



FEED THE FUTURE

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

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS REPORT KARAMOJA CLUSTER



A Kenya - Ethiopia border crossing point at Kibish. Whereas the river marks the international boundary, its water is a shared resource between the Turkana, Nyangatom and Topotha, Photo Credit. CBCR Activity Partner

DISCLAIMER

This report was produced at the request of the Cross-Border Community Resilience (CBCR) Activity implemented by Chemonics and ACDI/VOCA through funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The report was prepared independently by the Karamoja Development Forum (KDF). The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the USAID or the United States Government.



FOREWORD

Communities in the Karamoja cluster rely heavily on land and water for opportunistic farming and livestock production. As in any other context, the borderland communities have established systems for sharing these natural resources, based on both customary law or traditions, and formal administrative, policy and legislative frameworks. Whereas the communities have relied on and continue to deploy traditional natural resources sharing and management systems, their incorporation in their respective countries' political economy has subjected them to formal and hybrid mechanisms. Thus, the Cross-Border Community Resilience (CBCR) Activity's goals of enhancing resilience and hence reducing the need for humanitarian assistance among communities in the Karamoja cross-border cluster is achievable with a comprehensive understanding of the natural resource systems (NRM) in the cluster.

CBCR commissioned this NRM analysis to present a comprehensive overview of the existing resource sharing and natural resource management (NRM) systems in the Karamoja cross-border cluster. To this end, an examination of the existing natural resources in the Karamoja cluster, together with ownership and control of these resources among men and women, the formal and informal NRM arrangements at the local, national and regional levels, and changes in the natural resources over the years (as occasioned by climate change, human activity and large-scale infrastructure projects) inform part of this reports' comprehensive analysis of the NRM in the Karamoja cluster. Additionally, the main gaps in equitable and harmonious resource sharing and NRM including capacity needs at various levels, how arrangements can be strengthened, and how cross-border policies can be harmonized, are significantly discussed in various parts of this report.

Although this report contributes to CBCR's programming objectives, its findings are also useful to development practitioners both in government and non-government in the Karamoja cluster. I therefore invite interested partners and other actors in the Karamoja cluster to make use of the reports' findings in their own work and learning processes.

Jebiwot Sumbeiywo, Chief of Party (CoP),

Cross Border Community Resilience Activity (CBCR).

Contents

.....	i
FOREWORD	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
ACRONYMS.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. METHODOLOGY	3
3. FINDINGS.....	5
3.1. Natural Resources Sharing And Management in the Karamoja Cluster.....	5
3.3. Main Resource Sharing and management Mechanisms and their Organization in the Cross-Border Cluster.....	7
3.3.1. A Culture of Resources Sharing And Management.....	8
3.3.2. 3.3.2. The Role of Peace Committees in Sharing Arrangements.....	9
3.3.3. Community Meetings, Negotiations, and Written Agreements in Sharing Arrangements	10
3.3.4. The Role of Councils of Elders.....	11
3.3.5. Participatory Approaches in Resources Sharing and Management	13
3.4. Gender Relations in Natural Resource Sharing and Management.....	14
3.5. Changes in Key Resources and Dynamics in Cross-Border Areas.....	17
3.6. Government and NGOs' Interventions to Empower Local and Cross Border Communities	20
3.6.1. Legal and Policy Frameworks at National Levels	21
3.6.2. Regional Policy Frameworks	24
3.6.3. Roles of Government in Cross-Border Sharing of Resources.....	26
3.6.3. Challenges in Government Interventions.....	27
3.6.4. Roles of Nongovernmental Organizations	29
3.7. Gender and Social Inclusion Considerations, Opportunities, and Constraints in Cross-Border Resource Sharing and Natural Resources Management	30
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	32
Recommendations for the Cross-Border Community Resilience Programme.....	32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Karamoja Development Forum (KDF) wishes to acknowledge the contributions of several people to the success of this study. Special mention goes to the research team, including Longoli Simon Peter, Daniel Ogwang', Lomokol Olive, Ngole Dennis Ross, field-based researchers, transcribers, community leaders, and research participants in the different study locations, without whose support this study would have not been possible.

KDF further wishes to sincerely thank the team at the Cross-Border Community Resilience (CBCR) Activity for methodical and professional management of the study, and for their guidance all through the three months of the study.

ACRONYMS

ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
CBCR	Cross-Border Community Resilience
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
DADO	Dodoth Agro-Pastoralist Development Organization
EAC	East African Community
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GoU	Government of Uganda
ICPALD	IGAD Center for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development
KDF	Karamoja Development Forum
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
LC	Local Council
LOKADO	Lotus Kenya Action for Development Organization
MADEFO	Matheniko Development Forum
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority
NEA	National Environmental Act
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NRM	Natural Resource Management
POKATUSA	Pokot, Karamojong, Turkana, and Sebei Peace and Development Program
RDCs	Resident District Commissioners
RRC	Relief and Rehabilitation Commission
UPDF	Uganda Peoples Defence Forces
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
VSF	Vétérinaires sans Frontières
WRMP	Water Resources Management Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pastoralists in the Karamoja cluster, a geopolitical location straddling the borderlands of Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, and South Sudan, rely on the availability of natural resources in their communities. Because of variability, or extended lack of resources in some of the regions of the cluster, pastoralists often rely on the resources of neighboring communities. Through qualitative methods – 40 focus group discussions and 40 key informant interviews – 419 participants in this study shared their perspectives on the utilization of natural resources in the Karamoja cluster. This helped the research team understand the dynamics underlying the sharing of natural resources in the cluster.

A few takeaways from the study are arranged according to the themes of inquiry below:

Natural resource sharing communities in the study areas: Pastoralists in the study areas maintain their livestock herds by managing their rangelands and their herds' mobility across those rangelands. In the Karamoja cluster, nearly every pastoralist group migrates, even though to varying degrees. Overall, grazing patterns are understood to have changed because of reduced predictability of rainfall. A key determinant of resource sharing is the availability of resources, and the conflict/peace scenarios for the migrating communities. Sharing of natural resources is deeply entrenched in the belief that these are 'God given' resources and that pastoralists' reciprocity – that they share these resources in times of need – is necessary for survival of herds and people in the context of adverse changes.

Main resource sharing mechanisms and their organization around the cluster: Mobility remains the driver of livestock keeping in the Karamoja cluster. This report shows that mobility and the traditional mechanisms driving it are still relevant in the cluster. While there are different experiences across every community, mechanisms such as *ekokwa/etem/ekiriem* and *akiriket*¹ may vary in terms of reference but, by-and-large, cut across the cluster, and are applied for the same intents and purposes. The council of elders (*akiriket*) is very important in making migration decisions and negotiating with other communities. Elders gather first and advise the younger members of the community whether to migrate or not. Using techniques developed over decades, the elders can determine whether to migrate by studying vegetation and water sources. The decision to migrate is made only after the elders have advised of the need to negotiate with the host communities. Negotiations and eventual agreements typically include discussions about which water sources and grazing areas visiting users may access, how long they may stay, the number and species of livestock permitted, and assurances that livestock is healthy. Change within pastoral domains, however, has implied that the authority of elders has been challenged/reduced. This study attributes this to the heavy government presence, and not to positive outcomes everywhere in the Karamoja cluster.

It, therefore, goes that the socio-cultural thread through the communities of the Karamoja cluster is an enabler of natural resources sharing. This study finds that the purpose of negotiation for resources in the cluster is not to determine whether resources are to be shared, but to determine the conditions of access.

The role of peace committees in sharing arrangements: Other than traditional institutions, there are structures that play a role in the sharing of natural resources within the Karamoja cluster. These include peace committees and community institutions that work towards performing some roles within the broad natural resource system. For example, they support negotiations over resources and promote

¹ *Ekokwa* and its variants mean an assembly; *akiriket* is a council of elders, an equivalent of a parliament.

conservation. Overlaps between these structures exist, as some of these committees are constituted by elders or political leaders at the community level.

Community meetings, negotiations, and resource sharing agreements: Negotiations for resources have been found to take place among most of the communities in the Karamoja cluster. This is especially the case when communities are crossing to other territories. In doing so, traditional ways and means of engagement with those parties have been found to be applied. Where this is not possible, perhaps because of insecurity, some communities have been found to exercise force – usually using weapons such as AK47s – to access these resources. In some of the negotiations over access to resources, concerned non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have supported some form of written agreements. This study, however, did not establish any added value of written agreements vis-à-vis verbal agreements.

Gender and the role of women in NRM: Women play an important role in the pastoral livelihood systems of the study areas, as livestock keepers, natural resource managers, income generators, and service providers. These roles are all influenced by perceptions of gender values and relations. Pastoral women are primary land users because they manage livestock. They are also significant secondary users as they collect rangeland products such as firewood, grasses, fodder, and palm leaves, as well as gums, resins, saps, and other medicinal plant materials. It is clear from this study that there are distinct roles between men and women, boys, and girls. It is further clear that women/females are rarely given a voice in decision-making in societal issues such as natural resource management and cross-border sharing agreements. Whilst this is the case, this study avers that there are mechanisms and platforms, such as the ‘tree of women’, for the engagement of women and girls in decision-making processes.

The role of formal institutions in resource sharing: In addition to the four states’ formal institutions, there are several natural resources management policies in East Africa that are specifically related to cross-border sharing of natural resources. One example is the East African Community (EAC) Protocol on the Conservation and Management of the Environment. The protocol promotes the sustainable use and conservation of natural resources in the region, including forests, water, and wildlife. It also includes provisions for the management of trans-boundary natural resources, such as shared water courses and forests. The Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) Protocol on the Environment is another regional policy framework that aims to promote the sustainable use and conservation of natural resources in the region, including through the management of trans-boundary natural resources.

Gender, equity, and social inclusion in the Karamoja cluster: The management and sharing of resources is still predominantly a domain of men and male elders. The study finds that changes related to the participation of women in natural resource management and sharing continue to take place. This is owing to factors such as the increased roles of government and non-governmental organizations, and the evolution of livelihoods in the cluster, among others. However, these changes have not yet taken root as the traditional practices and beliefs are still entrenched.

In consideration of the findings of this study, it is proposed that the CBCR Activity undertakes the following proposals in the implementation of its programs.

1. Through IGAD’s Center for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development and Cross-border Facilitation Unit (based in Moroto), establish a coordination mechanism for local organizations and governments in the cluster to share initiatives, and enhance linkages between actors on pastoralism and natural resources development.

2. Support processes to review existing local and national agreements on joint grazing or resource sharing where they do not exist or promote existing ones. In Uganda, support processes to renegotiate with relevant stakeholders the Moruitit and Nabilatuk resolutions – both of which are relevant to the resource sharing needs of the Karamoja cluster pastoralists of Uganda, and West Pokot and Turkana in Kenya. Local NGOs, local governments, county governments, and provincial governments are important entry points.
3. Invest in climate information dissemination through the national meteorological departments and by using enabled smartphone technology. Smartphones with apps that are periodically updated with climate change and disaster risk management information, conflict incidents, and drought and mitigation measures could be made available to selected trained community-based information focal persons to provide periodic updates to community members. This data could be generated through satellite or other technology. While telecom infrastructure is sparse in some areas, it is still worth considering that in most parts of the cluster there is connectivity. Mobile solar chargers can be the solution to electricity problems.
4. Understanding, recognizing, and considering the institutional aspects of natural resource management that influence resource management and access arrangements is a critical first step for all stakeholders. This should also be used to guide pastoral area planning, so that on-the-ground initiatives are based on pastoral livelihoods and ecosystem needs rather than international and administrative borders. Within its climate change adaptation capacity building efforts, the CBCR Activity needs to mainstream knowledge efforts aimed at increasing skills in pastoralist adaptation and resilience practices.
5. The CBCR Activity would do well to recognize the relationship between natural resource management, conflict, and resilience. Support for peace initiatives must address conflict issues at a much deeper level, and natural resource management must be understood as inextricably linked to conflict and conflict resolution.
6. Develop cross-border trade in the north of Turkana and South Omo, West Pokot and Amudat, Nabilatuk and Nakapiripirit; Kotido, Moroto, and Turkana West. In some of these areas, there are bad roads and other infrastructure, but there exists a lot of potential to further incentivize the peaceful sharing of natural resources.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cross-border pastoralist communities engage in a wide range of shared arrangements with regards to their access to, and use of, natural resources, particularly water and pasture for their livestock. The communities also trade in livestock and livestock products, and other commodities across the borders. The sharing mechanisms are guided by strong identity, ethnic, cultural, and social ties, as well as traditional institutional settings that cross international borders. The Borana, the Gabra, and the Garri, for example, are found in both southern Ethiopia and northern Kenya, many of whom have dual citizenship of the two countries². The communities along Kenya's and Ethiopia's borders all speak Oromo³. The Borana and the Gabra of the Oromo ethnic group have long relied on a particularly strong body of institutions, the *rabba gada*, to guide social organization, livelihoods, natural resource management, and conflict resolution on both sides of the border⁴. The Borana also have a strong culture of resource planning. It is against the backdrop of the prevailing practices across the borderlands that this report aimed to present a comprehensive overview of the existing natural resource sharing and management systems in the Karamoja cluster. Specifically, the objective of this report was to contribute to the CBCR Activity's evidence base on cross-border natural resources management systems in the Karamoja cluster.

This natural resources management (NRM) systems analysis is informed by the Cross-Border Community Resilience (CBCR) Activity, a five-year project financed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented by ACDI VOCA and Chemonics International. The CBCR Activity is designed to enhance resilience and, thus, reduce the need for humanitarian assistance among communities in the cross-border clusters of Karamoja, Moyale, and Mandera. The Activity aims to empower local entities, including communities, civil society, private sector, and governments, to chart their own pathways for addressing conflict, improving livelihoods, and/or reducing the risks of shocks and stresses. The CBCR works to foster local ownership of development investments by supporting local leadership in work planning, implementation, and monitoring. The purpose is to contribute to the resilience of cross-border communities in the Karamoja, Moyale and Mandera clusters with the goal of reducing the need for humanitarian assistance among communities in the cross-border clusters.

This study provides a comprehensive assessment of the Karamoja cluster NRM systems. The study shows that among some of the Karamoja cluster communities, particularly those in Uganda and Kenya, the increased involvement by the government in natural resource management is increasing the quality of outcomes in natural resources sharing. It further shows that where formal institutions have an increased presence, outcomes are not always guaranteed to be positive if engagements with local institutions are not inclusive.

The study shows that pastoralism is the main source of livelihood for the communities in the Karamoja cross-border cluster, and they rely heavily on mobility for accessing resources. Additionally, informal (traditional) and formal governance structures play a crucial role in the equitable and peaceful sharing

² Wachira, M. (2009, August 31). 'Neither Ethiopian nor Kenyan, just Gabra, Garre or Borana', *The East African*, p.1.

³ Bassi, M. (2005). *Decisions in the shade: Political and juridical processes among the Oromo-Borana*. Red Sea Press.

⁴ Desalegn, D. (2007). *The biocultural diversity of living Indigenous sacred landscape in the Gamo highlands of Ethiopia*. Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society.
https://openlibrary.org/books/OL23577311M/The_biocultural_diversity_of_living_indigenous_sacred_landscape_in_the_Gamo_highlands_of_Ethiopia.

and management of cross-border resources. Participants in the study expressed deep sociocultural relationships among the communities in the Karamoja cluster, linked by cultural and social ties, ethnicities, identities, and institutional settings that span the borders. Traditional resource governance structures and migration in the region were previously guided by age sets, however, formal and local government/political structures now influence final decisions. Traditional gatherings and cultural committees are essential mechanisms for resource sharing and management. *Ekokwa* is a traditional mechanism used by the Karamojong, the Turkana, and the Nyangatom to negotiate resource use with neighbors. The emerging titling system supported by governments is disempowering elders, which creates a disequilibrium in the management of common property. The peace committees, which were started 20 years ago to manage violent conflicts, have a significant role in natural resource sharing. The committees are composed of *kraal*⁵ leaders, elders, and youth, who make decisions on resource management, and promote peace and resolve conflicts between host communities and migratory pastoralists. Women are now included in the committees due to advocacy by NGOs on the importance of gender inclusivity.

This research also shows that, despite some shift in gender roles, the traditional roles are still distinctly intact, especially at the local level. Women used to be involved in caring for animals, but with the changing ways of life in Karamoja, their involvement has decreased. Despite several interventions by the government and non-government organizations to increase women's participation in natural resources management, local norms, fear of speaking up in public, age, and other factors create barriers to women's active participation.

To ensure gender equality and social inclusion in natural resource management, governments across the cluster have been educating the public and advocating for women's participation in decision-making processes. Despite these efforts, men continue to dominate community and natural resource sharing forums. Thus, there is a need for sensitivity efforts to include women and obtain men's support by emphasizing the benefits of gender inclusion. Youth participation is also crucial, but male youth have had a deeper level of involvement. To ensure equitable sharing of benefits and opportunities in natural resource management, steps must be taken to address gender inequalities, promote equal access to resources, build women's capacities, and address gender-based violence and discrimination. This introduction is followed by a methods section that presents the various approaches in data collection and analysis, after which the report focuses on the study findings that have been briefly introduced. The study then concludes with a summary of the main findings, and recommendations for the CBCR Activity's programming.

⁵ A kraal refers to an enclosure of village huts.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study primarily focused on pastoralist communities along the borders of Kenya, South Sudan, Ethiopia, and Uganda. Pastoralists in these areas have long relied on natural resource management to maximize land use and sustain livestock productivity. In each country, several districts/locations with pastoralist settlements were visited based on their location around the different cross border areas, the differences in resources endowments, and the existence of cross border sharing of resources (see Table I below).

Table 1: Study locations

COUNTRY	District/Location	
Uganda	Moroto, Kotido, Kaabong, and Amudat.	
South Sudan	Kapoeta South, Chukudum, Narus, and Kauto	
Ethiopia	South Omo: Jinka, Omorate, Hawasa, Nyangatom Woreda, Kangaten	
Kenya	Turkana	Loima, Urum, Nakitong'o, Oropoi, and Loreng.
	West Pokot	Kacheliba, Alakas, Lokales; Alale, Loro, Lorengekipi

Source: Researchers' adaptation from visits to the study locations.

The study was qualitative in nature and relied on both primary and secondary data. Specifically, primary data was collected through key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and observations. The primary data collected was supplemented by secondary literature on existing resource sharing and NRM systems and practices in the Karamoja cross-border cluster.

The research team used KIIs to engage up to 40 relevant officials from Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) and government institutions in these locations. These included national drought management authorities, natural resource management officers, and environmental officers. Key informants also included community leaders, chiefs, *kraal* leaders, elders, opinion leaders, sub-county and district technical and political leaders, all of whom provided critical information about NRM management practices from the communities' perspective. The research teams kept a daily journal of their findings, noting assumptions and new questions, while also considering ethnicity and risks. A KII guide was used to gather information on experiences and understanding of NRM systems and practices, as well as associated challenges.

The research team facilitated 40 FGDs using an FGD guide. Each FGD had 8 - 12 participants, and included local leaders such as village elders, chiefs, opinion leaders, and *kraal* leaders, as well as a few selected male and female community members who are knowledgeable about NRM systems and practices.

Gender inclusivity was considered in the selection of participating community stakeholders, with one-third of participants being adult males, adult females, and youth, respectively. Initially, the research

team recognized that the FGDs appeared to jeopardize women's ability to participate and freely express their opinions on gender, decision-making, and natural resource sharing issues. Recognizing this difficulty, the research team reconsidered holding separate gendered focus groups for men and women.

Gender disaggregation was deemed necessary because gender divides influence how resources, social institutions, and stakeholders are perceived and valued. This ensured that during the exercise, all issues, social institutions, resources, and stakeholders of concern to all gender groups were captured and mapped, along with all their differentiated issues of concern.

Table 2: Summary of KIIs and FGD conducted

	West Pokot Kenya	Turkana-Kenya	Kapoeta- South Sudan	Karamoja-Uganda	South Omo - Ethiopia	Total
FGDs	8	8	8	8	8	40
KIIs	8	8	8	8	8	40

Source: Researcher generated table

Table 3: Gender representation in FGDs

Method	West Pokot Kenya	Turkana-Kenya	Kapoeta South Sudan	Karamoja-Uganda	S. Omo-Ethiopia	Total	Percentage
Female	30	39	38	41	41	189	45%
Male	57	36	51	56	30	230	55%

Source: Researcher generated table

3. FINDINGS

This section presents and discusses the findings of the study. The key findings show that pastoralists in the Karamoja cluster maintain their livestock herds by managing their rangelands and the mobility of their herds across those rangelands. The rangelands have a variety of natural resources such as pasture and water required for livestock management and pastoralist livelihood sustenance.

Pastoral groups were discovered to have long relied on particularly strong cultural practices to guide social organization, livelihoods, natural resource management, and conflict resolution, both locally and across borders. Peace committees, traditional gatherings, or cultural committees, mostly led by elders, were found to be essential mechanisms for resource sharing and management, while adhering to customary rules.

Cross-border resource management committees supported by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were also found to be beneficial in fostering peaceful relations among border communities. Community meetings, negotiations, and written agreements in sharing arrangements were revealed to be critical methods of resolving critical natural resource issues. Participation of community members was found to be a critical component for the success of all resource sharing mechanisms, with women playing a particularly important role, despite rarely being given a voice in societal decision-making.

All the study areas are subject to the vagaries of environmental degradation, particularly the ongoing shrinkage and disappearance of livestock resources such as trees and pasture. Conflict and insecurity caused by cattle rustling, herder-farmer disputes, and administrative boundary changes were also found to have influenced changes in resource sharing mechanisms.

Government and NGO responses in the study areas include policy initiatives that shape cross-border pastoralist movements in a variety of ways, ranging from regulation and protection of pastoralism to addressing other issues with secondary effects on pastoralism. However, the lack of policy or its ineffective implementation has limited the effectiveness of the responses.

3.1. NATURAL RESOURCES SHARING AND MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAMOJA CLUSTER

Pastoralists in the Karamoja cluster maintain their livestock herds by managing their rangelands and their herds' mobility across those rangelands. Rangelands are large areas of land with native vegetation such as grasses and shrubs. High temperatures and low, unpredictable, and highly variable rainfall characterize the rangeland ecosystems of the study areas, resulting in low vegetation cover density.

Pastoralists rely on a variety of natural resources and this study discovered that there is a huge potential, at least in terms of varieties, of natural resources across the Karamoja cluster. These include minerals such as stones, sand, marble, limestone, and gold. Natural livestock resources include water sources such as *ngatapar* (ponds), and *ngamatatain* (valley tanks and dams), as well as different types of pastures, forests, and bushes. Land is also considered a natural resource for pastoralists, upon which all the natural resources occur, and it is used for mobility and migratory routes, cultivation, and settlement. Pastoralists use forests for collection of food and local building materials. They also collect wild fruits and graze livestock there. Forests are also sources of water as they contain dams, boreholes, ponds, and wells.

This study has established that communities share resources both within and across borders mainly due to the differences in natural resources endowments, conflict, and climatic variability in the cluster. For example, in Uganda's Karamoja region, the Didinga, Ngiturkana, Pokot, Ethur, Dodoth, Bokora,

Matheniko, Jie, Toposa, Tepes, Karimojong, Acholi, and Sebei communities all share resources, particularly when there is peace. As such, conflicts in the form of cattle raids, especially between the Dodoth and Jie, the Jie and Bokora, the Bokora and Matheniko, and the Matheniko and Bokora, impede resource sharing at times. These conflicts have caused communities to distance themselves from good pasturelands and water resources, as stated by some individuals during an FGD held in Kapadakook, Kotido district in Uganda. As one FGD participant noted:

*“First, God gave us water and grass. In time of scarcity, we share our resources with the Dodoth, the Turukana, the Bokora, the Ethur, and the Matheniko. It’s the recent insecurity/raids that have affected our stay. We are praying to God to touch the hearts of our brothers so that we go back to the days of peace like we used to, so that we share grass and water in good faith.”*⁶

In South Sudan, interview participants revealed that resources are shared among the Toposa, Dodoth, Didinga, Buya, Turkana, Jie, Murle, Ngikoromua, and the Lotuko. For their part, the Turkana of Kenya share natural resources with the Karamojong communities in Uganda such as the Matheniko and Tepeth on the Loima side, and the Jie and Dodoth on the Kotido and Loyoro sides, up to the upper plains of Kamion sub-county in Kaabong district. Resources are also shared with the Sudan’s Didinga, Toposa, and Jie from the Lokichoggio side.

Also in Kenya, the Pokot, Luyia, Turkana, Sebei, and some Karamojong share resources in West Pokot. In Ethiopia, the Nyangatom/Dassanech primarily share resources with the Topotha, Buya, Jie, Didinga, Turkana, and Karamojong.

Among communities with deeper socio cultural relations, as is the case with the Pokot of Uganda and the Pokot of Kenya, the idea of ‘border’ is not experienced. Moving across to Uganda or Kenya for natural resources between these communities does not require prior permission. Permission is only sought by the Pokot when they reach ‘third territories’ – that is in Nakapiripirit and Nabilatuk. The import of this observation is that while they are not on the international border, Nabilatuk and Nakapiripirit are critical to cross-border development activities. At a drink one evening in Kunyao in West Pokot, a Kenyan politician remarked, *“While West Pokot is the hope of Kenya’s beef industry, Karamoja is its backbone – thanks to an abundance of resources and livestock there.”*⁷

3.2.ACCESS (UNEQUAL AND EQUAL) TO OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF NATURAL RESOURCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

Women and men in rangeland areas require access to grazing and water for their livestock as well as a variety of natural resources for use within pastoralist households, such as drinking water, fuel wood, medicinal plants, wild food, and building materials. Pastoralist institutions govern access to water, grazing, and other natural resources within the rangelands, typically through communal tenure systems based on patrilineal kinship. These can be complex, diverse, overlapping, and dynamic⁸.

However, changing tenure systems following privatization in the Horn of Africa's rangelands are known to be detrimental to women, with women losing formal titles and fences and barriers. This forces them to walk farther to access resources, while the breakdown of communal support systems leaves them

⁶ FGD participant, Kapadakook, Kotido, Uganda, 27 September 2022.

⁷ Interview with political leader, Kunyao, West Pokot, Kenya, 4 September 2022.

⁸ Flintan, F. (2008). *Study on good practice: Women’s empowerment in pastoral societies*. IUCN-WISP. https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/import/downloads/gender_format.pdf

highly vulnerable⁹. They have been described as sitting on two stools, namely customary governance tenure and statutory, formal tenure¹⁰.

The cultural structure of pastoralist communities restricts women's ownership and control of natural resources. Pastoralist men own and control livestock, dominate politics and decision-making, are the heads of households, lineages, and clans, and regard themselves as "real" pastoralists¹¹.

Conversely, women in livestock production are relegated to secondary, supportive roles, serving as subordinates to fathers, husbands, and sons. They are barred from public life and chastised for their identity¹². Pastoralist women, therefore, struggle to achieve economic independence because they lack social capital. Although livestock ownership and access are complicated, women are generally unable to benefit from the primary output of the pastoralist economy, despite playing a variety of, and often unacknowledged roles in livestock production.

3.3. MAIN RESOURCE SHARING AND MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS AND THEIR ORGANIZATION IN THE CROSS-BORDER CLUSTER

This section shows that pastoralism is the primary source of livelihood for the communities in the Karamoja cluster, and they rely heavily on mobility to access transient resources. Both informal and formal governance structures play a role in the sharing and management of these resources. Traditional institutions, such as age sets and traditional gatherings, are integral to resource sharing and management in the Karamoja cluster.

The concept of peace committees, which have been around for at least 20 years, play a significant role in natural resource sharing and resolving conflicts between host communities and migratory pastoralists. The committees are composed of *kraal* leaders, elders, and youth, and operate based on customary rules. However, the introduction of land registration is disempowering elders and creating a disequilibrium in the management of common property.

Pastoralists in the study area use traditional mechanisms, such as *Etamam*, to negotiate access to resources from fellow pastoralists. Emissaries are sent to communicate the intention of visiting a neighboring community and request permission to share resources. Community meetings are held prior to the emissaries being dispatched as it is widely regarded as unethical to gain access to resources without first obtaining permission. Negotiations can result in written agreements, but they are often not owned by the communities and are instead held by state institutions or NGOs. Community initiatives to resource sharing agreements are frequently ignored and considered illegal by state institutions. The councils of elders play a crucial role in making migration decisions and negotiating with other communities.

These are explained in detail in the following sections.

⁹ Flintan, F., B. Cullen., & S. Latosky. (2011). *Pastoral women thoughts on 'change': Voices from Ethiopia*. Future Agricultures. <https://www.future-agricultures.org/news/pastoral-womens-thoughts-on-change-voices-from-ethiopia/>

¹⁰ Adoko, J. & S. Levine. (2008). Falling between two Stools. How Women's land rights are lost between state and customary law in Apac District, Northern Uganda. In B. Englert & E. Daley (Eds), *Women's Land Rights and Privatization in Eastern Africa* (pp. 101-120). James Currey. Insert the page range.

¹¹ Hodgson, D.L. (2000). 'Gender, culture and the myth of the patriarchal pastoralist.' In D.L. Hodgson (Ed.), *Rethinking pastoralism in Africa: Gender, culture and the myth of the patriarchal pastoralist* (pp. 1-28). James Currey.

¹² Ibid.

3.3.1. A CULTURE OF RESOURCES SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

As it has already been observed, pastoralism is the primary source of livelihood for the communities in the study areas, and they rely heavily on mobility to access transient resources in areas of high and seasonal rainfall, ecological and nutritional variability. Overall, both informal or traditional and formal governance structures are instrumental in the equitable and peaceful sharing and management of cross-border resources.

Traditional Institutions and the Sharing and Management of Resources

Participants in the study expressed deep sociocultural relationships among the communities in the Karamoja cluster. They said these have been developed, in part, due to shared pastoralist experiences. The pastoral groups are linked by strong cultural and social ties, ethnicities, identities, and institutional settings that span international borders. They have long relied on particularly strong cultural practices to guide social organization, livelihoods, and the management of natural resources and conflict both locally and across borders.

Traditional resource governance structures and migration in Karamoja Uganda, for example, were dictated by age sets, that were the major informal structure at the time. Nonetheless, final decisions on processes are now influenced by formal and local government/political structures as demonstrated by the following submission by a key informant in Moroto, Uganda.

“There were kraal leaders below the age sets, and beneath them are the karacuna (the youth) who are scouts who move around to establish where pasture is in close relationship with the availability of water because they try to estimate the distance of how far you can go and graze before one comes for watering.”¹³

Traditional gatherings or cultural committees are an integral mechanism to the sharing and management of resources in the Karamoja cluster. For example, when livestock watering areas become overcrowded, efforts are made to separate and gazette watering areas for new arrivals from those for local communities. These decisions are made during traditional meetings and events of the *Ekokwa* and the *Akiriket*.

Ekokwa/Ekirem/Em is the main traditional mechanism used by the Karamojong of Uganda, the Turkana of Kenya, and the Nyagatom of Ethiopia in negotiating resource use with their neighbors. *Ekokwa* convenes community members irrespective of their clan, gender, or age to participate in the negotiating processes as well as decision-making. When an elder or a *kraal* leader receives information from emissaries or scouts sent on a mission to search for pastures or water from across the region, *Ekokwa* is frequently called. As one study participant in Kotido, Uganda, narrated, ‘‘*The Ekokwa is what resolves those issues. For example, if livestock eats someone’s garden in that place, kraal leaders call for Ekokwa to discuss on modalities on how to pay for the damages.*’’¹⁴

Another study participant further clarified that *Ekokwa* is known as *Akiriam* or *Ekiriam* among the Turkana pastoralists, while among the Nyangatom community of Ethiopia, *Ekokwa* is known as *Akiuda*, which means “gathering or coming together to discuss a common good”¹⁵.

¹³ Interview with key informant, Moroto, Uganda, 25 October 2022.

¹⁴ Focus group discussion, Kotido district, Uganda, 25 August 2022.

¹⁵ Views from validation workshop, Lodwar, Kenya, 28 October 2022

At least as observed in West Pokot, the emerging titling system supported by the government is disempowering elders. In this regard, a study participant noted how, “*when the land was communal, power belonged to the elders [...] this is a big issue, needs another engagement with the Turkana.*”¹⁶ Since documentation or registration of land is new in pastoralist settings, it is arguable that this creates a disequilibrium in the management of common property. In Kacheliba, elders have formed some rules around the protection of the bushes, and the protection of a nearby dam. As such, a study participant observed that, “*they [elders] sit under their tree, next to the dam and watch who breaks the rules.*”¹⁷

3.3.2. THE ROLE OF PEACE COMMITTEES IN SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

The concept of peace committees is at least 20 years old in the Karamoja cluster¹⁸. They were initially started to ensure that violent conflicts were managed in the cluster. Peace committees are believed to have significant roles in natural resource sharing, given that competition for resources can sometimes lead to conflicts. The main functions of these local peace committees are to promote peace and resolve conflicts between host communities and migratory pastoralists. They are largely composed of *kraal* leaders, elders, and youth who make decisions on resource management modalities, such as grazing land and general environmental control. They also advise community members on issues that affect their daily livelihoods.

It should be noted that the use and access to natural resources in areas with operational peace committees was based on customary rules, such as the prohibition on trespassing on a common reserve dry grazing area or watering animals directly from a water source¹⁹. The modalities of customary negotiations to gain access to natural resources appear to have been preserved, with the notable exception of women being allowed to participate in some decision-making events as committee members. The efforts of NGOs to educate communities about the importance of gender inclusivity have resulted in the inclusion of women on committees as mentioned by a key informant:

*“Whenever there is a suspicion of conflict among pastoralists, we convene a meeting to address the problem. We resolve any issues that arise. In Napumpum, there is a peace committee of about 30 people. We have the same committees in Rikitai, which has 30 members, Nakapelimoru, which has 30 members, and Losilang, which has 30 members. There are females among the thirty members of each of these groups.”*²⁰

Study participants also reported some efforts to form cross-border resource management committees. Cross-border committees work to foster peaceful relations between border communities. A key informant from a NGO involved in establishing and supporting cross-border committees stated that exchange visits involving both pastoralists and government representatives preceded the formation of these committees. As the study participant narrated,

“There are now issues with grazing patterns, and a natural resource management committee here is working with one in Kenya. The role of the cross-border committee is to ensure peaceful coexistence among herders as they cross borders in search of resources. First, the committee’s

¹⁶ Interview with RRC Kapoeta, South Sudan, 16 September 2022

¹⁷ Interview with key informant, Kotido, Uganda 27 August 2022

¹⁸ Early peace committees were initiated by the Conflict Early Warning Mechanism of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD).

¹⁹ Focus group discussion, West Pokot, Kenya, 30 August 2022

²⁰ Interview with Kraal Leader, Kotido district, Uganda, 26 August 2022.

elders go to their leaders or a local NGO that deals with peace issues, and these leaders or NGOs go to talk to people at the border, interact with them, and get the NRM committees from both sides to meet to discuss common peace issues to share the pasture and water there at the border.”²¹

In the context of cross-border natural resource sharing in the Karamoja cluster, peace committees have played important roles. With the support of NGOs, national governments, and inter-governmental institutions such as the UN, IGAD, and the African Union, they have participated in the negotiation and enforcement of agreements on natural resources sharing, as intermediaries.

3.3.3. COMMUNITY MEETINGS, NEGOTIATIONS, AND WRITTEN AGREEMENTS IN SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

In seeking resources from their fellow pastoralists, within or across the border, pastoralists also deploy dialogue and negotiation. In this regard, traditional mechanisms such as *Etamam* are used. *Etamam* is a process through which elders send their youth as emissaries to pass a message to their counterparts in the areas with plenty of water, pastures, salt leaks, and security to inform them of their intention to come along with their cattle to partake or share in these resources. During these processes, there is exchange of gifts in the form of goats or a bull given to the host community. Upon agreeing, the host community then permits the visiting community to come and share, and they also agree on the sharing modalities.

The use of emissaries to request access to resources was reported as a critical practice in all communities across the cluster. During the dry season, the emissaries’ role is to seek permission from cross-border and neighboring communities to share their resources. It is widely regarded as unethical for communities to gain access to other’s resources without first obtaining permission. As one key informant stated:

*“Before we go to the neighbors, we take a report to them in advance, requesting that they share their resources with us. They sometimes agree and sometimes they don’t. Before we go to the neighbor, we sit down as a family and discuss how we should interact with our neighbors. We should not provoke our neighbors because we are visitors. Go in peace, like brothers and sisters. They do not leave without first meeting in a home to discuss how to coexist with neighbors.”*²²

However, it should be noted that community meetings are held prior to the sending of emissaries. In Karamoja, the local communities hold their own meetings (*Etem/ngitemwan-pl-*) to talk about how the drought is affecting the livestock. Emissaries are then dispatched with the request to the elders and leaders of the other community, who are asked for their consent to come. The community elders will then provide instructions on how the community making the request should access the resources. For instance, the requesting community may be asked to wait and use water from water points located far from homes and gardens if food is still present in gardens. They will then allow them to visit the nearby grazing and watering areas once the harvest is complete, with strict instructions of how resources should be used sustainably. As mentioned by a FGD participant in Kapadakook, Kotido, in Uganda,

*“In our agreements, we agree that we don’t burn grass. Fire will finish grass and when grass is finished here, we shall be forced to go and look for grass far away from nearby water sources and we may be at a risk of insecurity. The only problem is that some people don’t listen to this advice.”*²³

²¹ Interview with NGO official, Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 17 September 2022.

²² Focus group discussion, Moroto, Uganda, 20 August 2022.

²³ Focus group discussion, Kotido district, Uganda, 24 August 2022.

On the Ethiopian side of the cluster, elders initiate resource sharing negotiations among the Nyangatom by calling for meetings with the youth from both sides of the border. In such meetings, the elders urge the youth to make agreements among themselves and they, in turn, inform the elders, women, and other youth who have been left behind. They then agree on which sides the visitors can graze on, and their friendship grows until they find themselves at the same grazing point because the agreement was already signed. As a female key informant observed, *“We sit and come up with the way forward like what can we follow or agree on to allow the other people to migrate here and have their animals graze here. The agreement is oral, though there are NGOs that write down.”*²⁴

Negotiations have resulted in some written agreements regarding cross-border grazing, migration, or the relocation of animals to *kraals*. FGD participants in Kaabong, for example, reported written agreements regarding resource sharing locally among the Kaabong and across borders with the Turkana of Kenya. However, there were concerns about the approach’s long-term viability because it was initiated by NGOs who did not conduct any follow-up activities. As noted by a participant in a female and male FGD in Kamion in Kaabong district:

*“It was a long time ago when an NGO promoting natural resource management suggested that we write down some guidelines, such as how to share grass and how to coexist with animals. It was the committee that attempted to remove the dam division, and that agreement is now in the NGO office. The agreement was available, but we did not read it, and when you see that no one followed up, it is even worse because people left the moment they arrived at the dam, and the people were not at peace when they left.”*²⁵

However, FGD participants in Rupa-Moroto district stated that written resource sharing agreements amongst pastoralists that are facilitated by state institutions and NGOs are not usually owned by the communities. These agreements are written in the language of the state or NGOs, and do not reflect the realities of pastoralists. Pastoralists do not own these agreements, and copies are held by the state institutions or NGOs that facilitate them.

Community initiatives to resource sharing agreements, such as the Nabilatuk resolution/agreement²⁶, are frequently ignored and regarded as illegal and non-binding by state institutions. In other words, because imposed processes are distant, communities tend to avoid them and instead rely on local community initiatives to negotiate resource sharing²⁷.

3.3.4. THE ROLE OF COUNCILS OF ELDERS

The councils of elders are very important in making migration decisions and negotiating with other communities. Permission to migrate, for example, is obtained from the host community’s *Akiriket*. Elders gather first and advise the younger members of the community whether to migrate or not. Using techniques developed over decades, the elders can determine whether to migrate by studying vegetation and water sources. The decision to migrate is made only after the elders have advised of the need to negotiate with the host communities. Negotiations and eventual agreements typically include

²⁴ Focus group discussion, Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 17 September 2022

²⁵ Focus group discussion, Kaabong district, Uganda, 28 August 2022

²⁶

²⁷ Interview with key informant, Moroto district, Uganda, 23 August 2022.

discussions about which water sources and grazing areas visiting users may access, how long they may stay, the number and species of livestock permitted, and assurances that livestock is healthy.

On the Ugandan side of the cross-border cluster, elders also advise community members to approach local leaders such as the Resident District Commissioners (RDCs) and elected leaders to negotiate peace with neighbors before migrating²⁸. Elders also make the rules and resolve disputes that arise during local and cross-border resource sharing processes²⁹.

However, the research found out that unlike in the past where elders were respected and recognized as custodians of resource sharing mechanisms and decision-making, their role today is weak, and their influence has diminished. In Kalapata, Kaabong district, a respondent stated that:

*“When cattle were in plenty, animals were driven to a new grazing location, and the elders would authorize a bull slaughter to consecrate the journey. Throughout the grazing period, there would be discipline among shepherds and the population as elders held meetings occasionally to review the progress of their activities in the given location and as well get feedback from the youth regarding the security of the kraals. Today, things have changed; there is no more respect and love for elders.”*³⁰

Many participants in this study noted that the declining power and the role of elders in natural resource management is at varying degrees. Even in communities such as the Pokot that would rank better in terms of the strength of traditional institutions, the role of elders was reported to have diminished to a reasonable degree. According to a study participant in West Pokot, Kenya:

*“Pokot used to listen to the elders. The young people and the elderly were united. The council of elders was an organized system. Elders set aside grazing lands from settlements, and it was respected. But now things have changed. That kind of respect is being eroded. But now everybody is saying ‘I must settle anywhere so long as I stay in peace’.”*³¹

The alteration of the traditional governance structure is attributed to the presence and involvement of state institutions in the affairs of pastoralists’ governance systems. It is widely acknowledged that it is now government that has the power, and it is, therefore, the mandate of government to bring these elders together³².

Several participants in this study exhibited mistrust of state institutions versus traditional institutions in terms of managing natural resources. According to them, the role of the state in these resources is often to a net negative outcome, especially where conservation and extractive activities are considered. In Namorupus in Turkana, for example, an elderly man in an FGD stated that they will never give control of vital community resources such as Loima hills to the management of the government. As the elder narrated,

“For us, our pasture is in this hill called Loima, as is water for animals. Food for people is also in this hill called Loima. We get wild fruits and have gardens. This hill truly has everything for people and animals, which is why we love it. We are currently denying the government ownership because if the government occupies this hill, it will be destroyed; destroying pasture for animals

²⁸ Interview with District leader, Kaabong district, Uganda, 29 August 2022

²⁹ Interview with key informant, Kotido, Uganda, 27 August 2022

³⁰ Focus group discussion, Kotido, Uganda, 28 August 2022

³¹ Focus group discussion, West Pokot Kenya, 05 September 2022

³² Focus group discussion, West Pokot, Kenya, 06 September 2022.

and wild food for people, because where the government occupies, people begin cutting down trees. This hill also has a forest with wild animals, including hyenas and other wildlife, which is why we say that if the government occupies this hill, it will be destroyed along with everything in it. So, we have decided to leave this hill as no man's land.”³³

Some communities are resistant to the government taking ownership of communal resources because they believe that if the government were to occupy it, the hill and everything on it would be destroyed. This is because the government would likely clear the land, cut down trees, and destroy the pasture and wild food sources.

Nonetheless, it is important to mention that there may be cases where a government intervention might be beneficial for the communal land. An example is in cases of illegal activities or in the protection of endangered resources. However, in general, a better approach would be for the government to work collaboratively with communities, including indigenous peoples, and to respect their rights and traditional management practices.

3.3.5. PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES IN RESOURCES SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

Community participation was also found to be a useful mechanism for natural resources management and sharing processes. Community meetings are said to be very effective because resolutions are, most times, respected and followed by local cultural leaders and political administrators. These gatherings are important in communities because they foster a sense of belonging and ownership over all decisions made.

According to one key informant, the community meetings were sometimes held as joint cross-border meetings, and they were most common among the South Sudan, Ethiopia, and Kenya cross-border communities. As the study participant narrated:

“The governments of South Sudan and Kenya have held several meetings or peace talks in Nadapal and even Lokichogio in this regard. However, in the case of Kauto, there is no involvement of the two governments. The two countries' communities come together. When the results reach their government, they are always approved.”³⁴

Customary institutions that community people locally accept as authority are also involved in the formalization of customary rules and principles that can be legally recognized by a state judicial system. An example of a customary law that is meant to mitigate communal conflicts was provided by a key informant in Kapoeta, South Sudan as follows:

“Let's take Lokorumo, which opened in 2017 and is shared by the Turkana and the Toposa. The Turkana and the Toposa met at the mining point and sat down to discuss how we would be hungry if blood was shed in the mining area. So we should pass laws and if the Turkana, for example, violate the peace, the Toposa will go to the Turkana chief to find out who is responsible. The Toposa also agreed that this area should not be used for bloodshed. So, because we are seeing people starving, we must create laws, and if the Turkana kill the Toposa, they must first go to the chief. It is the chief's responsibility to put pressure on the chief of that area to bring the perpetrator

³³ Focus group discussion, Turkana, Kenya, 08 September 2022.

³⁴ Interview with key informant, Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 18 September 2022.

to book. If they want to compensate, they compensate. If they want to avenge, they avenge. That was the basis for their bylaws."³⁵

There are also customary laws that govern the use of water and grass. In Turkana, for example, pasture management laws are agreed upon with practices like *ngipekai*, in which community members are not allowed to use certain types of grass. Grazing is also done in shifts, with one area used for grazing while another is left to regenerate pasture. Water resources such as dams and boreholes are divided into those used for watering animals and those used for domestic purposes such as cooking and drinking.

According to a Nyangatom FGD participant, the community laws have penalties for those who violate them. For example, if an individual is found to have burnt the grass and destroyed pasture in disregard of the community regulations, he will be forced to kill a bull or a goat as a fine and punishment. This is decided by the locals without the involvement of the government. This was also found to be the case in West Pokot. However, the Karamoja, Turkana, and South Sudanese communities have weaker, poorly enforced mechanisms relating to the punishment of offenders on the rangelands.

Overall, it should be noted that traditional mechanisms for resource sharing among pastoralists have become weak and less functional because of the high presence and influence of the state and government institutions. Unlike in other countries/states, participants agreed that there is "too much government" in Uganda, meaning that Uganda is too structured with lots of intelligence, military involvement in cattle protection and recovery, wildlife, and natural resource sharing. The government is also involved in negotiations, grabbing of rangelands, and vaccination of cattle.

The implication is that where there is less government presence, pastoralists have the power to negotiate with their counterparts on resource sharing. They can also decide on migratory routes in the face of drought and are in a better position to forge and maintain agreements and peaceful coexistence. When there is "too" much power in the hands of the state, pastoralists' rights are infringed, and their mobility is restricted. In this case, the position of the state is more pronounced than pastoralists' voices, participation, and rights.

3.4. GENDER RELATIONS IN NATURAL RESOURCE SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

Women play important roles as livestock keepers, natural resource managers, income generators, and service providers in the pastoral livelihood systems of the study areas. These roles are all influenced by perceptions of gender, values, and relations. Pastoral women are primary land users because they manage livestock. They are also significant secondary users because they collect rangeland products such as firewood, grasses, fodder, and palm leaves, as well as gums, resins, saps, and other medicinal plant materials.

Women in pastoralist areas are relegated to secondary, supportive roles, serving as subordinates to fathers, husbands, and sons, and are barred from public life and chastised for their pastoralist identity. It was also clear from this study that there are distinct roles between men and women, boys and girls³⁶. Women/females are rarely given a voice in decision-making in societal issues such as natural resource management and cross-border sharing agreements.

The limited participation of women/girls in decision-making structures means that their role in shaping natural resources sharing is rather limited. This is despite the fact that they have their own traditional

³⁵ Interview with key informant, South Sudan, 16 September 2022.

³⁶ Hodgson, *supra* n 15.

structures such as *ekitoe angaberu* (the tree of women), which is a discussion platform dedicated for women. It goes without saying that this structure has a symbiotic relationship with structures/mechanisms dominated by males.

This study shows, however, that recent changes have indicated an increase in the participation of women in some key decision-making structures. In particular, the participation of women has increased in *ekokwa/ekiriem/etem*, though to varying degrees across the cluster. Karamoja districts of Uganda and Turkana communities are understood to be well advanced across the region in terms of women's empowerment and participation owing to increased engagement of women in government and non-governmental development work. Women's participation, according to respondents in this study³⁷, is lower in the Nyangatom, Dassanech, and Toposa regions. This can be attributed, in part, to a history of conflict in these regions and a relative 'absence' of government.

Pastoralists build social relations and kinships at an individual level – be they by women, youth, elders, or men, and these social interactions inform wider interactions over natural resources. Social relationships between women of different communities are, therefore, understood to shape the decision of men over resources. This is also a consideration between youths of different communities.

It is worth noting that in some study locations, such as Rupa in Moroto district of Uganda, some respondents discounted the role of women, calling them unknowledgeable and incapable of making decisions over natural resources. The role of women in the *kraals* was largely credited to be around household chores or watering animals (carrying water is seen to be a function of women). Some NGOs, it was said, are working to reverse this trend, as said by a female key informant in Moroto, Uganda:

*“Traditionally, decision-making in most of the issues like migration and resources management has been dominated by men. In Akiriket, for example, women are not permitted to stand, let alone speak. However, there has been an attempt through development partners and government to promote women's involvement in natural resource management in the pastoralist context, such as the women's peace forum, trauma healing groups in relation to peace, and women in grazing committees, peace committees, range land management committees, and the development trust.”*³⁸

This fact is not any different in other areas such as Turkana, where FGD participants and KIIs confirmed that women have very limited participation in resource and cross-border sharing agreements. Women are only given opportunities in NGO and government organized structures such as peace, rangeland, and grazing committees.

A key reason for this is that a patriarchal social structure dictates how affairs are managed. For example, in the traditional tiered structure of the Karamojong, different age sets access communal power through *asapan* (initiation) rites which only applying to males. During such initiation rites, important decision-making roles related to governance of economic, social, and environmental aspects are bestowed to males. As one respondent noted, *“Women manage their sorghum. Men manage grass.”*³⁹ The implication is that men consider themselves better gifted to manage natural resources, as women are confined to household roles. Another participant in Nyangatom even had tougher words to say that, *“for men, the exception is the stupid one; for women, the exception is the bright one”*.⁴⁰ Ironically,

³⁷ Interview with a local government leader, Karenga, Uganda, 28 August 2022.

³⁸ Interview with sub county councilor, Moroto, Uganda, 24 August 2022.

³⁹ Focus group discussion, Moroto, Uganda, 23 August 2022.

⁴⁰ Interview with pastoralist leader, Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 13 September 2022.

while they say their children are their most treasured possessions, many men could not explain why they leave them in the care of women or why they are 'trusted' to take care of children.

What is interesting to find out is that whilst the decisions on natural resources sideline women, they (women) are the ones who bear the brunt of the negative effects that follow denial of access to resources, or the conflicts that may follow. As one key informant explained:

“When it comes to pastoralists, men play a significant role. The only challenge that women face is when peace/ceasefire agreements fail, because they suffer the most and are killed more than men. Women suffer because, whenever peace talks are scheduled, our community does not include women in resource negotiations. However, women are the ones who suffer the most in terms of food insecurity, and they are the ones who always bring food to the kraals. They are always the people who are ambushed and killed on the way.”⁴¹

However, key informants also intimated that given the sensitization and organization that women have received from government and development partners, some have formed women's groups whose role is to advocate for peace. As explained by a FGD participant:

“Peace initiatives are no longer led solely by men. Women do as well. Several months ago, the Turkana women came to our community in search of peace. And they did it during a time when we were at odds with the Turkana, and it was dangerous and not safe to do so. They arrived and told us that they want peace and that if you want to kill us, you should do so. We have come as women. As a result, women can advocate for peace whenever they see the need. I believe they felt bad because their children had died in the conflict.”⁴²

The youth, on the other hand, are seen to be more active in resource management and sharing agreements. The responsibility of the youth, especially male youth, is livestock care (grazing). The elder men show them where to graze and where to water the livestock. If the watering areas dry up, they bring the report back to the elders, who tell them what to do. However, participants stated that the youth are the main propagators of conflicts because they do not listen to elders who advise them to refrain from practices such as cattle raiding.

According to the elders, the youths have accessed guns that they use in livestock rustling. They also observed that their decision-making power has reduced. Previously, the elders oversaw livestock, and land use and management. That is no longer the case in communities that experience internal conflicts. This is especially observable in Karamoja district of Uganda, where internal conflict is rife. In Turkana, Nyangatom, and Toposa, it was observed that the hegemony of traditional institutions and that of elders held. This is, in part, because there are no incidents of livestock theft or rustling within their distinct groups, which is not the case in Uganda.

Some of these conclusions are like those in many other reports on gender in pastoralist communities. It is, however, important to note that the overriding picture coming from the various study participants is that power and decision-making among pastoralists' communities is far from being concentrated in the hands of one man or of only men. Instead, power is highly diffused and distributed across different centers. This diffusion and distribution of power includes women as significant decision makers and custom creators.

⁴¹ Interview with key informant Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 17 September 2022.

⁴² Participant in a mixed FGD, Kapadakook, Kotido district, Uganda, 28 September 2022.

There are social relations between pastoralist communities that cannot be taken for granted and women play a key role in these relations. For example, sharing of tobacco snuff (*etaba*), water, exchange of gifts, and trade relations are not independent of gender social relations. It was also clear that decisions about natural resource sharing, both at home and across communities, are a continuous negotiated process between men and women. As stated by a woman in an FGD in Kaabong district:

*“Most decisions about resources at home and outside are based on discussions and agreements. The most important thing is discussing jointly and agreeing on issues [...] decision-making is now limited to men because they must take quick decisions while in the bush.”*⁴³

The role of women can never be underrated in pastoralists’ power and decision-making processes. Women have the capacity to manage natural resources because they interact with them on a daily basis. They interact with cattle, land, and family, and these interactions give them the power to manage, discuss and negotiate with the men on the same issues.

It is understood that in Turkana, as much as women have voices to raise their opinions, they ought to be invited to spaces of power to participate in decision-making. In Karamoja, women are said to be so busy at home doing care work that they have no time to engage in public discussions. However, on the South Sudan side of the cluster, women actively participate in *akero*, where decisions about migration and sharing of resources are discussed and negotiated.

3.5. CHANGES IN KEY RESOURCES AND DYNAMICS IN CROSS-BORDER AREAS

The Karamoja cluster is facing a lot of challenges with regards to natural resource depletion caused by various factors such as overgrazing, overuse of land and water, changes in land use (such as infrastructure development), and climate change which is causing desertification. These, in turn, have led to decreased productivity and food security, as well as increased competition for resources.

It is worth emphasizing that this region is particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts and more severe droughts. Environmental degradation, particularly the ongoing shrinkage and disappearance of palatable grass cover, was frequently mentioned by the study participants as a major challenge to rangeland productivity in the Karamoja cluster. The first rains have been especially damaging in the aftermath of long dry spells or droughts, causing excessive runoff of water and soil erosion. Several pastoralists and key informants linked runoff to poor soil infiltration capacity caused by reduced ground cover.

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that pastoralists and urban communities are increasingly relying on environmentally harmful practices like cutting down trees for charcoal-making as a year-round income-generating activity, rather than just during times of stress, as in the past. Many participants attributed the decreased tree cover to continued charcoal production which, in turn, leads to land degradation. As explained by a FGD participant from West Pokot in Kenya,

“We have seen a decrease in livestock resources, like trees and pasture. Even water specifically for animals has decreased. Diseases have increased and that means the mortality rate for the livestock has gone up. Secondly, the livestock lacks pasture that is why they are affected. When you go to the vegetation cover, trees and whatever, has declined. Why? Because human population has affected the vegetation by using those trees for charcoal and construction of houses. Water

⁴³ Focus group discussion, Kaabong district, Uganda, 28 August 2022

has also declined in the water sources like rivers because humans have cut the trees along the river line, and this has reduced even water levels and volume in the river, and that is a problem."⁴⁴

Pastoralist communities in the Karamoja cluster have traditionally employed various conservation practices, such as bush thinning, cutting invasive trees and plants, and burning, to maintain and enhance land productivity and use. The bush thinning, cutting of invasive plants, and controlled burning are aimed at preventing the spread of invasive species, as well as promoting new grass growth and controlling pests like ticks during dry seasons. However, in recent times, these practices have significantly decreased due to various reasons. These changes are occasioned by the diminished role of customary institutions, which have long been subjected to a variety of external pressures, including government restrictions, formal policies, and programs. Attempts to include customary institutions in governments' natural resource management interventions have included initiatives to reorganize and formalize them. As explained by a key informant working with an NGO in Moroto,

*"The most significant change that I can see is an attempt to formalize traditional mechanisms. Initially, you would notice that the pastoralists had their own method of negotiating for these resources. And now it is heavily formalized, and decisions are in the hands of either security or political leadership. However, there have been attempts in terms of memoranda of understanding between the countries. However, to say that this is formalized is an exaggeration because the actual formal mechanisms do not exist."*⁴⁵

The erasing of cultural traditions and norms because people want to follow modern culture with claims that old culture is obsolete, has also weakened traditional resource management practices. The encroachment of bushes and invasive plants on rangelands at the expense of palatable grass cover was also seen as a manifestation of land degradation caused by the abandonment of customary rangeland management practices in the majority of the study areas. The adoption of practices alien to the communities has resulted in the introduction of previously unknown activities, such as charcoal burning and brick baking, both of which harm the environment.

According to this study, access to grazing and water in some areas has been granted by government officials rather than by customary authorities or elders through traditional negotiations. This amounts to open and unrestricted access to pastureland and water for primary rights holders, which supersedes customary rules designed to ensure natural resource management for both host and visiting users. Where others can effectively wield power over rangelands, the incentive to invest in rangelands and protect water sources may be severely harmed.

Movement patterns within and across borders have also changed dramatically, owing to increased competition for land, changing demographics, and economic, environmental, and policy pressures. Pastoralists choose distance and routes by balancing forage and water access, energy and time expended by moving, and grazing time. Their decisions are informed by a variety of sources, including historical experience, networks, traditional governance systems, and nationally designated routes.

A few overlapping, complex, and self-reinforcing factors, such as the conversion of rangeland to other uses, shifts in production and marketing priorities, an agrarian bias in policymaking, environmental difficulties, and population growth, have a significant impact on movement patterns because of increased competition for land within and across borders.

⁴⁴ Focus group discussion, West Pokot, Kenya, 03 August 2022.

⁴⁵ Interview with key informant, Moroto district, Uganda, 24 August 2022

Conflict and insecurity have also forced or changed the movement of some pastoralists, leading to clashes along routes. Pastoralist communities in the Karamoja cluster face a variety of cross-border conflict dynamics, such as armed insurgencies, cattle rustling, herder-farmer disputes, state violence, violent crime, and gender-based violence. These problems occur both inside and outside of borders. The borderlands are additionally characterized by neglect and underdevelopment, making them especially vulnerable to conflict incubation. While pastoralists may be affected or involved in security issues, it should be noted that pastoralism does not always cause or exacerbate them.

Broader political processes that disregard pastoralist institutions, such as administrative boundary changes, have also been blamed for conflict in the study areas. In some cases, these processes fail to consider existing customary institutional arrangements. It has been argued that this has contributed to inter-clan and inter-ethnic conflicts that have also crossed state borderlines. These boundary demarcations have exacerbated conflict by also cutting some communities off from accessing new resources, such as minerals. As explained by an elder in an FGD in Kotido town,

*“During those years, we had things like gold and other minerals, as well as some material used to make spears. Nowadays, it is not much like that. This is due to insecurity, which has hampered human movement to mining areas in search of these minerals. It is only in areas where the government has provided security, such as in Nakiloro, where the government is providing miners with security. These minerals are less visible to us these days.”*⁴⁶

Moreover, tensions are rife over administrative boundaries between cross-border states. State borders that are contested can also impede mobility and increase the risk of conflict. For example, the Ilemi Triangle contains important water points that are used by groups from the four countries (South Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Kenya) for herding, hunting, and cultivation⁴⁷. The area has changed hands and is now under Kenyan jurisdiction, but its borders are undefined, and ownership is disputed. Following the discovery of hydrocarbons and minerals in the region, attitudes are hardening⁴⁸. While porous borders make it easier to access economic opportunities and social systems, overlapping territorial claims complicate and lengthen migration⁴⁹.

Similarly, an increasing proportion of pastoral land is being enclosed or otherwise closed off to herders, impeding mobility within and between states. In Uganda, mineral extraction is of concern. For Ethiopia, it has been noted that government activities, in particular electricity and agricultural activities along River Omo, have affected production patterns for pastoralists there.

Governments always aim for sedentarization of pastoralists to push their interests. However, as participants in interviews in Kangaten in Ethiopia shared their experiences, this is more commonly achieved by ignoring pastoralists' claims to resources and the customary institutions that manage them. In 2006, for example, the Ugandan army used a protected *kraal* system, which severely limited livestock movement and increased livestock mortality and morbidity due to overcrowding. As a result, Karamoja pastoralists suffered significant losses in their final push away from pastoral production⁵⁰.

⁴⁶ Focus group discussion. Kotido, Uganda, 28 August 2022

⁴⁷ Feyissa, D. (2020). Mobility and migration in the Karamoja Cluster. Policy Brief. United Nations Development Programme. <https://www.africa.undp.org/content/rba/en/home/library/issuebriefs/borderland-policy-briefing-series---mobility-and-migration-in-th.html>.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Bushby, K. & Stites, E. (2015). 'Cross-border dynamics in the Uganda–Kenya–South Sudan borderlands cluster.' In: The World Bank (Ed). *From isolation to integration: The borderlands of the Horn of Africa*. The World Bank <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/33513/The-Borderlands-of-theHorn-of-Africa.pdf>.

⁵⁰ Interview with key informant, Karamoja, Uganda, 29 August 2022.

As grazing land has been reduced, sharing agreements with host communities have been greatly impacted, with host communities claiming that there is no longer enough land to share with visiting communities. On this note, a study participant observed thus:

“The land is small, and when the livestock from neighbors come in, it exerts pressure on grazing land and water. When they run short of water, they end up migrating to areas such as Lolelia. It affects them.”⁵¹

Most rangelands have been gazetted either for wildlife conservation or mineral extraction, and less land for movements and grazing is left for pastoralists. In the Uganda borderlands, there is an evident but silent conflict between the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) and pastoralist communities as explained by a study participant:

“In Morungole, UWA is trying to create a bigger conservancy animal corridor from Karenga, Loyoro, and it is going to restrict pastoralists’ mobility and access to pastures, water and migratory routes and this might bring conflict, and this is very serious. I am told the Ik have already rejected it.”⁵²

Participants on South Sudan’s part of the cluster further noted the enforcement of conservation activities as infringing on their ability to move across the borders. The access to pasture resources is *“especially restrictive in the Kidepo basin, especially when livestock migrates to the south, around the border with Uganda.”⁵³*

The peripheral status of pastoral areas is changing across the Horn and East Africa. Whether driven by security concerns, as in the case of Somalia and Kenya, or a new appreciation of their economic potential, border areas that were previously largely ignored by the state are now attracting interest from both local and global capital⁵⁴. For example, the construction of hydro-electric dams on Ethiopia’s Omo River, which has altered its annual flood, combined with sugar plantations irrigated by the river, have eliminated prime dry-season grazing within Ethiopia, forcing those affected to seek livelihood opportunities further inside Kenya⁵⁵.

These infrastructure investments are deepening the integration of cross-border areas into national economies, but they have significant implications for indigenous populations' food security and social relations. One such project that could impact pastoralists in the Karamoja cluster is the Lamu Port, South Sudan, Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor project, an infrastructural project that is expected to run through South Sudan, Ethiopia, Uganda, and Kenya from the Lamu Port of Kenya on completion. In the Karamoja cluster, the LAPSSET corridor project will be implemented in a *“fragile zone, in which the effects of climate variability and climate change have had an impact.”⁵⁶*

3.6. GOVERNMENT AND NGOS’ INTERVENTIONS TO EMPOWER LOCAL AND CROSS BORDER COMMUNITIES

⁵¹ FGD participant in Kapeliese, Nyangatom, Ethiopia, 18 September 2022.

⁵² Interview with key informant, Kaabong, Karamoja, Uganda, 29 August 2022.

⁵³ Participant at the regional validation workshop for this study Lodwar, Kenya, 10 October 2022.

⁵⁴ Lind, J., Sabates-Wheeler, R., Caravani, M., Kuol, L. B. D. & Nightingale, D. M. (2020). Newly evolving pastoral and post-pastoral rangelands of Eastern Africa. *Pastoralism*, 10(24),1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13570-020-00179-w>.

⁵⁵ Feyissa, supra n 47.

⁵⁶ Ndiku K. (2014). A corridor of opportunity? The LAPSSET project in local context. <http://peaceinsight.org/en/articles/kenya-lapsset-conflict/?location=kenya&theme-> !

There are several interventions at the national and regional levels towards enhancing cross-border sharing and management of natural resources in the Karamoja cluster.

3.6.1. LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS AT NATIONAL LEVELS

The East African countries of Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia have put in place legal and policy frameworks aimed at addressing the challenges of natural resource management. These frameworks include national laws and policies on the management and conservation of the environment, as well as sectoral policies on forestry, wetlands, and agriculture.

However, despite these efforts, there are still gaps and challenges that need to be addressed. These include a lack of clear mechanisms for trans-boundary water management, limited recognition and protection of customary land tenure systems, and inadequate coordination and engagement with local communities and civil society organizations. This section will examine the policy and institutional frameworks in place in these four countries and the challenges they face in ensuring the sustainable management of natural resources. The county specifics are described below:

KENYA

Until recently, formal land tenure arrangements in Kenya fell into three categories: government land, private land, and trust land. The arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) were primarily regarded as trust land, a system established by the colonial authorities to address insecurity in the African reserves⁵⁷. The trust land regime vested land management and administration in the County Councils, in principle as trustees for people living in these areas. County Councils often exercised strict control over the allocation of land, and were poorly accountable to local communities.

The policy framework in Kenya has attempted to incorporate more pastoral-friendly institutional provisions, with natural resource management instruments implemented to strengthen decision-making at lower levels. The key ministries handling natural resources have been instituted to administer the policy and legal framework at the national and county level, with recognized indigenous systems of governance playing a key role⁵⁸. However, policy formulation at the counties has been slow in the last decade, with drafted policies awaiting approval in the County Assemblies. Lack of capacity and poor political will at the county level have impeded the policy process⁵⁹.

Public participation only involves budget planning, with no prior knowledge or understanding of how the allocation process works, and without any feedback⁶⁰.

There is an opportunity to support policy processes at the county level by developing a policy literacy strategy, incorporating research evidence to inform natural resource management practice, and adopting functional policies that address cross-border natural resource management. Factors that support coordination, integration, and engagement in policy processes include having an enabling Disaster Risk

⁵⁷ Wayumba, G. (2004). 'Land tenure and sustainable pastoral livelihoods in Kenya.' In H. J. Hurni & U. Wiesmann (Eds.), *Global change and sustainable development: A synthesis of regional experiences from research partnerships* (pp. 159-172). Geographica Bernensia.

⁵⁸ USAID. (2020). *Kenya Country Development Cooperation Strategy*.
https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1860/Kenya_CDSS_2019-2024_FINAL.pdf

⁵⁹ Ochieng, D. E., Opondo, M., & Karanja, F. K. (2020). Participatory governance and policy formulation in pastoral areas: A case study of Marsabit County, Kenya. *Pastoralism*, 10(1), 1-17.

⁶⁰ Njeri, R. W., Kiemo, K. S., & Namusonge, G. S. (2019). An assessment of public participation in budget making process in Kenya: A case of Nairobi City County. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Innovative Technology*, 6(7), 39-52.

Management (DRM) policy framework, which guides disaster management response activities and development programming⁶¹.

UGANDA

Uganda, like many other countries in the East African region, faces challenges related to cross-border natural resource management, particularly in the context of pastoral communities that rely on trans-boundary resources such as water and pasture. The legal and policy frameworks in Uganda have attempted to address some of these challenges, but there are still gaps that need to be addressed⁶².

One of the key legal instruments relating to natural resource management in Uganda is the National Environment Act (NEA) of 2019. The NEA provides for the management and conservation of the environment, including natural resources such as water, forests, and wildlife. It also established the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), which is responsible for implementing and enforcing environmental policies and regulations in Uganda⁶³.

In addition to the NEMA, there are other policies and laws that address specific aspects of natural resource management in Uganda. For example, the Water Act of 1995 provides for the management and regulation of water resources in Uganda, including trans-boundary waters. The Wildlife Act of 2019⁶⁴ provides for the conservation and management of wildlife and their habitats in Uganda. The Land Act of 1998⁶⁵ regulates the acquisition, management, and disposal of land in Uganda, including community land.

In terms of policies, Uganda has a few sectoral policies that address natural resource management, including the National Forestry Policy of 2001,⁶⁶ the National Wetlands Policy of 1995,⁶⁷ and the National Agricultural Policy of 2013. These policies provide guidelines and strategies for the sustainable management of natural resources in Uganda.

Despite these legal and policy frameworks, there are still gaps and challenges related to cross-border natural resource management in Uganda. For example, there is a lack of clear mechanisms for trans-boundary water management, which has led to conflicts between Uganda and its neighbors, particularly in the context of the Nile River. There are also challenges related to the recognition and protection of customary land tenure systems, which are often relied upon by pastoral communities⁶⁸.

Furthermore, there is a need for greater coordination and cooperation among government agencies and stakeholders in the management of natural resources in Uganda. This includes coordination between different ministries and agencies responsible for natural resource management, as well as greater engagement with local communities and civil society organizations.

⁶¹ Munene, M. M., Kaburu, H., & Ogola, W. O. (2018). Disaster risk management policy formulation and implementation process in Kenya: A case study of the Nairobi County. *Disaster Risk Reduction*, 31, 287-294.

⁶² Herbert, S. & Birch, I. (2022). Cross-border pastoral mobility and cross-border conflict in Africa – patterns and policy responses. XCEPT Evidence Synthesis. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham. https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2021-12-09_GSDRC-Pastoralist-Mobility-FINAL2-1.pdf

⁶³ National Environment Act, 2019.

⁶⁴ Wildlife Act of 2019.

⁶⁵ Land Act of 1998.

⁶⁶ Republic of Uganda. (2001). National Forestry Policy of 2001. <https://www.nema.go.ug/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/National-Forestry-Policy.pdf>

⁶⁷ Water Act, 1995.

⁶⁸ Akampurira, P. (2019). Challenges of transboundary water resources management in Uganda. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development*, 1(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.37284/jassd.1.1.1>

To address these challenges, there have been efforts to develop cross-border natural resource management frameworks in Uganda. For example, the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) was established in 1999 to promote cooperative management of the Nile River Basin among the countries that share its resources, including Uganda. The NBI has developed several initiatives and programs aimed at promoting sustainable development and management of the Nile Basin.

Greater coordination, cooperation, and engagement with local communities and civil society organizations⁶⁹ are essential to ensuring the sustainable management of natural resources in Uganda.

ETHIOPIA

Ethiopia, like Kenya and Uganda, faces challenges in its legal and policy frameworks for cross-border resource sharing. The Ethiopian 1995 federal constitution provides for some rights of the people and the responsibilities associated with protecting the environment. The Ethiopian government has formulated and implemented socio-economic development policies, strategies, and programs in various sectors in support of natural resource management and climate change. However, the implementation of these policies is complex and lacks coordination and effective communication with different stakeholders, local development organizations, and environmental promoters, thus negating the purpose of having a multi-sectoral approach⁷⁰.

Furthermore, the implementation of the Environmental Policy of Ethiopia, 1997 and the Ethiopia Water Resources Management Policies (WRMP), 1999 is complex and is yet to be adequately translated into inter-sectoral programs of joint actions. This is because they lack the capacity to set up appropriate institutional arrangements in different aspects of natural resource management. The Ethiopian policy environment on natural resource management requires all the agencies to have very efficient and effective institutional mechanisms to implement the policies. This leaves no room for change or readjustment of strategies, which hinders policy implementation and adaptation to the current development challenges. Additionally, some policies such as the Rural Land Administration and the Land Use Proclamation (No. 456/2005) and the Environmental Policy of Ethiopia, 1997 were formulated more than two decades ago with no or limited reforms.

Most policies are formulated at the federal level where most of the technical experts are situated, with a lack of skilled technical persons particularly at the lower levels of policy implementation. Furthermore, it was evident during the study that the policy literacy among state officials, civil society, and local community is very low. This hinders the effective operationalization and translation of policies enunciated at the Federal level at the local and community levels due to lack of knowledge on the community's experience on accessibility to natural resources. Multiple policies need to be revised to encompass the current development challenges experienced by cross-border communities, especially pastoralists⁷¹.

The Ethiopian government has made progress in managing its natural resources, including water resources, and has implemented programs and policies aimed at managing natural resources and mitigating the impacts of climate change. The Ethiopian government's efforts have also been focused on promoting sustainable development, addressing environmental degradation, and improving the

⁶⁹ Okello, A., Muhumuza, F., & Vudriko, P. (2018). Customary land tenure systems in Uganda. A review. *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 6(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jlrs.v6i1.12470>

⁷⁰ Khan, N. A., Hassan, M. F., & Hussain, S. W. (2021). Challenges and prospects of transboundary natural resource management in East Africa: a case study of Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(9), 11091-11102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-12172-5>

⁷¹ Desta, A., & Belete, H. (2018). Environmental Policy Implementation in Ethiopia: A Review of Challenges and Prospects. Ethiopian Development Research Institute

livelihoods of communities dependent on natural resources. In 2015, Ethiopia, Kenya, and South Sudan signed a tripartite agreement to promote regional cooperation in areas such as cross-border trade, infrastructure development, and natural resource management.

There is a need to establish effective institutional mechanisms at all levels of government to implement policies and programs effectively, improve technical capacity of those involved in implementing policies at the local level, and update policies and strategies to address current development challenges. These steps will be crucial to further progress in managing natural resources and promoting regional cooperation for resource sharing among Ethiopia, Kenya, and South Sudan.

SOUTH SUDAN

South Sudan is a country rich in natural resources, including oil, minerals, water, and land. However, the management and sharing of these resources has been complicated by the country's ongoing conflict, as well as its relationships with neighboring countries, particularly Kenya and Uganda⁷².

South Sudan's 2011 transitional constitution provides for the protection of the environment and sustainable management of natural resources. The country has also developed policies and laws related to natural resource management, including the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) of 2012, the National Water Resources Management Policy of 2017, and the Land Act of 2012. However, the implementation of these policies and laws has been hampered by a lack of capacity and resources, as well as ongoing conflict and political instability⁷³.

South Sudan shares several important resources with Kenya and Uganda, including water resources from the Nile River, oil reserves, and land for agriculture and livestock grazing. The management and sharing of these resources have been complicated by political tensions and conflicts between the three countries⁷⁴. Additionally, the construction of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam by Ethiopia has caused concerns among downstream countries like Egypt, Sudan, and South Sudan over potential impacts on water availability and quality.

Despite these challenges, there have been some efforts to promote cross-border resource sharing and management. In 2018, South Sudan, Kenya, and Uganda signed a memorandum of understanding on regional cooperation for sustainable development. The agreement covers several areas, including the management and conservation of shared natural resources, such as water resources from Lake Victoria, the Nile River, and other shared rivers and aquifers. The three countries have also established joint border committees to address issues related to cross-border trade and resource management.

However, the implementation of these agreements has been limited by a lack of resources, capacity, and political will. In addition, there are ongoing conflicts and tensions between the countries that continue to affect resource management and sharing. For example, the recent conflict in South Sudan has disrupted the country's oil production, which has had ripple effects on the economies of Kenya and Uganda, who depend on South Sudanese oil for their energy needs.

3.6.2. REGIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORKS

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Aweke, F. (2018). Environmental Governance in South Sudan: An Overview of Key Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy*, 9(1), 32-49.

⁷⁴ Gizaw, A. (2014) Natural Resources Management in South Sudan: Opportunities and Challenges. *Natural Resources*, 5(10), 477-486.

At the regional level, several key frameworks, such as the African Union's (AU) framework and the Declarations of N'djamena and Nouakchott, are non-binding⁷⁵. These can be first steps toward legally binding international agreements, as well as providing momentum for national advocacy. However, their implementation is contingent on commitments by member states' as well as their respective border communities⁷⁶.

Furthermore, the AU Agenda 2063 is a framework for implementing seven aspirations, each with a goal of improving equitable and sustainable socio economic prosperity, peace and stability, culture, and stronger governance. Two of its seven aspirations speak closest to natural resources management, namely: a) developing human capital, social assets, infrastructure and public goods, and b) establishing enduring peace and security.

Additionally, the IGAD protocol on transhumance, which was approved at the ministerial level in November 2020, calls for the use of transhumance corridors and the issuance of a transhumance certificate⁷⁷. One aim of the protocol is to enhance a conducive environment for pastoralism in member states and to formulate, for that purpose, a harmonious facilitative and regulative regional framework on transhumance⁷⁸. In line with this, the protocol has three key intentions: a) allowing free, safe, and orderly cross-border mobility of transhumant livestock and herders in search of pasture and water as an adaptation mechanism to climate change and weather variability within the IGAD region, b) committing member states to invest adequate resources to pastoral regions and competent institutions managing transhumance, c) harmonization of national laws and policies related to livestock and pastoral development, land use and governance, disease control and cross-border measures⁷⁹.

Moreover, Kenya and Uganda signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) in September 2019 that allows for reciprocal grazing and other forms of cross-border assistance, such as access to education and health services in Kenya by communities from other parts of the Karamoja cluster⁸⁰. This began as a grassroots initiative that grew into a bilateral agreement. However, for the time being, it is merely a declaration of intent. Furthermore, it does not address the issue of uneven disarmament, which has been rigorous and sustained on the Ugandan side but intermittent elsewhere in the cluster, upsetting the balance of power between different groups⁸¹.

Regional and continental frameworks are thought to be more progressive in their recognition of mobility and trans-boundary resource management⁸². For example, the African Union Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa is described as a "much-needed antidote" to some governments' sedentarization agenda⁸³.

However, whereas several regional policy frameworks encourage cross-border movement and natural resource sharing mechanisms for pastoralists, the main policy and legal framework limitation has been

⁷⁵ Davies, J., Ogali, C., Slobodian, L., Roba, G., & Ouedraogo, R. (2018). Crossing boundaries: Legal and policy arrangements for cross-border pastoralism. FAO & IUCN. <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20193405113>

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Intergovernmental Authority for Development. (2020). IGAD Protocol on Transhumance. IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD). <http://www.celep.info/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/2020-IGAD-protocol-ontranshumance-final-endorsed-version.pdf>.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Feyissa, supra n 47.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ African Union. (2014). Protocol on transhumance in Africa. <https://au.int/en/treaties/protocol-transhumance-africa>

the dissonance between national and regional or continental policy responses to border areas and borderland communities⁸⁴.

Border areas are also typically dominated by security and sovereignty concerns⁸⁵, and governments are frequently influenced by immediate geopolitical pressures⁸⁶. Furthermore, regional commitments signed by ministers other than those in charge of security or foreign affairs, such as those governing cross-border trade, may be viewed as less significant in domestic government circles⁸⁷.

Generally, governments have failed to protect or support pastoralism and the mobility on which it depends, and some policy responses have been detrimental. Where governments have acknowledged the need to facilitate livestock mobility, they have not gone far enough beyond abstract statements of support to result in tangible improvements on the ground⁸⁸. Problems related to the failure to acknowledge these pastoralist practices in policy-making processes at regional and national levels have had far reaching impacts.

3.6.3. ROLES OF GOVERNMENT IN CROSS-BORDER SHARING OF RESOURCES

Government and NGO responses to cross-border pastoralist movements are primarily through policy initiatives that shape cross-border pastoralist movements in a variety of ways, ranging from regulation and protection of pastoralism to addressing other issues with secondary effects on pastoralism. However, the absence of policy, or its ineffective implementation, has consequences for pastoralist livelihoods, thus heavily impacting natural resources.

It was established through the study that government authorities are playing an increasingly important role in cross-border management of pastoralists issues, including through inter-state border security meetings, peace-building processes, cross-border development projects in pastoral areas, and cross-border trade.

The Government of Uganda has, for example, been reported to have supported some cross-border meetings of pastoralists to facilitate peaceful coexistence and management of resources as narrated by a key informant:

“When the Turkana come near, the government calls for a meeting and we discuss about the coming of the Turkana and how to share with them the resources. Then the elders will allow them, then we welcome them. Then we tell them to water their animals from a gazetted area. That’s after meeting with them (Ekokuo); and then they give us something.”⁸⁹

These meetings in Uganda are primarily facilitated by government/local leaders such as Local Councils, Resident District Commissioners (RDCs), and Members of Parliament.

⁸⁴ World Bank (2020a). *From isolation to integration: The borderlands of the Horn of Africa*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/33513/The-Borderlands-of-theHorn-of-Africa.pdf>.

⁸⁵ Ng’asike, P. O. (2019). Fusing formal and informal trading: Emerging practices in the livestock value chains between Kenya and Somalia. DIIS Working Paper. Vol. 12. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies. https://pure.diis.dk/ws/files/3068202/DIIS_WP_2019_12_FINAL.pdf.

⁸⁶ Davies, J., Ogali, C., Slobodian, L., Roba, G., & Ouedraogo, R. (2018). Crossing boundaries: Legal and policy arrangements for cross-border pastoralism. FAO & IUCN. <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20193405113>

⁸⁷ Ng’asike, supra n 88.

⁸⁸ Kitchell, E., Turner, M. D., & McPeak, J. G. (2014). Mapping of pastoral corridors: practices and politics in eastern Senegal. *Pastoralism*, 4(17), 1-14. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13570-014-0017-2>.

⁸⁹ Focus group discussion, Kotido, Uganda, 28 August 2022

A similar trend was also reported in Nyangatom, Ethiopia, where government officials mobilize the communities involved in resource sharing arrangements to learn about the challenges they are facing, and to provide guidance on how to control instances of conflict. This is as explained by an Ethiopian government official:

“When Kenyans enter Toposa, and yet it is small land and small grazing area, what the government does is to call the two communities and advise them on how to share these resources. For example, they allocate the areas where to keep livestock during rainy season, leaving other areas to be preserved for dry season.”⁹⁰

The Ugandan government also facilitates resource sharing by constructing dams to avoid conflicts caused by a lack of water. The Kobebe dam in Moroto district is one such dam that serves many communities, including cross-border Turkana and Pokot communities. According to key informants, the government plans to build one dam east of Nakapelimoru in Kotido district⁹¹ to be shared by the Dodoth and Turkana. The government also plans to upgrade the watering area at Loongor to serve the Bokora, Matheniko, and Dodoth.

Livestock disease management is one of the areas of intervention by governments. NGO participants have informed this research that joint vaccination activities have been undertaken by the Kenya and Uganda government authorities with the motivation of reducing the spread of trans-boundary diseases.

It is notable that across the Karamoja cluster, there are varying degrees of government involvement in the management of natural resources sharing. This is observed to be primarily the result of different government and political systems. Uganda stands out with a military, and intelligence and political structure going down to the village and *kraal* level, influencing resource use and management. As a key informant said:

“There are now district structures and peace committees, but major decisions are made by the RDCs and the LC5 office, such as allowing cross-border movement from Kenya to Uganda. I am also aware that Uganda and Kenya have an MOU that, in theory, allows for the movement of pastoralists across the border. I say in theory because, recently, I believe the UPDF has prevented the Turkana from entering Uganda due to insecurity.”⁹²

Kenya follows, though with a much lighter military and political influence at the local level. South Sudan and Ethiopia have much less prevalent government influence in natural resources management.

Conversely, where there exists less government influence, authority over natural resources management or sharing has been seen to be more a matter for traditional institutions or leaders to deal with.

3.6.3. CHALLENGES IN GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS

Several participants in the study thought that several governments are disincentivizing the practice of pastoralism by prioritizing other forms of livelihoods. Framework agreements such as the MOU signed between Uganda and Kenya in 2019 was seen as a mechanism that can be used to solve issues of conflicts and support pastoralism and cross-border pastoralism⁹³.

⁹⁰ Interview with government official, Nyangatom, Ethiopia 19 September 2022.

⁹¹ Efforts are underway to construct three big dams on the Uganda side of the border with Kenya to improve cross-border natural resources use by the Ministry of Water & Environment, Uganda with funding from the German government.

⁹² Interview with key informant, Moroto district-Uganda, 25 August 2022.

⁹³ Interview with district Councilor, Karenga district, Uganda, 29 August 2022

Senior government officials reported that the government lacks the financial resources to enforce regulations related to natural resources sharing. They added that this is manifested in the lack of effective planning and coordination on natural resources use in the Karamoja cluster⁹⁴.

Other participants noted the limited community participation in the development of resources mechanisms, including that related to the Uganda – Kenya cross-border development framework⁹⁵. They said that the government has often failed to involve local communities in the management of natural resources in the Karamoja region, which has led to resentment and mistrust of government efforts⁹⁶.

The power and influence of national institutions and regulations over the use of natural resources is mainly concentrated in the capital cities. Despite their impact, they are not effectively equipped to handle cross-border resource sharing and, instead, rely on international frameworks to carry out this task.

The governments in the Karamoja region have faced challenges in effectively managing their natural resources, including corruption and a lack of technical capacity. Efforts have been made to improve management through community-based natural resources management, integrated natural resources management, regular monitoring and evaluations, partnerships and collaborations, and legal frameworks.

Several respondents in the study decried the little involvement of the government in the management of natural resources and its failure to support cross-border sharing of resources. In some resource-rich locations, it was observed that cross-border developments would ensure economic prosperity for residents across the border. A participant in Kaabong explained their uniqueness and resource-wealth as something that could benefit pastoralists in Kenya, South Sudan, and Uganda if government projects were well designed, saying:

“Kaabong is unique in that it shares borders with South Sudan and Kenya, and is no other district in the region has such location. The district does not have access to the neighboring countries in terms of roads and does not have access to those countries for water or other natural resources. The main challenges that the district faces in terms of natural resource sharing are due to insecurity and criminal activity. The government had attempted to construct a large dam in the area, but the work was never completed, and the project has become a "white elephant". There are ongoing conflicts between Karamoja and Turkana over resource sharing, and the government has not been able to facilitate these negotiations effectively.”⁹⁷

Challenges in natural resource sharing and management within the government have largely been acknowledged by participants in this research. On occasion, the function of government in responding to drought and food shortages through relief and community resilience programs was acknowledged⁹⁸. Several participants in this study were optimistic that peace and resource sharing across the border will improve in the next few years. They noted that the current challenges in the region are the last to happen, and that if peace is attained, resources sharing will continue⁹⁹.

⁹⁴ Interview with District leader, Kaabong district, Uganda, 18 August 2022

⁹⁵ Interview with District leader, Kaabong district, Uganda, 28 August 2022.

⁹⁶ Interview with RCC, Kapoeta East, South Sudan, 16 September 2022

⁹⁷ Interview with District Councilor, Karenga district, Uganda, 19 August 2022

⁹⁸ Focus group discussion, Kapoeta, South Sudan, 16 September 2022

⁹⁹ Focus group discussion, Turkana, Kenya, 08 September 2022

3.6.4. ROLES OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

NGOs were also said to have played a role in guiding and coordinating natural resource management and sharing. Study participants in Karamoja, for example, reported that a range of NGOs, including international organizations, faith-based organizations (FBOs), and community-based organizations (CBOs), have projects related to peace, natural resource management, and catchment management, among other things. Others are involved in developing the capacity of community institutions at various levels. This is through development trusts, range land management committees, grazing committees, peace committees, and trauma healing for youth.

Participants in the Nyangatom study area in Ethiopia reported that NGOs, alongside governments, hold workshops and trainings on peace and climate change issues in the communities and across the borders. Some of the workshops are intended to inform *kraal* leaders and youth about climate change, when the rain will fall, how heavy the rain will be, how people will move, and how to conserve resources for the future.

Some NGOs were established with the primary goal of coordinating regional cross-border peace and development initiatives. The Pokot, Karamojong, Turkana, and Sebei (POKATUSA) Peace and Development Program based in Kapenguria is an example. POKATUSA was founded to facilitate and coordinate long-term peace and development initiatives among pastoralist communities in Kenya and Uganda. While now defunct, its efforts are credited for progress on resources sharing in the Pokot-Karamoja borderland in the early 2000s.

Some NGOs were reported to be using a multifaceted approach to fostering peaceful coexistence of pastoralists as well as resource management. An NGO in Turkana West, for example, has initiatives aimed at water and pasture management in the Turkana region. It also holds peace meetings with pastoralists to educate them on resource sharing and to discourage locals from participating in cattle raids. A young female participant in Kalobeyei observed that if the current government wants to make sense of natural resource sharing cooperation with pastoralists in Kaabong, they must work with NGOs as they know better the nuances of natural resources sharing¹⁰⁰.

Moreover, NGO activities have been observed to be gender sensitive, increasing the role of women in what would be a male domain in natural resource management. This is because peace committees supported by NGOs often require a quota of participants to be women. In fact, this study observed some structures that are either led by women or consist of women only. This include structures like the Women Peace Forums in Kenya and Uganda, and a Women Peace Crusade in Turkana West¹⁰¹. NGO interventions include programs to facilitate cross-border peace, construction of water facilities, environment conservation, and community engagement to curb practices such as bush burning. There are, however, some challenges faced by NGOs in cross-border resource sharing.

First, they lack legitimacy and the authority to enforce decisions and agreements between different countries. Second, they have limited resources, which restricts their ability to implement and sustain cross-border resource sharing initiatives. Third, the lack of coordination as well as cultural differences lead to fragmented and ineffective interventions. Finally, NGO interventions often have limited impact and are not sustainable over the long term, particularly if they fail to address the root causes of the problem, or if they exclude meaningful participation and empowerment of local communities and

¹⁰⁰ Focus group discussion, Turkana, Kenya, 08 August 2022

¹⁰¹ Longoli, S. (Ed.). (2019). Karamoja Pastoralist Magazine: Etamam: The process and mechanism of ensuring negotiated access to pastoral resources in Karamoja. Moroto: Karamoja Development Forum.

stakeholders. Therefore, it is crucial for NGOs to address these weaknesses and work towards more effective, sustainable, and participatory cross-border resource sharing interventions.

3.7. GENDER AND SOCIAL INCLUSION CONSIDERATIONS, OPPORTUNITIES, AND CONSTRAINTS IN CROSS-BORDER RESOURCE SHARING AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

While a lot of research indicates a shift in gender roles¹⁰², this research shows that at least in natural resource decision making and management, gender roles are still distinctly intact. In the past, women used to be involved in caring for animals, but as the way of life in Karamoja has changed, their involvement in animal husbandry has decreased.

As illustrated in an earlier section on gender and the role of women in natural resource management, this dichotomy in roles is especially at the local level. There are, however, many interventions by governmental and non-governmental organizations to increase the participation of the youth and women in natural resource management/sharing. This is through participation in several committees and initiatives. This is how IGAD captures the participation of women in a recent knowledge fair:

*“Through this forum, women from Kenya, Ethiopia, South Sudan, and Uganda identified similar issues that needed to be addressed to reduce marginalization. Through training, networking, and lobbying, women play an important role in early conflict warning and prevention, peace-building, and making agreements on resource sharing.”*¹⁰³

Local norms, the structure of decision-making spaces, the ‘fear’ by women to speak up in public, age, and other factors that create and sustain power relations and marginalize social groups, impede the potential for women's active participation. They are also some of the main barriers to mainstreaming women, youth, and traditionally marginalized groups into NRM activities/programs.

However, development actors have adopted several interventions emphasizing the importance of participation in cross-border resource sharing and NRM. Such interventions include targeting and engaging women and youth in stakeholder processes and various activities. These interventions are designed in such a way that women's participation is significant, or that more agency for women to negotiate access, control, and profit from interventions is provided.

In Kapoeta, for example, the RRC department emphasizes gender equality in pastoralist communities and the importance of all community members, particularly women and adolescents, participating in resource sharing agreements and management:

*“As the RRC, we regard everyone as equal. We do not distinguish between men and women. What a man can accomplish, a woman can do. Because a woman, like a man, has two hands. Now, as RRC, we are involving women because, as I recall, in some locations, such as Nyangatom, women look after cattle, particularly in homes where there are no boys. They assume the boy's responsibilities. We also expect women to participate in what men do including in resources sharing negotiations. The presence of women in negotiations with Turkana signals peace because women are recognized as non-violent individuals who do not desire bloodshed.”*¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Stites, F. & Akabwai D. (2010). Masculinity and Modernity in Karamoja. Feinstein International Center and Save the Children in Uganda.

¹⁰³ IGAD. (2021). Report of the 2021 *IGAD gender and resilience share fair*. <https://resilience.igad.int/resource/report-of-the-2021-igad-gender-and-resilience-share-fair-good-practices-in-mainstreaming-gender-in-cross-border-resilience-interventions-in-karamoja-and-mandera-clusters/>

¹⁰⁴ Interview with RRC, Kapoeta, South Sudan, 16 September 2022.

One of the key interests in this study was to investigate women's ability to make decisions regarding resource sharing negotiations and natural resource management. This is because the impact of larger societal changes, such as increased involvement of women in decision-making in pastoralist communities, hinges on the belief that their participation in these processes can increase their ability to bring about transformation.

It was determined that men are traditionally considered as the decision-makers and managers of natural resources, while women play a more supportive role, which is mostly driven by traditional cultural beliefs about men and women's responsibilities in decision-making and resource management. However, there has been a major change away from this attitude, owing mostly to the government's efforts to sensitize the people about the need for gender equality and social inclusion in resource management. As a key informant in Kotido, Uganda observed:

“These reforms were brought about by the government's effort to educate the public. We didn't mind women before the government educated them. This type of training has made us recognize that women are also useful members when decisions are being made in society and in committees. These decisions must be made in collaboration with women. The government is working hard to educate us on the importance of sharing everything with women.”¹⁰⁵

Men were shown to take a larger role in natural resource management, and they continue to dominate influence in community and natural resource sharing forums. This necessitates a need for sensitization efforts to include women and obtain men's support for women's participation by emphasizing the benefits of gender inclusion.

Inclusion of youth, whose primary function during times of peace is to assist in watering the animals and looking for fresh pastures, is also crucial. Youth participation in resource sharing systems is essential since they are characterized as having misdirected energy, being the source of most conflicts, being hot-tempered, readily causing conflicts, and engaging in theft. In the Karamoja cluster, however, male youth have a deeper level of involvement as emissaries or scouts for resources across borders.

Mainstreaming gender in natural resource sharing in the Karamoja cluster involves taking a proactive approach to addressing gender inequalities in access and control over resources. This can be done through gender-sensitive planning and policy making in natural resource management, ensuring women's participation in decision-making processes and resource management committees, integrating a gender perspective in resource assessments and monitoring, promoting equal access to resources and benefits for both women and men, building the capacity and skills of women in resource management, and addressing gender-based violence and discrimination in resource access and utilization.

By taking these steps, the goal is to ensure that the benefits and opportunities of natural resource management are shared equitably between women and men, and that women's perspectives and needs are considered in the management of these resources.

¹⁰⁵ Interview with a Kraal leader, Kotido district, Uganda, 27 August 2022.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pastoralist communities along the borders of Kenya, South Sudan, Ethiopia, and Uganda have relied on customary mechanisms, rules, and norms to guide natural resource use in their rangelands across international borders, administrative boundaries, and ethnicities. It was discovered through this study that the existence and enforcement of customary rules and reciprocity norms governing natural resource management are critical in controlling and regulating both land use and social relations between the ethnic groups.

Herd movement management, for example, is critical in rangeland management, with some areas suitable for use during the dry season and others during the wet season. The rangeland is a communally owned economic resource that must be shared by the various pastoralist ethnic groups and clans both within and across borders. They have put in place institutional systems for establishing primary and secondary access rights, as well as procedures and principles for negotiating water and pasture sharing among various pastoralist groups. This indigenous institutional framework governs the mobility of herders and their livestock, including across international borders, maintains and restores collaboration among clans and ethnic groups, and serves as a conflict resolution framework.

Conflicts in the form of cattle rustling and environmental degradation, particularly the shrinking and disappearance of palatable grass cover, are major drivers of changes in the NRM systems of pastoralists in the study areas. These changes have been exacerbated by the diminished role of customary institutions, which have long been subjected to a variety of external pressures, including government restrictions, formal policies, and programs that rarely consider their roles, and tend to view natural resource management in purely technical terms.

Whereas women are still seen as playing a less significant role due to the patriarchal structure of these communities, the role of women in pastoralists' power and decision-making processes cannot be overstated. Women can manage natural resources because they interact with them daily.

For a variety of reasons, including the deterioration of pastoralist institutional arrangements governing natural resource management, the viability of the clusters' livelihood systems has been weakened. This is due, in part, to state policies and actions that have refused to recognize pastoralists' right to own or manage their rangelands, thereby ignoring their cultural institutional system.

Government and NGO responses to cross-border pastoralist movements are primarily through policy initiatives that shape cross-border pastoralist movements in a variety of ways, ranging from regulation and protection of pastoralism to addressing other issues with secondary effects on pastoralism. However, the absence of policy, or its ineffective implementation, has consequences for pastoralist livelihoods, thus heavily impacting natural resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CROSS-BORDER COMMUNITY RESILIENCE PROGRAMME

These recommendations are aimed particularly at the Cross-Border Community Resilience Activity, but may be adopted by other government agencies, international donors, regional organizations, and I/NGOs interested in assisting with cross-border natural resource management initiatives.

Program scope:

The geographical scope of the CBCR Activity is quite good already. In Uganda, the program could expand in the southern part of Karamoja to the districts of Napak, Nabilatuk and Nakapiripirit. In the

rest of the cluster, the activity locations are well selected. The justification is that the districts are dry season grazing areas for livestock from West Pokot. This will ensure the program is focused on all hotspots in the Karamoja cluster relevant for cross-border development.

In terms of content and approaches:

1. Through IGAD's Center for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development and the IGAD Cross-border Facilitation Unit (based in Moroto), establish a coordination mechanism for local organizations and governments in the cluster to share initiatives, and to enhance linkages between actors on pastoralism and natural resources development.
2. Support processes to review existing local and national agreements on joint grazing or resource sharing where they do not exist or promote existing ones. In Uganda, support processes to renegotiate with relevant stakeholders the Moruitit and Nabilatuk resolutions – both of which are relevant to the resource sharing needs of the Karamoja cluster pastoralists of Uganda, and West Pokot and Turkana in Kenya. Local NGOs, local governments, county governments, and provincial governments are important entry points.
3. Invest in climate information dissemination through the national meteorological departments and enabled smartphone technology. Smartphones with apps that are periodically updated with climate change information, disaster risk management, conflict incidents, and drought and mitigation measures could be made available to selected trained community-based information focal persons to provide periodic updates to community members. This data could be generated through satellite or other technology. While telecom infrastructure is sparse in some areas, it is still worth considering that in most parts of the cluster there is connectivity. Mobile solar chargers can be the solution to electricity problems.
4. Understanding, recognizing, and considering the institutional aspects of natural resource management that influence resource management and access arrangements is a critical first step for all stakeholders. This should also be used to guide pastoral area planning, so that on-the-ground initiatives are based on pastoral livelihoods and ecosystem needs rather than international and administrative borders. Within its climate change adaptation capacity building efforts, the CBCR Activity needs to mainstream knowledge efforts aiming at increasing skills in pastoralist adaptation and resilience practices.
5. The CBCR Activity should integrate conflict management into its programs in a way which recognizes the linkages between conflict and natural resources management. In doing so, it will recognize the relationship between natural resource management, conflict, and resilience. Support for peace initiatives must address conflict issues at a much deeper level, and natural resource management must be understood as inextricably linked to conflict and conflict resolution.
6. Develop cross-border trade in the north of Turkana and South Omo; West Pokot and Amudat, Nabilatuk and Nakapiripirit; Kotido, Moroto, and Turkana West. In some of these areas, there are still bad roads and other infrastructure, but there exists a lot of potential to further incentivize the peaceful sharing of natural resources.