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Abstract

Pastoralism is an adaptation to the unique conditions of rangeland landscapes and it requires equally adapted systems of governance and tenure. It is often possible to find solutions to secure pastoral tenure within established national law, but the application of the law may require innovative approaches to adapt to the requirements of pastoralism. This is often difficult when public policy – written or unwritten – is to reallocate pastoral lands to other users or to transform pastoralism into a different land-use system. IFAD follows a systemic approach to improving the governance of pastoral lands, which takes pastoral water as the entry point for interventions, and is built on respect for the pastoral system and the three pillars on which it is based: resources (water, land), societal (families, chiefdoms, institutions) and economic (livestock). The examples in this paper show how IFAD-supported projects have been strengthening governance of tenure as the platform for sustainable pastoralism. The challenges for pastoral tenure have been addressed by putting focus on strengthening customary pastoral institutions (or customary-formal hybrids), building the resilience of common-pool resource users, participatory land-use planning and multi-stakeholder user agreements to mitigate conflict and developing inclusive policy and legal frameworks.
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1. Introduction

Pastoralists have historically been the stewards of pastureland and livestock, however they continue to lack secure land and resource tenure both due to political marginalization and the difficulty of implementing resource governance that addresses the complex, diverse and communal land use exercised by pastoralists. This leaves pastoralist communities in a situation of vulnerability that will likely be exacerbated by climate change, especially in arid and semi-arid areas. At the same time, pastoralist communities are effectively managing the risks to climatic change and increasing resilience, but they need secure rights to land and natural resources to do so.¹

The drylands, where pastoral systems are often the most sustainable livelihood option and main economic drive, are typically regions with the poorest basic infrastructures and services, even by rural standards, and a history of inappropriate policies and interventions. They are also remote areas suffering persistent poverty, vulnerability to processes of dispossession and poor governance and violent conflicts. An engagement with pastoral development is therefore at the core of a commitment to reduce poverty in rural and marginal areas, and directly relevant to the mandate of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).²

This paper looks into IFAD’s engagement in improving the governance of pastoral lands. It starts with an overview of issues and challenges for securing pastoral governance of tenure, after which several experiences of IFAD-supported projects from around the world are discussed.

2. Issues and challenges for securing pastoral governance of tenure

2.1. Pastoralism and rangelands

Pastoralism is defined as extensive livestock production in the rangelands and it is practiced worldwide as a response to unique ecological challenges. The ways different societies have responded to those

---

challenges have much in common, and equally create some common challenges in terms of strengthening governance of tenure. Pastoralism is a system of managing livestock and land for economic benefit and ecological sustainability, and a particular tool is the management of herd mobility, often over vast distances. Pastoralists are the people behind the system, managing and protecting the land, and profiting from livestock. Their culture is inseparable from their herding strategies and is central to the way they govern their natural resources.³

There are an estimated 500 million pastoralists worldwide, the majority in developing countries where they face many development and poverty challenges⁴. Pastoralists usually make their living through a complex set of activities, raising livestock not only for domestic use (dairy, fibre, manure, meat, hides) and asset building, but also for market as a way to obtain goods they themselves cannot cultivate or manufacture.

The land occupied by pastoralists is often referred to as the rangelands. Rangeland ecosystems have largely evolved in places of climate extremes and high climatic uncertainty. They are challenging and unpredictable environments in which nature and society have evolved, leading to unique biological and cultural diversity. Rangeland ecosystems provide many goods and services to humanity, including provision of food and fibre, regulation of water supply and sequestration of carbon.⁵

The intimate relationship between pastoralists and their rangelands is so strong that it is hard to separate the two and treat them independently. Yet despite this, the vast majority of pastoralists lack permanent rights over their land. While pastoralist development requires attention to a broad spectrum of needs – including education, health, security and markets – governance and land management must pay heed to the three main components of pastoralism: people, livestock and land, which forms the common foundation of pastoralism anywhere.⁶

---

2.2. Land use in rangelands

Pastoral land use is complex and based on a bundle of rights\(^7\), including, but not limited to: access, management, control, alienation, exclusion and withdrawal – all-encompassing different aspects of property within which theses rights overlap and intersect, and are constantly being contested and re-negotiated. Many pastoral systems are based on mutual trust and reciprocity, enforced through local dispute resolution mechanisms. Pastoralists require secure access to specific resources at different times of the year, including grazing lands, wells, salt pans, trees and others, and these rights are usually ruled by principles of flexibility and reciprocity. Many pastoral societies require that territorial boundaries remain uncertain — often referred to as fuzzy — with continual negotiation over access in which individuals or user groups re-evaluate their share of, and level of control over, strategic resources. This can create tension with sedentary communities with whom pastoralists share resource rights, particularly where statutory law gives priority to settled populations and to tenure claims based on cultivation and permanent (year-round) use.\(^8\)

Fodder and water are the most significant resources for pastoral livestock management, but a wide range of other assets are also used and claimed by pastoralists\(^9\). Pastoralists consume — as food or medicine — wild fruits, seeds, tubers, barks, gums and leaves. They also use many species of tree for fodder, shade, fencing, construction and for fabricating household furniture and tools. Due to the predominant reliance on lands with low biological productivity and high variability, pastoralists require access to vast areas of land to ensure they have resources for their herds.

Water points are key to managing rangelands. Livestock need regular access to water for biological reasons. Therefore, herds can move along transhumance tracks and graze on rangelands only as long as they have access to water. As a result, individuals and groups controlling access to water points de facto control access to the surrounding lands. In order for herds to move from one water point to another, rights of access to water must be open to multiple users. If water points were privately owned with exclusive


\(^9\) Ibid.
rights, pastoral movements would become difficult and pastoral communities would be condemned to destitution in years of low rainfall. On the other hand, the more water is available and accessible to all, the more livestock can be brought to graze on the surrounding rangelands. And, the more livestock, the higher the risk that dry-season grazing is depleted before a new rainy season. Therefore, by indirectly restricting livestock access to grazing lands, control over water points has traditionally provided the mechanism to ensure sustainable resource use.10

Mobile pastoralism is highly suited to the management of rangelands and provides both economic and environmental benefits. Mobility contributes to ensuring access to fodder, water supplies and shelter, to mitigating the effects of external problems like drought, disease and conflict, and to selling products in volatile markets. It is a flexible, adaptive and appropriate strategy to manage variable environments. Livestock mobility is not an end in itself, but a means for effective rangeland management and is a key tool in preventing and managing risks. However, mobility has a deep social and cultural influence among pastoralist communities and is often central to their identity and relationships. Pastoral mobility is influenced by the condition of essential resources and infrastructure that are needed for movement, including water points, livestock tracks, pastures and campsites. Degradation or loss of these facilities can greatly compromise mobility.11

Customary land tenure systems play a major role in rangeland governance, but their function remains poorly recognized and rarely supported by national land policies12. Government policy has often been misguided due to the usually erroneous assumption of “the tragedy of the commons”13, in which completely free access to a shared resource (rangelands in this case) leads to overexploitation and eventually to its complete depletion. More recent work on common property regimes clearly shows not only how systems of collective management work, but why they are both necessary and efficient.14

12 Ibid.
2.3. Challenges

The Technical Board supervising FAO’s Technical Guide on Improving Governance of Pastoral Lands\textsuperscript{15} agreed on five key challenges for pastoral tenure:

i. \textit{Reconciling relationships between states and pastoralist:} Communities in many countries pastoralist communities have a weak relationship with the state and this can lead to top-down interventions from government that are harmful to pastoralist rights and livelihoods. Many states still see pastoralism as backwards and favour crop production on pastoral lands, enacting policies to acquire the necessary land. The challenge is to convince governments of the value of pastoralism as a land-use system and to see it as a development priority compared with the perceived benefits and potential short-term gain of alternative land uses. Pastoral communities also have to be convinced of the legitimacy and value of the state and, in some cases, need to develop a sense of civic responsibility and citizenship.

ii. \textit{Managing conflicting interests and claims for lands and other resources:} Competing users often hotly contest pastoral lands. Part of the reason behind the competition for pastoral land is that they are seen to be weakly tenured, lacking in political support and, often, are only seasonally utilized. Alternative land uses are frequently considered by government to be more economically viable than pastoralism, even when evidence clearly shows the opposite. The challenge is for states and decentralised government to establish truly participatory negotiating frameworks that can clarify the different claims over land.

iii. \textit{Improving consultation and participation mechanisms for pastoralists, recognizing them as citizens with legitimate rights:} The conflict between legitimacy of customary tenure systems and legality of state institutions can only be resolved through the participation and involvement of multiple actors. Pastoralists frequently lack the skills, information and tools for lobbying and legal negotiation to make their voices heard and to secure their land rights. The challenge is to strengthen pastoralist participation and responsive, accountable representation in decision-making arenas and processes related to their lands.

iv. **Specific legal requirements for pastoralism**: Pastoralists require security not only of grazing lands but also of the corridors and tracks they use to navigate their landscapes sustainably and of many other natural resources that are essential for the smooth operation of their system. It is difficult to strike a balance between the necessary flexibility and fuzziness of pastoralist governance and the potentially rigid formal demarcation of rights involved in securing legal title. The challenge is to guarantee fair treatment of pastoral issues, dealing with them through an inclusive, negotiated and flexible framework.

v. **Developing integrated land-use planning at relevant scales**: Most countries in the world lack land-use plans that guide their strategy at national or regional levels and when such plans exist, pastoralism tends to be practically absent. Mobility and flexibility are poorly addressed by static maps and in addition to the misrepresentation of pastoralists and the scarce pastoralist participation in design and monitoring, land planning may commonly neglect the territorial role of pastoralism. The challenge is for states to develop national land-use plans that consider pastoralism and other land uses jointly at a strategic level, establishing a balance between them.

3. **IFAD’s engagement in improving the governance of pastoral lands**

IFAD is the only United Nations specialized agency and international financial institution focused exclusively on reducing poverty and food insecurity in rural areas through agriculture and rural development. It has ample experience in contributing to and shaping national policies and programmes, and in providing investment vehicles for governments, other development partners and the private sector, with rural people, including pastoralists, at their centre.

In its Strategic Framework 2016-2025\(^\text{16}\), IFAD recognizes that for poor rural people, lack of access to natural resources – agricultural land for crop production, water for irrigation, and common property resources (forests, rangeland, water sources, fisheries resources) – is a critical constraint. Improving access, security and transferability of natural resources increases the value of household assets, generates higher levels of investment and agricultural productivity, and facilitates access to credit. Furthermore, the

better defined and more secure the tenure or use rights, the more likely that those resources are sustainably managed.

IFAD’s engagement in improving the governance of pastoral lands is guided by the following principles:

1. **Alignment with national priorities and support to poverty reduction strategies:** IFAD seeks to promote responsiveness to the needs of poor rural people, based on field evidence. At the same time, since land tenure systems are location-specific, tenure issues are addressed locally. It is critical to consider the linkages between the different land-based resources – crop land, pasture, forests, etc. – and the different concerns of those whose livelihoods depend on them.

2. **Adherence to the “do-no-harm principle” at all times:** Addressing land access and tenure security through local participatory land-use planning and management exercises is an effective approach to conflict mitigation and resolution.

3. **Appreciation of the diversity and dynamic nature of existing agrarian structures and tenure systems:** This diversity rejects one-size-fits-all policy prescriptions. It demands context-specific analyses and interventions that recognize the plurality of the forms of access to, and control over, land, and of the ways this access and control can be claimed, (re)allocated, institutionalized or reproduced.

4. **Centrality of the empowerment of poor rural people and the organizations that represent them:** Empowerment of poor rural people and their organizations is a prerequisite for sustainable improvements in their access to land and tenure security.

5. **Focus on the gender dimensions of land rights:** Women are particularly vulnerable and disadvantaged under most tenure systems. Strengthening their rights to land will contribute not only to gender equality but also to poverty reduction, since women are responsible for household subsistence production and welfare.

---

vi. **Support to production services and market linkages to maximize the positive effects of access to land and tenure security**: Improved access to land and land tenure security, though critical, are not the only factors that determine the reduction of vulnerability and the willingness or capacity of poor rural people to invest in sustainable land management and increased productivity. Addressing constraints on access to financial services and information, markets and agricultural extension is equally important, and IFAD takes responsive and relevant targeted measures.

Between 2003 and 2015 IFAD funded 29 projects that focused on pastoral development for an amount of US$ 497 million. Support to pastoral development related to rangeland management, capacity building, pastoral infrastructure, risk management, animal health, human health, education, institution building, commercialization, microfinance and policy dialogue. By improving the governance pastoral lands, IFAD is contributing to the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security\(^\text{18}\). The experiences of different IFAD-supported projects in this regard are presented below. They relate to: (i) strengthening institutions; (ii) promoting sustainable natural resource management; (iii) avoiding and managing conflict; and, (iv) developing policy and legal frameworks.

### 3.1. Strengthening institutions

IFAD has long recognized the critical importance of social and economic empowerment of rural people living in poverty, both individually and collectively, and promoted policies and investments that enhance their capabilities and livelihoods. A key element of its approach is to build the capacity of grass-roots institutions and organizations, or foster their establishment where they are non-existent, as a means to enable its target group to attain secure access to natural resources and production services, build their skills and knowledge to take advantage of new economic opportunities. In so doing, IFAD promotes better governance, policies and institutions for agriculture and rural development.\(^\text{19}\)

---


The capabilities of local organizations and social networks determine how pastoralists operate collectively to address governance challenges. Strengthening the capability of local organizations, social networks and the institutional space in which they operate helps to increase the opportunity for pastoral institutions to strengthen governance of tenure, and to enable those institutions to take greater advantage of such opportunities. This includes roles for both customary and state institutions to strengthen interactions, to build trust and to take practical measures for defending tenure.20

The governance capabilities of both community and state organizations at the local level are key to effectively strengthening land tenure of pastoral communities. This includes the ability of organizations and individuals to interact and collaborate in ways that support responsible governance of tenure, avoid and resolve tenure conflicts, learn and solve problems, and define new and creative responses. Social networks underpin the ability of any society to respond to challenges and crisis, often providing access to needed resources or support in difficult times. Social networks can be based on communities and social movements. On the other hand, governments can intervene creating social services and support to avoid a breakdown in relations that lead to conflict.21

Key aspects of governance in the context of pastoral development include the relationship between central, regional and local government, the institutions that regulate economic behaviour and access to resources, especially land tenure rules and procedures, and the structures of economic production and exchange within customary groupings such as camps and neighbourhood groups. In most of the domains there is a set of formal, modern legal rules and procedures and also a set of customary rules of varying strength. IFAD-supported projects have been strengthening customary pastoral institutions (or customary-formal hybrids), from those regulating collective action formal in the management of natural resources, to those overseeing the management of conflict. Examples from Mongolia and Senegal are discussed below.

3.1.1. Mongolia

Context


21 Ibid.
In 1992 a transition to private livestock ownership took place in Mongolia which, with the disintegration of the institutional framework to manage livestock and pasture lands, resulted in an “open access” situation causing widespread degradation of pastoral land. With a lack of alternative employment and income opportunities, the number of herding households doubled, with many of the new herders not having sufficient skills and knowledge in livestock and pasture management. The newcomers also had little access to crucial resources, such as winter and spring camps. Seasonal moves of herds have declined since 1990. Herders tend to stay close to rural centres (Soum centres) due to the availability of services. In addition, poorer households, as they lack the physical or financial required for seasonal mobility, are forced to stay and use the already degraded grazing lands.

With restricted access to export markets and a limited domestic market for meat, individual herders have been increasing herd size in order to accumulate wealth and focusing on other livestock products, such as cashmere, wool and higher value dairy products in proximity to urban centres. The lucrative market for cashmere has led to an increase in the proportion of goats within the herd, going beyond the ratio of sheep-goats that is considered appropriate for sustainable pasture management.

**Approach - Pasture herder groups**

In Mongolia herders are not organised above the family group, *khot ail*[^22], level which is too small for decision-making over the very large areas of land needed for management under extensive herding[^23]. In line with the Land Law and the draft ‘Pastureland Law’[^24], the IFAD-supported *Market and Pasture Management Development Project* is therefore supporting the establishment of grassroots herder institutions to promote inclusive and sustainable community-based pasture management. “Pasture herder groups”[^25] are built on the *khot ail* and are responsible managing their common pasture unit (*belcheer*).

[^22]: *Khot ail* is a traditional level of household collaboration, camping and working in a group.
[^23]: FAO Country pasture profiles – Mongolia
[^25]: The following steps are followed in the creation of *pasture herder groups*: (i) Training of *Soum* or District Government Officials on the project approach, pasture management, target groups and targeting Strategies; (ii) Inception workshop in each *Soum*; (iii) Training of candidate pasture herder group facilitators (resource persons) in each *Soum*; (iv) Capacity building of pasture herder group facilitators; (v) “Face-to-Face” meetings and trainings with herder households; (vi) Initial meeting with households in local area (indicative pasture unit); (vii) Workshop...
ashiglaltin heseg). Their community-based pasture management plans are integrated into district land use plans. These plans are based on geographic pasture units, defined and mapped with the help of herders through a participatory process.

Seasonal rotation of grazing and resting of pastures is an essential part of the pasture management plans to increase the productivity and quality of natural pastures and is based on traditional management practices. Summer pasture is conserved for winter utilization by rehabilitating hayfields and protecting them from grazing or harvesting and storing hay. The use of animal manure as fertilizer is encouraged to improve hayfield productivity. Reserve pasture areas are identified in the pasture management plans and protected by “social fencing”, where pasture users have agreed to erect an invisible fence around their common land. Given the importance of access to water for livestock, the pasture management plans ensure an even distribution of water points. In this regard, wells are rehabilitated or constructed. A member of the pasture herder group is trained to ensure the maintenance of the water point.

The Project furthermore provides support to the implementation of the pasture management plans. Specific investments identified in the pasture management plans include collective activities such as: construction of new shallow wells for livestock watering (to extend access to grazing areas), fencing of hayfields for winter pasture conservation and fodder preparation, construction of winter shelters for livestock, and fencing of wetlands and water sources to protect from degradation by overgrazing and trampling. Activities targeted towards poor households include providing access to renewable energy (solar and wind) to reduce dependence on wood and fossil fuel, and a transport subsidy to facilitate herder mobility and demonstrate the benefits of rotational pasture management.
At the same time, the formation of common interest herder groups is supported with the objective of undertaking income generation activities through micro-enterprises in value addition of livestock and/or crop products or other activities. Project support is focused on three value chains, namely dairy products, berries and vegetables.

**Results**

The Project has facilitated the organization of a total of 2,800 herder households in 120 pasture herder groups, which amounts to nearly 40 percent of herder households in the project area. All groups have developed pasture land management plans.

The establishment of grassroots herder institutions has proven to be an effective approach to promote inclusive and sustainable community-based pasture management. Group members collaborate better among themselves and with the *Soum* government on rangeland management issues.

The management of pastoral lands has improved through group/peer pressure to adhere to rules (for example dates to move) and through collective action such as hay making, digging of a well, building winter shelter, dividing tasks in herding of large and small livestock. These activities build on the customary practices of *Khot Ail* members.

Organization in groups also promotes the social and economic inclusion of poor households. It allows poorer households, for example, to undertake seasonal moves, have access to equipment (such as for hay making), information and credit, engage in paid labour, and participate in herding activities through which they can benefit from dairy products or young animals.

Furthermore, pasture herder groups are now able to propose actions and request support for pasture and water management beneficial for their member households in *Bagh* meetings. The conclusions and proposals of these meetings inform the *Soum* rangeland plan. On the other hand, pasture herder groups act as institutions through which the *Soum* pasture land management plan can be implemented more effectively.

---

26 Smallest administrative unit or sub-district.
It is moreover easier for the Bagh governor and Soum level officers to work with herder households that are organized in groups and have a leader. Pasture herder groups have become an institution to facilitate co-management between the government, as the owner of the pastureland, and the herders, as the users.

3.1.2. Senegal

Context

Livestock husbandry in eastern Senegal has historically been dominated by seasonal movements around the Senegal River Valley (Fuuta Toro) with dispersal north into Mauritania and south into the Ferlo during the rainy/flood seasons (June to November) and return to the floodplain during the dry season (December to May)\textsuperscript{27}. Expansion of irrigated cultivation, operation of the Manantali Dam (built in 1988), and recurrent drought have drastically reduced floodplain pastures\textsuperscript{28}. This has increased the importance of more classic patterns of transhumance. Along the north-south axis, herds in the West African region will generally move north during the rainy season and south during the dry season. There are reports over the past two decades of a southerly extension of transhumance corridors and an increase in the amount of time spent in the south with an increasing fraction of transhumance livestock remaining late in the dry season to catch the earlier rains to the south before moving north\textsuperscript{29}. A more recent feature of this trend has been the increased movement of livestock during the dry season toward the southeast into Mali (Kayes Region). These shifts in the timing of movements have an effect on the presence of the livestock in the more heavily cultivated areas in the middle latitudes\textsuperscript{30}. Population growth and declining rainfall are putting significant pressure rangeland resources and leading to an increased competition between the different resource users.

Approach – Pastoral units

The IFAD-supported *Agricultural Development Project in Matam* (Phase I and II) and the *Support to Agricultural Development and Rural Entrepreneurship Programme* have supported “pastoral units” to ensure good rangeland management, improve access to water and reduce pressure on the grazing lands. Pastoral units are resource management units following a borehole and based on pastoral (not agricultural) resource management. In the middle of each pastoral unit is a watering point. The area belonging to a certain pastoral unit is the area closest to that watering point. A pastoral unit is made up of a group of localities that - given their economic interests, historical ties and physical proximity - share the same pastoral and agricultural areas and use the same water points. Hence, even before the pastoral units were made, the pastoralists thought of these areas as different territories from where it was most rational to walk to a certain watering point.\(^{31}\)

Communities living in the same pastoral unit have priority rights to use the resources that are available, but also responsibilities regarding their management. The establishment of the pastoral units is based on two basic principles: (i) preserving the existing natural resources and restoring degraded areas in order to increase their productivity and (ii) empowering communities to engage effectively with local authorities in the implementation of projects and to manage their natural resources in a sustainable manner.

Projects have included a ‘gender observatory’ run by community volunteers (men/women/youth). The observatory is aimed at raising awareness on gender equality and allows pastoralists, specifically women and youth, to make their voices heard.

The pastoral units are equipped with boreholes, a water towers, drinking troughs, feed storage and vaccination parks. Measures are also taken to protect the pastures through the construction of firebreaks, land rehabilitation and the promotion of community-based rangeland management. In addition, support is provided for strengthening the capacities of livestock keepers and their organisations, developing participatory land use management plans for each pastoral unit, and establishing management bodies. Collaboration is sought with the district veterinary office to provide advisory services to the livestock keepers and with the regional water department to set up borehole users’ associations that are responsible

---

for managing the water points in a sustainable manner. Finally, the aggregation of different pastoral units at regional level has been promoted to increase the possibility for their voice to be heard.

Results

Twenty-two pastoral units have been established by the IFAD-supported projects. Together with other pastoral groups and the local authorities, these institutions played a role in decision-making processes for the management of the Ferlo region, negotiating sustainable access to pastures and regulating the drilling of private wells. This has decreased significantly the number of conflicts between livestock keepers and agricultural producers.

The rangeland management committees, that built on customary use patterns and cooperation between pastoralists and farmers, have proven to increase the sustainable management of the environment, including the prevention of uncontrolled bush fires and tree-cutting. A positive effect has also been witnessed on the animals, with milk production by 27 per cent and fertility rates increasing by more than 100 per cent.

Important partnerships have been mobilised with public institutions, local services, producer organizations, NGOs and research institutes. As a result, pastoral units and their management committees, through dialogue with the government, managed to obtain the construction of schools and health posts in their region. Through negotiation with other herder groups and decentralised government offices, they have succeeded in limiting the number of licences for drilling private wells to avoid overgrazing.

3.2. Promoting sustainable natural resource management

Sustainable management and utilization of natural resources is directly related to IFAD’s third strategic objective. Many IFAD-supported pastoral-oriented projects show ‘rangeland rehabilitation’ and ‘natural resource management’ to be the project focus or a key objective. Rural livelihoods are affected by a variety of risks and shocks, resulting from, inter alia, environmental factors and climate change, market and policy failures, and conflict. Making sustainable progress in building the asset base, capabilities, and
market opportunities for poor rural people requires that risks and shocks are addressed in a comprehensive manner, thereby building resilience in rural people's livelihoods. IFAD is expanding its support for the development, dissemination and uptake of improved and climate-resilient agricultural technologies and practices that raise the productivity, sustainability and resilience of smallholder production systems.\footnote{International Fund for Agricultural Development (2016). IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025: Enabling Inclusive and Sustainable Rural Transformation. International Fund for Agricultural Development, Rome, Italy.}

Local and indigenous knowledge needs to be recognized as a critical component of the ecological social interactions in sustainable pastoralism and its use needs to be strengthened\footnote{Food and Agriculture Organization (2016). Improving governance of pastoral lands: Implementing the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of national food security. Governance of tenure: Technical guide. FAO, Rome, Italy.}. Indigenous, traditional and local knowledge systems provide a fundamental link between social and environmental systems and contribute to the maintenance of ecological diversity and biodiversity, which underpins food security. Local and indigenous systems of knowledge are held in and defined by both cultural systems and environmental contexts. Consequently, environmental sustainability and appropriate cultural systems of knowledge generation and transmission have emerged within landscapes governed through customary tenure.\footnote{Crawhall, N. (2014). Indigenous knowledge in adaptation: conflict prevention and resilience-building. Brief 10. Conflict-sensitive adaptation: use human rights to build social and environmental resilience.}

Environmental degradation is often fundamentally due to governance failures. These failures need to be rectified locally, nationally and internationally. IFAD places strong emphasis on facilitating the restoration and sustainable management and use of ecosystems. Sustainable community-driven development approaches are essential to effective natural resource management. IFAD continues to promote participatory approaches and local programming processes that respond to the needs, priorities, opportunities and constraints identified by poor rural people – and based on their local knowledge, customs and priorities – is essential. Empowering local communities and individuals to manage and drive their own development processes, and to provide legal recognition and protection of their rights to access, control and use of natural resources is fundamental to good governance. Building resilience for users of extensive common-pool resources requires the explicit support and recognition of local management
systems and tenure. Examples from IFAD-supported projects in Lesotho and Tajikistan are discussed below.

3.2.1. Lesotho

Context

Sixty per cent of Lesotho’s total land area is estimated to be rangeland. The rangelands in Lesotho are dominated by grass and are in a poor condition. They have been deteriorating over the years largely due to weak institutional arrangements and poor grazing management practices. Degradation of the natural grazing lands of Lesotho is largely due to changing land use patterns, such as encroachment of cultivation and settlements into rangelands, partial breakdown of traditional seasonal grazing patterns due to increased stock theft, less mobility of herds as a result of new settlements, loss of authority of traditional chiefs, confusion about authority concerning land use, and Government of Lesotho’s policy of discouraging transhumance, decrease of fallow grazing land, because of a fear of loss of traditional right of use if not cultivated, and uncontrolled burning, and excessive livestock numbers. Other factors include climatic changes such as prolonged winters, droughts and erratic rainfall which affects rangelands rehabilitation; poor law enforcement; institutional arrangement.

Addressing the issue of overgrazing in rangelands is one of the national priorities especially in view of the fact that livestock production supports livelihoods of many people in rural Lesotho and livestock products such as wool and mohair have a significant contribution to the GDP of the Country. On the one hand, sustenance of the wool and mohair industry largely depends on properly managed and healthy rangelands. On the other hand, rangelands management is one of the areas seen to be of high significance in

---

36 While the responsibility for the management of grazing areas in lowlands and foothills/lower mountain slopes has been transferred to the Community and District Councils, the “Cattle Post Areas” in the mountains have remained under the management and administration of paramount chiefs.
addressing land degradation and playing a significant role in building the resilience of the ecosystems.\textsuperscript{38} The Government, with the help of various projects and partners, is promoting the establishment of Community Grazing Associations, also known as Village Grazing Schemes, within the Range Management Areas, to promote sustainable community based rangeland management.

**Approach - Climate-smart participatory rangeland management**

The IFAD-supported *Wool and Mohair Promotion Project* (WAMPP) Climate Smart Rangeland Management aims to establish a sustainable system of communal grazing and rangeland management with the objective of improving livestock nutrition and maximizing production and returns for smallholder wool and mohair producers. Focus is being put on building climate change resilience of those involved in the rangeland sector. To achieve this it is necessary to establish the users’ rights and responsibilities and to define the range land resource which he/she or they have the right to use.

WAMPP is promoting climate-smart participatory rangeland management. The project takes a community-based approach to delineating grazing areas, establishing stocking rates and developing grazing plans, following a participatory rangeland management methodology. The mapping of existing and new grazing/rangeland use and infrastructure is being done for all Community Council (60) and Cattle Post (10) grazing and rangeland areas to be covered by WAMP and includes the mapping of: grazing and rangeland areas, water sources for livestock, stock routes, and areas for pastor-silvi-culture, fodder banks and conservation agriculture interventions for grazing areas and any other information that is considered important for sustainable grazing/rangeland management. It is done jointly by user groups, traditional leaders and Community Council representatives with the support mainly of District rangeland and other suitable District or Community Council staff.

Wool and mohair producer groups and organizations and other user groups using the same grazing and rangelands are supported in developing climate-smart sustainable management plans which are expected to inform the formulation of Community Council and Cattle Post grazing and rangeland management plans. The formulation of grazing/rangeland by-laws/regulations and rangeland management and investment plans is done jointly by user groups, traditional leaders and Community Council.

\textsuperscript{38} USAID/IUCN Programme on Applying Ecosystem Approach in the Orange-Senqu Basin.  
representatives with the support mainly of District Offices of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and other line Ministries. Village and local user group management plans are combined at community and district level. This is followed by the registration of the of usufruct rights to the land and the regulations to be applied to its use. Grazing entitlement are developed in conformity with customary procedure i.e. with the consensus of the Principal Chiefs and the formal District Administration.

Investment plans identify priority interventions for improving grazing/rangeland management. A Rangeland Development Fund has been established to help Community Grazing Associations implement their long term rangeland management plan\textsuperscript{39}. The Fund is used for: stock watering points, seeding of grazing/rangeland, fodder production by farmer groups, conservation agriculture and soil and water conservation measures for grazing areas, fencing, livestock shelters/housing and any other aspects that have been identified as a priority in the planning process.

**Results**

WAMPP seeks to reverse the degradation of the natural grazing lands by introducing sustainable, climate-smart and resilient approaches to rangeland management to mitigate threats and promote enhanced efficiency and remuneration in the livestock sector. The project is currently only in its first year of implementation, so there aren’t a lot of results to be showed yet. Nevertheless, it is strengthening decision-making for different levels of stakeholders in rangeland management planning and implementation. In addition, by reducing the speed and quantity of run-off from the rangeland, the project is reducing the gully erosion that has been a major contributor to the loss of agricultural land in recent decades.

3.2.2. Tajikistan

**Context**

In Tajikistan, with almost 80% of the agricultural land consisting of pastures. Arable land is restricted to valley floors, where crops are irrigated because of aridity. Pastures are a major natural resource in Tajikistan and are of great importance to the local as well as to the national economy. Under the

\textsuperscript{39} Allocating one-off grants of up to USD $20 000.
centralized Soviet system, specialized sovkhozes and kolkhozes were responsible for either crop or livestock production. When these state farms were dissolved and economic support for marginal mountain areas ceased after 1991, people reverted to subsistence agriculture. In Tajikistan, state farm assets, mainly sheep, goats and yak, were distributed to individual households. However, land still belongs to the state. The livestock sector—the most important branch of agriculture in the mountainous areas of Tajikistan—was dramatically affected by economic decline after 1991.40

Cattle, goats and sheep are raised for milk, meat and fibre, but herds are small. Households move with their animals from winter to summer pastures. Summer pastures are located farther away from the villages in high mountain valleys, whereas winter pastures are near to settlement areas. Over the last 20 years, management of pastures in the country has deteriorated considerably. In the past, pastures were well kept and there were identified animal routes and clearly defined rules on the use of pastures; veterinary checkpoints functioned properly; and there were schedules of livestock movements from winter to summer pastures in each province. The only concern for the government was the lack of reserves of rough and concentrated feed to be used in the event of fodder shortage during exceptionally cold winters. Nowadays, pastures are grazed intensively and the use of additional feed is very limited. Currently, many livestock owners (usually with a small herd) no longer take their livestock to winter or summer pastures. Their herds are allowed to graze continuously within a radius of 3–5 km of the villages because herders cannot afford to buy hay or feed concentrates to allow stall feeding. This situation has led to the intense year-round use of traditional spring–autumn pastures, which are now used even during winter.41

There are many constraints in the livestock sector: the ability of livestock farmers in Tajikistan to maximize the use of their pastures is constrained by many problems, including the lack of technical knowledge of small livestock holders, poor governance arrangements on pasture management, inefficient management of community livestock, shortage of feed during the winter months, environmental degradation, and lack of access to quality fodder seed and infrastructure - all of this further exacerbated by climate change. Approximately 85% of pastures are affected by land degradation.42

With the growing number of livestock, emergence of commercial livestock farmers and further deterioration of natural pastures, the focus on pasture management reforms resulted in adoption of the Pasture Law in March 2013, which has played an important role in enabling a completely new quality for pasture management and use. The Pasture Law serves as a foundation for the institution of pasture management decentralization reforms occurring on a small scale in selected areas.\footnote{Jumabayeva, A. & Karimov, S. (2017). Transformation from collective to communal pasture management: review of pasture reforms in Tajikistan. Journal of Law and Rural Development: Land Governance, No 1. International Fund for Agricultural Development, Rome, Italy.}

**Approach – Climate-resilient community livestock and pasture management**

The IFAD-supported *Livestock and Pasture Development Project* (LPDP) aims to support the practical implementation of the Pasture Law. The project starts with establishing or strengthening pasture user unions (PUU). These unions brings together pasture users at the Jamoat level (institution of self-government in towns and villages). PUU is a formal organization with its members working together to solve the current problems and plan future joint activities, such as: organizing mass vaccination of the entire livestock in the community, controlling livestock grazing, monitoring the state of pastures, repairing bridges or rehabilitating roads, and most importantly protecting the interests of each member of the PUU regarding secure access to pastures.

More specifically, LPDP is strengthening the adaptive capacity, governance and management skills of PUUs and their elected Boards (PUUB) and reduce their vulnerability to climatic stress. This is done by raising awareness amongst their members of the importance of incorporating climate risk reduction measures within community livestock and pasture management plans and ensuring the long term sustainability and health of pastures and the restoration of pasture landscapes, thus improving livestock productivity and contributing to reduced feed shortfall and income loss.

PUUs are supported in developing community livestock and pasture management plans to address issues of degradation of pasture resources, deterioration of pasture infrastructure, climate adaptation needs in sustainable pasture management and restoration, improved winter feeding, livestock health and production issues. The main objective of the plans is to define options to increase quantity and quality of
overall fodder production, while reducing the pressure on overgrazed degraded areas and regenerating their productive capacity.

Climate change adaptation measures include: (i) restoration of degraded pastures through rotation and fencing, and improvement of vegetation cover with highly diverse native plant species that are tolerant to climate constraints; (ii) Infrastructure (road improvement, bridges, watering points, etc) that facilitates animal movement; (iii) improved water management in areas that are at risk of drought (fences for shade, measures to retain water in soil, drainage, riverine and water spring restoration, protection and shade through reforestation around water points); (iv) measures to prevent soil erosion, mudslides and floods, including the plantation of bushes and trees – agroforestry systems - that, besides being effective against soil erosion, can act as a barrier against storms and wind, and serve as a possible source of by-products (fruit, berries, medicinal and edible plants, honey, wood); (v) infrastructure (construction of livestock shelters and upgrading of facilities for herders) to enhance the value of spring/autumn pastures in view of the longer grazing season due to increased temperatures and a shorter winter season; (vi) agricultural machinery to produce/harvest/store fodder (grass cutters, hay making machines, silage choppers, etc.) to increase the availability of fodder and create reserves for the winter period; (vii) Restoration of vegetation along river, which allow for better regulation of water, constitute a barrier against floods, improve water quality, and are a source of fodder.

Training and capacity building is provided to the PUU members to carry out assessment and efficient planning, ensuring the active participation of the more vulnerable households and involvement of women in planning and decision making. Livestock carrying capacity plans are based on flexible carrying capacity estimates to continuously adapt the stocking rates to the highly variable climatic conditions and biomass availability. The Project provides investment grants to support the initial implementation of the plans. The exact amount of each grant is linked to the number of members and the performance of the PUU, including its capacity to collect pasture use fees.

The LPDP has started a process of inventorying rights to pasture lands in participating communities and allocation of the use rights to PUUs. The PUU is granted exclusive right to manage the community pastures of the village under a tripartite Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Head of the Hukumat (district state administration), the Heads of Jamoats (institution of self-government in towns and villages) and the project management unit. This MoU grants the PUU a 10-year pasture management
authority. The MoU requires the Hukumat to facilitate the recognition of community pastures by a land-use certificate in place of a rental agreement. This provides PUUs with a long-term assurance of the right to use the community pasture and helps to reduce disputes regarding access to pastures.

Results

The project is adopting a balanced approach between environmental management, economic growth and strengthening of social capital. A key focus of the project is to develop the adaptive capacity of PUUs to manage their pasture areas better and sustainably, taking into account the predicted impacts of climate change on pastures and pasture communities. PUUs with secure land-use rights and empowered with technical knowledge and organizational skills will continue to manage pastures on the ground.

Almost 80,000 hectares of pastures are managed by 203 PUUs. Each of them has developed its climate-resilient community livestock and pasture management plan, which is being updated regularly. So far, 223 grants have been provided to implement the management plans. This has been used for buying machinery used to grow and gather winter fodder and hay, developing watering points and improving infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc.).

The PUUs are now applying pasture rotation and have appointed grazing supervisors to manage the implementation of individual rotation plans. Livestock keepers are benefiting from the rotation in terms of: increased forage, milk production and animal weight and fertility. Improved vegetation is increasing rainfall infiltration and reducing erosion.

3.3. Avoiding and managing conflict

In some countries, pastoralism is frequently associated with conflict, and while this does not reflect the global state of pastoralism — which is notable for its internal conflict management mechanisms — there is likely to be a close association between resource conflicts and weak governance of tenure. Furthermore, as efforts are made to strengthen tenure, there are risks of aggravating conflict or generating new conflicts if adequate precautions are not taken. Many pastoral systems and communities are bisected by
international or domestic boundaries, which can be a complicating factor and pastoralists are, in some cases, wrapped up in political conflicts on different scales.\textsuperscript{44}

Conflict is highly complex and seldom attributable to one or two factors only. Multiple sources of tension or vulnerability may interact, including poverty, religious or ethnic tension, traditions of cattle raiding, increasing availability of firearms, unclear tenure, corruption and patronage, land and population pressure, industrialization and agricultural expansion, underemployment of youth and many more. Conflict “multipliers” include phenomena such as land grabs, foreign land investments and climate change, many of which are aggravated by insecurity of tenure. Conflict further undermines human security, including the ability to achieve food security, with no country in conflict having achieved food security.\textsuperscript{45}

It is of critical importance to avoid and manage conflict, to ensure that tenure policy and interventions are conflict sensitive (i.e. that they do not contribute to conflict) and to enhance collaboration and cooperation. Despite the many risks of conflict in pastoral societies, the predominant relationships among pastoralists and with others are largely collaborative and synergistic. This is an important consideration as strengthening collaboration and positive relationships, and building on established mechanisms for intercommunity negotiation, can help reduce the extent of conflict.\textsuperscript{46}

IFAD recognises that in order to mitigate conflict, broad stakeholder participation, particularly of rural people and their organizations, is critical for all land-related policy and institutional reform processes. Given that formal conflict resolution mechanisms, such as the courts, are generally costly and less readily accessible, existing community-based conflict resolution mechanisms should be drawn upon as a first recourse for solving conflicts, with statutory mechanisms as a final recourse. In this regard, participatory land-use planning and multi-stakeholder user agreements (e.g. among farmers and pastoralists) have proven to be very effective approaches.\textsuperscript{47} Examples from IFAD-supported projects in Tanzania and Chad are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{47} International Fund for Agricultural Development (2008). IFAD Policy on Improving Access to Land
3.3.1. Tanzania

Context

After crops, the livestock industry is the second largest contributor to Tanzanian agriculture, representing 5.5 percent of the country’s household income and 30 percent of the Tanzania’s agriculture GDP. As with farming, livestock-raising is primarily undertaken by smallholder farmers. Pastoralists have used the rangelands in what is now Tanzania for hundreds of years, developing a land management system adapted to variable ecological, social and economic conditions. Pastoralists play a dominant role in this sector, contributing greatly to Tanzania’s economy: according to government records, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists rear approximately 98 percent of the country’s some 21 million cattle and 22 million small stock and produce most of the milk and meat consumed nationally. Pastoralists have been, and continue to be, permanently dispossessed of their land holdings, which has reduced the area available to them for livestock production.  

In Tanzania there are approximately 1.5 million pastoralists spread among five pastoral tribes and communities, with the Maasai being the largest and most well-known. Pastoralists face a number of acute challenges including a shortage of land for grazing. Livestock owners can obtain land for grazing under customary law, through a recognized right of customary use under the Village Land Act or by a specific land allocation by the Village Council. However, conflicts over land access prevail due to increased population pressures and the diversification of land use patterns in Tanzania (i.e. expansion of settled and ranching farming, national parks, towns and settlements). Further, pastoral organizations point out that pastures that are lawfully granted may be perceived as idle or bare land and identified for investment purposes. Additionally, a large part of the land areas used for pastures fall under the category General Land, which is under the exclusive control of central government.

Approach – Joint village land use planning and land certification


The IFAD-supported Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) aims at securing land and resource rights of pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and crop farmers, while improving land management by supporting village and district land use planning and rangeland management. An important part of this endeavour is to introduce new ideas and suggest improvements to the village land use planning (VLUP) process in order to better contribute to sustainable rangeland management. A key challenge, for example, is ensuring the maintenance of livestock movements for optimising pastoral production systems across village boundaries. Participatory rangeland mapping proved to be a useful tool for documenting and gaining a better understanding of methods for facilitating such movements into the VLUP mapping process.

Conventional land use planning tends to limit the mobility of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers and access to other important resources. More participatory land use planning provides opportunities for agreements over the sharing of resources between villages and for facilitating mobility across them, for example through joint village land use plans (as well as plans for single villages). However, such agreements have not been put into practice to any significant degree. The complexities of dealing with such issues put off land planners, and a lack of resources limits time and personnel for often long-winded negotiations and, sometimes, conflict resolution.

The development of village participatory land use plans is guided by the Village Land Act (VLA) and the Land Use Planning Act. The VLA grants power to Village Councils (VCs) and their institutions to prepare such plans. The Land Use Planning Act provides for the formation of planning authorities, functions, and procedures of developing village participatory land use plans and approval processes. A key innovation of SRMP is joint village land use planning, which secures resources such as grazing areas shared across village boundaries. Six main steps are followed when developing joint VLUPs, as follows:

i. **Preparations in district and villages:** Discussions with the different stakeholders in order to explain the value, opportunities, and likely obstacles for joint planning. Training of government personnel and CSOs in VLUP and land policy or legislation may also be required;
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ii. Data collection and analysis: PRA tools are used to gather information on local land uses, natural resources and their distribution and sharing, obstacles and opportunities, etc.

iii. Mapping existing village land uses: A joint planning authority (JPA), constituting two or more village planning authorities (i.e. VCs) seeking to use and manage land or resources jointly, will need to be established. Using the participatory rangeland resource map as a starting point, the current major land uses are mapped. Where conflicts or disagreements exist over village boundaries, then these will need to be resolved – processes such as community dialogue can be useful in this regard.

iv. Administering and managing land: Once the boundaries of the priority land use types are drawn, plans for administering and managing the different land use areas need to be established.

v. Enhancement of security of tenure: In order to protect and enhance the security of the shared resource(s), a joint village land use agreement (JVLUA) is drawn up based on the boundaries of the shared. An association of (shared) resource users should then be established e.g. a Pastoral, Livestock Keepers, or Rangeland Association. The members of this association apply to each VC (which are part of the JVLUA) for a collective certificate of customary right of occupancy (CCRO) covering the part of the grazing area that falls under each VC’s jurisdiction.

vi. Development of a shared resource management sector plan: Once CCROs have been provided for the shared resource, then the group is responsible for developing a management plan for it. This can be done with technical and financial support from the relevant District Council, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, and/or NGOs.

Results

Between 2010 and 2015, SRMP assisted nine villages to carry out village land use planning, and successfully piloted the implementation of joint village planning across three of these: Lerug, Ngapapa and Orkitikiti. The process led to the protection and certification of a shared grazing area that has been called “OLENGAPA” to incorporate a part of each village’s name.
In the OLENGAPA area, villagers were supported to carry out a participatory mapping of the different resources in the villages and their distribution. This was used to develop a base map for the village land use planning process, including showing which resources are shared by the villages and where they are situated. Eventually, a joint village land use agreement was developed and approved, which then led to the establishment of a joint grazing land committee made up of members from all the three villages. This committee is responsible for planning, management, enforcement of by-laws and coordination of the implementation of the OLENGAPA land use agreement and land use plan.

SRMP has now entered its third phase (2016-2020), in which ILRI and the MALF together with other partners including the National Land Use Planning Commission and national research organisations will focus on the scaling-up of the joint village land use planning approach in several new clusters of villages, as well as expanding the original ones. This includes the securing of grazing areas through the provision of CCROs and improving the management of the areas by the established Livestock Keepers Associations through action research on rangeland rehabilitation, and on intensification of rangeland and livestock productivity.

Building on SRMP, IFAD and the Government of Tanzania have started the design of the Drylands Development Project that will support integrated rangeland-based livelihoods while providing ecologically sound strategies for resolving conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.

3.3.2. Chad

Context

Broadly speaking, pastoralists in Chad practice a seasonal pattern of transhumance between northern rainy-season pastures and southern dry-season pastures. These movements are in direct response to ecological and rainfall conditions found in Chad. At the height of the rainy season and in the months that follow, generally between August and November, livestock herds are concentrated in the arid north of the country on the fringes of the Sahara desert where short, but highly nutritious annual grasses and surface water predominate. But as surface water and pastures dry up livestock are gradually moved south to graze
initially on crop residues and later natural pastures including browse. The cycle is repeated the following year with livestock gradually moving north as the rains arrive in June or July.\textsuperscript{54}

However, access to increasingly scarce natural resources has generated fierce competition and conflict in Chad. Successive and prolonged periods of drought have caused livestock production to shift from the north into sedentary farming areas of the south, causing conflict between the groups. Herders heading south early in the year damage un-harvested crops, and trample newly-seeded land at the beginning of the rainy season as they return north. Farmers with bore-wells risk being overrun by livestock. The groups fight for control of wild plantations of gum arabic, which herders have traditionally used for generations and local sedentary groups have recently discovered are valuable.\textsuperscript{55}

**Approach - Collaborative management of pastoral resources**

The IFAD-supported *Pastoral Water and Resource Management Project in Sahelian Areas* has given a key position to the management of natural resources, in particular water, which represents a livelihood for many in Chad. The objective is to improve access to and sustainable management of water by the rural poor.

The project started with a participatory diagnosis of the pastoral resources, looking at the following issues: physical location of wells, users of the water point, land tenure situation of the site, rules regulating access to pastoral resources, the role of women and young people in pastoral activities, conflict management practices, water point management, environmental assessment, and priority issues as identified by transhumant communities.

Local people’s capacity to plan, build and maintain infrastructure has been strengthened which enables them to sustainably manage soil and water. This helps to check and reverse degradation to achieve soil and environmental stability without significantly altering ecosystems. A concerted management of all water uses (agricultural, pastoral and domestic) at the level of a given administrative and/or geographical unit (canton, watershed) is promoted. As such, water point management committees have been


\textsuperscript{55} USAID (2010). Property Rights and Resource Governance - Country Profile: Chad. USAID, Washington DC.
established that are responsible for the maintenance and repair of the well, conflict prevention and protection of the environment.

Moreover, surveillance committees have been set up around natural depressions, which are responsible for: (i) ensuring that the ponds are accessible to all users; (ii) ensuring that water from the natural depressions is not used for market gardening or for the manufacturing of bricks; (iii) conflict prevention and management strategies around ponds; (iv) reforestation around the natural depressions; and, (v) ensuring periodic maintenance of the ponds.

Transhumance systems have also been secured by establishing water points and marking transhumance corridors in the central and western parts of Chad. Organizations that plan and manage water points and transhumance corridors have been promoted and supported by this project. As such, the project has set up joint committees with representatives of administrative and traditional authorities, livestock farmers and farmers, and local representatives of central government line agencies. Several tasks have been assigned to them, including: (i) sensitizing all rangeland users on the importance of marking livestock corridors; (ii) collaborating with the project team on the provisional and permanent marking of livestock corridors; (iii) ensuring that fields and dwellings are not installed in the corridors; and (iv) ensuring that all corridors are marked and all conflicts resolved.

In addition, the project has focused on improving the capacity to manage water management disputes. Water access is an issue that generates many bloody conflicts among ethnic groups. Traditional authorities (transhumant tribal chiefs and sedentary canton heads) have often been able to make a definitive contribution to managing these conflicts. Another example of effective dispute management are local conventions that bring together the major stakeholders (producers, farmer-herders, traditional and modern authorities) to plan and manage soil and water management works. Support has been provided for the establishment and operations of such organizations.

**Results**

Overall, the project has made a significant contribution to strengthening the institutional framework for the collaborative management of pastoral resources. The project has supported the establishment of 154 water point management committees, 77 pond surveillance committees and three livestock corridor
management committees, who have been fully involved in the planning of the investments and are ensuring the sustainable management of pastoral resources.

The involvement of administrative and traditional authorities, and local representatives of central government line agencies and the clear sharing of roles and in conflict management has contributed to reducing the risk of engendering conflicts that, if ill-managed, could degenerate into disorder and even ethnic or social confrontation. Support to local institutions has had a strong impact in terms of "social capital". Institutions are now fully integrated into the institutional, social and economic landscape.

3.4. Developing policy and legal frameworks

Many countries have laws in place that can support progress towards responsible governance of tenure for pastoral lands, but these laws are not always implemented. Pastoral legislation alone does not solve the problem of weak pastoral tenure, but it provides the legal basis for action.

Where addressing land access and tenure security issues is part of its country strategy, IFAD identifies likely partners and allies within government, among development partners, farmers’ organizations and other civil society organizations to build up alliances for pro-poor land policies and programmes. Building on its country programmes and the lessons learned therefrom, IFAD engages in evidence-based and socially-inclusive policy dialogue and multi-stakeholder policy discussions to promote, within national policy (poverty reduction strategies, sector-wide approaches) and regulatory frameworks, a focus on the land rights of poor rural people. IFAD works with local authorities and community-based and farmers’ organizations to increase awareness of policies and laws and the impact that their implementation (or lack thereof) is having on the ground. Country programmes strengthen the advocacy capacity of local actors to bring these issues before higher level officials.

3.4.1. Kyrgyzstan

Context

Traditionally, Kyrgyz herders used a transhumant system, grazing mixed herds at higher altitudes in the summer, middle altitudes in the spring and fall, and on low-lying pastures in the winter. In an effort to
increase homogeneity in stocks (primarily sheep) the Soviets introduced a centrally controlled intensive livestock production system that included a winter feeding program using imported feed. At independence, 80% of Kyrgyzstan’s estimated eight million sheep were owned by state and collective farms. As the large agricultural enterprises were liquidated, the sheep and other livestock were distributed to households, but the loss of a guaranteed market for Kyrgyz wool, combined with low wool prices and high meat prices, resulted in a rapid reduction in the country’s sheep and cattle herds.56

Individual households have been rebuilding Kyrgyzstan's livestock numbers. The individualization of livestock holdings, which resulted in large numbers of households with small numbers of animals, coupled with a distrust of professional herd management and fragmented administrative control over pastures, has concentrated grazing to local pastures year-round. As a result, remote pastures have become underutilized. An estimated 33% of the pasture near farms and settlements is substantially degraded, 19% suffers from erosion and inedible weeds have overtaken 33%.57

Extensive legislative efforts culminated in 2009 in the adoption of the “Pasture Law.” Revising pasture management, which was split among different national and local administrative bodies, the law reconnects the use of summer, spring/autumn and winter pastures. It also provides for more equitable and transparent allocation of pasture rights and offers a mechanism whereby stocking rates can be better aligned with pasture carrying capacity; as a result, revenues for investment in pastures, as well as tax revenues, have increased considerably. Pasture land management is devolved to local government, down to the level of pasture users, in the form of pasture users’ unions (PUUs).58

**Approach – Supporting the implementation of the Pasture Law**

IFAD, together with the World Bank and the Swiss Development Cooperation, implemented the Agricultural Investments and Services Project (AISP) (2008–2014). Support in the implementation of the 2009 Pasture Law has been a major component of the project. The AISP was designed to improve the
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institutional and infrastructural environment for farmers and herders, with a strong emphasis on the livestock sector. A specific component of the project aimed at fostering integrated, equitable, and socially and environmentally sustainable pasture use and management by devolving responsibility to the local actors, and applying a community-based approach.

AISP participated in raising awareness of decision makers and provided recommendations on legislative reforms, culminating in the development and the adoption of the 2009 Pasture Law. The project team, the Agricultural Projects Implementation Unit, as well as other executive agencies of the project – particularly the Pasture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture and Melioration – played a significant role in explaining the numerous benefits of the reform, and in guiding and moving forward the overall process.

Given the success of AISP, the achievements in pasture management were consolidated in new programmes, namely the Pasture and Livestock Management Improvement Project (2014–2019), financed by the World Bank, and the Livestock and Market Development Project phases I and II (LMDP I and LMDP II) (2014–2019/2020 respectively), financed by IFAD. The programme supports legal and regulatory reforms as well as sustainable pasture management through capacity-building of the PUUs.

LMDP I and II currently continue to assist the government in its legal and regulatory reform, building on the achievements of AISP. Technical experts provide legal advice to the Pasture Department and State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry regarding legislative reforms as well as legal training for communities and service providers.

Projects have supported the establishment of 768 PUUs and the development of 714 community pasture management plans. PUUs are required to develop community-based pasture management plans, which are intended to serve as a foundation for pasture land management, as well as for its maintenance, improvement and use. Pasture use rights are to be allocated through pasture tickets, which give the holder the right to a number of animal grazing days, as well as access to grazing routes. With pasture demarcation being a prerequisite for PUUs assuming the responsibility of pasture management, projects furthermore supported activities to demarcate pasture boundaries between the aiyl okmotys, and the establishment and operation of dispute resolution mechanisms to settle disagreements between and among the administrations over boundaries and user rights.
Results

In Kyrgyzstan, the establishment of an appropriate legal framework was a critical precondition for sustainable community-based pasture management. Prior to 2009, fragmented management by government was unfair and disrupted seasonal grazing, resulting in generalized pasture degradation.

Following its implementation in 2009, the Pasture Law provided a clear legal framework allowing for strong PUUs to assume responsibility for sustainable pasture management and to collect the fees necessary to maintain pasture lands. The legal reform process confirmed the importance of implementing agencies’ capacity and the huge commitment required if social mobilization activities are to be inclusive. Rural communities, adequately empowered and supported, have proved to be conscientious and effective managers of common resources.

Not only did the legal reform prove to have a positive impact on the rural population, but investments in pasture management improvement proved to be both economically viable and financially profitable for farmers. Benefits were generated primarily through the establishment of community-based PUUs to manage pastures, and through community-based investment in pasture infrastructure, providing improved access to pastures. This resulted in reduced stocking rates and, consequently, higher livestock productivity in terms of meat and milk yields.

Kyrgyzstan’s experience is highly valued in the region and recognized as best practice. Government representatives and pasture users from neighbouring countries have since visited Kyrgyzstan to study the 2009 Pasture Law as well as its policy and legislative reforms.

3.4.2. Minimum Standards for Sustainable Pastoral Development

Through a grant project, IFAD supported the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), in the elaboration of the Minimum Standards for Sustainable Pastoral Development59. The guidelines help decision makers, who may not work routinely on pastoralist issues, to make better decisions over policies

and investments that impact on pastoralists and their environments. More specifically, they help planners and policy makers avoid investment strategies and policies that impact negatively on pastoralists and; to enable them to ensure that specific policies and plans for pastoral development are more closely tailored to the needs of pastoralists.

The guidelines are designed to breakdown the challenges around pastoral development into component parts and to provide illustrations of how these components can be addressed. Examples are provided throughout the text, with links to web resources that provide much more comprehensive information. The examples are provided to inspire the reader to look for solutions but are not intended as prescriptions in themselves. The appropriate solutions may differ according to each context. What the examples should do is make the reader realise that, whatever the challenge, a solution can be found that does not compromise the basic logic of pastoralist resource management.

The guidelines make a strong call to place governance and rights, including those of minorities, at the centre of pastoralist development, by:

i. Creating and supporting multi-stakeholder fora to ensure inclusion of pastoralists and non-pastoral actors in local and national planning processes and to promote dialogue between these groups, and particularly between government and pastoralists.

ii. Promoting empowering approaches for development planning and developing capacity, particularly amongst local government, to understand the role of participatory approaches as an empowering process rather than an implementing convenience.

iii. Ensuring that empowerment includes all sectors within a society, going as far as ensuring that empowerment of marginal groups (especially women) forms the foundation of pastoralist development.

iv. Ensuring appropriate support for Civil Society, recognising the distinction between Civil Society Organisations and Non-Governmental Organisations.

v. Combining community empowerment with institutional accountability by building the capacity and willingness of government to endorse and support community empowerment.
3.4.3. Special Session of the Farmers’ Forum with Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders

The Farmers’ Forum, established in 2005, is an on-going, bottom-up process of consultation and dialogue between smallholder farmers’ and rural producers’ organizations from all over the world and IFAD and our Member States. The Forum is rooted in and aims to strengthen effective partnerships and collaborations between IFAD and Farmers Organizations (FOs) in country programmes and investment projects as well as building their capacity and engaging in policy dialogue initiatives. The sixth global meeting of the Farmers’ Forum was held from 15 to 16 February 2016 and was preceded by a special session on Pastoralism.

In preparation, consultations were held in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which gathered over 200 representatives from 38 countries to collect burning issues, needs, demands and proposals to improve the livelihoods of pastoralists and livestock breeders.

The session brought together almost 100 farmers’ leaders and representatives (of whom 40 per cent were women) representing millions of small-scale farmers, pastoralists, livestock breeders and fisher peoples in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. At the end a statement was agreed on indicating priority areas for investments for pastoralists and extensive livestock breeders and priority areas for IFAD to facilitate policy dialogue, advocacy and other policy initiatives in support of pastoralists and extensive livestock breeder organisations, and calling for the inclusion of pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder organisations at different stages of IFAD business model.60

3.4.4. Global gathering of women pastoralists

The Global Gathering – the first of its kind – took place in Mera, a rural area of India in the province of Gujarat, in November 2010. Sponsored by IFAD, the event brought together more than 100 pastoral women and men from 31 countries across the world. The goals were to work towards empowering women pastoralists to participate equitably in decision-making within their communities and in government and other national, regional and international forums, and to raise awareness of the specific challenges faced by women pastoralists in the shifting social, economic and ecological environment. There was great diversity in the situations faced by women at the gathering, with women from highly

marginalized and patriarchal communities sharing their experiences with women from relatively well-organized women’s groups. However the women also had much in common as pastoralists and as women, from problems with land rights and marginalization to the need to keep their children fed and healthy. Participants included men. Key themes identified by participants and discussed in interest groups included: natural resource management and climate change; access to markets; women’s decision-making at home, in their communities and more widely; advocacy; engaging men; women’s health; education; and, human rights. The participants came up with a joint statement in which they called on governments, governing agencies of the United Nations, other relevant international and regional organizations, research institutes and our own customary leaders to support them.61

4. Conclusion

Pastoralism is an adaptation to the unique conditions of rangeland landscapes and it requires equally adapted systems of governance and tenure. It is often possible to find solutions to secure pastoral tenure within established national law, but the application of the law may require innovative approaches to adapt to the requirements of pastoralism. This is often difficult when public policy – written or unwritten – is to reallocate pastoral lands to other users or to transform pastoralism into a different land-use system. This paper has shown innovative approaches that have been promoted by IFAD-supported projects.

An engagement with pastoral development and improving the governance of pastoral lands are at the core of a commitment to reduce poverty in rural and marginal areas, and directly relevant to IFAD’s mandate. IFAD follows a systemic approach to improving the governance of pastoral lands, which takes pastoral water as the entry point for interventions, and is built on respect for the pastoral system and the three pillars on which it is based: resources (water, land), societal (families, chiefdoms, institutions) and economic (livestock). The examples in this paper show how IFAD-supported projects have been strengthening governance of tenure as the platform for sustainable pastoralism. The challenges for pastoral tenure have been addressed by putting focus on strengthening customary pastoral institutions (or customary-formal hybrids), building the resilience of common-pool resource users, participatory land-use planning and multi-stakeholder user agreements to mitigate conflict and developing inclusive policy and legal frameworks.

Pastoralist and extensive livestock breeders representatives at the 2016 Farmers’ Forum Special Session with Pastoralists and Extensive Livestock Breeders stated that IFAD should continue to implement its policy on improving access to land and tenure security with specific attention to the security and tenure of pastoralist communal land and the governance of natural resources. Particular attention should be devoted to cross border movement, mobility and conflict in these areas. In so doing, the operational principles of “Free Prior and Informed Consent” should be systematically applied in all investment projects and programmes.

Land tenure security is necessary, but it is not sufficient for sustainable rural poverty reduction and improved livelihoods. Measures to strengthen land tenure security must be complemented by pro-poor policies, services and investments that reduce vulnerability and enable people to make the best use of their access to land. Furthermore, enabling policies are needed beyond the national level to address issues such as migration, pastoralism and conflicts that cut across national boundaries and even regions, and require multi-country or regional approaches.

The Pastoralist and extensive livestock breeders representatives called upon IFAD to directly invest in pastoralism asset development (in human development, livestock and natural resources): (i) promote key infrastructures in the sector (water points, rural roads, secure pastoral corridors, infrastructures/units and innovative technologies for grass/fodder production, livestock product processing and adding value); (ii) facilitate pastoralists’ access to economic services for value chain development; (iii) support capacity building and institutional strengthening, especially dedicated to women and youth; and (iv) support social services adapted to mobile livelihoods (access to financial services, adequate and appropriate health, formal and informal education services, social protection and safety net programmes and information and communication technologies).