



FEED THE FUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative



Karamoja Resilience Support Unit

PASTORALIST AND LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT IN KARAMOJA, UGANDA

A Rapid Review of African Regional Policy and Programming Initiatives

October 2017



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The author of the report is Frank Emmanuel Muhereza.

KARAMOJA RESILIENCE SUPPORT UNIT
Pastoralist and Livestock Development
in Karamoja, Uganda

A Rapid Review of African Regional Policy and Programming Initiatives

October 2017

USAID Contract Number: 617-15-000014

Karamoja Resilience Support Unit
www.karamojaresilience.org

Implemented by:

Feinstein International Center at Tufts University Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy
P. O. Box 6934
Kampala
Uganda
Tel: +256 (0)41 4 691251

Suggested citation:

Muhereza, E.F. (2017). Pastoralist and Livestock Development in Karamoja, Uganda: A Rapid Review of African Regional Policy and Programming Initiatives. Karamoja Resilience Support Unit, USAID/Uganda, Kampala.

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
1 INTRODUCTION.....	8
2 REGIONAL PASTORALISM POLICIES AND PROGRAMMING INITIATIVES.....	9
2.1 African Union (AU).....	9
2.2 Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD).....	9
2.3 Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA).....	9
2.4 East African Community (EAC).....	10
3 MAINSTREAMING REGIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN UGANDA.....	11
3.1 Economic Development.....	11
3.1.1 <i>Long-term development planning frameworks</i>	11
3.1.2 <i>Increasing public and private sector investments</i>	12
3.1.3 <i>The need for institutional strengthening and policy changes</i>	13
3.2 Agriculture.....	14
3.2.1 <i>Contribution of agriculture to the GDP</i>	14
3.2.2 <i>The intensification of crop production</i>	15
3.3 Livestock.....	15
3.3.1 <i>The economic contribution of livestock production and pastoralism</i>	15
3.3.2 <i>The development of the livestock sector</i>	17
3.3.3 <i>Addressing issues of pastoral mobility</i>	20
3.4 Social Services.....	21
3.5 Natural Resources.....	21
3.6 Conflict Management.....	22
4 MAINSTREAMING RESILIENCE IN REGIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS.....	24
5 OPPORTUNITIES FOR FURTHER KRSU ENGAGEMENT.....	26
5.1 Lessons KRSU can draw From Regional Programs.....	26
5.2 Lessons from Karamoja that can be shared with Regional Actors.....	26
6 CONCLUSIONS.....	28
7 REFERENCES.....	29

ACRONYMS

AU	African Union
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CEWARN	Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism
CLA	Communal Land Association
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CPMR	Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution
CPP	Country Programming Paper
DIDP	Drylands Integrated Development Programme
DSIP	Development Strategy and Investment Plan
EAC	East African Community
FY	Fiscal Year
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IBAR	Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
ICPALD	IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
KAPFS	Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security
KIDP	Karamoja Integrated Development Program
KRSU	Karamoja Resilience Support Unit
LiDeSA	Livestock Development Strategy for Africa
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
NDP	National Development Plan
NEPAD	New Economic Partnership for African Development
NPA	National Planning Authority
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
OWC	Operation Wealth Creation
PFFA	Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa
PRDP	Peace, Recovery and Development Plan
REC	Regional Economic Community
RLPF	Regional Livestock Policy Framework
RMPF	Regional Migration Policy Framework
RPLRP	Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project
SIP	Sector Investment Plan
TAD	Transboundary Animal Disease
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VETGOV	Reinforcing Veterinary Governance in Africa

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This review examines regional policies and programming initiatives in East Africa and the Horn of Africa related to pastoral areas development, and their relevance to the Karamoja Region of Uganda. The objectives of the review were:

1. To review regional policies and programming initiatives of the African Union (AU), Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and the East African Community (EAC) related to pastoral areas development, and provide a commentary on the extent to which these regional bodies are advancing policies and thinking in Uganda, focusing on selected themes;
2. To provide commentary on the extent to which resilience concepts and language are explicitly used for framing regional policies and programs related to pastoral areas and livestock development, as well as determine the extent to which resilience was fully embedded in regional policies and programs across all regional organizations and programs;
3. To identify opportunities for further Karamoja Resilience Support Unit (KRSU) engagement to draw lessons from regional programs to guide work in Karamoja, and share lessons from Karamoja with regional actors.

The rapid review used a desk review of regional policy and programming documents, and interviews with selected stakeholders. It was undertaken between August 24 and August 30, 2017.

KEY FINDINGS

The AU has by far the most progressive policy framework with regards to pastoralism. The AU is the leading proponent of the need to recognize pastoralism for what it is. All the Regional Economic Communities (RECs), namely COMESA, the EAC, and IGAD, have aligned their policies and frameworks with the AU on many aspects of livestock development, although there are differences in points of emphasis when it comes to pastoralism. COMESA and the EAC are more pro-livestock focused. IGAD is the bridge between the two extremes, with IGAD's Regional Strategy Framework more oriented to livestock, while the IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD) Protocol is more oriented towards pastoralism. IGAD is strongest in

its call for ways to increase resilience of livestock producers, including pastoralists, to drought and other shocks and disasters.

Generally, all the RECs agree with the AU that livestock makes significant economic contribution, not only to the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as well as to the respective agricultural GDP, but also to several non-economic benefits accruing from pastoralism.

The AU and RECs acknowledge that the true extent of the economic and other contributions of livestock and pastoralism, especially to the lives of pastoralists and conservation of natural resources, has not yet been appropriately appreciated or understood. It is acknowledged by the AU and all the RECs that the lack of a good understanding of the contribution of livestock and pastoralism at the policy level, and especially among the political leadership, makes it difficult to safeguard the rights of pastoralists, not only to access critical pastoral resources, but also to live the way they chose to.

In terms of interventions, the AU and all the RECs acknowledge the need to protect and invest in the development of livestock. It is however mainly the AU that seeks to target the development of pastoral areas and pastoralism in its own right. The AU emphasizes the need to protect and develop livestock assets of pastoralists in order to enhance equitability. In undertaking the development of the livestock sector, the AU calls for commitment to the political, social, and economic development of pastoral communities and pastoral areas, which reinforces the contribution of the livestock sector to the national economy.

The AU strategy seeks to transform the livestock sector while at the same time enabling the interventions undertaken to contribute directly to the well-being of pastoralists in the traditional sector. In the investment undertaken in the development of the livestock sub-sector, the AU calls for policies that focus on both increasing livestock production and productivity and on directly benefiting poor livestock keepers who prioritize survival over increased production.

Although Uganda is a member of the AU and all three RECs (COMESA, the EAC, and IGAD), and therefore has officially signed off on AU and REC policies, there is a marked disconnect with regards to the government's policies towards pastoralism. Uganda's legislative framework on livestock is not in tandem with spirit of the policies and program initiatives of the AU and the RECs to the extent that the legislative and policy frameworks do

not clearly recognize pastoralism as a viable economic system of production of way of life of many involved in livestock production. The constitution of Uganda does not specify any particular rights for pastoralists.

The government vision for Karamoja is one of a settled community of commercial crop farmers, wage workers, and commercial livestock farmers engaged in either ranching or dairy farming based on improved breeds of livestock. It has no place for pastoralism. There are no initiatives for the preservation of indigenous Karamojong livestock breeds. Officials in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) think there are no more pastoralists in Karamoja. The government is using development policy and development programs to reorder Karamojong society to suit its version of the desired future for Karamoja. Uganda's position has become precarious as a signatory to regional policies and protocols that call for transboundary mobility of persons and especially pastoralists. Nationally, policies being adopted seek to curtail cross-border as well as internal mobility of Karamojong pastoralists.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is a need to analyze the actual economic and other contributions of livestock to the livelihoods of the Karamojong and to local economies and the national economy. Once this information is available, it should be packaged appropriately for engagement with different audiences, including policy makers, planners, and political leaders at different levels. The available stereotypes regarding pastoralism should also be documented and debunked once and for all.
2. There is a need for KRSU to raise awareness at the national level and in Karamoja on progressive regional policies and program initiatives that are supportive of pastoralism. This calls for a repackaging of these regional policies and programs to provide policy makers and other audiences targeted for advocacy relevant information that is easy to comprehend.
3. There is a need for KRSU to provide a platform for linking the AU and RECs with national and Karamoja-based civil society interested in pro-pastoralism policy advocacy as well as with political representatives from Karamoja in order to leverage better understanding on how to put the pastoralism agenda back at the center of policy discussions.

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report of a rapid review of the regional policies and programming initiatives in East Africa and the Horn of Africa related to pastoral areas development, focusing on initiatives involving Uganda and the Karamoja Region. The review used a desk review as well as targeted stakeholder interviews. It was undertaken between August 24 and August 30, 2017. The objectives of the review were:

1. To review regional policies and programming initiatives of the AU, IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC related to pastoral areas development, and provide a commentary on the extent to which these regional bodies are advancing policies and thinking in Uganda, focusing on selected themes.
2. To provide commentary on the extent to which resilience concepts and language are explicitly used for framing regional policies and programs related to pastoral areas and livestock development, as well as determine the extent to which resilience was fully embedded in regional policies and programs across all regional organizations and programs.
3. To identify opportunities for further KRSU engagement to draw lessons from regional programs to guide work in Karamoja, and to share lessons from Karamoja with regional actors.

The consultant was not in a position to speak with any official at the AU, IGAD, COMESA, or the EAC, although emails were sent to contacts provided by KRSU. No reply was received. In Kampala, the consultant was able to speak with only the IGAD Desk Officer in the OPM; the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist of the World Bank-funded Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) in the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF); and the Director of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund Phase III (NUSAF III). As a result, other than IGAD, it was not possible to determine the details of policies and program initiatives by the AU and RECs involving Uganda and the Karamoja Region apart from a reading of their documents, which were available online.

The report is divided into seven sections. Section one is the introduction. Section two highlights the various policies and program initiatives related to the livestock sector and pastoral areas development that are relevant for Karamoja. Section three analyzes the extent to which regional policies and programs have been mainstreamed in Uganda, focusing on selected thematic areas. Section four examines the mainstreaming of resilience in regional policies and

programs. Section five examines the opportunities for KRSU's further engagement of the issues articulated in the policy and program initiatives of the regional bodies. The conclusions are in Section six and references in Section seven. An appendix has also been attached.

2 REGIONAL PASTORALISM POLICIES AND PROGRAMMING INITIATIVES

2.1 AFRICAN UNION (AU)

Uganda is a member of the AU. The relevant policies and programming initiatives undertaken by the AU that are related to pastoral areas development and relevant to Uganda in general and the Karamoja Region in particular include the following:

1. Organization of African Union (OAU) Charter, 1963;
2. The African Union Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, October 2010;
3. African Union-Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) Strategic Plan for 2014–2017;
4. The Livestock Development Strategy for Africa (LiDeSA), 2015–2035, January 2015;
5. The IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategy, January 2013;
6. The Draft IDDRISI Uganda Country Programming Paper (CPP), March 2013;
7. The IGAD Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN).

Uganda has been involved in the implementation an AU program initiative called Reinforcing Veterinary Governance in Africa (VETGOV). This program was implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) in collaboration with the AU-IBAR. The main objective of the intervention was the institutional strengthening of veterinary services at national level.

2.2 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY ON DEVELOPMENT (IGAD)

Uganda is a member of IGAD. The relevant policies and programming initiatives undertaken by IGAD that are related to pastoral areas development and are relevant to Uganda in general and the Karamoja Region in particular include the following:

1. The IGAD Treaty;
2. The ICPALD Protocol, June 2015;
3. The ICPALD Strategic Plan, 2016–2020, December 2015;
4. The IGAD Regional Strategic Framework and Implementation Plan 2016–2020, January 2016;

Uganda has been involved in the following IGAD program initiatives in support of the development of the livestock sector in general and the development of pastoral areas and pastoralists in particular: (a) in line with IDDRSI, in 2007 the OPM established a National Platform for Disaster Preparedness and Management (Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Platform) for coordinating disaster risk management activities in the country. The National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management has also been developed, in addition to the National Action Programme (NAP) to Combat Desertification. The Uganda Rangeland Development and Management Policy is underway; (b) under the auspices of IGAD, the MAAIF is implementing the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP), a regional program covering the Karamoja Cluster (including Kenya), funded by the World Bank; (c) under the IGAD IDDRSI, a Cross-Border Development Facilitation Unit (CBDFU) has been established in Moroto and a Regional Facilitator recruited to coordinate, at local, national, and regional levels, development activities related to the implementation of IDDRSI in the cross-border areas of Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, and South Sudan; (d) under the auspices of ICPALD, the government is participating in an initiative to develop a transhumance protocol for Karamoja Cluster 1 (covering Uganda, Kenya, South Sudan, and Ethiopia), involving the mapping of cross-border migration corridors. Consultations in Karamoja were held in August 2017; (e) Uganda is also implementing the IGAD CEWARN.

2.3 COMMON MARKET FOR EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA (COMESA)

Uganda is a member of COMESA. The relevant policies and programming initiatives undertaken by COMESA that are related to pastoral areas development and are relevant to Uganda in general and the Karamoja Region in particular include the following:

1. The COMESA Treaty, 2004;
2. The COMESA Agricultural Strategic Framework, 2010–2014;

3. The COMESA Regional Livestock Policy Framework (RLPF) of 2015.

There were not many project activities involving COMESA that were encountered. However, Uganda has been involved in a number of COMESA program initiatives in support of the development of the livestock sector in general and the development of pastoral areas and pastoralists in particular, especially in the area of promoting transboundary trade and free movement of livestock and livestock products.

2.4 EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY (EAC)

Uganda is also a member of the EAC. The relevant policies and programming initiatives undertaken by the EAC that are related to pastoral areas development and are relevant to Uganda in general and the Karamoja Region in particular include the following:

1. The Treaty for the Establishment of the EAC of November 30, 1999;
2. The 4th East African Community Development Strategy, (2011/12–2015/16), August 2011;
3. The Agriculture and Rural Development Policy (ARDP) for the EAC, November 2006;
4. The Draft EAC Regional Livestock Policy, Background Paper, September 2012;
5. The Livestock Policy for the East African Community, Second Draft, August 2012;
6. The National Validation Workshop on Draft EAC Regional Livestock Policy: A Background Paper, September 2012.

Uganda has been involved in initiatives aimed at the finalization of the finalization of the EAC Regional Livestock Policy.

3 MAINSTREAMING REGIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN UGANDA

In supporting the development of the livestock sector in general and the development of pastoral areas and pastoralists in particular, the AU and RECs such as IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC have defined the critical development challenges faced and proposed interventions in ways that this section examines. The policies and program initiatives of the AU and RECs with regards to the following six thematic areas below have also influenced the policies and thinking in Uganda on the development of the livestock sector in general, and Karamoja in particular, in the following ways.

3.1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

3.1.1 Long-term development planning frameworks

The AU and all the RECs situate their policy narratives on economic development within long-term development planning frameworks. In 2013, the AU developed the Africa Agenda 2063, which serves as a shared strategic framework for inclusive growth and sustainable development (AU Commission 2015a). In this 50-year strategy for the African continent in all spheres of social and economic development, AU aspires to deliver a 6 percent annual growth in agriculture in the AU member states, which will contribute significantly to national economic growth and also forestall an anticipated agricultural product supply deficit (AU-IBAR 2015, 8). In their long-term development plans, there is a clear commitment to the transformation of the agrarian economies of member states, leading to the eradication of absolute poverty and improved livelihoods and well-being of populations. The envisaged structural transformation translates into a reduced share of agriculture's contribution to the national economy, as services and manufacturing become key drivers of the economy. One of these initiatives to which RECs have aligned their policies and programs is AU's New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). NEPAD's long-term objectives are to put African countries, both individually and collectively, on a path to sustainable growth and development, halt its marginalization in the globalization process, and eradicate extreme poverty (AU-IBAR 2015, 52; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 20; AU Commission 2010, 24–5).

In line with the above long-term development vision of the AU and RECs, the government of Uganda adopted in 2007 the Comprehensive National Development Planning Framework (CNDPF) policy, which provides for the development of a 30-year vision implemented through three long-term plans of 10 years and six 5-year National Development Plans (NDPs). These overarching policy frameworks offer strategic guidance and direction to Sector Investment Plans (SIPs) and Local Government

Development Plans (LGDPs), as well as to annual work plans and priorities, on the basis of which allocation of public resources is made in the national budget (Republic of Uganda 2013b, 3). The development of the country's long-term vision started in 2008, and was finalized and launched in April 2013. Uganda's Vision 2040 is a 30-year long-term vision within which the country seeks to transition from a poor country dominated by peasant producers to a prosperous middle-income country by 2020 (Republic of Uganda 2013b). The government also formulated the first National Development Plan (NDP I) for the period 2010/11 to 2014/15 (Republic of Uganda 2010a). The government is currently implementing NDP II for the period 2015/16 to 2019/20 (Republic of Uganda 2015). It has been clearly stated in the NDP II that the interventions, strategies, and approaches proposed in the Plan were aligned to development obligations stipulated in specifically the AU's Africa Agenda 2063, IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC (Republic of Uganda 2015, 23).

The long-term commitment of the AU and all the RECs to the eradication of extreme poverty is an aspiration shared by the government of Uganda, starting with the poverty reduction strategies that were enunciated through the Poverty Eradication Action Plans (PEAPs) between 1997 and 2007. As a result of the government's concerted poverty eradication campaigns, significant progress is noticeable in addressing poverty and vulnerability in Uganda. The national poverty rate declined from 56 percent in 1992 to 19.7 percent in 2012/13. However, over 6.7 million people remain poor, and poverty disparities exist across regions and social groups as well as between rural and urban areas. It is still widespread in cattle-keeping areas, especially among pastoralists in areas such as Karamoja (Republic of Uganda 2015, 21). According to a 2016 World Bank Report on Poverty Assessment in Uganda, the proportion of households living below the international extreme poverty line of US\$1.90 a day (2011 prices) fell from 68.1 percent in 1993 to 34.6 percent in 2013 at the national level. However, in Northern and Eastern Uganda, including Karamoja, poverty had increased. The proportion of the total number of poor people who live in the Northern and Eastern regions (including Karamoja) increased between 2006 and 2013, from 68 percent to 84 percent (World Bank 2016, 3–5). The annual poverty reduction percentage in Central and Western regions (7.4 and 7.9 percent, respectively) was twice as high as in the Northern and Eastern regions (3.1 and 4.7 percent, respectively) (World Bank 2016, 6). Although Uganda has aligned its policies on poverty eradication to the AU and the RECs, in pastoral areas such as Karamoja progress has been limited. By 2015, 65 percent of Karamojong households reported having

unstable incomes, while in 2014, 56 percent reported being affected by food insecurity. The percentage of Karamojong children exhibiting significant stunting due to insufficient food was 36.9 percent (UNDP 2015, 73–4).

3.1.2 Increasing public and private sector investments

The AU and RECs have committed to increasing public and private sector investments in the agricultural sector in general and livestock production in particular, not only to stimulate faster and sustained high levels of economic growth, but also to attain increased production and productivity in crop and livestock agriculture (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 59; AU-IBAR 2015, 44; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 39; EAC Secretariat 2011, 65). There have been calls by not only the AU but also the RECs for an increase in public financing (budgeted, allocated, and actually disbursed) to agriculture in general and livestock production in particular. The AU and some of the RECs have specifically recognized a need to target the development of pastoral areas and pastoralism. They seek to reverse the trend whereby only a small percentage of funds actually allocated and disbursed to the agricultural sector go to livestock production. The AU, for example, calls for the share of the national budget spent on livestock to be increased to at least 3 percent as an affirmative action to ensure equitable distribution of national resources by targeting previously marginalized pastoral communities. This has potential to strengthen the economic viability of pastoral activities (AU-IBAR 2015, 35–6; AU Commission 2010, 25). COMESA Secretariat noted that despite livestock contributing 35 percent to the agricultural sector, only about 20 percent of the budgeted funds allocated agriculture went to livestock (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 20).

Under the 2nd National Development Plan (NDP II), government is committed to a private sector-led growth in which strong public/private partnerships (PPPs) are encouraged to achieve sustainable development. Government is concentrating on the enabling environment, especially on ensuring macroeconomic stability while at the same time undertaking huge investments in public goods infrastructure to make private investments profitable (Republic of Uganda 2015, 23). Government strategies emphasize involving the private sector, promoting and stimulating competitiveness of the livestock sector, and providing a conducive fiscal and regulatory framework for growth of the sector by putting in place suitable institutional frameworks and infrastructure for delivery of support services (Republic of Uganda 2004, 6). The public sector is playing a guiding, supporting, and regulatory role in implementation of the policy, as well as providing support services to create an enabling environment for the private sector to invest in the industry (Republic of Uganda 2004, 6–7). In the agricultural sector, government has committed, under the sector's Development Strategy and Investment Plan

(DSIP), to improving the enabling environment by putting in place relevant statutes, regulations, and standards; removing critical constraints to private sector growth; supporting opportunities that improve market efficiency; and improving the incentive environment facing the private sector in the key market chains (Republic of Uganda 2010b, 15).

Public and private sector financing for the development of Karamoja has increased significantly since 2009. The government has implemented several donor-funded multi-million US dollar development programs in Karamoja, including the following: Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda Phase I (PRDP I) from 2007 to 2011 and Phase II (PRDP II) from 2012 to 2015; Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Program (KIDDP) from 2007 to 2010, followed by Karamoja Integrated Development Program (KIDP) from 2011 to 2016; Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) with Phase 1 (NUSAF I) implemented from 2005 to 2009, NUSAF II from 2010 to 2015, and NUSAF III from 2016 to 2020; Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPFS) from 2009 to 2014; Karamoja Livelihood Improvement Program (KALIP) from 2009 to 2014; the Drylands Integrated Development Programme (DIDP) from 2014 to 2017.

KRSU has calculated the funds that were expected to be spent by donors in Karamoja in 2017. The findings revealed that 10 bilateral donors were funding 46 ongoing projects in the seven districts of Karamoja worth an estimated 89 million euros, approximately 380 billion Ugandan shillings, broken down as follows: Department for International Development (DFID) (28 percent), USAID (25 percent), World Bank (14 percent), Irish Aid (10 percent), Sida (7 percent), European Union (5 percent), Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) (3 percent), Japan Embassy (3 percent), Germany (3 percent), and Italy (2 percent) (KRSU 2016, 5). More than 70 percent of these funds are channelled directly through international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multilateral and bilateral organizations, and local civil society organizations. Some of the funds are channelled through government at national and district levels, and private sector actors (KRSU 2016, 7).

The AU and RECs call for not just increased funding for the development of the livestock sector, but specifically for the development of pastoralism. An analysis, for example, of the 2009 KAPFS revealed that out of ten intervention areas proposed to improve food security, only one specifically targeted livestock, and the rest were crop-focused (Republic of Uganda 2009). A recent report has indicated that less than 5 percent of the KAPFS budget was allocated toward supporting livestock production, and just over 1 percent of the overall budget was dedicated to

supporting Karamojong pastoralism.¹ The same report revealed that crop-based interventions in KAPFS were allocated more than US\$20,000,000 compared to just over US\$500,000 allocated for animal health support.²

An analysis of the Ministerial Policy Statements for the OPM, under which Karamoja falls, also revealed significant discrepancies in the funding, not only for the development projects in Karamoja, but also for priority funding for the livestock sector and pastoralism in particular. Under Vote 003 for the OPM, the funds allocated for “Administration and Support Services” (Vote Function 1349) registered the highest growth of 20 percent points between fiscal year (FY) 2013/14 and FY 2014/15, compared to an increase of only 9 percent points in the funding allocated for “Management of Special Programs” (Vote Function 1303), under which development activities in Karamoja fall.³ An analysis of the funds allocated for “Administration and Support Services” between FY 2013/14 and FY 2015/16 revealed an even higher increase of 82 percent points, compared to a 24 percent point decline in the funds allocated for development activities in Karamoja under “Management of Special Programs” (Republic of Uganda 2016, 81–82). This means that as public funding to Karamoja increases, the funds allocated to “Administration and Support Services” were increasing faster than the funds allocated to development activities. An analysis of the allocations to recurrent programs under Vote Function 1303 “Management of Special Programs” revealed that the funds annually allocated to Karamoja Region remained the same from FY 2013/14 to FY 2015/16, while there were substantial increases for Luwero-Rwenzori Triangle (Republic of Uganda 2016, 46–54).

3.1.3 The need for institutional strengthening and policy changes

In acknowledging the economic contribution made by livestock in general and pastoralism in particular, the AU and RECs call on governments to commit themselves to formulating supportive pastoral development policies through which appropriate budgetary support can be offered from both the public and private sectors. The AU and all the RECS recognize the need for institutional strengthening and policy changes in the livestock sector. Current policy frameworks and legislation are faulted for not creating an enabling environment for increased investment in the development of livestock production. The AU and, among the RECs, IGAD are at the forefront of calls for supportive pastoral development policies to

strengthen the capacity and capabilities of pastoralists to manage their resources better for their own benefit and that of the country rather than for purely technical interventions that focus exclusively on livestock and natural resources (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 62; AU Commission 2010, 24). The EAC and COMESA seek harmonization of regional livestock policies at the national level.

The AU has particularly underscored the need to challenge and dismantle negative stereotypes about pastoralism and has called upon governments to recognize and integrate the positive aspects of pastoralism into national socio-economic development strategies (AU Commission 2010, 25). The AU is particularly critical of current policy frameworks for not being pro-pastoralist, hence necessitating initiatives that leverage policy changes. It is mainly the AU that has made a strong case for the political representation of pastoralists through dialogue between governments, pastoralists, and their leaders as well as civil society at all levels from the local to the regional level. The AU has rightly observed that the needs of pastoral people are far better reflected in national policy and planning frameworks in which they have been appropriately represented and directly involved (AU Commission 2010, 4).

Although government’s long-term overarching strategic planning frameworks, especially the NDP II, recognize the contribution of livestock to the agricultural and national GDP, there is neither a comprehensive national policy on livestock development in general, nor one on pastoralism and the development of pastoral areas in particular. This is despite acknowledgement of the need for a pastoral development policy with a strategic plan of action to “stabilize and increase production and productivity of pastoral activities, and to improve food security and household incomes in a sustainable and predictable way” in the IDDRSI Uganda CPP (Republic of Uganda 2013a, 4). Without a national policy on livestock or the development of pastoralism and pastoral areas, it becomes challenging to harmonize policy priorities in the livestock sector relevant for pastoral development with regional livestock policies and program initiatives of the AU, as well as IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC.

Issues affecting pastoralism have been articulated under different policy instruments touching on a wide range of sub-component issues of livestock, such as ministerial

¹ See Kristin Bushby and Elizabeth Stites, *Resilience and Risk in Pastoralist Areas: Recent Trends in Diversified and Alternative Livelihoods, Karamoja, Uganda*, in Little (2016), 12.

² See Bushby and Stites, *Resilience and Risk in Pastoralist Areas*, in Little (2016), 21.

³ See Femiar Wadada and Moses Kyaligonza, *Alternative Policy Statement for Karamoja Region for FY 2014–2015*, Office of the Leader of the Opposition, Parliament of Uganda, Kampala.

policy statements and sector investment plans. Some of the policy issues have been espoused in the Rangeland Management Policy, which was approved by the MAAIF in August 2017, has been submitted to cabinet, and is awaiting approval. The Meat Policy, whose aim is to make livestock play a leading role in economic development and poverty eradication, favors increased livestock production and productivity to increase the supply and quality of meat and meat products through processing and value addition, which will increase returns from internal marketing and exports (Republic of Uganda 2003). The government formulated a National Animal Breeding Policy to provide guidelines for animal genetic improvement intended to achieve a sustainable increase in the productivity of farm animals to ensure self-sufficiency in animal products for food security and socio-economic development in the country (Republic of Uganda 1997). The MAAIF, with support from the United Nation's Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), tried to develop a National Pastoral Code, under the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy, but it stalled at some point. The Rangeland Management Policy has also been in draft form for a very long time.

3.2 AGRICULTURE

3.2.1 Contribution of agriculture to the GDP

All RECs subscribe to and have adopted the agenda of AU NEPAD's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), in which African heads of state committed themselves to increasing significantly the share of national budgets allotted for agriculture and rural development. The EAC adopted and approved CAADP in January 2016. The RECs also uphold the 2014 Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation, which commits AU member states to allocating at least 10 percent of public expenditure to agriculture, and to ensuring its efficiency and effectiveness as a pathway to agricultural industrialization. The aim of all these declarations is to ensure sustainable agricultural development through increased production and productivity in order to foster high economic growth (AU-IBAR 2015, 45; EAC Secretariat 2006, 4). The AU and all the RECs recognize the contribution agriculture makes to GDP, rural employment, foreign exchange earnings, source of raw materials for agro-based industries, and livelihoods. Their policies and program initiatives reflect the importance attached to agriculture.

In line with the thinking of the AU and RECs, the government of Uganda recognizes that agriculture is not only the backbone of Uganda's economy but is also key to the country's industrialization strategy. In 2013, the highest percentage of the over 2,000 registered enterprises involved in manufacturing (63 percent) were engaged in agro-processing (Republic of Uganda 2015, 21). Both NDP I and NDP II recognize agriculture as one of the key productive sectors driving the economy. Because Uganda

has aligned its intervention in the development of agriculture to regional policies and programming initiatives, the economy has been growing, as evidenced by the declining share of the agriculture sector's contribution to the GDP. It declined from 43 percent in FY2004/5 (Republic of Uganda 2004, 8) to 24.7 percent in 2010/11 and 25.3 percent in 2012/13 (Republic of Uganda 2015, 20), to 23.8 percent in FY 2014/15 (UBOS 2016, 85), to 22.1 percent in FY 2015/16 (Republic of Uganda 2017, 56). In FY 2015/16, agriculture grew by a dismal 3.2 percent (UBOS 2016, 85).

While the agriculture sector DSIP recognized the need to increase public investments in agriculture to achieve the targeted 10 percent growth per year in line with the AU Maputo Declaration on CAADP, which the government assented to in 2003 (Republic of Uganda 2010b, 13), as recently as FY2016/17, public investment was nowhere near either the CAADP target or the Malabo Declaration, with only 4.0 percent of the national budget allocated to agriculture. The share of agriculture is expected to decline even further to 3.8 percent according to budgeted estimates for FY2017/18 (Republic of Uganda 2017, 141). Even when the share of the public expenditure invested in agriculture was still low, in FY 2016/17, only 33.7 percent of the approved budget had been disbursed by December 31, 2016 (Republic of Uganda 2017, 41).

In line with the thinking of the AU and the RECs, the agricultural sector DSIP for 2010/11 to 2014/15 recognized that with up to 73 percent of households in Uganda in 2010 engaged in agriculture as a source of livelihoods, agriculture was critical not only in reducing poverty but also for economic growth. The DSIP aims to transform agriculture since it is acknowledged that farmers' livelihoods and economic growth are more likely to improve, and poverty is more likely to be reduced, if agricultural production and productivity improve (Republic of Uganda 2010b, 1–4). As also noted by the AU and most RECs, the government has committed under the agricultural sector DSIP to improving the enabling environment for development of the agricultural sector by putting in place relevant statutes, regulations, and standards; removing critical constraints to private sector growth; supporting opportunities that improve market efficiency, and improving the incentive environment facing the private sector in key market chains (Republic of Uganda 2010b, 15).

The findings of the 2016 Poverty Assessment Report for Uganda prepared by the World Bank are very revealing. The successes by Uganda in reducing poverty have been attributed to the growth in agricultural income among poor households, mainly in Central and Western Uganda, but not in Northern and Eastern Uganda, including Karamoja, where poverty has increased (World Bank 2016, 3–5). This implies that the government strategy of

increasing household incomes by encouraging and supporting adoption of settled crop cultivation among the Karamojong has not succeeded in reducing poverty in Karamoja. It is clear that even when the government agrees with the thinking of the AU and RECs on increasing public resources invested in agriculture as a share of the national budget, the actual practice is totally different, since much of the funds do not end up in financing development activities. Secondly, increasing investment in agriculture to increase household incomes and contribute to the economic growth and the national GDP and to reduce poverty does not achieve the same effect in Karamoja as it does in Central and Western Uganda.

3.2.2 The intensification of crop production

The AU and all the RECs were concerned about the increasing vulnerability to drought, food insecurity, and sometimes conflicts of pastoral communities in the dryland areas. The AU and all the RECs advocated for the intensification of crop production intended to lead to increased production and productivity, which, combined with improved post-harvest handling and processing, would address the problem of food shortages and the associated widespread malnutrition. The AU and all the RECs committed themselves to supporting the modernization and commercialization of agricultural production, not only to increase household incomes and achieve food and nutrition security, but also to improve standards of living in the dryland areas, which suffer adverse climatic conditions (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 1; IGAD Secretariat 2013, 23; AU Commission 2010, 1; EAC Secretariat 2006, 7–9). As to where the focus should be, there were differences in perspectives between the AU and the RECs.

Although the AU and some of the regional bodies acknowledged the importance of animal-sourced foods in addressing food insecurity in dryland areas, the current policies and program interventions supported by some RECs reveal an overwhelming focus on food crop production. In terms of the regional program initiatives proposed for addressing food insecurity, for example by COMESA, there was a bias in favor of crops (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 4). All EAC initiatives for increasing food production focused on crop agriculture, with very limited attention to issues of pastoralism. The EAC Secretariat is implementing the East African Food Security Action Plan (2011–2015) approved by EAC heads of state on April 19, 2011 (EAC Secretariat 2006, 49). The EAC Secretariat has also developed the EAC Food Balance Sheet Framework. Efforts have been underway at the EAC Secretariat to establish an Agricultural Development Fund as well as a Regional Early Warning System on Monitoring Food Shortages (EAC Secretariat 2006, 78). It was mainly the AU that was critical of narratives that promoted sedentary rangelands crop production at the expense of livestock production and pastoralism (AU Commission 2010, 15).

One of the strategies pursued by RECs whose policies and program initiatives focus on crop farming is agricultural intensification, which in many rangelands has been associated with bringing more land under crop cultivation. This has resulted in an increase in conversion of rangelands to alternative nonpastoral uses. It is generally acknowledged among proponents of such a perspective that undertaking crop farming in dryland areas cannot be “business as usual.” Rather, it necessitates investment in mechanization and irrigation as well as increased use of improved seeds and planting materials and adoption of modern agronomic practices (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 10; EAC Secretariat 2011, 37). The AU, and a few of the RECs critical of the latter perspective, point to the high per capita cost for farm inputs associated with the technology of production, which are not neutral to scale. Apart from the intensification of crop farming in the rangelands taking away from livestock production and prime pastoral lands, which not only interferes with the pastoralist cycle of migration but also reduces the productivity of the remaining pastoralist economy, rangeland crop farming leaves out the smallholders in favor of large-scale operations. It creates inequality, which undermines the ability of growth achieved in agricultural sector to reduce poverty (AU Commission 2010, 2).

Government interventions for the development of Karamoja are promoting sedentarization of pastoralists, with large parts of the greenbelt areas in different parts of Karamoja being converted into mainly farmlands, and also permanent settlements. Crop farms usually appropriate the more ecologically endowed areas of the greenbelts, which the pastoralists reserve for meeting their grazing needs at the peak of the dry season. Uganda Prisons Farm at Namalu has been allowed to expand its acreage to produce more grain to supply the school feeding program in Karamoja. The government of Uganda, seeking the rationalization of land use in Karamoja following demands for de-gazetting, heavily encroached on parts of protected areas. Most of areas de-gazetted in the past were taken up by settlements and crop farming without any regard to the constraints occasioned by the dry-season migrations of livestock in search of water and pastures.

3.3 LIVESTOCK

3.3.1 The economic contribution of livestock production and pastoralism

The significance of livestock is acknowledged not only by the AU but also by all RECs, especially with regards to its contribution to economic growth and GDP (agricultural and national), trade, services, and the manufacturing industries, all of which cumulatively translate into poverty reduction. It is also recognized that livestock plays an important role in enhancing food security and nutrition as well as livelihoods and social relations within communities. The AU and RECs acknowledge that most

of the enterprises in rural and urban areas in cattle-keeping regions are linked to the livestock value chains, for which livestock is major production input or key source of raw material. Apart from the cattle owners and herders and their dependents, livestock also benefits an array of stakeholders including traders, transporters, owners of slaughter facilities/butchers, feed manufacturers and distributors, and retailers, restaurants, hotels and bars, and local authorities and their officials, including tax collectors, health inspectors, veterinary extension staff, veterinary drug manufacturers, distributors, and dealers. This makes livestock an important economic activity that provides employment to a large number of people, both directly and indirectly. Livestock trade and trade-related activities are also a key source of revenues for the local and central governments. It is on this basis that the AU and RECs call upon countries to mainstream livestock in general and pastoralism in particular in not only economic and agricultural growth strategies but also in poverty reduction and sustainable development programs (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10; AU-IBAR 2015, 8; IGAD Secretariat 2015b, 10; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 4–5; IGAD Secretariat 2013, 20; AU Commission 2010, 24; EAC Secretariat 2006, 192). In fact, borrowing from Delgado et al. (1999), the AU is treating livestock as the frontier for the next revolution in food production because of its potential to address the deficit in the supply of animal-sourced foods that, if nothing is done, will be outstripped by fast-rising demand, occasioned by fast-growing population growth, a rise in urbanization, and increasing preference for livestock products as a source of protein (AU-IBAR 2010, 9).

Among a few of the RECs, in addition to the AU, there is also an increasing recognition that pastoralism accounts for a significant share of livestock's economic and other contributions, whether directly or indirectly. As the leading proponent of this perspective, the AU acknowledges not only that pastoralists occupy about 40 percent of Africa's land mass but also that pastoralism accounts for the highest contribution from the livestock sector to the economies of AU member countries (AU Commission 2010, 1). Unlike the EAC, whose focus has mostly been on the economic contribution of agriculture in general (EAC Secretariat 2006, 1), the AU, with support from IGAD, has been at the forefront of calls for new methodologies of economic analyses that reveal the true economic value of not only livestock but also pastoralism, to assist the government to position pastoralism relative to other land use systems, and other productive sectors and livelihood systems (AU Commission 2010, 24; IGAD Secretariat 2016, 26).

The AU and all the RECs recognize that there are also several non-economic benefits accruing from pastoralism such as household consumption, transport and ploughing, source of fuel energy, organic manure, social/cultural and religious/spiritual values, as well as livestock being a very

important social safety net. These benefits need to be emphasized also. It is on this basis that AU and the RECs recognize the considerable need for enhancing appreciation and understanding of the economic and other contributions of African pastoralism not only to the lives of pastoralists but also to the well-being of communities inhabited by pastoralists. The AU and RECs also emphasize the role of livestock in the conservation and preservation of natural resources (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 26; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 4; IGAD Secretariat 2013, 20; AU Commission 2010, 24).

Despite livestock production being widespread, with pastoralism constituting a way of life for a large section of the population, the AU and RECs expressed concerns that a good understanding of the economic contribution of not only livestock but also pastoralism was lacking at policy level, and especially among the political leadership. This lack of understanding makes it difficult to safeguard the rights of pastoralists, not only to access critical pastoral resources, but also to live the way they chose to (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 8; IGAD Secretariat 2015b, 10; AU Commission 2010, 24). On the importance of livestock, most RECs agree with the AU, which is the most pro-pastoralist. However, the positions adopted by the different RECs on the interventions necessary to support livestock in general, and pastoralism in particular, vary. The AU policy is called Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa (AU-PFPA) (AU Commission 2010). AU's Livestock Development Strategy for Africa (LiDeSA), 2015–2035 is also extremely pro-pastoralist (AU-IBAR 2015). The titles of the respective policy positions by the RECs speak volumes about where each put its emphasis. COMESA and the EAC are more pro-livestock focused. There is a sense in which IGAD is the bridge between the two extremes. The COMESA policy document is called Regional Livestock Policy Framework (RLPF) (COMESA Secretariat 2015). The one for the EAC is called Livestock Policy for the East African Community (EAC Secretariat 2012a). As for IGAD, the IGAD Regional Strategic Framework and Implementation Plan 2016–2020 is more oriented to livestock (IGAD Secretariat 2016) while the ICPALD Protocol is more oriented towards pastoralism (IGAD Secretariat 2015a).

The AU is the leading proponent of the need to recognize pastoralism for what it is. While IGAD does not disclaim the significant economic contribution of livestock, it has also created a specialized IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD). ICPALD's primary purpose is to domesticate the AU-PFPA whose main thrust is on pastoralism without necessarily discounting the importance of the livestock production system. Between the AU and IGAD, there is an explicit recognition that pastoralism contributes to the national economy in ways no other production system can, by making the most effective economic use of dryland areas

compared to, for example, crop farming. It is on this basis that the AU calls for policy initiatives to secure and protect the lives, livelihoods, and rights to development that are favorable to the way of life of pastoralists (AU Commission 2010, 24), while IGAD is more focused on ways of increasing resilience to drought and other causes of shocks and disasters to livestock producers, including pastoralists.

The AU proposes enactment of legislation and policies favorable to the development of pastoralism rather than interventions that define development as pastoralists quitting pastoralism to become something else (AU Commission 2010, 1–3). The AU supports development in pastoral areas that targets not only livestock, especially improvement of livestock production infrastructure, but also the pastoralists who depend on the livestock and its products (AU Commission 2010, 22). As a result of its overwhelming pro-pastoralist orientation, the AU has been at the forefront of calls for new, creative ways to develop pastoralism rather than ones that seek development trajectories that promote non-livestock-based enterprises in pastoral areas that lead to the dismantling of pastoralism. While the AU perspective emphasizes the importance of commercialization of livestock production, it also seeks the development of pastoralism by promoting transition of smallholder cattle keepers from subsistence-based livestock rearing to commercially oriented production.

The government of Uganda, in line with the thinking of the AU and RECs, acknowledges the contribution of livestock to the socio-economic development of the country. It provides food, employment, and export revenue as well as income to the farmers and other stakeholders. Livestock is considered a major contributor to the government's strategy for poverty eradication and improving people's livelihoods and welfare (Republic of Uganda 2004, 5). In recognition of the economic contribution of livestock to agricultural GDP, the government included beef and milk among the 12 enterprises selected in agriculture for emphasis in investment along their value chains under the NDP II (Republic of Uganda 2015, 25). The statistics on the performance of the livestock sector reveal an overall declining share of the GDP by agriculture due to the structural transformation of the economy. While growth of livestock-farming activities is estimated to have declined from 2.9 percent in 2014/15 to 2.8 percent in 2015/16, the contribution to total GDP of livestock farming increased from a 4.2 percent contribution in 2014/15 to a 4.3 percent one in 2015/16 (UBOS 2016, 85).

Although livestock's contribution is recognized by the government, there is an overwhelming agricultural policy focus on crops in terms of public resources invested, due to the official belief that crops offer the best opportunity for overcoming food scarcity. The same thinking shapes the government predisposition towards Karamoja, in which it

is acknowledged livestock offers better insurance against food insecurity compared to crops. While the government acknowledges the economic contribution of livestock and pastoralism, the full extent of their contribution and its implications are seldom understood and appreciated by politicians and policy makers at different levels of decision making. The government of Uganda has expressed its commitment to providing a conducive environment for the continued development of the livestock industry in general (Republic of Uganda 2004, 5). Although the contribution of livestock to the GDP and national economy is recognized, translating this into tangible support to the section of the population that supports the livestock sector constituted largely by pastoralists is a challenge, as the government seeks to transform Karamoja by de-emphasizing the significance of pastoralism. The potentially negative long-term effects on pastoral livelihoods of the new government approach have not yet been analyzed.

While the government of Uganda recognizes that livestock rearing is the dominant and rational economic enterprise in dryland areas, the interventions that are being undertaken in Karamoja appear to target improvement in livestock production, marketing, and trade as well as commercialization and intensification of livestock production. Government programs such as Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) are aimed at improving agronomy, increasing market access, improving post-harvest handling and storage, and creating industrial linkages to enhance household incomes and create employment in order to boost agricultural contribution to economic growth. Even under OWC, while there are initiatives to support livestock re-stocking, there is also an attempt to depict Karamoja as being devoid of pastoralist communities following the loss of livestock suffered during the forceful disarmament between 2006 and 2009 and the widespread outbreaks of livestock disease epidemics thereafter. Limited attention is being paid to addressing pastoral issues at both the policy level and at the level of implementation of the policies and programs intended to transform Karamoja.

3.3.2 The development of the livestock sector

There are many areas where the AU and RECs agree on why it is essential to invest in the development of the livestock sector to increase production and productivity to meet the growing demand for livestock and livestock products. The AU and all the RECS are concerned about the levels of poverty afflicting cattle-keeping areas, and support initiatives for greater commercialization of livestock production aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of the sector and increasing its integration in expanding market opportunities (AU-IBAR 2015, 43–4; AU Commission 2010; IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 5; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 1–4). There is collaboration between the AU, IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC on

transboundary animal diseases (TADs) and livestock trade and marketing, as well as on livestock production and productivity.

There are, however, some differences in strategies and approaches proposed among the RECs in developing the livestock sector. Areas of emphasis also vary. Among the RECs, the first perspective focusses mainly on livestock and livestock development, and the second perspective focusses on pastoralism and the development of pastoral areas. The focus on the first perspective is usually at the expense of the pastoralism and the development of pastoral areas. The leading proponent of the first perspective is COMESA, which calls for investments in improvement of livestock production, marketing, and distribution to stimulate domestic and export trade of livestock and livestock products in order to enhance the contribution of the livestock sector to national and regional economic development (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 2). COMESA member states have however made an attempt to bring to the attention of the COMESA Secretariat the need to integrate pastoralism issues in the COMESA RLPF (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 14–31).

While all the RECs acknowledge the need to protect and invest in the development of livestock, it is mainly the AU that seeks to target the development of pastoral areas and pastoralism in their own right. The AU emphasizes the need to protect and develop livestock assets of pastoralists in order to enhance equitability (AU Commission 2010, 23). The EAC acknowledges that livestock keeping under pastoralism may be the most suitable production system and economic activity in the dryland areas. However, its handling of issues of pastoralism is contingent on investments being undertaken for dryland development, especially addressing resource constraints occasioned by the combination of climate change, population increase, and armed conflicts. Unlike the UA and the EAC, COMESA is more focused on developing commercial livestock production as opposed to pastoralism. IGAD acknowledges livestock as a critical endowment resource but one that needs to be exploited for the good of communities that inhabit the dryland areas and depend on livestock for their survival (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 5). IGAD calls for investment in drylands to improve human, financial, and technical capacity of livestock and other drylands producers and stakeholders (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 11).

In undertaking the development of the livestock sector, the AU calls for commitment to the political, social, and economic development of pastoral communities and pastoral areas, which reinforces the contribution of the livestock sector to the national economy (AU Commission 2010, 25). The AU strategy seeks to transform the livestock sector while at the same time enabling the interventions undertaken to contribute directly to the well-being of

pastoralists in the traditional sector. The AU seeks to facilitate transition of livestock owners from extensive subsistence production to intensive production for the market. The AU calls for policies that both focus on increasing livestock production and productivity and also directly benefit poor livestock keepers who prioritize survival over increased production. For such poor pastoralist households, priority is on securing adequate access to basic production inputs, such as pastures and water. The AU also calls for respect and support for relevant traditional livestock management practices (AU-IBAR 2015, 43–5).

The approach by the AU as espoused in the LiDeSA document signals a paradigm shift in the approach to investment in the development of the livestock sector. The AU puts emphasis on the need to harness the sector's potential for equitability by balancing investments required to achieve economic growth on the one hand and enhancing sustainable socio-economic development on the other hand. While commercialization of livestock production is pursued to achieve accelerated sector growth, there is also emphasis placed on protecting and supporting fragile livelihoods in extensive production systems through improved income generation and alternative livelihoods. The AU calls for interventions that support pastoral development by enhancing pastoral representation and good governance, with appropriate technical approaches entailed in the development of large-scale ranching schemes. The AU seeks an approach to pastoral development that embraces indigenous knowledge of cattle keepers, as well as innovations for sustainable natural resources management (AU-IBAR 2015).

While the AU-PFPA seeks recognition of the rights of pastoralists to lead a life of their choice, and an acknowledgement of the economic contribution of pastoralism (AU Commission 2010, 20–4), the AU's LiDeSA seeks a gradual intensification, modernization, and commercialization of Africa's largely extensive traditional livestock production systems that are practiced by pastoralists in order to transition them from a subsistence-based economy to a market economy (AU-IBAR 2015, 17). These two perspectives are not inconsistent in any way. They simply call for caution on the approaches preferred for the development of pastoralists and pastoralism. The AU approach is one that seeks a balance between accelerated agricultural growth and transformation pursued through commercialization and intensification of production on the one hand, and ensuring shared prosperity and improved livelihoods for livestock producers in the traditional sector, whose fragile livelihoods will be protected and supported through improved income generation and alternative livelihoods, on the other hand (AU-IBAR 2015, 45). The AU acknowledges that because of the structure of the livestock sector with the huge number of rural producers, informal

sector actors, and indirect linkages across the different value chains, increased investment in the sector provides an avenue for more equitable distribution of benefits and the creation of increased quality employment opportunities for both youth and women (AU-IBAR 2015, 14). It is on this basis that the AU recognizes the need to integrate pastoral development policy into national policy frameworks (AU Commission 2010, 23).

Among some of the investments that the AU and RECs advocate for is the establishment of an insurance scheme for livestock to reduce vulnerability to drought in the dryland areas (AU Commission 2010, 32; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 12; IGAD Secretariat 2015b, 53). Livestock insurance is an issue that has been articulated by all the AU and RECs apart from the EAC, whose main focus is on health insurance for humans and the general financial insurance (EAC Secretariat 2011).

While there is some agreement on the contribution of livestock and pastoralism and why significant investment in livestock production is necessary, there is a clear disconnect between what regional policies say needs to be done to enhance livestock's role and what the government of Uganda is doing to develop Karamoja, where livestock makes a significant contribution to the livelihoods of the population. The government acknowledges the importance of livestock in Karamoja, which comes exclusively from smallholder pastoralists. The Ministerial Policy Statement for OPM for FY 2016/17 refers to the economic potential of the pastoral areas of Karamoja, which it described as *"huge and can greatly contribute to the national GDP once properly exploited with adequate investment."*⁴ It is, however, clear that government has not yet fully harmonized national policies on livestock and pastoralism with regional livestock and pastoralism policies advocated for by the AU and the RECs. Sometimes the way government is approaching the transformation of Karamoja with regards to its handling of the issue of pastoralism is at odds with regional approaches to livestock production in general and pastoralism in particular.

In the official narratives of the government of Uganda, pastoralism has been defined as a problem for development in Karamoja. The long-term objective of government is to get rid of pastoralism by enabling the Karamojong to adopt alternative nonpastoral sources of livelihood. The continued ownership and reliance on livestock as the main source of livelihood are seen by government as predisposing the Karamojong to never-ending conflicts due to continuing mobility, which government seeks to end. Development interventions that seek to encourage the Karamojong to diversify and adopt alternative non-livestock-based sources of livelihoods sometimes are not

able to support pastoralists to respond to the unique challenges they encounter in the complex context of Karamoja, which increases their vulnerability to shocks and hazards.

Uganda's legislative framework on livestock is not in tandem with the spirit of the policies and program initiatives of the AU and RECs to the extent that they are silent about or inimical to pastoralism. The constitution of Uganda does not specify any particular rights for pastoralists. Most laws from the colonial period are still on the statute books. The Cattle Grazing Act of 1945 (Cap. 42) prescribes under Section 2 (2) the number of cattle that are supposed to be grazed on a particular piece of land. To the extent it does, it fails to recognize traditional livestock management practices that enable pastoralists to maximize the use of rangelands through herd and species diversification. The Cattle Traders Act of 1943 (Cap. 43) gives in Section 5 the responsible minister power to prohibit or restrict the movement of cattle from any area to any other area by statutory order. This provision effectively curtails dry season mobility of pastoralists. Although these laws are rarely invoked, they do not recognize that the opportunistic grazing systems employed by pastoralists not only lead to optimal use but also protect rangelands from degradation.

Through programs such as KIDP and DIDP that are being implemented in Karamoja, the government is investing in the improvement of livestock breeds as part of a strategy to expand the beef and milk production potential in a bid to stimulate the modernization and commercialization of livestock production in Karamoja. The government vision for Karamoja is one of a settled community of commercial crop farmers, wage workers, and commercial livestock farmers engaged in either ranching or dairy farming based on improved breeds of livestock. The vision has no place for pastoralism. There are no initiatives for the preservation of indigenous Karamojong livestock breeds. Officials in OPM think there are no more pastoralists in Karamoja. The government is using development policy and development programs to reorder Karamojong society to suit its version of the desired future Karamoja. Government officials in MAAIF are noncommittal, although they acknowledge there are changes taking place in Karamoja.

When the AU and RECs call for adoption of standards for livestock products to enhance accessibility to global markets, one of the considerations usually made is for establishment of a livestock identification, certification, and traceability system that links particular livestock products to specific geographical zones whose disease control regimes are known, to ensure food safety standards

⁴ See Project 1317, Vote Function 1303 (Management of Special Programs) under Vote 003 for the OPM (see Republic of Uganda 2016, 63).

and for quality assurance purposes (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 10; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 12). This particular aspect of regional policies has influenced the thinking of the government in its handling of issues of development in Karamoja. In Karamoja, the government has since 2009 been undertaking electronic branding of livestock not as a “farm-to-fork” identification and traceability mechanism whose primary function is to enhance global market access as advocated by the AU and the RECs, but as a tracer mechanism for easing the identification of cattle to stem cattle thefts and raiding activities.

3.3.3 Addressing issues of pastoral mobility

The issue of pastoral mobility has been addressed by the AU and all the RECs, although the areas of emphasis vary. There are some who are more concerned about the free movement of livestock and livestock products for promotion of regional and international trade. COMESA’s interests were mainly to ensure safety of livestock and livestock products entering the market, and agro-processing for value addition. The support to pastoralists was to the extent it enabled improvement in the management of livestock diseases to promote exports that meet international standards (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 2).

Some of the RECs were more concerned about the regional harmonization of national policies and legislations to, on one hand, promote regional and transboundary natural resource management for the sustainable development in cross-border cattle keeping communities (EAC Secretariat 2011, 37; IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 5) and to, on the other hand, enhance accessibility to veterinary and livestock extension services to address TADs and zoonosis that prevent livestock from pastoralists from being traded in lucrative regional and global markets (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 1; EAC Secretariat 2011, 37). It is only the AU and IGAD that recognize that pastoralist ecosystems often transcend national borders, and acknowledge that movement within transboundary ecosystems is economically and ecologically rational, hence necessitating the need for a regional approach in addressing and mitigating transboundary mobility issues that impinge on cross-border pastoral communities in arid and semi-arid areas (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 5; AU Commission 2010, 2).

The AU is the most emphatic in its support for national policies that make possible not only regional livestock movements for trade but also the strategic mobility of pastoralists that enables the efficient use and protection of

rangelands based on an understanding of the benefits of traditional resource management systems. The AU considers mobility key to pastoralists’ adaptation to the physical environment in which they live, as well as to the changes taking place occasioned by climatic change and other trends (AU Commission 2010, 22). The AU calls for maintaining and sustaining pastoral and livestock mobility through carefully negotiated livestock movements that enhance complementarity between transhumant herders and crop farmers (AU Commission 2010, 17).

The government has ensured there is an enabling environment for free movement of goods and persons across the common borders. There are no inhibitions to the movement of persons between Lorukumo (Moroto District) and Lokirima (Loima Division) and Karita (Amudat District) and Alale (Kapenguria). The Turkana sell their small stock in Karamoja and buy grain (mainly sorghum, maize, and maize flour) and other supplies from Karamoja. An immigration station has been established at Karita. A regional immigration office has been opened in Moroto. There is increasing collaboration between Uganda and Kenya in dealing with TADs, which is in line with the proposals by the AU and RECs. The government of Uganda’s approach to dealing with TADs is increased disease surveillance, management, and prevention, which is in line with regional policies. Uganda participated in the EU-funded VETGOV program implemented by AU-IBAR to provide livestock-sector stakeholders with a platform for engaging policies, strategies, and legal frameworks for the development of the local livestock sector.

Under the IGAD Regional Migration Policy Framework (RMPPF), there are already initiatives to support, facilitate, and eventually legally regulate cross-border and internal mobility of pastoralist communities.⁵ Consultations on the adoption of the IGAD Protocols on Transhumance were held in Uganda in August 2017. In the Karamoja Cluster, cross-border transhumance routes have already been mapped and await approval of the IGAD summit to make it possible for free movement of pastoralists along designated corridors between Uganda, South Sudan, and Kenya to occur.⁶ However, perspectives by the AU and RECs on transboundary mobility of pastoralists associated with livestock-herding practices have not had much effect on government policy and thinking towards Karamoja and the migrations of Karamojong pastoralists. While the consequences of policy-induced limitations on mobility of especially Karamojong pastoralists are acknowledged in the IDDRSI Uganda CPP (Republic of Uganda 2013a, 3),

⁵ See IGAD RMPPF, July 11, 2012, <http://migration.igad.int/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Regional-Migration-Policy-Framework1.pdf> (accessed August 2017).

⁶ KII with Kevina Nabutuwa, IGAD Desk Officer in the OPM, August 2017.

the current policy of the government towards Karamoja seeks not only the sedentarization of the Karamojong pastoralists but also an end to the mobility of herders both within and outside Karamoja. Cross-border mobility by Karamojong pastoralists into districts of Uganda neighboring Karamoja and into communities in neighboring countries is abhorred because it is associated with widespread raiding and armed conflicts. The government associates the dry season mobility of the Karamojong with vices of nomadism as well as violent armed conflicts occasioned by raiding activities. The government prefers sedentarization of the Karamojong so they can adopt alternative livelihoods, including permanent settled crop farming.

Uganda has also not yet put in place appropriate policy and legislative frameworks for regulating dry season transboundary movements of herds of pastoral groups from Kenya (Turkana and Pokot) and South Sudan (mainly Didinga and sometimes Toposa) into Karamoja, which is one of the causes of westward migrations by Karamojong herders into neighboring districts in Teso, Lango, and Acholi sub-regions, where the local leaders have increasingly been unwelcoming to Karamojong herders. The government instead seeks to restrict the movement of Karamojong herders within Karamoja, without appropriately addressing the transboundary dimensions of the migrations into Karamoja by Turkana, Pokot, and other pastoral groups from neighboring countries. There are no established institutional mechanisms for dialogue on cross-border and transboundary sharing of rangeland resources between Karamoja and neighboring districts in Uganda. The dialogue is usually ad hoc and reactive, and most often extremely adversarial.

The government has since July 2016 been implementing an agriculture insurance scheme to provide insurance premium subsidies to farmers as a strategy for addressing vulnerability of pastoralists caused by high livestock mortality associated with drought, disease, and other factors. Farmers purchase agriculture insurance products to protect themselves from losses occasioned by nature. Farmers are provided insurance premium subsidies that enable them to access agriculture financing from financial institutions. The insurance scheme is a cover that is aimed at protecting agricultural producers (farmers, ranchers, and others) against loss of either crops or livestock due to pests and diseases or natural disasters such as hailstorms, drought, and floods (Republic of Uganda 2017, 103; Republic of Uganda 2013a, 18). This scheme has neither been extended to Karamoja nor benefitted pastoralists from other parts of the country. Best practices and lessons can be learnt from the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), which has been implementing a livestock insurance scheme in Northeastern Kenya.

3.4 SOCIAL SERVICES

The AU and all the RECs articulate issues of inadequate service delivery for pastoralists in dryland areas as an issue of poverty. They recognize the difficulties faced by cattle keepers in drylands areas in accessing basic social services, especially health and education, due to a combination of factors, including outright neglect and marginalization, and the remoteness and sparse population of the areas they inhabit, which are often prone to armed conflicts (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 17; AU-IBAR 2015, 40; AU Commission 2010, 22–7; EAC Secretariat 2006, 2). On the one hand, the AU and RECs advocate for poverty eradication programs that are centered around improved serviced delivery, and on the other hand, they call for policy support for alternative basic service delivery models that are specifically designed to suit the context of pastoral areas (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 24; AU Commission 2010, 28).

The government is investing heavily in increasing availability of conventional basic services in Karamoja. In addition, the notion of alternative service delivery models advocated for by the AU and RECs has also influenced the thinking in Uganda, especially in delivery of primary health care and basic education for the pastoralist communities of Karamoja. The government has also allowed community-based animal health workers to complement the services offered by veterinary extension staff. There are a number of creative strategies that have been enabled in Karamoja to enhance access to education, such as the alternative basic education program. The government uses food rations, not only to increase access to education for girls and other school-aged children, but also to enhance access to health services, especially ante- and post-natal services, and childhood immunization.

3.5 NATURAL RESOURCES

The AU and RECs acknowledge that natural resources play a very significant role in the development of pastoral areas. Although these resources are critical for sustaining the livelihoods of cattle keepers, they are under threat of degradation from overuse and misuse. The AU and RECs call for strategies for enhancing sustainable use and management of natural resources to secure access to resources necessary for the survival of pastoralists, and enhance food security, economic growth, and poverty eradication in pastoral areas (AU Commission 2010, 24; IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10–12; EAC Secretariat 2006, 19–20). The AU and IGAD call for not only recognition of the rights of pastoralists to access the rangelands and pursue a livelihood of their choice, but also for acknowledgement that pastoralism is critical for the promotion of sustainable use and management of natural resources and conservation of the environment. The AU and RECs advocate for improving the governance of

pastoral rangelands through strengthening of traditional pastoral institutions that are relevant for enforcing compliance with norms and values that dictate the sustainable use of the drylands. These institutions are also repositories for traditional knowledge that maximizes returns from the drylands (AU Commission 2010, 24; IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10–12; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 39). The AU particularly calls for legal and political recognition of communal land rights and ownership in pastoral areas as a strategy to safeguard the rights of pastoralists to unfettered access to critical resources for their livestock, including water and pastures (AU-IBAR 2010, 17; AU Commission 2010, 26).

There are several policies intended to promote sustainable management of natural resources, including national policies on land, water, environment management, and forestry, among others. There are none that explicitly deal with livestock development or pastoralism, although Section 15 of the Land Act of 1988 (Cap. 227), as amended, deals with communal land associations (CLAs) and was intended to address insecurity of tenure for individuals and communities, especially pastoralists, that rely on common property regimes to access natural resources. A cabinet approval of the final draft of the Uganda Rangeland Development and Management Policy has been pending since 2007 (see Republic of Uganda 2007a). The government appears to have dropped the idea of enacting a Uganda Pastoral Code, in which pastoralism-specific policy issues, including regulation of mobility, are articulated (see Republic of Uganda 2007b).

Uganda's IDDRSI CPP acknowledges that loss of communal resources in pastoral areas is a cause of increased natural resource conflict that also undermines pastoralists' drought coping mechanisms (Republic of Uganda 2013a, 7–8). However, the implementation of CLAs to protect land rights of communities where resources are communally used, including pastoral areas such as Karamoja, even when it was specifically provided for in the National Land Policy (Republic of Uganda 2013c, 23), has not been widely supported by the government. In Karamoja, individual titling of land in rangelands has enabled indigenous elites to appropriate land from communal domains. Once land has been freed from customary constraints, it is easily sold off and transferred to outsiders. The ensuing forms of land grabs are already a cause for worry in Karamoja.

Government narratives on the development of Karamoja view pastoralists as the primary drivers of rangeland degradation caused by “overstocking” and “overgrazing.” As a result, not much effort has been made to secure land as a communal resource for grazing of livestock in the pastoral areas. However, the government has undertaken significant investment in the development of communal water facilities under different programs in Karamoja.

Under NUSAF III, the government is experimenting with a community-driven watershed area development approach for not only development of crop farming through block farms but also environmental revitalization through agro-forestry interventions.

3.6 CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

The AU recognizes that livestock raiding is an emerging organized crime occasioned by de-pastoralization (AU Commission 2010, 18). While the AU recognizes the need to address protracted conflicts in pastoral societies, especially resource-based conflicts, simultaneously with other structural problems (AU-IBAR 2015, 76; AU Commission 2010, 3), it does not address itself specifically to the subject of disarmament. One of the priority areas of the IGAD Regional Strategy aims to achieve peace and security by calling for disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) interventions to address transnational security threats (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 47). The Uganda IDDRSI CPP is more specific in addressing conflicts in pastoral areas, calling for peaceful disarmament of armed elements in pastoral areas (Republic of Uganda 2013a, 20). COMESA is concerned about the need to put in place mechanisms for mitigating resource-based conflicts (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 16–26). The EAC is more concerned about the proliferation of small arms, and calls for a Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution (CPMR) Framework and small arms control programs, as well as the implementation of joint measures to combat cattle rustling (EAC Secretariat 2011, 60).

The AU and all the RECs recognize that many pastoral areas are afflicted by armed conflicts, which affect growth and development in these areas (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10; COMESA Secretariat 2015, 26; AU Commission 2010, 1). RECs recognize that as awareness of injustice suffered by pastoralists increases, the continuing marginalization of pastoral areas can lead to discontent, which can become a trigger point for conflicts (AU Commission 2010, 2). The areas of emphasis between the AU and the RECs varied. The approach proposed by the AU for conflict mitigation and management entails proper identification of conflict causes, drivers, and triggers. The AU also calls for recognition of and support for traditional conflict management mechanisms, as well as sensitization of communities on the prevailing national laws and regulations (AU Commission 2010, 25). The AU recognizes that supporting building resilience among livestock producers can benefit the peace and security agenda in regions affected by armed conflicts, which is beneficial in the international fight against terrorism (AU-IBAR 2015, 29). The AU also recognizes the rights of pastoralists to protection from violence and calls for the promotion of sustained conflict resolution (AU Commission 2010, 22–23). IGAD is best known in the area of conflict prevention and management in pastoral

areas for the CEWARN Mechanism. In the ICPALD Protocol of 2015, IGAD calls on member states to initiate and implement conflict-sensitive and responsive programs in undertaking livestock development activities to raise women's and youth's contribution to the national economy (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 11).

The EAC has already developed the EAC Peace and Security Protocol, and is developing the EAC CPMR Mechanism. EAC member states signed a Protocol on Co-operation in Defence Affairs in April 2012. The protocol provides a framework for addressing the strategic security challenges of the region. In February 2003, EAC security ministers signed the EAC Protocol on Peace and Security, which provides for cooperation of EAC security forces in areas of criminal intelligence (EAC Secretariat 2006).

In line with the proposals by IGAD and the EAC, Uganda carried out a peaceful disarmament campaign in Karamoja starting in 2000 and ultimately undertook a forceful disarmament campaign from May 2006, culminating in a declaration of the return of peace to the whole of Karamoja in July 2010. Uganda has also since 2002 been implementing the IGAD CEWARN Mechanism in Karamoja. Through CEWARN, information on violent conflict incidents and occurrences is collected, analyzed, processed, and packaged in a way that makes it possible to provide indications about the potential for escalation. Possible strategies for de-escalation of the conflicts can therefore be proposed, while at the same time alternative responses for mitigating already evident conflicts can be provided. The information is then made available to the government and non-state stakeholders in the Karamoja Region, including to the neighboring countries of South Sudan and Kenya, where a similar mechanism is being implemented. Through collaboration with CEWARN, several initiatives have been undertaken in line with the thinking of the AU and RECs that calls for cross-border collaboration in conflict management and mitigation. These include cross-border peace-building initiatives such as cross-border peace committees between Uganda and Kenya. The two countries have also exchanged military liaison officers. Several activities in this area have been supported such as Tegla Lorupe cross-border sports activities and celebrations of traditional cross-border peace initiatives such as the Moru-a-Nayeche Peace Accord between Turkana and the Karamojong and Lokirima Peace Accord between Turkana and Matheniko.

As a strategy for building sustainable peace along border communities, Uganda has supported transboundary development projects to foster mutual coexistence, collaboration, and cooperation. The government has constructed new roads and repaired others leading to borders between Karamoja and Turkana, Karamoja and Pokot, as well as those connecting Karamoja to South

Sudan. The government has also supported the development of livestock markets at strategic locations along the common border-crossing points. Progress has been made with the livestock markets at Lokirima and Karita.

4 MAINSTREAMING RESILIENCE IN REGIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

The AU and most of the RECs have appropriated and widely use resilience concepts and language in the framing of their regional policies and programs. Some use the concepts directly, while others use it implicitly. IGAD, for example, seeks, as a major thrust of its policies, to promote resilient pastoralist livelihoods in arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) while at the same time boosting agricultural production and sustainable management of natural resources for sustained economic growth (IGAD Secretariat 2016, 10). The foundation that the AU and RECs require for articulating and mainstreaming resilience in their regional policies and programs is principally a recognition not only that pastoralism is widespread and makes a significant economic contribution but also that it makes the most efficient economic use of drylands, where no other economic production is possible. It requires recognition that pastoralists who inhabit pastoral areas have a right to lead a way of life of their choice. Once policies and programs advocated for by the AU and RECs seek to convert pastoral areas to non-livestock use and to transform pastoralists into something else, they cease to recognize the necessity for the resilience of pastoralism.

All the AU and RECs are aware of some of the causes and drivers of pastoralist vulnerability, such as: increased pressure on rangelands occasioned by rising human populations; increasing settlements and urbanization; adverse effects of prolonged droughts, increased rainfall variability and high incidence of diseases; inappropriate policies; and weak institutional frameworks. The development interventions they propose mainly undermine pastoralism, to the extent that they seek the intensification of livestock production, sedentarization of pastoralists, and promotion of alternative sources of livelihoods in cattle-keeping areas, including the conversion of rangelands into farmlands for permanent crop cultivation.

Different RECs and the AU advocate for different initiatives in which resilience is articulated both directly and indirectly. For example, COMESA has been at the forefront of advocating for the establishment of an insurance scheme for cattle to reduce vulnerability to drought in the dryland areas (COMESA Secretariat 2015, 12). The AU was most successful in the integration of resilience in the framing of its regional policies and programs on pastoral areas and livestock development, when compared to policies of the RECs. The AU has embedded resilience, not only in the 2010 Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa (AU Commission 2010), but also in the LiDeSA for the period 2015–2035 (AU-IBAR 2015). The AU recognizes that although pastoralism is a traditional way of life of pastoralists, it is

far from being static, as pastoralists in many areas are adapting to trends such as new economic opportunities and better access to modern means of communication (AU Commission 2010, 1).

The inability to mainstream resilience in the framing of regional policies and programs related to pastoral areas and livestock development is the result of either a lack of understanding of the important contribution that pastoralism makes to the livelihoods of pastoralists, the protection of the rangelands, and the national economy, or a deliberate attempt to reorder pastoral societies to achieve different objectives of development aspirations in pastoral areas. Whether it is a misperception of pastoralism or a disapproval of the way of life of pastoralism or a combination of both, the development interventions that have been preferred by the AU and RECs reflect an attempt to transform pastoralists into something else. This attempt will undermine the resilience of categories of pastoralists who continue to depend on livestock for their livelihoods.

Apart from the AU (see AU Commission 2010; AU-IBAR 2015), none of the RECs recognize the importance of directly involving and working with pastoralists at national, regional, and international levels to raise the voices of pastoralists and enhance the profile of pastoralism in policy discourses. When the representation of pastoralists in policy-making frameworks is either limited or absent, there is a power imbalance created that affects the ability of pastoralists to influence policies that apply to pastoral areas and the institutional dispensation within which livestock development is undertaken. Even when pastoralists are present in these fora, they get trapped into an overwhelmingly nonpastoralist knowledge regime that is unfavorable to pastoralism.

IGAD and the EAC seek to promote livelihood diversification in pastoral areas as a response to the increasing vulnerability of pastoral livelihoods. While these RECs consider diversification necessary to reduce risks and improve human security in the drylands, the form of diversification sought focuses not on livestock but on non-livestock enterprises, especially non-wood forest products (to develop and utilize available resources like medicinal plants, snake venom, land with irrigation potential, and ecotourism, among others) as well as development of indigenous artisanal mining activities, among others (IGAD Secretariat 2015a, 10; EAC Secretariat 2006). This approach essentially seeks to advance de-pastoralization as a response to increasing vulnerabilities associated with pastoral livelihoods.

These interventions do not help to strengthen the resilience of pastoralism, which makes the most economic use of available scarce resources without necessarily undermining their ability to recover naturally. Other than the AU and IGAD, COMESA and the EAC are not explicit about the importance of mainstreaming traditional resource management systems into their policies and program initiatives related to pastoral areas and livestock development. To the extent that the AU and RECs do not acknowledge the importance of resource management strategies employed by pastoralists to respond to constraints in their physical environment, in which mobility plays a very central role, their policies and programs in pastoral areas are likely to undermine the resilience of pastoralists and increase their vulnerability to both manmade and natural shocks and hazards.

The IDDRSI framework emphasizes the need to increase production and productivity of pastoralism through modernization and commercialization interventions whose implementation modalities are not only sensitive to the way of life of the pastoralists but also broaden and enhance the policy- and institution-related strategies of the pastoral communities (IGAD Secretariat 2013). For resilience to become fully embedded in the regional policies and programs of the RECs, it is necessary to recognize differences in the levels and forms of vulnerability between different categories of cattle keepers, both in space and time. Many of the RECs treat pastoralists and livestock producers as homogenous categories. The RECs also need to transcend the negative stereotypes about the unviability of pastoralism due to constraints imposed on livestock production from competition for land with other forms of land use as well as demographic pressures and intensifying poverty. These stereotypes serve to perpetuate vulnerabilities of pastoralists.

Drought resilience has become the cornerstone of IGAD engagement with pastoralism. The framework adopted by IDDRSI acknowledges the need for strengthening of pastoral livelihoods as a strategy for managing disasters faced by pastoralists (IGAD Secretariat 2013). The AU focuses on interventions necessary to enhance drought management in dryland areas inhabited by pastoralists, which are affected by temporal and spatial variability of rainfall that affect resource availability (AU Commission 2010). COMESA recognizes the need for national livestock policies to pay attention to the diversity of agro-ecological conditions under which livestock resources are produced and traded (COMESA Secretariat 2015).

The AU, like most of the RECs, engages the causes, drivers, and consequences of vulnerabilities in the dryland areas. RECs call for interventions to manage risks associated with the factors that cause destitution and other vulnerabilities among pastoralists. The AU and RECs advance several arguments regarding ways of mitigating

the effects of drought on livestock assets in pastoral areas to enhance the capacity of pastoralists to recover from the effects of drought. The AU and RECs have also made reference to processes of institutionalization of approaches designed to manage the causes of vulnerabilities. For drought, reference has been to the following: Drought Cycle Management, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), and Disaster Risk Financing. For conflicts, reference has been to CEWARN (AU Commission 2010, 22–3).

5 OPPORTUNITIES FOR FURTHER KRSU ENGAGEMENT

5.1 LESSONS KRSU CAN DRAW FROM REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The following are some of the lessons that KRSU can draw from regional programs already underway in Karamoja that can guide its work in Karamoja:

- The development interventions for the transformation of Karamoja and intensification of livestock production need not be undertaken at the expense of the vulnerable livelihoods of traditional Karamojong pastoralists involved in subsistence-based extensive livestock production characterized by low input and low output. While a process of de-pastoralization is occurring, there is a very large number of Karamojong who are still both directly and indirectly involved with and dependent on livestock for their livelihoods and survival. The commercialization of livestock production for accelerated growth, not only in livestock production and productivity but also in livestock's contribution to the local and national economies, can be undertaken in a way that also improves the livelihoods of those still involved in livestock production through improving their incomes and pursuing diversification around livestock-based enterprises.
- The actual economic and other contributions of livestock to the livelihoods of the Karamojong and to local economies and national economies need to be analyzed and the information packaged in an appropriate manner and widely disseminated to remove lingering misconceptions and negative stereotypes about how the significance of livestock in Karamoja is waning with the presumed widespread dispossession of Karamojong of livestock in the aftermath of the forceful disarmament campaign, particularly between 2007 and 2010. The importance of pastoralism to the livelihoods of the Karamojong also needs to be emphasized where there is overwhelming evidence of its manifestation.
- KRSU should consider supporting local and national civil society organizations involved in evidence-based policy advocacy activities targeting decision makers at national and district levels to widely disseminate well-researched and -packaged information on the contribution of livestock in general and pastoralism in particular to the national and district economies in Karamoja, as well as to the livelihoods of the Karamojong.
- Participatory stakeholder consultations at national, district, and sub-county levels need to be undertaken to determine where Karamoja's comparative advantage lies in terms of livelihood and economic activities, given natural resources currently available in Karamoja and competitive systems of production.
- KRSU should work with other relevant stakeholders to stimulate discussions around the need to identify and develop livestock value chains in Karamoja that will unlock the value of the standing livestock asset, stimulate its untapped multiplier potential, and enhance the sector's distributive capacity.
- KRSU also needs to work with other existing initiatives to continue and deepen the engagements with relevant stakeholders directly involved in the policy making at national and district levels, seeking a better understanding of pastoralism and its economic and ecological contribution. There is need for not only increased political representation of pastoralists but also dialogue between pastoralists and their political leaders with the government and policy makers.
- There is an urgent need to look critically at what is happening in the settlements in the greenbelts areas of Karamoja from the south to the north to understand what the future holds for a move towards greater sedentarization of Karamojong and conversion of greenbelts to settlements and farmlands.

5.2 LESSONS FROM KARAMOJA THAT CAN BE SHARED WITH REGIONAL ACTORS

There are several opportunities for KRSU to share lessons from Karamoja with regional actors. Among others, the following are considered critical:

- KRSU can share lessons on engaging the government, which has made up its mind about not promoting a cattle economy in Karamoja, going against all known conventions, including policies and program initiatives by the AU and RECs, to which government has signed treaties and protocols.
- There are also lessons from Karamoja that reveal that it is not enough to have political will favorable

to the development of the livestock sector in general. There has to be a concrete understanding of the role of pastoralism and its contribution to the livelihoods of populations in pastoral areas. Where the political will looks at pastoralism as the problem and calls for its proscription as a way of life and production system, policy initiatives are unlikely to be supportive, which undermines opportunities for poverty-reduction interventions built around livestock production. Where the role of pastoralism is understood, there is need to translate this understanding into increased public and private sector investment in pastoral areas' development.

- While there is emphasis on diversification into nonpastoral alternative livelihoods, it is emphasized that efforts also need to be made to promote diversification around livestock in order to realize the full potential of pastoralism.

6 CONCLUSIONS

There are several regional policies and programming initiatives of the AU, COMESA, the EAC, and IGAD in East Africa and the Horn of Africa related to pastoralist area development that have influenced the policies and thinking in Uganda with regards to the interventions being undertaken in Karamoja. There are significant areas of convergence in terms of how the critical development challenges faced by pastoralists in general are defined and the interventions proposed to address these challenges. Many of the policies and programs for the development of the livestock sector have been aligned to these regional policies and programs. There are also some areas where interventions undertaken in Karamoja are at odds with the underlying objectives of the regional policies, especially with regards to the development of pastoral areas and development of pastoralism.

The most important lesson from the regional policies and program initiatives for KRSU is that development interventions for the transformation of Karamoja and intensification of livestock production need not necessarily be undertaken at the expense of the vulnerable livelihoods of traditional Karamojong pastoralists involved in subsistence-based extensive livestock production, which is characterized by low input and low output. One area that KRSU needs to consider for engagement going forward is supporting processes through which the actual economic and other contributions of livestock to the livelihoods of the Karamojong and to local economies and national economies will be analyzed and the information packaged in an appropriate manner and widely disseminated to remove lingering misconceptions and negative stereotypes about how the significance of livestock in Karamoja is waning.

7 REFERENCES

- AU Commission. 2010. Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities. AU Commission, Addis Ababa.
- AU Commission. 2015a. Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want First - The First Ten-Year Implementation for 2014–2023. AU Commission, Addis Ababa.
- AU-IBAR. 2010. Framework for Mainstreaming Livestock in the CAADP Pillars. AU-IBAR, Nairobi.
- AU-IBAR. 2015. The Livestock Development Strategy for Africa (LiDeSA), 2015–2035. AU-IBAR, Nairobi.
- COMESA Secretariat. 2015. Regional Livestock Policy Framework (RLPF). COMESA Secretariat, Lusaka.
- Delgado, C., M. Rosegrant, H. Steinfeld, S. Ehui, and C. Courbois. 1999. Livestock to 2020: The Next Food Revolution. Food, Agriculture and the Environment Discussion Paper 28. IFPRI, Washington DC, FAO, Rome, and ILRI, Nairobi.
- EAC Secretariat. 2006. Agriculture and Rural Development Policy (ARDP) for the EAC. EAC Secretariat, Arusha.
- EAC Secretariat. 2011. The 4th East African Community Development Strategy, (2011/12–2015/16): Deepening and Accelerating Integration. EAC Secretariat, Arusha.
- EAC Secretariat. 2012a. Livestock Policy for the East African Community, Second Draft. EAC Secretariat, Arusha.
- IGAD Secretariat, 2013. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategy. IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti.
- IGAD Secretariat, 2015a. The IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD) Protocol. IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti.
- IGAD Secretariat, 2015b. Strategic Plan for the IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD), 2016–2020. IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti.
- IGAD Secretariat, 2016. The IGAD Regional Strategy. Vol. 1: The Framework. IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti.
- KRSU. 2016. Karamoja Donor Mapping Report. KRSU, USAID/Uganda, Kampala.
- Little, Peter, ed. 2016. Resilience and Risk in Pastoral Areas: Recent Trends in Diversified and Alternative Livelihoods. USAID East Resilience Learning Project, Feinstein International Center, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University, Somerville.
- Republic of Uganda. 1997. The National Animal Breeding Policy. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2003. The National Meat Policy. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2004. The National Animal Feeds Policy. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2007a. Uganda Rangeland Development and Management Policy. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2007b. The Uganda Pastoral Code. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2009. Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (2009–2014): Karamoja Agricultural and Pastoral Production Zones. OPM, Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2010a. The National Development Plan (NDP I) for 2010/11 to 2014/15. NPA, Kampala.

7 REFERENCES

- Republic of Uganda. 2010b. Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries: Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP) for 2010/11–2014/15. MAAIF, Entebbe.
- Republic of Uganda. 2013a. IDDRISI Uganda Country Programming Paper to End Drought Emergencies in the Horn of Africa. OPM, Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2013b. Uganda's Vision 2040. NPA, Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2013c. The Uganda National Land Policy. Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (MoLHUD), Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2015. Second National Development Plan (NDPII) 2015/16–2019/20. NPA, Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2016. Ministerial Policy Statement for the Financial Year 2016/17, OPM Vote 003. Presented to Parliament for the Debate on Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. OPM, Kampala.
- Republic of Uganda. 2017. Background to the Budget Fiscal Year 2017/18: Industrialisation for Job Creation and Shared Prosperity. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Kampala.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). 2016. The 2016 Statistical Abstracts. UBOS, Kampala.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2015. Uganda Human Development Report: Unlocking the Development Potential of Northern Uganda. UNDP, Kampala.
- World Bank. 2016. The Uganda Poverty Assessment Report 2016. Farms, Cities and Good Fortune: Assessing Poverty Reduction in Uganda from 2006 to 2013. The World Bank, Washington DC. <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/381951474255092375/Uganda-Poverty-Assessment-Report-2016.pdf> (accessed September 2017).

Appendix I. Terms of Reference for Review of Regional Policies and Program Initiatives in Support of the Livestock Sector and Pastoral Development in Karamoja

BACKGROUND:

The USAID/Uganda KRSU provides programming, policy, and coordination support to donors, the government, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Karamoja, with a focus on evidence-based analysis and learning. Specifically, the KRSU focuses on:

- Assisting USAID/Uganda to strengthen its resilience programs and policy support in Karamoja;
- Providing strategic, programmatic, and logistical support to the multi-donor Karamoja Development Partners Group;
- Providing capacity-building support to the government for their policies and programs in Karamoja;
- Generating an evidence base and ensuring analytical support using reviews, studies, evaluations, and similar activities.

Further information about KRSU is available at www.karamojaresilience.org.

One aspect of providing policy support to Karamoja and pastoralism in Uganda is to understand the current status of policies and programs at a regional level, with African regional bodies, and how these bodies are supporting pastoral areas and pastoral livestock development. It is also important to understand Uganda's engagement with regional bodies, and the extent to which Uganda aligns its own policies and programs with those of the AU, IGAD, COMESA, and the EAC in terms of pastoral areas development.

SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES:

1. Conduct a rapid review of the regional policy and programming initiatives in East Africa and the Horn of Africa related to pastoral areas development, focusing on initiatives involving Uganda and the Karamoja Region. This activity should include a listing of relevant policy and programming in the AU, COMESA, the EAC, and IGAD, and provide commentary on the extent to which these regional bodies are advancing policies and thinking in Uganda; e.g., if and how Uganda aligns its approach to Karamoja with these regional initiatives and policies. The review should be multi-sectoral, and can cover economic development, agriculture, livestock, social services, natural resources, conflict management, and other sectors.
2. Provide commentary on the extent to which resilience concepts and language are explicitly

used for framing regional policies and programs related to pastoral areas and livestock development. Is resilience fully embedded in regional policies and programs across all regional organizations and programs?

3. Identify opportunities for further KRSU engagement as a means to both draw lessons from regional programs to guide work in Karamoja, and to share lessons from Karamoja with regional actors.

DELIVERABLES:

The consultant will prepare a report covering the three activities above: (1) a draft report of no more than 20 pages in length; (2) a verbal briefing to USAID/Uganda on the draft report, and to seek feedback from USAID; (3) a final report.

TIMEFRAME:

A 20-day input is required between July 20 and August 31, 2017.

LOCATION:

The consultant will be based in Kampala.

SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE:

- At least 15 years' professional experience of development programs in pastoral areas of East Africa.
- At least 10 years' working knowledge of the regional programs and policies of regional African organizations and donors, with capacity to engage senior regional program staff.
- At least 10 years' experience of USAID programs and projects in East Africa.

