

Report for IWGIA

**Study on main policy issues impacting on the livelihoods  
of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in Tanzania &  
mapping of key organizations**

Submitted By Carol Sørensen, April 2006

## List of abbreviations & acronyms

ACME	Private engineering & construction firm
CASEC	
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCM	Chama cha Mapinduzi – the ruling party in Tanzania
CORDS	Community Research & Development Services
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DANIDA	Danish Development Assistance
DFP	Delegated Fund for Pastoralists
DFC	Delegated Fund Committee (for the DFP)
DOROBO	A registered charitable fund
ECF	East Coast Fever, a fatal tick born disease of cattle
ERETO	Ngorongoro Pastoralist Project
GMA	Game Management Area
GMP	General Management Plan (for managing the NCA)
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IIED	International Institute for Environment & Development
INGO	Indigenous NGO
IWGIA	International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs
LEAT	Lawyers Environmental Action Team
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
MWEDO	Maasai Women’s Development Organisation
MWLD	Ministry of Water and Wildlife Development
NCAA	Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority
NCA	Ngorongoro Conservation Area
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty
PARDEP	Pastoral Research & Development Programme
PCS-EA	Pastoralist Civil Society in East Africa
PC	Pastoralist Council
PINGOS -	Pastoralist Indigenous Non Government Organisation’s Forum
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PWC	Pastoralist Women’s Council
HAKIARDHI	Land rights research & resource institute
RDS	Rural Development Strategy
RECONCILE	Resource Conflict Reconciliation
SPILL	Strategic Plan for Implementation of Land Laws
TAPHGO	Tanzania Pastoralist & Hunter Gatherer Organisation
TNRF	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum
TZ	Tanzania
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
UCRT	Ujamaa Community Resources Trust
VETAID	
WMA	Wildlife Management Area

# Study on main policy issues impacting on the livelihoods of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in Tanzania & mapping of key organizations

## LIST of CONTENTS

List of abbreviations & acronyms .....	i
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1. Background to the study .....	1
1.2 Output of the study.....	1
1.3 The scope of the study and structure of the report .....	2
2. Setting the scene .....	3
2.1 Marginalisation of pastoralists & hunter gatherers over time .....	3
2.2 Changes in strategies for tackling marginalisation.....	6
3 Key issues facing pastoralists and hunter gatherers today .....	8
3.1 Key issues facing pastoralists .....	8
3.2 Key issues facing hunter gatherers.....	10
4. Recent policy development with bearing on pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities in TZ .....	13
4.1 Introduction.....	13
4.2 Myths and prejudice in policies .....	13
4.3 The ongoing policy reform with a bearing on pastoralists and or hunter gatherers .....	14
Draft Livestock Policy of 2005 .....	15
Community conservation of wildlife.....	15
Land policies and acts .....	17
The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty for 2005-2010 .....	18
5. Policy dialogue, lessons learned and the way forward .....	20
5.1 Engagement in policy dialogue at national and local levels.....	20
5.1 Lessons learned about policy dialogue .....	20
5.2 Ideas on the way forward in policy dialogue .....	21
Ideas for the way forward for pastoralists.....	21
Ideas for the way forward for hunter gatherers .....	22
Ideas for the way forward on land.....	23
6. Organisations working with pastoralist and hunter gatherers in Tanzania .....	24
6.1 Organisation in pastoralist and hunter gatherer areas .....	24
6.2 Overview of pastoralist and hunter gather NGOs .....	24
Organisations working at local level.....	27
Organisations engaged in national level policy dialogue and advocacy .....	28
6.3 Strategic allies for pastoralists in policy dialogue.....	30
7. Recommendations on the way forward for IWGIA support in Tanzania .....	31
7.1 Support to activities .....	31
7.2 Potential partners for IWGIA.....	32
7.3 A consolidated approach.....	35

List of documents consulted

List of people consulted

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Background to the study

This study was commissioned by IWGIA, the International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs. As stated in the terms of reference (TOR) for the study, *“IWGIA is an international human rights organization that supports the rights of indigenous peoples worldwide.”* IWGIA works with indigenous organisations in Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Arctic.

In practical terms, IWGIA channels support through indigenous peoples’ own organizations which are designed and implemented by the organizations themselves. Organizational capacity building is often an integrated part of support; however, the core support goes to implementation of concrete activities which fall within IWGIA’s priority competences concerning human rights, land rights and women’s rights.

In Africa, IWGIA has supported projects in Kenya and Botswana. The support given in Kenya mostly concerns organizations representing the pastoralist Maasai, Samburu, Borana and Turkana as well as the Ogiek people. These projects focus on advocacy for land rights and women’s rights as well as projects aimed at ensuring constitutional protection of indigenous peoples.

Concerning Tanzania, the TOR state that: *“IWGIA’s contact with and support to indigenous peoples’ organizations in Tanzania is still limited. (By “indigenous peoples” we refer in a Tanzanian context to pastoralists and hunter/gatherers). However, we are potentially interested in expanding our support in Tanzania – at this stage possibly to a level of supporting a total of 3-4 organizations”*. Over the past two years, IWGIA has provided support to a project in Tanzania managed by CORDS. The aim of the project is to work with local communities to secure land rights for pastoralists through existing mechanisms within the national land laws. The project has so far succeeded in assisting villages within Monduli District to obtain village titles to land. IWGIA plans to support a following phase where village land use agreements and by-laws will be developed to further protect pastoralist land use within the village lands.

Several organizations have approached IWGIA for support; and IWGIA is willing to support organizations in Tanzania which work with themes in the area of IWGIA’s special competence and mandate. However, prior to embarking on supporting other organizations, IWGIA felt the need to have *‘a better overview of the major problems and policy issues facing pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in Tanzania’*. In addition, IWGIA wanted to have an overview of which NGOs provide services to pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania and an indication of their capacities.

## 1.2 Output of the study

The main output for this study is described in the TOR as follows: *“This study/report shall serve as a reference document to be used in IWGIA’s assessments of incoming project applications. The study will be important for our potential future work in Tanzania as it will assist and guide us in selecting organizations which work most effectively to improve the situation of their target communities or which seem to have a promising potential to do so. The study will cover three key areas:*

- 1) Describe the most important key issues that indigenous peoples in Tanzania need to work on. This should be seen in the light of IWGIA’s area of competence (human rights, land and natural resources rights, women’s rights). A suggested focus is on policy processes as this seems to be an important area, where a lot is happening very quickly in Tanzania and where indigenous peoples need to be active.*
- 2) Describe the indigenous NGO (non-governmental organization) landscape in Tanzania and map out organizations that could be interesting partner organizations for IWGIA.*
- 3) Assess the TAPHGO (Tanzania Pastoralist and Hunter Gatherer Organisation) strategic plan/proposal with a view to potential IWGIA funding.”*

### **1.3 The scope of the study and structure of the report**

The study comprised of a two week period of consultations with organisations and other stakeholders concerned with pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania, to gain their views, insights and recommendations. These consultations were held in Dar es Salaam, where most of the national level organisations and government departments are located, and Arusha. Although pastoralists and agro-pastoralists cover every region of Tanzania, and hunter gatherers are found in very small numbers in several districts, being able to visit and assess each region and organisation working with these groups would have been time consuming and costly and could not have been realised within the constraints of this study. The focus on Arusha, the second city of Tanzania, is justified in that IWGIA already supports projects in the region, the main umbrella organisations for pastoralists and hunter gatherers are situated in Arusha, and Arusha Region's economy is dominated by pastoralism, making it a core pastoralist area. It is also in Arusha Region that the majority of hunter gatherer people are located.

As well as providing invaluable expert information and advice, the consultations also led to identification of the various policies, and documents related to policies, which have a bearing on the lives of pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania. These policies were discussed and the discussions contributed to the analysis presented in the report.

Although the discussions with pastoralist organisations and other actors provided insights to the problems facing pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania and the ways in which organisations were engaging in tackling the problems, the final analysis and responsibility for this report lies with the author<sup>1</sup>. Time limitations are reflected in the depth of analysis, especially in relation to mapping the NGOs and CBOs working with the pastoralists and hunter gatherers and assessing their capacity to achieve the planned results. It is clear that further consultation will be required before IWGIA engaged with any of these organisations. However, the study does provide an overall analysis of the present situation for pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania.

Firstly the report provides a brief history of the processes of marginalisation of pastoralists and hunter gatherers and a summary key issues for pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania today. It then presents an outline of recent policy development which has a bearing on the lives of pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania. The report goes on describe the way various organizations engage in policy dialogue with government and other actors in the policy debate, the lessons learned from the process and to present suggestions for how policy dialogue could be strengthened. This is followed by a description of some of the key organisations working with pastoralist and hunter gatherers in Tanzania, especially in the areas of concern for IWGIA, including describing the roles of the umbrella organizations, TAPHGO and PINGO's Forum (Pastoralist and Indigenous Peoples Non- Government Organisation's Forum). Finally recommendations are put forward for ways in which IWGIA could engage in providing support to pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania.

---

<sup>1</sup> The author's has over six years experience of working in Tanzania with pastoralist issues as well as many years exposure to the pastoralist debate.

## 2. Setting the scene

### 2.1 Marginalisation of pastoralists & hunter gatherers over time

An account of the present situation of pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania requires an overview of the historical processes which have placed them where they are. The literature shows that pastoralists and hunter gatherers have a history of being politically and economically marginalised, not just in Tanzania, but Africa generally (Hesse & Odhiambo 2002), and that these processes have contributed to their present situation (Madsen 2000, Hodgson 2005), with loss of land consistently being the key issue.

During colonial times, pastoralists' assets of land and livestock, particularly cattle, were coveted by colonial administrations (RPCS-EA 2003). In Tanzania, colonial administrators under German rule (from 1905 - 1918), made efforts of containing pastoralist Maasai in 'reserves' (Hodgson \* ). This made land available to further the administration's goal of providing land for white settlers. It also meant that beef and livestock were more easily available as pastoralists were forced to sell their assets due to their diminished land holdings. Following the defeat of Germany in 1918, Britain was given the mandate to administer the country, and the British administration continued the policy of trying to contain pastoralists in reserves, also to release pastoralist land for British settlers. During the colonial periods, hunter gatherers saw their prime hunting lands turned into National Parks and game reserves (Madsen 2000) where they were forbidden to hunt, and their remaining lands were used as hunting grounds by the settlers. Also, the British administration excised land from the pastoralist reserves for hunting and game reserves, and enforced a livestock head tax on pastoralist cattle in order to increase taxes and livestock sales for colonial endeavours. When the British administration ostensibly provided pastoralists with development projects, in the form of dams, boreholes or pipelines for livestock production, or schools for pastoralist children, these interventions were paid for by the pastoralists themselves through enforced contribution of livestock to the value of the intervention<sup>2</sup>, including wages for the British experts who oversaw the projects (Hodgson\*).

The two most ambitious early post colonial government enterprises went hand in hand, one enforcing the other. These were the nation building undertaking, which started in 1961 with the independence of Tanganyika (Tanzania formed in 1964) and the villagisation program of 1973-1976. Nation building was understandably an important priority in most independent countries, as newly elected governments established hegemony and dismantled other forms of authority. The villagisation or ujamaa program, although attempted in some other newly independent countries, was a trade mark of early Tanzanian independence. This program set about relocating scattered rural communities into larger nucleated villages, to be provided with services by the state through its party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM). Each village was administered by a CCM village chairman and a village committee. These villages often acted as collectives, with communally tilled fields and other communal commercial enterprises. In general, customary land holding was dismantled under the villagisation programme in 1973 (Shivji & Kapinga, 1998).

Neither the nation building nor the villagisation projects endorsed or promoted the way of life or economy of pastoralists or hunter-gatherers. Hunter gatherers were largely ignored in the nation building project, but the strong cohesion of pastoralist political and social structures was seen as a threat, and directives were issued by the state to try and dismantle these structures, such as banning of the warrior training camps e.g. in Loliondo and banning other age graduation ceremonies presided over by the customary political leadership. These directives still colour pastoralist's perception that the state does not respect pastoralists or their way of life.

However, it was the villagisation project (1973-76) which may have had the greatest long term impact on pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania, as this program stands in direct divergence with their livelihood needs and aspirations (RPCS-EA 2003). This is because pastoralists need to move over large areas

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, in Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), when the Maasai pastoralists were evicted from Serengeti National Park, which had previously been Maasai territory, the various schemes initiated by the colonial administration to compensate the Maasai for the loss of resources in Serengeti were paid for in livestock by the Maasai themselves (pers comm. Ngatait Olelerrug, Ole Runguna and Sikai Olesereb, 2004. Fosbrooke ...).

to access pasture for their livestock<sup>3</sup> and hunter gatherers move with the game; while the villagisation program sought to condense scattered communities into villages which could be provided with services by the state. At this time many pastoralist leaders 'went into exile' in Kenya, having come into disfavour with the state for agitating for pastoralist areas to be exempted from the villagisation program (Parkipuny pers comm). Although the large 'ujamaa' villages were established throughout pastoralist areas in Tanzania, the concept of communal production was not accepted by pastoralists and efforts of enforcing communal production failed badly<sup>4</sup>. During the 1970s and 80s, programs were initiated by the state to forcibly settle the semi-nomadic hunter gatherers in villages. In this way, hunter gatherers were minorities in villages controlled by other interests, becoming marginalised in what they considered to be their own land (UCRT 2004). Not surprisingly, hunter gatherers were unable to take up the sedentary lifestyle of a peasant, rather the experience forced them into more remote areas, with a more nomadic and shy lifestyle in an attempt to avoid unwelcome interference from government and other agencies (Madsen 2000).

Concurrently with the villagisation and nation building efforts of the post independence government in Tanzania, the state continued the process of land alienation started in colonial times. Various projects were initiated, such as the infamous Canadian wheat scheme in which the Tatoga pastoralists lost 10% their land (Lane 1999) and Maasai pastoralist land was excised for state run ranches and other parastatal enterprises. To this day, land continues to be excised from pastoralist and hunter gatherer areas by the state for creation<sup>5</sup> and extension<sup>6</sup> of National Parks, and rights to land use are eroded through establishment of game reserves, game management areas, Ramsar sites<sup>7</sup> and hunting blocks<sup>8</sup>. There is also a new incursion into pastoralist lands holdings, with 25,000 km<sup>2</sup> of land being expropriated from village land and allocated to investors through the Land Bank Scheme<sup>9</sup> (Matee & Shem, 2005)

Despite the undoubted contribution of policies to the marginalisation of pastoralists and hunter gatherers from political and economic processes, the most concrete threat posed to their livelihoods over time was the ever accelerating conversion of woodland and pasture to arable land by small and large scale crop cultivators. A look at the policies of colonial and post-colonial development in Tanzania shows that cultivation is the favoured form of land use, consistently receiving donor and government support. Legislation supported these interventions, giving priority of rights to those who cultivate land over those who utilise pasture or forest land. The dominant view that pastures are 'unused' or 'open' land and that cultivated land is 'developed' land, persists to this day and is reflected in legislation and policies. Hunter gatherers leave little or no trace of occupancy, and their land has been considered to be 'open' land, free to be occupied by other land users (Madsen 2000).

One of the consequences of these policies and practices has been increasing poverty levels amongst pastoralists, and although pastoralist poverty has been the concern of various development interventions in Africa, including Tanzania, since the early colonial period (Hodgson 1995, Heffernan 2001), it is generally agreed that these interventions have been consistent and costly failures (Scoones 1994, Anderson & Broch-Due 1999), to the degree of exacerbating problems faced by pastoralists (Barrow 1996, Heffernan 2001, Swift 1994), and in some cases being the main cause of poverty for pastoralists today (Anderson 1999, Hodgson 1999, Scoones 1994). The failure of programs for pastoralist development have covered a wide range of interventions, and have variously produced all or some of the following results: increased poverty,

---

<sup>3</sup> Over time pastoralists in Tanzania have developed intricate and sophisticated mechanisms for managing access to resources according to commonly understood practices which cope with the dynamics of pasture production in the semi arid areas where they live. The villagisation program did not take these pastoralist livelihood strategies into account; rather the villagisation program was based on communal farming experiences, especially from China and eastern Europe.

<sup>4</sup> Most of these involved enforced contribution of livestock by pastoralist livestock keepers to communal herds, which were later 'privatised' by individuals working for the authorities concerned. Unsurprisingly this caused further resentment and resistance to the villagisation program

<sup>5</sup> e.g. eviction of Maasai from Mkomazi in 1988 and creation of Mkomazi National Park

<sup>6</sup> For example proposals in 2005 for extension of the Serengeti National Park into Ngorongoro District and of Tarengire National Park.

<sup>7</sup> The Lake Natron Ramsar site intends to control movement of livestock and people while the Malagarasey Ramsar site has banned grazing and evicted pastoralists

<sup>8</sup> For example, the whole of Ngorongoro District, with 94% of the population are pastoralists, is a game controlled area, hunting block, or the NCA, which means that the whole district is either directly or indirectly under the influence of MNRT. In 2005, part of Yaeda Valley, one of the few areas where hunter gatherers live, was given to a hunting company by the Department of Wildlife under MNRT as a hunting block

<sup>9</sup> under the Tanzania Investment Centre, legislised by the Land Act of 1999 and the Investment Act of 1997

loss of land, pollution of water, environmental degradation, decreased productivity of pastures, increased livestock disease and death, increased violence and insecurity, increased exclusion and vulnerability, decreased capacity for self management

The outcome of these failures is that pastoralists have been stigmatised as difficult, conservative and anti development. In other words, the beneficiaries are unreasonably seen as the cause of the failure of the intervention. The result is that donors and development organisations do not want to risk working with pastoralists (Andersen 1999) and governments further marginalise pastoralists by setting up schemes to convert them into peasants (Heffernan 2001) or ranchers (Hodgson 1999). The outcome is that pastoralists, while potentially highly productive, are amongst the world's most vulnerable people, and it is suggested that future costs of not paying attention to the pastoralist's situation will be considerable (Scoones 1999).

The same processes which have marginalised pastoralists in Tanzania have also marginalised hunter gatherers, who have suffered consistent and continuous loss of their land and livelihood throughout history and up to the present day, as their hunting areas are converted into arable land, national parks, hunting blocks or pasture, while their way of life is eroded together with their culture, language and identity (UCRT 2005, Madsen 2000). They have consistently been ignored and by-passed, and have not been able to engage in the political processes for various reasons. Current efforts to secure rights to land for remaining Hadza hunter gatherer communities seem promising, but are still vulnerable to external political and economic factors (pers com, UCRT). For example, one area in Yaeda valley, to which Hadza hunter gatherers have gained land rights, is in the process of being allocated by the Tanzanian Wildlife Department of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism as a hunting block (pers com. PINGO's, UCRT 2005). Ironically, this land area, having being placed under the control of the Hadza to practice their form of hunting and gathering for food and attendant land management, was rapidly regaining the numbers and species of game (pers comment UCRT) that had previously been depleted through hunting concessions and illegal poaching; obviously the area was once again an attractive proposition for lucrative hunting concerns.

Generally hunter gatherers are stigmatised by all groups in Tanzania, to the extent that some hunter gatherer groups, such as the Akie, are losing their language (UCRT 2004). There are many examples of the kind of 'development' that is envisaged for and provided to hunter gatherers in Tanzania, from the infamous forced sedentarisation projects and the experiments of the imposed secondary schooling programs conducted by government in the 1970s (pers comm. Dr Ngowi), to documented child abductions through the Pentecostal TAG (Tanzanian Assemblies of God) church in the 1990s aimed at assimilating Hadza children into mainstream Tanzanian life (Madsen 2000), to the on-going spectacle of Hadza being presented to tourists on day trips from Karatu<sup>10</sup>. The prevalent perception driving these projects, are that hunter gatherers live primitive, uncomfortable and dangerous lives, and need to be protected from themselves. This results in projects being foisted on hunter gatherers<sup>11</sup> in which they are trained, primarily to cultivate land and keep livestock. The failure of these projects is used as further evidence that hunter gatherers are anti development, backward and primitive. This widespread attitude persists to this day, to the extent that it has become a popular wisdom, and countering these attitudes is a difficult and precarious task.

Coupled to the lack of sympathy for the hunter gatherers evidenced in society in general, the hunter gatherers themselves find it difficult to counter these views or contest their rights, as they have become scattered or dispossessed, as in the case of the Akie, or their political and social arrangements are decentralised to the degree that leadership will always be questioned and countered within their own society, as in the case of the Hadza, and prolonging contact with external agents is difficult to maintain (Madsen 2000). At present, hunter gatherers rely on being affiliated with NGOs or their organisations have joined up with umbrella organisations such as PINGOs and TAPHGO, where they hope to strengthen their position by being part of a larger coalition; but it is also maintained, that even within these organisations they are marginalised.

---

<sup>10</sup> It came to my attention that village government officials in collaboration with NCAA staff control this lucrative niche, enforcing Hadza to remain in camp for tourist visits. My informant requested anonymity because of threats received when advocating for the Hadza concerned.

<sup>11</sup> A current example is a project which has provides food to the Hadza communities in exchange for Hadza to participate in being trained in goat keeping and cultivation

## 2.2 Changes in strategies for tackling marginalisation

Although the processes of economic and political marginalisation of pastoralists and hunter gatherers have been gradual, they have been strangely persistent over time and are perceived by many analysts as the main causes of the continuing loss of land and increasing levels of poverty and wealth differentiation within these communities. In addition, the notion that pastoralists and hunter gatherers are backward, anti development and uncooperative has persisted, and remains a driving force in their current political and economic marginalisation.

Pastoralists and hunter gatherers have not accepted this continuing marginalisation, and have adopted various strategies for contesting their position and tackling the problems facing them. However, they operate in a highly dynamic environment, as described below by Hesse and Odhiambo (2000) in the case of pastoralists:

*Pastoral livelihood systems are highly dynamic, as pastoralists seek to adapt to evolving social, economic, environmental and political conditions at local national and international levels. These changes bring in new actors and impact on pastoral society in different ways, creating internal conditions for further change and requiring the constant adaptation and updating of the 'pastoral problem' and its solutions.*

This dynamic environment has meant that over time strategies have changed, often quite dramatically and suddenly. The strategies have always met with some degree of success, but have not managed to solve 'the problem'.

After the failure in the 1970s to counter the state's efforts to settle all rural people in nuclear villages through engagement with the state, pastoralists and hunter gatherers turned to litigation and international fora for assistance in the 1980s and 90s. Internationally pastoralists and hunter gatherers were able to represent themselves as indigenous people, and link to other indigenous peoples (Klinken and Seita 2005). This experience provided them with an extensive network as well as knowledge about the workings of international institutions and the UN. It also provided an ideological basis for understanding and contesting what was happening to them as a result of the marginalisation of their position in Tanzania. In the 1990s, pastoralists sought litigation as a means of contesting the alienation of their land (e.g. the Maasai in Mkomazi and the Barabaig case with the Canadian wheat scheme), and established NGOs which were human rights based and which were to fight for the rights of indigenous pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities. While successful in raising the profile of pastoralists and hunter gatherers, both nationally and internationally, litigation at home failed to return the lands lost to agricultural development and international conservation interests. This resulted in some people in government and donor circles seeing the NGOs as confrontational and conservative or anti development, fuelling further marginalisation in political and economic processes. Also the disappointment of the failed litigation added to the feeling amongst pastoralists and hunter gatherers that they had been failed by the state as well as their own organisations, and the organisations became more inward looking and unconnected, concentrating on service provision.

Today, after re-examining the situation and trying to find solutions to continuing predicaments within the current pastoralist and hunter gatherer situation, the focus has returned to engagement with the Tanzanian government and authorities. A livelihoods and natural resource management approach to solving key issues faced by pastoralists and hunter gatherers has been sought. The strategy adopted is that instead of confrontation, NGOs seek to engage with government in strategic networks hoping to influence the outcome of policies by engaging in the policy debate. Donors seem to be supportive and promote this approach, and undoubtedly progress has been made in pastoralists being considered as stakeholders in policy development. The strategies most commonly employed are to

- Seek strategic alliances  
For example with programs and NGOs dealing with natural resource management, land rights, food security, veterinary service delivery, and with the private sector involved with tourism
- Agitate for inclusion in the policy processes  
pastoralists were recognised for the first time as a livelihood in the NSGRP 2005, pastoralist umbrella organisations were requested to provide comments on the new NCAA General Management Plan (2006), and pastoralists have successfully agitated to be heard in the making of the livestock policy (2005), while efforts to

be included in the SPILL (2005) have not been so successful. Hunter gatherers have not engaged in policy dialogue

- Engage at community level with trying to secure land use for pastoralists and hunter gatherers This is through conducting participatory land use mapping which is then transferred into village bye laws protecting village land use plans, and through village demarcation and titling. Both hunter gatherers and pastoralists use these methods with some success

Although engagement has to a certain extent been achieved, it was reiterated by many people during discussions, that there has as yet been no positive bearing on either the accelerating rate of land alienation or the degree of political marginalisation at local level.

Some pastoralists see the period of linking to indigenous people's organisations as a waste of time and even harmful to their cause. They explain that seeking external international support has alienated the state, which does not recognise the term 'indigenous people', further marginalising these already vulnerable groups from participating in national and local level policy processes. Others however, see that the experience of working with the rights based approach through international institutions has strengthened the capacity of NGOs to contest their rights and analyse their situation, even to the degree of influencing non 'indigenous' NGOs. There is general agreement that working with a livelihoods and natural resource management approach makes it easier to engage with government, and to seek strategic allies in support of pastoralists and hunter gatherers. Nevertheless, as stated above, there is some impatience that this approach has not produced results of benefit to pastoralists or hunter gatherers and the feeling of urgency for results is increasing.

There are undoubtedly dilemmas in accepting the livelihoods and natural resources management approaches: is pastoralism just a livestock production system supporting livelihoods and using specific resource management techniques? In that case, are pastoralists without cattle therefore no longer pastoralists? What about the pastoralists who live other lifestyles, such as professionals engaged in government or NGOs or business ventures? In seeking engagement with government and strategic allies, who is driving the pastoralist and hunter gatherer agenda's, and for what purposes? These debates continue and are part of the vibrant dynamics of the strategies adopted over time by pastoralists to tackle issues of marginalisation and deprivation. Pastoralists are to some extent visible and verbal in these debates; hunter gatherers still remain on the fringes and continue to be marginalised, even in the debates.

## 3 Key issues facing pastoralists and hunter gatherers today

### 3.1 Key issues facing pastoralists

In Tanzania, pastoralists practice extensive livestock keeping<sup>12</sup> in some of the most complex ecosystems, often where there are considerable biodiversity, wildlife and landscape values and where other land-use systems are practically unviable. Pastoralists have built up sophisticated resource use practices to support their livelihoods (Behnke & Scoones 1993), usually closely linked to their culture (Birgegaard 1993, Lane & Moorehead 1994), which are sustainable over time (Homewood & Rodgers 1991, Ellis 1994). These practices are productive both in terms of contribution to local and the wider economy<sup>13</sup>, and in terms of the way in which the landscape is managed. Data to support this statement are provided in the figure below.

#### Pastoralism in the Tanzanian economy:

- There are 2.2 million people practising pastoralist or agro-pastoralist production in Tanzania. This is 10 % of the population – source: National Census 2003
- Pastoralists and agro-pastoralists manage 61 million hectare (610,000 km<sup>2</sup>) of Tanzania's landmass – source: draft National Livestock Policy 2005.
- Pastoralists and agro-pastoralists own approximately 16.7 million cattle, 12.25 million goats and 3.4 million sheep, or 98 % of the national herd (the third largest in Africa) – source: draft National Livestock Policy 2005.
- 1.5 million cattle, 2.5 million goats and 555,000 sheep are slaughtered annually in Tanzania for the domestic market (source: workshop on Rangelands and Livelihoods, March 2004, Arusha). 70% of the milk produced in 2004 comes from pastoralist and agro-pastoralist herds. – source: draft National Livestock Policy 2005
- The livestock sub sector contributes an average of 30% of the agricultural GDP – source: draft National Livestock Policy 2005. Agriculture contributes 43.2% of the national GDP – source: World Fact Book 2005, which means that livestock contributes 13% of the national GDP. These figures do not account for the cross border trade or for more informal trade.
- 3.5m hectare (34,605 km<sup>2</sup>) of the land under pastoralist management is gazetted as Game Controlled Areas. Income from tourism in pastoralist areas is thus dependent on pastoralist land management, and tourism contributes 12% of the GDP. - source: NGRSP 2005

It is evident from the above figures that Tanzania is reliant on pastoralist and agro-pastoralist production<sup>14</sup> for its main supply of animal protein in national food security. Yet these same people suffer from unusually high levels of poverty; and within pastoralist communities, a widening gap between rich and poor is developing, creating an underclass of impoverished pastoralists (Waller 1999, experience from Ereto). “As such” according to Heffernan, “*pastoralist populations are among the world's most vulnerable citizens*” (Heffernan 2001,p.1).

Experience from Tanzania collected as part of the World Bank funded Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) process in 2003, shows that pastoralism as a livelihood in the present Tanzanian context is highly vulnerable to poverty. Some of the issues were found to be structural (such as unfavourable policies and practices) and can be modified; others were natural (such as drought) and can be mitigated. But political will is needed to alter the status quo. A participatory assessment of poverty in Ngorongoro District, commissioned by the DANIDA supported Ereto project in 2003, examines what makes pastoralists vulnerable to poverty. The

---

<sup>12</sup> Extensive livestock keeping depends on the capacity to access and track variable and dynamic resources across a large area. This demands herd mobility, flexible resource tenure & management institutions, knowledge, communication and access to key resources.

<sup>13</sup> In Africa, the value of livestock products has been estimated to 35% of the total agricultural GDP (Winrock 1992 in Scoones 1994, p2).

<sup>14</sup> Pastoralists and agro pastoralists make up only 10 % of the population, yet they contribute a minimum of 13 % of the national GDP in the form of livestock products alone. If tourism, crop production, waged labour, business enterprises and other services were considered, this contribution would undoubtedly be higher

assessment demonstrates that pastoralists are finding it increasingly difficult to respond to stresses such as drought, prices or disease, given the present policy context (Sangale 2004).

Some direct causes of pastoralist poverty identified are the loss of pastures, the spread of livestock disease, restrictions on land management, insufficient access to water, lack of support to marketing infrastructure and isolation of pastoralists from mainstream economic opportunities. In addition, pastoralists have been marginalised politically, with the result that they have over time consistently lost their lands (Lane & Moorehead 1995) and even the recognition of their identity as peoples with their own languages and political systems (Hodgson 1999).

The failure of governments and donors to meaningfully include pastoralists in development agendas could be seen as the primary cause of pastoralist poverty and disintegration, with a whole host of poverty causing factors arising from this lack of inclusion and support. Hesse and Odhiambo identify two main reasons for marginalisation of pastoralists from political processes:

- 1) Government have little economic or political interests in promoting pastoralist interests
- 2) There is no vibrant and effective civil society present capable of engaging with policy apparatus to represent and defend pastoralists interests

They argue that, *'although substantial money and resources continue to be invested in pastoral areas with the objective of building the capacity of pastoralist people to drive their own development agenda, relatively little attention is paid to the political and social dimensions of pastoral civil society empowerment'* (Hesse & Odhiambo 2002 p3)

To put the recent spate of policy reform in Tanzania into the current perspective, a new government was formed by early 2006 after general elections in 2005. Despite forming a ministry specifically responsible for livestock, the new government has made it clear that there is no sympathy for the pastoralist situation and no will to understand their position, rather there is drive from government to provide a 'final solution to the pastoralist problem'. During discussions it was repeatedly reiterated that there is a desperate need for pastoralists to be effective, and pastoralists are trying to find a way to react the government statements which will not be counter productive. The key issue for pastoralists is thus clear and related to the capacity of pastoralists to cope with all other issues:

**Key issue: The capacity of pastoralists to produce cohesive and convincing arguments, together with their ability to engage with government structures at local level and in the policy debate at the national level.**

Four other concrete issues that pastoralists face are identified as follows:

- **Land alienation and conversion of pastoralist land to cultivation.** Without doubt, the single most significant issue which pastoralists have to tackle is the ever increasing land alienation, and pastoralists must effectively engage in the contest over land and land resources at both national and local levels, if they are to survive as pastoralists. This message was very clear from all the consultations held in both Arusha and Dar es Salaam, and is also clear from the literature available.
- **Inappropriate and damaging policies.** Inappropriate policies are partially accountable for the following situations, which are recognised as endemic to pastoralist areas all over Tanzania:
  - loss of land
  - restrictions on land management
  - poor markets
  - poor or inappropriate water development
  - poor veterinary services
  - poor human health service provision
  - poor education service provision
  - poor transport infrastructure
  - poor security
  - poor participation by pastoralists in political processes

Pastoralists urgently need to engage productively with government and key strategic partners in order to reform policies and develop appropriate structures to enhance pastoralism. The new approach of government supposedly places the citizen as the key stakeholder in policy development, but the top-down older approaches prevail and policies, such as the livestock policy and the SPILL, are still being developed without consultation. As stated by Hesse and Odhiambo: *'The need for pastoralists to organise an effective voice to take part in reforms if they are to ensure that their interests are taken into account cannot be denied'* (Hesse & Odhiambo 2002:1)

- **Inappropriate development interventions.** It is generally agreed that development interventions for pastoralists have been consistent and costly failures, to the degree of exacerbating problems faced by pastoralists. These interventions have led to
  - loss of land
  - pollution of water
  - environmental degradation
  - decreased production of pastures
  - increased livestock disease and death
  - increased violence and insecurity
  - increased exclusion and vulnerability
  - decreased capacity for self management

Amongst development agents, including government and donors, there needs to be a much broader understanding and acceptance of the rationale behind the pastoralist livelihood system, as well as an understanding of its interaction with the wider policy and institutional environment. Also, development agents need to work out approaches which are responsive to the dynamics of pastoralism, so that support programs remain pertinent

- **Loss of influence at local level.** Pastoralists have lost influence at local level. This means that
  - Pastoralists have lost the majority on most district councils governing pastoralist areas
  - Pastoralists are not adequately represented on district councils
  - Pastoralists have to pay higher taxes (livestock head tax), & cannot influence land issues
  - Pastoralists are not adequately represented in parliament, as pastoralist constituencies are very large and pastoralists also operate in mixed constituencies where they are poorly represented.

The lack of influence at local level is an outcome of poverty and vulnerability, where local people do not have the confidence or see the reason for participating in local politics. Pastoralists and pastoralist organisations must realise that they are being outmanoeuvred in accessing power at local level and engage strongly at this level as well as at the national level. Without local engagement, land and other resources will be lost despite successes in engaging with policy processes at the national level.

### **3.2 Key issues facing hunter gatherers**

Hunter gatherers consist of very small groups of people, mostly Hadza (approximately 1,500 people) and Akie or Dorobo (unknown population) scattered around several regions in Tanzania. Most of the information available to the consultant concerns the Hadza, while information on the Akie was limited. For both communities, the loss of land for hunting, confusion over the legal status of their hunting activities, enforcement of inappropriate projects and stigmatisation and discrimination have all impinged on their lives. The situation for the Akie communities is critical, as they have lost their land to Maasai pastoralists and been assimilated as appendages of the Maasai culture, where they are known as Dorobo, meaning 'without livestock' in Maa. Their situation was clearly described during an exchange visit organised by UCRT in September 2004, where representatives from the Hadza and the Akie communities met to learn from each other and adopt positive lessons.

*'We Akie are seriously stigmatised as impoverished and backward and, for many years have had no representation at local or national level. Many of us have been systematically dispossessed of our ancestral lands and forced to leave the forests and abandon our culture and language. Most of our productive lands were taken by dominant groups of pastoralists and agriculturalists scattering the Akie, forcing us to seek refuge in harsher environments or as second class citizens of neighbouring groups'* (UCRT 2004)

Hunter gatherers are so marginalised politically and economically, that often their existence is denied by the local authorities and other stakeholders<sup>15</sup> and they are not mentioned in any policies. This may be because government has no economic or political concern for the interests of hunter gatherers. In other words, *'The Hadza and other hunter gatherers share similar circumstances with that of pastoralists in the fact that the interests of minority populations are not taken into account in national development programs'* (Madsen 2000:22)

As is often the case in developing countries, in Tanzania the notion of development remains within the ideological framework of modernisation; yet modernisation as a framework for development has been discredited over the past three decades as chauvinistic, providing opportunities and benefits to the powerful at the cost of the weak or vulnerable. However, there are historical reasons for the persistence of this discredited development model in Tanzania, and demands from authorities for modernisation are still clearly articulated in current policies, projects and practices<sup>16</sup>. So pervasive is this mindset that it can be difficult to get beyond the call for modernisation. This has clearly been the case for hunter gatherers, where even well intentioned interventions, such as the CUSO supported village titling project, have become opportunities for personal gain at the expense of the wider hunter gatherer community.

Despite all sorts of efforts to 'develop' hunter gatherers over the past 100 years, providing them with houses, agricultural tools, land and livestock, free food and clothes hand-outs, the hunter gatherers have persisted to some degree in their lifestyle, even at the cost of severe stigmatisation. And although the natural resource base has been severely reduced over this period, and hunter gatherers have had to become more and more secretive and careful in their circumspection of other people, hunting and gathering remains a successful, productive and satisfying enterprise for the people involved (UCRT 2004). It is recognised that hunter gatherers are successful within their livelihood strategies and able to provide themselves with a living, even when surrounding communities are buckling under for drought and migrating in order to survive (Madsen 2000). However, it is also reported that some groups of Hadza have become dependent on hand-outs, and that the situation for Akie and other 'Dorobo' hunter gatherers has become critical, as they become ever more scattered or succumb to becoming second class citizens within other communities (Madsen 2000, UCRT 2004).

All in all, the hunter gatherer lifestyle challenges the notions of development, even for the NGOs that support hunter gatherers rights to self determination. In addition, the donors that want to strengthen the capacity of hunter gatherers to develop and engage in their own agendas find it hard to provide any meaningful support because hunter gatherers have found it difficult produce the kind of organisational arrangements required by donors. The two most essential issues for hunter gatherers are interlinked: and both are difficult issues demanding radical changes in the approaches and philosophies of both development agents and the hunter gatherer communities themselves.

### **1) Lack of recognition of the legitimacy of hunter gatherer communities and their livelihood strategies**

As one key analyst of the hunter gatherer situation in Tanzania states, *'...interventions must recognise the right of hunter gatherer communities to determine their own future.'*(Madsen 2000:8) In other words, any future intervention must begin by asking the hunter gatherer communities the fundamental question of whether the proposed measures help them to maintain and strengthen their self determination, or not. In addition, in recognising the legitimacy of hunter gatherers, interventions must seek to find ways of working with the existing leadership structures and qualities (e.g. modern management successfully

---

<sup>15</sup> When Ereto carried out a land use mapping exercise in one of the last remaining Hadza areas near Lake Eyasi in 2004, local village authorities and other stakeholders denied the existence of hunter gatherers in the area. This was originally Hadza land, and the area has been encroached by pastoralists and crop cultivators from neighbouring areas

<sup>16</sup> e.g. the draft Livestock Policy (2005), the SPILL of 2005, the draft Rangelands Act (2005), PRS 1 of 2000, RDS of 2001 all demand that pastoralists be 'modernised'. The joint government/IFAD project is designed to settle pastoralists

utilises 'flat structures' in leadership), so that hunter gatherers themselves are able to legitimately engage in policy dialogue at intervention, local and national levels.

## 2) **Hunter gatherers unable to produce legitimate leadership.**

Hunter gatherers find it difficult to contest their rights, as their political and social arrangements are decentralised to the degree that leadership will always be questioned and countered within their own society. As explained by Andrew Madsen: *'A common feature of all these relatively recent programs is that they all experience difficulties in dealing with Hadzabe communities, characterized by pervasive emphasis on equality and where no clear leadership structure exists (Woodburn 1982). A consequence of this is that some organisations end up working with Hadza individuals who claim a leadership role but who in fact do not have the confidence of the community they claim to represent. Or, alternatively the outside organisation comes to rely heavily on government personnel, many of whom hold prejudicial attitudes toward the Hadza and/or conflicts of interest'*. (Madsen 2000:64). Yet hunter gatherers themselves must find ways in which their leadership style can legitimately be utilised in interaction with outside interests and policies, if they as a community are not to continue to be marginalised, stigmatised and finally 'disappear'.

Another subset of concrete issues faced by hunter gatherer communities are listed below. But the two closely linked main issues described above must be tackled, before the issues of land, poor policies and discrimination are solved

- **Loss of land.** Hunter gatherers have lost huge tracts of prime hunting land and continue to lose land to crop cultivation, pasture, hunting, poaching, tourism and mining interests. *As we have seen elsewhere, once a people lose their land it is not long before they lose everything else: their language, their heritage, identity, children, culture and all too frequently their lives* (Madsen 2000:8). This is confirmed by Akie communities, who state that *'the Akie culture and language are however, disappearing, due to their association with and assimilation by the Maasai who moved from the north into Akie lands 100 years ago'* (UCRT 2004)

The current threat of the loss of hunting lands in Yaeda valley to an Arab hunting concession are reportedly galvanising the communities into action (UCRT 2005), with the issues of leadership and responsive donors being critical factors for the outcome of the effort

- **Misguided and destructive government policies and interventions** Forced re-location and sedentarisation of the semi-nomadic hunter gatherer communities have had a big impact on the communities, including leading to dependency on aid organisations and government for hand outs and culminating in vulnerability to abuse.
- **Discrimination and stigmatisation by the majority population.** Top-down approaches to hunter gatherer development have failed to produce the required results and the failure of these projects is used to further the notion that hunter gatherers are backward and primitive. This again reinforces the widespread discrimination by the majority population against hunter gatherers. These attitudes are deeply entrenched, even in the organisations whose mandate it is to assist. Countering these attitudes is a difficult task that has to be seriously addressed if hunter gatherer communities are to gain legitimacy in the eyes of NGOs, government and other agents.

## 4. Recent policy development with bearing on pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities in TZ

### 4.1 Introduction

The recent rate of policy development in Tanzania has been hectic, with demands for reform of outmoded laws and reform of state administration being the driving force behind these new policy developments. While some of the demands for reform do originate from civil society, a lot of the demands for policy change are coming from donors, investors (e.g. in the case of local government reform, the land laws, wildlife and forestry acts) and from the ministries themselves.

One of the key opportunities for pastoralists and hunter gatherers is that, in the name of good governance, the processes used to develop policies have changed dramatically, from a situation where the state made and promoted policy aimed at modernisation of the nation, to a situation where the 'key stakeholder' is the citizen who has the right and obligation to be heard and contribute toward the development of policy. Recently pastoralists have made use of this situation, demanding and agitating for the right to participate as key stakeholders in policy debate and formulation. Examples are the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) process, the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) the Livestock Policy and the Wildlife Act, and more recently the Strategic Plan for Implementation of the Land Laws (SPILL).

This report draws on documents which summarise the recent development of policies with a bearing on pastoralist livelihoods in Tanzania, the policies themselves and discussions held in Tanzania during field work. No analysis has been made to date on the situation of hunter gatherers in relation to policy development, and hunter gatherers have not attempted to enter the debate. This report will attempt to link the situation of hunter gathers to policy, but at the same time it must be acknowledged that much more work is needed to specifically look at the impact of recent policies on the well-being of hunter gatherer communities and on their future.

### 4.2 Myths and prejudice in policies

There is a general observation that policies and laws which touch on pastoralist livelihoods display commonly held prejudices and myths about pastoralists and their production systems. In addition, the development framework based on modernisation, which has dominated the Tanzanian political scene since independence, is still evident in policy formulation. The combination of modernisation theories and mystification of pastoralism has produced some startling policy statements, for example Rural Development Strategy (RDS) of 2001 states that:

*'Migration is a very serious problem to pastoralists who migrate in search for pasture, water and disease free zones. During the course of migration, pastoralists degrade the land due to overgrazing, cause land conflicts and spread animal diseases. When all else fails, they reduce expenditure by taking children out of school and limiting the quality and quantity of the food they eat (RDS 2001:68)*

A draft of the Strategic Plan for Implementation of the Land Laws (SPILL), Feb 2005, goes even further, in Box 6 on page 7 it notes what is referred to as **"Critical concerns of Stakeholders"**

*'The sector has been called upon to NOTE with great concern that:*

- Pastoral production has very low productivity levels (*meaning it does not address poverty reduction policy*)
- Pastoralism degrades large masses of land (*meaning it is not environmentally friendly*)
- Pastoralism invades established farms and ranches, forests and wildlife conservation areas, agricultural farms (*meaning it violates security of tenure*)
- At the moment is impossible to control livestock diseases, thus making it difficult to export meat, milk and livestock due to international demands on livestock health and products free of infectious agents (*meaning has marginal support only to economic development*)

**Pastoralists have to be given land and told to settle (*meaning that nomadic tradition must stop*)'**

(SPILL, draft strategic plan, February 2005, p 27, box 6)

The quotation above is ‘an example of how negative perceptions of pastoralists are enshrined in national policies’ (Kipuri & Sørensen 2005). If implemented, these kinds of policy will have serious implications for pastoralist and hunter gatherers, impacting on their livelihoods, culture, civil rights and in the long term, on the environment.

According to William ole Nasha, three main myths prevail:

- 1) Pastoralists are irrational and keep cattle out of pride, being unwilling to sell even when prices are high
- 2) Pastoralists are footloose wanderers, aimlessly following their herds
- 3) Pastoralists cause environmental degradation by keeping excessive numbers of cattle and aimlessly wandering around.

These myths feed the modernisation paradigm, reiterated time and again for pastoralists, which is

- to sedentarise pastoralists and turn them into ranchers or crop cultivators
- to de-stock pastoralists
- to get pastoralists to cross breed their livestock with exotic ‘modern’ races
- to privatise pastoralists land
- to control livestock movement routes
- to control numbers of livestock and humans in pastoralist areas
- to impose wildlife management regimes or hunting blocks in pastoralist areas
- to encourage external investment in tourism or ranching in pastoralist areas lands

This paradigm is reflected in many policies produced over the past five years, including the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), the Rural Development Strategy, the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy, the Land Policy, the draft Livestock Policy, the draft SPILL, the emerging Rangelands Act and the Wildlife Act, just to name a few.

However, with the liberalisation of the economy and the slow breaking up of the one party state, newer and more participatory approaches are gaining favour and some of these approaches can be seen in for example the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, the monitoring of poverty for the PRS process and the spirit of the decentralisation policies. These opportunities are being used by NGOs to influence the policy dialogue in the favour of their constituencies, and here pastoralist NGOs seem to be in the forefront.

### ***4.3 The ongoing policy reform with a bearing on pastoralists and or hunter gatherers***

As stated above in the introduction to this section, there had been a spate of policy reform in recent years in Tanzania. It is not possible or productive to summarise them all here, but the main policies with impact on pastoralists and hunter gatherers are summarised below.

In addition to the policies outlined below, local government reform is an important process which has direct bearing on both pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities and with which they are engaged on a daily basis. The reform process is taking part at different levels and intensities and with different degrees of success in different parts of Tanzania. It is a dynamic and potentially very powerful process, putting the citizen as the key stakeholder. There is potential for empowerment of communities in engaging positively with this process, but also a dangerous likelihood that discrete communities, such as pastoralist or hunter gatherers, become further marginalised if they are weakly represented, or not represented, on district councils.

There has been a very disturbing tendency for pastoralists to lose seats on district councils and village councils, so that their representation has been greatly reduced in districts which they share with other communities. This means that in cases with land allocation or dispute, pastoralists have a weak voice and risk being further marginalised in the political processes. This lack of representation also affects all areas of service delivery, from schools, veterinary services, and health care provision, to markets and communications infrastructure. Local government reform will have a bearing on all other policies, also those listed below.

### **Draft Livestock Policy of 2005**

The Ministry of Water and Livestock Development developed a livestock policy internally, in the hopes that it could be passed in 2004 before the elections and subsequent change of government. The policy itself presents most of the usual biases toward pastoralists. Concerning the ‘cattle complex’ the policy points out that pastoralists keep large numbers of livestock for prestige and that these large herds destroy the environment. In addition, the policy reports massive unregulated movement of pastoralists and livestock causing conflict with other land users. New measures are proposed to deal with the situation:

- Ensure livestock numbers kept are commensurate with the range carrying capacity
- Advise pastoralists to reduce their livestock numbers by de-stocking
- Regulate movement of livestock
- Establish stock routes for accessing water

Concerning pastoralist land use, the policy states that: *utilisation of rangeland resources is mainly communal that does not favour rangeland development, hence leading to overstocking, overgrazing and land degradation.* This is in contradiction with the NSGRP, which recognises pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood and the Village Land Act which provides for communal land tenure. Again conflicting with the Village Land Act, the draft policy goes on to state that - *- grazing lands in general areas and village lands will be surveyed, demarcated and declared as range development areas, and furthermore, legal and regulatory measures to manage rangelands and control free movements of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists shall be instituted.* If this is carried through, it will remove pastures from the control of pastoralists and villages, putting them under the control of the minister. The draft livestock policy will undoubtedly do away with pastoralism as a viable livelihood and add to pastoralist and agro-pastoralist poverty if it is enacted before it is modified.

This policy was developed by technicians and administrators within the Ministry, with no external consultation. However, the fierce reception given by pastoralist civil society and professionals working with pastoralist development and environment has had an impact, and the policy is still under review. Pastoralist NGOs are coming together, as well as attempting to involve other livestock keepers such as agro-pastoralists, to develop advocacy skills and influence the content and purpose of the policy in their favour. The result is that the policy has been presented to pastoralists civil society organisations, which have then formed a coalition to present their recommendations to the ministry.

There remains conjecture as to whether the recommendations will be incorporated into the policy to be presented to parliament. This is a weak point in the process, as there are only five pastoralist Members of Parliament, and they have problems in presenting a united front. This matter is being tackled by pastoralist NGOs who are trying to influence a wider group of MPs who have pastoralists within their constituencies to form a coalition with the pastoralist MPs to ensure that pastoralist interests are taken into account in the process of legislation.

Hunter gatherers are not mentioned in the policy, despite their close affinity with pastoralists (such as between the Maasai pastoralists and the Akie hunter gatherers) and the conflicts over water rights between pastoralists and hunter gatherers (such as between Datoga pastoralists and Hadza hunter gatherers). This omission has not been taken up by NGOs.

### **Community conservation of wildlife**

The Wildlife Policy of 1998 is intended to pave the way for reform of the Wildlife Conservation Act and a draft Wildlife Act was issued in 2004 for discussion. The idea of the new act is to merge the ideals of sustainable wildlife conservation with the interests and well being of rural communities. The Wildlife Policy of 1998 provided a change in paradigm and orientation, a departure from the old government centred top-down approach toward a policy with a more modern outlook that aims to balance conservation and development (poverty reduction) and encourage cooperation between Government, civil society and private sector. Revenues derived from sustainable use are to be more equitably distributed, and in particular rural communities will have a major share in managing the resource.

The notion of community involvement in conservation has recently been promoted in Tanzania, with substantial support from donors<sup>17</sup>. The concept gave rise to the development of draft Wildlife Management Area (WMA) regulations in 2003, which were heavily promoted in Ngorongoro District by the government and Frankfurt Zoological society. WMA regulations were to be incorporated in the new Wildlife Act. However, in Ngorongoro District, pastoralist communities and their village leadership unanimously rejected the WMAs in each locality where government and FZS planned to initiate WMAs, as the communities found that the WMAs would infringe on their rights to land as well as excising the WMA from their village land holdings.

After extended conflict concerning the proposed WMAs between pastoralist civil society in Ngorongoro District and the MNRT, a consultative workshop was organised in 2004 by PINGOs, UCRT and TNRF to discuss the draft Wildlife Act. The Wildlife Act is to replace the Wildlife Conservation Act (WCA) of 1974, which has been the main legislation responsible for regulating wildlife outside of National Parks<sup>18</sup>. This includes regulation for Game Reserves, where human settlement and utilization is prohibited, and Game Controlled Areas (GCAs) where human habitation co-exists with wildlife conservation. Most GCAs overlap with Village lands, with resulting conflicts between stakeholders with differing perceived interests.

The workshop identified failure of the draft Wildlife Act to harmonise with other laws such as Land Act and Village Land Act of 1999 and the Local Government Act of 1982, meaning there is potential for continuation of unresolved conflicts. The workshop also noted that there was inadequate provision for participation of local communities in the protection and management of wildlife as well as the lack of benefits to communities from wildlife on their lands and that the draft act still vested enormous powers to the Director of Wildlife, rather than as suggested, the local government authorities. Although the Wildlife Division organised a lengthy process of civil society participation, there are fears that the results are not sufficiently contained in the present draft

There are however some features which could be useful to pastoralists and hunter gatherer communities and that would provide for instance, legal recognition and the roles of 'Traditional Communities' in wildlife conservation activities in their traditional setting. Before they can be useful, pertinent issues remain to be addressed:

- 1) WMA regulations are a predicament as communities concerned do not have a say in the running of the WMA, and more critically do not have control over determining prospective investors. Also the District Advisory Body regulating each WMA, chaired by the District Commissioner, is mostly composed of administrators. This cannot be acceptable to villages as the villages own the resources on their village land, according to the Village Land Act.
- 2) The present WMA Regulations have been universally rejected by pastoralist communities. If the WMA is to be accepted, the regulations need to be re-designed through a genuinely consultative process with communities and their lawyers, where communities take the lead role. The regulations developed need to be transparent, accountable to communities, and adaptable to each specific community's needs. At present village by-laws are sufficient for community needs, and benefits from wildlife (through tourism) to pastoralist communities are considerable.
- 3) Hunter gatherers face a predicament under the new Wildlife Act, as wildlife ownership and protection is placed directly in the hands of the government, hunting only permitted under licence. This conflicts with any concept of joint or co-management ideals, and makes hunting at community level illegal.
- 4) The Wildlife Act empowers the Minister to designate wildlife corridors, dispersal areas, buffer zones and migratory routes, even on village land. Conflicts will continue between the state, local government and communities over land use issues. Protection of wildlife corridors, dispersal areas, buffer zones and migratory routes could be incorporated into village land use plans and by-laws if the process was consultative rather than top-down.

---

<sup>17</sup> GTZ is heavily involved in the wildlife sector, and DIFID and DANIDA are also involved in promoting community conservation

<sup>18</sup> NP, GCA, the NCA and game reserves cover 28% of Tanzania's land mass (report of the workshop)

- 5) Not surprisingly, the Director of Wildlife continues to have enormous powers over many institutions under the Draft Wildlife Act; he has authority over WMAs, hunting blocks and in the running of wildlife colleges. Hunting blocks will continue to be issued by the Director without the need to consult with communities. Conflicts over hunting blocks have escalated over recent years, as communities become more aware of their rights under the constitution and other legislation, and it is predicted that conflicts may increase as communities receive more support in exercising their rights under the on-going local government reform.

### **Land policies and acts**

Although the Land Policy (1995), Land Act (1999) and Village Land Act (1999) are not new, these laws are being utilised by pastoralists and hunter gatherers to secure their rights of access, tenure and control over land. Springing from these laws are newer initiatives which, if implemented, will have considerable negative impact on livelihoods of pastoralist and hunter gatherers. These are the Land Bank Scheme supported by the Investment Act of 1997, and the draft Strategic Plan for the Implementation of the Land Laws (SPILL) of 2005. Civil society has not participated in the development of the Land Bank Scheme, and pastoralists and hunter gatherers have been excluded from participating in formulation of the SPILL. All these laws, policies and administrative procedures are bulky and comprehensive, with some parts providing positive opportunities for pastoralists and hunter gatherers, while other parts have been described as 'the last nail in the coffin of pastoralism' (Mattee and Shem, 2005:33). Below is a brief outline of the policies. However, this is an important area and there needs to be much more work carried out on the significance of these land laws, especially in relation to hunter gatherers.

As ole Nasha notes in a paper on pastoralism and policy (un-published, 2006), the National Land Policy of 1995 provides an example of how negative perceptions of pastoralists translate into national policies, presenting over-stocking as one of the main reasons for developing for the policy. To tackle what the policy considers to be free movement of livestock, the government intends to prohibit 'nomadism', yet 'modern transhumant pastoralism' will be promoted through incentives such as water and cattle dips, and cattle movement will be regulated through delineated stock routes.

However, the Land Policy does make provision for the government to gazette rangelands to protect them from agricultural encroachment, give abandoned ranches, originally excised from pastoralist land holding, back to pastoralists, and issue certificates of village land to protect common property regimes (ole Nasha 2006). The last point is of value to hunter gatherers and this is being considered as an option by NGOs working in hunter gatherer areas. The policy was transformed into the Land Act of 1999 and the Village Land Act of 1999.

The Land Act makes it possible to acquire titles to customary land holdings on village land. This will usually have a negative impact on pastoralism and hunter gatherer communities as it means individualising and privatising land held under customary arrangements, with consequent displacement of the original land users and fragmentation of pasture and hunting areas. However, as these titles can be given collectively, it also means that clans, families etc can secure their rights to land under the existing provisions of the law. Although this may sound attractive, experience from elsewhere in the region (e.g. Kenya and Botswana) has shown that collective titles have led to widespread displacement and pauperisation of pastoralists to the benefit of other groups, especially ranchers and crop cultivators.

The Village Land Act makes it possible for villages to develop and register joint land use agreements, as well as to set aside some of the village land for communal use. The National Land Use Commission has set up clear guidelines for how to go about making legally binding arrangements. This means that villages can allocate large areas of their land for pasture, either within individual villages or as an agreement between villages, which will give it legal protection from encroachment by crop cultivation or crop cultivators. The procedure is to develop the plans with communities and village government and apply for the plans to become village bylaws. Application must be made through the District Council. Once the plans are cleared by central government as not contravening any law, they can be approved by the District Council. Once approved by District Council, they become legally binding. It is this procedure that is being used by both pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities to secure exclusive rights to their land, and exclude encroachment by cultivation or other interests.

However, a potential threat to village land security, even once by-laws are approved, is found in the Land Bank Scheme, legalised by the Investment Act of 1997 and the Land Act of 1999 (Mattee and Shem 2005). According to the Citizen Newspaper, and Mattee and Shem (2005), by 2004 over 2.5 million ha of land in Tanzania had been surveyed and found suitable for investment. The Land Bank Scheme is a facility by which land is identified as suitable for investment and 'given' to the Tanzania Investment Centre (TIC) for conversion to land for sale to investors who fulfil criteria set up by the Investment Act of 1997. This land can be excised from registered village land 'in the public interest'. According to information given<sup>19</sup> during interviews, all the pastoralist and hunter gatherer areas have already been surveyed and 'suitable land' has been placed with the TIC; at the same time, none of the councillors or village chairmen interviewed knew that their land had been surveyed, or knew anything of the Land Bank Scheme. As pastoralists and hunter gatherers operate in areas of great tourism and hunting potential, investors are likely to be keen on acquiring land in these areas, and the Land Bank scheme greatly eases procedures for investors as the scheme means that communities, Village Government and District Councils can be by-passed, and deals struck directly with the TIC.

Another potential threat to village land security, also contravening the Village Land Act, is the draft Livestock Policy (2005), which states that that grazing lands in general areas and village lands will be surveyed, demarcated and declared as 'range development areas'. This will remove these areas from the jurisdiction of the village and place them under the control of the minister, and legislation will be put in place 'manage rangelands and control free movement of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists'. The draft Rangelands Act (unofficial as yet) picks up on this idea and proposes that the Minister has powers over these 'rangelands' to the degree of controlling both human and livestock numbers as well as controlling activities on the rangelands. In addition, the Minister will have the power to declare any area of village land to be a 'rangeland'. It is obvious that these notions of rangeland management have nothing to do with pastoralist production systems. It is also clear that the proposed Rangeland Act and the draft Livestock Policy conflict directly with the Village Land Act and the National Land Policy, as well as provision under the Constitution for the rights of citizens to participate in their own government.

Further recent development in land issues is the draft Strategic Plan for the Implementation of the Land Laws (SPILL) of 2005, drawn up to simplify the administration of the law as required by 'investors' and the larger donors. The SPILL reiterates the biases against pastoralists, saying that pastoral production does not address the national poverty reduction policy, is not environmentally friendly, violates security of tenure, does not support national economic development and concludes that nomadic traditions must stop (SPILL, draft strategic plan, February 2005:27). The SPILL goes on to state that pastoralists must settle and be told to stop their 'nomadic' lifestyle. This draft demonstrates a profound lack of understanding of the factors driving pastoralist production systems, and it is clear that pastoralist civil society has not been involved in the process of its development.

Although hunter gatherers are not mentioned directly, both hunter gatherers and pastoralists could benefit from the provision that: '*Discrimination of access to vulnerable groups is a violation of human rights*' and point 3, '*Long standing occupation of land leads to legally accepted land rights*' (p 40). However, the SPILL later states that: '*Nomadic lifestyles and civilisations are incompatible with the provisions of the Village Land Act*' (p 41), which statement directly conflicts with pastoralist and hunter gatherer livelihood strategies.

In 2005, pastoralist organisations tried to engage with the draft SPILL, but with limited success as they were excluded from commenting on the content and their recommendations were ignored. However, the organisations intend to advocate for inclusion in the process of the formulation of the SPILL, and are working on strategies of how to do so. Pastoralists also need to critically engage with the proposed Rangelands Act if and when it emerges, as in its present form it will remove all pastoralists land from the control of pastoralists. The Land Bank remains a shadowy area, and there has been no real attempt by pastoralist or hunter gatherer organisations to engage with it or to analyse the threat posed.

### **The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty for 2005-2010**

The government of Tanzania has committed itself to reducing poverty within the country. The formal Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) started in 2000 with an initial attempt to define and tackle issue of

---

<sup>19</sup> this information was given by a surveyor in the Ministry of Lands. The TIC refused to comment.

poverty, but which excluded pastoralist or hunter gatherer civil society participation. This omission is reflected in the many negative references to pastoralism which are based on the prevailing myths or prejudices, for example the strange concept of promoting de-stocking in order to reduce poverty. Pastoralist civil society organisations and other actors coordinated efforts to campaign for inclusion in the next part of the PRS process. So when the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) took place in 2003, pastoralists featured as a livelihood for the first time, and a team of pastoralist professionals travelled the country to assess poverty amongst pastoralists and the causes of poverty and vulnerability.

The findings of the PPA showed that pastoralism as a livelihood in the present Tanzanian context is sustainable, but is highly vulnerable to poverty. Some of the causes of poverty and vulnerability were found to be natural causes, such as drought. However, with positive policy support, drought can be mitigated by providing strategic water resources as well as targeted markets. Some of the direct causes of poverty and vulnerability to poverty were found to be structural, such as unfavourable policies and laws. These structural causes of vulnerability identified need to be modified through appropriate policy reform before pastoralist poverty can be reduced.

The findings from the PPA were supposed to feature in the NSGRP, which they did to a modified degree. The NSGRP for 2005-2010 proposes that measures be taken to strengthen security of tenure of demarcated village lands held communally or individually and remove conflicting provisions in laws that manage sectors. These policies, if enacted, will give hunter gatherers and pastoralists greater security of tenure over their common property management regimes.

Specifically regarding pastoralism, the NSGRP proposes a goal of: 'promoting efficient utilization of rangeland, empowering pastoralists to improve livestock production through improved access to veterinary services, reliable water supply as well as recognising pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood' (NSGRP 2005). This strategy is aimed to boost growth in the livestock sector from the present 2.7 % to 9% in 2010.

As stated by William ole Nasha: *Recognising pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood system is a revolutionary achievement in a situation where the state has all along considered the same as destructive to the environment and a livelihood that shall be transformed. The improvement of livestock productivity through provision of key services is a welcome development in a situation where those services have not been available* (ole Nasha undated).

#### **Actions proposed by NSGRP to reduce vulnerability in pastoralist livelihoods**

- Promote efficient utilisation of rangelands and empowerment of pastoral institutions for improved livestock productivity
- Promote programmes that increase income generating opportunities for women and men in rural area through promoting small-scale industries, non traditional product and traditional crafts
- Promote pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood
- Construct charcos, improve access and quality of veterinary services and promote dairy and leather industries
- Ensure improved access to reliable water supplies for livestock development through promotion of small-scale rainwater harvesting

The policy situation in relation to the NSGRP is described as follows:

*NSGRP is the principal policy for development in Tanzania and other policies are supposed to harmonise with its guideline. Yet the study commissioned... to identify and analyse all existing and emerging policies with a bearing on pastoralism in Tanzania (Shem & Matee 2005), has found that the majority of these policies, while in some cases recognized as providing opportunities for pastoralists, mostly fail to understand either the pastoralist production system or the livelihood. Even the proposed livestock policy fails to recognise the genetic potential of indigenous livestock breeds or landraces and fails to recognise the wisdom of extensive grazing regimes in dry land areas. Although there are facilities for securing land rights for extensive grazing systems under law (for example under the National Land Policy of 1994 and the Village Land Act of 1999), these facilities are by and large ignored or unknown, and have not been applied in practice.* (Kipuri & Sørensen, 2005)

This means that the NSGRP, while being hailed as a breakthrough for pastoralists, is not in itself sufficient to provide pastoralists with a favourable policy environment, especially while the political will to harmonise laws and remove structural obstacles to pastoralist wellbeing is still not forthcoming. It is very much up to civil society to advocate for harmonisation of laws to support pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood, and the NSGRP gives pastoralists a legitimate framework to advocate for change.

## 5. Policy dialogue, lessons learned and the way forward

### 5.1 Engagement in policy dialogue at national and local levels

As mentioned previously, pastoralists seek to engage with government through strategic networks in order to influence the outcome of policies by a critical engagement in the policy debate. The present main actors at the national level are the umbrella organisations, PINGOs Forum, (Pastoralist Indigenous Non-Governmental Organisations) and TAPHGO (Tanzania Pastoralist and Hunter Gatherer Organisation), while UCRT (Ujamaa Community Resource Team) and CORDS (Community Research and Development Services) also operate at national levels. The key allies such as OXFAM, TNRF (Tanzania Natural Resources Forum), Haki Kazi and VetAid provide strategic material and other support on advocacy. In addition, training and experience is provided through the RPSC-EA program (Reinforcement of Pastoralist Civil Society – East Africa), giving the extra dimension of cross-regional contacts.

Both of the umbrella organisations work mainly at national level, their work at local level being mostly focussed on training and capacity building of their member organisations. To my knowledge only two organisations work at local level and occasionally at national level, and that is UCRT and CORDS. This is understandable, as the effort at fully engaging at both levels would be a great strain on any organisation. However, it is important that the experience at local level is carried through to national level, and vice versa. This may be the best way to expose the myths informing policy development, and get policy makers to understand that pastoralism and hunting and gathering are legitimate livelihoods of legitimate Tanzanian citizens.

Most of the organisations working at the local level with policy issues are either providing training to communities on land and human rights, or strategically implementing land policies in order to secure land rights for communities.

*‘Legal structures for managing natural resources are well stipulated in the Village Land act of 1999. Village Governments with village general assemblies have been granted the rights and responsibilities in determining how land and natural resources are to be used and developed’ (Ngoitiko 2001:1)*

Organisations are working with village land titling, helping villages to obtain legal rights to land and resources. Following that, organisations are working with participatory land use planning, and helping communities make village by-laws to protect the plans and ensure that village lands are not encroached. And there are organisations providing training to village government and communities on the laws and rights concerning local government. These activities produce tangible results and increase local capacities. While there has been a strong focus on policy development at the national level, and this is beginning to produce some results with pastoralists being taken seriously by government, the connection between policy development and the local level has not received so much attention, although there are many more organisations working at the local level to implement policies, and this for both pastoralists and hunter gatherers. These experiences should be entered into national policy dialogue and feed into the policy process.

### 5.1 Lessons learned about policy dialogue

A workshop held in Moshi in 2005 provided the following analysis of the situation in Tanzania regarding pastoralism and policy.

#### Pastoralism and the Tanzanian context (source JOLIT 2005)

- There is no institutional home for pastoralism
- The policy environment generally reflects prevailing negative attitudes toward pastoralists & pastoralism
- Pastoralists & pastoralism is almost entirely absent from the development discourse
- The few mentions of pastoralists or pastoralism are very negative
- The areas of concern mentioned are very limited

The same workshop analysed the progress in pastoralist engagement in the policy process. It was found that there had been a striking lack of success up to that time in policy engagement due to: lack of engagement of pastoralist CSOs and NGOs at National levels, domination by a few groups within pastoralist society, lack of

alliance building e.g. with agro-pastoralists, divisions within pastoralist civil society, and an adversarial rather than critical engagement.

However it was agreed that there had been more successful engagement recently, with a more systematic and objective orientated approach, for example engagement around the Wildlife Law and PRS process, including the NSGRP. Since then, the engagement around the draft Livestock Policy has built on lessons learned, and the strategies adopted are:

#### To engage in national level policy dialogue

The two pastoralist and hunter gatherer umbrella organisations, PINGOS Forum and TAPHGO, as well as other NGOs such as UCRT and CORDS are participating in and initiating national level engagement.

#### To build and maintain strategic alliances

Pastoralist and hunter gatherer organisations such as PINGOs, TAPHGO, CORDS, UCRT, have built up strategic alliances with each other and with other Tanzanian NGOs, for example TNRF, Haki Kazi, Haki Ardhi, LEAT and international NGOs such as VetAid, OXFAM and ILRI, as well as with other agents such as RPCS-EA

PINGOs and TAPHGO are making alliances with agro-pastoralist organisations, as well as consolidating relationships with pastoralist NGOs from the coast and southern Tanzania. The pastoralist NGOs are good at building strategic alliances. It is important to make sure that women have a strong voice in these alliances, or credibility gained will be lost.

#### To consolidate relations within pastoralist civil society

There is a serious attempt to come to terms with divisions within pastoralist civil society. Working on concrete issues has built up confidence that these divisions can be overcome and that diversity can provide valuable dynamics, strengthening advocacy efforts.

There is need to build and maintain mutual respect within pastoralist civil society while acknowledging divisions. One way to do this is to carry on working together on 'projects' with clearly defined outputs. The projects can be to advocate for more supportive policies, to produce documentation for policy dialogue, to lobby for more influence, and so on.

#### To adopt a critical engagement

Pastoralist NGOs have had considerable success in attempting critical engagement in the policy processes, as can be seen in the engagement with the PRS process and the Livestock Policy.

There is a need to consolidate this position by producing well researched and clearly articulated arguments. It would also be advantageous to link strongly to communities by linking community experience to the policy processes, and ensuring participation of women.

## **5.2 Ideas on the way forward in policy dialogue**

The following section provides a summary of ideas put forward during discussions, of how pastoralists and hunter gatherers could strengthen the effectiveness of their engagement in policy dialogue to positively influence the outcome

### **Ideas for the way forward for pastoralists**

For pastoralists, the key issue identified is the willingness of pastoralists to produce cohesive and convincing arguments, together with their ability to engage with government structures at local level and in the policy debate at the national level. This is particularly urgent as currently there is very little sympathy in government circles for the pastoralist cause, and yet pastoralists seem to be facing more problems than ever. The current situation for pastoralists was described as '*desperate*' by many people interviewed.

The strategies employed for critical engagement with policy processes as a result of lessons learned are becoming more effective and the work being done is slowly gaining momentum. This work should be continued and strengthened, as pastoralist civil society is getting more sophisticated in its approach, gradually widening its network. However, organisations are still vulnerable to outside influence and how support is given is significant, as issues of ownership may become a problem and cause havoc in present

strategies. Any support must take into account the precarious situation of pastoralists, and should fit into and reflect the on-going processes and be driven by the pastoralists themselves.

A particularly important opportunity for engagement in policy reform processes is presented in the NSGRP, which is the guiding policy for development in Tanzania, and which recognises pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood that needs to be supported and promoted through appropriate policy development. This opportunity should be pursued at both national and local levels. Other opportunities are presented in the local government reform processes which recognise the citizen as the key stakeholder. To make use of these opportunities, pastoralists will have to radically develop and strengthen civil society.

A significant current strategy is for the umbrella organisations, at present Maasai dominated, to consolidate relations with other pastoralist groups such as the Ilparakuyu and Barabaig or Tatoga. In addition, an emerging strategy is to include agro-pastoralists<sup>20</sup> in efforts to influence policies concerning livelihoods (e.g. the livestock policy). If agro-pastoralists can see the benefits in making strategic alliances with pastoralists, then there is a chance that this can become a powerful lobby for reform. Strengthening alliances between pastoralists and between pastoralists and agro-pastoralists is a pre-requisite for developing a strong coalition of MPs, with a mandate and responsibility to promote pastoralist/agro-pastoralist interests in parliament, reinforcing the efforts of civil society.

A key issue at local level is that pastoralists are losing influence within their villages and especially within their districts, with less and less pastoralists having key positions in local government, and even in core pastoralist areas becoming minorities on the councils. Pastoralist civil society organisations must wake up to this situation and work out strategies to strengthen local people's participation in governance. There are a range of strategies which could be employed, and it is important that these options are explored and acted upon as soon as possible. In addition, the on going work being done in the communities to strengthen their rights to land resources needs to be recognised as policy work, and making sure that this experience reaches up to the national level to inform the policy debate would make an impact on policy makers and processes. It is vital that strong links are forged between the communities 'on the ground' and the policy processes.

Importantly, as the communities are being trained in their rights and making concrete efforts to secure these rights, they need to become part of a civil society movement working at both local and national level. Once civil society is strengthened in this way, becoming more vocal and effective, government will have to listen, it will be easier and more productive to engage in policy dialogue, and the outcome is expected to be more supportive policies leading to improved and less vulnerable livelihoods.

### **Ideas for the way forward for hunter gatherers**

The key issue for hunter gatherers is to gain recognition of the legitimacy of hunter gatherer communities and their way of life. Future interventions must begin by asking the hunter gatherer communities whether the proposed interventions help them to strengthen their self determination, or not. And any intervention must find ways of working with the existing decentralised leadership

There are undoubtedly existing opportunities for hunter gatherers to establish and secure rights and improve their livelihood within the Village Land Act and in the Wildlife Policy, as well as in the efforts for decentralisation of local government, and within their rights as citizens under the Constitution. These opportunities have been exploited for some time, with mixed results, but lessons have been learned and some reasonable progress is being made to secure some land for the hunter gatherers. However, hunter gatherers remain vulnerable to external political and economic factors, and are so weakly represented within the local and national political systems that they rely heavily on external<sup>21</sup> support in countering these encroachments.

Another question remains on how hunter gatherers will enter policy dialogue at any level. The present situation for hunter gatherers is critical as they are losing their land and even their way of life has no

---

<sup>20</sup> One of the problems of including agro-pastoralists is that they have never been organised in NGOs specifically catering for their needs, as pastoralists have. Another problem is that pastoralists and agro-pastoralists have always been competitors, especially in livestock raids.

<sup>21</sup> Here meaning from non-hunter gatherer Tanzanian NGOs, i.e. their own organisations and representation are too weak to counter outside encroachment.

legitimacy in the eyes of the majority. Added to this, they are very weakly represented in the umbrella organisations ostensibly representing them, and their own organisations suffer from lack of credibility in the eyes of their communities.

There is a great need to strengthen hunter gatherer ties to the umbrella organisations and to strengthen their influence within the organisations. The umbrella organisations themselves urgently need to have their capacity for engaging with and representing the interests of hunter gatherers strengthened. At present the umbrella organisations share some of the prejudices against hunter gatherers found in society generally, and are at a loss as to how to provide appropriate support these communities. Support to hunter gatherers needs to specifically target the capacity of the umbrella organisations to engage with hunter gatherers, and training should be provided by experienced consultants with a long experience and understanding of hunter gatherer communities and their structures. Funding to umbrella organisations needs to be specifically directed to training of the umbrella organisations, including their boards, and strengthening of hunter gatherer organisation and leadership. Special attention should be paid to women, as it is said that hunter gatherer women have the capacity to provide cohesion within their society.

There is also a need to strengthen hunter gatherer ties to NGOs, such as UCRT, which are already working in a credible way with hunter gatherer communities. At present these ties are the main links to local government and other agents, and it could be through these links that hunter gatherer communities build their capacity to produce an organisation that is credible in their own and others eyes.

### **Ideas for the way forward on land**

Priority should be given to issues concerning land for both pastoralists and hunter gatherers. Despite opportunities in the Village Land Act for securing communal lands for hunting or for pastures, there are a great many threats to pastoralist and hunter gatherer land and land use at present. These threats are agricultural encroachment, tourism interests, hunting concerns and conservation expansion, Wildlife Management Areas regulations, the Land Bank Scheme, the SPILL, the draft Livestock Policy, the emerging Rangelands Act and a range of other unsupportive policies. Pastoralists are already engaged on building up strategies for tackling issues of land alienation and encroachment, and the impetus of this engagement is apparently growing.

The present actors, such as PINGOs, TAPHGO, UCRT, CORDS and their key allies, such as OXFAM, TNRF, Haki Kazi and VetAid, should seek alliances with Haki Ardhi and LEAT to try and work out strategies for how to go about securing land for pastoralist and hunter gatherers. Maybe these organisations should create a formal a land alliance, so that the land issues are focussed and government and development actors fully understand the concern. Links could then be made to local level NGOs and CSOs to link their land experiences to policy debate and advocacy, and at the regional or international level to other NGOs concerned with land matters. This land alliance<sup>22</sup> should focus on land issues of concern to pastoralists and hunter gatherers, and make use of existing opportunities and platforms to put forward their concerns and recommendations. The formal setting up of a pastoralist and hunter gatherer land alliance would provide the opportunity of setting up a 'pastoralist desk'<sup>23</sup> to work with motivating organisations and coordinating efforts and strategies for pastoralists and hunter gatherers to critically engage in policy dialogue and reform. Experience from the IGLG (Institutional Governance Learning Group) could be brought on board, by promoting learning about land issues at small CBO/NGO level.

---

<sup>22</sup> As Tanzania does not at present have an alliance of NGOs/CSOs concerned specifically with land, it can be envisaged that a land alliance may spring from the pastoralist – hunter gatherer initiative

<sup>23</sup> The idea of having a 'pastoralist desk' was reiterated many times during interviews. It is felt that having full time engagement with policy issues would be advantageous, as at present the various organizations engaged in policy dialogue are also busy doing other things

## **6. Organisations working with pastoralist and hunter gatherers in Tanzania**

### **6.1 Organisation in pastoralist and hunter gatherer areas**

Hunter gatherer men and women have egalitarian structures, where leadership is only a quality for specific purposes at specific times. This lack of pronounced leadership with a range of responsibilities and duties is said to make working with hunter gatherers difficult. Pastoralists on the other hand are highly organised in age sets, clans and sections. The age set leader is an all round leader taking on a wide range of responsibilities and duties and as such has a strongly political role making it important when working with pastoralists to take this political dimension into account. Pastoralist women have less hierarchical structures, and spokeswomen are usually older widows. Women prefer to work together on issues, without men, and this should be considered when working with pastoralist women.

All rural areas in Tanzania<sup>24</sup>, including pastoralist and hunter gatherer areas, fall under the control of villages. Villages are legal entities and governed by the village assembly, made up of all inhabitants over the age of 18. The village assembly elects a chair person and a council, who manage the day to day affairs of the village, including land allocation. Village bye laws are made to provide legally binding regulations for the village and its communities.

Villages are grouped into wards, and citizens elect a councillor for each ward, to sit on the District Council. District councils make decisions on how the district will be managed, including taxes, approval of village bye laws, land matters and how schools, hospitals and clinics and other services will be administered. The District is administered by government employees under a District Executive Director. A District Commissioner is appointed by the President to represent him in the District and be the head of the police and security forces. Each District has an MP, who is voted for by the citizens over the age of 18, and sits in the country's parliament to approve laws and other administrative matters.

There are also many Community Based Organisations (CBOs). Some of these are small, working within villages at sub-village level. These organisations can do excellent work within their communities and should be supported in terms of information sharing and training. Often these smaller organisations are critical for engaging with local communities, and for organising community based interventions and initiatives. The formation of NGOs is more complex and is governed by legislation under the recently enacted NGO law. NGOs are therefore more formal and usually operate across much larger areas. Most pastoralist and hunter gatherer NGOs are represented in the two umbrella organisations, Tanzania Pastoralist and Hunter Gatherer Organisation (TAPHGO) and Pastoralist Indigenous NGO's Forum (PINGOs) working with pastoralist and hunter gatherer issues in Tanzania.

### **6.2 Overview of pastoralist and hunter gather NGOs**

As can be seen from the list presented below, there are many organisations working with pastoralist issues, and only a few working with hunter gatherers<sup>25</sup>. Some of these organisations are NGOs in name alone, unable to perform unless there are funds. Many of these organisations are working strategically toward empowering their communities and providing services with concrete activities. However, although doing worthwhile work, many are small and difficult to reach and their capacity to account for funds and plan for and report activities are limited.

There are probably several of the NGOs listed below which would fall into the category of medium sized NGOs with staff and annual work plans and budgets, and working to produce good results. However, during the field work period it was not possible to visit all the NGOs and assess them as these organisations are found throughout Tanzania. PINGOs produced a training needs assessment of member organisations, but the outcome was not adequately detailed to be able to use in mapping the members.

---

<sup>24</sup> except in core protected areas, such as National Parks, Forests or game reserves

<sup>25</sup> All the listed NGOs are members of PINGOS and/or TAPHGO

### Schematic overview of pastoralist and hunter gatherer organisations

Name of organisation	Stated thematic areas	Geographical location
Inyuat E Moipo	<i>Education, women, economic empowerment, land &amp; environment</i>	Arusha
MAA (Mukulat Advancement Association)	-	Arusha
Kamamma Integrated Development Trust	<i>Integrated rural community development</i>	Arusha
Maasai Resource Centre for Indigenous Knowledge	-	Arusha
Maasai Pastoralist People & Development	<i>Support in education, health &amp; environmental conservation</i>	Arusha
Emusoi centre	<i>Help Maasai girls realise value of education</i>	Arusha
Ngaramtoni Training Centre	<i>Training centre &amp; conducts research</i>	Arusha
NAADUTORO	<i>Health, education &amp; resource management</i>	Arusha
Afya Bora	<i>Raising awareness on health &amp; education</i>	Arusha
CORDS (Community Research & Development Services)	<i>Pastoralist resource tenure security, research &amp; information</i>	Arusha & Monduli
* Naramatisho	-	Chalinzi
KIRETTO development program	<i>Integrated sustainable development for pastoralists</i>	Hedaru – Same
* SHILDA (Southern Highlands Livestock Development Association)	<i>In charge of overall coordination of NGOs (concerned with pastoralism) in S Tanzania</i>	Iringa
GET (Gejaru Education Trust)	<i>Mobilise Barabaig community to access education</i>	Katesh
NUMUCHU	<i>Poverty reduction amongst pastoralists</i>	Katesh
Ragondega CBO	<i>Advocacy on pastoralists rights</i>	Katesh
Hanang Orphans Support Fund	<i>Support pastoralist (Barabaig) orphans in education</i>	Katesh
DILEGA (Developing Indigenous Livestock Economy with a Gospel Approach)	<i>Support pastoralists achieve sustainable development with a gospel approach</i>	Katesh
SINAJI	<i>Education &amp; animal health for sustainable development</i>	Katesh
HAL (Hanang Agricultural & Livestock project)	<i>Agriculture and livestock development</i>	Katesh
PALISEP (Pastoralist Livestock Services Project)	<i>Poverty reduction and human rights advocacy</i>	Orgosoro
KIDUPO	<i>Community economic empowerment</i>	Loliondo
Austro Project	<i>Vet services to pastoralists</i>	Loliondo
LCDO (Loongido Community Development Organisation)	<i>Community transformation for social &amp; economic development</i>	Loongido
SINAJI	<i>Food security &amp; environmental conservation</i>	Malambo
Maasai Pastoralists Development Initiatives	<i>Support pastoralists in education, water and health services</i>	Monduli
WEDAC (Women Empowerment & Development Agency Co Ltd)	<i>Economically empower women in pastoralist areas</i>	Monduli
* TANIPE (Tanzania Network of Indigenous People)	<i>Advocate for rights &amp; sustainable development of indigenous people in TZ</i>	Morogoro
PADET (Pastoralist Development & Education Trust)	<i>Advocacy on education, human &amp; animal health</i>	Same

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Stated thematic areas</b>	<b>Geographical location</b>
Maasai Women Development Organisation	<i>Support women to improve their economic and social status</i>	Monduli, Simajiro Kiteto
Inyuat E Maa	<i>Agriculture &amp; livestock production, education &amp; literacy, sustainable conservation</i>	
Endonyoor Morwak/Mukulat Heritage Trust *	<i>Protect &amp; develop Maasai sacred sites of Endoinyo oo Irmorwak and Mukulat</i>	Hai & Monduli
Irkisongo Pastoralist Initiative		Monduli
Laramatak Development Organization (LADO)	<i>social services &amp; raise awareness with communities on development</i>	Loliondo Division
OSEREMI	<i>Improved livelihoods for pastoralists through improved livestock production</i>	Loliondo
Aigwanak Trust		Ngorongoro
Ujamaa Community Resource Trust (UCRT)	<i>Sustainable livelihoods for pastoralists &amp; hunter gatherers, advocate for natural resource rights</i>	TZ
SADA		Sale
Iaramatak Loronerie (OOPA)		
Emusot E Purka		
Masajiwanda Trust		
EKABA		
KIPOC-Barabeig		
BULGADA		
KINNAPA Development Programme		
GEJAR Trust		
MAPADA (Malambo Pastoralists Dev. Ass)	<i>Education, health , clean and safe water, Carry out evangelical work</i>	Malambo
KIPOC		Ngorongoro
Aigwanak Trust		Ngorongoro
Pastoralist Women's Council (PWC)	<i>To promote cultural, economic &amp; political development of pastoral women</i>	Sale & Ngorongoro
Longido Community Development Association		Longido
Ngoing'oke E Maasai Longido		Longido
* UWAMA		
* Emanyata Integrated Development Program		
MAMIDEO		
Hadzabe	<i>Hadzabe hunter gatherer organisation</i>	
* HIMWA		
* MTAWAMBO		
Loonguk Cultural Boma		
NGOPADEO		Ngorongoro
SADA (Sanjan Development Association)	<i>Livestock &amp; natural resources to improve their livelihoods, human rights in general</i>	Sale - Ngorongoro
Simanjiro Pastoral Education Trust		Simajiro

At a general level, NGOs are said to be weak, and the NGO scene is reportedly still characterised by lack of trust and faith, with NGOs competing for resources. However, the organisations briefly described below are known to work on programmes which empower local communities, especially in the areas of human rights, land and natural resources rights, and women's rights, as well as having sound managerial and financial accounting capabilities. The organisations have also managed to engage successfully with local government and other key decision makers at the local level and have occasionally engaged in policy work at the national level. As such, the organisations described might be suitable partners to work with IWGIA on implementing activities.

### **Organisations working at local level**

#### **Ujamaa Community Resource Trust (UCRT) (email: [ujamaa-crt@dorobo.org](mailto:ujamaa-crt@dorobo.org))**

UCRT is strongly anchored in the local communities and employs a staff of committed men and women, who are Maasai and Datoga pastoralists and Hadza hunter gatherers. As stated in UCRT's report for 2005, its main strategic focus is 'on strengthening local capacities for natural resource management through training, planning and empowerment'. The NGO is based in Loliondo and Arusha, and works throughout northern Tanzania, mostly with pastoralist, hunter gather and fisher communities. UCRT also occasionally participates in national level policy debate. The main activities are:

- Assisting villages in demarcating village boundaries and acquiring village certificates
- Assisting villages in formulating by-laws based on land use plans
- Training of communities and their leaders (that is customary leaders as well as village and district leadership), on land rights, financial management and accountability, Wildlife Management Area Regulations and issues to do with governance
- Assist villages in drawing up legally binding contracts with tourism concerns, so that villages can earn incomes from tourism
- Assist communities in conflict resolution, especially related to conflict with conservations interests (like National Parks)
- Managing the Dorobo fund secondary school scholarships for 150 hunter gatherer and pastoralist girls in 2005
- Program for hunter gatherers<sup>26</sup>: UCRT has been working with a programme for empowerment of hunter gatherer groups in Yaeda and Ngapapa, the focus being on securing land rights. Concrete activities have been training in land rights for hunter gatherer communities, training in conflict resolution for communities and land officers, training on WMA regulations, making of village land use plans protected through bye laws in collaboration between hunter gatherer communities, Village Councils and District Councils.

UCRT recently recruited more team members and is building its capacity which, coupled with its long term community grounded experience give it strategic opportunities to support the national level policy work.

#### **Pastoralist Women's Council (PWC)**

The following is based on interviews as annual work plans, budget etc have not been provided.

PWC is committed to its work and strongly anchored in local communities. The success of PWC, which is managed by a board and secures much of its funding from various local fund raising activities, has inspired the emergence of other women's organisations throughout Ngorongoro District, who want to see PWC as an umbrella organisation for all pastoralist women organisations. The main areas of operation are as follows:

- Providing a safe shelter for women who have been abused by their husbands, and setting up counselling to try and resolve the conflict so that the woman can return home.
- Raising funds to send girls to secondary school and places of further education.
- Entering negotiations with the wildlife services to fund water development for communities. Women in the area have managed to build several earth dams in this way
- Providing training to communities and women on land and civil rights
- Providing training to women and communities on HIV/AIDS and helping women develop strategies to tackle the disease

---

<sup>26</sup> UCRT is reportedly the only organisation currently working with hunter gatherer communities to improve their rights.

- Providing training to women's groups and the board on financial accountability
- Promoting policy issues at local level. For example by engaging in the debate on WMAs and on land rights in general
- Supporting adult literacy initiatives, especially amongst pastoralist women

As a sign of the high regard in which PWC is held, PWC has recently been requested by the communities to take over the task of managing and rehabilitating the E-manyata secondary school, originally built for the communities, but which had been mismanaged and exploited by recent management and fallen into disrepair.

### **Community Research and Development Services – CORDS (email:cords@habari.co.tz)**

CORDS is a well respected and established organisation, based in Arusha and working in Kiteto, Monduli, Ngorongoro and Simanjiro districts. It operates within four core themes having specialised staff to work in each of the themes

- Livestock Development Programme (LDP) -
- Gender and women development (GWD)
- Community Resources Utilisation and Management Programme (CRUMP)
- Pastoralist Land Rights Protection Programme (PLRPP)

As far as this report is concerned, PLRPP is an area of interest, with a purpose *'to reduce pastoral land grabbing and conflicts between land users and empower village leaders/villagers by raising awareness on pastoral land rights'*. Activities cover amongst other things, facilitating village boundary agreements, demarcating and registering villages in accordance with regulations, organising land rights training at community level, and following up on acquisition of the village land certificates. In addition, the CRUMP program works to secure village land use according to guidelines from the National Land Use Planning Commission, and assist villages to make bye-laws concerning their land use. The main aim of CRUMP is *'a secure resource base for pastoral communities'*.

In addition to working at community level, CORDS has some experience of working at national policy level and has the potential to bring community experience to policy dialogue.

### **Maasai Women Development Organisation - MWEDO (email:mwedo@habari.co.tz)**

MWEDO, established in 2000, is a comparatively new organisation based in Arusha, but with activities in Monduli, Simajiro, and Kiteto Districts. MWEDO is a membership based organisation with currently approximately 300 members. The four main themes are human rights and advocacy, household economic empowerment, public service development and cultural citizenship. The organisation focuses on a practical approach, but has recently engaged more strongly in the policy processes at local level.

### **Organisations engaged in national level policy dialogue and advocacy**

The national level scene is very dynamic, as pastoralist NGOs seek out strategic partners and develop strategies to work with policy reform. At present the pastoralist NGOs working at the national level are PINGO's Forum (Pastoralist Indigenous NGO's Forum) and TAPHGO (Tanzania Pastoralist and Hunter Gatherer Organisation), both of which are engaged in policy dialogue with government and other key decision makers. Occasionally UCRT, which usually works with communities and government at the local level, also contributes to national level dialogue.

Pastoralists are said to be the only production system with own organisations throughout the country and umbrella organisations which specifically represent them. The two umbrella organisations, TAPHGO and PINGOs are both based in the North of Tanzania, in Arusha, an area dominated by Maasai pastoralists. The momentum to join these umbrella organisations is growing and many pastoralist NGOs from central, southern and coastal areas are also joining either TAPHGO or PINGOs. Yet it would seem, on looking at the members of the two umbrella organisations presented above, that both umbrella organisations are dominated by members from the north. One reason given is that 1) there are not so many pastoralist NGOs representing the southern, central and coastal areas as in the North, and 2) the coordinating organisations of these NGOs have already joined PINGOs and TAPHGO (e.g. SHILDA from Iringa), in this way including most pastoralist organisations in the alliance.

It was reported that some agro-pastoralists are forming NGOs so that they can also join the Umbrellas, which is a move welcomed by pastoralist organisations. Once the agro-pastoralists join the network, there will be a

powerful lobby for policy reform in support of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist livelihoods. The expanded network means that advocacy efforts will be backed up in parliament.

**PINGOs Forum** was established in 1994. The mission statement says that PINGOs will *'coordinate and promote solidarity for the improvement of the livelihoods of indigenous pastoralist and hunter gatherers in Tanzania, through advocacy on human rights and sustainable development'*.

PINGOs was on the verge of collapse in 2001 after a vote of no confidence at large meeting of 50 pastoralist and hunter gatherer NGOs and CSO representatives, when it was decided to establish a new umbrella organisation (TAPHGO). Since then, PINGOs Forum has managed to reform itself by improving its management and capacity for financial accountability and in the process PINGOs has regained the confidence of its members as well as recruiting new members. PINGOs have a strong and resolute chairman who puts the members' interests forward and is able to delegate responsibility to management. PINGOs has recently recruited several staff and feels confident that it can both provide training to its members and initiate and participate in policy dialogue with government and other actors. PINGOs suffered a blow last year when its coordinator went to work for OXFAM in Dar es Salaam, however, the present coordinator also sees this move as a benefit to PINGOs, as their relationship with OXFAM has been strengthened creating a better connection to Dar es Salaam, which is where the main part of the national level policy dialogue takes place.

Currently PINGOs has 34 members. PINGO's strength reportedly lies in its capacity to build and maintain strong networks, also with its own members, as well as its outward going pro-active approach

**TAPHGO** was established in 2002. The mission statement says that TAPHGO will *'promote networking, coordination and solidarity among different stakeholders in development of pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities.'* (For more on TAPHGO see Appendix X)

TAPHGO is a new organisation, founded in 2000 when a meeting of pastoralist and hunter gatherer NGOs concluded that PINGOs was unable to fulfil the need of a committed umbrella organisation. The meeting commissioned a group of prominent pastoralist leaders to set up TAPHGO. At a meeting held in July 2001, 70 participants representing 50 organisations finalised the constitution of TAPHGO (Brehony 2003). TAPHGO was finally registered in 2002 and it is commendable that TAPHGO is now fully functional; it has a constitution, offices, staff and a coordinator operating under the guidance of a powerful board and board of trustees. TAPHGO has managed to recruit many member organisations and feels confident that it can both improve the capacity of its members and engage effectively with the policy dialogue at national level. TAPHGO has approximately 30 members. TAPHGO's strength reportedly lies in its financial accountability and the commitment of its powerful board, as well as in its sober and reflective approach to policy dialogue.

Both organisations have been involved in critical review of policies which have a bearing on pastoralists and have been engaging with the policy processes at the national level. In addition, they provide training to increase the capacity of their members, especially related to accountability and reporting, as well as in regard to land and human rights. As stated previously, these umbrella organisations have a low capacity to promote hunter gatherers livelihoods and push forward the agenda of hunter gatherer communities into the policy arena.

The relationship between the two organisations has been a concern since the inception of TAPHGO, as two umbrella's have the potential to split pastoralist organisations into two camps. The relationship between the two organisations can be tense, although both organisations work together well and have produced good results, especially in the area of engaging with policy processes. On the positive side, the relationship is dynamic, keeping both organisations alert, and over time each will develop own areas of competence. Also as there are so many member organisations and the pastoralists cover large land areas with organisations often in remote places, it might be difficult for one umbrella organisation to serve all members with training and so on.

Some people would like to see the new organisations merge when the time is ripe; this view is most often held by donors and government. However, at present the dynamic is productive, the organisations work well together and the organisations themselves are not ready to merge. As both organisations collaborate effectively in policy dialogue it may be wise for other actors to accept that the two organisations fulfil current needs and that if there is a need for change, the members will initiate it.

### **6.3 Strategic allies for pastoralists in policy dialogue**

Pastoralist civil society works with a range of strategic allies to engage in the policy debate. The following provides a very brief description of the current allies. The descriptions are based on interviews.

#### **Reinforcing Pastoralist Civil Society – East Africa (RPCS –EA)**

RPCS-EA is a regional program initiated by IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development) and RECONCILE (Resource Conflict Resolution). RPCS-EA is based near Arusha but covers the east African region, catering for pastoralists in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia. The first phase of the RPCS-EA program, which is currently running, provides strategic learning on the rationale of pastoralism. The training on the rationale of pastoralism aims to improve the understanding of policy makers, administrators, NGOs and pastoralists themselves, about pastoralist strategies and the key issues pastoralists face.

In addition, RPCS-EA has brought together pastoralist organisations from the whole region to conceptualise and design the program, and has also been a key ally in developing the strategies employed by Tanzanian pastoralists to engage in the policy debate.

#### **Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRf)**

TNRf has only recently been registered as an NGO. TNRf is based in Arusha, but its work covers the whole of Tanzania. Although TNRf has only recently been registered as an NGO, it has functioned over a number of years as a loose alliance of organisations, and as such has been active in working with pastoralist civil society to analyse policies and develop strategies for engaging more effectively in the policy debate. Apart from working with the larger NGOs and umbrella organisations, TNRf has an experience with working with small CBOs and NGOs by funding activities on the ground related to natural resources management.

The main function of TNRf, as a forum, is to ensure good information flow, and this role has been central to promoting the effectiveness pastoralist civil society's engagement in the policy debate at the national level.

#### **Haki Kazi**

Haki Kazi means 'the right to work'. Haki Kazi is based in Arusha, but covers the whole of Tanzania. Haki Kazi is a well established, fairly large NGO, with a long experience in working with all issues concerning human rights, especially related to the right to participate in government and good governance issues generally. Haki Kazi is an experienced strategic partner, advising and coaching pastoralist civil society on strategies and opportunities for engaging in policy dialogue.

#### **OXFAM**

Oxfam is an international NGO and has been involved in working with pastoralists in Tanzania over a great many years. Both Oxfam GB and Oxfam Ireland support pastoralists. The main areas of support to pastoralists are

- income generating activities for women
- training and support to pre-schools
- adult literacy initiatives
- training in land and human rights
- support to the ACCORD program for tackling HIV/AIDS in pastoralist areas
- the JOLIT program

The JOLIT (Joint Oxfam Livelihoods Initiative for Tanzania) program is relevant to this report, as it has been instrumental in coordinating pastoralist attention to policy development, especially since it has employed a specialist for lands and pastoralism on its staff.

#### **VetAid**

VetAid is an international NGO, with an office based in Arusha which has operated in the northern pastoralist areas of Tanzania since 1997. VetAid works primarily with livestock health, but also with income generating activities for women and issues related to policy concerning pastoralist production: that is with policies concerning livestock, livestock health, livestock disease, livestock marketing, as well as policies on land and other productive resources.

## 7. Recommendations on the way forward for IWGIA support in Tanzania

### 7.1 Support to activities

This study has found that pastoralists and hunter gatherers are described as becoming increasingly vulnerable to poverty, and that they experience ever increasing loss of land previously used in their livelihoods as well as increasing marginalisation in political process at local levels. The current situation has been described as desperate, as government and donors become increasingly negative toward pastoralists and the policy framework becomes ever more restrictive. However, NGOs have had some success in countering these tendencies by working to secure land rights for pastoralist and hunter gatherer livelihoods at the local level and by engaging in strategic alliances to influence policy development at the national level. Support to pastoralists and hunter gatherers should fit into the on-going processes of working at both national and local level, but there is also a need to promote and forge strong links from the ground to the policy processes. In addition, the study found that there is a need for a pastoralist/hunter gatherer 'desk', to influence, motive and coordinate all these activities, especially related to land.

IWGIA has experience with working with pastoralists and hunter gatherers in the East African Region, especially in Kenya, and also in Tanzania. IWGIA works through organisations to increase capacity of the organisations and to work with concrete issues on the ground related to land rights and human rights. These areas of competence and experience put IWGIA in a strong position to support the on-going strategies of pastoralist and hunter gatherer organisations in Tanzania in tackling poverty, vulnerability and marginalisation of their communities. The kind of approach used is significant to the situation of pastoralists and hunter gatherers in the present political context, as the study found that all organisations are still vulnerable and external forces<sup>27</sup> could still cause havoc and change agendas. Probably supporting genuine local 'ownership' of the processes is the most important task at this time, and spreading support over several organisations may be a good strategy.

Findings from this study suggest that IWGIA should concentrate on engaging with organisations in conducting some or all of the following activities, which will be led by the organisations themselves:

- Provide support to securing land for pastoralists and hunter gatherers. IWGIA should continue providing support to villages to gain titles to their land and to secure pastoralist land use by making and securing village bye-laws. In addition, IWGIA should provide support to making legally binding arrangements between villages to secure communal grazing patterns. There are provisions within the law for these activities, and there are several pastoralist NGOs with expertise in conducting this work.

IWGIA should expand its support to assist hunter gatherer communities, and care should be taken to learn from previous experience, so as not to make the same mistakes. There are no credible hunter gatherer NGOs who can do this work, so it is recommended to work through an NGO with relevant experience and which is known and trusted by the hunter gatherer communities. The NGO should be encouraged to foster capacity within hunter gatherer communities, and coach emerging hunter gatherer organisations or actors in the work.

- Provide support to training at local level on land and human rights. In connection with above, IWGIA should ensure that training is provided to local level actors (CSOs, CBOs, NGOs, village government and district councillors) on land laws and on rights and strategies to influence local level governance. It is important that women are also involved in learning about land laws and their rights to influence political processes. The need for local level involvement in political processes was constantly reiterated in discussions, and this local level involvement needs to be stimulated. There are provisions within the local government reform processes and NSGRP for this training, and there

---

<sup>27</sup> By this is meant external organisation or funds. Experience shows that even well intentioned, but often poorly informed initiatives have unwittingly destabilised processes when the organisations being assisted are weak and competitive

are several pastoralist NGOs with relevant expertise. Possibly PO - RALG (new name) and the National Land Use Commission could be called upon to collaborate with NGO/CBOs in this training

- Ensure that local level experience is brought to policy level. The need for forging strong links between local level actors and the policy process was reiterated during discussions. One way of doing this is to bring the experience of concrete activities or practices from the communities into the policy debate. It is suggested that an NGO with experience and a good record of collecting data and ensuring good information flow is supported to take on this work
- Provide responsive support to consolidating pastoralist NGO coalition. There are a variety of ways in which IWGIA could support efforts to consolidate a shared strategy for the future of pastoralism amongst pastoralist NGOs, but this should be undertaken in close collaboration with the umbrella organisations. One way could be in providing support to working with member organisations, especially to those organisations which represent pastoralist NGOs from the southern or coastal areas of Tanzania and NGOs focussing on women's rights to participate. Another is to promote a sound knowledge base on the rationale of pastoralist and hunter gatherer livelihood strategies
- Strengthen the umbrella organisations' capacity to promote hunter gatherers as legitimate citizens with legitimate livelihoods. IWGIA could provide umbrella organisations with expert training and exposure to hunter gatherer livelihoods and organisational structures and the problems and issues facing hunter gatherer communities, so as to ensure that the umbrella organisations have the capacity to work with hunter gatherer communities and promote them in policy dialogue as legitimate citizens with legitimate livelihoods.
- Support the pastoralist and hunter gatherer land alliance. If the idea of creating an alliance of pastoralist and hunter NGOs and strategic partners to work with land issues is still pertinent, IWGIA could provide support to a 'desk' situated with a host organisation<sup>28</sup>. For example, a memorandum of understanding on how the alliance would work could be drawn up and a committee of some sort could provide guiding principles on the daily running and reporting of the initiative, and the 'desk' would then coordinate the alliance and its activities. The land alliance would be important for bringing forward land issues in the formulation of laws and policies, harmonising policies with the Village Land Act, local government reform processes, NSGRP and in making sure that emerging policies, such as SPILL, the Rangelands Act, the Livestock Policy, the Wildlife Act do not undermine pastoralists and hunter gatherer livelihoods by interfering with their land rights.

In addition, special attention could be paid to the situation of hunter gatherers in relation to land laws, policies and land administration, and to working out strategies on how hunter gatherers could influence the processes.

## **7.2 Potential partners for IWGIA**

As stated previously, there are many actors and organisations working with indigenous pastoralist and hunter gatherer communities throughout Tanzania, with a range of capabilities, a range of activities and a range of impact. Some of the smaller and apparently weaker CBOs, with apparently poor capacity to fulfil criteria, such as accountability, may be doing appropriate work much appreciated at community level. While even the larger well established and well funded organisations require capacity building in certain areas if they are to be effective and fulfil their mandate.

However, as stated in the TOR, IWGIA can only work with organisations with sufficient administrative capacity to handle projects supported by IWGIA, which has no country office in Tanzania. Taking this into account, and using the stated criteria of 1) proven ability and dedication to work effectively and achieve results, 2) accountability and transparency, and 3) focus on key issues identified in the study and IWGIA priority areas, this study proposes that IWGIA could engage with any of the following organisations.

---

<sup>28</sup> The host organisation should be strategically chosen and should not be one of the umbrella organisations

- The two umbrella organisations working at national level, TAPHGO and PINGOs.

The two umbrella organisations have the confidence of their members, are good at establishing strategic networks and are developing skills in the area of policy engagement. Both are able to fulfil the criteria set by IWGIA, and collaboration with IWGIA could consist of working in any of the following areas:

- Critical engagement in policy debate in support of pastoralists and hunter gatherers. This could be strengthened by supporting already established strategies. IWGIA could have a role in strengthening collaboration and cohesion within pastoralist civil society.
- Promoting hunter gathering as a legitimate livelihoods. Expert training and exposure should be provided to the umbrella organisations, so that they fully understand hunter gatherer's livelihoods and recognise them as legitimate. IWGIA could support this process and strengthen the capacity of the umbrella organisations to develop strategies to promote hunter gatherers as legitimate citizens with rights to participate in governance. Once the umbrella organisations have increased their capacity to promote hunter gathering as a legitimate livelihood, hunter gatherers will have an opportunity to engage in policy debate.
- Promoting land as a key issue for pastoralists and hunter gatherers. TAPHGO and PINGOs are promoting this at two levels, through a critical engagement in the policy debate and through training of communities in land and civil rights. IWGIA could support these efforts through funding a formalised alliance of civil society organisations. In addition, IWGIA could promote learning at community level on land and human rights and support training to member organisations on how to help communities secure their rights. This includes explaining how important it is for people to take part in political processes such as securing representation at local level (village and district councils).

- Three community based organisations, UCRT, PWC and CORDS

All three organisations have a very strong local anchorage and support as well as being highly committed to their work. All three fulfil the criteria set by IWGIA and IWGIA could support these organisations in the following ways:

- CORDS and UCRT have both gained considerable experience in providing support to villages to gain titles to their land, secure land use through village bye-laws, and provide safe housing for the bye-laws. Between them, the two NGOs cover most of the northern pastoralist areas of Tanzania. A new area of work would be in assisting communities to secure communal grazing through legally binding arrangements between villages according to guidelines set down by the National Land Use Commission. IWGIA could provide support to both these NGOs to continue with this important work.

In addition, IWGIA might support CORDS and UCRT in promoting and consolidating the work with NGOs in other pastoralist areas in southern and coastal Tanzania.

- UCRT have been working in the same way with hunter gatherer communities (both Hadza and Akie or Dorobo) to secure exclusive rights to their lands, to secure land use through village bye-laws and to reduce conflict with neighbouring communities. UCRT has worked with hunter gatherers for some time, and includes hunter gatherers in its staff. UCRT has gained the trust of hunter gatherer communities. At the time of the study there was no credible hunter gatherer NGO, although it was reported that one was being formed and prominent hunter gatherers were supporting it. IWGIA could support UCRT in its work with hunter gatherer communities and in addition give UCRT the task of coaching any emerging credible hunter gatherer actors and organisations, and working with them so that in time the organisation could take over some of UCRT activities concerning hunter gatherer communities.
- PWC has worked for many years with pastoralist women, and is becoming a pastoralist women's umbrella organisation. PWC is extremely strongly anchored locally and has full support of the communities. PWC presents a strategic opportunity for improving the options for pastoralist women to participate more fully in policy dialogue and the development debate and IWGIA could support

PWC to become more involved in policy dialogue at both local and national levels<sup>29</sup>. The involvement of women will add credibility to pastoralist engagement in policy processes at national level and make an impact on awareness of rights at the local level. Through this support, women could learn about their rights as citizens to influence political processes and participate in governance at local level (village and district councils). Documentation of the impact of various policies on livelihoods and women's rights could be an important factor in the national level policy debate<sup>30</sup>.

- The national level NGO, TNRF (Tanzania Natural Resources Forum)

TNRF has the ability, experience and expertise to fund small NGO/CBO activities and bring the local experience to policy level. In addition, TNRF is respected and trusted by the umbrella organisations and their members. The reason why IWGIA should support TNRF in funding small pastoralist and hunter gatherer NGO/CBO is two fold:

1) The umbrella organisations (TAPHGO and PINGOs) derive their mandate from member organisations, and members need their capacity increased if they are to effectively support the umbrella organisation. Often training of small organisations is best conducted around concrete activities, where they also have to manage the activity and accompanying funds in a transparent and accountable way. TNRF would be more suited to managing the funds<sup>31</sup> than the umbrella organisations themselves, who might be perceived by their members as donors thus confusing the relationship and creating conflict<sup>32</sup>. In addition, if the umbrellas fund small projects, it will draw the focus away from important policy work, as at present the umbrellas do not have adequate capacity in terms of human resources to manage small projects.

2) TNRF has expertise in bringing the experience of small NGOs and CBOs to policy level. The kind of support given should be decided in close collaboration with the umbrella organisations, and should feed into the work they are doing at policy level. It is important that the experience of pastoralist and hunter gatherer women is brought to the national policy level, and gaining this experience will be a key task. In addition, it would be useful if some of the NGOs and CBOs funded represent pastoralist groups in southern and coastal areas of Tanzania. Supporting such an organisation would in turn widen the base and credibility of the northern based umbrella organisations in their engagement in critical policy dialogue.

- The regional institution RPCS –EA (Reinforcement of Pastoralist Civil Society – East Africa)

RPCS-EA has undoubtedly had a role in strengthening the cohesion of pastoralist civil society in Tanzania, by 1) bringing them together to design and develop the generic course on pastoralism, and 2) bringing them together with pastoralist organisations from Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia. RPCS-EA is a key ally in formulating policy strategies, and pastoralist organisations make full use of its expertise and regional outlook.

RPCS-EA provides strategic learning for pastoralist civil society. This is important for changing perceptions and developing skills for engaging in national level debate. IWGIA could fund training for selected NGOs/CSOs and/or Members of Parliament who have pastoralist or agro-pastoralist constituencies. The training would provide them with in-depth understanding of the rationale behind pastoralism and provide them with the tools to explain pastoralist production and analyse the underlying reasons for pastoralist poverty.

The outcome for NGOs and CSOs would be to strengthen their alliances around a common understanding of problems facing pastoralists, and create a basis for developing a shared vision for the future of pastoralism in Tanzania

---

<sup>29</sup> through working with the umbrella organisations and the proposed land alliance

<sup>30</sup> this work could be coordinated by TNRF

<sup>31</sup> Although both umbrella organizations do have the financial capability with good financial controls

<sup>32</sup> Also the conflict over the Delegated Fund for Pastoralists has made an impact and the umbrella organisations and their members shy away from repeating the experience.

The outcome for MPs would be a better understanding of the rationale of pastoralist production systems, a common understanding of the issues surrounding the production system which will produce better arguments for supporting policies beneficial to pastoralists and their livelihoods

- **Pastoralist and hunter gatherer land alliance**

IWGIA could ascertain whether the idea of creating an alliance of pastoralist and hunter NGOs and strategic partners to work with land issues is still relevant. If the concept is still considered important, IWGIA could fund an inception workshop. Depending on the outcome, IWGIA might want to support the initiative. As stated elsewhere, this initiative could be significant to the effectiveness of engaging in policy issues. At present work with policies is ad-hoc, responding to emerging crisis; a formalised land alliance could provide pastoralists and hunter gatherers with a broader, yet coordinated and more focused line of reasoning in policy work. In addition, a land alliance could coordinate efforts of the various NGOs and their umbrella organisations for increasing land security and good governance at the local level.

### **7.3 A consolidated approach**

Taking the above analysis and suggestions into account, the following consolidated recommendations are made, in order of priority:

**For pastoralists:**

- 1) *IWGIA to continue supporting CORDS in securing land rights for pastoralists*
- 2) *IWGIA to provide support to UCRT in their efforts of securing land rights for pastoralists*

**For hunter gatherers:**

- 3) *IWGIA to provide support to UCRT to work with hunter gatherers and huntergatherer organisations to secure land rights for hunter gatherers*

**For land rights**

- 4) *IWGIA to support the establishment of a hunter gatherer and pastoralist land alliance desk*

#### **1) Support to CORDS on securing land rights**

The work being done by CORDS with IWGIA support is producing results in securing land for pastoralists. It is recommended that CORDS' work with securing land rights for communities and villages should continue to receive IWGIA support. However, in order to bring in findings from this report, the agreements between CORDS and IWGIA could be expanded and consolidated to include:

a) A provision for providing training to the councillors and communities on land rights specifically for pastoralists. This training could be provided by an external agent, specialised in training, which would again consolidate the intra-pastoralist organisation cooperation, building trust and expanding experience. It is not enough to provide training on the legal aspects of land rights, this training should also contain a strong message that pastoralists have to get involved in local level political affairs if their land rights are to remain secure in the future.

b) A provision for linking the experience gained of the process and the impact of the activities to the broader policy dialogue. This can be done by carefully documenting how 1) land rights are secured, 2) documenting cases where outside infringement has been rejected, 3) documenting cases of land rights infringements/abuse, and 4) documenting the impact of the previous on pastoralist livelihoods. The experience should be linked through the PCS-EA programme the policy dialogue in which PINGOS and TAPHGO are engaged. PCS-EA can provide expert input to the documentation process, and, using the results in their program, further expand the links to the East African region. If these linkages are to be successfully utilised, it will require careful negotiation and agreement between the organisations concerned, but there will be a lot gained from investing in the time required, as well as adding considerable value to the on-going work being undertaken by CORDS.

### **1) Support to UCRT on securing pastoralist land rights**

UCRT are working to secure land rights and resource use rights for communities, in much the same way as CORDS and with the same ideology: that securing village land title and use plans will provide communities with the unalienable rights to exclusively manage these lands. It is recommended that IWGIA provide support to UCRT to continue and expand this work for pastoralist communities.

Furthermore, as in the case of working with CORDS, it is recommended that agreements are made between IWGIA and UCRT that a) training to councillors and communities on pastoralist land rights and on the need to engage in local level government should be provided while conducting the above exercises and that b) the experience gained from working with communities should be linked through PCS-EA (or IIED/Reconcile) to the on-going policy dialogue

### **3) Support to UCRT to work with hunter gatherer communities on securing land rights**

UCRT are at present working with villages and communities to secure land rights and resource use rights for hunter gatherer groups. As hunter gatherers are so few and as their way of life is so heavily stigmatised, working to secure their rights is sensitive and difficult, however, UCRT have managed to find a balance, bringing all concerned parties together to reach agreement on what needs to be done on the ground. It is recommended that IWGIA support this process.

In addition, UCRT has hunter gatherer members in the team, and works wherever possible with hunter gatherer organisations. It is recommended that IWGIA channel support to UCRT's work with land rights so as to encourage the emergence of representative and appropriate hunter gatherer organisation around the specific issues (such as land rights).

It is further recommended that, as part of the IWGIA support, UCRT should provide training to communities and councillors on land rights and the role of leadership to ensure that rights are respected. Also, UCRT should agree to carefully document their work with land rights issues, in order for the local experience of hunter gatherers to be brought to the national agenda. This can be done through TNRF, who have the expertise and the platform to promote hunter gather land and natural resources rights at national policy level.

For the above mentioned strategies to be effective over the long term, it is significant that the hunter gatherer umbrella organisations PINGOS and TAPHGO are empowered to cope with promoting the hunter gatherer agenda. It is recommended that IWGIA support specialised training to the Board and management of PINGOS/TAPHGO on the rationale of hunter gatherer livelihoods, on their situation within the socio/political set-up in Tanzania, and on possible strategies to secure them their rights. This training should be provided by a person with profound knowledge of hunter-gatherer issues, who has a range of suggestions for strategies which might improve their situation and strengthen their position. Once the training has been received, PINGOs and TAPHGO should be supported to come up with a program on how the two umbrella organisations can forward the hunter gatherer agenda on the national policy front.

### **4) Support to a hunter gatherer-pastoralist land alliance/desk**

Throughout this study, the call for a coordinated effort on securing land rights was consistently reiterated by the people consulted. It is clear that access and security of tenure over land remains the most significant issue for pastoralists and hunter gatherers in Tanzania today.

At present there is considerable effort going into securing land for pastoralists and hunter gatherers, at local level as well as national policy level. However, at local level the efforts are not evenly spread geographically and there is no learning or information sharing between the efforts. It is therefore recommended that IWGIA consolidates the work being done on securing land rights by supporting a 'desk' which would coordinate an alliance on land rights for pastoralists and hunter gatherers.

It is recommended that the desk be situated in TNRF, who have the necessary backstopping expertise, and who are not biased toward any groupings. TNRF could also manage the financial support. The 'desk' should

coordinate an alliance between pastoralist and hunter gatherer NGOs, CSOs and communities focussing on land matters.

If such a desk were formed, lessons learned from the work of CORDS, UCRT and others could be coordinated and consolidated at community level, and the land issue would be brought forward to the national policy level, giving a more powerful voice to the national level lobby. This approach provides a sustainable perspective for support to pastoralists and hunter gatherers in securing their rights to land and livelihood.

## ***List of documents consulted***

- Anderson D (1999), Rehabilitation, Resettlement & Restocking: Ideology & Practice in Pastoral Development. In *The Poor Are Not Us*. Eastern African Studies, James Curry Oxford, EAEP Nairobi, Ohio University Press, Athens (p240-256)
- Barrow G.C (1996), *The Drylands of Africa*, Initiatives Publishers, Nairobi
- Behnke R & Scoones I (1993), Rethinking Range Ecology: Implications for rangeland Management in Africa. In *Range Ecology at Disequilibrium: New Models of Natural Viability & Pastoral Adaptation in African Savannas*. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Birgegaard L (1993), Natural Resource Tenure: a Review of the Issues & Experiences with Emphasis on Sub-Saharan Africa. *Rural Development Studies 32*, Uppsala
- Brehonny E, Mattee A, & B. Nangoro (2004) Inclusion & opportunity: a way to reduce marginalisation & vulnerability. A study on the development of a policy component for Ereto II (commissioned by Ereto II)
- Brehonny E (2003), Assessment report of TAPHGO, Mapambazuko Training Centre, Arusha
- Broch-Due V & Anderson D (1999), Poverty & the Pastoralists: Deconstructing Myths, Reconstructing Realities. In *The Poor Are Not Us*. Eastern African Studies, James Curry Oxford, EAEP Nairobi, Ohio University Press, Athens (p 3-19)
- CORDS Pamphlets: Pastoralist Land Rights Protection Livestock Development Programme. Gender and Women Development. Community Resources Utilisation and Management Programme. General working for sustainable livelihoods pamphlet
- Cullies A & Wilson C, 2005, Winners and losers: privatising the commons in Botswana. In *Securing the Commons No 9*. Drylands Program IIED
- DANIDA (2004) Support to Indigenous Peoples: strategy for Danish support to Indigenous Peoples. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- DANIDA (2005) Tool kit: best practices for including indigenous peoples in sector programme support. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Ellis J (1999), Climate Variability & Complex Ecosystem Dynamics: Implications for Pastoral Development. In *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*, Intermediate Technology Publications (p37-46)
- Heffernan C, Nielsen L & Misturelli F (2001), *Restocking Pastoralists: A Manual*. LDSG
- Hesse C & Ochieng Odhiambo M (2002) In search of a vision for the future of pastoralism in East Africa. Discussion paper for RPCS-EA
- Hodgson D.L (2002) Precarious alliances: the cultural politics and structural predicaments of the indigenous rights movement in Tanzania. In *American Anthropologist 104 (4)* 1086-1097, American Anthropological Association
- Hodgson D.L (2002), Comparative perspectives on the indigenous rights movement in Africa and the Americas. In *American Anthropologist 104 (4)* 1037 -1049, American Anthropological Association
- Hodgeson D (1995), *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity & "Development": Images, Interventions & the Reconfiguration of Maasai Identities, 1916-1993*. PhD thesis, Dpt of Anthropology, University of Michigan
- Hodgeson D (1999), Images & Interventions: the Problems of Pastoralist Development. In *The Poor Are Not Us*. Eastern African Studies, James Curry Oxford, EAEP Nairobi, Ohio University Press, Athens (p221-239)

- Homewood K. & Rodgers W (1991), *Maasailand Ecology: Pastoralist Development & Wildlife Conservation in Ngorongoro, Tanzania*. Cambridge University Press
- IIED (1994), *RRA Notes 20: Special Issue on Livestock*. International Institute for Environment & Development
- JOLIT (2005) Pastoralism and advocacy – lessons learned for the PRS process. Discussion paper presented at JOLIT Partners Forum, Moshi
- Kipuri N & Sørensen C (2005), A study of best practices and lessons learned from phase 1 of Ereto (for policy dialogue). Draft report to Ereto 11 and Danida.
- Kipuri N (1998), Wildlife tourism and its impact on indigenous Maasai women in East Africa. In *Indigenous women: The right to a voice. IWGIA Document No 88*, Copenhagen
- Klinken R van & Seita, J ole (2005), Delegated Fund Committee, Mid Term Review. CORDAID, PO Box 16640, The Hague, The Netherlands
- Lane C & Moorehead R (1999), New Directions in Rangeland & Resource Tenure & Policy. In *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*, Intermediate Technology Publications (p116-133)
- Lane C.R (1996), *Pastures Lost: Barabaig economy, resource tenure and the alienation of their land in Tanzania*. Initiatives publishers, Nairobi
- Lane C.R (1995), *Custodians of the commons: Pastoral land tenure in East and West Africa*. Earthscan Publications, UNRISD
- Lissu T.A (1997), *Policy & legal issues on wildlife management in Tanzania's pastoral lands: The case study of Ngorongoro Conservation Area*. Prepared for course on 'Constitution Making & the Environment', 3-22 March 1997, Nairobi
- Madsen A (2000), *The Hadzabe of Tanzania: Land and human rights for a Hunter-Gatherer community*. IWGIA document no 98
- Maranga S. (2001) *Gender study (amongst pastoralists) report*. A report commissioned by Ereto I, Dec 2001.
- Mattee AZ, & M. Shem (2005) A review of current policies and laws that touch on pastoralism in Tanzania (commissioned by Ereto II)
- MWEDO (2006) operational plan for Maasai Women Development Organisation, 2006
- Ngoitiko, M (2004), Social & economic aspects of wetland management in Lake Natron Basin, a report submitted to DANIDA
- Ole Nasha, W. (undated) Analysis of policy environment for pastoralist production in Tanzania.
- Pastoralist CSOs (2005), Statements of pastoralist civil society organisations on the proposed livestock policy 2005. signed by Pingos forum, TAPHGO, Osiligi PSO, Inyuat e maa, Iaramatak Lorkonerei, Community Resource Trust, Kinnapa, Ekaba.
- PARDEP (1998) Pastoralism in Tanzania: its status, challenges and development alternatives. Research report by Pastoral Research & Development Programme
- PINGO's Forum, Hakikazi, Sand County Foundation, Orkonerei Pastoralists Advancement, Community Resource Trust (2002) Inclusion of rangelands livelihoods in national poverty eradication/alleviation strategies. A report of the PRS review workshop held in Arusha on 25-26 March 2002 Arusha.*
- PINGO's Forum. TAPHGO, VETAID, ILRI (2005), Inclusion of pastoral friendly provisions in the National Livestock Policy, 2005: A submission to the Livestock Policy Taskforce
- PINGO's Forum, UCRT, WWG (2004), Reforming wildlife law in Tanzania. A report of a workshop held in Arusha, 14-15 September 2004

- PINGOs Forum (2005), PINGOs Forum News, Issue 1, Jan to April 2005
- PINGOs Forum (2005), PINGOs Forum News, July to September 2005
- RPCS-EA (2003) Challenging the Myths: A workshop on Perceptions of Pastoralism in East Africa. Held at MS-TCDC, Arusha, Tanzania 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> May 2003
- Scoones I. (1994) New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa. In *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*, Intermediate Technology Publications (p1-36)
- Shivji I.G & Kapinga W.B (1998) Maasai rights in Ngorongoro, Tanzania. IIED/Hakkiardhi
- Swift J (1999) Dynamic Ecological Systems in the Administration of Pastoral Development. In *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*, Intermediate Technology Publications (p153-173)
- TAPHGO, Constitution of the Tanzania Pastoralist & Hunter Gatherer Organisation
- TAPHGO (2005) Proceedings of a multi-stakeholder workshop organised by TAPHGO, 1-2 August 2005. Funded by MS-Tanzania
- TAPHGO, Annual progress report for July 2004 to June 2005
- TAPHGO, Project progress report for July 2005 to December 2005
- TAPHGO (2005), Annual internal review workshop on partnership between MS-Tanzania and TAPHGO, Sept 30 2005
- TAPHGO (2005) Organisation needs assessment for member organisations in Manyara, Arusha and Iringa Regions
- Taylor G & L. Johansson (undated) *Our voices, our words and our pictures. Plans truths and videotapes from NCA*. Forests, Tress and people Newsletter No 30
- UNESCO (undated) The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural & Natural Heritage
- UCRT (2005) Ujamaa Community Resource Trust (UCRT) Narrative & Financial Report for 2005
- UCRT (2004) Presentation of Hadza-Akie exchange visit, September 2-26 2004
- URT (1990) A conservation and development strategy for the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Report of the Ad Hoc Ministerial Commission on Ngorongoro.
- URT, MRALG (1998), Policy paper on local government reform, Local Government Reform Program, Dar es Salaam
- URT, MAC (1997) Agriculture and Livestock Policy
- URT (1974) The Wildlife Conservation Act
- URT (2002) The wildlife Conservation (wildlife Management Areas) Regulations 2002
- URT, Prime Ministers Office (2002) Rural Development Strategy, Final Main Report
- URT, MWLD (2005) Draft National Livestock Policy
- Van Klinken R & ole Seita J, (2005) Delegated Fund Committee, Final Report of the Mid Term Review
- Vet/aid & PINGOS Forum (2004), *Livestock production in Tanzania: policy issues, strategic links and keys to growth*. Report on a workshop, Arusha, 28 April 2004
- Waller R, (1999), Pastoral Poverty in a Historical Perspective. In *The Poor Are Not Us*. Eastern African Studies, James Curry Oxford, EAEP Nairobi, Ohio University Press, Athens (p20-49)

### *People consulted*

Date 2006	Name	Designation	Organisation
01/02	Prof Issa Shivji (tel)	Land rights expert & lawyer	HAKKIARDHI
02/02	Vincent Shauri	Program Officer	LEAT
-	Loserian Sangale	Board member TAPHGO	Consultant
03/02	Ellen Buch-Hansen	Pastoralist desk, Royal DK Embassy	DANIDA
-	Hans Duimayer	Water development, pastoralists	ACME
06/02	Naomi Kipuri	Indigenous people & land rights	Consultant
-	John Letai	Program Officer	PSC-EA
-	Ced Hesse	Director, Dry-lands Program	IIED
-	Michael Ocheing Odhiambo	Director	RECONCILE
07/02	Robert Sillevs	Senior Adviser	ERETO
-	Alfred Sakafu	Executive Director	CASEC
-	Dorothy Hodgson	Assistant professor	RUTGERS
08/02	Moses Sangale	Coordinator	TAPHGO
-	Jackson Muru	Program Officer	TAPHGO
-	Esau Losioki	Finance Officer	TAPHGO
-	Elson Makai	Ag. Information Officer	TAPHGO
-	Lampulung ole Kosyando	Project Manager	DFP
-	Flemming Winther Olsen (tel)	Country Director	MS-TZ
09/02	Edward Porokwa	Coordinator	PINGOS
-	Robert Allport	Country Director	VETAID
-	Thad Petersen	Dorobo Safaris co-director	DOROBO
-	Edward Lauri	Ag. Coordinator	UCRT
-	Elikarimu Gaiewi	Field Officer, Hanang	UCRT
-	Lieve Lynnen	ECF treatment delivery	Private vet
10/02	Benedict ole Nangoro	Director	CORDS
-	Elard Mawala	Land use planners, Kiteto	CORDS
-	Oneson Barakaeli	Land use planner Kiteto	CORDS
-	Emanuel Ndulet	Land demarcation, Monduli	CORDS
-	Raphael Lengare	Land demarcation Monduli	CORDS
-	Kariongi	Board Chair Taphgo, Sec Church	TAPHGO
-	Ndinini Kimesera Sikai	Executive Director	MWEDO
-	Gertrude King'ori	Volunteer (MSc researcher)	MWEDO
-	Paul Wilson	Program Officer	MWEDO
13/02	Alais ole Morindat	Program adviser & trainer, (TAPHGO board member)	PSC-EA
	Dismas	(Board member PWC) field officer	UCRT
	Elizabeth Singleton	Coordinator	TNRF