





# Constraints and Solutions to Increased Productivity in two Pastoral Communities of Moroto and Samburu

George Gitao<sup>1</sup>, Dagmar Schoder<sup>2</sup>, Peace Musiimenta<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The University of Nairobi, Dept. of Microbiology, Parasitology and Pathology, Kenya <sup>2</sup>Vetmed University Vienna, Inst. of Milk Hygiene, Austria <sup>3</sup>Makerere University, School of Women and Gender Studies, Uganda



## **INTRODUCTION**

In sub-Saharan Africa, pastoralism has evolved over many generations as the most efficient agricultural system as it involves movement of people and livestock in accordance with the shifting availability of water and pasture. The dry, pastoral lands of East Africa include 70% of the horn of Africa, more than 80% of Kenya and 60% of Uganda. While Kenya is home to 4 million (10% of the population) pastoralists, Uganda has 5.5 million (22%) pastoralists who are mainly dependent upon livestock (1).

#### **MAIN GAP**

The ability of many pastoralists to maintain a sustainable livelihood has been compromised through: (i) political and economic marginalization (inappropriate development policies and increased resource competition), (ii) climate change, and (iii) a fundamental misunderstanding of their social and economic value (2).

#### **AIM OF THE STUDY**

In the first phase of an APPEAR funded project ("Integration of social science in poverty eradication research among pastoralists by scientific researchers"), (i) the main challenges to pastoralist communities were defined, and (ii) upcoming livelihood activities and income sources were identified.

## PLACE OF INVESTIGATION – STUDY METHODS

The study was conducted between Dec 2015 and Jan 2016 in Moroto District, in the Karamajong region of Uganda and in Opiroi, in Samburu county, Kenya.

Focused group discussions (FGDs) were carried out with groups of between 20 and 40 participants. The semi-structured interview was the main tool and was guided by a checklist of open-ended theme questions (3). Finally, key informants interviews and transect walks were conducted with local administratives, opinion leaders and community mobilizers.

# **OUTCOME I- MAIN CHALLENGES**

FGDs and key informant interviews revealed that the main challenges to the pastoral communities were: (i) climate change (resulting in water shortages and soil erosion), (ii) livestock diseases, (iii) foreign interventions\*, (iv) cultural issues such as cattle rustling and dowry payment, (v) lack of reliable markets, and (vi) limited veterinary services.

The main six livestock diseases at both sites were foot and mouth disease, anaplasmosis, peste des petits ruminants, contagious caprine pleuropneumonia, lumpy skin disease and contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, in that order of priority.

Most of the foreign interventions in Karamajong have focused on coping strategies, without giving the people an opportunity to contribute creatively about their own plight and to initiate strategies. FGDs revealed that both men and women pastoralists have suffered from donor/government-dependency and fail to appreciate the interventions, which are unfortunately seen as 'theirs' rather than 'ours.'

## **OUTCOME 2 – OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING LIVELIHOODS**

The respondents saw future possibilities in the following activities:

- (i) more emphasis on camel and poultry farming instead of merely cattle
- (ii) vegetables production\*, especially during the rainy season
- (iii) honey production / beekeeping
- (iv) wildlife and cultural tourism
- (v) firewood and charcoal collection and sales\*, gold mining\*, providing unskilled labour\* (e.g. fetching water, brick laying, etc)
- \* Refers to Moroto region

### **OUTLOOK**

Based on these findings, the future perspective of the project is to design and implement development models that can substantially improve the livelihoods of pastoral communities.

# REFERENCES & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- (I) King, A. (2000). http://datacatalog.worldbank.org/
- (2) Oxfam (2008). Survival of the fittest, Oxfam Briefing Paper, 38
- (3) Schuman & Presser (1979). The Open and Closed Question. American Sociological Review. 44 (5): 692–712

  Project was funded by Appear ISPERAPS 2015: Prep 138 (5th Call)