

# **Final Evaluation – MRG Pastoralist Programme 2009**

## **Executive Summary**

MRG's Pastoralist Programme, here evaluated, ran from 2006 to 2009 and was the second of its kind. The previous project, which ran from 2000 to 2005, identified many cross-cutting problems in pastoralist communities, such as poor access to education, health and housing, land seizure and discrimination against pastoralists in national land laws, national borders restricting freedom of movement, and conflicts within and between communities. Though these problems are material, it was recognised by MRG that a significant part of the solution is conceptual: the beliefs and opinions of mainstream society towards pastoralists, and of pastoralists towards themselves, are at the root of social and economic change for these impoverished and marginalized communities. Changing negative mainstream attitudes towards pastoralists, empowering pastoralist communities to defend their rights and take part in decision-making processes, and institutionalising their integration and advancement in their own countries, would be just as vital to these communities as directly providing food, healthcare, shelter and education.

The new programme therefore sought, like its predecessor, to address the problems of poverty, marginalisation, and discrimination suffered by pastoralists by increasing their civil and political participation. Community leaders, men and women, were sensitised in training workshops, and pastoralist members of parliament were also given support. Positive traditional structures such as Elders' Councils were also supported, and a Regional Council of Elders was established. Policy briefings and a campaign report were published. Pastoralist representatives were sponsored to attend international and regional meetings to share their experiences. Capacity building grants were given to implementing partners.

MRG has enjoyed a great deal of success in its aims. Overall, the feedback on MRG's Pastoralist Programme has been very positive and it has produced many observable positive results. In particular, the establishment of a Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council is a unique achievement for MRG, and with continued support could play a highly innovative and important role in conflict resolution in the region. Government attitudes in many areas are changing, due in large part to the

work of pastoralist MPs supported by MRG. MRG's gender mainstreaming is also significant – including a thematic report dedicated to pastoralist women; four training events organised specifically for pastoralist women; women participants at all four national elders' trainings and the regional elders' training; and women representatives in MRG's international advocacy work. MRG's approach seems generally well-designed to make best use of the funding available. The achievements of the project are surveyed in more detail below: these concrete outcomes demonstrate in themselves the success of the Programme.

No human endeavour is perfect, however, and there are some areas for potential improvement. With greater funding a more sustained project could be devised. Some project aims could be better focused. A more proactive media strategy could be developed and new methods of information dissemination tried. This evaluation analyses the positive outcomes of the project and provides recommendations on how to build on lessons learned.

The evaluation research was conducted between February and April 2009, and all four target countries were visited. Implementing partners, political representatives, civil society actors, international NGO representatives, leaders and other members of pastoralist communities were interviewed. They are listed in Annex A. Due to the wide range of activities and locations over the duration of the Programme, it is difficult to provide a completely comprehensive assessment of a readable length. Issues, achievements and suggestions of the greatest importance have therefore been highlighted. Above all, I have tried to reflect fairly the opinions and recommendations of the partners and communities whose lives have been influenced by MRG's Pastoralist Programmes – since they, in the long run, are the voices who matter most.

## Recommendations

The **Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council** is an innovative and potentially highly effective means of achieving conflict resolution and regional co-operation. With adequate support the RPEC could make a unique contribution to security and poverty reduction. Continued funding for the RPEC is vital.

Likewise, MRG support for **national Elders' Councils** and **the League of Pastoralist Women** has led to concrete results. Further support is vital for their survival.

MRG **support of pastoralist representatives at international fora** has been a great success. Further support is strongly recommended, as is consideration to ensuring that a wide spread of different individuals are given the chance to attend.

Lessons learned in **training events and workshops** can last for years – they are highly effective in terms of value for money and their further support is strongly recommended.

Because of the porous nature of regional borders, serious consideration should be given to the **inclusion of Sudanese and if possible Somali communities** and civil society actors in future pastoralist initiatives.

Partner capacity building: partner and MRG feedback indicates that **salaried positions** for selected partner organisations will lead to more sustainable reporting and implementation activities. At this stage in MRG's pastoralist work salaried positions are strongly recommended.

**Attention to gender mainstreaming** in the programme has been good. But MRG must continue to monitor how genuine are the effects of sensitisation work and efforts to open up political space for minority women, paying particular attention to support for NGOs and individuals working on gender issues.

**Media strategy:** public media in all forms are a very powerful tool for advocacy. MRG's campaign reports and briefings are highly influential and respected: more could be made of them in future projects by including clearer positive proposals for

national media strategy in target countries. In particular **the new pastoralist campaign report** – an excellent tool for advocacy – should be afforded more publicity and exposure.

**Information dissemination:** for policy briefings and campaign reports oral dissemination methods and translation into more indigenous languages (even in an abridged form) should be considered. **Radio** is a particularly powerful tool for poor, mobile and semi-literate communities – this tool should be researched and incorporated into future programmes.

Funding for **focused baseline surveys in select areas** such as north-eastern Kenya is recommended.

MRG should develop a **specific policy relating to work under the new NGO law in Ethiopia**, and potentially Uganda.

***Fay Warrilow***  
***17<sup>th</sup> June 2009***

Annex A: Interviewee list

Annex B: Glossary of terms

## **Contents**

### **p.1-2 Executive Summary**

### **p.3-4 Recommendations**

### **p.5-6 Contents**

### **p.7-9 Section I: Introduction**

#### **p.8 Section I: Methodology**

### **p.10-12 Section II: The Evaluation**

### **P.13 Section III: Findings**

#### **p.13 Section III: 1. To what extent has the project increased links and levels of participation/representation?**

p.13 Section III: 1a. Level of representation and participation of pastoralist women in decision making processes at community and national levels

p.13 Section III: 1a(i) Successes – gender mainstreaming and empowerment

p.14 Section III: 1a(ii) Challenges – political space

p.15 Section III: 1a(iii) Challenges – FGM, domestic violence

p.15 Section III: 1a(iv) Conclusions

p.17 Section III: 1b. Level of representation and participation of pastoralist elders in decision making processes at community and national levels

p.17-19 Section III: 1b(i) Successes – elders, societal structures and conflict resolution

p.19-20 Section III: 1b(ii) Successes – The Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council

p.20-22 Section III: 1b(iii) Challenges/Conclusions – funding, regional arms flow, traditional power structures, political repression

p.22 Section III: 1c. Strengthened links and increased understanding between pastoralist MPs and their communities

p.22-23 Section III: 1c(i) Successes – political recognition

p.23-24 Section III: 1c(ii) Challenges/Conclusions – grassroots representation

p.24 Section III: 1d. Increase in capacity, skills and knowledge of pastoralist NGOs and CBOs to better represent pastoralist communities in decision-making processes at community, national, regional and international level

p.24-25	Section III: 1d(i) Successes – international advocacy
p.25-26	Section III: 1d(ii) Successes – tripartite co-operation
p.26-28	Section III: 1d(iii) Challenges – government will
p.28	<b>Section III: 2. Country context and country-specific goals</b>
p.28-30	Section III: 2a. Ethiopia
p.30-32	Section III: 2b. Kenya
p.32-33	Section III: 2c. Tanzania
p.33-35	Section III: 2d. Uganda
p.35	Section III: 2e. Conclusions
p.35	<b>Section III: 3. Availability and accessibility of reports and policy recommendations on the situation of pastoralists</b>
p.35-36	Section III: 3a. Baseline data
p.36	Section III: 3b. Campaign reports
p.36-38	Section III: 3c. Conclusions
p.38-40	<b>Section III: 4. Extent to which MRG intervention has helped minority grassroots partner organisations achieve sustainability by building increased capacity</b>
p.41-47	<b>Section IV: Overall Conclusions</b>
p.41-42	<b>Section IV: 1. Relevance</b>
p.42-43	<b>Section IV: 2. Effectiveness</b>
p.43-44	<b>Section IV: 3. Efficiency</b>
p.44-46	<b>Section IV: 4. Impact</b>
p.46-47	<b>Section IV: 5. Sustainability</b>
p.48-50	<b>Section V: Annexes</b>

## Section I: Introduction

The aim of the evaluation was to assess to what extent the Pastoralist Programme has achieved its objectives, and what measures should be adopted in future to further them. The TOR stipulated that the duties and responsibilities of the consultant would be to:

1. Assess the level of participation and representation of pastoralist elders and women in decision-making processes at national, regional and international levels.
2. Assess the link between pastoralist MPs and their constituencies in the four countries.
3. Assess the capacity of partner pastoralist CBOs and NGOs to represent pastoralist communities at national, regional and international fora.
4. Assess the availability and accessibility of reports and policy recommendations on the situation of pastoralists.

On this basis, considering the general project goals and the four measurable outcomes specified in the TOR, the following evaluation questions were posed to frame the research:

1. To what extent and in what ways has the project:
  - a. Increased the level of representation and participation of pastoralist women in decision-making processes at the community and national, regional and international levels?
  - b. Increased the level of representation and participation of pastoralist elders in decision-making processes at the community, national, regional and international levels?
  - c. Strengthened links and increased understanding between pastoralist MPs and their constituencies?
  - d. Increased the capacity, skills and knowledge of pastoralist NGOs and CBOs to better represent pastoralist communities in decision-making processes at community, national, regional and international level?
2. Has the programme achieved its country-specific goals?

3. What is the availability and accessibility of reports and policy recommendations on the situation of pastoralists?
4. To what extent has the MRG intervention helped minority grassroots partner organisations achieve sustainability by building increased capacity?

## **Methodology**

The programme assessment was informed by the SMART criteria – Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic and Time-bound – and the Summary of Objectives, Results and Activities outlined in the 2006 Irish Aid project proposal. The methodology included the following key research activities and tools:

- General background research, i.e. documentary research and briefings with MRG field and HQ staff;
- Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders, including the target beneficiaries, i.e.
  - pastoralist community members and leaders, including MPs,
  - MRG partner organisations,
  - NGOs,
  - INGOs, UN and other international bodies, and
  - professionals in relevant fields;
- Interview checklists;
- Discussion and review with MRG Regional and HQ staff.

It should be noted that the nature and implementation of the project make it difficult, to some degree, to measure MRG-specific outcomes. MRG has worked in concert with other NGOs in pastoralist communities to raise awareness of rights and governance issues, to the extent that it can be difficult to attribute results solely to any individual organisation. In the opinion of the evaluator this should not be seen as a disadvantage of the project – in fact, MRG’s approach and philosophy of support, advocacy and assistance with the conceptualisation of issues is well designed to work in co-operation with other stakeholders. Indeed, positive results which come from the efforts of a network of actors rather than one in isolation are likely to be more deep-rooted and sustainable. Working with other NGOs also reduces the likelihood of repetition of interventions, increasing efficiency in terms of time and value for donor money. There are, nevertheless,



some successes which are entirely attributable to MRG, most notably the establishment of the Regional Council of Pastoralist Elders.

Though difficult to measure outcomes it is not impossible. Testimonies of beneficiaries and partner organisations, as well as some quantitative data, build a picture of the course of the intervention. Here it is important to note that the evaluation research, though comprehensive, is necessarily mainly qualitative. This is because, firstly, of the conceptual nature of many project activities; and secondly because of the logistical difficulties of collecting fresh quantitative data on a large scale, i.e. limited timeframe, wide scope, difficulty of accessing some areas and limitations re literacy of target communities – since literacy levels are low (for example 11% in Karamoja in Uganda) questionnaires are not practical to use with many community members unless they are supervised by research assistants. The issue of baseline data is further discussed below.

The report is broadly structured on the basis of the Irish Aid CSF template. Findings will be addressed according to the structure of the above evaluation questions, while keeping the preceding duties and responsibilities in mind. In accordance with the Irish Aid template, the Conclusion will assess the project and its results in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, as well as standards of performance and established policies. Recommendations will specify further action which should be taken by MRG on the basis of the evaluation.

## **Section II: The Evaluation**

Overall, the aim of the Pastoralist Programme was to increase and improve pastoralist communities' access to their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights in the four focus countries, i.e. Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

The country-specific political and social context in which pastoralist communities live and NGOs, national and international, operate, is relevant and will be discussed. But the central concerns of pastoralist communities are common to all. These are: low levels of social service provision and socio-economic development; the issue of security and disarmament; the effects of climate change; civil and political marginalisation; the prospect of forcible sedenterisation and agriculturalisation; gender inequality and the disempowerment of pastoralist women; the erosion of traditional livelihoods and social structures; the experience of land grabbing and displacement.

These issues are highly interconnected, and in every case increased political and civil participation makes it more difficult for the rights of pastoralist communities to be ignored. Through awareness-raising and capacity building, the project aimed to help pastoralist communities become empowered to assert their human rights as equal members of their societies.

The project was the second of two relating to pastoralism conducted by MRG since 2000. Activities were to include:

- Eight in-country training events (2 per focus country, one for elders one for women)
- A regional skills exchange workshop on conflict management and prevention for the Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council (male and female)
- MRG's Annual Training Seminar on International Human Rights (MRG notes this component was cancelled due to lack of matching funding)
- Attendance by Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council delegates at the annual advocacy training week in Geneva
- Capacity building grants for eight partners
- Eight public awareness campaigns
- National advocacy activities
- Creation of a Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council (RPEC)

Conflict prevention and management projects  
Interventions at regional and international fora  
MRG report: pastoralist women  
Shadow reports or advocacy briefings

The evaluation builds on the findings and recommendations of previous evaluations, those relating to pastoralist communities directly and those of other projects. In particular, measures were taken where possible to comply with the recommendation of the 2007 Batwa project evaluation that independent (i.e. non-partner organisation) interpreters should be sourced when visiting communities. This was done in all countries except Ethiopia, where logistical and security considerations prevented independent sourcing and also limited the amount of field research possible.

MRG and partner organisations produced several reports relating to the Pastoralist Programme that were provided to the evaluator by MRG HQ and partner organisations. These included:

- MRG: Final report submitted to CIDA (November 2007)
- MRG: Final Report submitted to Danchurch Aid Ethiopia (February 2008)
- MRG: Annual Progress Report submitted to Irish Aid (November 2007)
- MRG: Report on the Uganda National Pastoralist Week 2008
- PFE: Report on the Pastoral Elders' training in Dire Dawa (for Afar and Somali) and in Jinka (for Hamar Aerbore Tsemay and Mena) (January 2006).
- PINGO's Forum: Follow up of the training workshop on civic and voters' education, good governance and human rights for pastoralist elders, held at City Link Hotel, Arusha, Tanzania (no date)
- MRG/CORDS: Training on human rights for pastoralist women in Tanzania (September 2005)
- PFE: Progress Report on MRG supported projects Jan – June 2008 and beyond (July 2008)
- MRG/CEMIRIDE/GTDO: Workshop on developing the capacity of pastoralist elders, held at Bomen Hotel, Isiolo, Kenya (September 2006)
- PFE: Regional training on resource-based conflict and the role of pastoralist elders in the east and horn of Africa (EHA) (April 2007)
- PFE: Report on pastoral women training workshop and pastoral elders' training

workshop (February 2006)

(?): Brief on the Inaugural Uganda Pastoralist Week 2006 (November 2006)

Uganda Land Alliance: Women Pastoralist Training Evaluation (August 2008)

Horn of Africa Network: A common long term strategy for pastoralists, draft workshop report (March 2009)

Where relevant, these reports will be referred to in this report, but it is not considered necessary to summarise them here since the full text may be obtained from the relevant organisations (or the evaluator). I have not been provided with an overall final report for the project – rather, reports to individual donors which focus on the activities funded by these donors. The final report is pending due to the fact that some partners have yet to finalize a few activities and provide reports to MRG.

## **Section III: Findings**

### **1. To what extent and in what ways has the project increased links and levels of representation/participation?**

#### **1a. Level of representation and participation of pastoralist women in decision making processes at community and national levels**

##### 1a(i) Successes – gender mainstreaming and empowerment

MRG has paid careful attention to gender issues in every aspect of the Programme. Its gender mainstreaming work included a thematic report dedicated to pastoralist women; four training events organised specifically for pastoralist women; women participants at all four national elders' trainings and the regional elders' training; and women representatives in MRG's international advocacy work. There have consequently been several observable successes in MRG's capacity-building work with pastoralist women.

In November 2007, following the regional trainings for pastoralist elders MRG reported feedback that the Kenyan Pastoralist Women Political Network had been active in campaigning on behalf of pastoralists, to ensure that pastoralist and minority women were taken into consideration in the allotting of 50 proposed reserved seats in parliament for women. In February 2008, it was reported that a pastoralist woman had been elected into the regional parliament of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regions (SNNPR) and that she was one of the attendees of MRG and PFE's training in Ethiopia. The Uganda Land Alliance reports of its MRG-sponsored training that:

'...women representatives mentioned that the level at which power and advocacy were being exercised had increased, especially for them who attended the training. The councillors mentioned that the training enabled them to improve on their lobbying skills at the district and that they were in a position of sensitising other women about demanding for their services [...] the councillors mentioned that most of the women lack self-esteem [...] however they are sensitising the women to enable them to acquire knowledge and skills of lobbying and advocacy which they believe will enable them to lobby for themselves.'

These are positive signs.

Another notable success is the mutually reinforcing effect the two MRG projects working with the pastoralist Endorois community in Kenya – the Pastoralist Programme and the Legal Cases Programme – are reported to have had on each other in terms of gender empowerment. The 2007 external evaluation of MRG's Legal Cases Programme outlines these positive outcomes:

'The empowerment of women was particularly striking [...] set against the background of years of work already undertaken by the Pastoralists Programme [...] the litigation arose from MRG's Pastoralists Programme; in the context of the empowerment of women in particular, litigation in this case has served to demonstrate the great potential for strengthening and building upon gains already made by an existing programme [...] as a result of MRG's Pastoralists Programme [...] women had already begun to gain increased confidence.' [pp 3, 7]

#### 1a(ii) Challenges – political space

There remain challenges in pastoralist communities concerning the representation of women in decision-making. In terms of national representation there are questions about how genuine is the political space which has been opened up for pastoralist women in the region. It was observed during the evaluation that questions to male MPs about women's empowerment were met, almost uniformly, with the advice that the evaluator should ask female MPs about 'women's issues' – as if gender equality was not of relevance to men. But gender empowerment is not the preserve of women only – it is of importance to all members of society. The Uganda Land Alliance, in its 2008 evaluation of its own MRG-sponsored training, also concludes from the feedback it collected that:

'There is more need for sensitisation workshops for both women and men on issues that are pertinent to both sexes and not to only concentrate on ones that are focused on women only'.

MRG's recently-published report on pastoralist women, by Andrew Ridgwell and Naomi Kipuri, notes that, still:

'The total number of pastoralist women MPs in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda adds up to only a handful. In Ethiopia, which has the largest pastoralist population, there are a number of notable pastoralist women MPs, but they tend to be confined to junior positions [...] of the four countries discussed in this report, the two that operate extensive affirmative action for women – Tanzania and Uganda – actually have the lowest number of pastoralist women parliamentarians elected by constituency, which suggests that the system has not favoured women from minority groups.' [p. 3]

These remaining challenges in terms of political representation are echoed by implementing partner interviewees. In Tanzania, PINGOs states that:

'[...] for pastoralist districts all of the MPs are men – this probably has something to do with the culture. We don't vote for women. Also women haven't got involved so much in politics. There are some women councillors in pastoralist districts.'

In Kenya, Womankind (a Garissa-based NGO supporting Somali pastoralist women) comments:

'Women MPs are not given real space, it's cosmetic space, if they speak in Parliament someone says something about their gender – it's about who you know in Parliament [...]

'Women think they can't perform, their efforts have been killed, they think they don't have the potential, but [...] women are very active in mobilising people to vote, they don't realise that they are making decisions all the time.'

One potential concern regarding gender empowerment relates to the willingness among elders to accept women in the decision making process. Some pastoralist communities remain highly patriarchal in structure. In MRG's February 2008 report to Danchuch Aid Ethiopia it is stated that:

'Recently the effort to convince pastoralists to include pastoralist women in the newly-established Pastoralist Elders' Council in the Oromia Region has been stiffly resisted. Accordingly we have come to realise that to attain this objective we have to carry out a lot of awareness raising through subtle work on the

ground.'

There are also achievements in terms of widening political space, such as the League of Pastoralist Women being developed in Kenya with the assistance of civil society groups and NGOs including MRG, CEMIRIDE and Cordaid (partner and funder of MRG respectively).

#### 1a(iii) Challenges – FGM

Female Genital Mutilation remains a serious problem in some pastoralist communities. A 7-year-old Somali pastoralist girl from the north eastern region of Kenya was reported as having died as recently as April 2009 after FGM was performed. As well as being a tool for advocacy the most recent MRG report, on pastoralist women, is also a useful source of evidence on the practice. Sophia Abdi Noor, a prominent Somali pastoralist woman MP in Kenya, spoke in detail of the institutional discouragement she had experienced when trying to run for elected office and the remaining challenges for women in parliament and society. She cited FGM is one of the most significant, causing lasting psychological as well as physical damage.

In a July 2008 submission to CEDAW, experts urged the Tanzanian government to 'recognize the importance of linking the battle to defeat gender based discrimination to the fight against illiteracy, pointing out that efforts to eradicate the practice of female genital mutilation were linked to illiteracy' and stressed that 'the Government must summon the necessary political will if that fight was to be won'.

#### 1a(iv) Conclusions

MRG has made a clear genuine effort to mainstream gender issues in its work. Interviews and documentation confirm that this has produced good results. However there is more work to be done.

In terms of political space, attitudes within pastoralist communities themselves, and within the country as a whole, towards women in decision making processes are highly complex. General efforts to mainstream gender issues in politics may have some positive effect on representation for pastoralist and women from other



minority groups, but these groups also require the special attention that MRG and its partners encourage.

Yet though the issue is complex there is a clear circular pattern in terms of political representation for pastoralist women in the countries in question (and indeed women in general). In many areas, for example in the Kenyan parliament, pastoralist women representatives are selected, not elected. For pastoralist women MPs to have real power they must be elected as well as selected; the distinction between these two forms of power must be recognised by human rights organisations and the former lobbied for. To be elected women candidates must be supported and voted for, which requires sensitisation at community level. This sensitisation must be done carefully to ensure that a) it is genuine and b) that it does not upset the family balance in a way which is ultimately negative for community members. MRG has taken account of these considerations in the formulation of policy so far and should continue to do so.

MRG and its partners have demonstrated a good understanding of the links between FGM and other forms of deprivation within pastoralist communities, and the subject receives prominent treatment in the MRG's most recent campaign report – which is a potentially powerful lobbying tool. Support should continue to be given to grassroots organisations and individuals who are addressing this particular issue.

### **1b. Level of representation and participation of pastoralist elders in decision-making processes at community, national, regional and international levels**

#### 1b(i) Successes - elders, societal structures and conflict resolution

The governance structures of pastoralist societies are intricate, well-established, and were developed to suit the particular lifestyle of their members. Elders have a central role in information transfer, decision making and conflict resolution and are, traditionally, a voice that the young warriors of pastoralist communities are compelled to listen to. Many interviewees reported positive effects of workshops and trainings in terms of creating understanding and co-operation between elders from different pastoralist groups. In Ethiopia, MRG implementing partner Hope for

the Horn reports that the 'experience of sharing among pastoralists [...] was very educational and exciting at the same time'.

Conflict resolution activities undertaken by partners with the support of MRG have had positive effects. Another example is cited by Hope for the Horn of an MRG-supported workshop in Harshin:

'In Harshin district, where there are Somali clans, they have their own systems to share these resources such as water. They usually do resource sharing in a spirit of tolerance, but they cannot cope with the current situation [of drought]. What elders know the young people do not know – the tolerance of elders also is a thing that people learn with experience. The people who started to fight and say bad words have no good experience of what tolerance and sharing means, sharing and respecting others.

[...] we ask them what do you want to achieve, they tell us where it has gone wrong and they want to put things into the right perspective, we talk to both sides, then ask them what would be the solution, what do you expect from this workshop, so they come up with solutions themselves. When they come together, they are experts in solving their own problems. At the end of the workshop they shook hands, apologised, then said let us renew the old friendship.'

Interviewees from implementing partners Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia (PFE) and Hope for the Horn confirm that in Ethiopia at least, the potential for cascading of information in pastoralist societies is high, due to the traditions of sharing news:

'The nature of pastoralists is that when someone travels, everyone comes to him and asks him to inform them about problems he has encountered, the aim of these workshops is to train the trainers, and when they go back to their respective locations, the way of communication to pastoralists is verbal, it's an oral society, in different villages they go back and inform people in different localities, it's a very good way of spreading the knowledge.'

Elders report positively of the lasting effects of the workshops and trainings in which they have participated. An elder of the Ethiopian Kereyou community said of

the training he took part in during 2005:

'We learnt about gender issues, child rights, to speak in the language of rights, if there is bad governance how to react against it, we were trained in that.'

MRG's February 2008 report to Danchurch Aid notes that the Oromia Pastoral Elders' Council has been recognised by both regional and federal governments in Ethiopia.

#### 1b(ii) Successes – The Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council

The MRG-supported Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council is potentially a very important tool for conflict resolution and disarmament, since it provides a direct link to pastoralist communities who are buying and using guns and/or being raided. One of the central problems for pastoralist communities in East Africa is security and disarmament. Disarmament and development go hand in hand, and where pastoralist regions remain poor and armed, raiding and fighting are doomed to continue. The continued raids experienced in Moroto in Karamoja, a single district forcibly disarmed by the Ugandan government, provide a clear example of the difficulties faced in the quest for disarmament – unless all bordering communities are disarmed at the same time, unarmed communities are exposed to raids. So far, the joint integrated disarmament initiative theoretically in process at government level in the region has produced scanty results.

Even if the governments of the region were genuinely to co-ordinate disarmament efforts, pastoralist communities would be (on past experience, rightly) suspicious of outside efforts to disarm them. As will be examined later, MPs, even pastoralist ones, are at times perceived by pastoralist communities as too detached from their issues – elders and other leaders who live with their people may be in a better position to create dialogue.. RPEC Chairman Dr Abdullahi Wako explains that:

'All borders belong to pastoralists – for example the Borana in Kenya, the Karamojong in Uganda, the Turkana in Kenya. If Kenyans want to disarm, unless Karamoja starts it will be futile. The Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council should be able to convince people to work together. A number of leaders are very active in peace resolution work – if not for elders in Mandera the conflict there would

have been far worse, but with quick action we were able to resolve the situation. Between the Pokot and Turkana too, because they have the same thoughts we have been able to connect them and solve disputes through dialogue.'

The Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council was discussed positively at meetings between MRG and representatives from the African Union Peace and Security Council in 2007. If the RPEC is further developed and supported, it could become trusted and accepted by pastoralist communities and also be a lobby group for pastoralist interests with some teeth at national and international level, providing a practical and highly effective means of peacebuilding within pastoralist communities.

1b(iii) Challenges/Conclusions – funding, regional arms flow, traditional power structures, political repression

There are, however, challenges. Firstly collaboration with the AU, and indeed the future of the Council as an entity, are dependent on further funding. The Council was charged at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Regional Conference for Pastoralist Elders in 2007 with the 'immediate tasks' to 'establish and strengthen the national councils', 'collect data by conducting baseline surveys of finding out the problems, identifying the number of pastoralists in each country categorised by gender, youth and elders', 'establish a Database and make the data available', 'engage in advocacy to have pastoralist rights respected and legally known', 'register the RPEC in Kampala first and in every other country when the national Councils are established'. The RPEC is now registered in Kenya due to legal obstacles in Uganda. MRG comments that so far implemented initiatives have been limited because MRG was compelled to carry out additional work, spending extra time to fundraise and call a second regional conference to constitute the Regional Elders Council. Furthermore, MRG was unable to register the Elders Council in Kampala as initially planned due to legal complications. The registration process therefore had to be started afresh in Kenya: these two processes were necessary to make the regional council inclusive and legal.

Secondly, if the RPEC (or for that matter any other peacebuilding measure) is to have a lasting effect on security in pastoralist border regions, the matter of arms flow from Sudan must be addressed: the populations of southern Sudan may or

may not be classed as pastoralists but in terms of disarmament they are part of the solution. In any future activities, their inclusion – even in the regional council itself – should be considered. Arms flow from Somalia should also be considered, though current logistical and political considerations may limit what practical action can be taken in this direction.

Finally, in terms of the effectiveness of empowering elders as representatives of their communities, two questions present themselves. Are elders really the voice of their community, and how much do different pastoralist groups have in common? Though the structures which give elders authority and influence within their societies are still relevant and useful, it must be noted that some interviewees suggested that elders can be an oppressive influence in their societies; and that conversely, in other areas they may be controlled or bribed by (armed) youth.

Some thought should also be given as to who is represented by women's groups and to what effect. From the interviews and research done, it appears in some areas that women's groups may only represent young unmarried women, while in other areas it is only post-menopausal women who are accepted into decision making processes. The extent of communication between women's, elders' and youth groups could also be further analysed. MRG comments that the project encouraged the positive aspects of the traditional system while at the same discouraging the negative aspects of the system including marginalization of women, FGM, early marriage, wife inheritance, cattle rustling etc. The logic behind reviving the traditional elders council is to fill the gap that has been created due to its absence in the last fifty or so years, especially in the area of conflict prevention and resolution as well as coping with drought and famine.

Even within a country (in fact more so, at times, than across borders) pastoralist groups may vary significantly – for example there are significant differences in terms of culture, history and language between Somali pastoralists of north eastern Kenya and the Maasai of southern and western Kenya and northern Tanzania. Critical thought must be given to monitoring how effectively catch-all national and regional councils of elders really represent the interests of all pastoralists. Pastoralists interviewed said that group lobbying efforts were a good idea as long as all groups were empowered to participate:

‘Pastoralists have differences but we can use these to build bridges to cross together, if we are one unit talking for all, Maasai, Borana, Somalis [etc].’

The interests of hunter-gatherer groups within pastoralist regions such as the Ik in Uganda and the Boni in Kenya must also be taken into account in efforts to create regional dialogue and increase the representation of pastoralist communities. The Ik of Kaabong in Karamoja, for example, are claimed by many interviewees to be the marginalized within the marginalized, with poorer access to welfare provisions than their pastoralist neighbours and unable, even, to retain property since it is stolen by neighbouring communities.

Finally, it is very important to note that in politically repressive environments sensitisation on governance and rights issues may come with its own challenges, as the Kereyou elders interviewed report:

‘During the past time there was no experience of elections, the government just assigned people, but during the 2005 election it was very nice, everybody participated. That period was very exceptional – children, women participated effectively but the result was disappointing. We applied our knowledge, we told all people how to participate and we were able to mobilise the community – we gained a lot of knowledge but we probably can’t apply that knowledge now, if we speak of political and other rights we end up in jail. That is the problem here in Ethiopia.

‘It’s very disappointing, we have gained a lot of knowledge, of gender issues and democratic rights, the rights of children, women and men. But now what’s happening, all political people are seeing us as enemies, we can’t be involved in development activities, so we are marginalized. Those who seek to empower pastoralists end up in jail – we got good knowledge but this repression impedes progress.’

This aspect of governance and human rights sensitisation will be further discussed in the overall Conclusion.

### **1c. Strengthened links and increased understanding between pastoralist MPs and their constituencies**

### 1c(i) Successes - political recognition

'Last year MPs and Ministry officials came to a workshop. At the end there was a declaration, whether they took this seriously we can't guarantee and there's been no feedback from them yet, but at least they have started to talk about pastoralism, the language has changed. It's not enough yet, but the most important thing is that everyone talks about pastoralism, that's an achievement.'

Political recognition of pastoralist groups is generally increasing in the region, and it is clear from testimonies such as that above (from implementing partner KADP in Uganda) that MRG-supported trainings, workshops and policy briefs have had their part in this. In particular, the establishment of Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups, supported by MRG and other organisations, has been a highly important development for political representation of pastoralists at national level, and the visibility and accountability of pastoralist MPs to the communities they represent. In Tanzania, for example, PINGO's Forum comments that:

'[...] one of the things that has changed is that more Members of Parliament, even non-pastoralists, are listening to pastoralist concerns, that's risen very high, there are over 100 MPs who consider themselves Pastoralist MPs since they have groups of pastoralists in their districts. When the Tanzanian Pastoralist Parliamentary Group started there were less than 10 pastoralist MPs, by 2007 there were 38 members, and at the last meeting 89 MPs attended.'

The PPGs have differing levels of influence in each of the countries, but have had a measurable influence on policy-making in all. In Kenya the Pastoralist Parliamentary Group, in conjunction with other groups such as MRG partner CEMIRIDE, has been pressing for recognition of the economic significance of the (pastoralist-driven) livestock sector to the Kenyan economy<sup>1</sup>. In Tanzania, PINGO's further states that:

'Last year we worked with the PPG to challenge a bill being taken to Parliament, the Wildlife Bill. It was not passed last year, now recommendations have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on interviews with Kenyan MPs, April 2009.

added and it won't be passed until the President assents to it.'

MRG notes that the above achievement was possible because the Chairperson of the PPG informed NGOs and CBOs about the Bill and its negative impact and advised them to mobilize the pastoralist communities. As a result hundreds of pastoralist groups came to the parliament when the Bill introduced.

Another major example of successful advocacy on the part of pastoralist MPs comes from Karamoja, Uganda, where Karamojong MPs reportedly worked with human rights advocacy groups and the (relatively free) press to expose abuses by the UPDF during the forcible disarmament of Moroto district.<sup>2</sup>

#### 1c(ii) Challenges/Conclusions – grassroots representation

There are, however, remaining challenges. One is not restricted to pastoralist communities, but is relevant to the degree of political representation they may have. To be democratic representatives MPs must reflect the grassroots will of the people. Yet those who are elected to parliament – even if they ARE from the communities in question – may not be elected on merit, but due to social pressure and/or the promise of money or other benefits for votes. They may not reflect the concerns of their communities or even visit often.<sup>3</sup> Of the 4 Karamojong MPs interviewed in Uganda, there were particularly clear variations in terms of capacity and awareness of the issues facing the communities the MPs were supposed to be representing. Many community members interviewed in Karamoja were also ambivalent, at best, about the potential for their political representatives to look after their interests: in Irriri in Moroto district, interviewees said that their political representatives visited rarely and that they felt there was no possibility for an ordinary Karamojong to become an MP because of their poor access to education.

Are 'pastoralist' MPs always interested in the welfare of all pastoralists or only that of their particular community? Though all MPs interviewed said that they believed pastoralist communities should unite to have as strong as possible a voice, in practice it might be difficult for an MP from one part of the country to feel

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on interviews with Karamojong MPs, April 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Based on interviews throughout the region, and personal accumulated knowledge.



responsibility for a different community in completely different area. In Tanzania, when asked whether the relatively strong Maasai presence in parliament was helpful to the Barabaig community's problems with land appropriation, an (Iraqw) woman councillor said that the Maasai were only interested in Maasai concerns – 'though they should help, because it could be relevant to them one day'.

Through no fault of their own MPs may also be limited in their ability to visit their communities because of the transport and living costs involved, particularly if they are part of an opposition party (i.e. receiving no financial support for visits from government).

In response to these potential problems MRG notes that it is supporting the development of a scorecard system to assess the performance and effectiveness of Ugandan MPs. The system is the idea of Mr David Pulkol, a former MP from Karamajong area and currently chairperson of the Africa Leadership Institute in Uganda. The parliamentary scorecard assesses MPs' performance based on their contributions, attendance and influence in committees and plenary debates. It also grades their performance at constituency level by checking their attendance of local council meetings, their accessibility by phone, and the presence of an office or staff.

The scorecard system will effectively monitor performance but MRG should also consider genuine logistical/financial obstacles suffered by MPs, and ways that practical support might be given.

**1d. Increase in capacity, skills and knowledge of pastoralist NGOs and CBOs to better represent pastoralist communities in decision-making processes at community, national, regional and international level**

1d(i) Successes – international advocacy

Partners report that MRG's support in attending regional and international conferences and training events has been very important to their confidence and knowledge of how to best represent their communities at all levels. Simon Nangiro of implementing partner KADP in Uganda states that:

'MRG's capacity building work is important to us – for example in Geneva last December I was able to make a small presentation at the UN Forum on Minority Issues on behalf of the Karamojong on education. Sometimes we might think that everything ends with [national] government – but when we see it is global we have a basis on which to pin government down. You meet other people and realise that other people share your problems – that kind of thing is useful. We can talk confidently then, can cite the [international human rights] acts, we have a basis to say this or that is wrong.'

Hubbie Hussein Al-Haji of NGO Womankind, based in north-eastern Kenya, cites MRG's sponsorship of her co-founder Sophia Abdi Noor to go to the African Charter Commission on Human Rights in the Gambia as important in helping pastoralist women in Kenya to engage with the government. Tezera Getahun of implementing partner PFE was sponsored by MRG to attend the 42<sup>nd</sup> Ordinary Session of the ACHPR in Congo Brazzaville and reported that he was able to make interventions there on behalf of pastoralists.

#### 1d(ii) Successes – tripartite co-operation

MRG's aforementioned report for Danchurch Aid also notes that in 2006 over 300 pastoralist representatives from all over Ethiopia, 30% of whom were women, were invited to the National Palace for a discussion with the Prime Minister, indicating 'a change in attitude of government officials as well as an increased will for recognition and engagement with pastoralist community leaders'. Though Ethiopian pastoralists have suffered (and in Somali and Afar regions, reportedly continue to suffer) violent repression on the part of the government, the country is also, somewhat counter-intuitively, home to some of the more progressive institutional measures in the region.

The tripartite agreement between the World Bank, the Ethiopian government and the (MRG-supported) Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia which forms the basis of the country's Pastoralist Community Development Fund is such a measure. Those government officials who are receptive to pastoralist rights attribute the institutional change in attitude in large part to the efforts of civil society. Shanko Delelegne Desta, Head of the Afar Region Co-ordination Department in Ethiopia's Ministry of Federal Affairs, says:

[...] as far as pastoralist development is concerned, we have been working with PFE for more than 5 years, and there has been lot of intervention in the area of pastoral development – the PFE, the Standing Committee in Parliament, the [Japanese Social Development Fund]. PFE is building capacity in pastoral areas, capacity in income-generating to enhance livelihoods. So many interventions work in consultation [with civil society] for socio-economic development and conflict resolution. A lot of pastoralists have no access to infrastructure or social services. Now we are accepting pastoralism as a mode of life, and the government has designed interventions to bring pastoralists up to other regions' level of development [...] civil society has done a lot, has brought a lot of ideas to be integrated with government strategies.'

Tezera Getahun of implementing partner PFE states that Ethiopia's Pastoralist Day (January 25 has been designated as a pastoralist day by the Federal Government and the event has been celebrated since 1997) is also an important opportunity for pastoralist NGOs and CBOs to raise awareness on a national level:

[...] the basic problem is the knowledge gap, so for example on Pastoralist Day, there are a lot of pastoralists from different areas of the country and actors coming together. Even the Prime Minister of Ethiopia officiated at the 4<sup>th</sup> Pastoralist Day celebrations, the day has national holiday status. Pastoralism is now on the national agenda [...] in terms of development it's getting better, there are millions of dollars coming down to pastoralist development.'

#### 1d(iii) Challenges/Conclusions – government will

There have been many achievements in respect of MRG's support of capacity and knowledge-building of civil society organisations in the target countries. Sponsoring pastoralist representatives to attend international and regional conferences is a cost-effective, two-way method of knowledge dissemination and capacity building: the pastoralist actors are able to raise awareness of their situation internationally, and are encouraged in their own national efforts by the knowledge they have gained at the fora.

A co-operative rather than combative attitude to national government, where

possible, is also without question the most sensible approach for an international lobby group like MRG. Strong criticism of government is of course required at times, but a recognition that there are usually people of goodwill within governments with whom (as in Ethiopia) civil society can work, is absolutely necessary. Nonetheless the goodwill of government actors, while not to be automatically dismissed, must be treated carefully. In Ethiopia, MRG implementing partners question the commitment of government overall to preserving the traditional lifestyle of pastoralists:

‘Despite all the progress the government hasn’t changed the goalposts; governments don’t like people moving and would like to see them sedenterised. Movement is a sign of detachment to them.’

Of serious concern to all NGOs dealing with governance and human rights advocacy in Ethiopia is the NGO law currently being implemented which will effectively bar NGOs from carrying out these activities (in theory a local NGO would still be legally free to carry out advocacy but since any NGO with more than 10% international funding will not be classed as fully local, the law in effect makes it impossible for anyone to do it). This is an area in which continued advocacy support from MRG for grassroots organisations (i.e. concerning how to react to the law) could be of great use.

MRG notes that the Ethiopian government seems determined to curtail the vital role that civil society organizations are capable of playing in creating mass awareness of social and political issues, cultivating a more informed citizenry and mobilizing people to make informed voting choices so that they are able to effectively participate in politics. Civil society has great potential to help equip ordinary citizens with the democratic tools to hold government more accountable. This issue is discussed in more detail in Section III: 2a.

A law requiring international NGOs to report to district authorities before beginning work in a region is also likely to come into force in Uganda, though whether this will have any practical limiting effect on the work of NGOs remains to be seen – the Ugandan authorities state that the rationale behind the law is to prevent repetition of work by government and civil society, and to prevent embezzlement of money by organisations claiming falsely to have done work which another organisation

has done. There is a good case for accepting this as *one* genuine reason behind the law, though there may be other motivations, such as control and monitoring of NGOs and a possible attempt by the government to have greater control over international funding sources.

In terms of planning, some implementing partners questioned the sustainability of information imparted at isolated activities. In their opinion, they said, it might be that:

'to expect continued output out of a single training activity and [research training] is too much – with adults you need to go over information with them again and again, then you can ask what are the challenges, and what do you need'

General administrative capacity of and support to partners is discussed in more detail below.

## **2. Country context and country-specific goals**

### **2a. Ethiopia**

MRG's general goal for Ethiopia (as outlined in the Irish Aid CSF proposal) was that:

The government develops and begins implementation of inclusive development programmes. Government improves infrastructure in pastoralist areas (including water storage/harvesting, roads, abattoirs and meat transport and marketing)

There are positive moves within Ethiopia to implement public service provisions in pastoralist areas. These have been discussed in detail in Section III: 1d(2). Civil society groups, in particular the local umbrella NGO Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia, appear to be strong in capacity and well-organised. PFE and Hope for the Horn have a good relationship with certain quarters of government and a proactive attitude to their work (though email capacity is lacking). PFE's published reports are of a high standard; and its Pastoral Organizations Directory of April 2008 lists more than 60 organisations supporting pastoralist interests in Ethiopia. Hope for the Horn has also been influential in its work with pastoralists in Ethiopia, though

recently it has experienced obstructions to its work in the politically sensitive Somali regions and has been forced to shut its office there (HFH only works in the Somali Region).

Ethiopia is now a federal state, which has been a doubled-edged sword: in some ways minority groups have experienced greater self-determination as a result of federalisation; but there have also been instances of inter-ethnic friction and violence. The results of the May 2005 elections were an unpleasant surprise to the ruling Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), resulting as they did in greatly increased representation for the opposition. Government policy subsequently became increasingly repressive, and opposition MPs were arrested.

Pastoralist communities are viewed by a large proportion of the Ethiopian government as both a potential security risk (particularly in the regions bordering Somalia) and an anachronism. As in other parts of east Africa, the creation of a national park – Awash – has been disastrous for (Kereyou) pastoralist communities, depriving them of their land and denying them access to the Awash river.

Partners testify to the significant political and civil gains for pastoralists in the past decade, and the government officials I met and talked to are evidence for some sympathetic quarters in the Ethiopian government: but the Kereyou and other pastoralists remain deprived of their land and politically repressed. There is more work to be done to support them.

The most significant – and ominous – current development in terms of human rights advocacy in Ethiopia is the new NGO law. MRG notes that the law has been adopted by the Ethiopian parliament on January 8, 2009. This law has been criticized by local and international human rights organizations and donor agencies alike. Many of the key provisions of this law violate Ethiopia's obligations under international human rights law and fundamental rights guaranteed in its own constitution, including the right to freedom of association and freedom of expression. MRG notes that:

'The Proclamation has a chilling effect on civil society membership and participation: potential civil society members could reasonably fear that their jobs,

businesses and private lives could be at risk by the mere fact of their membership. They could be targeted for persecution, harassment or mistreatment. The ironic thing is that ordinary citizens are likely to avoid joining civil society organizations — and thereby forego the legitimate exercise their ‘constitutional’ and human rights to free association — out of fear of government retaliation.

The Proclamation provides for no judicial or administrative appellate review: for instance, there is no way to challenge an agency determination of denial of an application to register, order of dissolution, suspension or dismissal of officers in a court of law before independent judges. There is no way for civil society members who are not suspected of wrongdoing to challenge disclosure of their private records or statements to the agency.

The Proclamation is extremely intrusive in the affairs of civil society: using its sweeping powers, for instance, the agency and its director can appoint, remove, or suspend officers of civil society organizations, manage or freeze their assets, perform intrusive audits without suspicion of wrongdoing, unduly interfere in their internal decision making processes, scrutinize their operations and work plan, review their budget, order changes in their bylaws, and even force testimonial and documentary disclosure with ‘respect to any matter in question’, prohibit all activities carried out by non-Ethiopian NGOs that relate to human rights and other identified fields. The new law draws an important distinction between "foreign" and "Ethiopian" NGOs. "Foreign" NGOs are expressly barred from doing any work related to human rights, governance, protection of the rights of women, children and people with disabilities, conflict resolution and a range of other issues.

The law will strip Ethiopian NGOs that work on human rights issues of access to foreign funding. The new law would effectively close down the few independent domestic NGOs that continue to work on human rights- and governance-related issues by stripping them of access to foreign funding. The new law defines as "foreign" any Ethiopian NGO that receives more than 10 percent of its funding from foreign sources or has any members who are foreign nationals, and then bars "foreign" NGOs from working on human rights and governance issues. This would hit hard, given the lack of obvious fundraising and development opportunities inside Ethiopia, one of the poorest countries in the world.’

## 2b. Kenya

MRG's general goal in Kenya was that:

The promised review of land is completed and results in pro-pastoralist recommendations which are implemented

The repercussions of the post-election violence in late 2007/early 2008 have been serious for Kenya, economically and socially. For minorities, the abandonment of a pre-election draft constitution promoting their rights is a huge loss, and civil society and political groups continue to lobby for its re-institution. In Kenya as in Ethiopia (do you mean Ethiopia? Otherwise, it does not make sense), there are significant differences between the political power of different pastoralist groups, with the northern groups such as the Somali and Borana pastoralists among the most marginalized. However, there are some favourable developments. Due to tenacious lobbying on the part of civil society coalitions, recognition of the economic importance of (pastoralist-owned) livestock to Kenya is gaining a foothold.

And recently, a Maasai civil society group protesting at the planned expansion of Nairobi metropolis into Maasai land in Kajiado district demonstrated that peaceful lobbying can produce concrete results – the expansion plans have (for now) been halted.<sup>4</sup> Under another project, MRG and CEMIRIDE sued the Kenyan government for restitution or compensation on behalf of Endorois pastoralist communities expelled from their ancestral lands to make way for the Lake Bogoria National Park and subsequent mining. Legal cases can be a very important tool to make governments sit up and take notice of the interests of a minority group: it is not a great stretch to surmise that the Endorois case may have had an influence on how seriously the subsequent Maasai complaints were taken by government. The Endorois case is discussed in depth in the Legal Cases Programme Evaluation.

In terms of the country-specific achievements outlined above for Kenya – that the promised review of land is completed and results in pro-pastoralist

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on interviews in Kajiado in April 2009.



recommendations which are implemented – a response from CEMIRIDE<sup>5</sup> summarises gains and remaining challenges:

MRG and Partners' advocacy work around land rights and especially ensuring recognition of Pastoralism can be said to have achieved some results. This is reflected in the Draft National Land Policy which is at the cabinet level awaiting endorsement. Minority and indigenous groups claim that at least fair consultations were undertaken in the process of formulating the Draft Land Policy, and also engagements during the National Constitutional Review Process. The strongest point is that the Land Policy recognizes communal land tenure therefore providing opportunities for consultation on what [constitutes] communal land, use and transfer of land that would be held in Trust by the local authorities. Upon the enactment of the Draft Land Policy the key issue would remain streamlining the relationship and mandates of the local authorities and the communities. It appears still that communities would lose out without their improved capacity to engage with the local authorities. For MRG and partners, and in furtherance of the work undertaken in the past, there would be need to follow through with further advocacy work related to the finalisation of the Draft Land Policy, the constitution review process that is ongoing to ensure that these gains are not lost. Importantly, there is progressive acceptance of the concept of group rights in many government reform processes and a better understanding of the pastoralists as a livelihood. The problem however is that this has not been codified by the government through finalisation and formulation of key policies including the Draft Policy on Arid and Semi Arid Lands. This has been pending at the cabinet level for the last four years. There is persistence [too] in equating livestock sector perspectives with Pastoralism as a system thus disregarding a holistic livelihoods approach. This has hampered realisation of disaggregated data on Pastoralism.

The fact that in Kenya a special ministry was created targeting arid and semi lands (Ministry of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands) might be a step since issues are better illuminated under such a ministry. The same in Uganda. However, the challenges are that they may merely turn out to be coordinating ministries and often given limited resources and mandates. Often there have been difficulties delineating roles between such specially created ministries and other line ones such as Ministry of Water, Livestock, and Agriculture etc. The same ministries, such created, often lack legal basis and are at the mercy of regimes of the time. With the change of regimes they may be scrapped off. Laws need to be enacted in parliament forcing certain budgetary quotas to go to minority/pastoralists areas instead. Political goodwill to make decisive steps towards recognizing livelihoods, developing systems that are facilitative of delivery of social services still lack. Even though improved service delivery in this areas have been noted this has been without proper coordination. This explains why with all catastrophes that befall

---

<sup>5</sup> Emailed to the evaluator June 2009

pastoralists areas it takes time or months before any proper response is realised from the government.

## 2c. Tanzania

MRG's goal for Tanzania was that:

The government changes its attitude towards pastoralism and sees it as a favourable and viable economic system. The government puts in place structures that facilitate social services to pastoralist areas.

The Tanzanian government has historically had a negative and dismissive attitude to pastoralist communities. Maasai communities were deprived of fertile land on the establishment of the Ngorogoro and Serengeti national parks, while Barabaig communities in northern Tanzania have experienced violent repression, land misappropriation and discrimination which continues to the present day. The Government of Tanzania did not recognise pastoralism as a distinct way of life in a [2006] submission to CERD.

Media representations can be a telling indication of the general mood of a country and (especially where the press is not wholly free) its government towards minority groups. In Tanzania, there remains some way to go in creating positive attitudes in the mainstream towards pastoralism. An Arusha Times article in the February 7-13 2009 issue highlights the problem in public attitude. Entitled 'Maasai cattle cause global warming', the article begins by stating that: 'A recent study visit to Maasai land in Arusha revealed that people who keep large numbers of cattle contribute to global warming and therefore to climate change significantly. This refers particularly to local people in Maasai land, Mwanza and Mara Regions in Tanzania'. Although it ends on a slightly more positive note (suggesting that cattle may contribute to the generation of renewable biogas energy) the fact that such a disparaging article – particularly the headline – is acceptable in Tanzania is highly significant.

Social service provisions are patchy, and not present for all pastoralist communities. Maasai interviewees from a community in the north, for example, informed me that the only opportunity their children had to go to school was at a school run by an international NGO. It must be noted, however, that there are likely

to be many poor non-pastoralist communities in Tanzania which also experience lack of government service provision.

Though there have been advances in terms of political representation for pastoralists in Tanzania, there remain many problems for pastoralist communities and their supporters. There have been some efforts by government to return misappropriated land to the Barabaig pastoralist communities in northern Tanzania, but there remain disputes over this land and the Barabaig suffer a stark absence of political power. In one example, I was prevented from visiting Barabaig communities in Hanang district in northern Tanzania by a district official. Barabaig interviewees informed me that it is the district authorities, here, which are themselves responsible for attempting to again misappropriate land which has been returned to the Barabaig by central government. There is a lot more work to be done with pastoralist communities in Tanzania.

## 2d. Uganda

In Uganda, the goal was as follows:

Government acknowledges root causes of intra-pastoralist conflicts and consults with communities on appropriate solutions and begins implementing them. Pastoralist communities' rights are mainstreamed into government development processes and programmes

Multi-party democracy in Uganda has so far largely been a success, despite the great number of ethnic and linguistic groups in the country. However there have been two major sources of instability: the long-running conflict with the Lord's Resistance Army in the northern districts and accompanying oppression of its population by both government and LRA; and conflict and raiding within and near Karamoja.

The Ugandan government's war with the LRA has now largely abated, and IDPs in the north are returning to their homes. The government is turning its eye now to Karamoja, and has recently completed an experimental forcible disarmament programme in Moroto district, with mixed results. Moroto is now relatively safe to travel in and peaceful – but Karamojong communities here report raiding by clans

from other districts, and have suffered the loss of much of their assets. Abuses of the population by the UPDF which took place during the disarmament process were reported by Karamojong MPs and human rights organisations, and the government is reported to have taken some action to address this.

The motivation of the Ugandan government in addressing security and development in Karamoja is – without question – mixed. There are major ruby and gold deposits in the area, and mining is becoming an increasingly important issue when looking at human rights issues. There is also a lot of international NGO money coming in to the region which the Ugandan government may wish to have greater control over. But discussions in Uganda (both for this evaluation and during some years previously) suggest that there is also a genuine recognition on the part of the government that the best way to address security issues in Karamoja is through regional development.

In contrast to the press report cited from Tanzania, the appointment of the First Lady Janet Museveni as the Minister for Karamoja has attracted some positive national coverage recently in Uganda. In the state-supported Saturday Vision of April 4 2009, a special report on Karamoja is featured, entitled 'With a Bible and the cane, Janet enters Karamoja'. Mrs Museveni is reported as being 'unhappy that billions of shillings sent to Karamoja have not yielded expected results'<sup>6</sup> and statistics on the marginalisation of Karamoja in terms of health and education are printed. Karamoja's historical separateness from the rest of Uganda and its suggested colonial-era origins have been explored in academic and lay publications – but a deep-rooted national suspicion of Karamoja as a violent and backward place is now becoming increasingly subject to revision. In late 2007 a memorable article on Karamoja was featured in a popular Ugandan women's magazine, including a photo piece on how other Ugandan women could emulate 'Karamojong fashion'. Small changes like this – the inclusion of a minority group in a news report or a fashion magazine – often reliably indicate a much deeper shift in public opinion.

---

<sup>6</sup> There may, in fact, be underlying political reasons for this criticism of 'wasted' aid money - c.f. the mooted NGO law – but it is still a positive development in terms of bringing the problems of Karamoja to the awareness of the rest of Ugandan society.

The Uganda Land Alliance comment on the Ugandan context<sup>7</sup> that:

'Government is taking pastoralist issues quite seriously I would say. The Sustainable Land Management Programme under the Ministry of Agriculture is focusing on some pastoralist areas. The National Land Policy draft 3 has provisions of enhancing the protection of the common property resources and pastoralism. The rangelands policy has not progressed though the draft is there.'

## 2e. Conclusions

See Overall Conclusions.

### **3. Availability and accessibility of reports and policy recommendations on the situation of pastoralists**

#### 3a. Baseline data

There is a scarcity of baseline information on pastoralists. Governments may find it difficult to penetrate and sometimes to locate pastoralist communities. But there are also political reasons for failing to census marginalized groups. Somali pastoralists in North-Eastern province in Kenya, for example, allege a lack of will on the part of the government to count them and assess the problems they face in the frequently drought-ridden north east; what a government doesn't 'know', it is not obliged to assist with. Therefore, MRG's support to conduct surveys and produce studies on pastoralist groups is significant. Uganda Land Alliance, which performed a survey in Karamoja with the support of MRG, says that the information is:

'...very useful for our continued work, it's clearly [pointing] to what are the critical

---

<sup>7</sup> Email to evaluator June 2009

areas that need attention, it has contributed to our broad thinking about interventions in the area'

KADP, also active in Karamoja, attests to the importance of policy work:

'MRG has been supporting us on policy and advocacy issues, for example last year in Pastoralist Week we developed policy briefs and MRG contributed funding to this. There is a lack of strategic planning in the Ugandan government, so we produced a guide on recognising pastoralism, saying that it deserves special attention. It covered land use, service delivery, infrastructure. Previously we have had briefs on AIDS and education [...] the most important thing is that everyone now talks about pastoralism. That is an achievement.'

### 3b. Campaign reports

MRG's campaign reports have had impact. In Tanzania, PINGO's Forum reports that MRG's 2004/2005 campaign paper by Markakis has been circulated widely in districts and ministries (with 1000 copies produced in Kiswahili, 500 in English with a reprint of a further 500 copies) and was referred to in the 2006 Wildlife Policy. The most recent campaign report – 'A Double Bind: the Exclusion of Pastoralist Women in the East and Horn of Africa' – had generally engaged the interest of those interviewees who had access to it, and accordingly received praise and constructive criticism such as the following from a Kenyan pastoralist woman NGO worker:

'The pastoralist women's report was good [...] not all pastoralist women from different regions are there, like the Boni and the Ogiek, so there is room for improvement but generally it is a very good document, I read it and liked it.'

Positively, the report has been translated into Swahili and it was noted by the evaluator that it was available for the public to take away in the offices of at least one partner organisation (PINGO's). PINGO's Forum in fact translated the first pastoralist report, which was published some four years ago. The new report on pastoralist women has, MRG states, also been translated into Swahili, by GTDO. Most interviewees from partner organisations and individuals with links to MRG were aware of its publication. MRG notes that the report has now been

disseminated to partners. It would be useful to follow up in the near future whether the report has penetrated to community level – this relates to the issue of dissemination of information which will be discussed later. Though the report was launched at a UN minorities forum in Geneva in December 2008, it is not clear that it has received much publicity in the region, which would have been (indeed would still be) a relatively cheap and easy thing to achieve and would appear a natural step for MRG to take (particularly considering that there had been sensitisation work with journalists as part of the Programme).

### 3c. Conclusions

One civil society interviewee in Kenya commented on the latest campaign report ‘that most pastoralists are oral communities so MRG should use oral tools’ – however it can be convincingly argued that in communities where older members are not literate, children often read written documents to the whole family, thereby ensuring good exposure for them. However, if MRG’s campaign reports are intended to be absorbed by the people they are about, other methods of dissemination could also be used. Radio programmes are an excellent way of conveying information to poor, possibly mobile communities, and PFE in Ethiopia and MRG International indeed report that radio programmes have been used in sensitisation work. PFE put out programmes at the time of the 2005 election in Ethiopia in collaboration with MRG. MRG comments that it may be possible to bring out and implement this idea in one of the intercommunity projects, under the upcoming pastoralist project.

Translation of briefings and campaign reports into more indigenous languages should also be considered – to some pastoralists in the region, Swahili would be as alien as English – since the costs if this is done in-country would not necessarily be prohibitive. Uganda Land Alliance has translated some of its MRG-sponsored briefs into Karamojong, a positive step.

A strong media strategy is absolutely vital to the maximisation of MRG’s good work in raising the profile of pastoralist communities in their respective countries. CEMIRIDE comments:

The media coverage in Kenya has improved but in Tanzania things look like they are worsening. There is need for MRG to invest in developing a strong strategy. More and more media coverage of pastoralist issues and areas are being recorded in Kenya almost to a day. The question, however, has been the quality and sincerity of the coverage. The focus has been on disaster, negative incidents like droughts, diseases, and so. The media lacks more of analytical reporting skills and has had little support from CSOs in this respect. Often briefs by NGOs are couched in technical language that disinterests journalists. In Uganda, work by PANOS and IMPACT has revived hopes of training more journalists to report accordingly on Pastoralism. In Kenya apart from single consultations with senior editors conducted by CEMIRIDE and partners way back in 2004 little has improved. There is also need for innovation in the way we approach the trainings, avoiding the usual workshops and getting journalists to catch fast hand experiences of the livelihood even as they undergo training. MRG can do well to scale up this area of engagement with the media in relation with partners. In my view Tanzania would need a lot of help here.

Collecting baseline data must be taken very seriously. In remote areas such as those in which many of the pastoralist communities live, it is certainly not easy to collect accurate and comprehensive baseline data. Lack of public transport and poor roads make it difficult to reach many communities (in Karamoja, for example, many areas were cut off for months following the floods of early 2007) while their remote nature may raise costs and slow down operations (transport, accommodation, food, replacement of equipment etc). Collecting quantitative data is made harder by low levels of education and literacy: at grassroots level most questionnaires will need to be filled in verbally with the assistance of literate researchers, raising manpower costs and/or length of survey time. If communities are dispersed, sampling will be sparse, and/or the area surveyed small, and/or survey time long. Surveys of pastoralist communities contribute significantly to advocacy activities by providing clear evidence of the problems faced in these communities – but they require careful planning to be effective.

In terms of MRG's own reporting and project proposals, it is noted that the stated project aims and activities were at times very wide-ranging. Though some, such as the initiation of a Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council, are focused, innovative and potentially highly effective, others could be more specific – for example 'national



advocacy activities’, ‘conflict prevention and management projects’, ‘interventions at regional and international fora’ and ‘shadow reports or advocacy briefings’. When activities have such a broad description, it may be difficult to measure whether they have been performed effectively or not.

However MRG notes in response that some of the project components were deliberately made non-specific. This was aimed at giving each partner the opportunity to come with issues which are relevant and timely for them and their respective countries. MRG also notes that since it cannot predetermine the agenda of the UN agencies, it has to use the term interventions.

#### **4. Extent to which MRG intervention has helped minority grassroots partner organisations achieve sustainability by building increased capacity**

The question of capacity in terms of empowerment and confidence-building has already been addressed in section 1d. But administration and planning activities are also relevant to the question of capacity-building in partner organisations.

Generally, administrative capacity seemed relatively strong in the partners visited, who are well-established and funded compared to some other grassroots organisations in the region representing minority communities. However the Garba Tulla Development Organisation reports experiencing serious difficulties in maintaining its activities due to long-running obstructions by other parties in its region of operation. MRG has advised GTDO that legal action or registration as a new organization will be necessary.

Communication also appears and is reported as being good between MRG and partners: there are frequent visits and direct contact between partners and MRG HQ. However concern has been expressed by MRG Uganda over the lack of reporting feedback from some partners on occasion.

Generally speaking, there may be several reasons for a situation like this occurring between donors and grassroots partners. These could include a lack of practical administrative capacity: money, office skills, education (particularly a problem for marginalized groups, particularly in post-war zones) are lacking and the partner is not entirely clear on what is required from the donor. It could also be the case that objectives agreed with the donor have not been achieved, due to circumstances within or beyond the partner’s control, and the partner is unwilling to report the failure. It could also be because of the logistical challenges of reporting from remote areas where communications are poor. In all of these

cases there may be assistance that MRG can give to partners to make it easier to report.

For their part, partners should make an effort to respond to contact from MRG so that misunderstandings do not arise. Details of how capacity building grants given to the eight partner organisations were spent may be helpful in shedding light on this particular issue.

Though the feedback from partners on MRG's support was generally good, some suggested that it would be easier to have a sustained relationship rather than individual MoUs, drawn up for a particular task and a particular task only. Partners questioned what their structural relationship to MRG was – whether they were consultants for particular tasks, or whether they should consider their relationship to be sustained and ongoing. MRG notes that the support it provides to partners needs improvement and is consequently implementing a salary system in the next project. At the same time it notes that most partners, in spite of having a signed agreement, were unable to fulfil their obligations on time and that as a rule, MRG will release any money to a partner only if the partner has completed a previous task and has provided satisfactory financial and narrative reports.

It was also suggested in more than one country that more planning was needed on the part of MRG concerning how interventions would fit into the overall workplans of partner organisations:

‘MRG doesn't really provide strategic funds for partners, [...] but it's better to have long term projects for partners, better to have that than pop in and then go. They pay a percentage for a specific project but it assumes that the staff are just there for that project. It would be good to plan long-term programmes.’

In response to this suggestion, MRG however notes that the Pastoralist project and the previous project were developed on the basis of consultation and discussions carried out during a project planning meeting, showing that each partner has been involved in the planning of the project: ‘Furthermore, budget for project activities were computed on the basis of feedback received from partners on the ground. When it comes into implementation, most of the time MRG will transfer the project cost to relevant partners. On the top of this, it has been awarding project implementing partners a sum of \$5K for the collaboration.’

MRG further notes that lessons have been learned from the recent project and efforts are being made to make additional money available to partners in the new project. It notes that partners are awarded co-ordination funding in addition to project costs, and are expected to utilise part of this money to conduct monitoring and evaluation.

Finally in this section is important to note a general point, not specifically concerning MRG but as a note for *all* donors. In every project implemented by an international donor body and grassroots partners, if partners have trouble meeting their obligations for any reason – be it because the funding is not sufficient, or because they are not clear on what their obligations are, or for any other reason – they should feel free to discuss with the donor. MRG has listened to difficulties reported by partners and should continue to do so. Such a relationship is, generally, in any partners' interests and any donor's – since if a partner feels there is 'no excuse' they may be tempted to simply tell a funding body what they want to hear.

## Section IV: Overall conclusions

Conclusions concerning each section of the findings have already been included. This final Conclusions section focuses on the most important points and lessons for future projects.

Partners had a great deal of positive feedback generally on MRG's approach and MRG staff. MRG's attitude and interest in minority groups was favourably compared to the approach of larger international humanitarian agencies:

'Whereas I see [other bigger donors] as a group of people who are not interested in what they are doing – they don't analyse the conditions, they don't want to listen, MRG understands the background, understands our issues and understands about us'.

However, problems were also raised. Successes and challenges are discussed thematically below.

### 1. Relevance

It is clear that pastoralist societies in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda are an appropriate target for political and civil empowerment of the kind envisaged by MRG's programme. In each of these countries, pastoralists are seriously institutionally marginalized and their human rights infringed in terms of welfare provision, land ownership and political representation. They also bear the brunt of a number of natural threats, in particular drought, now exacerbated by climate change. Women within pastoralist societies often suffer *in extremis*.

Education, health provision, sustainable livelihoods, gender equality, security and other elements which make for a decent standard of living are fundamentally linked to political and civil representation, if they are to be provided to marginalized groups in a sustainable way by the governments whose primary responsibility it is to do so. It is also in the wider security and (as pastoralist lobby groups are trying to demonstrate) economic interests of the nation states in question to provide development and representation to pastoralists, something that is being recognised to some degree by their governments.

The support of elders' councils and the RPEC in particular seem an excellent way of addressing security and development issues in the relevant regions. Issues of joint disarmament are central to the welfare of pastoralist societies and it is to be hoped that progress can be made with the African Union and RPEC collaboration. There are however some questions that must be examined in relation to elders' councils, as is discussed below.

## **2. Effectiveness**

Though they were at times achieved through the same activities, the goals of the Pastoralist Programme may be broadly characterised in three ways:

Awareness-raising and capacity building throughout pastoralist communities and their wider societies through the transmitting of information in trainings, workshops and publications.

Empowerment through the capacity-building of community leaders – elders, women and youth – to advocate for their communities.

Empowerment through the capacity-building of pastoralist politicians, especially women, to advocate for their communities.

Workshops, conferences and training seminars formed a significant part of the Programme and were reported to be very effective in terms of capacity- and confidence-building for attendees. It was clear from interviews that information learned at MRG training events can remain with participants for many years. In this sense, MRG's awareness-raising and capacity building can have a more permanent effect than other more obvious but more temporary forms of humanitarian assistance such as food aid (though this of course has its own important role). However, some partners suggested that the intermittent nature of projects may leave them with problems sustaining effects and requested more systematic interventions by MRG. As one partner commented:

'The issue of capacity building in the community – to address civic rights is a lasting measure in terms of sustainability – the only thing is, how do you sustain

activities? How do you sustain the ordinary monitoring of the programme?’

Another consideration with workshops and trainings to watch closely for is the potential for workshops to sensitise people into knowing the ‘right things to say’. This may be particularly the case with gender sensitisation in patriarchal societies, where it may take more than a little convincing for some men to genuinely accept that women possess equal rights.

The question of whether elders and other community leaders can successfully represent their communities has been discussed above, and the answer was yes, with the proviso that leadership structures should be monitored and examined critically (including surveying community members) to ensure that they are indeed providing positive leadership and representation.

The effectiveness of MPs as representatives for their communities was also discussed. MPs are very important as pastoralist voices (and voices sympathetic to pastoralists) at a political level but some interviewees expressed dissatisfaction with the level of representation they saw from their MPs. Political structures and conventions in the region may also compromise the quality of representation pastoralist communities enjoy, though this can be addressed with community sensitisation and capacity-building of potential leaders. It was noted that even if they provide successful representation for their constituents, pastoralist MPs may not immediately view it as a priority to represent pastoralists as a whole – but part of the (well-founded) rationale of the MRG Programme is that there is strength in numbers. The sensitisation offered by MRG to pastoralist MPs themselves to see this wider picture in the form of conferences and trainings is therefore also important. It was questioned how genuine the political space open to women pastoralist MPs (indeed women MPs in general) in the region is, and noted that there might be further gender sensitisation work to do.

### **3. Efficiency**

In terms of value for funding money and relative sustainability, the MRG approach appears to have been efficient, though a more detailed breakdown of spending and further discussion with MRG may be necessary to comment further on this. It is clear from the testimony of interviewees and examination of literature produced by

partners and MRG that the MRG's support has helped to raise awareness among community leaders, build the capacity of partners, and make information about the issues facing pastoralists more prominent in their respective countries.

However, there is one major area which MRG may wish to examine, and this is planning. To make the best use of money and capacity available, outcomes should be focused and realistic. Logistical difficulties and funding requirements should be carefully reflected on to make project targets fully realisable.

MRG reports that the Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council will receive its own budget line in the next project. This is a very positive measure – since though the work of forming grassroots advocacy bodies is very well-conceived in principle and has already met with some success, if it is not fundamentally sustainable it cannot be the best use of funding. It is to be hoped that it will also be possible to support national Elder's Council and pastoralist women leadership groups such as Kenya's League of Pastoralist Women.

MRG has recognised that salaried positions for selected partners will improve efficiency and delivery, and state that this will be addressed in the next programme.

#### **4. Impact**

Many interviewees reported positive effects of workshops and trainings in terms of creating lasting understanding and co-operation between different pastoralist groups. The long-term effects of MRG's advocacy and empowerment approach are potentially highly significant. A strong political and civil voice for pastoralist communities is at the foundation of other humanitarian needs, at least if national governments themselves are to address the needs of their people – in the end a much more sustainable approach to development than relying on international NGOs. Likewise, MRG's approach of empowering grassroots NGOs and leadership structures to advocate for their communities is sustainable, appropriate and efficient, providing gender sensitivity and sensitisation is maintained, and there is good dialogue during interventions with these groups concerning their needs and problems. It was observed in the evaluation that there is much positive feedback from the partners about their work with MRG, but also some concerns to be

addressed, particularly relating to planning and funding.

One important issue to note is the potential unwanted consequences of sensitising marginalized people to their rights in repressive political environments. In such an environment, beneficiaries may be given knowledge they subsequently find difficult to use. This has been discussed briefly above in the context of Ethiopia, and one female participant of a 2005 workshop in Ethiopia tells a shocking further story of government repression following sensitisation activities:

'Before the training there were national elections, during two elections women never participated, they didn't know they could. After taking the training I went to my place, as a result women began to participate in the elections, building confidence. But my husband was wounded, because of that training, my husband was shot with 6 bullets, put in jail, there was a lot of suffering and I was alone with the children. The training built my confidence, otherwise I would be lost, empty.'

This interviewee does not regret the training she has received. But in considering impact, it is also important to consider how, if possible, beneficiaries may be supported sustainably to use the knowledge they have acquired.

It was noted that conflict resolution activities have also had a significant positive impact, as have MRG-produced or supported campaign and policy papers. In the case of campaign papers, impact could be increased by greater publicity and distribution in the region, and oral dissemination activities such as radio programmes.

Country-specific impact was as follows (see also Section III: 2):

Ethiopia: over the course MRG's two Pastoralist Programmes there have been notable successes for in Ethiopia in terms of increased representation, recognition and acceptance of pastoralists and their way of life, and some improvements concerning infrastructure. However, misappropriated land remains misappropriated and there is an increasing level of government repression. The new NGO law must surely be a major focus of attention for any future work for MRG in Ethiopia: partners must be given support in finding ways



to continue their work.

Kenya: though the review of land is not yet complete, there has been progress in the development of the Draft Law. Again, though further research would be needed to confirm a direct link, it is reasonable to surmise that the success of the Maasai Kajiado Community Task Force in turning back the expansion of Nairobi Municipality from their lands was assisted by MRG's work with implementing partners on the Draft Land Law and the resultant 'progressive acceptance of the concept of group rights' within government. The increased representation of pastoralists in the Kenyan government, including women MPs is a great achievement (though note the comments about political space in Section III: 1a(ii)). Though CEMIRIDE draws attention to the importance of not rigidly equating the livestock sector with the pastoralist community, it is also important to note that the active lobbying within the Kenyan government on the part of pastoralist MPs for the recognition of the economic significance of livestock production is a positive development for pastoralists. More support from government for this sector and for pastoralist herding communities could improve pastoralist livelihood options and raise their profile favourably within Kenya.

Tanzania: though there have been successes in terms of increasing representation for pastoralists in government in Tanzania, there is a long way to go in this country. Interviewees from PINGOs Forum requested assistance with registering as a full NGO, since they feel this will increase their influence and legitimacy. The Barabaig, in particular, continue to suffer from obvious institutional discrimination in northern Tanzania and have little representation in government. There is more work for MRG here in terms of lobbying government for increased representation and service provision, and changing attitudes to pastoralists. Media strategy is particularly important in this context.

Uganda: there have been many positive developments in Uganda thanks to the work of MRG, its implementing partners, pastoralist MPs and lobby groups. The institution of Janet Museveni as Minister for Karamoja is potentially a positive development – showing positive government interest in the region and raising its profile within Uganda. However, the government attitude to Karamoja is complex and the experimental disarmament of Moroto district has had mixed results. The repercussions of the mooted new NGO law in Uganda will require careful monitoring by human rights groups. There are also some marginalized

pastoralist or pastoralist-neighbouring communities within Karamoja and the rest of Uganda which receive less attention than the Karamojong. Future MRG projects could pay special attention to these: for example the Basongora (already included by MRG) and the Ik (not, to my knowledge, so far included by MRG). Overall, though, MRG has a good opportunity in future projects to use the relatively open attitude of government in Uganda to build on its past successes.

## **5. Sustainability**

The sustainability of the programme outcomes and impacts vary. In an important sense, MRG's training and capacity building work is highly sustainable. Interviews conducted suggest that as befits a human rights organisation, MRG's work is generally underlaid by a real respect for its beneficiaries, and it is in itself empowering to people to know they are respected. Knowledge can last far longer than material benefits – a single workshop, or a trip to an international conference, can be life-changing for the person experiencing it. And indeed memories of trainings appear fresh in the minds of attendees interviewed. But some refresher trainings would probably be necessary to keep information sharp for many delegates. This is not a comment on the quality of the training, but on the nature of the human mind. Refresher trainings could be an opportunity to consider how support can be given to attendees in difficult political contexts (though it is also appreciated that the political climate may become such that it becomes impossible for MRG to be active in certain regions).

The Elders' Councils are less sustainable without some continued external financial and/or technical support. Without funding, transport and administration costs could prohibit elders meeting and disseminating information, particularly on a national and regional level. Since these councils appear generally to be a well-conceived and effective initiative, this would be unfortunate, and the funding required to keep the councils active would not necessarily be large. MRG comments that it strongly believes in the importance of providing the RPEC with logistical and financial support until it reach a stage where it can raise the funds by itself. To this end, the new project has a budget line exclusively dedicated to the Regional Elders Council.

Elders play an important role in ensuring the integration of women and gender sensitisation must continue for a fully sustainable and effective civil participation. MRG comments that pastoralists are becoming sensitised to the fact that if as a community they are to gain an equal share of the cake they have to participate in the democratic system, including elections – they are beginning to understand that this is not only an incentive for embracing gender equality, but that it is imperative to win elections and have a say in the government.

Capacity building within partner organisations has achieved successes – in particular the support for representatives to visit international fora has been a great boost to their confidence and knowledge base. Administrative capacity generally appears relatively strong in partner organisations and none are wholly dependent on MRG support – a good sign in terms of efficiency. But it is not clear that MRG's work is finished yet in relation to any of the partner organisations interviewed, and GTDO in particular may require extra support. There are some questions over reporting which may require dialogue between MRG and partner organisations.

## **Section VI: Annexes**

### **Annex A: Interview list**

#### **MRG**

Claire Thomas – MRG UK

Tadesse Tafesse – MRG UK

Paul Mulindwa – MRG Uganda

Jolly Kemigabo – MRG Uganda

#### **Ethiopia**

Assefa Tewodros, Project Co-ordinator, Federal Project Co-ordination Unit,

Pastoral Community Development Project

Shanko Delelegne Desta, Head of the Afar Region Co-ordination Department

Kereyou elders and woman representative, Afar district

Abdul Karim A Guleid – Hope for the Horn

Tezera Getahun, Daniel, Wantusan – Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia

Oxfam Ethiopia

#### **Kenya**

Daniel Ole Tenaai - Olmaa Pastoralist Development Programme

Richard K Letesh - Maasai young man, Kajiado district

Mary Lasiti Tumaroi - Maasai young woman, Kajiado district

Joyce Soikan – Maasai woman, Olturuto, Kajiado

Agnes Naigeyo – Maasai woman, Kekonyokie South, Kajiado

SS Ole Timoi-Dupotp Emaa – Maasai elder, Kajiado

ML Ole Sisika – Maasai elder, Kajiado

David Ole Kedianye – Maasai elder/leader of Nairobi Metropolis Task Force

Mr Abass – Aridlands

Hubbie Hussein Al-Haji – Womankind

Hon Sophia Abdi Noor, MP

Hon Abdul Bahari Ali MP

Hon Chachu Ganya, MP

Hon Ekwe Ethuro, MP

Dr Abdullahi Wako, Garba Tulla Development Foundation

Molu Tepo, Garba Tulla Development Foundation

Yobo Rutin – CEMIRIDE

Halake Dida – WISP

Safia Abdi – Cordaid

Philip Ole Wuantai and Tiampati, Kajiado Community Task Force

Daniel Kimiata – UNOCHA

### **Tanzania**

Edward Porokwa – PINGO's Forum

Gidamis Shahanga – PINGO's Forum

Hon Leonard Gapeliojig – Hanang District Councillor, Mogitu Ward (Barabaig Councillor)

Anju Mangiola Diwani – Barabaig landowner, Gehandu Farm, Hanang

Rose Kamili Slaa – Iraqw councillor representing Barabaig constituency, Hanang

Yohana Timothy Laizer – Maasai elder

Maasai community members

### **Uganda**

Esther Obaikol – Uganda Land Alliance

Simon Nangiro – KADP (Moroto office)

Stephen Abura – KADP (Moroto office)

Monika Apuun – KADP (Pian office)

Paul Omayo, Samuel Losuru, John Lorot, Jolly Joseph Akeo, Regina Lomilo,

Adiaka Madelena – Karamojong community representatives, Irriri

Communities of Rupa sub-county and Okudud village, Moroto, Karomoja

Joseph Deheets Lokapel – Rupa sub-county administrative officer

Moroto district representatives

## **Annex B: Glossary of Abbreviations**

ACHPR	African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights
AIDS	Auto-Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AU	African Union
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CEMIRIDE	Centre for Minority Rights Development (Kenya)
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CERD	Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CORD	UK-based international post-conflict development charity
CSF	Civil Society Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EPRDF	Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
GTDO	Garba Tulla Development Organisation
HFH	Hope for the Horn
IDP	Internally Displaced People
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
KADP	Karamoja Agricultural Development Programme
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
MRG	Minority Rights Group International
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PANOS	London-based international development agency
PFE	Pastoralist Forum of Ethiopia
PINGOs	Pastoralist Indigenous NGO's (Tanzania)
PPG	Pastoralist Parliamentary Group
RPEC	Regional Pastoralist Elders' Council
TOR	Terms of Reference
ULA	Uganda Land Alliance
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UPDF	Uganda Peoples' Defence Force
WISP	World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism