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‘We used to sing to the camels when browsing: *gashi ma qabtide, gaw walba u gudub.*
It means: ‘to satisfy your appetite, move to wherever there is pasture.’

[Killeh/Awale, 2003, p.13]

Izzy Birch
Introduction

This is one of a series of desk reviews produced as part of the project ‘Securing Pastoralism in East and West Africa: Protecting and Promoting Livestock Mobility’. Its focus is livestock mobility in Somaliland and the Somali National Regional State (SNRS) of Ethiopia (hereinafter called Somali region). These areas share a similar ecology and have strong economic, political and social ties. References are made to relevant experiences elsewhere in Ethiopia and in other Somali-speaking parts of the Horn of Africa, but these were not the specific focus of the study.

The methodology involved a review of available literature, supplemented with brief interviews with key informants in Hargeisa and Addis Ababa. A visit to the Laaye pastoral association south-west of Hargeisa generated further information about the particular experience of one group of pastoralists in Somaliland.

The desk review was asked to focus on two issues:
1. The context affecting livestock mobility.
2. The work of key development and research actors involved in promoting livestock mobility.

The review was limited by the time available – four working days in Somaliland and two in Ethiopia – as well as by the normal difficulties in obtaining unpublished literature.

The report has five sections:
1. A brief overview of the nature of pastoralism and livestock mobility in Somaliland/Somali region.
2. A summary of the main reasons why livestock mobility is changing in Somaliland/Somali region.
3. An overview of the work of key development and research actors as it affects livestock mobility, and an indication of the issues that still need attention.
4. A summary of relevant experiences in other parts of Ethiopia.

The assistance of Dr Eyasu Elias and the SOS Sahel Ethiopia office, as well as the many people who shared documents and ideas, is warmly acknowledged.
1 The nature of pastoralism and livestock mobility in Somaliland/Somali region

Pastoralism in Somali-speaking Africa shares many of the same characteristics as pastoral systems elsewhere on the continent but has some important, distinctive features.

- Pastoral production has a strong export-orientation. Somalia’s long trading history is recorded as far back as the first century AD. The livestock trade is favoured by close proximity to the Gulf States, particularly as a source of animals for the three million Hajj pilgrims. Livestock exports provide around 80% of Somaliland’s foreign exchange earnings (UNDP figures for 1998, Gaani 2005). The total value of Ethiopia’s livestock and livestock products would rival coffee as the country’s most important export commodity if the value of its unofficial cross-border livestock trade, in which Somali region has a prominent role, were taken into account (Halderman 2004).

- A patrilineal, highly segmented clan structure controls access to natural resources and to the various livestock trading routes. Although the Siad Barre administration tried to eradicate traditional institutions, the clan system has proved remarkably persistent. It provided invaluable social protection during the crisis of the late 1980s. After the war ended the successful process of state formation in Somaliland was led by elders. Clan ties play out across the Somaliland/Ethiopia border. In 1995, for example, Harshin district in Somali region hosted one of Somaliland’s peace conferences. Inter-clan rivalries in Somaliland’s domestic politics have at times led to instability in Somali region (Hagmann 2006).

- Somalia is one of the few countries in Africa where pastoralists are not a minority of the population. Most people in Somaliland are directly dependent on pastoral production; the Ministry of Agriculture estimates that 60% rely on livestock products for their daily subsistence (Gaani 2005). Perhaps as a result, rural-urban linkages are strong; the urban economy in Somaliland is still driven by the production and marketing of livestock and livestock products (Sommerlatte/Umar 2000); most urban families retain close ties with their rural relatives. Livelihoods in Somali region are diverse but still dominated by livestock (Devereux 2006).

- An extensive diaspora provides significant financial support and a sense of connection to the wider world for even the most remote areas. An estimated one million Somalis send back an estimated one billion US dollars in remittances each year (Ahmed 2006).

In reviewing livestock mobility in Somaliland/Somali region we therefore need to consider both the seasonal movement of livestock for grazing and water and the movement of stock through the marketing system.
With regard to the first: there are four main seasons in both Somaliland and Somali region (Fig. 1), although with localised differences.

**Fig 1: Somalia seasonal timeline**
Source: FSAU
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Somaliland has three distinct zones (Fig. 2) – the hot coastal belt (Guban), the highlands (Ogo), and the plateau (Haud) which extends across the Ethiopian border.\(^1\) Although there are variations in localised patterns of movement, the broad trend is for livestock to move south and west onto the Haud/into Ethiopia in the summer wet season (April-July) and north during the dry winter season (January-March). Pastoralists on the Guban, where there are permanent wells, tend to be more sedentary than those further south.\(^2\)

![Somaliland Topographical Zones](image)

The direction of livestock movement in the vast Somali region is more varied. In the past, the pattern was for pastoralists in the eastern part of the region to use dry-season wells in Somaliland and return to Ethiopia for wet-season grazing. Similarly,\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Pastoralists themselves use the term *haud* to mean the thick bushy grazing areas favoured by camels, within the larger area generally termed ‘Haud’ by others. Bushy *haud* is distinguished from open plain, or *banaan* (Sugule/Walker 1998).

\(^2\) The names given to people from different parts of Somaliland capture the pattern of their movement. *Guban* pastoralists are called *Jilba Lab* (‘those with the folded knees’) by incoming herders, because of their limited movement. Pastoralists from Galbeed, further south, are called *Qatow-Qatow*, meaning ‘those who dart from place to place haphazardly’ (Sommerlatte/Umar 2000). Pastoralists in Laaye confirmed that movement northwards was easier than movement south and west, because there were fewer obstacles (such as enclosures) and easier relations with groups in that area.
Degodia pastoralists from the Liban zone in the south-west of the region once moved as far as Wajir in northern Kenya. But these long-distance cross-border movements, facilitated by reciprocal arrangements between clans, are rarer now than in the past (see section 2).

With regard to mobility and the livestock trade, livestock are channelled through a series of clearly defined routes in the general direction of the Somali ports (Berbera, Bossaso and Mogadishu) and the Kenyan market (Fig. 3). There is little movement towards Ethiopia’s domestic markets, partly because of differences in taste: Ethiopian highlanders are said to prefer highland breeds, while Somali meat is more popular in the Gulf States (Devereux 2006). Each of these trading routes is associated with a different clan. Traders using ‘their’ corridor benefit from the protection of their clan, but they cannot easily switch to another route when problems arise (Umar/Baulch 2007). Trucks are commonly used in Somaliland to move small stock; larger animals are still trekked, although vehicles are increasingly being used for these as well.\footnote{Trekking is still more common in the southern part of Somalia. Terra Nuova has used GIS in livestock collars to track livestock being trekked from south Somalia to the markets in Kenya, as a way of identifying critical control points for future interventions (such as vaccination).} The routes are two-directional: traders bring foodstuffs and consumer goods on the return journey. A more detailed map of Somalia’s livestock marketing system is contained in Annex 2.

**Fig 3: Map of trading routes in Somali region** [source: Umar/Baulch 2007, p28]
The changing nature of livestock mobility in Somaliland and Somali region

The general trend over the past half-century is that livestock mobility has been progressively shrinking. Somali herders once moved their animals distances of up to 600km; the maximum range today is closer to 50-100km (Fre et al 2002). Where in the past movements commonly lasted over 20 gedis, the norm is now just one. The reasons for this are complex and inter-connected, but can perhaps be clustered around four main themes:

1. A ‘changing relationship between pastoralists and the land’ (Hagmann 2006), and specifically a gradual trend towards more sedentary livelihoods in both Somaliland and Somali region.
2. Changing gender and generational aspirations.
3. The impact of war, conflict and exile.
4. The institutional environment.

Each of these four affect the two types of mobility – seasonal transhumance and trading movements – to a greater or lesser degree.

2.1 Pastoralists and land

Settlements and water points
In the 19th century the only towns in Somaliland were those on the coast, such as Zeila and Berbera. Hargeisa, on the highland plateau, was a later development, emerging in the 1890s at about the same time as Nairobi (there were close links between British settlers in Kenya and Hargeisa). There were still very few settlements in Somaliland or Somali region during the first half of the 20th century, but during the second half they increased significantly. The key grazing area of the Haud, for example, once lacked permanent water. It was grazed only in the wet season, when it generated abundant pasture that was well suited to camels.

In the late 1950s a Somali returning from Egypt introduced the concept of the berkad, which is an underground cement-lined water storage tank. The first was built on the Haud in Gudubi, in the south of Somaliland’s Togdheer region. There are now an estimated 7000 berkads in the Haud, although not all of them are operational (Ahmed et al 2001). The explosion of permanent water points means that the Haud is now grazed all year round, leaving no space for regeneration. Settlements have sprung up around the water points: the average distance between villages is now less than 20km in any direction (APD 2006a).

The maps in Figs. 4 and 5 illustrate the expansion of water points and settlements in the area of Somali region that borders Somaliland. Box 1 describes the distinct patterns of dry season and wet season grazing that used to prevail. Half a century ago the strip of land along the border had no water points; today, Gashamo district alone has 126 clusters of berkads, with between 50 and several hundred berkads in each cluster (Sugule/Walker 1998).

---

4 Longer movements, particularly for camels, still take place at times of prolonged drought.
5 Gedi is a staging point during pastoralists’ movement.
Fig 4: [source: Sugule/Walker 1998]

Map 4: Dry Season Well Points 1960

Fig 5: [source: Sugule/Walker 1998]

Map 5: Water Points 1998

Box 1:

‘Previously, stock were watered in the dry season from the wells in Bulale, Geladi, Warder and its environs, or those in Somalia such as Burco, Oodweyne, and Hargeysa. The areas that could be grazed in the dry season were therefore constrained by the need of stock to return to these wells for water at periodic intervals… Generally, stock would be grazed as close to the wells as good fodder could be found. In most dry years, family herding units would split in the dry season. The nomadic hut would be positioned close to the wells with women and children looking after the shoats and a few milking camels. The bulk of the camel herd would spread out far from the wells with boys and young men.

In the wet season, livestock would spread out far from the wells in search of fresh pasture (cusub) in areas that had not been grazed in the dry season. At this time the camels and shoats would often come back together and be grazed in the same locality. Camels and shoats in green grazing (doog) do not need to be watered. This meant stock could be grazed at long distances from the wells. When the green grazing began to dry, they would water from standing water collected at natural pans…

[As the heart of the dry season approached, livestock would resume watering from the wells and grazing closer to these. This meant that, to an extent, there existed identifiable areas for grazing in the dry season separate from the wet season.’

[Source: Sugule/Walker 1998]

Land use practices

The colonial administration in Somaliland demarcated grazing from agricultural land in a line originally located 10km south of Hargeisa and stretching 150km both east and west. Over time, and with growing demand for farm land, the boundary was extended to 20-25km south. Today it has no meaning. In the past there were also three livestock corridors which facilitated the north-south movement of animals between the highland plateau and the coast through the agricultural areas around
Hargeisa: one ran close to the town (the ‘camel road’), one west of it and the third east. Government provided veterinary support along these corridors, such as dips to manage ticks. Again, these are no longer in use.

Similarly in Somali region the ‘boundary’ between agricultural and livestock production has shifted. Some Somalis, such as those in the west of Harshin district, learned ox-ploughing from neighbouring Oromo groups early in the 20th century. Pastoralists in Harshin began to enclose land towards the end of the 1980s to protect it from agricultural encroachment. Even so, the dividing line between areas of agricultural and livestock production has gradually moved further east (Hagmann 2006). In Somali region as a whole an estimated 417,000 hectares of prime rangeland have been converted to rain-fed and irrigated agriculture over the last 60 years (Gebru et al 2006).

Somaliland also has a history of managed grazing reserves. Under both the colonial and Siad Barre administrations areas of land were closed off during the wet season and opened during the dry. Governments paid local people incentives to manage these. While there were many positive environmental benefits, some of the reserves were situated too close to growing urban centres; many current conflicts have their roots in competition over land carved out of these reserves (APD 2006a). Some civil society organisations have been trying to resurrect the practice (see section 3), with mixed results.

**Enclosures**

A more arbitrary and individualised form of enclosure is growing fast in both Somaliland and Somali region. The fencing of grazing land is a relatively recent phenomenon. In Aware district of Somali region it started in the late 1980s, mostly by cattle keepers involved in fodder production (Sugule/Walker 1998). Traditionally, people have the right to enclose land in the area controlled by their clan unless the clan forbids it, but elders now seem unable to control the spread of enclosures. Those which are removed are often re-built (see section 3).

Land is being fenced for two main reasons: for the resources it provides both people and animals, and for buttressing claims to permanent political control. With respect to the first of these reasons, parcels of land of around 5-10 hectares are being fenced for a range of motives, including by pastoralists themselves:

- As a source of income, to sell fodder to other pastoralists in the dry season or to merchants involved in the livestock export trade, or to sell/rent trees to charcoal producers.
- To practice rain-fed agriculture, such as sorghum and *khat*, and particularly by those without livestock. This was a common choice of returnees after the war.
- To manage livestock during the dry season in a way that minimises the damage caused by extensive migration (such as using wood for livestock pens).6
- To facilitate settlement near towns and thus take advantage of labour, income, and service opportunities, such as supplying the urban milk market.
- To safeguard rangeland from abuse by other groups. Some pastoralists in Somali region, for example, are fencing land to prevent trees from being cut for charcoal.
- From fear of losing out, as more and more land is taken.

6 This unusual justification was given to the VetAid country co-ordinator in Somaliland by a group of pastoralists.
In some cases land is enclosed but not used. In other cases it is claimed but not physically demarcated – a practice likened by one research study informant to ‘mental enclosures’ (Hagmann 2006 p109).

Urban-based business interests also enclose land. One emerging trend in Somaliland is likely to shift further the ownership of livestock from pastoralists to the urban elite. Those in towns have always had livestock looked after by their relatives, but in a hands-off way. Now they are starting to take more of a direct interest in the management of livestock, on land which they have enclosed for that purpose.

A significant driver behind enclosure is charcoal production. This is a long-standing practice in Somali areas but previously only for domestic purposes using dead trees; culturally, charcoal production was regarded as a last resort for destitute pastoralists (Oumer 2007). Several factors have caused a rapid increase in production: the refugee influx in the late 1980s (see section 2.3), successive bans on the export of live animals by the Gulf States (in 1998 and 2000) which drove people to seek alternative sources of income, and rising demand as urban populations and sedentarisation both grow. The main traders are businessmen from Somaliland who organise production in rural areas of Somaliland/Somali region through charcoal co-operatives, which provide labour and their clan’s forest resources. A large part of this production is then exported to Djibouti and the Gulf States, although Somaliland’s urban centres consume over two million bags each year (APD 2006).

The ease of cross-border movement makes the business accessible to many people. The Ministry of Pastoral Development and Environment in Somaliland issues licences to charcoal traders; of around 170 licence holders, 40 have cross-border operations (Oumer 2007). Oxfam GB estimates that ten trucks with charcoal leave one district in Somali region (Harshin) each day. A Presidential Task Force charged with drafting policies for the energy sector believes that Somaliland’s forest cover has reduced by two-thirds, from 24m trees in 1960 to 8m today. The charcoal trade is a growing source of conflict and damage to the environment, reducing forage and enclosing/degrading rangeland.

With respect to the second incentive behind enclosures, i.e. political control, there is evidence of clans using settlements and enclosures in both Somaliland and Somali region to extend their control over grazing and to substantiate their demands to create new administrative areas. Some authors highlight in particular the impact of Ethiopia’s policy of ‘ethnic federalism’ and decentralisation, and the way in which these new local resources encourage the politicisation of clan identities (Kefele 2006). The number of districts in Somali region has risen from 41 in 1995 to 53 in 2005 (Hagmann 2006); new kebeles (the smallest administrative unit) are also being created.7 One way of securing political or administrative control is through the occupation of land. Territory has always been controlled by different clans, but in the past these boundaries were negotiable; reciprocal agreements between clans facilitated access to grazing across clan boundaries as circumstances required. Today, the association between clan and territory appears to be becoming much tighter and borders more fixed.8

---

7 Hagmann notes that there is no map showing the correct administrative boundaries for Somali region.
8 Similar processes are evident in Somali-speaking areas of north-east Kenya (Walker/Omar 2002).
The result of all the above is that pastoralists are more closely identified than they were in the past with a smaller area of land, and move livestock over much shorter distances. Box 2 contains some anecdotal examples of the impact of the changes discussed in this section.

**Box 2**

**Anecdotal impact of increases in settlements and water points**

A family from Dhibibo village in the Guban area of Sheikh district spent five days returning to their village from the Ogo, but was unable in all that time to find a secure place to rest on the journey due to the number of enclosures in the area.

Source: Ahmed et al 2001

‘In the dry season the sheep and goats used to drink at intervals of 12 days and everyone knew how to make 100 barrels of water for his household last for three months. Nowadays we are consuming a whole berkad because the interval has been reduced to four days.’

Pastoralist workshop participant, cited in Gaani 2005

‘[P]astoralists from Allebadey District… on the Ethiopian side of the border can no longer seek water and pasture for their livestock in Gabiley, Arabsiyo and neighbouring vicinities in Somaliland because of the proliferation of fences and farms in the area. Violent clashes here are common.’

Source: APD 2006a

‘In the past, there were many places where you could take your animals without going so far away. There were fewer people so there was a lot of space. The other problem today is that some people are fencing off land so there is less space to roam with animals. No people used to do that before. People are fencing off land because they want to burn it and use it for charcoal burning. This is also making it difficult to find land easily for animals.’

Source: Devereux 2006 p98

### 2.2 Gender and generational change

The trend towards more sedentary livelihoods is also being driven by changing values and aspirations within Somali society. Culturally, women’s mobility is more limited than that of men’s (Oumer et al). Even so, women dominate the domestic meat and milk marketing trade in Somaliland and are involved in the export of ghee to Yemen (Gaani 2005). Women in Somali region are active cross-border traders; they comment that business has none of the ‘stiff traditions’ found within livestock production and politics that exclude them (Umar/Baulch 2007).

Households within the pastoral system, however, are experiencing out-migration and a decline in available labour. This is partly a reflection of the changing aspirations of a younger generation. Women in Laaye, Somaliland, felt that girls were more reluctant to repeat the hard lives of their mothers and grandmothers and preferred a life in town. For younger men, activities such as charcoal burning provide a more immediate source of income than livestock. The widespread chewing of *khat* is also reducing male labour and placing more demands on women. Traditionally, women would not have managed camels, but it is now ‘not unusual’, in the words of one informant, to see this.
Some families compensate for the loss of male labour by shifting to small stock. Others hire replacement labour or adopt a more sedentary life. Household labour is declining at the same time as the household herd is proving unable to support the family’s needs (Candlelight 2005), either because household size is increasing or because families need more animals than they did in the past to sell for commodities and food. As one elderly informant remarked: ‘Before, a pastoralist used to assess his livestock by how many of them are about to breed; now it is how many of them can be sold’ (Ahmed et al 2001, p.26).

A conversation with members of a pastoral association in Laaye village, south-west Somaliland, illustrates several of the points made in these two sections (Box 3). The map they drew of the contemporary limits of their movement is reproduced in Fig. 6.

Fig 6: Laaye pastoral association, mobility map

Box 3: Laaye pastoral association

“Before, the area was open range. There was no settlement between Gabiley in the north and Allabaday on the Ethiopian border. We were free to move; there were no obstacles.

The whole family moved, children and old people as well. Now some of the family stay behind in the village. In the dry seasons we have to pay for water: we have spent 650,000 Somaliland shillings on water tankering in the past four months (> £100).

Livestock used to move much further than they do now. Before, we would go as far as Jigiiga in Ethiopia. Now, the furthest we go in Ethiopia is Harshin, for grazing and the livestock market.

My grandfather had 100 camels and 400 shoats. People were more productive then – there was no chewing of khat. Today we have fewer animals but more families.

In the future I can see only more limits and more boundaries. Girls don’t want to stay here living this life.

In the past we never even thought about these issues we’ve been discussing today: in fact, we would never have had such a discussion.”

Khadra Fahiye Ali (Laaye Pastoral Association Chair), Ali Mohomed Dhamal (Vice Chair), Hassen Ismail Mohamed (teacher and community health worker), and Abdi Mohamed Dhamal (member), Laaye pastoral association, 13 March 2008

---

9 The pessimistic tone of the comments may reflect the fact that the conversation took place at the end of the dry season after a difficult year.
2.3 War, conflict and exile

The Somalia/Ethiopia border area has been affected by conflict for many decades. The colonial partition of Africa left the Somali people divided across five states (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somaliland, Somalia and Kenya). Colonial borders cut through rangelands and separated dry from wet season grazing areas. This did not necessarily impede pastoralists’ movement: in a treaty signed in 1924 the British and Italians tried (unsuccessfully) to prevent migration across the border. Even today, more than 95% of regional trade in livestock in eastern Africa is carried out through unofficial channels (Little 2007).

However, the partition gave rise to an irredentist movement for the unification of Somali territories. Its strength has waxed and waned since Somalia’s independence, but it was a factor behind the 1977-78 Ogaden war, during which close to one million Ethiopian Somalis crossed into Somalia. Ten years later approximately 500,000 refugees from Somalia crossed into Ethiopia, driven out by Siad Barre’s massive retaliation against armed uprisings. In 1991 refugees began returning in both directions after the major towns in the north of Somalia were recaptured by the Somali National Movement and Siad Barre fell from office.

While Somaliland has succeeded in building comparative peace and stability, Somali region remains unstable and under the tight control of the Ethiopian state; almost all federal government employees in the region are either military troops or customs officials (Hagmann 2006). The Ethiopian government attempts periodic border closures with the aim of clamping down on what it regards as ‘contraband’. In 2002 and again in 2005 foreign-registered vehicles were banned, livestock and commodities confiscated and markets destroyed (Devereux 2006). In May 2007 the Ethiopian National Defence Force began a new counter-insurgency campaign against the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF). The US State Department reported restrictions on trade and mobility caused by the military operation and by ONLF landmines (US DOS 2007); Human Rights Watch documented acts of extra-judicial killing, arbitrary detention and torture, confiscation of livestock, denial of access to wells and grazing, and barriers to trade (Human Rights Watch 2007). Five districts have been affected: Degahbur, Korahe, Warder, Fig and Gode. Natural gas deposits in Somali region, said to be among the largest in the world, are further fuelling the instability (Devereux 2006).

Localised inter-clan conflicts are also affected by tensions across the international boundary and by the changes in land use discussed in section 2.1 (particularly the growth of enclosures). Whatever the source of conflict, it affects livestock mobility in several ways:

- **Loss of access** to grazing, farmland, water points and livestock corridors.

  Research in Somali region in 2005 found that conflict had prevented 23% of households from accessing farmland or grazing and 15% from accessing water points (Devereux 2006). Access may be lost in a direct way, through open

---

10 Legally, all cross-border trade made without a Letter of Credit issued by the national bank of Ethiopia is considered contraband. Most small-scale traders cannot meet this requirement. The lack of an official banking system in Somalia is a further impediment to formal recognition of cross-border trade. Hostilities between Ethiopia and Somalia prevent the formalisation of trade relationships (Hagmann 2006, Umar/Baulch 2007).

11 These percentages do not reflect experiences from the most conflict-affected parts of the region, which the researchers were unable to access.
conflict or physical damage to infrastructure such as water points, or it may be lost indirectly from fear of moving into certain areas. During the civil war in Somaliland in the late 1980s pastoralists confined themselves to certain areas, particularly those close to the Haud, to distance themselves from a hostile state (Candlelight 2005).

- **Breakdown of resource management systems.** In Ga’an Libah in Somaliland, for example, the institutions that once managed this protected area broke down with the arrival of so many internally displaced people. Conversely, hostilities left the coastal belt thinly populated during the war, which contributed to its environmental recovery (Candlelight 2005).

- **Changing social values.** One informant argued that with the end of the war and the declaration of independence by Somaliland in 1991, people began returning to the places where they were born and with which they had a sense of identification. Investing in fixed assets such as fencing and berkads was a way of reinforcing that sense of belonging and their claim to a particular piece of land. The experience of exile had other effects: some boys missed the opportunity of learning livestock management skills while living as refugees; some returnees opted to settle in towns having become used to a more sedentary life; others took up farming in the wetter areas on their return because they had no livestock, or dug berkads or started charcoal burning as a way of earning income (Sugule/Walker 1998).

The factors discussed in previous sections, such as the expansion of enclosures and the changes in patterns of land use, are fuelling conflict and at the same time undermining the capacity of customary institutions to manage it.

### 2.4 Institutional environment

Many of the trends discussed so far apply in general terms to both Somaliland and Somali region. However, the policies and actions of the Somaliland and Ethiopian governments are sufficiently distinct that they need addressing separately.

**Somaliland**

Previous administrations in Somalia pursued anti-pastoralist strategies similar to those of other governments in the region. Investment by the colonial administration was weighted towards the peasant and urban sectors of the economy (Hussein 2005). The post-independence Siad Barre administration maintained a bias towards crop production and ‘modernisation’, and political power shifted decisively to an urban-based bureaucratic elite centred on Mogadishu (Hussein 2005, Jimcaale 2005). The 1974 Law on Cooperative Development alienated some of the best grazing land and higher potential watershed areas. The cooperatives themselves became dominated by their wealthier members, squeezing out smaller livestock owners; the motive behind them was also suspected to be one of domestication and settlement. The Land Reform Act of the following year further advantaged non-local individuals, as those close to the government were more easily able to secure leases and enclose areas of grazing.

The current administration in Hargeisa is more sympathetic to pastoralism but is very weak. The following challenges undermine its ability to determine and deliver a clear sense of direction for mobile pastoralism in Somaliland.
Ministerial responsibilities overlap and are poorly coordinated. Responsibility for natural resources falls under five different ministries or departments: the Ministry of Pastoral Development and Environment (MoPDE), Ministry of Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Mineral Resources and Water, and the National Environment Research and Disaster Preparedness Authority (NERAD). MoPDE, for example, is charged with issuing permits for berkad construction, but new water points are endorsed by the Ministry of Mineral Resources and Water without MoPDE’s knowledge. The proliferation of ministries reflects in part a desire to ensure clan representation across the political system. State institutions are themselves not above clan politics, since their officials are clan members whose actions are not necessarily neutral (APD 2007).

Even if clear policies were in place, the government has insufficient capacity to implement and enforce them. Enclosures are officially banned under the Agricultural Land Ownership Law, for example, but the state is unable to enforce this (APD 2007). The Environment Conservation and Protection Act entitles MoPDE to issue licences to charcoal producers but too many have been given (APD 2006a). Lack of funds is one factor. The (unrecognised) government has few resources at its disposal, other than taxation on the livestock export trade. MoPDE, a key ministry, has only 110 staff. Salaries have declined in real terms: a senior government official in 2001 earned 1/15th of the value of his salary in 1993. In common with other countries, competition from the NGO sector attracts staff away from the government system.

The land rights of pastoralists are not secured within the legal system. Under the Somaliland constitution, all land is the common property of the nation, controlled and administered by the government (Article 12.1). Urban land falls under the Urban Land Planning Law (Law No. 17/2001) and agricultural land falls under the Agricultural Land Ownership Law (Law No. 8/99); no separate law governs pastoral land (APD 2007). In the absence of a clear policy, pastoral land is in practice still governed by customary law, although customary institutions are proving unable to deal with the new challenges they face.12

Ethiopia
The policy direction of the Ethiopian state remains broadly hostile towards lowland mobile pastoralism. The federal government’s 2002 policy statement advocates the transformation of pastoralism to an agro-pastoral/urban existence through voluntary sedentarisation along river banks. The geo-political dynamics of the region generate additional difficulties for Somali pastoralists in particular.

A particularly strong example of the government’s hostility towards mobility is its treatment of the cross-border livestock trade. Cross-border trade is still regarded as illicit. Excess bureaucracy acts as a disincentive to participation in the formal trading system; exporters reportedly need to visit at least 12 offices to process export documentation (Aklilu 2002). The Ethiopian Customs Authority and the army are empowered to confiscate any property being traded illegally (Umar/Baulch 2007); harassment of traders is common (Devereux 2006, Umar/Baulch 2007). Livestock are

---

12 A draft land law has been developed but is yet to go before parliament.
more heavily taxed than any other export commodity (MoARD 2005). Repeated taxes are charged at every district or zonal boundary crossed, and yet this still confers no legality on the trade (Umar/Baulch 2007). The lack of a supportive institutional environment is illustrated by the different levels of revenue earned each year from the livestock sector in different countries of the region: Sudan earns around $150m, Somalia $100m, but Ethiopia only $20m.

2.5 Conclusion: impact on livestock mobility and livelihoods
A combination of factors - the commercialisation of natural resources (fodder, water and firewood), out-migration from rural areas, land alienation, intensification of water development, and inter-clan conflict - has resulted in a pastoral system in Somaliland and Somali region that is more sedentarised than in the past, with livestock kept closer to settlements and watering points. The long-distance migrations of previous generations are unusual today. At the same time, a sophisticated marketing system successfully moves large numbers of animals to domestic and export outlets with little support from either government. Traders spread their risks by working in groups and by relying on the protection of their clan.

Restrictions on mobility have a direct impact on livelihoods. During the 2004 drought in Ethiopia the deaths of livestock in large numbers in Gashamo district was attributed to the immobility of the lifestyle; many of the villages which had sprung up were subsequently abandoned (Devereux 2006). Pastoralists who depend on berkads (which are usually privately owned) and who lack access to wells are particularly vulnerable when they dry up; they are then forced to purchase water at high cost from tankers. Areas grazed all year round have little chance to recover. Official obstruction of cross-border trade affects the rural economy as a whole.

Customary mechanisms for managing mobility are in turn undermined by the expansion of agro-pastoralism and the multiplication of water points and enclosures. Ineffective traditional institutions plus an ineffective/inappropriate response by the state creates a management vacuum. When all of this is placed in the context of a changing climate the outlook is not an optimistic one. There are no detailed climate models for Somalia although a drier future is predicted (Barrow et al 2007). Anecdotal information from respondents in Somaliland confirms that where once there were two distinct wet seasons in the year, which provided regular rainfall over the whole country, the rain is now patchy, intermittent and brief.
3 Actors involved in the promotion of livestock mobility

Somaliland

When Somaliland declared its independence in 1991, following years of conflict and instability, the priority for both government and civil society was the re-establishment of security and the rule of law. This was achieved through a series of clan conferences, which are credited with establishing the ‘hybrid’ state that is Somaliland today – i.e. one which combines some of the qualities of a modern participatory democracy with customary systems of governance and reconciliation.

During the same period, and for the same reason, most development agencies concentrated on supporting the process of return and rehabilitation. While this is largely held to have been successful, and involved some innovative work by young, dynamic returnees working with organisations such as HAVOYOCO, it resulted in a distribution of assistance that was skewed towards the more densely populated parts of the country – i.e. those closer to the Ethiopian border and to Somaliland’s major towns. These are also the areas most closely identified with the country’s dominant Isaaq clans.

Serious attention to pastoral livelihoods was relatively neglected until the late 1990s. Even now, most NGOs are still focused on urban and settled populations. Some organisations have been taking positive steps to support pastoral livelihoods (Table 1), but the promotion of livestock mobility per se rarely appears to be an explicit objective of their work.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy for Peace &amp; Development (APD)</td>
<td>Local NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC World Service Trust</td>
<td>International trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candelight</td>
<td>Local NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU) Somalia/FAO</td>
<td>International agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German AgroAction</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn of Africa Voluntary Youth Committee (HAVOYOCO)</td>
<td>Local/regional NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral and Environmental Network in the Horn of Africa (PENHA)</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral associations and village committees (various)</td>
<td>Community-based organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland Pastoral Forum (SOLPAF)</td>
<td>National NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nuova</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VetAid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xaqsoor</td>
<td>Local NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, several of these organisations are implementing activities which may have an indirect impact on mobility. These include work to re-introduce grazing reserves, remove enclosures, raise awareness on environmental issues, support the livestock trade, and research the current state of pastoralism in Somaliland.

---

13 Horn of Africa Voluntary Youth Committee.
a) Re-introducing grazing reserves
Grazing reserves were common during the colonial and immediate post-colonial administrations. Candlelight first experimented with re-introducing the idea in the Dulcad plain south of Burao (Box 4). The idea was then taken up by Penha, and is also favoured by government and livestock specialists in Somaliland. Regeneration in Dulcad was dramatic after only a short time, but when the reserve was re-opened too many livestock moved in, reversing the gains that had been made. One of the main lessons from this work is that grazing reserves will only be effective if managed on a wider canvas and implemented in different areas simultaneously.

Box 4: Rehabilitation of Dulcad Communal Range Reserve
The Dulcad Plain lies 65km south-west of Burao on the Haud plateau. It used to provide excellent grazing – in the words of one elder, it was ‘like a park, rich with different kinds of vegetation, grass as tall as a ten year old boy, and teeming with wildlife’. However, the proliferation of berkads disrupted the traditional cycle of grazing movements. When combined with the increase in numbers of people and animals, the result was serious over-grazing and degradation.

With the support of Candlelight, a local NGO, the three villages surrounding the plain organised a committee of 18 elders to manage the range reserve project. 46 men from the same villages were hired to carry out environmental rehabilitation activities (such as water diversion earth bunds) and to act as guards. The management committee drew up rules and regulations for managing the reserve, which covered animals found grazing in the reserve without permission, damage to the boundary, charcoal burning and game hunting.

The plain was closed at the start of the Deyr rains in October 2002. Within a few months there were encouraging signs of recovery; many species not seen for several years had reappeared, and birds and wildlife had returned.

The plain was re-opened in February of the following year, but was then used not just by neighbouring pastoralists but by those from up to 40-50km away. It was the middle of the dry season, and pasture in most other areas was exhausted. Conditions within the reserve quickly deteriorated. ‘[O]ne of the most important recommendations of the project is the need for the replication of similar activities in other plains, as a means of reducing [the] grazing burden on one location.’

Source: Killeh/Awale, 2003

b) Removing enclosures/awareness-raising on environmental issues
Several NGOs have worked with elders to remove enclosures, such as Xaqsoor in Oodweine (March 2005) and in Borama (January 2006). With support from Candlelight the community near Ga’an libah has begun policing the environment against new enclosures and charcoal burners. However, these efforts have not always proved sustainable: in one place enclosures were burnt three times and three times re-built.

NGOs such as Candlelight, HAVOYOCO, German AgroAction, CARE Somaliland and Xaqsoor are carrying out a variety of other environmental protection programmes, including awareness-raising of the impact of charcoal production and improving soil and water conservation.
c) Supporting the livestock export trade

Somaliland is highly dependent on revenue from livestock exports. On average it exports between 1.2m and 1.4m small stock each year but to very few markets. Successive bans by Gulf States on the export of live animals demonstrated the vulnerability of Somaliland’s export trade. Fig. 7 shows the fall in exports after the bans in 1998 and 2000. The government in Somaliland has recently rehabilitated some of the marketing infrastructure in Berbera, including the holding grounds, marshalling yards and laboratory, and has trained staff. It has other plans to rehabilitate holding grounds near Hargeisa and Burao. But it has made slow progress in securing a formal lifting of the ban; the ban is still technically in place on the part of Saudi Arabia but in practice being circumvented (animals are reaching Saudi through Yemen and the United Arab Emirates).

Fig. 7: Livestock exports from Berbera and Bosasso, 1994-2004 [source: Devereux 2006 p.58]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Camels</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terra Nuova is supporting the Somaliland Chamber of Commerce to disseminate livestock marketing information. The BBC’s Somali Livestock Project has been doing the same, using radio to reach herders with information not just about prices, but about emerging market opportunities, competitor profiles and business advice. Other agencies such as VetAid prefer to emphasise the importance of supporting livestock productivity.

e) Research

The Academy for Peace and Development in Hargeisa has carried out research on land-based conflict and on decentralisation. FAO’s Food Security Analysis Unit produces information on livestock movements as part of its regular food security bulletins.

---

14 The impact of the ban was felt across the region. Prices of livestock in Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia fell by around 30% after the 2000 ban (Umar/Baulch 2007). In Harshin district of Ethiopia the price of small stock in 2003 was as low as 60-150 Ethiopian birr, whereas in the 1980s sheep and goats could fetch up to twice that amount (Hagmann 2006).
Other activities by agencies interested in pastoral development include capacity building with government departments and pastoral institutions, although none of this appears to be motivated by any explicit reference to livestock mobility in particular. A new national network, the Somaliland Pastoral Forum, was registered as a national NGO in April 2007 and may be a useful vehicle through which to pursue pastoralists’ concerns.

Issues to address
Lessons from the experiences outlined above suggest that the following issues need attention.

1. There is no overarching framework to guide the future direction of pastoralism in Somaliland. There also appears to be no consensus on whether current trends can or should be reversed. Different actors have different views on what the future will look like – for example, whether pastoralism will inevitably become more individualised and intensive, and therefore whether investment should concentrate on maximising vertical rather than horizontal output. Without this consensus, it is hard to be clear what the future role of livestock mobility within pastoral systems should be.

2. The absence of a national pastoral development strategy and a government equipped to ensure its implementation also means that there is no mechanism to mediate between the interests of competing investors. Moreover, interventions to protect mobility are primarily taking place at the local level, by relatively small agencies and community groups. While these may have very positive benefits in themselves, they affect, and are affected by, interventions (or the lack of them) elsewhere. Larger-scale solutions are required if initiatives such as grazing reserves and enclosure removal are to have long-term beneficial results.

3. Livestock mobility is affected by a range of inter-connected issues. Social change (between genders and generations) seems to be particularly significant in Somaliland at present, and to be generating a level of pessimism about the future of pastoralism which, again, a clearer sense of national direction might help to challenge.

Somali region
There was less opportunity in the course of this review to develop a definitive picture of what agencies are doing in Somali region, but the following information was gathered. It should be noted that several Somaliland-based NGOs are active in Somali region, which is easy to reach from Hargeisa.

a) Support for cross-border livestock marketing
The aim of FAO’s Examination and Certification of Livestock for Export (EXCELLEX) Project was to facilitate cross-border livestock movements between Ethiopia, Somaliland & Puntland and between Ethiopia and Djibouti through an agreed certification system. An agreement was reached under which traders would pay part of the transaction in foreign currency. A customs post was established on the border in Togwachale, and the Commercial Bank in Jigjiga was authorised to provide foreign exchange services and to issue export permits for cattle and camel
being exported via Togwachale and Berbera. (Small stock are more problematic to process through such a system because they cross the border at different points without detection.) More than US$4m was transacted through the Commercial Bank in Jigjiga using this system. However, the project ended before agreements could be finalised with Djibouti (Aklilu 2006).

Some NGOs are also supporting cross-border trade, particularly involving women. By 2005 five registered cooperatives supported by Oxfam GB in Harshin had supplied 2320 pieces of hide and 180 shoats to Hargeisa market (Oumer et al). Two-thirds of their members are women. At first they operated through a local broker, but after a visit to Hargeisa and Berbera they now organise the marketing themselves. Animals are mostly trucked at night to avoid harassment. The cooperatives bid successfully to supply a restocking programme, and have also repaid loans from USAID’s Pastoral Livelihoods Initiative. Oxfam’s support has been in the form of training, facilitation of their visit to Somaliland’s markets, and organisational development (they are planning to register a district-level cooperative). [Source: Beruk Yemane]

b) Strengthening natural resource management
Several NGOs are supporting natural resource management activities in Somali region, including the rehabilitation of dry season grazing, water development in areas where rangeland is currently inaccessible, and erosion control. Such documentation as exists, for example from Hope for the Horn, makes almost no reference to livestock mobility. There was insufficient time to secure documents from PCAE.

c) Research
The Pastoral Communications Initiative has supported a series of research studies in Somali region into livelihoods, vulnerability, and cross-border trade. The conclusions from these studies have informed section 2 above (Devereux 2006, Umar/Baulch 2007).

Issues to address
At the end of his research in Somali region, Devereux argues that flexibility and mobility are key to pastoralists’ ability to cope with risk, and that that ability to cope is therefore undermined by constraints on mobility of all kinds (economic and social as well as physical mobility).

In Somali region, the priority issues to address in order to enhance the physical mobility of pastoralists would seem to include:

- Stronger government action to address external threats, such as the periodic livestock bans.
- Stronger institutions at the local level which have the authority and capacity to deal effectively with the various barriers to mobility and negotiate between competing resource users.
- A resolution to the conflict between the Ethiopian government and the ONLF.
- A more supportive institutional framework for cross-border livestock marketing.
4 Relevant experiences elsewhere in Ethiopia

The main constraints on livestock mobility in Ethiopia as a whole include the following (source: Gebru et al 2006):

- **Loss of rangeland to other forms of land use.** Approximately 2m hectares of rangeland have been converted to agricultural land in Afar, Somali, Oromia, SNNPR, Gambella and Benshangul regions (see Fig. 8). Nearly 500,000 hectares have been converted to wildlife parks in Afar, SNNPR and Gambella regions. 75% of the 5.5m hectares of land demarcated for wildlife reserves are in pastoral regions. The sugar cane plantation in Logiya, Afar, has taken 60,000 hectares of grazing.

- **Encroachment of unwanted species.** An estimated 25-30,000 hectares of land in Afar have been invaded by *prosopis julifora*, which squeezes out other plants and cannot easily be passed by livestock.

- **Land enclosures.** The traditional enclosures (*kollo*) for calves in Boran, for example, are increasingly being privatised or managed for the exclusive use of individual (mostly wealthy) households.

- **Conflict.** Over 75,000 hectares of prime rangeland on the Alidege plain in Zone 3 of Afar region are not used because of conflict between Afar and Issa pastoralists. In general, however, Gebru et al argue that resource conflict is associated more with the rise of non-traditional land uses, especially farming in areas traditionally used for grazing/watering.

- **Weak customary institutions.** The institutions through which pastoralists have traditionally managed mobile livestock systems appear unable to deal with the challenges brought by new forms of land use.

Fig. 8: Administrative regions of Ethiopia [source: UN-OCHA]
Table 2 illustrates several of these issues from research in four woredas of Borana and Karrayu.

**Table 2 [source: Eyasu 2007 p.11]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study sites</th>
<th>Production scenarios and land rights concerns</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diid Yabello</td>
<td>Dominantly agro-pastoralist. Highly affected by ranches and expansion of farm plots.</td>
<td>Yabello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surupa</td>
<td>Commercial urban activities combined with farming. Highly affected by ranches and conflict with the Guji Oromos.</td>
<td>Yabello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachille</td>
<td>Pure pastoralist zone. Privatization through enclosure of communal rangelands is becoming a major cause of concern.</td>
<td>Dirre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbul</td>
<td>Agro-pastoralist zone. Affected by the expansion of private enclosures.</td>
<td>Liben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gidara</td>
<td>Dominantly pastoralist. Affected by sugar plantations (Nura Era farm).</td>
<td>Fentale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faate Leedi</td>
<td>Agro-pastoralist. Highly affected and displaced by the sugar factory and the Awash National Park.</td>
<td>Fentale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tututi</td>
<td>Agro-pastoralist. Land alienation by state farms, conflict with Argoba tribe and expansion of Lake Basaka.</td>
<td>Fentale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haro Qarsa</td>
<td>Pure pastoralist community. Seriously affected by the Awash National Park and conflict with the Argoba ethnic groups.</td>
<td>Fentale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banti Mogassa</td>
<td>Pure pastoralist system. Displacement due to the Awash National Park and conflict with the Afar.</td>
<td>Fentale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other informants in Ethiopia made the following points:

- Livestock mobility is becoming a key development issue in Ethiopia – described by one as the ‘blood vessel’ for pastoralists.
- The policy environment is undermining the effectiveness of traditional tenure arrangements – for example due to the bias towards other forms of land use, the lack of clear policy with respect to pastoral land rights, and confused responsibilities between institutions at the local level.
- Restrictions on mobility may have cultural as well as ecological/economic consequences. There are examples of pastoralists being denied access to important cultural sites in Borana, for example.
- Government regards mobility in a negative light, as something that drives conflict and that facilitates illegal trade. But rather than focusing on the challenges, it would be better tactically to emphasise the opportunities mobility presents, such as maintaining ecosystem balance, supporting livelihoods during drought, and promoting marketing, as well as the value attached to those outcomes.

The following organisations are involved in work to promote livestock mobility.

**a) Afar Regional Research Institute**

In October 2007 the Centre for World Food Studies in the Netherlands (SOW-VU) started a research project in collaboration with the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research and the Afar Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Research Institute. The aim of the project is to improve the drought resilience of pastoralists. A pilot project was started to track the migration routes of livestock. Herders carried Platform Transmitter
Terminals that sent real-time signals of their location to a central station in the Netherlands where satellite images were produced. After three months the project reportedly faced some technical problems, including permissions from the Ethiopian Telecommunications Corporation.

Further details:
Ahmed Seid, Director General Afar Regional Research Institute
Tel: 0911 877510 or 033 666 0434
http://www.sow.vu.nl/

b) Ethiopian Pastoralist Research and Development Association (EPaRDA)

EPaRDA emphasises the significance of conflict as a key constraint on livestock mobility in the South Omo area of Ethiopia and Turkana district of northern Kenya. EPaRDA highlights the absence of effective government in South Omo and the lack of peace-building and conflict management policies and strategies within the Ethiopian state apparatus as a whole. It also challenges resource scarcity arguments in driving conflict, arguing that there are many areas of grazing not used because of insecurity.

EPaRDA has been supporting peace-building and conflict resolution activities between Nyangatom and Dassanech pastoralists in South Omo and between pastoralists in South Omo and the Turkana in Kenya (the latter in collaboration with a Kenyan organisation called Riam-Riam). The project is managed by a joint coordination committee with governmental and non-governmental representatives from both Kenya and Ethiopia. Joint peace committees between conflicting groups meet every 30 days and organise patrols.

In July 2007 there were serious floods in South Omo and the Dassanech were evacuated. Over half of them are now living with the Turkana, which has never happened before. The rejuvenation of rangeland by the flooding presents an opportunity for a reciprocal arrangement in future, with the Dassanech hosting the Turkana. A recent mid-term review of the programme also pointed to improved relationships between pastoral groups within Ethiopia. The Hamar, Arbore and Boran now share the same dry-season grazing and markets: Hamar visit Borana’s Telttele market while Boran are seen in Arbore market. Inter-marriage has also started, while women are reportedly less afraid to travel further afield than in the past.

Further details:
Dr Zerihun Ambaye, Executive Director, EPaRDA
Tel: 0911 406652
Email: eparda@ethionet.et

c) FARM-Africa

Among FARM-Africa’s several rural livelihoods initiatives in Ethiopia is the Afar Prosopis Marketing Project. Its purpose is to help communities remove Prosopis infestations in a sustainable manner and secure markets for the charcoal they produce from the cleared trees. The project also supports livestock marketing by training marketing groups and strengthening their links with exporters.
Further details:
FARM-Africa Ethiopia
P.O. Box 5746, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 011 1552 684
Email: farm.epp@ethionet.et
http://www.farmafrica.org.uk/programme.cfm?programmeid=44&context=region&regionID=1

d) GTZ Borana Lowlands Pastoral Development Programme
Research by Sabine Homann and colleagues in two locations of Borana, carried out in co-operation with GTZ’s Borana Lowlands Pastoral Development Programme, used a combination of GPS/GIS technology and participatory methods to develop a spatial picture of the changing livelihoods of pastoralists. Groups of elders and herders were brought together to discuss changes in land use and mobility. They were also asked to comment on satellite images of the area. Local scouts then helped to measure land use areas with GPS equipment. This was supplemented by in-depth interviews with 60 heads of households.

The findings showed that permanent grazing had expanded; wet and dry season grazing was less differentiated than in the past; long-distance movements of herds were less frequent; and farmland and forage enclosures were expanding into communal rangelands, placing constraints on livestock mobility. As a result, many households can no longer survive from pastoralism alone. The process generated debate about what was driving change, and created a basis from which to discuss land use strategies with different stakeholders.

Further details:
http://ictupdate.cta.int/en/feature_articles/ethiopia_analyzing_the_patterns_of_herd_mobility
http://www.tropentag.de/2004/abstracts/links/Homann_sBHgNtKK.pdf
Homann/Rischowsky, 2005.

e) SOS Sahel Ethiopia
The Gender and Pastoralism Project in SOS Sahel Ethiopia is about to complete a literature review of livestock movements within the Bale Ecoregion on behalf of the Bale Ecoregion Sustainable Management Programme (BERSMP), which is being jointly implemented by SOS Sahel Ethiopia and FARM-Africa. Its aim is to establish a clear understanding of seasonal livestock movements and land-use changes over time.

The study focuses on the four woreda where the BERSMP is being implemented: Dello Mena, Harena Buluk, Goba and Nansebo. It identifies the following factors affecting livestock movements (SOS Sahel GAPP 2008):
- Land of land tenure security in pastoral areas and alienation of grazing lands.
- Agricultural biases on the part of planners.
- Expansion of settled agriculture.
- Expansion of large-scale mechanised farming, which has moved migration routes into higher altitude regions.
• Conflict between customary ownership rights and state policies, such as Peasant Association organisation and land redistribution.
• Establishment of the Bale Mountains National Park in 1970, covering an area of 2400km².

The BERSMP is also carrying out a programme of action research and GIS mapping into livestock mobility and land use practices. Trend analysis with communities explored seasonal influences on mobility, and illustrated people’s preferences for different sites; livelihood analysis illustrated the impact of changes in mobility and land use on wealth and poverty. The Lay Volunteers International Association (LVIA) will be digitising the maps. The BERSMP regards them as a potentially powerful tool which communities can use to engage with other stakeholders, but will be testing this assumption through impact assessment. The possibility of mapping on a larger landscape level is also under discussion.

Further details:
SOS Sahel Ethiopia
P.O. Box 3262, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 011 416 0391
Email: sos.sahel@ethionet.et

FARM-Africa Ethiopia
P.O. Box 5746, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 011 1552 684
Email: farm.epp@ethionet.et

f) Pastoral Elders Council, Oromia
The purpose of the Council is to lobby for pastoralists’ rights within Oromia and beyond. It was established after the 5th Ethiopian Pastoralist Day in 2003. The intention is to establish similar Councils in other regions once the lessons have been learned in Oromia.

Nura Dida, chair of the Council, attributed the decline in mobility in rangelands to the following:
• Land enclosures, either for opportunistic farming or to produce fodder for livestock. After community discussions people make promises to remove the enclosures but rarely do so.
• Government bias towards agriculture, with a significant extension service for farmers but none for pastoralists.
• Lack of agreed differentiation between grazing and farming areas.
The Council is not arguing against farming, but rather seeks to make people more aware of the implications and to find ways in which farming and pastoralism can co-exist.

g) Other ongoing research
• SOS Sahel Ethiopia is commissioning a study on livestock mobility among the Somali, Borana and Karrayu, to be completed within the next few months.
• Norwegian Peoples’ Aid has sponsored research by SOS Sahel Ethiopia, PCAE and the Pastoral Forum Ethiopia on pastoral land tenure in Somali, Borana and Karrayu areas. The preliminary findings have been published.
• A team led by Stephen Sandford has been commissioned to draft a pastoral land policy. The draft should be ready in April.
- The Oromia Pastoral Development Commission has commissioned a land use planning study with a view to informing a land use policy for pastoral areas.
- SOS Sahel Ethiopia’s gender and pastoralism project has explored range management and marketing issues in Somali, Afar and Oromia regions (Ridgewell/Flintan 2007, and Ridgewell et al 2007).
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## Annex 1: People met

### Somaliland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy for Peace and Development</td>
<td>Mohammed Abdi Omer, Safiya Osman Tani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC World Service Trust, Somali Livestock Project</td>
<td>Aden Dule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlelight for Health, Education and Environment</td>
<td>Ahmed Ibrahim Awale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Ahmed Hashi Oday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laaye Pastoral Association</td>
<td>Khadra Fahiye Ali (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Mohomed Dhamal (Vice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassen Ismail Mohomed (teacher/CHW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abdi Mohomed Dhamal (member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Livestock</td>
<td>Mohamed Ali Giire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penha</td>
<td>Saadia Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nuova</td>
<td>Ibrahim Omer Osman, George Matete,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Godiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VetAid</td>
<td>Hassan M. Ali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethiopia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Pastoral Research and Development Association (EPARDA)</td>
<td>Zerihun Ambaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for the Horn</td>
<td>Abdulkarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia Pastoral Development Commission</td>
<td>Feyisa Tafa, Debele Bechol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
<td>Beruk Yemane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Elders Council</td>
<td>Nura Dida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Communications Initiative (PCI)</td>
<td>Girma Kebede Kassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAE</td>
<td>Abdidaad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children USA</td>
<td>Adrian Cullis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS Sahel Ethiopia</td>
<td>Feyera Abdi, Dr Muktar, Fiona Flintan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Somali livestock marketing system
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