loan Scheme (VSAL) / Village Community Banking (VICOBA). With VSAL/VICOBA members of PFS/FFS make weekly saving contribution, currently at Kshs 20 (on Kenyan side) and Ushs 1000 (Ugandan side). An additional Kshs 10 for Kenya and Ushs 500 is made by members weekly towards welfare. The savings collected are then loaned to members for one month at 10% interest per month.

VSLA/VICOBA is providing PFS/FFS, particularly women with the financial and other resources to engage in alternative livelihoods and is also an important aspect in group cohesion. Members benefit from loans that are mainly invested in animal trade, small retail business such as buying and selling of sugar, tea leaves eggs, cereals mainly maize, soaps, vegetables and hotel business on market days. The loans have also been used to purchase drugs for animal treatment at a fee. Oyakosim PFS in Kaabong District for example managed to accumulate up to Ushs 3,665,000 within a relatively short time. Members are borrowing and utilizing the money for various purposes including building of houses from the profits generated from the investments made from the borrowed money, paying school fees etc.

Generally in Pastoralist communities of the study area and Karamojong cluster in general, there has been a negative attitude towards savings in the past and the VSLA/VICOBA has been a landmark in terms of transforming attitudes towards savings. These have also played a significant role also in engaging women in gainful economic activities and alternative livelihoods and need to be further developed.

Further, PFS approach has also helped to influence and demystify the traditional attitude of men towards women: For instance, men now are able to allow their wives to attend meetings and engage in decision making which is a key starting point to the empowerment process of women. Secondly women are now allowed to sit with men in the same group and contribute to discussion which was not the case before. They are increasingly being elected to key leadership positions including chairperson and are actively participating in the saving and loan scheme. They have also been able to take loans and engage in IGAs.

There is however still need for all the leaders in PFS/FFS to be given further training on business skills, record keeping, financial management and leadership skills. Further, Regular monitoring and mentoring by implementing agency should be provided at this initial stage to provide a good benchmark.
7. Water sources and community management

The different sources of water in the Kidepo valley include; rivers, ponds, dams and boreholes. Majority of water facilities are owned by the communities who developed them and are responsible for maintaining them although are practically are poorly managed. Majority of the rivers are seasonal as they lose their water very fast. In this region, water points have a major bearing on the distribution and concentration of livestock and settlement. They also permit the management of range carrying capacity, and also enable temporary protection of certain areas from livestock (green belts). In order to keep livestock in areas without notable surface water resources, boreholes have been constructed. The choice of positioning boreholes is made not only according to the availability of water resources but also according to the requirements of the community. It was established during the study that both humans and livestock get water from the same source despite the efforts by community to provide livestock drinking troughs near the source.

Although boreholes, ponds and earth dams have been constructed in the region, they are not enough (Fig 4). Communities have water management committees that take charge of their protection but due to the big population, supply is still challenged.
8. Kidépo Valley National Park and Resource use around the Park

The Kidépo Valley National Park was established by the Government of Uganda in 1962. Located in the corner of Uganda’s north-eastern border with Sudan and Kenya, the Kidépo Valley National Park covers 1,436 square kilometers and was initially established as a game reserve in 1958 and amended to Game Park status by statutory instrument in 1962 (UWA). The park has a high latitudinal range and correspondingly wide climatic conditions resulting into diverse flora and fauna. Mountain forests also dominate some of the high places, while areas along the Lorupi River support dense Acacia geradi forest. The flora and fauna of the park are more typical of Kenya than the rest of Uganda.

Kidépo Valley National Park has retained its original acreage of 1,436 square kilometres as of 1962, accounting for 5.2% of the land area in Karamoja. 86 species of mammals—including bat-eared fox, striped hyena, aardwolf, jackal, cheetah, and wild dog, 473 species of birds—notably hornbills, eagles, and ostriches—and 692 plant species have been recorded. To date, the park is still managed under the policy of strict protectionism5.

Unlike other parks in Uganda, in Kidépo Valley National Park, there is strictly no grazing and once a person is found grazing they are arrested. However, in case of disaster the Minister responsible for tourism has statutory powers to permit controlled grazing. According to James Okware, Senior Warden, Uganda Wildlife Authority in the Moroto Office, access can also be granted for collection of some forest products within the Park, such as fire wood, bee keeping or honey, collection of herbs. This however requires that the community enters into an agreement in form of: “...a Memorandum of Understanding with the Park Authorities, so that specific access gates are assigned for their use (both entry and exit) and the demarcation of specific passages are adhered to, especially with people in parishes nearby”.

For effective management of the Wildlife Reserves, the Wildlife Authority signed Memoranda of Understanding with all the five districts of Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Nakapipirit, Moroto with to jointly manage wildlife in the districts, a process that was preceded by consultative meetings. Previous surveys have however established that communities surrounding this national park are not aware of such opportunities for access especially during prolonged dry seasons, when such emergency measures are of importance.

There is lack of adequate literature on environmental and natural resource management in the Kidépo valley area and yet numerous natural resources are harvested and processed in the study area. The environment is a source of key pasture and water resources, building material, wild foods, fuel wood and charcoal, honey collection, hunting etc. The rapid field survey however confirmed that the local community was well aware of the natural resources present on village land, however efforts to conserve these resources are not proactive and do not incorporate the village members sufficiently. Wildlife is managed centrally by the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). However, in recent times, with support from the district authorities; the village authorities have taken the initiative to develop proposals to access some funds collected from the Kidépo Valley Park.

Lack of compensation to communities for loss of farm crops due to wildlife was however an issue at the top of the communities’ concern.

The Kidépo valley National Park is not clearly demarcated for observance by the communities and there are areas where settlements had encroached into the park area. This situation is a fertile breeding ground for community–wildlife conflicts and community–Wildlife Authority
conflicts, and various members of the community have been arraigned in court for settling/farming into areas that are defined as park area. Further, there are many cases of claims to land and occupation of around Kidepo park where settlements are evident and due to rising human population.

The rapid survey revealed that the ministry of natural resource management never actually gets a share of the monies that arise from the management agreements with the park as these are channeled directly to the UWA. Neither is the community benefitting as most are yet to form associations that will sign Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) on behalf of their communities, so that the monies from these arrangements can be directly received by the communities.

A comprehensive study carried out in Kaabong area (Mugisha, 2002) revealed several issues by the communities around Kidepo park regarding resource management and use around the park.

The following were concerns that communities identified with regard to changes that are affecting the present environment around Kidepo:

- Firewood has become scarcer. People now travel longer distances to collect firewood
- Drought leads to crop failure, reduced grazing and water for both livestock and human consumption
- There is a serious lack of building materials such as poles, rafters, reeds, fibers and grass
- Increased soil erosion has created many gullies in the country side, which are dangerous to livestock and human beings
- Due to hunting, there has been a total destruction of big game and now it is difficult to see any of these animals.
- Uncontrolled immigration and restriction of mobility has increased human and cattle pressure on environment, which has led to over grazing.

Further interviews with communities during the present assessment revealed that incidences of human-wildlife conflict were rampant with no compensation from the UWA. The only thing the UWA offered the communities was the provision of a warden to be stationed within the community to stave off wildlife from reaching farmers’ fields. The communities were no satisfied with this approach as they indicated it has so far not been effective at preventing crop losses due to wildlife on their farmlands.

The communities went ahead and listed the following ways in which they are presently dealing with this emerging resource management scenario around the park:

1. People are trying to plant more trees and reserve the natural forest such as in Karenga sub-county
2. People have informed the government about the Turkana immigrants who are entering their area
3. People have increased ridges (piled grass) and have began to dig drainage channels to stop soil erosion
4. Inter-cropping and crop rotation are some of the methods that have been introduced to increase food production
5. Communities have informed the relevant authorities about the problem animals that come out of the PA to destroy their crops
6. They are cooperating with the parks’ management in apprehending poachers who poach in the park.
7. Communities have instituted a system to levy a fine to their members who are caught poaching. These poachers are charged and fined, by the community leaders. Fines range
from 4 bulls and confiscation of guns, which are handed over to the park to become a park property. 

To aid sustainability, several factors will inform future activities of the park and provide avenues to improve relationship with the communities residing around it. These are:

1. There should be improved relationship between park management and neighboring communities
2. Government should increase logistical support to the park in form of transport, staffs, communication, infrastructure, improved roads and airfield.
3. Training of the indigenous local people to manage some parts of the park
4. Increase mutual co-operation between the park management and security organs in addressing issues like cattle rustling, poaching and maintenance of good relations with neighboring communities at park borders.
5. More education and sensitization of local communities neighboring park
6. Poverty in rural areas should be addressed to stop people from hunting. Tourist sites should be established and promoted in the neighboring communities
9. Summary of current livelihood realities among pastoralist communities in the Kidepo valley

In summary and based on the foregoing, mobile herders in the Kidepo valley face a multitude of challenges ranging from negative attitudes of policy-makers and service providers about their way of life to insecurity. The following are key challenges faced by pastoralists in this area.

Negative attitudes of policy-makers and service providers towards mobile herders
Many times, mobility is neither appreciated nor understood as a viable livelihood system. This attitude is shaped by many factors including for example: association of mobile herding to the negative practice of cattle raiding and theft; a history of marginalization; multitude of myths and misunderstandings, such as — “Pastoralism has very low productivity; sedentary cattle raising is more productive than mobile systems; Pastoral techniques are archaic; modern scientific methods need to be introduced; Mobility is inherently backward, unnecessary, chaotic and disruptive; and Pastoralists need to settle to benefit from services. As a consequence, mobile herders have continued to be ill served by development policies and actions since planners have tried to convert pastoralists into something else, perceived more modern, more progressive and more productive.

Livestock performance and food security
Livestock health-related concerns are impinging on both the immediate short and long term food security of pastoralists. The original traditional set up in the Region before the disarmament process was such that some 5 — 10% of the livestock would be kept at the homesteads to cater for food needs; while 90% would be kept in the mobile kraals away from the villages. This arrangement has been disrupted since the advent of disarmament and Protected Kraals — with considerable food security implications to the homesteads. The present confinement of animals in protected kraals across the Region has led to competition for scarce resources (i.e., pasture and water) — hence affecting their productivity and making them prone to disease breakouts and, ultimately, death of some animals.

Threatened livelihoods and coping mechanisms
Mobility patterns of pastoralist communities have been greatly interfered with — partly due to security related restrictions associated with the protected kraals. Gradually, this may have an impact on land resource management as well as on the long term livelihood strategies and coping and natural mechanisms of the pastoralist communities. Security-related restrictions imposed on animal movement have had serious implications on animal health as well. Animals move longer distances for pastures and water — leaving them with not enough grazing time. This reduces their productivity. Over-congestion in protected kraals also exposes animals to diseases such as, East Coast Fever, goat plague and Contagious Bovine Pleuro Pneumonia.

There is also concern that concentration of livestock in one area compresses the soil — causing destruction of the soil and vegetation and general environmental degradation.

Finally, not all mobile herders own livestock. Some of them are engaged as herders (usually older children) by livestock owners. Some of these herders could indeed have owned livestock at one time or another; but could have lost all or significant portion of them for many reasons — such as, the hefty dowry payment, animal diseases, rampant raids, etc. As such, a significant amount of out-migration is going on for many destitute families in the region to various
destination points in search for alternative means to support their livelihoods — simply because all their cattle were lost.
This scenario present the need for alternative livelihood systems (developed within the livestock sector), not to swap the herder’s livelihood systems with those perceived to be “more modern, more progressive and more productive ones;” but, rather to provide a livelihood security to many vulnerable families and their families in the event of any future adversities.

Inadequate pasture and water intensified by restricted movement due to insecurity
The ecological characteristics of the Region with low or no rain have continued to undermine the availability of adequate pastures and water for the animals. Like in other areas in the general Karamojong cluster Region, areas around Kidepo have been experiencing a long dry spell due to late rains; and, as observed during the assessment, this was already causing crop failure in some areas. The problem of inadequate pasture and water has been worsened by restricting mobile herders’ movements. Some of the previous grazing destinations were in districts outside the Region. These restrictions have left mobile herders with limited movement choices in search of pasture and water to satisfy the needs of their animals.

Limited and inadequate social services to communities
While the security situation has generally improved as a result of security responses, mobility as a livelihood system is yet to be adequately supported with basic social services to boost the livelihood security of the pastoralist community. In spite of the obvious need, many of the community service delivery systems to mobile herders are in the initial stages of social services provision; and some — such as animal health services — are still largely experimental. Even where the system appears to be picking, the coverage is still low; and in some cases service provision by stakeholders is generally uncoordinated.

A cycle of armed cattle raids and insecurity and vagaries of climate
A considerable amount of livestock— even in the protected kraals — is still being lost to both internal and cross-border raids in this area. The combination of losses due to raids and droughts has greatly contributed to the diminishing numbers of livestock, raising serious concerns about food security and the future of the pastoralist communities here. According to the pastoralist communities, the UPDF has followed raiders in an effort to retrieve their stolen animals, although in certain instances these efforts did not yield much.

Also as a strategy, animal branding (e.g., U63D for Dodoth; U23J for Jie; U58A for Amuria, etc.) using a hot iron has enabled easy identification and retrieval of stolen animals from other kraals. Although cross-border raids have been considerably reduced due to the disarmament process and security deployment at the borders with neighbouring districts and countries, the security situation remains unpredictable — a key challenge to both pastoralists and social service providers.

Gender and income generation opportunities as livelihood sustainability mechanism
Currently, there are a number of short and long term income-generating activities aimed to support livelihoods in the Region. While very few of these directly target pastoralists, a host of them target instead herders’ families in their homesteads. Those that target herders’ families, including girls and women, in the homesteads include: Income Generating Activities (IGA) and saving schemes, such as, cereal banking; revolving-loan systems, and crop production, some introduced through pastoral field schools. Others include: providing livestock to women groups; cash-for-work strategies — where a greater percentage (mostly up to 80%) of the labour-input
contributed to community projects (approved by districts) is paid in terms of physical items (e.g., food, farm inputs, etc.) and the rest in cash or redeemable vouchers.

Other capacity building activities through Farmer and Pastoral Field Schools have been undertaken here. Training in marketing livestock is one of the few projects that has targeted pastoralists directly. Generally however, there are very few marketing infrastructure and information opportunities in the Region on which mobile herding communities could depend to market livestock-related and other resources. Not much effort has been made to establish markets in the region largely due to historical marginalization and neglect by successive governments.

**Status of Protected areas (Wildlife and Forestry)**

Even though communities are entitled to benefits from utilization and investment in wildlife conservation areas in their region by law (UWA Act), they are not sufficiently organized or positioned in terms of information, capacity and opportunity to engage the Uganda Wildlife Authority on such matters.

Two key forests in this area – Timu and Morungole – are being protected by the National Forest Authority and the district Natural Resource Management office as water catchment areas. In view of this recognition and pressure from human demands for settlement and use, the Authority has made a policy shift to collaborative management involving communities. However, the delivery of opportunity for management and benefits under such an arrangement may not be attained if the communities are not sufficiently prepared for this engagement and therefore require relevant capacity to achieve that.
10. Recommendations to guide programming, advocacy and policy

The assessment findings point to key programmatic and contextual issues that should be addressed if future programmes targeting mobile herding communities are to succeed. Because of the strategic importance of animals as a traditional livelihood support, development programming should focus on holistic development and survival around the livestock sector.

Generally, capacity building to develop appropriate skills is needed. Service packages must endeavor as much as possible to incorporate local knowledge, specializations and structures. At the end of the day, community-based service delivery systems must stay with the communities themselves.

While linking delivery systems to existing local government structures is as important a lifeline for purposes of reporting / governance, logistics and sustainability, the answer lies in community-based sustainability mechanisms, e.g., involvement of the communities, use of and/or building on existing structures, knowledge, resources (human and material) as well as empowerment of community workers through skills training / income generation activities to sustain their work (i.e., delivery of services) and earn some income out of it.

Efficient and effective service delivery will definitely require periodical coordination meetings of government and development partners to streamline working relations; have a universal understanding of the situation on the ground, and a common delivery approach. At the heart of this is programming that knits conflict sensitivity into all its modalities of service delivery based on regular conflict analysis of community contexts — to avoid exacerbating existing tensions and undermining local capacities for peace. Below are recommendations for VSF-Belgium and other development partners that could guide key entry points into this ecosystem.

Pastoral Livelihoods

- Advocate for establishment of committees for land resource management: There is currently restriction on movements of herders and their animals across district borders — thus limiting herders to scarce land resources within Karamoja. Borrowing a leaf from Kenya, establish district/local citizens’ environmental management committees to regulate herders’ movements into defined areas to reduce grazing pressures and to reduce conflict over resources.

- Support improvement of internal mobility in the Region’s fertile areas through peace dialogues

- Through peace dialogues, improve inter-district (or inter-ethnic) relationships in the Kidepo valley and Karamoja Region to provide mutual access to each other’s land for pastures and water for animals.

- Gazetting and management of emergency grazing areas and emergency water sources: Government should gazette and manage emergency grazing areas and emergency water sources in the Region’s districts (sub-counties) as part of a contingency plan in the event of a drought. Since much of Kidepo valley is cultivated, Government needs to map out, mark and manage seasonal corridors and routes for herders and their livestock to access pasture and water.

- Support improvement of market infrastructure and information: For improved markets and sustainability, herders in Kidepo need to be empowered to adequately manage and market their own livestock resources since they have a comparative advantage.
• Support opportunities to link pastoralists directly to urban outlets outside the Region for sale of their animals and animal products (e.g., milk, meat, hides and skin, etc.)
• Support establishment of mobile livestock markets near grazing areas to enable herders to sell their animals and products easily rather than look for markets that may be too far away from them
• Support training in appropriate skills in livestock-related trade for pastoralist communities
• Establish leather tannery facilities in the Region for sale of hides and skins and products;
• Improve market infrastructure and information for the benefit of the mobile kraals. There is a need to link herders to national and international art and craft outlets to encourage the growth of their indigenous pastime artisan work which they do in the kraals
• Advocate and implement more livestock-based programmes, e.g., restocking of livestock; enhancing treatment of animal diseases and improvement of breeds
• Advocate for pro-pastoralist policies aimed to safeguard and sustain the local livelihoods of livestock keepers. Naturally, mobile herders are preoccupied with livestock husbandry and are frequently on the move in search of pasture and water for their animals. It is may be more beneficial for any policy framework on livelihood interventions in the Region to safeguard and sustain the local livelihoods of livestock keepers as a way to minimize their vulnerabilities, such as, to food insecurity
• Introduce emergency de-stocking initiatives aimed at buying animals which are in decline from the pastoralist communities— in order to safeguard pastoralists’ livelihoods.
• Introduce herders to other livelihood alternatives for their own food security, e.g., to fast and high yielding seeds and planting materials — particularly in the wetter/fertile areas in the region and exploitation of locally available natural resources (especially in Karamoja) like Gum arabica, Aloe vera and limestone.

Animal Health
• Expand and strengthening of the Mobile Animal Health services in these areas;
• Carry out a mapping exercise of CAHWs in the Region; and identify areas not serviced by them.
• Where there is need for more, support training of CAHWs preferably drawn from the kraal community / village
• Support information sharing between animal health associations and the DVO
• Understand the chief causes for inactive CAHWs and address the root causes that have led to this situation.
• Support kraal community-based advocacy initiatives

Security and conflict
• Enhancement of security to create a favourable environment: intensify security surveillance surrounding grazing areas, along raiding routes/corridors, and at notorious cross border points frequented by raiders to avert the security threat on persons (including children) and their property.
• Continue the coordinated and harmonized security strategies for countries around the Kidepo valley given the porous nature of the region’s common borders.
• Continued pro-people disarmament of all communities without exception — to end cattle rustling and banditry; looting in the villages of food, crops, household items, etc.
• Engage in advocacy at national/ district level to address peace and conflict issues within the Region as well as cross border issues with neighbouring districts and countries
• Support regular coordination meetings for government and partners on peace and security for situation update, improving working relations and developing common understanding and approaches to peace building
• Support the participation of the traditional leadership structure, e.g., Kraal Leaders / Elders, women, children and youth, in finding solutions to recurring conflicts. Encourage the use of local knowledge on peace building and conflict mitigation, e.g., making alliances.

Protected areas Natural Resources
• Ensure that communities are equipped with knowledge and information to engage and negotiate for involvement in investment ventures on the basis of entitlements contained in Uganda Wildlife Authority Act for their beneficial interests and collaborative co-existence of their herds and other land uses with the conservation agenda.
• Find mechanisms to resolve human-wildlife conflict and mechanisms for cash/non-cash compensation to farmers in cases where wildlife destroys crops.
• Communities adjacent to or in the periphery of Central Forest Reserves need capacity to negotiate their engagement in collaborative forestry management in ways that are beneficial to their access and use rights as provided for under the National Tree Planting Act 2003 in Uganda.
Annex 1: A STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS: Actors operating around the Kidepo Valley area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government organisation / area of operation</th>
<th>Services provided</th>
<th>Service gaps (identified by provider or/and other stakeholders)</th>
<th>Proposed modalities to strengthen service provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOU</strong> Entire Region</td>
<td>Primary service provider of all services in the region as per PRDP, the KIDDP and the Plan of Action</td>
<td>Service provision still not adequate in the Region — including those to the pastoralists; over-congestion of animals in protected kraals; raids/theft of animals in the Protected kraals</td>
<td>Decentralisation of livestock protection; recruitment of LDUs to complement the UPDF; Increase security surveillance/patrol through provision of transport to area military detaches; extend CPC structures to mobile kraals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfam</strong> Kotido, Kaabong</td>
<td>Excavation of dams; support vaccination of animals; capacity building for CAHW; construction of Veterinary Drug Shops</td>
<td>Inadequate coordination among social service providers; inadequate transportation for service delivery;</td>
<td>(Re)institute coordination mechanisms for effective service delivery; need for adequate transportation during mass vaccination drives; recruit CAHW from the communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KADEP</strong> Kotido</td>
<td>Training of CAHW; provision of start-up drug kits; opening up water sources</td>
<td>Poor road infrastructure/network — making access to mobile herders difficult</td>
<td>Develop road infrastructure / network in the Region; extend restocking programs to the Region — for security of livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRC</strong> Moroto, Nakapiripirt</td>
<td>Conflict mitigation and management — dealing with peace committees in sub-counties to broker peace; provision/rehabilitation of water sources, e.g., de-silting, boreholes rehabilitation</td>
<td>Conflict mitigation and service not targeting mobile herders directly — but their family members in the homesteads.</td>
<td>Create peace committees in mobile kraals to handle peace/conflict-related issues — using the morning kraal assemblies as a forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDAIR</strong> Kaabong</td>
<td>Build/repair boreholes; constructions of dams; build cattle troughs</td>
<td>District under-resourced; inadequate coordination meetings; security challenges leading to suspension of</td>
<td>Organize regular coordination meetings; intensify security to enable service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOU/WFP/WV/ Samaritan’s Purse</td>
<td>Entire Region</td>
<td>Emergency food distribution</td>
<td>Not targeting mobile herder directly. Distribution of food aid via villages of permanent residence. Establish food distribution points within mobile kraals to benefit large numbers of the vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCiUG</td>
<td>Kotido, Moroto, Kaabong, Nakapiripirit</td>
<td>Training of CAHW &amp; provision of vet. Kits and bicycles; fast yielding crops targeting herders as well; facilitation of peace building thru. dialogues; IGA projects for confidence building (opening up land for farming) between UPDF and demobilised former youth warriors and other youth</td>
<td>storage facilities and transportation for mobile school still inadequate. Involve Mobile-ABEK learners and pastoralist communities in peace-building projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Local CBOs and NGOs involved in Peace Building in the Karamoja Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>area of Operation</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Karamoja Agro-Pastoral Development programme (KADP)                      | Local NGO      | Nakapiripirit and Moroto districts       | • Livelihoods Security  
• Sustainable Management of common Property Resources  
• Good Governance and Conflict Transformation  
• Policy Recognition and Support to Agro-Pastoralism |
| 2. Karamoja Women Umbrella Organization                                     | Women Network  | Larger Karamoja Region                   | • Capacity Building of women in conflict resolution, gender based violence, human rights  
• Income generating activities  
• Lobbying and advocacy  
• Networking  
• Peace building and conflict transformation  
• HIV/AIDS  
• Other cross-cutting issues |
| 3. Karamoja Initiative for Sustainable Peace (KISP)                         | Local CBO      | Nakapiripirit and Moroto districts       | • Peace building  
• Alternative livelihoods  
• Rapid Response  
• Early Warning and Response |
| 4. Riam Riam Civil Society Network                                          | Network        | Larger Karamoja region                   | • Networking and coordination  
• Policy lobbying and advocacy  
• Research and information management  
• Institutional strengthening and capacity building. |
| 5. Action for poverty reduction and livestock modernization in Karamoja (ARELIMOK) | Local NGO      | Moroto district                          | • Community dialogue between the Matheniko and the neighbours  
• Training peace committees in each of the sub counties of Matheniko.  
• Food Basket monitoring  
• Mobilization and sensitization of both negative and positive mothers for PMTCT services at the health centers.  
• Training of community resources persons, peer educators and GBV sub county focal persons and community sensitization workshops on HIV/AIDS prevention, care and support.  
• Economic empowerment of people living with HIV/AIDS through poultry keeping.  
• Piloting an Access to Justice Project |
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>Local CBO: Larger Karamoja</td>
<td>Peace, Human Rights and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Protection and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hygiene and Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Care and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(KAPEPS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Justice and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Dodoth</td>
<td>Local CBO: Kaabong district</td>
<td>Community Animal health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AgroPastoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting income generating and Cereal banking activities for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>women and youth groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building/training of women and Youth Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace building, Conflict transformation and mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights education/awareness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender and HIV/AIDS education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby and advocacy for Pastoralist's rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy and Good Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of Relief Emergency Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Basket Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kotido</td>
<td>Local CBO: Kaabong and</td>
<td>Peace building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Kotido districts</td>
<td>Conflict Mitigation and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and humanitarian programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>Faith based organisation</td>
<td>Health and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diocese</td>
<td>Kotido district</td>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights, women and child rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstream peace building in all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Friends of</td>
<td>Faith based organisation</td>
<td>Support to OVCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
<td>Income Generating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revival</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support to OVCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(FOC-REV M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and conflict mitigation programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kadam Farmers</td>
<td>CBO: Nakapiripirit</td>
<td>FGM elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Organization (KAFARO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peace dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved agriculture both livestock and crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaise with LCs' on BDR data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Intervention of forced marriages and child abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating as volunteers during child immunization days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hygiene promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support to Resettlement sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting to girl child education and provision of scholastic materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peace and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HIV/AIDS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Child protection and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education through informal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Food security through NAADS prog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peace dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• T.B. implementation and assistants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CRCM in community and neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Human rights awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved crop farming methods and livestock keeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HIV/AIDS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental protection and conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for school going age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGM intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental protection and conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peace and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evangelism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs in Kaabong district are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dodoth Agro-Pastoral Development Organization (DADO) is also a member of the district peace committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kaabong Peace and Development Agency (KAPDA) is also a member of the district peace committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Morungole Women Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St. Monica Women’s Group based in the Catholic Church in Kaabong Town Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Humanitarian Presence in Kaabong

HUMANITARIAN PRESENCE BY CLUSTER AND SUB COUNTY
KAABONG DISTRICT
AS OF JUNE 2009

KAABONG:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: KIDS, NAADS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD

KAPENDO:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: KIDS, NAADS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD

KALAPA:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: OXAM, NAADS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD

KAABONG RURAL:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: NAADS, KIDS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD

KAABONG TC:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: NAADS, KIDS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD

LOVARO:
- Education: ADRA, WFP, DADO, UNICEF
- PSAL: NAADS, KIDS, DADO, WFP, FAO, KFD
- Health: MSF, WHO, CUAMM, UNICEF
- Water: UNICEF, KFD
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