

Rebuilding pastoralist livelihoods during and after conflict

William Avis

University of Birmingham

03 September 2018

Question

What are the impacts of different approaches to protecting and promoting / rebuilding pastoralist livelihoods during and after conflict?

Contents

1. Overview
2. Pastoralist livelihoods and conflict
3. Supporting pastoralist livelihoods in ongoing conflict
4. Minimum Standards for Sustainable Pastoral Development
5. References
6. Annex 1: Policy options

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Overview

The impacts of different approaches to protecting and promoting / rebuilding pastoralist livelihoods during and after conflict is mixed, complicated by the evolving nature of conflict (including its different forms), the range of pastoral groups operating across African contexts and the supra national nature of their activities. This rapid review synthesises findings from rigorous academic, practitioner, and policy references published in the past 10 years that discuss approaches to supporting pastoral livelihoods.

Pastoralists constitute circa 5% of the total population of some African countries and contribute between 10-44% of the Gross Domestic Product of those countries in which they operate. It is estimated that pastoralists contribute about 90% of the meat consumed in East Africa and close to 60% of the meat and milk products consumed in West Africa. Pastoralism thus plays a significant role across vast swathes of Africa and disruption to the livelihoods of groups involved may have a significant impact on the societies in which they operate.

According to a range of studies, a number of ongoing African conflicts (e.g. Central African Republic, Chad, Mali, north-eastern Kenya, Somalia and the Sudan) involve pastoralists. A variety of factors have been identified in the literature as driving conflict among pastoralists and between pastoralists and other land users (subsistence farmers and large-scale private farms etc.) as well as the state. Understanding the impact of conflict on pastoral communities is, however, fraught with challenges, involving shifting dynamics and a range of conflict types. A typology of these is provided by De Haan et al., (De Haan et al., 2014).

Table 1: Typology of conflicts, their defining features, causes and consequences (Source: De Haan et al., 2014: 12)

Type of conflict	Key defining factors	Causes/drivers	Consequences
Localized conflicts over resource access	Demography, climate (drought)	Limited access to dry season grazing and water for livestock, crop damage by livestock	Can scale up to larger conflicts
Criminal activities	Level of risk and attractiveness of payments, social status	Poverty and inferior perspective of other sectors	Destabilize social cohesion in pastoral societies, upset management
Rebellion and irredentism	Strength of social cohesion in group, hierarchical structure	Neglect or repression by central authorities, combination of localized alliances and grievances	Disruption of central services (for example animal disease control), interruption of migratory husbandry practices by other groups
Religious extremism	Weakness of social cohesion, degree of infiltration of other extremist groups	Lack of livelihood prospects for future	Destruction of social services, accelerated trends in criminal activities

A number of efforts have been made to support pastoral communities, however, a recurrent criticism of existing policy interventions is that they are often poorly implemented, lack adequate funding, and are implemented by ill-equipped non-pastoral administrators. It is also difficult to disentangle targeted livelihoods interventions from broader programmes to support pastoral development including conflict, resilience, and development programmes. Indeed, the overarching insecurity of pastoral groups and their historic marginalisation entails that support must inherently tackle a number of crosscutting issues.

An emerging trend in regional and multilateral pastoral development policies is a shift from conventional approaches such as livestock development to pastoral development. The shift from livestock to pastoral development has also heralded a shift from national to regional pastoral resilience programmes, with the latter considered to be more sensitive to the regional nature of pastoralists' transboundary migratory patterns.

Whilst the economic potential of pastoralism and its contribution to national GDP has been identified in the literature, there exists a conflict between the promising economic opportunities offered by pastoralism and the prominence of insecurity and conflicts among pastoralists, between pastoralists and agriculturalists and between pastoralists and the State. Together, these characteristics point to the emergence of new pastoralists, who, on the one hand, retain certain elements of old pastoralism while at the same time take up new activities and have different livelihood patterns.

The lessons that emerge from this rapid literature review suggest that, in order to be successful in unstable environments, development initiatives (including livelihoods support) should be both stabilisation-oriented (providing better access to physical and livelihood security for populations) and conflict-sensitive. State-supported projects that combine development and overcome security measures for the population's benefit, if designed and implemented in a participatory fashion, can improve pastoralists' perception of the state as repressive. This is especially the case if these projects improve the access to security and justice, among other services, by populations as well as improve living conditions and offer sustainable income opportunities that are more secure.

Overarching the report is an emerging consensus amongst experts that poorly designed pastoral development interventions that do not fully take the drivers of conflict and violence into account can create more instability and exacerbate conflicts. Further to this, not all forms of development of pastoralism will induce stability, and developing pastoralism does not guarantee regional stability i.e. the action of some fringe pastoralists. However, if the objectives of stabilisation and conflict prevention are well integrated into the support of the pastoralist economy, evidence shows that this can contribute to lower levels of insecurity and help foster peace.

2. Pastoralist livelihoods and conflict

Pastoralists constitute circa 5% of the total population of some African countries, in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel, they comprise between 10-20% of the total population (UNECA, 2017). It is estimated that pastoralists are active across 40% of the total landmass of Africa and contribute between 10-44% of the Gross Domestic Product of some African countries (see table 2). The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) estimates that 1.3 billion people benefit from the livestock value chain (ILRI, 2013). It is estimated that pastoralists contribute about 90% of the meat consumed in East Africa and close to 60% of the meat and milk products consumed in

West Africa. Pastoralism thus plays a significant role across vast swathes of Africa and disruption to the livelihoods of groups involved may have a significant impact on the societies in which they operate.

Table 2: Gross domestic product at current market price, agricultural contribution to gross domestic product (per cent) and livestock contribution to agricultural gross domestic product (2014) (Source: UNECA, 2017: 8)

Country	GDP (USD)	Agriculture contribution to GDP (%)	Livestock contribution to agricultural GDP (%)
1 Benin	9 575 356 735	23.5	41.6
2 Burkina Faso	12 542 221 942	34.5	55.5
3 Chad	13 922 224 561	52.6	44.0
4 Djibouti	1 589 026 158	3.0	90.0
5 Eritrea	2 607 739 837	11.7	25.0
6 Ethiopia	55 612 228 234	41.9	36.4
7 Kenya	60 936 509 778	30.3	43.0
8 Mali	12 037 229 619	39.5	30.0
9 Mauritania	5 061 180 371	22.8	53.0
10 Niger	8 168 695 870	36.7	33.0
11 Nigeria	568 508 262 378	20.2	10.0
12 Senegal	15 657 551 477	15.8	30.0
13 Somalia	5 707 000 000	60.2	40.0
14 South Sudan	13 282 084 042	36.0	60.0
15 The Sudan	73 814 947 341	29.2	60.0
16 Uganda	26 998 477 289	27.2	14.4
Total	884 434 868 534	27.0	38.8

UN OCHA (2015) comment that there is growing consensus that pastoralism is uniquely well adapted to the environments in which it is practiced. As an economic and social system, it is considered to operate effectively in low and highly variable rainfall conditions, managing the complex relationship between man and the natural environment. Economists working on pastoralism in sub-Saharan Africa have also found that livestock production is an engine for trade, farming, tourism and urban activities (UN OCHA, 2015: 5).

Whilst acknowledging the significant contribution of pastoralism to national economies, it is important to note that the majority of pastoralists operate in arid and semiarid land and make their living in environments characterised by climatic variability and precipitation unpredictability. These conditions of recurrent droughts result in crop failure, mass herd decimation, food insecurity, hunger and famines (UNECA, 2017). In most countries, pastoral populations are a minority and are located in the periphery zones and areas that are difficult to access, often leading to disenfranchisement and poor integration with the rest of the country. Further to this, pastoralist livelihoods are often undermined by persistent or sporadic conflict with a range of groups including other pastoralists, farmers, commercial interests and the state etc. (De Haan et al., 2014).

Drivers of conflict

According to a range of studies (Mkutu, 2016; AU/IBAR, 2011; De Haan et al., 2014), a number of ongoing African conflicts (e.g. Central African Republic, Chad, Mali, north-eastern Kenya, Somalia and the Sudan) involve pastoralists. A variety of factors have been identified in the literature as driving conflict among pastoralists and between pastoralists and other land users (subsistence farmers and large-scale private farms etc.) as well as the state. Table 3 provides an overview of different factors that are considered to drive conflict.

Table 3: Factors driving pastoralist society into conflict and violence Security, Economic, and Political Stresses (De Haan et al., 2014: 10)

Stresses	Internal	External
Security	Legacies of violence and trauma	Invasion, occupation; External support for domestic rebels; Cross-border conflict spill overs; Transnational terrorism; International criminal networks
Economic	Low income levels, low opportunity cost of rebellion; Youth unemployment; Natural resource wealth; Severe corruption; Rapid urbanisation	Price shocks; Climate change
Political	Ethnic, religious, or regional competition; Real or perceived discrimination; Human rights abuses	Perceived global inequity and injustice in the treatment of ethnic or religious groups

Whilst these broad factors are important in contextualising conflict, UNECA (2017) comments that at least six factors distinguish present conflicts from those of the past:

1. Although the wars have been triggered by national questions ranging from inequitable development, marginalisation and exclusion to self-determination, they have not only assumed a regional dimension but also have been internationalised;
2. The internationalisation and trans-nationalisation of the conflicts between pastoralists and the State have contributed to the creation of global solidarity networks, which have become part of or are supported by transnational jihadist and global justice movement activists;
3. The new wars in pastoral regions are multifaceted; these wars take place at the local level over scarce or at least unpredictable resources, at the national level between States and pastoralists who are struggling for the right of self-determination or autonomy, at the regional level as proxy wars pitching neighbouring States against each other, and at the transnational level as expressions of transnational jihad movements;
4. The sources of financing for the rebel or liberation movements are equally diverse, including extortion, animal theft, diaspora support and illicit activities, such as kidnapping for ransom and drug and human trafficking;
5. Unlike previous State-pastoralist conflicts, the leadership of the current movements are vying to not only bring about an alternative national political order but are also contributing to transnational jihadist movements that have originated in other parts of the globe, with the objective to change the global order;
6. Pastoral areas in the Sahel, the Horn of Africa and Southern Africa (Kalahari Desert and Namib Desert) have become the focus of large-scale land concessions and important hubs for the production of minerals, gas and oil. Pastoralists' resistance to State control and their quest for self-determination, autonomy and a fairer share of the wealth of their land is unparalleled in recent history.

Conflict in pastoral regions is thus multifaceted, often triggered by local or national issues ranging from inequitable development, marginalisation and exclusion to self-determination, thus also

assume regional and international dimensions. Land alienation, encroachment on rangeland for urban expansion, agriculture, oil, gas and mineral prospecting exacerbate challenges to pastoralists' way of life that may influence conflicts among pastoralists, between pastoralists and farmers, and between pastoralists and entities awarded large-scale land concessions (UNECA, 2017). The State is often a party to conflicts in pastoral areas, where pastoralists are forcibly evicted or denied access to grazing land.

Conflicts at all levels are exacerbated by the proliferation of small arms resulting from macro-level conflicts, which leads to increased banditry and makes commercial raids more viable. Small arms also enable smaller groups of raiders to act regardless of community disapproval of raids; weakened community sanctions on cattle theft; and environmental degradation and unpredictability (African Union, 2010). Violent conflict is often cited as having a fundamental effect on human and economic development. Pastoralists' reliance on mobility makes them particularly vulnerable to conflict and fear of conflict, which can cut off their access to key resources and block them from important markets (UN OCHA, 2015).

Table 2: Factors that restrain or accelerate violent conflict (Source: De Haan et al., 2014)

Factors	Restraining transformation of conflicts into violence	Accelerating transformation of conflicts into violence
Cultural	Fatalism, pacifist attitude, common language (Hausa), traditional chief authority	Despair, avenging historical injustices
Social	Community life in the village—space sharing, cooperation, women's dialogue, and intercommunity exchanges.	Increasing presence of firearms; contradictory and arbitrary conflict-resolution structures, either traditional or governmental
Economic	Convergence and complementarity of production strategies (agricultural, pastoral)	Demographic growth, declining agricultural and pastoral productivity
Political	Democracy; emergence of political representatives, associations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that defend the interests of pastoralists	Examples set by rebellions that gained political power through violence (Tuareg, Toubou); tyranny by the sedentary majority without protection for minorities; faulty decentralization of political power, when it outpowers the leaders of breeders' associations; radicalization risk of political representatives, associations, and NGOs that defend the interests of pastoralists

Impact of conflict on pastoralist livelihoods

According to RECONCILE/FAO (2012), past conflicts involving pastoralists were traditionally quite straightforward in terms of their causes and manifestations. They were localised both in terms of the protagonists and their overall impact. It was thus possible to resolve them using community mechanisms. RECONCILE/FAO (2012) note that current conflicts are more complex

in their causes and impacts and may involve a range of actors, some of them situated long distances away from the locations of conflict.

Conflicts result in insecurity that undermines the fabric of the society. They contribute to a breakdown in societal values, undermine coping mechanisms thereby engendering general economic decline. Food insecurity and lack of essential amenities are also created by conflict. Conflicts also contribute to degradation of the rangelands as mobility is constrained and the institutions that traditionally ensure their sustainable use are rendered ineffective. De Haan et al, (2014) summarise the impact of conflicts across three dimensions.

Economic dynamics and conflict: In contexts where conflict may undermine existing pastoral livelihoods, individuals or groups may be attracted by the lure of criminal activities or extremist behaviour. According to De Haan et al., (2014) this is largely dependent on how attractive and secure pastoral livelihoods are at present and in the future. RECONCILE/FA (2012) note that the collapse of coping mechanisms occasioned by persistent conflict undermines local and national economies. To survive after the loss of livelihoods triggered by the breakdown of coping mechanisms, people resort to detrimental undertakings including the sale of assets, destruction and vandalising of infrastructure, while able bodied members of society migrate to urban centres in search of menial jobs.

Concomitantly, pastoralists may also be viewed as attractive recruits by organised criminal organisations due to their knowledge and control of roads that enable illegal trade (De Haan et al., 2014). IUCN (2012) comment that, if pastoralism is to be attractive, the current inequity and vulnerability of poor and young pastoralists need to be addressed. This includes the provision of alternative sources of income to compete with the illicit sources.

Given the proliferation of arms in many contexts, moves into illicit activities may be considered a profitable option for poverty stricken groups. De Haan et al., (2014) comment that there are some indications that armed groups emerge from the poorer pastoralist groups; however, the rich may also support illegal gangs because they are disappointed with the central government and its broken promises.

Development interventions must take into account the specific needs of populations forcibly displaced by drought or conflict. Forced displacement as a result of conflict affects approximately 1.1 million people in the Sahel alone, a large portion of them pastoralists. Loss of mobility and placement into camps creates heightened vulnerability and poverty as livelihood opportunities are limited and the ability of pastoralists to retain their livestock is undermined (Schrepfer and Caterina 2014). Special efforts are needed to support the return of pastoralists to original settlements or, if this is not possible, to help them to maintain their pastoral life and economy, which might mean interventions that help them to reconstitute their herds.

Resource access dynamics and conflict: Traditional natural resource access rules in pastoral areas are rapidly changing, prompted by and in some instances exacerbating or encouraging new conflicts. According to De Haan et al. (2014) and UN OCHA (2015) these relations have been historically based on a symbiotic relationship between the crop farmers, who benefited from organic fertiliser and traction animals, and the pastoralists, who profited from the crop residues, feed, and barter of their products for grains.

As conflict has encouraged the securitisation of many border areas, alongside the commercialisation and gazetting of land by certain interests. The ability of pastoralists to move and access resources has become more difficult. This has led to significant changes in livelihood

approaches of both pastoralists and the communities with which they engage. In the past decade the most valuable pastoral lands have become subject to large-scale agricultural investment, resulting in the loss or fragmentation of rangelands, induced sedentarisation of pastoralists, and a radical reduction in livestock numbers (Galaty, 2013: 152).

As elucidated by De Haan et al., (2014) crop farmers increasingly invest in livestock, whereas pastoralists are taking up cropping because their herd sizes have fallen below the minimum to sustain their households. The symbiotic relationship between crop farmers and pastoralists therefore disappears. At the same time, both groups are losing land to expanding agribusiness and real estate development leading to increasing competition for access to water and dry season grazing, marked by outbursts of violence.

Alongside these local conflicts exist an array of national and transnational tensions that impact on pastoral livelihoods. While there is dispute over how related these local conflicts are to the broader instability, some local resource conflicts have scaled up to larger conflicts and even contributed to already existing rebellions. Similarly, droughts and insecurity have led to highly volatile emigration streams and massive cross-border dislocations, with subsequent resource access conflicts and even war. Population growth in crop-farming ethnicities is faster than in the pastoral ethnicities, and expansion of agribusiness and urban development is expected to continue, pushing crop farmers into pastoral areas, where livestock is an essential complement to crop-farming, reducing the mobility of pastoral herds and limiting the availability of land for grazing. This increases the likelihood of resource access-related conflicts and, coupled with other security threats, could lead to further local conflicts mutating or merging with other types of conflict and violence (De Haan, et al., 2014).

The sustainable use of pastoral rangelands depends in large measure on mobility, which allows for rotational use of wet and dry season grazing areas. Mobility is the first and major casualty of conflict as the resulting insecurity forces the community to concentrate livestock within a fraction of its former territory. Loss of access to grazing land and water sources puts the pastoral system under pressure and gradually reduces its self-sufficiency. This means that the land use system is no longer able to respond to ecological and climatic variability resulting in ecological degradation.

Land alienation, referred to by the African Union as land division and encroachment on rangelands, is considered both a factor causing conflict and one of the main Impacts. Land alienation particular ferments further animosity among pastoralists, between pastoralists and farmers and between pastoralists and entities awarded large-scale concessions for minerals, gas, oil or agricultural production (Elias & Abdi, 2010).

Social and political dynamics and conflict: The collapse of pastoralist livelihoods, in part attributed to conflict by RECONCILE/FAO (2012), leads to large out-migration and displacement of communities, leading to destitution, idleness, abuse of substances e.g. alcohol and khat (miraa), particularly among the youth. Such youth - already disgruntled by other challenges like unemployment - are a potential reservoir for violence that can be exploited by conflict entrepreneurs.

A number of social and political drivers lead young pastoralists in particular to join illicit or extremist groups, although inclusive schemes and programs to prevent pastoralists' vulnerability to violent and criminal activities may be part of the answer. As noted by UNECA (2017) conflict has encouraged pastoralists to reinvent old and centuries-tested knowledge and capabilities shaped by mobility and resistance to the authority of the modern state.

The often communal nature of conflicts also mean that they may further perpetuate polarisation of affected communities, undermine social networks and historical links and create trans-generational animosities that undermine opportunities for development for the concerned communities while also jeopardising national integration and economy. According to RECONCILE/FAO (2012), the resulting insecurity engenders loss of opportunities for the concerned communities as resources that could be used to improve economic and social opportunities are directed at security and peace building operations, while potential partners for development are discouraged from investing in the communities.

Finally, strained relationships between pastoralists and the State pose serious economic and political security issues for the countries of the Horn of Africa and the Sahel. Due to their regular mobility and remoteness from government authority, pastoralists are increasingly implicated in international crime networks (human trafficking, drugs, illegal migration and transnational jihadist and religious extremist groups), with serious negative implications not only for their safety but also for the economies of their countries (UNECA, 2017). According to UNECA (2017) among this 'new' or 'fringe' pastoralism, young people have joined jihadist organisations with connections to transnational extremist groups, and others have become part of illicit activities, such as drugs and human trafficking, contraband trade and the kidnapping of tourists.

New or fringe pastoralism

Whilst the economic potential of pastoralism and its contribution to the GDP of a number of nations has been identified in the literature (De Haan et al, 2014), UNECA (2017) note that there is conflict between the promising economic opportunities and the prominence of insecurity and conflicts among pastoralists, between pastoralists and agriculturalists and between pastoralists and the State. Together, these characteristics point to the emergence of new pastoralists, who have, on the one hand, retained certain elements of old pastoralism while at the same time taken up new activities and have different livelihood patterns.

Although it is not free from challenges, which include conflict, insecurity, drought and now new fringe pastoralism, pastoralism as a whole has large transformative potential, meaning there is need for a positive narrative on pastoralism or a paradigm shift in order to harness this potential. New approaches could involve strengthening skills, technology, markets and links to value chains, and investments so that pastoralists can benefit from emerging trends. An obvious solution that, according to Yemeru (cited in UNECA, 2017), is not taken seriously is to focus on the integration of pastoralists into national, regional and international value chains — this is happening spontaneously, but should be supported through specific policies and strategies.

According to UNECA (2017) the current policy responses to new pastoralism have treated it either as a matter of law and order or as an effort to counter national terrorism as part of the war on terror. Dialogue and a much deeper understanding of the sociocultural and political dynamics that have propelled the new pastoralists into this course of action are needed. Under the circumstances, the policy responses do not seem to be working, and an increasing rift is growing between the State and society in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa.

3. Supporting pastoralist livelihoods in ongoing conflict

It is broadly understood that livelihood strategies encompass what people do, such as agriculture and wage labour (Schafer, 2002), and what they have, including their natural (land, forest

products, water), physical (livestock, shelter, tools, materials), social (extended family and other social networks), financial (income, credit, investments) and human assets (education, skills, health). According to Collinson (2003), political status, which may be added as a sixth asset, can be understood as proximity to power, such as representation in local institutions and connections to structures of power such as political authorities and armed actors. People's livelihoods are also determined by the wider governance environment: the policies, institutions and processes that determine access to and control over assets.

Accordingly, Collinson (2003) continues that livelihoods approaches in conflict have links with protection. This means that an analysis of power and politics is essential for livelihoods approaches in conflict, and a protection analysis could assist with this. This latter point is particularly pertinent for any discussion of support for pastoral livelihoods.

In recent years, African regional organisations have been proactive in developing policies aimed at protecting the rights of pastoral peoples. The African Union Commission and United Nations Office for Humanitarian Affairs initiated discussions in 2007 with a view to developing a framework to facilitate the development and implementation of pastoral policies that could contribute to securing and protecting the livelihoods and rights of pastoral peoples. These discussions culminated in the development of the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa. The framework contains guiding and cross-cutting principles. The two objectives of the framework are:

- to secure and protect the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoral peoples and ensure continent-wide commitment to political, social and economic development of pastoral communities and pastoral areas;
- to reinforce the contribution of pastoral livestock to national, regional and continent-wide economies.

The policy framework recognises the development-conflict nexus in African pastoral areas emphasising that: "the key principles of this initiative were in line with, and contributed to, the strategic pillars of the Commission, namely promotion of peace and security, cooperation, partnership and development, shared vision and institutional capacity strengthening." The policy framework was the first effort of its kind to promulgate a pan-African pastoral policy, with the African Union urging its member States to integrate pastoral development into their national development policies.

More recently, a greater awareness for the issues affecting the pastoralists has emerged. The N'Djamena Declaration (2013) on the contribution of pastoral livestock to the security and development of the Saharo-Sahelian region recognises the critical role pastoralists play in maintaining stability¹, as does the Nouakchott Declaration (2013)². The N'Djamena Declaration recognises the link between policy failure, poverty, vulnerability and conflict among pastoralists.

An emerging trend in regional and multilateral pastoral development policies is a shift from conventional approaches such as livestock development to pastoral development. The pastoral resilience programmes in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel – which involves, national

¹ https://www.pasto-secu-ndjamena.org/classified/N_Djamena_Declaration_eng.pdf

² <http://www.rr-africa.oie.int/docspdf/en/2013/NOUAKCHOTT.pdf>

Governments, the World Bank, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) – are testimonies to this new trend. The shift from livestock to pastoral development has also heralded a shift from national to regional pastoral resilience programmes, with the latter being more sensitive to the regional nature of pastoralists' transboundary migratory patterns.

This includes the adoption of pastoral codes that guarantee mobility and access rights to resources. Enhancing resource access and mobility will reduce conflicts, and in particular their escalation to a wider level. Several countries have passed various pastoral codes that define the rights of the pastoralists, including Mauritania (2000), Mali (2001), Burkina Faso (2003), and Niger (2010) (Toutain et al. 2012, 47).

There is also an increasing move toward decentralisation that, if done in a way sensitive to the pastoral population's needs, could work positively. Across all of these international and national initiatives, a recurrent criticism is that they are often poorly implemented, lack adequate funding, and are implemented by ill-equipped non-pastoral administrators (De Haan et al., 2014).

More critically, attempts to support pastoral livelihoods during and after conflict are often undermined by a number of contextual factors (De Haan et al., 2014).

- Pastoral ethnicities are a minority in many African countries and suffer from political marginalisation.
- There is an increasing lack of clarity in the geographical and administrative mandates of formal and traditional governance systems leading to overlapping and competing conflict-resolution outcomes and exacerbating marginalisation.
- There is evidence of corruption and public official's participation in illicit activities which undermines legitimacy.
- The historically strong social cohesion and hierarchical structure within certain communities is eroding with greater exposure to the outside world, especially among the youth. The archaic lineage model is impaired—the younger generation feels much less morally and socially indebted to the older ones. Because they are often deprived of education, or have access only to schooling systems that are ill-adapted to their needs, the young join traffickers or religious radicals who promise unprecedented opportunities for them.

The continuation of current trends will further politically marginalise pastoralists and form a fertile recruitment basis for illicit activities.

Coping strategies

As noted above, there has been a continuous evolution of pastoralist livelihoods in response to insecurity, conflict and climate variability. Whilst some groups have opted to adopt illicit activities to augment livelihoods, others have adapted in other ways. According to RECONCILE/FAO (2012) examples of coping strategies of pastoralists drawn from Kisima Hamsini/Kom areas include:

1. A deliberate shift from keeping cattle and sheep to rearing camels and goats. The latter adapt better to drought.

2. Increasing commercialisation of pastoralism. This involves keeping and fattening a few animals and later selling them at much higher profits than they would otherwise fetch while still roaming. Pastoralist Women for Health and Education (PWH&E) and Pastoralist Resource Management and Advocacy Programme (PREMAP) are among organisations spearheading this innovation in Isiolo district.
3. Educated and relatively wealthy people are migrating to trading and urban centres and adopting new livelihoods and income generating activities in trade and services. While this may be good for the individuals, it is detrimental to the communities left behind as it robs them of the necessary and required capacities to facilitate development in the area.
4. Wildlife conservancies are increasingly catching up as a coping strategy, spearheaded by the Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT). So far, the Trust has facilitated the establishment of seven conservancies in the region.

Such coping strategies may provide insights into how pastoral livelihoods interventions can support diversification.

Interventions

According to Watakila (2015) development agencies are active in supporting communities to develop strategies for coping better with conflict. This includes support to livelihood diversification, training on rehabilitation and maintenance of water points, improvement of feed supply through the harvesting, processing, treatment and conservation of locally available feed resources, improving management and use of natural resources, livestock marketing, and strengthening traditional range management systems.

Such interventions are often based on an assumption that there needs to be greater resource access and mobility, which would reduce conflicts and cap their escalation (De Haan et al, 2014). The recent (since the late 1990s) introduction of pastoral codes is considered a positive development, but according to De Haan et al (2014), such interventions are often technocratic and poorly or incompletely implemented. Features of cross cutting interventions that have shown positive results include the following elements.

- **Institutions of collective action (pastoral associations)** can play a useful role in amplifying pastoralists' voices and increasing their inclusion in the national policy debates, and hence reducing participation in illegal activities. Regional or national pastoral associations have had some success although domination by elites may reduce their effectiveness. These associations can provide a successful framework for enhanced service delivery, e.g. veterinary and pastoral water services. A good example of an integrated service has been the combination of contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) and child vaccination campaigns in Chad, which increased vaccination coverage of young pastoralists and reduced costs (Weibel, Schelling & Zinsstag, n.d.). Pastoral associations have been less successful in supporting the introduction of improved range management and sustainable operation of water infrastructure.
- The establishment of **more appropriate services**, if done in an inclusive and conflict-sensitive manner, can also directly enhance stability and therefore livelihoods. Of these, education is considered a critical component. A combination of mobile, radio, and boarding school models could be tested to overcome the constraints of mobility, child labour, parental illiteracy, and religious opposition. Innovative solutions must also be found to deliver adequate animal and human health services to highly dispersed

populations. Basic animal health care systems that use para-veterinarians and community animal health workers have generally provided good results if they are supported by the public sector and not seen to be in competition with it (Niang 2004).

- The establishment of **mechanisms and incentives to adapt livestock numbers** to the “boom and bust” pastoral economy is important to avoid pastoralists becoming food aid dependent. Whilst some local market development might be needed, but generally the traditional sector is considered quite efficient; it is preferable to avoid strong public sector involvement. The public sector (including the regional centres) should play a bigger role to support stratification³ of livestock production with higher potential zones, as well as to establish mechanisms and incentives for early destocking and restocking⁴ (De Haan et al., 2014).
- Another indirect influence on stability and therefore livelihoods is **food aid**. If incorrectly designed or implemented, food aid can suppress local production and distort livestock prices and food markets. If poorly delivered, for example, if the aid ends up on the black market or benefits the wealthy, it can cause discontent and contribute to conflict. However, acute and severe food insecurity can also diminish the resources available to armed groups.

The lessons that emerge from these experiences are that, in order to be successful in unstable environments, development initiatives (including livelihoods support) should be both stabilisation oriented (providing better access to physical and livelihood security for populations) and conflict sensitive. State-supported projects that combine development and overcome security measures for the population’s benefit, if designed and implemented in a participatory fashion, can improve pastoralists’ perception of the state as repressive, especially if these projects truly improve the access to security and justice, among other services, by populations as well as their living conditions and offer sustainable income opportunities that are more secure than trafficking.

Furthermore, and important for the long terms support of pastoral communities, ensuring participation and inclusion of pastoralists in local political governance mechanisms and in deciding what kind of interventions are needed in their areas is key to building trust with the state. Initiatives should take into account some of the good principles of pastoral development so that they are adapted to the local context and sensitive to the needs of the population, including but not limited to enhancing mobility, preserving cultural heritage and traditional institutions that are recognised as useful by the majority of pastoralists, and strengthening education, healthcare, access to justice/ conflict resolution mechanisms, and other services (IUCN, 2012).

In essence, the current prevalence of integrated regional pastoral development programmes shows that policymakers have come acknowledged the transboundary nature of pastoral

³ Stratification concerns the livestock production system, whereby the males (the feeder animals) are raised in the Sahel to a relatively young age (2.5-4 years), and then sold to out-grower farmers in the higher potential areas (the better endowed savannas), where they will be fed (“finished”) on good feed. The better feeding at the end of the lifecycle increases the quality of the meat, and hence its grade. With an increasing per capita income in SSA and more discerning consumers, it is argued that this system, which has had a mixed performance in the past, now has a chance to succeed.

⁴ Early destocking concerns a set of incentives (transport and slaughter subsidies) to make it attractive for traders to purchase weakened stock from remote herders at the onset of a drought. When a drought sets in, prices drop sharply, and remote herders have difficulty selling their stock. Offering transport incentives to traders can result in better access, and also encourage the more remote herders to sell their weakened animals.

production. Such interventions also acknowledge that skewed pastoral development policies are among the major factors fuelling conflicts that have plagued pastoral areas in the Horn of Africa and in the Sahel (De Haan et al., 2014).

4. Minimum Standards for Sustainable Pastoral Development

To support an array of actors develop policies that are cognisant of the unique challenges faced by pastoralists, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, 2012: 28-30) has developed a set of guidelines to improve decision making for policies and investments that impact on pastoralists and their environments. These guidelines encourage the development of country strategies that recognise and support pastoralism. Guidelines include the following suggestions:

Develop country strategies that recognise and support pastoralism

1. Understand what pastoralism is and how varied it can be. Pastoralism is practiced in about 75% of the countries of the world, and even in industrialised countries pastoral groups are often disadvantaged due to their remoteness. Country strategies need to be developed in cognisance of the diverse pastoral groups found within and across national borders.
2. Understand the value of pastoralism, which is not only measured in the obvious products such as meat or milk, but includes other livestock goods (e.g. hides and fibre) and services (e.g. transport and manure), non-livestock goods (e.g. timber and non-timber forest products), important environmental services (e.g. water cycling and wildlife conservation) as well as social and cultural services.
3. Recognise that many of the most significant values of pastoralism (including milk and even meat) are poorly captured by market data since many transactions occur outside the market. Economic development should not be solely guided by market data in a context of widespread market failure and more appropriate methodologies should be used to gather data beyond that found in national accounts and surveys.
4. When considering options for the drylands, take into consideration resilience as a key feature of livelihoods and a primary development objective. In highly uncertain environments, producers maximise yield in good times and limit loss in bad times. Conservative attitudes of pastoralists to development often reflect the observed poor understanding by outsiders of a complex production objective. The mentioned logic applies to new technologies that seem compatible with pastoralism as well as to livelihood strategies that are still advocated as an alternative to pastoralism.
5. Based on a more complete economic valuation of pastoralism, recognise the opportunity costs of alternative land uses and the impact of promoting alternatives for non-pastoralists (including destitute former pastoralists) on pastoral production, and recognise that these costs are felt at the landscape scale. Each hectare of riparian pasture excluded from the pastoral system may imply many more hectares of non-riparian land that are rendered less productive in the overall system, and simple hectare per hectare comparison is inappropriate.

Avoid non-pastoral investments and policies that undermine pastoralism

1. Recognise that non-pastoral projects can impact heavily on pastoralism, such as irrigation projects that reduce water flow to dry lowlands. Investment in crop cultivation at a national level often leads to distorting incentives in drylands to adopt less resilient livelihoods at the expense of pastoralism, leaving people in the drylands more vulnerable to drought whilst simultaneously undermining the resilience of pastoralism.
2. Do not abrogate responsibility for equitable rights in pastoral lands. In many developing countries, land tenure is weaker in pastoral systems and policy favours settled farmers. In this case, investments and policies supporting non-pastoral land use in either pastoral or in adjacent lands can lead to alienation of resources from pastoralists, and are likely to result in increased pastoral poverty and conflict.
3. Ensure balance in national consultations and planning, in recognition of the fact that pastoralists may be disadvantaged minorities and that other land users compete with pastoralists over land, water and other resources.
4. Understand that pastoralism is a multiple land use system and not simply a form of livestock production. The system can therefore be undermined by investments that compromise non-livestock incomes and natural resource use.
5. Integrate pastoralism in biodiversity conservation policies.

Place governance and rights, including those of minorities, at the centre of pastoralist development

1. Create and support multi-stakeholder fora to ensure inclusion of pastoralists and non-pastoral actors in local and national planning processes and to promote dialogue between these groups, and particularly between government and pastoralists. Multi-stakeholder fora should be constructed in cognisance of the fact that pastoral territories can be large and stakeholders may live far beyond district and even national boundaries.
2. Promote empowering approaches for development planning and develop capacity, particularly amongst local government, to understand the role of participatory approaches as an empowering process rather than an implementing convenience.
3. Ensure that empowerment includes all sectors within a society, going as far as ensuring that empowerment of marginal groups (especially women) forms the foundation of pastoralist development.
4. Ensure appropriate support for Civil Society, recognising the distinction between Civil Society Organisations and Non-Governmental Organisations.
5. Combine community empowerment with institutional accountability by building the capacity and willingness of government to endorse and support community empowerment.

Promote investments and policies that support pastoralism

1. Invest in pastoralism as a diverse land use strategy as opposed to exclusively a livestock production system, with recognition of important complementary as well as alternative livelihood options.
2. Invest in pastoral livestock production based on the assumption that pastoralism is rational, and that it can be reinforced with appropriate technological and management adjustments, but cannot be sustainably substituted.
3. Address the fundamentally important question of land rights, ensuring that pastoral development is built upon greater security of access to and use of natural resources. In

many cases development must address more than just land rights and has to take into consideration the bundle of rights that pastoralists are denied if significant steps are to be made in sustainable development of pastoralism.

4. Invest in basic services, including education, infrastructure, and health. These investments may yield slow returns, but they are the surest way to guarantee sustainable development and poverty reduction in the long term. Basic services include markets, and the use of markets will be greatly improved through greater access to and uptake of financial services, including credit, savings and insurance.
5. Invest in local governance, in linking customary and statutory institutions, and in building local government capacity to govern more effectively in partnership with pastoralist communities.

In a similar vein, UNECA (2017: viii-ix) make the following recommendations.

1. Design and implement long-term pastoral development programmes with the aim to enable structural economic transformation, market access and diversification of sources of livelihood.
2. Develop country-specific, regional transboundary legal and administrative frameworks to ease restrictions on pastoral cross-border mobility for trade and exchange of pastoral products. Equally important is improving the pastoralists' resilience and coping mechanisms in order to respond to climate change and seasonal rainfall variability.
3. Take into account agriculture-livestock integration and plans for the future of pastoralists when formulating land policies. In general, policies tend to expand agriculture and other forms of production without doing this. In some cases, pastoralists have been denied access to traditional grazing land and pastures without being given access to alternative land or compensated for the land they lost.
4. Pastoralists should collaborate with local government authorities and community leaders to facilitate land ownership for pastoralists under customary land arrangements, and national land policies and legislation.
5. Land policies that are equitable and inclusive provide the necessary instruments for conflict prevention and political stability in pastoral areas and should be integrated into the policies designed for improving the pastoral economy, with the strategic aim of fostering peace and security.
6. Policymakers have recognized El Niño as a major environmental hazard leading to drought and floods that impair food and livelihood security in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa. Therefore, policies aimed at sustainable livelihood production should cover the predictable effects of El Niño on the population as a whole and pastoralists, in particular, in order to improve their coping strategies.
7. Governments, the private sector and international partners should increase and encourage investment in livestock production to facilitate the use of modern production techniques and marketing outlets.
8. Due to underrepresentation of pastoralists in national politics, Governments and political institutions (political parties and parliaments) should undertake deliberate efforts to increase the participation of pastoral communities in public life and their representation in Government and political institutions.
9. Regionally, pan-African and regional organizations, development partners and Governments should support and encourage pastoral development organizations in the

creation of country and transboundary networks capable of influencing national and regional pastoral development policies.

10. Governments, the private sector and international partners should support the development of sustainable water sources and grazing and pasture land to reduce the risks associated with future occurrences of drought and El Niño. It is only through sustainable sources of affordable animal feeds - both plant-based and manufactured - that pastoralists can secure sustainable livelihoods.
11. With the spread of education, pastoral associations and national and regional networks, building partnerships with relevant actors (particularly in research and extension services) are critical for the improvement of pastoral production technology and methods. Technologies and innovations emanating from agricultural research endeavours cannot be considered useful unless and until they are made available in usable forms to producers.
12. Support should be extended by Governments, the private sector and the international community for investment in meat and milk processing to meet the increasing demand of urban consumers for milk and milk products. For example, vast quantities of milk are currently wasted because of the limited processing capacity of producers, the poor cold chain systems and the very short shelf life of milk and dairy products. Behavioural change takes a long time, but it should not be neglected, when, for example, dairy production interventions are contemplated.
13. As the pastoral production techniques and methods used have, by and large, remained the traditional ones, many of which are out of step with current innovations suitable for small-scale production, it is vital that capacity development and training institutions be established with the aim of upgrading livestock production. A more pressing need is to train pastoralists and staff working in livestock extension services in modern pastoral production techniques and innovations.
14. Current African urban development policies need to be more cognizant of the presence of a large number of pastoralists around small and large urban settlements, providing cities with meat and dairy products. In many cases, pastoralists have found themselves displaced and dispossessed against their will.

5. References

African Union (2010). Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities. African Union.
https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/30240-doc-policy_framework_for_pastoralism.pdf

AU/IBAR (2011). Pastoralism and Conflict: Getting Policies Right. The African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources. <http://sites.tufts.edu/capeipst/files/2011/03/AU-IBAR-10-Eng.pdf>

Abbink, J. et al. (2014). Lands of the Future: transforming pastoral lands and livelihoods in eastern Africa. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
<https://www.eth.mpg.de/3214252/mpi-eth-working-paper-0154.pdf>

Collinson, S. (2003). Power, livelihoods and conflict: case studies in political economy analysis for humanitarian action. ODI. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/289.pdf>

- De Haan, C. et al. (2014). Pastoralism Development in the Sahel A Road to Stability? World Bank. http://cega.berkeley.edu/assets/miscellaneous_files/18-ABCA_-Pastoralism_and_stability_in_the_Sahel_master_-_Final_for_translation-_June_9_2014.pdf
- Elias, E. and Abdi, F. (2010). Putting Pastoralists on the Policy Agenda: Land Alienation in Southern Ethiopia. IIED. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/14599IIED.pdf>
- Galaty, J. (2013). The Collapsing Platform for Pastoralism: Land Sales and Land Loss in Kajiado County, Kenya. *Nomadic Peoples*, 17(2). <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/whp/nomp/2013/00000017/00000002/art00004>
- International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) (2013). Making visible the “invisible benefits” of African pastoralism will spur national and pastoral economies both. ILRI. <https://clippings.ilri.org/2013/06/24/making-visible-theinvisible-benefits-of-african-pastoralism-will-spur-national-and-pastoral-economiesboth/>.
- IUCN (2012). Supporting Sustainable Pastoral Livelihoods A Global Perspective on Minimum Standards and Good Practices. IUCN. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/manual_for_min_standards_low_resolution_may_2012.pdf
- Mkutu, K. (2016). Pastoralist Conflict, Governance and Small Arms in North Rift, North East Africa. Bradford University. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/46810305.pdf>
- Niang, A. (2004). Successful Privatization of Para-professional Services in Traditional Livestock Farming Systems in Senegal. *Revue Scientifique et Technique de l'Office International des Épizooties* 23 (1). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15200108>
- RECONCILE/FAO (2012). Impact of Conflict on Pastoral Communities' Resilience in the Horn of Africa: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. FAO. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/drought/docs/Conflict%20study.pdf
- Schafer, J. (2002). Supporting Livelihoods in Situations of Chronic Conflict and Political Instability: Overview of Conceptual Issues. ODI. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2686.pdf>
- Schrepfer, N. & Caterina, M. (2014). On the margin: Kenya's pastoralists – From displacement to solutions, a conceptual study on the internal displacement of pastoralists.” Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre : Geneva. <http://www.internaldisplacement.org/assets/publications/2014/201403-af-kenya-on-the-margin-en.pdf>
- Toutain, B et al. (2012). Pastoralism in Dryland Areas: a Case Study in Sub-Saharan Africa. CSFD. http://www.reachingresilience.org/IMG/pdf/csfd_dossier_9_eng.pdf
- UNECA (2017). New Fringe Pastoralism: Conflict and Insecurity and Development in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel. UNECA. https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/PublicationFiles/new_fringe_pastoralism_eng1.pdf
- UN OCHA Pastoralist Communication Initiative (2007). The Future of Pastoralism in Ethiopia. UN OCHA. http://prime-ethiopia.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/The%20Future_of_Pastoralism.pdf

Watakila, F. (2015). Pastoralism and Conflict Management in the Horn of Africa: A Case Study of the Borana in North Eastern Kenya. University of Nairobi.

http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/94866/Watakila_%20Pastoralism%20and%20Conflict%20Management%20in%20the%20Horn%20of%20Africa:%20A%20Case%20Study%20of%20the%20Borana%20in%20North%20Eastern%20Kenya.pdf?sequence=1

Weibel, D. Schelling, E. and Zinsstag, J. (n.d.) Joint Human and Animal Health Services and Joint Livestock and Human Demographic Surveillance. Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute. <http://www.swisstph.ch/datensatzsammlung/newsletter/newslettermarch08/onehealthweibel.html>.

Suggested citation

Avis, W. (2018). *Rebuilding pastoralist livelihoods during and after conflict*. K4D Helpdesk Report 421. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on five days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2017.



6. Annex 1: Policy options (UNECA, 2017)

	<i>Sustaining pastoral livelihoods</i>	<i>Adding value for diversification</i>	<i>Expanding export trade</i>	<i>Finding alternative livelihoods</i>
Marketing and trade strategy	<i>Marketing to promote domestic and crossborder trade; Facilitation of sales by smaller producers (groups, cooperatives)</i>	<i>Marketing to support domestic, cross-border and export trade in processed livestock products; Facilitation of marketing and sales by different producer associations.; Provision of market information</i>	<i>Marketing to support national, cross-border and export trade in diverse markets; Marketing of Ethiopian livestock and meats; Provision of market information.</i>	<i>New business and service opportunities to generate employment and service provision.</i>
Land use management and land tenure	<i>Tenure rights and access to key resources (dry season grazing/water).</i>	<i>Tenure rights and access to key resources (dry season grazing/water); Urban planning and development.</i>	<i>Tenure rights and access to key resources (dry season grazing/water).</i>	<i>Urban and rural planning and development.</i>
Pastoral linkages to agriculture and industry	<i>Institutional development to promote negotiation and cooperation between agricultural producers and pastoralists, especially over dry season access to key resources.</i>	<i>Institutional development to promote joint cooperation and planning between value-added producers and pastoralists.</i>	<i>Institutional development to promote negotiation and cooperation between agricultural producers and pastoralists, especially over dry season access to key resources.</i>	<i>Promotion of agriculture, industry and services to absorb labour that is leaving pastoralism.</i>
Infrastructure	<i>Roads to domestic markets and borders</i>	<i>Small town development for investment; Market infrastructure, especially for value added products; Roads to terminal export.</i>	<i>Market infrastructure, especially for live animals; Roads to terminal export.</i>	<i>Small town development for investment. • Roads to link small urban centres.</i>
Investment and business development	<i>Credit and financial services</i>	<i>Credit and financial services; Incentives for establishment of new added value businesses.</i>	<i>Credit and financial services; Incentives for investment in export facilities.</i>	<i>Credit and financial services; Incentives for investment in small towns, including for members of the diaspora.</i>
Animal production and range management	<i>Bush control, especially of Prosopis; Breeding stock for improved resilience; Traditional range management.</i>	<i>Bush control, especially of Prosopis; Breeding stock for improved resilience; Traditional range management.</i>	<i>Bush control, especially of Prosopis; Breeding stock for improved export value; Traditional range management.</i>	

Veterinary services	<i>Low cost curative veterinary service; Regulation of veterinary drugs.</i>	<i>Medium-cost preventative veterinary services; Regulation of veterinary drugs</i>	<i>High-cost veterinary services to protect export markets, including through quarantine, surveillance, vaccination and quality certification for exported livestock products; Regulation of veterinary drugs.</i>	
Education and skills	<i>Basic formal education, tailored for mobile pastoral lifestyles.</i>	<i>Formal education, especially for women; Training in vocational and business skills.</i>	<i>Basic education, tailored for mobile pastoral lifestyles; Training in specialist skills for high value export trade.</i>	<i>Formal education, especially of women</i>
Risk management and safety nets	<i>Drought early warning and insurance; Income diversification start-up support.</i>	<i>Drought early warning and insurance; Rapid disease response.</i>	<i>Drought early warning and insurance; Diversified export markets; Income diversification start-up support.</i>	<i>Productive safety nets.</i>