

[OXFAM final report 2]

13 December 2004

THE STATE OF PASTORALISM

MONITORING POVERTY TRENDS IN PASTORAL AREAS

OF EAST AFRICA AND THE HORN

INITIAL FEASIBILITY SURVEY

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite a growing campaign against pastoral poverty in East Africa and the Horn, many organisations, including Oxfam, believe that pastoral poverty is growing, not declining. But it is hard to be sure: there are too few indicators, and the indicators that do exist do not give an accurate picture of critical developments and trends in pastoral livelihood systems.

It seems likely that present monitoring systems show only the tip of an iceberg of massive changes occurring among pastoral livelihood systems. Current monitoring suffers from several intractable problems. Because of the logistic difficulties in doing research in pastoral areas, national censuses and household budget surveys often ignore the pastoral population altogether. Information is gathered by government, NGOs and researchers, but objectives and methods vary widely, making aggregation and comparison difficult. Even where good data are gathered, most indicators are static 'snapshots' of the situation at a single point in time, and are rarely able to identify trends. Studies done with different methodologies sometimes reach conflicting conclusions, with one study

claiming poverty is increasing, another that it is diminishing. The lack of authoritative data on pastoral livelihood systems means not only that there are no baselines against which to measure the success or failure of policies or practical interventions, but also that it is difficult to identify alternative options.

This report assesses the feasibility of researching and publishing a periodic 'status report' on pastoralism in the Horn and East Africa. For simplicity, and in order to distinguish it from other reports, we give it the working title of 'Report on the Status of Pastoralism' - ROSP for short. Such a status report should illuminate the social, economic, environmental pressures on pastoralism, and the resulting trends in pastoral livelihood systems, especially in the extent and impact of poverty. The primary aim is to provide information to encourage and promote new or improved policies, resource allocation, and public perceptions of pastoralism. Data should also be researched and presented in such a way as to stimulate debate among pastoralists themselves about poverty.

What is proposed here is not simply a new study. Additional research will be needed, as will further analysis of data already collected. But the overall aim of ROSP is to identify and promote the changes necessary to reduce pastoral poverty and achieve the Millennium development goals.

This is not a task for Oxfam alone. In this report we try to identify how different agencies - government, NGOs, community organisations, researchers - should collaborate in this work, and spread ownership of it widely. This report identifies what needs to be done, and who might do it, as well as the specific roles that Oxfam could play, mainly as catalyst and facilitator, in the process.

The region covered initially is East Africa and the Horn - defined as Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania - but the door is left open to a wider participation, including Sudan (at least South Sudan), Somalia, Somaliland, Puntland, and possibly Eritrea.

2. PURPOSE OF ROSP

The proposal to monitor the status and trend of pastoralism arises partly from a feeling of frustration about slow progress (indeed in many cases lack of progress or even retreat) in identifying and putting into action policies and programmes to support pastoral livelihoods. Governments, Oxfam and many other organisations have made large investments in pastoralism in the Horn and East Africa, but results in terms of reduced poverty, improved well-being, or greater pastoral ownership of the development process have been meagre.

Increasingly NGOs and some government departments in the region have started to accept that pastoralism is a specialised, appropriate and potentially productive livelihood system, but lack the data, especially statistical data, to understand its internal logic or to formulate accurate policies to improve the lives of pastoralists. Despite some excellent

research and even some statistics gathered but not analysed, we do not yet have a reliable and detailed account of most of the trends and processes which are now profoundly altering pastoral livelihood systems. The data available to help planning are often poor, and even where they exist are generally only an account of events at a particular moment in time. A negative public perception of pastoralism, fuelled by widespread ignorance about pastoralists, mean that planners are operating largely in the dark. They do not know how to plan for pastoralism, and as a result it often escapes the formal government planning and budgeting process all together. This is more serious than simple marginalisation: the problem is the exclusion of pastoralists from key aspects of political and economic life.

The goal of the ROSP project is to change this situation by (i) better documenting and understanding the internal logic of the pastoral livelihood system, and the contribution of pastoralism to the national economy (ii) assessing present processes and threats, and (iii) identifying the policy implications for poverty reduction. ROSP will illuminate the present state of pastoralism, and allow an understanding of the mechanisms at work in the pastoral economy. It will track changes in pastoral livelihoods, especially those relevant to poverty and well-being. It will provide high quality information, including quantitative information where relevant and feasible, to herders themselves, to organisations working on their behalf, and to government. It will follow and analyse key changes in production, marketing, consumption, health and education. It will assess and where possible measure, both vulnerability and capabilities, and report how pastoralists are engaging with markets and states in new ways. By doing this, it will provide analysis and information on which governments can draft better pastoral policies and implement better programmes, and Oxfam and other non-governmental organisations can work in a more targeted and effective way.

The precise indicators to be monitored should be decided at the initial project workshops discussed below. An outline of the main topics which could provide indicators is in Annex 1.

ROSP should be a status report. But it should provide not only reliable indicators of process and trends, but also a better understanding of the processes underlying these trends, and a develop a strategy to bring these insights into the public, policy-making, domain.

To achieve these objectives ROSP should have four main activities:

- to build the capacity of national statistics departments, other relevant organisations such as NGOs, and eventually community-based organisations, to research, analyse, and present accurate information on pastoralism, including appropriate qualitative information;
- to encourage disparate existing initiatives on pastoral information-gathering to co-operate through effective networks within and between countries in the region;

- to use the output to encourage debate among researchers, officials and pastoralists about poverty and its remedies; identify the risks and constraints inherent in this process especially for pastoralists;
- to make the results of this debate available for policy-making and resource allocation, and encourage debate and action on the policy consequences of the conclusions.

ROSP's aim goes beyond simple poverty monitoring. ROSP needs also to develop a critique of present government policies and activities. Creating a policy-oriented database and facilitating the drafting and implementation of new policies is the key. None of the countries in the region has a fully-articulated pastoral policy, and some have no relevant policies at all. In at least two countries, government has announced its intention to settle pastoralists, as in their view this is the only way social services can be delivered to them, more livestock can be sold, and the destruction of the rangelands can be avoided. Poverty alleviation initiatives in the region started with high expectations about reaching pastoralists, but these hopes have been largely dashed as the difficulties involved in securing good data, and the failure of many activities, became apparent. The value added by ROSP would be to generate new, more accurate and representative understandings of pastoralism, of pastoral poverty and what to do about it, and to assist in identifying and implementing better policies and programmes. If ROSP is successful in achieving these aims it will trigger fundamental changes in the ways key institutions, especially government and others, understand and respond to pastoral issues.

3. ROSP PARTNERS

There are many potential stakeholders or partners in ROSP.¹ In order to keep management simple, we should be selective in the choice of close collaborators, starting modestly, working in depth with a small number of partners, and possibly expanding later as methods improve and capacities grow.

Partners are individuals and organisations who will use ROSP as a prime source of information, or who contribute funding or information. They are part of the informal network of organisations, small groups and individuals who generally share Oxfam's approach to pastoralism, who provide information, funding, or both, who are already collaborating on a day-to-day basis, and who will use the reports. Partners range from local organisations of pastoralists, through non-governmental organisations, to government departments, including especially departments responsible for livestock and rangelands, and for central statistics departments. Partners often work alongside Oxfam in pastoral areas.

¹ Stakeholder and partner are used interchangeably in this report to mean those organisations and individuals who are involved in pastoral develop issues, who might contribute to ROSP, or who might use its results in their work.

Partners may be *contributors, users*, or both . Contributors provide information or funding to ROSP. Users are in the network primarily because they use the results of ROSP in their work. Users include the people who transform information into national policy or action on a large scale, and therefore decide the impact of the information from ROSP, but they can also be small community organisations using ROSP information to develop more appropriate programmes for their members. The categories of contributor and users overlap considerably, with many organisations performing both functions.

Potential partners

The ROSP partnership will take time to develop and should be negotiated through the meetings and workshops proposed for the development of the ROSP system. Likely partners in the four focus countries include the following general categories, in no particular order of importance. More detailed suggestions about partners are made in annex 2.

Members of Parliament, including but not limited to MPs from pastoral districts. ²

Key government organisations:

- Prime Minister's/President's Office
- Central or National Statistics Bureaux in all four focus countries, and especially specialist units within the Bureaux such as Poverty Research Units
- Ministries of Planning and National Development
- Sectoral Ministries responsible for livestock and rangeland issues
- In Ethiopia, the Ministry of Federal Affairs, responsible for the main pastoral areas, is a key partner in the World Bank sustainable lowland livelihoods project
- In Kenya, the Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP), in the Office of the President, is an essential partner
- Eventually other sectoral ministries in relevant fields, including Education , Health, and Water

Central government is crucial, but in most cases regional bureaucracies are as important, and should be included. In the case of Ethiopia, regional government may be more important for pastoral issues than central government.

Non-governmental and community-based organisations and other pastoral representatives

- Oxfam country and regional staff
- Other international NGOs with pastoral programmes and networks including SNV, SCF, Pastoralist Communications Initiative (PCI), FARM Africa, OSSREA/PANOS

² In the case of Ethiopia, members of both the Federal and Regional parliaments.

- Local pastoral membership organisations, other pastoral representatives and pastoral networks in region: eg Pastoral Forums in Kenya and Ethiopia
- Decentralised pastoral information centres, eg Karimoja Data Centre

Private sector organisations

- Local consultancy firms specialised in pastoral issues

Research organisations

There are many national and international research organisations in the region with good overall capacity to address pastoral issues:

- International Livestock Research Institute
- OSSREA
- National research institutes, including university-based institutes

Key donors and international agencies

- The World Bank is an important partner in the region, with major projects involving pastoralists in three of the four pilot countries
- Some EU delegations have experience of pastoralism, and are giving support to pastoral initiatives
- Several bilateral programmes are important, including DfID, GTZ, Italy, Sweden
- The UNDP Dryland Centre in Nairobi has taken an important pastoral initiative.

Who is the main subject of concern?

The ROSP initiative is aimed at 'pastoralists', but this is imprecise and could lead to confusion.

Definitions of pastoralism are complex. The most widely accepted is an economic definition based on sources of household income: a pastoral household is one where more than 50 percent of total income, including the value of goods produced and consumed within the household, comes from livestock grazed principally on commonly managed rangelands. A household where between 25 and 50 percent of income is from such livestock activities, and over 50 percent is from agriculture is defined as agro-pastoral.

The exact thresholds in these definitions - 50 percent, 25 percent - are course largely arbitrary, but ensure that we are dealing with comparable populations in each case. A larger problem is that there are few detailed data on household income among pastoralists; indeed this is an important reason for the ROSP initiative. In the early stages, we will deal almost entirely with estimates. As ROSP advances, data will become more available.

An early ROSP workshop should decide whether the initiative should focus only on pastoral, or on pastoral and agropastoral households. A focus uniquely on pastoralists has the advantage of clarity, and faces up to the most difficult problem, that of the lack of data on pastoralism, and the difficulty in gathering them. On the other hand pastoralists are a relatively small population in the regional context. Extending the work to agropastoralists risks diffusing the impact of ROSP but would make have a much larger audience.

Ownership

Who owns the ROSP process?' The success of ROSP will depend on a strong sense of shared ownership between a variety of partners, whether contributors or users. It is important that all the main partners feel this sense of ownership, including the pastoralists themselves who are the prime beneficiaries in the long run. Proposals as to how ownership can be widely spread without losing its focus are suggested in the discussion below.

Role of Oxfam in the partnership

Oxfam needs the ROSP initiative because of the focus it would provide for an important part of its work on poverty, which has a tendency otherwise to be somewhat piecemeal - a drought here, a conflict there. ROSP could provide a unifying theme. Oxfam needs to prioritise, and this work on poverty could do that. It would also increase Oxfam's understanding of poverty in the context of pastoralism.

But ROSP should not be conceived as a uniquely, or even principally, Oxfam activity. If ROSP is to be successful, it needs to evolve and grow in directions where Oxfam does not necessarily have any comparative advantage. A successful ROSP would be firmly based in national statistical bureaux of each country, in special pastoral project management units, in NGOs and pastoral community organisations.

Oxfam has an essential role – as catalyst and facilitator - in getting ROSP off the ground. Oxfam's position and reputation in East Africa and the Horn are unique, and provide the opportunity for Oxfam to negotiate a partnership that would not easily work or have the same credibility in the hands of other organisations. Oxfam has made a long term commitment to pastoral work in the region, which provides guarantees to government agencies. Oxfam has the experience, contacts, credibility, and intellectual resources to be able to bring together the coalition of government and non-governmental organisations needed to design and launch an initiative of the complexity of ROSP. Oxfam needs to define for itself how best it can do that. A first list of possible tasks for Oxfam would include: (i) organising partners and facilitating key decisions in the period of setting up ROSP, (ii) taking a leading role in defining outputs, methods and progress indicators; (iii) retaining tight quality and editorial control for the first ROSP outputs in order to set high standards from the start; (iv) funding the initial set up and roll out costs.

4. ACHIEVING ROSP OBJECTIVES

The objectives outlined above to a great extent determine the architecture of ROSP, and especially the intensity of information gathering and analysis.

Style of the report

There are three broad alternatives for the style and format of the report itself. They are progressively more expensive and managerially demanding. However they are also progressively more detailed and accurate, with better analytic quality, and generate better policies and better programmes. The three options are:

1. *Status quo*. Focuses on a narrow range of activities; use only presently available data; do no additional analysis. Brings this information together with a short statement of key policy and practice conclusions resulting from existing analysis. Cheapest, least original and least useful option.
2. *Status quo plus*. Uses presently available data with additional desk analysis. More expensive, perhaps marginally more useful to policy makers but no very new ideas to be expected.
3. *New approaches*. Generates new data, mainly by commissioning (and where necessary building capacity within) government, civil society and private sector institutions to do new surveys and analysis. Most expensive option, but it generates new perspectives and new, more effective, policy options.

Table 1. Three options for content of the ROSP report

<i>Option</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>New data gathering?</i>	<i>New data Analysis?</i>	<i>Value added</i>	<i>Cost</i>
Status quo	Existing data	No	No	Low	Least
Status quo plus	Existing data	No	Yes	Middle	Middle
New approaches	Existing and new data	Yes	Yes	High	Highest

These three options were discussed at stakeholder meetings in each of the four countries visited during the feasibility study, and in the discussions around the first draft of this paper. There was agreement in favour of option 3, the 'new approaches' system, for the following reasons:

1. Most poverty analysis in the region that concerns pastoralists is still mainly in the form of static snapshots of particular *states*: eg how many people are below a particular poverty threshold (eg household income of less than \$1/person/day). There has been little work on the *processes* by which pastoralists are impoverished. *The ROSP objective should be to devise and analyse indicators of change in pastoralist societies, with a focus on the processes by which pastoralists move in and out of poverty.* This does not mean abandoning state indicators. The challenge is to collect and integrate both types of indicator. New types of process indicator need to be developed.
2. There has been little progress in including pastoralism in the most basic national statistics. A striking example occurred in Nairobi during the feasibility study. In 1985, in answer to a request for information on Turkana pastoral livelihoods (in the context of the original Turkana drought contingency plan), the Kenya Central Bureau of Statistics said: "we have excellent statistics, but only for the agricultural area; we have nothing on the pastoral areas". In 2004 (nineteen years later), in the context of the pastoralist poverty report, the same question was asked of the same agency. The reply was also the same: "we have excellent statistics, but only for the agricultural area; we have nothing on the pastoral areas." This is unacceptable. *ROSP should seriously address the need to generate more quantitative data to underpin pastoral development policies, and help mobilise the resources to do it.*
3. A large divide remains between hard and soft statistics. The first is a quantitative approach involving numbers taken from sufficiently large, random, samples, which necessarily exclude many of the really interesting and significant features. The second is a qualitative approach, which investigates smaller, non-random, samples in an attempt to understand some of these interesting things, but which is not statistically valid, and may therefore be an unreliable guide to what is really happening. There are signs of a new interest within the statistics world in bridging this gap. It remains to be seen whether there is the same interest in the qualitative world (eg development NGOs) in working towards a more quantitative approach. *ROSP should work with national statistics bureaux to bridge the gap between hard and soft statistics.*
4. A large amount of information is collected but not used to its full potential, and is sometimes not used at all. We should see what this existing data can tell us before collecting new information. For example, the data on which the early warning element of the Kenya drought contingency plan is based is analysed immediately at district level to give monthly or quarterly early warning status. These mainly qualitative but with some quantitative data are stored on computer disc in Nairobi or at district headquarters. It is likely that they could provide a much wider picture of changes in pastoral livelihoods and wellbeing from the late 1980s (the series starts in Turkana in 1987) and early 1990s in all arid and many semi-arid districts. *ROSP should locate and analyse useful previous work in order to understand longer term trends, and provide a background to current changes.*

5. There is a need for an iterative, step by step process intended to create dialogue between herders and Government/private sector. Option 3 could facilitate this process.
6. Perhaps most simply but also persuasively, Oxfam embarked on this work because of its conviction that the *status quo* was fundamentally flawed.

Recommendations that follow are based on the adoption of option 3, recognising that this involves considerable additional work, and that Oxfam can only be the catalyst and facilitator.

Structure and content of report

The ROSP report should contain five substantive sections:

Section 1. *New analysis of existing data* eg national censuses, household budget surveys, and the light they throw on the situation of pastoralists in the region, and the status of pastoral poverty. Incorporation with existing qualitative data to provide an account of status and trends in pastoral economies, including especially the development and control of poverty.

Section 2. *Analysis of new, largely quantitative, survey data* resulting from the adoption of new methodologies for pastoral data collection by national statistics bureaux and other researchers. These might include sentinel data panels. Information under this heading will only become available in year 2 or 3 of the project the earliest.

Section 3. *Analysis of qualitative data* gathered within ROSP framework, including comparative research on different themes relating to pastoral poverty, and 'stories' ie case histories of individual events and impacts, to put into relief the trends discussed in previous sections.

Section 4. *Compilation of these data sources into a coherent narrative about pastoral poverty* and conclusions.

Section 5. *Implications of the findings* for national policy and practice.

Full coverage of these chapters will only be achieved progressively. In particular it will take time for section 2 data (new surveys) to be researched and analysed. The first one or two ROSP reports are likely to contain principally information from sections 1 and 4.

It should be noted that ROSP should not only be concerned with pastoral development failures. Important lessons can also be learned from successes.

Logistics of the report

Frequency

The ROSP report should be published annually, although it will probably take several years to reach its full potential. The first edition will have to establish as much baseline data as can be compiled from existing sources. It will have much less statistical information from regular census and other surveys (sections 2 and 3 of the report as outlined above) because work on those issues will take some time to provide results.

Geographic scope: national versus regional report

The ROSP report could be compiled and published as a separate document for each of the four pilot countries, or as a single regional report pulling together regional trends and processes, as well as dealing with national information. It would probably be easier to produce national reports, since that is where the data originate. However, we believe there are strong reasons to aim at a regional report.

- Many key poverty processes are regional or at least locally cross border: eg market failure, drought, conflict. These can only be addressed effectively through regional or at least cross-border programmes;
- at present, regional linkages among East African pastoral organisations are weak; ROSP would be a good platform from which to improve them;
- the regional programme is part of Oxfam's comparative advantage over other actors, and should be taken advantage of.

It is likely that in the first year or two information from different countries in the sample will be of very different quality. This may mean that the first one or two editions may not cover all four countries. But we recommend that from the outset it is intended that the ROSP report should have a regional focus.

Given the importance of cross-border events in determining pastoral well-being, ROSP should attempt to include cross-border work in its remit. It would be wise to build on current work (for example, work by AU/IBAR, and the regular meetings between officials on either side of the Kenya/Ethiopia border). Joint work in border areas on issues such as national censuses by the statistics departments of each country would improve the quality of data, and provide a good basis for enhanced collaboration between other groups including herders.

Language and style

The document should be accessible to the main users, who are generally not specialists in the field. But it has to be sufficiently rigorous to satisfy researchers and social scientists

in government, NGOs and donors. Analytic credibility is essential if the conclusions are to be accepted by users.

The report should initially be published only in English, but with a summary in Amharic and Swahili. There should be a short investigation as to whether translation into regional pastoral languages (including notably Somali) would significantly increase the readership. If the answer is yes, then over a period of three years the report should expand to contain short summaries in key pastoral languages.

It is important that the report is easy to read. It might be necessary to hire a professional writer or journalist to put the data and analyses into accessible prose. But this would depend on an adequate budget: good science writers are expensive.

The report should be published in hard copy, with a digital version on the ROSP website.

Next steps

The next step should be for Oxfam to convene a design workshop in each participating country - Kenya, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda - to elaborate and launch ROSP. A wide spectrum of people and organisations should be invited and interested organisations should be allowed to define themselves in the discussion. (See annex 2 for proposals about organisations to be invited to these workshops.) The agenda at these workshops should include the identification of existing sources of data, potential sources of improved data collection, especially quantitative data, indicators needed (see annex 1 for suggestions about indicators), methodologies for collection and analysis of data, presentation and use of results.

Following the national workshops, a regional workshop should be convened to co-ordinate the proposals emanating from the four national workshops, and decide on a management structure. In the light of these discussions, it should be decided which countries could immediately start ROSP, and which should do further preparation. If all four initial countries want to move ahead, an effort should be made to support them.

5. MANAGING THE PROCESS

Oxfam should not attempt to do all this work itself, but should contract out key aspects to specialist organisations, government, the private sector, NGOs, or otherwise.

Areas of research to be contracted out to government departments might include:

- Further analysis of existing data to extract as much information on pastoralists and pastoralism as possible

- bringing pastoralists fully into future national censuses
- bringing pastoralists into future formal national household budget and poverty surveys.

Oxfam should contract with national statistics bureaux both for the further analysis of existing data, and for the development of new modules in all four countries relating to pastoralism to be included in future census and household budget rounds, and poverty surveys. Oxfam should support training, and workshops with specialists to develop suitable methods and locally meaningful indicators of pastoral poverty.

Areas of research to be contracted out to specialist research institutes, private sector organisations, or NGOs would be:

- thematic research on aspects of pastoral livelihoods relevant to poverty reduction, locally, nationally or regionally
- bringing together data from different sources - quantitative and qualitative - to illuminate changes in pastoral livelihood systems, vulnerability and poverty.
- the policy implications of these analyses.

Oxfam should retain a key oversight role:

- in conjunction with other partners, to define and develop areas of interest, methodologies and outputs,
- sub-contract or commission specialist organisations to research and produce papers on that theme. Initial themes might be at regional, national or local level,
- oversee the timely conduct of the research according to the contract agreements;
- maintain quality control over the outputs;
- oversee the production of reports including the main ROSP report.

The management of this exercise will be demanding and complex. The choice for Oxfam is between retaining direct management control over the entire process, and sub-contracting the management to a separate organisation, most likely a university research institute or a private sector consultancy agency.

Whereas the case for sub-contracting some of the substantive elements of the project seems to us reasonably clear, sub-contracting out the management is less obvious. There are advantages and disadvantages both to keeping it in-house and sub-contracting.

Our recommendation, supported by the meetings of Oxfam staff organised in the context of this mission, is that management should be sub-contracted out. Managing such a complex exercise in-house would place very heavy demands on the existing organisation. There is an advantage in Oxfam keeping at some distance from the process, in order to maintain a firm focus on expected long term results expected, without getting too enmeshed in the process. However Oxfam should retain some key components of the ROSP project within its own control as described above. Oxfam should also maintain a 'leadership' or facilitator role in the early stages until the project gets off the ground (at least until the first consultative workshops are held, and possibly longer).

6. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Partnership

1. The proposed Report on the Status of Pastoralists should be the result of a partnership negotiated between parties on the basis of shared interests. The partnership will take time to develop and must be negotiated sensitively given the unequal relationships between the parties. Likely partners include
 - interested Members of Parliament (not necessarily all from pastoral areas),
 - government departments at central and local level,
 - non-governmental and community-based organisations, including pastoral community organisations
 - the private sector,
 - research organisations
 - key donors and international agencies.

Decisions on who will participate in which activities and thus which partnership should be made at start-up workshops.

2. The success of ROSP will depend on a strong sense of shared ownership between key partners, whether they are contributors to or users of the report. It is important that all the main partners feel this sense of ownership, including the pastoralists. Involvement in the development and execution of surveys will contribute to a sense of ownership.
3. ROSP should not be conceived uniquely, or even principally, as an Oxfam activity. Oxfam has an essential role in getting ROSP off the ground in good shape, but not in running it from day to day afterwards.
4. Oxfam needs to define for itself how best it can facilitate setting up ROSP without taking on a permanent engagement. Possible tasks for Oxfam would include: organising partners and facilitating key decisions in the period of setting up ROSP, taking a role in defining outputs, methods and progress indicators; retaining tight quality and editorial control for the first ROSP outputs in order to set high standards from the start; funding the initial set up. In each country, and at regional level, Oxfam should ensure that it can hand this facilitation role over to government/another organisation in the longer term.
5. The next step is for Oxfam to convene design workshops in each participating country to elaborate and launch ROSP. A wide spectrum of people and organisations should be invited.
6. Design workshops should be organised in each of the four initial countries: Kenya, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda. In the light of the workshop discussions, it should be decided which countries should immediately start to implement ROSP, and which

should do further preparatory work. If all four initial countries want to move ahead, an effort should be made to support them in this.

Overall purpose, objectives, and focus

6. ROSP should have five main thrusts:
 - to build the capacity of government departments (especially statistics) and other relevant organisations to provide and use accurate information, especially quantitative information, on pastoralism;
 - to encourage disparate existing initiatives on pastoral information-gathering to co-operate;
 - to use the ROSP output to encourage debate among researchers, officials and pastoralists about pastoral poverty and its remedies;
 - to make the results of this debate available for policy-making, and encourage debate on the policy implications of the conclusions;
 - to support advocacy for the new policy directions suggested by ROSP.
7. ROSP would expand the information available, challenging what people consider to be pertinent information, and leading to improved policy making. This model would generate new data, mainly by commissioning (and where necessary building capacity within) government, civil society, private sector institutions, and perhaps pastoral community organisations to do new surveys and analysis.
8. Whether ROSP should focus on pastoralists alone, or include agropastoralists, should be decided at the initial country workshops. In general it would be preferable to start with a tight focus, and expand later as experience grows. However this should be decided by the workshops. The choice may differ from country to country.

Detailed objectives/issues for further discussion in consultation/planning workshops

9. A major ROSP objective should be to devise and analyse indicators of change in pastoralist societies, with a focus on the processes by which pastoralists move in and out of poverty.
10. ROSP should address the need to generate more quantitative data to underpin pastoral development policies.
11. The project should work with national statistics bureaux to bridge the gap between hard and soft statistics. Work on census and household budget data should be contracted to national statistics bureaux, with training and support organised through Oxfam. Oxfam should retain a key oversight role.

12. ROSP should locate and analyse useful previous work in order to understand longer term trends, and provide a background to current changes.
13. There is a need for an iterative, step by step process to create a dialogue between herders and Government/private sector around the new information generated by the ROSP process. Such a dialogue needs serious and imaginative thought from the start. The success of the ROSP initiative depends on the quality of this dialogue.
14. The ROSP report should contain five substantive sections:
 1. *Results of new analysis of existing data*
 2. *Results of analysis of new data* collected by proposed surveys
 3. *Analysis of qualitative data* collected within ROSP framework.
 4. *Compilation of data* into a coherent narrative, and conclusions.
 5. *Implications of the findings* for national policy and practice.
15. The ROSP report should be published annually, as a regional report pulling together regional trends and processes, as well as dealing with national information. It must be sufficiently rigorous to satisfy researchers and social scientists in government. The report should initially be published only in English, but with a summary in Amharic and Swahili.

Management

16. Oxfam should sub-contract the management of the overall programme to a separate organisation, most likely a university research institute or a private sector consultancy agency. Management will design and implement a monitoring and evaluation system which allows the progress of ROSP to be followed by Oxfam and other partners including participating pastoral communities.
17. Key ROSP research tasks should be sub-contracted to specialist organisations, government or otherwise.
18. Oxfam should maintain general oversight of the progress of ROSP through the monitoring and evaluation system.

ANNEX 1

MAIN INFORMATION TOPICS AND INDICATORS

1. INTRODUCTION

Information on pastoralism and pastoralists in East Africa and the Horn exists in large quantity, but it is not always readily available to those who need it, is often of poor quality, or ignores subjects crucial to the formulation of better policies. Most importantly, there is little reliable quantitative data. The ROSP proposal is intended to help solve these problems.

The problems are substantial. Pastoral researchers have tended to focus on social, political or historical data, and relatively little work has been done on economic issues. Most pastoral research is still qualitative. Even where quantitative work has been done it is often not reported in a form which catches the attention of policy makers. People are increasingly doubtful about the value of much existing quantitative data on pastoralism, especially poverty thresholds which generally come from the agricultural sector and may not be appropriate to pastoral livelihoods. But people are also increasingly suspicious of soft data: 'we talked to the Karimojong and they told us what they want', is no longer convincing. New policies must be based on hard evidence, not just impressions.

In fact a large amount of poverty research involving pastoral livelihoods has already been done in the Horn and East Africa region. But a lot of this has not yet been formally reported, and it hasn't yet provided a clear understanding of pastoral poverty and of the policy changes needed to reduce poverty.

To remedy this we need to access and analyse a range of existing data, including those which are already available (such as official statistics, local participatory assessments and many others) but not widely accessible, as well as mobilising new data through field surveys. We need a broad perspective to enable us to understand how pastoral livelihood systems are adapting to wider constraints and opportunities created by the changing organisation of states and by the spread of the market. We need to analyse pastoral successes as well as failures. And it is crucial that we don't just measure the present situation; we need a dynamic view of trends, not a few snapshots.

The lack of data is compounded in some cases by mutual suspicion. Development workers have often been critical of people who don't believe anything unless it has a number attached to it, and numbers people often ridicule those who base their judgements on short discussions with whoever is available. There are moves towards co-operation, but it's not yet a balanced partnership.

There have been large donor investments in pastoralism in the last four decades, but most of these have left little trace. Were the interventions ill-conceived? Not necessarily. Conflict or some other factor may be at least partly responsible. ROSP data should help move forward our understanding of such issues.

2. KEY INFORMATION CATEGORIES

The escape from poverty provides the overarching framework for this work. Considerable work has been done recently on rural poverty, but it is still contained very much within an agricultural perspective. Pastoral poverty generally results from a different set of processes from agricultural poverty, especially. Key processes in pastoral poverty are loss of access to common pool resources, and erosion or destruction of capital assets especially livestock. Markets often work against pastoral well-being. Conflict is now a major shock to pastoral systems. The selection of indicators needs to take these differences from agricultural poverty into account.

There are many issues on which greater understanding would help formulate better policies, but this exercise needs a clear focus and boundaries. We should bring all key partners into the debate, and with them identify a small number of priority issues. These priority areas should be amenable to policy intervention.

Preliminary discussions with Oxfam country and regional offices during the preparation of this paper identified a preliminary selection of key issues on which indicators are essential. These need to be developed in further discussion with partners in the ROSP exercise at the design workshops to be held in each participating country at the start of the project, but they give an idea of the sort of domains in which data are likely to be necessary.

2.1 Understanding the pastoral economy

A minimum data set should include:

Economic basis of pastoral livelihoods

In many cases even the most basic population statistics are lacking:

- number of herders (some data are available in census statistics, but not yet analysed)
- number of livestock (existing data are often based on no more than multiplying last year's figure by a standard coefficient)
- location and seasonal movements of people and animals

These basic data need to be acquired urgently. The capacity of national statistics offices to generate and analyse these data should be strengthened in each pilot country.

Household food economy studies now under way paint a preliminary, largely qualitative picture of the wide range of specific local pastoral adaptations. Further work to establish broad classes of household incomes and expenditures would locate the pastoral livelihood system more precisely in relation to agricultural and urban economies. Current ILRI work on livelihood mapping would add depth to this information.

Deriving poverty thresholds and poverty statistics

An urgent task is to derive a more meaningful set of proposals for poverty thresholds among pastoralists, and to apply these to the data, in order to get a more meaningful estimate of the shape and severity of pastoral poverty.

Contribution of pastoral production systems to national and regional economic activity and GDP

There is an urgent need for better statistics on the contribution of pastoral livelihood systems to national economic activity.

2.Social changes in pastoral society

A small number of social indicators needs to be chosen to give a feeling for social trends in pastoral society. These should include proxies for the evolution of gender relations, relations between age groups, changes in "social recognition" or the way different social groups treat each other, trends in service delivery and schooling as a minimum.

3. Access to natural resources

Data showing the rate of agricultural encroachment on pasture are highly desirable. Data from satellite imagery may be available for parts of the region; if not further analysis of existing imagery needs to be commissioned. Such analysis could be on quite small samples, as long as these are representative of different land use zone and livelihood systems.

4. Drought

Drought is a main driver of poverty. The Kenyan national drought contingency planning system, located in the Office of the President, provides real time information on trends and the status of indicators. ROSP should use these data, perhaps with additional analysis, to gain a picture of threats and responses during the year under review. In the three other pilot countries, data on drought exist, although they are rudimentary, and need to be mobilised and reported in ROSP.

5. Conflict

Conflict, displacement including cross-border emergency livestock movements, and other livelihood impacts need to be mobilised. There are several NGOs working on conflict who can supply useful information.

6. Markets

Livestock marketing is critical to pastoralist well-being. The basic data set should include:

- size and seasonality of main market flows of livestock
- livestock prices
- staple cereal prices

These figures allow an estimate of pastoralist terms of trade, a key welfare indicator, calculated as the relationship of meat to cereal prices.

Obtaining verifiable and accurate statistics on these issues will not be easy and there may be a time lag between the start of the work and the availability of such detailed information. This gap should be filled by using case histories and stories, for example:

- case histories and stories of changed livelihood strategies by pastoralists
- case histories and stories of experience of destitution by pastoralists
- accounts by pastoralists of the direction in which events are moving, what are the causes, and what can be done.

Such stories should be retained when the more quantitative information comes on line.

2.2 Baseline data

A serious problem in measuring trends is caused by a general *lack of baseline data for indicators of change*. Such data seems not to be available in most cases. But it is important to search for any that do exist. For example, in arid districts, the EW system can provide some baseline data from the late 1980s or early 1990s. Baseline data may also be available in the reports of a quite large number of aerial surveys, for example those done by ILCA and Ecosystems in the 1980s and 1990s. Documents such as the GTZ Range Management Handbook of Kenya in the mid-1990s may also provide useful comparative information.

2.3 Linking information to policy and decision making

The ROSP project should make information available for improved policy-making. Data should also be used to encourage debate within organisations and among pastoralists about the causes and remedies to poverty, in order to provide an environment conducive to changed practices and more effective policies.

The dynamics of pastoral communities are specific to particular places, and to particular social, political and historical settings. Indicators must reflect this. But a regional perspective and regional exchange of data and methods is also essential. It will be important to find the right balance between adopting successful indicators from elsewhere, and developing new community-specific indicators.

Policies on pastoral poverty alleviation are likely to have broad similarities in the region, but also specific differences. Differences in the attitude of policy makers in different countries will also be likely to influence uptake of the information. Kenya has a high potential for policy impact because of its recent experience with pastoralist initiatives. Tanzania, although it has been slow to adopt pastoralist policies, may be ready for faster change.

ANNEX 2

ROSP PARTNERS

This annex lists key organisations which have indicated they would like to collaborate with the ROSP project. This is a preliminary and partial list of suggestions only and will no doubt change in the light of workshop discussions. Possible participants are divided into *primary partners*, (people and institutions with a strong interest in pastoralism), *donor partners*, (donors who have engaged most successfully with pastoral problems), and *private sector partners*, (the growing number of businesses concerned with pastoralism). This does not attempt to be a comprehensive list, but simply gives examples to guide the work.

1. KENYA

1.1 Primary partners

Government

The *Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP)* and associated units in the Office of the President responsible for relief and rehabilitation, conflict and drought management, including district staff. ALRMP is a key partner in Kenya, a potential funder of some activities and an important user of ROSP information.

The *Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)*, Ministry of Planning and National Development, and especially the Poverty Research Unit. Statistics authorities are important users of ROSP information, and, with support and training could become key information providers. Existing Kenya raw survey data are available at the CBS for further analysis. They could for example be disaggregated by livelihood zone to identify more detailed information on pastoralists. CBS does not have funding or technical knowledge of pastoralism, and so cannot do such analysis without help, but is interested in collaborating in such an analysis. CBS would like to monitor a key set of indicators of pastoral livelihood trends over the medium term. This could include panel data.

The *Ministry of Livestock* is important because present livestock numbers in Kenya ASAL areas are just estimates. The Range Management Department would like to do a statistically valid sample survey of livestock numbers and distribution in arid districts.

The *National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA)* will eventually have staff in every district; it is currently developing indicators of environmental degradation

Non-governmental organisations and academic research institutions

The NGO Livestock Marketing Council, if it successfully establishes itself, should be a partner in ROSP activities. At present there are no national statistics on internal movements of livestock in Kenya, and data on external flows are weak.

Several international NGOs have active pastoral programmes including:

- the Oxfam country programme and the Horn, Eastern and Central Africa (HECA) regional office. Oxfam is the prime mover and potential part funder of the ROSP initiative.
- Other NGOs with expertise in pastoral development: examples include ITDG, SCF, SNV and several others.

Among many academic or policy-oriented research institutes and initiatives in Kenya the 'Chronic Poverty Research Centre' in Nairobi University will be especially important to ROSP.

1.2 Donor partners

Potential donor partners include key players in pastoral support in Kenya: multilateral organisations such as World Bank and the EU Delegation; UN organisations with pastoral programmes (FAO, UNDP Dryland Centre, Unicef), and bilaterals such as DfID, the Dutch and Danish Embassies, USAID.

1.3 Private sector partners

This category includes consultancy firms with expertise in pastoral issues, such as Acacia, Intermedia, Reconcile, and several others.

2. ETHIOPIA

As in the other countries, there is plenty of relevant information in Ethiopia. However it is scattered, available only with difficulty and not much used.

2.1 Primary partners

Government

The *Ministry of Federal Affairs* at national and regional levels is responsible for the administration of pastoral development programmes, including the very large World Bank lowlands poverty programme, and is thus a key partner.

The *Central Statistics Authority* carried out the first national census in 2001-2, but this excluded the largely pastoral lowlands. The first comprehensive census of the whole country, which will include pastoralists, is planned for 2005. There has already been a pre-census survey of nomads. However pastoralists will still be treated differently from other population groups. For example, there are no poverty lines/thresholds yet fixed for pastoral livelihoods, and the agricultural basket doesn't reflect pastoral needs. The government knows these are shortcomings and wants to fill them. So the space exists to do something useful.

Non-governmental organisations and academic research institutions

Several NGOs are surveying pastoral livelihoods. There is no common methodology or analysis format. NGOs doing good work, in addition to those listed under Kenya, include FARM-Africa and GTZ. The Pastoral Forum of Ethiopia, now getting autonomy from PANOS, needs strengthening with experienced researchers, and is an important potential partner.

Several academic Ethiopian research organisations would be interested in collaboration with ROSP. They include the Institute of Development Research, the Ethiopian Economics Association, and the Institute of Ethiopian Studies.

2.2 Donor partners

The World Bank will be active in the pastoral areas of Ethiopia in the next decade, and its work will include a baseline study in 120 pastoral woredas/districts in the next 5 years. ROSP could both contribute to and benefit from this exercise. The project has a large social research and policy component, including monitoring, which could provide a link between ROSP, the Ethiopian government and pastoralists.

DfID funds the Pastoral Communications Initiative (PCI), whose role is to better equip pastoralists to negotiate on their own behalf. EU has an interest in pastoralism, and could be an important ROSP partner.

3. TANZANIA

There is little discussion of pastoralism or livestock issues in the Tanzanian PRSP, despite its economic importance. There are many linkages between livestock and the rest of the economy, but many conflicts also. Tanzania has no policy for pastoralism, and rural development policy doesn't cover livestock. Supporting the development of a livestock and pastoral livelihood policy should be a key priority in Tanzania.

3.1 Primary partners

Government

As in other countries, there is little good information on pastoralism in Tanzania, and although some raw data have been captured by the national poverty monitoring and evaluation system, few have yet been analysed. Information about pastoral poverty is contained within the existing poverty monitoring data set. It may be possible to retrieve and analyse at least some of these data. So far there are no panel data on pastoral poverty. Oxfam should do this as an experiment.

The National Bureau of Statistics is responsible for the next household budget survey round; without help pastoralists are unlikely to be included. It is also due to do a national livestock census, but the methodology is still unsure.

The government's poverty monitoring master plan pulls together information from three main sources: local, regional and national government departments; the National Bureau of Statistics; and special studies carried out by a range of government and independent researchers. The poverty monitoring system relies on four technical working groups. For the moment the research and analysis working group is likely to be most important for pastoral data. This working group has created the poverty research agenda and will be responsible for the outcome. It is well equipped to organise further studies on pastoralism. We should keep the Research and Analysis working group informed about progress in ROSP.

Information about pastoral poverty is contained within the existing poverty monitoring data set. It may be possible to retrieve and analyse at least some of these data.

Tanzania has made considerable progress in making statistical data available on the internet. Tanzania has put raw data from censuses and other surveys on line so

researchers can consult them (through the Tanzanian Socio-Economic Data base – TSD). So far there are no livelihood overlays, but they should become available soon. Monitoring data is available at www.povertymonitoring.go.tz.

Poverty mapping will be completed by the end of 2004 with DfID help. NGOs have been involved in drafting methods and procedures.

Data on the size and distribution of the livestock population are available by region in the regular Ministry of Agriculture regular census. More detailed disaggregation of the data is impossible. And there are questions about the accuracy of the data.

A key objective should be to reveal the contribution of pastoralism to the national economy. This is a key first step to changing to pro-pastoral policies. A good entry point for pastoralists into the national policy process will be the next round of the PRS in 2005/6. The groundwork has been done. The PPA showed pastoralists to be very vulnerable, and demonstrated the need for new approaches, and new ways of intervening, for example on conflict.

Non-governmental organisations and academic research institutions

There are several academic research institutes, such as the Institute of Resource Assessment (IRA) in the University of Dar-es-Salaam, which should be brought into ROSP.

4. UGANDA

4.1 Primary partners

Government

The National Bureau of Statistics will be an important user of ROSP information and, with support and training, could become a key provider of data on human and animal populations and household incomes. The Bureau does household budget surveys, but this have not yet generated useful information for the pastoral population group. Both these poverty assessments covered Karimoja, but the information gathered was very qualitative. Further support through ROSP would enable existing data relevant to pastoralism to be analysed.

Non-governmental organisations and academic research institutions

In Uganda, there are no NGOs dealing mainly or uniquely with pastoralism. Although the new government policy is to engage with NGOs, but the government knows little about

NGOs, and the latter don't have good mechanisms to engage with government. Public/private partnerships (including government/NGO partnerships) are increasingly fashionable and common, and may provide the model for future collaboration.

Donors are funding NGOs to do research but there are capacity issues on both sides. Some NGOs and research institutes have large databases on rural poverty, although there are thought to be fewer data on pastoralists. Makerere University has benefited from long term collaboration with the Overseas Development Group at the University of East Anglia in the UK. Work in progress includes a panel data set in 3 districts, with a first round of survey in 2000, and a second in 2004.³

REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

There are several regional institutions with an important commitment to pastoralism. These include the Oxfam Horn, Eastern and Central Africa (HECA) regional office, and the Pastoralist Communications Initiative (PCI) based in Ethiopia. OSSREA has research programmes on pastoralists in several countries of the region. Regionally ILRI works on pastoral livelihood mapping.

³ See www.odg.uea.ac.uk/ladder.