Resilience in the rangeland:
Changes and challenges for pastoral communities in Kenya and Ethiopia

About the author

This report was prepared for CARE International by Sara Pavanello (independent consultant). Sara has an MSc in Development Management from the London School of Economics and is a former Research Officer at the Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) at the UK Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Her areas of research focus are cash transfer programming, resilience, social protection, food security and livelihoods, humanitarian response in urban areas and displacement.

List of acronyms

CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CMDRR	Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRRAP	Drought Risk Reduction Action Plan
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department
EW	Early warning
FGD	Focus group discussions
GS&L	Group savings and loans
IDI	In-depth interview
INGO	International non-governmental organisation
IPC	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
NRM	Natural resource management
PA	Pastoralist association
PDRA&A	Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment and Analysis
RREAD	Regional Resilience Enhancement Against Drought

Cover photo: Jilo Gasara, a pastoralist in Borana zone, Ethiopia © CARE/Stuart Dunn

This report, and the RREAD programme that it reports on, was funded by ECHO (European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection).

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The drought crisis that affected the Horn of Africa in 2011, and growing frustration with the devastating effects that recurrent droughts have had on local lives and livelihoods, prompted renewed attention and commitment to a 'resilience building' agenda among national governments, regional bodies, donors, and national and international agencies. This qualitative study aims to gain an understanding of the ability of different individuals in two study sites in northern Kenya and two in southern Ethiopia to cope with or adapt to the risks that they are confronted with, without compromising their long-term prospects; and to examine the extent to which the Regional Resilience Enhancement Against Drought (RREAD) programme implemented by CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia has supported this ability.

The overall objective of RREAD was "to contribute to increased resilience… through improved response and preparedness activities that enhance [pastoralist communities'] adaptive/coping capacities". The programme's design and implementation was guided by a Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) model, a people-centred approach to risk management. In practice, the CMDRR approach consisted of assessments and consultations at the community level to:

a) conduct a Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment and Analysis (PDRA&A); and

b) develop disaster risk reduction (DRR) measures; in particular, contingency and community development plans.

To achieve the programme's objective, CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia provided training and promoted activities to enhance pastoralist communities' preparedness and coping strategies through early warning (EW) and natural resource management (NRM) activities, as well as their adaptive capacity through group savings and loans (GS&L). The programme adopted a cross-border approach, involving neighbouring border pastoralist communities from Kenya and Ethiopia in joint CMDRR discussions and activities.

The study found close linkages between a limited ability to manage drought risks – through livestock mobility and access to dry season grazing zones – and conflict. The findings also point to the weakening of, and growing disregard for, traditional EW systems, which are part of a body of customary institutional arrangements that have traditionally helped pastoralists to plan in advance for the dry season and drought. The constraints to accessing dry season grazing zones and the weakening of traditional EW systems are symptomatic of the current state of pastoralism in the region, where attaining positive livelihoods outcomes and managing risks is increasingly challenging not merely because of weather-related stresses, but because of complex political, economic and social processes that have long strained pastoralists' strategies, customary institutions, and livelihood systems.

In light of the limited diversification options available, NRM and EW activities implemented in the study areas have sought to support pastoralism as a viable livelihood option by enhancing local communities' ability to manage drought risks.

However, it is important that such efforts are better tuned to the changing context, trends and dynamics, as well as to existing opportunities and challenges. Repeated drought shocks in a context of a weakened ability to manage such shocks have had devastating consequences on pastoralist households' assets. A key finding is that livestock is no longer the mainstay of the subsistence of the majority of the population in the study sites. Instead, livestock ownership appears to be increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few, who are considered better-off, while the majority, considered very poor or poor, either no longer own livestock or own very few.

This raises questions about the extent to which activities such as NRM and EW (primarily aimed at supporting a livestock-centred livelihood system) are relevant for the majority of people who do not own large herds, or no longer own livestock. External actors need to better acknowledge and understand the changing reality. Contextual analyses and other assessments should investigate and highlight differences in the wealth status, needs and priorities of different people within communities. Project activities should be directed not only at households which still own livestock but,

crucially, also at the many who have suffered serious depletion of livestock assets. This may include exploring restocking options for the poorest and most vulnerable.

In addition to livestock depletion, deepening poverty and growing differences in households' wealth status, the findings point to other significant processes of change. These include sedentarisation resulting from restricted access to vital pasture lands and unavailability of basic services such as mobile education to accommodate the needs of a mobile population; growing frustration with repeated livestock losses and dissatisfaction with pastoralism as a viable livelihood system and lifestyle; increasing demand for education and livelihoods diversification; and changing gender roles. Education and livelihoods diversification were widely perceived, especially by children and young people, as having the potential to minimise or eliminate drought risks altogether, and to open doors for improved living standards and ultimately resilience. Such expectations are, however, largely unrealistic. The majority of youth interviewed struggled to attain primary or secondary education. Many, including those holding a university degree, were reportedly unemployed and unable to find a job or open a business in pastoralist areas, and similarly unable to migrate or find employment in urban economies.

There is a role for NGOs and initiatives such as RREAD to more prominently engage with communities to better understand their needs and their ideas for the future. Realistic discussions on the challenges and opportunities that pastoralist and urban economies and lifestyles can offer, complemented with a better understanding of market dynamics and value chains, are needed to explore how best to support individuals and communities in their quest for resilience.

The following is a summary of the study's main recommendations.

ON THE CMDRR APPROACH

- There is a need to move away from simplistic categorisations of communities and their livelihoods (e.g. pastoralists, settled, urban, dropouts) and to better acknowledge the complex reality on the ground, as well as dynamics and trends.
- Local level assessments and analytical exercises conducted through CMDRR or other approaches should seek to:
  - understand the socially differentiated nature of resilience
  - understand the context and processes of change
  - highlight the root causes of vulnerability.
- Existing PDRA&A, contingency, and community development plans should be:
  - reviewed to take the above into account
  - more systematically linked up with government plans (e.g. County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) in Kenya) and other stakeholders (e.g. national and international NGOs).

ON LIVELIHOODS DIVERSIFICATION AND ADAPTATION

- Reflecting on the future of pastoralism in the face of limited livelihoods alternatives both in the cities and in pastoralist areas, and growing disillusion, particularly among children and youth, should be a first step for initiatives in pastoralist areas.
- There is a need to better understand market dynamics and trends, demand and skill gaps, market players, and value chains for livestock and livestock products, to identify new business opportunities and understand which ventures may hold the most potential to be sustainable.
- Building people's capacity must be seen as a long-term endeavour.
  - If and where appropriate, training could develop a more substantial focus on business management and development, accounting and bookkeeping, and other business-related topics.
  - Training targeting illiterate people should make use of visual tools to facilitate their learning.

- On the basis of the findings of market and value chain analyses, targeted and relevant vocational training and skills development could be provided to build capacity to fill market gaps.

- Pending analysis of market dynamics and a decision by communities to engage in certain activities, facilitating access to capital for enterprise development and business ventures, for example through micro-finance institutions, could be explored.

- Together with discussions at community and household levels in both Kenya and Ethiopia, restocking options could be explored for the most vulnerable. However, there is a need to shift from the traditional way of restocking and destocking. Restocking is not viable if carried out by external organisations such as NGOs; however, if communities sell their stocks at the most appropriate time and restock themselves, this can be viable. Creating or recreating dependency should be avoided.

- More explicit focus is needed on children and youth, both males and females, as well as other population groups, to better understand and engage with their needs, priorities and aspirations.

  - On the basis of the findings of market and value chain analyses, some youth could be helped to find employment or business opportunities in pastoralist areas, and their skills enhanced as needed.

  - Awareness sessions and discussions with youth groups could engage and attempt to change their pessimistic outlook towards pastoralism (especially in Kenya) and identify ways in which they could be involved in livestock-keeping activities. For example, they could be supported to engage in livestock trade by building their capacities in business development skills and linking them to access to financial institutions/credit facilities.

  - Visits of youth from pastoralist areas to urban centres could help to prepare them for a possible future life in the city, and to consider issues such as the challenges and opportunities of urban lives and livelihoods, and market and skill gaps in urban economies.

ON THE CROSS-BORDER APPROACH

- Without sustained efforts at higher levels of policymaking to develop cross-border or regional approaches to NRM, EW, conflict resolution, etc., the potential of local level efforts and initiatives to bring about lasting change is limited. There is a need to understand the appropriateness and implications of stepping up higher level engagement to complement local cross-border initiatives.

1 INTRODUCTION

In 2011 drought once again hit the Horn of Africa. It affected over 12 million people and caused extensive human suffering and loss of livelihoods (African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, 2011). In August 2011, 3.75 million people in Kenya alone needed food and other assistance; 1.4 million of them were classified as being in the 'emergency' category according to the IPC classification[1] (DEC, 2012). According to a World Bank analysis, the drought wiped out around 5 per cent of Kenya's total livestock population (Demombynes and Kiringai, 2011).

The immediate cause or trigger of the crisis, which some have described as the worst in 60 years, was consecutive failures of the short and long rains of late 2010 and early 2011 (Save the Children and Oxfam, 2012; African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, 2011). However, similar to previous drought-induced shocks in the region, it is widely accepted that the intensity and magnitude of the 2011 crisis, and the considerable scale of acute food insecurity that it triggered, cannot merely be attributed to rain failure (DEC, 2012). Other factors, including ongoing disruption of pastoralists' migration patterns, little or no investment in the drylands, conflict and insecurity, and increasing competition for land, have long affected local drought-coping strategies, exacerbating the negative effects of drought on lives and livelihoods (DEC, 2012; Save the Children and Oxfam, 2012; Levine, 2011).

The 2011 crisis prompted renewed attention and commitment to a 'resilience building' agenda among national governments, regional bodies, donors, and national and international agencies. In the Horn of Africa region, resilience is increasingly seen as having the potential to bridge the long-standing divide between emergency response and development assistance, and to contribute to tackling the root causes of recurrent drought-induced crises.

Despite widespread attention to and enthusiasm about resilience and the key concepts associated with it – including vulnerability, risk and adaptive capacity – there is no consensus on what resilience is and how it should be approached and assessed. This can also be seen in the proliferation of definitions and frameworks for analysing resilience.[2]

The following definition is taken as the starting point for the analysis:

> "Disaster Resilience is the ability of countries, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses – such as earthquakes, drought or violent conflict – without compromising their long-term prospects." (DFID, 2011)

By targeting living standards, this definition focuses on the resilience of people and households in the face of disturbance. Indeed, as Pain and Levine argue, "conceptualising resilience at the level of communities leaves no room for analysing the constraints to choice and action that might exist because of power inequalities and exclusion within the community" (2012, p.10; see also Levine et al., 2012). The definition also usefully relates resilience to the risks that people face in their everyday life, as well as the opportunities, choices and trade-offs that are available to them, and long-term implications for their prospects.

Lastly, the definition focuses not only on maintaining living standards in the face of shocks or stresses, but also on the ability of affected people to change and adapt, thus bringing the spotlight onto the transformative potential of resilience. Adaptive capacity, a term that has gained special prominence in climate change debates in recent years, can be defined as "the ability of a system to adjust, modify or change its characteristics or actions to moderate potential damage, take advantage of opportunities or cope with the consequences of a changing climate" (Ludi et al., 2012, p.8).

[1] The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) is a set of tools to analyse and classify the severity and magnitude of a food security situation. The IPC standardised scale categorises the severity of acute food insecurity into five phases: minimal, stressed, crisis, emergency, famine. See http://www.ipcinfo.org/

[2] For an in-depth discussion of existing conceptualisations and frameworks of resilience, see Bahadur, A V, Ibrahim, M and Tanner, T (2010) *The resilience renaissance? Unpacking of resilience for tackling climate change and disasters. Strengthening climate resilience.* Discussion paper, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

1.1 Aim and scope of the study

The aim of this study was to gain an understanding of the ability of different individuals in selected study sites in Kenya and Ethiopia to cope with or adapt to the risks, shocks and stresses that they are confronted with without compromising their long-term prospects, and to understand the extent to which the Regional Resilience Enhancement Against Drought (RREAD) programme implemented by CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia has supported this ability. The overall objective is to provide evidence to inform better understanding of local resilience as articulated by different people, and to clarify which types of interventions may be better suited to strengthening resilience.

1.2 Methodology

Fieldwork took place from 18 November to 1 December 2013 in Nairobi, and in selected sites in northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia (see section 2). The research team comprised one international researcher (also author of this report) accompanied by two RREAD programme staff. The methodology used was primarily qualitative, with a combination of primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected through focus group discussions (FGDs)[3] and in-depth interviews (IDIs)[4] with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, and key informant interviews (KIIs): see annexes for further information. Secondary data included RREAD documents, and studies and evaluations by other agencies.

The study faced several limitations.

- Resource and time constraints limited time in the field to four days in Kenya and three days in Ethiopia.
- As qualitative research methods involve relatively small numbers, the study's findings are not statistically representative of either those living in the study sites or in pastoralist areas in northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia.
- Cultural constraints made it difficult to involve female youth[5] and girls in fieldwork discussions.
- The study set out to select sites where RREAD has been operational for a number of years. However, this was not always possible, due to limited time, the remoteness of RREAD's operational areas, and the rainy season, which made several sites inaccessible.

[3] Focus groups were formed on the basis of multiple categories: male/female; young males/young females; beneficiary/non-beneficiary.

[4] IDIs sought to capture more in-depth, individual level experiences and perceptions.

[5] This study adopts the UN definition of youth, which includes people between 15 and 24 years of age.

2 OVERVIEW OF THE RREAD PROGRAMME

Since 2008, CARE International has been implementing the RREAD programme in the pastoralist border areas of northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia. RREAD is funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO) under the Drought Risk Reduction Action Plan (DRRAP), which supports a consortium of four INGOs – COOPI (Cooperazione Internazionale), Cordaid (Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid), VSF-G (Vétérinaires sans Frontières – Germany) and CARE International. The programme aimed "to contribute to increased resilience and reduced vulnerability… through improved response and preparedness activities that enhance [pastoralist communities'] adaptive/coping capacities".

The programme had four expected outputs or results.

1. Harmonised Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) process effectively linking early warning (EW) information and community development and contingency plans.
2. Harmonisation and improved management and access to services, livelihood resources and assets.
3. Good cross-border drought risk reduction principles and practices documented and disseminated to support DRR policy and strategy development.
4. Cross-border partners' support to communities and local government coordinated and harmonised.

2.1 Programme approach and key activities

The design and implementation of the fourth phase of the programme (as well as the programmes of other DRRAP partners) was guided by the CMDRR approach, defined as "a process of bringing people together within the same community to enable them to collectively address common disaster risks, and pursue common disaster risk reduction measures. It is a process that mobilises a group of people in a systematic way towards achieving a safe and resilient community." (Binas, 2010 cited in Abdi, 2011.)

In practice, the CMDRR approach adopted by RREAD consisted of seven-to-ten-day community-level assessments and consultations to reflect on disaster risks, and develop appropriate DRR measures. The Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment and Analysis (PDRA&A) process gathered relevant data about communities, conducted hazard, vulnerability and capacity assessments, and carried out disaster risk analyses with communities to stimulate joint thinking and awareness on DRR. The development of DRR measures included contingency plans, which provide a guide to a community's operational needs, and the actions and steps needed to manage hazardous events, and community development plans, outlining the activities and interventions needed to address the root causes of vulnerability and strengthen long-term community resilience. (See also Abdi, 2011.)

CMDRR discussions facilitated by RREAD staff involved different groups in a given community (i.e. men, women, elders, youth). Their views were consolidated in the PDRA&A and the contingency and community development plans described above. CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia then provided training and promoted activities to enhance communities' preparedness and coping strategies (i.e. EW and natural resource management (NRM)), and their adaptive capacity (i.e. group savings and loans (GS&L)). The CMDRR process has brought together neighbouring border communities in Kenya and Ethiopia to think collectively about their common hazards and develop joint measures. Similarly, NRM, EW, and GS&L training and related activities have involved members of bordering communities.

This study was conducted in a total of four sites in northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia[7] as follows:

KENYA

- RREAD project beneficiaries: **Lataka** pastoralist settlement, Uran location, Sololo District, Marsabit County.
- Non-beneficiaries: **Gololе** pastoralist settlement, Uran location, Sololo District, Marsabit County.

[6] Since 2008, ECHO has funded four successive phases of 18 months each.

[7] Throughout this document, when reference is made to Kenya and Ethiopia, it refers to the stated sites only, which were the focus of this study.

ETHIOPIA

- RREAD project beneficiaries: **Dambi Hara** pastoralist settlement, Dambi Pastoralist Association (PA), Moyale Woreda, Oromyia Region.
- Non-beneficiaries: **Ketala** pastoralist settlement, Dambi PA, Moyale Woreda, Oromyia Region.

All these settlements are located along the Kenya-Ethiopia border and are inhabited by Borana pastoralist groups of Oromo ethnic origin. Families live in round huts, some have adjacent livestock corrals, and all have a relatively small plot of land for rain-fed subsistence farming.

In both Kenya and Ethiopia, maize and green beans are the main crops cultivated, largely for household consumption. All respondents concurred that the role of agriculture in their livelihoods was marginal, due to erratic rainfall. Precisely because there was widespread consensus that rain-fed agriculture represented a very limited source of households' income and food production, this study finds it difficult to define the communities in this study as 'agro-pastoralists'. However, the term 'pastoralist' does not capture the diversity of their livelihood activities, income sources, lifestyles and aspirations.

The weakened ability of pastoralist communities to manage and withstand multiple droughts has had devastating effects. This study found depleted livestock holdings, deepening poverty and growing disillusionment with pastoralism as a livelihood system and lifestyle, as people increasingly have to take up livelihood activities other than livestock-keeping to diversify their economic activities.

Furthermore, not only did communities as a whole eschew neat categorisations, but the use of 'community' seems too broad a term and poorly suited to capture the variety of realities, needs and aspirations that emerged during fieldwork discussions.

3 MAIN RISKS IN THE STUDY SITES

Definitions of resilience emphasise the ability to cope or change in the face of adverse shocks and stresses. Shocks are usually defined as short-term disturbances, while stresses indicate longer-term disruption (Leach, 2008 in Pain and Levine, 2012). In practice, however, it may be more useful to think of a cyclical continuum of risks.

In all sites, respondents agreed that the main risk they face is drought. In Kenya, the majority indicated flash floods as the next most significant; in Ethiopia, the majority indicated conflict.

3.1 Drought

Across locations, and age and gender groups, respondents consistently mentioned the loss of livestock holdings as the most devastating immediate and long-term effect of multiple droughts. As in other pastoralist communities in the Horn of Africa, livestock was considered a proxy for wealth, and the recurring depletion of livestock assets was widely mentioned as a major financial shock driving households deeper into destitution. Several respondents said that the effects of drought crises will be felt for years, not only because herds take a long time to rebuild, but also because droughts are increasing in frequency and intensity, making recovery more difficult.

During FGDs and IDIs, the 2011 drought was frequently referred to, largely because of its severity, still vivid in people's minds, and its disastrous outcomes, still being felt. In all sites, respondents stressed that the majority of households in their settlement had suffered serious livestock losses and that most of the population had become poor. The threshold for being considered rich had also dramatically lowered. In the words of a woman in Dambi Hara: "Before 2011, if a household owned 100 cattle [it] was considered rich; today, households with 10 cattle are rich!"

In both Kenya and Ethiopia, discussions around household wealth status revealed similar perceptions. Households who no longer own livestock are widely considered as the poorest; those owning only a few head (usually three or less) are considered poor or very poor (also depending on family size); and medium, better-off, and rich households are those who own more than three head and have different species. As the table below shows, the poor and the very poor represented the majority of the population in each settlement.

Breakdown of wealth distribution based on livestock assets reported by respondents[8]

Study area	Total number of households	Total number of very poor households (no livestock)	Total number of poor households (three animals or less)	Total number of medium, better-off, or rich households (more than three animals and different species)
Kenya				
Lataka	240	90	115	35
Golole	550	100	400	50
Ethiopia				
Dambi Hara	275	65	100	110
Ketala	240	80	100	60

[8] While the data has been cross-checked with different respondents in each settlement, in the absence of a household survey or programme baseline/endline data, the above data should be considered indicative only and the result of qualitative investigations, not complemented by a more comprehensive quantitative exercise.

The findings above also indicate that livestock is no longer the mainstay of the subsistence of the majority of the population. Instead, livestock ownership appeared to be increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few, while the majority either no longer owned livestock or owned very few. The depletion of livestock holdings needs to be seen as part of related and often reinforcing parallel trends, including rapid human population growth, rangeland degradation, increasing competition for land, and displacement from traditional dry season grazing areas. The depletion of livestock assets, deepening poverty and hopelessness in a context of protracted inability to cope with and recover from drought shocks is an important push factor in the pursuit, or the hope of the pursuit, of greater livelihood diversification.

3.2 Conflict

In Ethiopia, respondents in Dambi Hara and Ketala unanimously indicated conflict as the second most significant risk, after drought. Discussions often referred to long-standing tensions between Boran and Garri[9] communities following the establishment of regional boundaries, as part of Ethiopia's implementation of the policy of ethnic federalism in 1991. Since then, Boran communities have objected to the annexation of a *tula* well (a permanent water source[10]) to Region 5 or Somali region, mostly inhabited by Garri communities, claiming that it should be included in Region 4 or Oromyia region, where the Borana zone is located.

In Kenya, recent political and administrative developments have added a new layer to long-standing grievances. The new Kenya Constitution, endorsed in 2010, mandates the devolution of power from the central authority to 47 county governments, each with its own elected government. In the run for the 2013 elections, the Gabra[11] forged an alliance with Garris and virtually swept all the top county seats in Marsabit County, causing discontent among Boran communities. According to a key informant, Boran "felt marginalised and the victims of an injustice", since according to constitutional provisions Boran should have been granted at least two seats.[12]

As indicated by several key informants, the conflict between Boran and Garri (and Gabra) had been reignited in the months preceding the study period. In Dambi Hara and Ketala in Ethiopia, respondents reported being targeted by attacks from Garri and have suffered human losses, destruction of property, and livestock raids.[13]

Access to a common dry season grazing reserve not far from Dambi Hara and Ketala, traditionally shared among Garri, Boran and Gabra ethnic groups, has become increasingly restricted because of insecurity and the high risk of violent confrontations and livestock thefts.

Respondents expressed a strong desire to put an end to the conflict, so that safety and access to dry season grazing could be restored. However, their frustration and resignation were palpable, as conflict and insecurity have been ongoing for decades. Elders in Ketala complained of inaction by the local government, despite their frequent calls for support with conflict resolution.

Government representatives interviewed in Moyale, Ethiopia, linked the intra-ethnic conflict in the Moyale area to long-standing grievances resulting from "regional demarcation and ethnic claims". Both government respondents and elders taking part in FGDs in Dambi Hara and Ketala referred to several peace meetings held in the area in the past, with the support of INGOs and government authorities, but described them as temporary palliatives and not lasting solutions, because the root causes of the conflict lay elsewhere.

The findings above indicate that in order to bring lasting change and tackle the root causes of grievances and conflict, peacebuilding activities at the local level should be complemented by bolder efforts at higher levels of policymaking. Since the second phase of the programme, RREAD has adopted a cross-border perspective for

---

[9] Boran are of Oromo ethnic origin, while Garri are Somali.

[10] Tula wells are deep water sources found in the Borana zone and managed by customary authorities and rules. As elders in Ketala explained, a tula well is not only important because it is a permanent source of water, and hence available during drought, but also because of the mineral-rich water found in such wells, critical for livestock productivity and health.

[11] Gabra are a pastoralist ethnic group of Oromo ethnic origin.

[12] Gabra are the majority in the former Marsabit district, while in the neighbouring Moyale district, Boran are the majority. See also local news at: http://sabahionline.com/en_GB/articles/hoa/articles/features/2013/09/03/feature-02; http://ayyaantuu.com/horn-of-africa-news/oromia/kenya-high-stakes-in-contest-for-governor-seat-in-borana/

[13] This study only interviewed two Boran communities in Ethiopia. Because of time constraints it was not possible to also involve Garri and Gabra communities to cross-check information, and understand how the conflict affects them.

programme design and implementation, including the promotion of cross-border activities that seek to foster a peaceful coexistence among border communities. It was beyond this study's scope to visit other border locations inhabited by Gabra, Garri, and Boran ethnic groups, some of which were the focus of an earlier RREAD study (Pavanello and Levine, 2011). However, since the ethnicities and alliances of pastoralist groups span international borders, and conflict in one area often carries serious repercussions elsewhere, the likelihood of conflict relapse in other border areas targeted by RREAD is high.

This should be a cause for reflection on the cross-border approach adopted by successive phases of RREAD, which have predominantly focused on the local level. Notwithstanding the positive effects of efforts that bring together bordering local communities and local government authorities to foster a more peaceful and collaborative existence (see Section 5.3, for example), the effectiveness and sustainability of such efforts in the absence of more strategic engagement at higher levels of policy and decision-making, particularly at national, federal, and regional levels, is questionable. This will be discussed later in the report.

4 PREPAREDNESS AND COPING STRATEGIES IN THE STUDY SITES

In this section, the study looks at the preparedness and coping strategies reported by study participants. However, the study also recognises that categorising responses to risks or problems using broad terms such as 'preparedness' or 'coping strategies' is an artificial way of depicting reality. For example, study participants' responses to drought and conflict risks pointed to key strategies – such as livestock migration or fodder collection – that have long been part of pastoralism, and have contributed to its viability. The constraints to the adoption of such strategies – such as restricted livestock mobility or the weakening of traditional EW systems – are symptomatic of the current state of pastoralism in the region, where achieving positive livelihoods outcomes and managing risks is increasingly challenging not merely because of weather-related stresses, but because of complex political, economic and social processes that have long strained pastoralists' strategies, customary institutions, and livelihoods systems.

4.1 Preparedness strategies: the role of traditional early warning systems

Traditionally, the Boran have a sophisticated indigenous EW system, part of the body of customary institutions that for centuries has guided the lives and livelihoods of Boran pastoralist communities. Traditional weather forecasters (called *ayantu* in Oromo) and readers of animal intestines (called *uchu*) interpret a variety of signs found in the natural environment, such as flowers, trees and constellations, to predict weather-related events. Historical knowledge and indigenous methods for counting the days between one season and another are also used to determine the start of the wet or dry season in a given area (Dida, 2013). Weather-related forecasts are then disseminated at community level during meetings, weddings, name-giving ceremonies and other events, as well as at an individual level, for example to people who consult *ayantu* and *uchu* to plan and prepare for drought.

Echoing the findings of other studies (see for example Muir, 2007), this study found that indigenous EW systems have been weakened and undervalued. Most interviewees said that they never consulted indigenous forecasters. Similarly, interviews with *ayantu* indicated that for several decades both their role as forecasters of weather events and their social status have greatly diminished, as has, consequently, their confidence. In Moyale, Ethiopia, an *ayantu* explained that in 2011, when a drought situation seemed to be developing, several people asked for his predictions but: "It was too late, and drought was no longer a prediction, it was a fact." He added that this is a recurrent pattern. While some consultations occur when the crisis is already unfolding, very few take place during the rainy season with a view to preparing in advance for the dry season that will inevitably follow.

Discussions with communities and key informants indicated that formal education and religion have contributed to the weakening of and disregard for traditional EW systems in the sites visited.

As discussed below, there is a high demand for education, especially in Kenya, where it is increasingly perceived as a stepping stone to the attainment of jobs, professional careers and an urban lifestyle. A range of respondents indicated that the formal education system, teaching staff and materials do not see mobile pastoralism in the 21st century as an environmentally sustainable and economically viable livelihood system, and are sometimes overtly critical of the pastoralist lifestyle and livelihood system. Some students in colleges and universities may well have a similar perspective on pastoralism. Interviews with *ayantu*, also confirmed by discussions with children and youth, indicated that most young people do not consider indigenous EW systems to be valid or reliable (as they are not based on formal or scientific knowledge), nor useful, because the overwhelming majority do not see themselves as pastoralists in the future.

Religion was also mentioned as an important driver of changing practices and attitudes, including towards indigenous knowledge. Traditionally, Boran are animists (the body of Boran animist beliefs is called *waaqefanna* in Oromo), but over the centuries many have converted to Islam and Christianity. A number of *ayantu* explained how religious leaders often preach against animist beliefs and traditional knowledge, labelling them as sinful

practices. Consequently, pastoralists have increasingly shunned traditional knowledge.

The weakening of traditional EW systems, which in the areas studied is seen mainly as being driven by education and religion, also needs to be seen as part of broader processes that have long sidelined and undermined pastoralist customary institutions. For decades, multiple pressures, both internal (i.e. from pastoralist communities themselves) and external (i.e. the state's presence, and policies and initiatives that do not take into account traditional institutional arrangements) have had profound impacts on customary institutions and customary authorities, often with dramatic consequences. As argued in Pavanello and Levine (2011), for example, in many contexts disregard of institutional arrangements around NRM has negatively affected peace, stability, and the economic security of pastoralist communities. In the areas studied here, one consequence of the weakening of EW systems and of the role of *ayantu* and *uchu* seemed to be the erosion of a 'culture of preparedness', and a general disregard for the measures that pastoralists would traditionally adopt to prepare in advance for the dry season and drought.

4.2 Coping strategies during drought

When asked what they were doing during drought crises, men and women respectively indicated livestock migration and fodder collection as the main strategies. In southern Ethiopia, several respondents also mentioned temporary migration of children and youth, both males and females, to urban centres in search of casual employment as a 'survival strategy' adopted by particularly vulnerable families during the 2011 drought. The findings on livestock migration presented here relate to southern Ethiopia, and provide interesting insights on the linkages between response to drought and conflict.

LIVESTOCK MIGRATION

As a result of the conflict between Boran and Garri and related security concerns, respondents from Dambi Hara and Ketala in Ethiopia reported limited and intermittent access to a nearby common dry season grazing area, a vast plateau located around 10km north-west of both settlements, which historically offered a vital source of pasture during dry seasons or droughts.

Respondents explained that they only "feel safe" accessing the part of the plateau that is close to their settlements, and that venturing further inside puts them at high risk of violent confrontation with rival communities, and livestock thefts. In 2011, this relatively small area could not sustain livestock from Ketala, Dambi Hara and nearby settlements for a protracted period. When resources started to dwindle, and following positive reports on the state of water and grazing land[14] in areas north of Yabello and Arero cities (Oromyia region, Ethiopia), the majority of pastoralists from Dambi Hara and Ketala reportedly decided to trek there with their livestock.

However, interviewees complained that these areas were not only very far away, at more than 200km from their settlements, but had also rapidly become congested. In Dambi Hara and Ketala, some households reportedly lost all or most of their livestock either in these areas, because resources had rapidly depleted and animals were simply too weak to embark on the long journey home, or on the way back, when many animals collapsed and died.

As these findings indicate, the substantial depletion of livestock assets during the 2011 drought in the areas visited in Ethiopia was not merely the result of a climatic shock *per se*, but was closely linked to restricted access to the common dry season grazing area due to insecurity and conflict. This finding echoes long-standing arguments that see the root causes of pastoralists' vulnerability to drought in the region as being related to socio-economic and political processes, including conflict, rather than merely to the adverse effects of climatic changes.

FODDER COLLECTION

During FGDs and IDIs, many women beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in Kenya and Ethiopia talked about the challenges and risks they face during dry seasons (and drought in particular), when they walk long distances to fetch fodder for lactating, small and weak animals that cannot trek for long distances and therefore remain in the settlement.

[14] When resources are dwindling, a team of emissaries is sent to potentially suitable locations for migration to check the availability and quality of water and pasture, and the willingness of the host community to accept 'visitors'. On the basis of the emissaries' feedback, elders meet to discuss and assess potential sites, and eventually decide whether to migrate, when and where (Pavanello and Levine, 2011).

In Kenya, women reported that at times of stress they climb the nearby hills to fetch pasture. Those who do not own pack animals such as donkeys have to carry the grass on their backs. As well as this highly demanding physical activity, they are also exposed to soaring temperatures, snake bites, and injuries if they fall on shrubs or stumps. During drought, these activities are often carried out on an empty stomach, simply because there is not enough to eat. Several women noted that many suffer miscarriages due to the combination of a heavy workload and reduced intake of calories.

Women in Ethiopia also reported challenging and risky journeys to collect fodder in the nearby plateau during drought. Insecurity and conflict represented an added layer of threat, in particular an increased risk of sexual violence and rape. To minimise incidences of confrontation with rival communities, women usually fetch grass at night, meaning they are at greater risk of being bitten by deadly snakes[15] or attacked by wild animals, and of being injured because they have to walk in the dark.

TEMPORARY MIGRATION OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH TO URBAN CENTRES

In Dambi Hara, Ethiopia, temporary migration of children and youth (both males and females) to urban centres was frequently mentioned as a strategy adopted in 2011 by vulnerable households "to ensure the survival of the family," as one man put it. Young males reportedly migrated both to nearby and more distant urban centres in Ethiopia and Kenya (including Nairobi) to look for casual jobs as waiters, mechanics or builders. Unfamiliar with life in the city, and often lacking documents such as identification cards, or residence and work permits, there were reports of young males having been arrested and having faced "very difficult times".

Girls as young as 13-14 years old reportedly also migrated on a temporary basis to Moyale, Ethiopia, or other urban centres closer to home, looking for work as cleaners or babysitters. Respondents were reluctant to explain the threats that these girls faced during their stay, simply saying: "It is a secret." Since sending young females to work in town is an unusual and culturally inappropriate practice, as confirmed by discussions with CARE Ethiopia RREAD staff, the adoption of this strategy indicates that in 2011, some families were experiencing a significant degree of distress.

[15] During several FGDs in Ketala and Dambi Hara, respondents reported that the plateau is infested with Puff Adder snakes (called *but* in Oromo). The Puff Adder, whose potent venom makes it the most dangerous snake in Africa, is more active at night than during the day. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bitis_arietans

5 RREAD APPROACH AND ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF PREPAREDNESS AND COPING STRATEGIES

This section focuses on exploring how the RREAD programme's CMDRR approach, EW and NRM activities have supported preparedness and coping strategies in the study areas

5.1 The CMDRR approach

The study identified positive outcomes from the CMDRR approach, as well as areas for improvement. Many beneficiaries said that the CMDRR process helped them to better articulate their collective needs, and made them more aware of the risks in their environment and how to better prepare for and manage these risks. This is an important achievement, given the poor 'culture of preparedness' that existed previously. The cross-border approach also highlighted the fact that border communities often share common risks, and that developing measures to respond to such risks should also be a common endeavour. Key stakeholders, including NGOs and government representatives, particularly valued the usefulness of the process's outputs: the PDRA&A, contingency, and community development plans. These documents were seen as useful for planning and implementing government and non-government sponsored projects, as they included relatively up-to-date needs assessments, and represented the collective articulation of communities' needs, and the gaps which need to be addressed to enhance their resilience.

Key findings include the following.

- Beneficiaries want to maintain an ongoing working relationship with CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia, and in particular to ensure that contingency and community development plans are up to date, and to receive ongoing capacity building and financial and technical support.
- Beneficiaries were concerned that there were frequent mentions of the need to regularly monitor, review, and update the plans. They also explicitly asked for more regular visits by CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia.
- The need for ongoing support from CARE was also noted in relation to capacity-building activities, such as training. Across gender and age groups, there was a strong desire to learn and gain knowledge and awareness. Participants, especially illiterate men and women, frequently mentioned the need for refresher training. Illiterate community members suggested a greater use of visual tools, such as pictures and drawings, during training.
- Beneficiaries also noted that CARE could play a bigger role in supporting them to convey plans to decision-makers for financial and technical support. In recent months, the PDRA&A, contingency, and community development plans had been disseminated at meetings organised and facilitated by CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia and attended by community representatives, government actors, INGOs, and other key stakeholders. These events are a good first step. However, for these plans to lead to meaningful change, CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia must act more effectively as a link between communities – who often lack the confidence, ability, and connections to highlight their grievances or requests – and stakeholders.
- RREAD programme staff agreed that communities need ongoing support and capacity building, and argued that this can only be achieved through long-term engagement and presence. In areas where CARE has been working for several years, there are encouraging examples of how ongoing support under RREAD has contributed to increasing beneficiaries' ability to convey plans to key stakeholders, and has helped to build their confidence.
- In Kenya, the newly devolved government structure offers a unique opportunity for citizens to participate in the planning process of their counties, and to incorporate the contingency and community development plans into the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). It is important that CARE Kenya (and other DRRAP partners working in Kenya) urgently explore this opportunity.
- Dambi Hara and Lataka's contingency and community development plans have a strong focus on drought risks as the main source of local vulnerability, with limited attention to the multiple and often overlapping political, economic and social processes that contribute to vulnerability and undermine local ability to manage risks. For example, these plans and

the PDRA&A merely mention conflict as a risk, and do not discuss the nature, source, and scale of the conflict, the implications for communities' ability to manage drought, or any proposed measures to address it. Also, despite the involvement of different profiles of people in community CMDRR discussions, the different views, priorities and aspirations of children, youth, women and men cannot be clearly seen in these plans.

- If the CMDRR process ultimately aims to enhance the resilience of both communities and individuals (particularly in light of the possibility that such plans may be incorporated into government plans), a more sophisticated, disaggregated, deeper level of analysis is needed to highlight the root causes of weakened coping strategies and resilience, and the needs and aspirations of different individuals and groups in each community.

5.2 Early warning systems

One of RREAD's objectives was to strengthen EW systems and foster linkages between community-based and government EW systems. This stemmed from the recognition that indigenous EW systems have been weakened and disregarded; that local communities are losing an important preparedness mechanism; and that such systems can be usefully linked with government mechanisms and structures to improve the timeliness of response to drought.

For a number of years, government agencies in both Kenya and Ethiopia, often with INGO support, have established local level committees – comprising key opinion leaders such as local government representatives, elders, health workers and teachers – to generate information on disaster risks, EW, food security, etc. From the community level, this information flows upward to national and federal levels – to the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) and the Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector (DRMFSS) in Kenya and Ethiopia respectively – via district and regional structures. In study sites, RREAD facilitated the inclusion of traditional weather forecasters into local committees, and carried out three days of training for committee members on the collection and dissemination of EW information, and the inclusion of indigenous EW.

Given the programme's focus on cross-border dynamics, a meeting was held in June 2013 in Moyale, Ethiopia, bringing together traditional weather forecasters, government officials, and representatives of the meteorological offices of both Kenya and Ethiopia with the aim of strengthening cross-border EW information and linkages between indigenous and formal EW systems.

A positive outcome of these initiatives is that communities have started to appreciate the importance of indigenous EW for preparedness activities and in turn the role of indigenous forecasters. In Lataka and Dambi Hara many people said that they had started to consult *ayantu* and *uchu*, for example, to hear their predictions on the start of the rainy season. Women mentioned using this information to know when best to plant green beans and maize, and both men and women were surprised about the accuracy of the forecasts. Respondents also explained that they realised the importance of EWs, because these activated the contingency plan.

Ayantu interviewed in the communities targeted by RREAD confirmed that a growing number of people were consulting them and asking them for weather-related information. *Ayantu* from Kenya and Ethiopia who attended the RREAD-sponsored cross-border meeting in June 2013 appreciated the opportunity to meet and share their experiences, forecasting techniques, and upcoming predictions. Similarly, staff from the Moyale Sub-county Meteorological Office found the meeting useful and were surprised about the similarities between formal and indigenous forecasts, even if they had been determined through very different techniques.

5.3 Natural resource management

In study sites, two main activities – the establishment of a dry season common reserve (called *kallo* in Oromo), and hay-making – were promoted to support better cross-border NRM, a critical drought preparedness and coping strategy.

A dry season common reserve was created in Lataka and Dambi Hara through rangeland reclamation activities. Men, women and youth of neighbouring border communities were trained in rangeland management techniques (such as which species of tree to cut down and which to retain to provide nutritious feeding and shade for grazing animals) and have been employed to work on rangelands for a small fee by CARE Kenya and CARE Ethiopia. Echoing the programme's previous findings (Pantuliano and Pavanello, 2009; Pavanello and Levine, 2011), beneficiaries are enthusiastic about the establishment of the reserve. During the wet season part of the grass is collected and stored through hay-making

activities (see below), and during the dry season or drought the reserve provides readily available pasture, thereby reducing the need to trek with animals for long distances.

As with the EW activities, an important achievement is that targeted communities have started to appreciate the benefits of NRM. In Lataka, respondents confidently said that they will maintain the reserve, even in the absence of support from CARE or other NGOs, because they have realised the importance of having readily available pasture nearby, all year round.

Several respondents in Kenya also noted positive effects on inter-community ties. During a number of FGDs attended by people from Lataka and Godloni across the border in Ethiopia, all participants stressed how this initiative strengthened relationships and sharing arrangements between the two communities. People noted that before "they were like strangers", and the term "unity" was frequently used to describe how they felt since attending the training, working on the reserve, and managing its access "as one community". Respondents in Dambi Hara described a similar relationship with the community of Dambi Bori across the border in Kenya.

Women in Lataka and Dambi Hara were trained in hay-making so they could produce fodder during the wet season to be used during the dry season or drought. This was also widely perceived as an effective way to better prepare for drought. Immediately after the rains stop, women cut hay and collect it as it begins to turn yellow, thereby retaining its nutritional value. The hay is then laid out to dry on specially made beds in the reserve to prevent it decaying. Afterwards, it is piled in stacks and stored for use in the dry season. Women reported that hay-making activities made pasture readily available for small and weak animals during the dry season and drought, increasing their chances of survival. This also reduced the need for women to walk for long distances to fetch hay during drought and so be exposed to the many risks outlined above (see Section 4.2).

5.4 Early warning and natural resource management support to preparedness and coping strategies

Beneficiaries' views, perceptions and experiences indicate a general appreciation of EW and NRM activities. While it was not possible to assess the extent to which these aided people to better cope with the effects of the 2011 crisis, they were nonetheless perceived as having enhanced communities' ability to deal with drought and strengthened cross-border relations. The study's findings also indicate a number of points for reflection.

As also highlighted in Section 4, rather than being discrete strategies, EW systems, NRM, mobility, and fodder collection are all part and parcel of a logical, flexible and responsive livelihood system, which should be supported as a whole to sustain its functionality. This basic issue needs to be central to external interventions seeking to support pastoralism, which too often view such strategies as stand-alone issues that can be enhanced with 'add on' project activities, such as preparedness or coping activities.

Cross-border initiatives, as also indicated above, have primarily been focused at the local level, without complementary advocacy activities to bring EW and NRM cross-border issues to higher levels of decision-making. However, unless efforts are made to ensure that Kenya and Ethiopia, at the national and federal level, work in coordination to establish a common EW system and a legal framework for dealing with cross-border land management, it is difficult to see how local-level EW and NRM activities can contribute to bringing about meaningful changes in drought management and response at the higher (national, federal and eventually regional) levels.

NRM and EW activities have sought to support pastoralism by enhancing local communities' ability to manage drought risks. Given the weakening of the pastoralist livelihoods system as a result of multiple and long-standing pressures and in light of the limited diversification options available, this is important and relevant. Indeed, unlike other livelihood production systems such as agriculture or sedentary livestock keeping, mobile and semi-mobile pastoralism is arguably the most robust system in the hot and arid rangelands of northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia, and it is crucial that ongoing policy and programme efforts continue to

find ways to ensure that pastoralism remains a viable livelihood option for the millions living in dryland areas (Pain and Levine, 2012; IIED and SOS Sahel, 2010 in Pavanello and Levine, 2011).

However, it is also important that such efforts are better tuned to the changing context, trends and dynamics, as well as to existing opportunities and challenges. The findings indicate that repeated drought shocks in the context of a weakened ability to manage such shocks have had devastating consequences on pastoralists' livelihood systems and livestock assets. Livestock is no longer the mainstay of the subsistence of the majority of the population in the study sites, and only a small number, considered the better-off, still own relatively large herds (see table on page 9). Livestock depletion, growing impoverishment, and growing differences in households' wealth status are some of the changes found; other socio-economic processes of change are discussed in the boxes below and opposite. This raises questions about the extent to which activities such as NRM and EW (primarily aimed at supporting a livestock-centred livelihood system) are relevant for the majority of people who do not own large herds, or no longer own livestock. As one elder in Dambi Hara said: "Yes, these [NRM and EW activities] are important but we have very little livestock left."

External actors need to better acknowledge and understand the changing reality. Contextual analyses and other assessments should investigate and highlight differences in wealth status, needs and priorities within communities. Project activities should include the many households who have suffered serious depletion of livestock assets. A focus on capacity building may not adequately respond to the needs of these households. Programmes supporting pastoralism as a viable livelihood system should consider the option of restocking the most vulnerable to a minimum threshold level.

Education and livelihoods diversification

Echoing the findings of a recent study (Gitonga et al., 2014), the attainment of education – in particular higher education – and livelihoods diversification (i.e. engaging in livelihood activities other than livestock keeping, such as business and/or professional careers) were widely perceived as having the potential to mitigate or avoid drought risks and lead to more resilient livelihoods. However, there is a sizeable mismatch between aspirations and reality. External initiatives should strive to better understand and address this, and to realistically assess the available and viable options that pastoralism, alternative livelihood systems, and urban economies can offer.

In Ethiopia, pastoralism was more widely considered to be a relevant and viable livelihood system, and families often kept some children at home to look after livestock. At the same time, there was a clear pull towards education and diversification, as indicated by families educating their children. In Kenya, the majority of respondents thought that in the future fewer people will be pastoralists, and livestock production systems will be less mobile. There was a marked focus on education and livelihood diversification, perceived to open pathways to a better life, more stable livelihoods, and resilience. However, for the overwhelming majority, financial constraints limiting access to education, and the limited employment opportunities that urban centres offer, are significant barriers.

Frustration and hopelessness arising from repeated loss of assets, the inability to recover from shocks, and deepening levels of poverty were often palpable during FGDs and IDIs. Diversification or leaving pastoralism altogether were overwhelmingly perceived as key risk-spreading or risk-avoiding strategies.

Most respondents felt that because of repeated drought-induced crises, maintaining livestock-centred livelihoods was increasingly risky. All expressed a strong desire for more stable and reliable livelihood sources. Income-generating activities other than livestock production were seen as less risky, better performing, and insulated from the risks and uncertainties associated with seasonal changes.

It is often assumed that supporting pastoralist communities to diversify their livelihoods can reduce vulnerability to recurrent drought risks and strengthen resilience. These assumptions however are not corroborated by evidence on exactly how diversification can mitigate or avoid drought risks, offer a viable and robust alternative to pastoralism for millions of people, and contribute to their resilience.

Changing gender roles

The study found that the role of women is changing, with women enjoying a higher profile within households and communities. There are two broad drivers for these changes. Firstly, NGOs and government initiatives have included women in project activities, and have provided training, workshops and awareness sessions on gender equality and women's empowerment. Secondly, prolonged household financial stress has pushed more women to take up productive activities. However, more advocacy work is needed to improve the position of women.

In both Kenya and Ethiopia, in families who still own livestock, wives increasingly have a say in decisions related to livestock sales. In the past those decisions rested solely in men's hands. Now women are more vocal, explicitly asking to be consulted and for decisions to be taken jointly. Women are also increasingly involved in community-level decision making; for example, they can now sit alongside men at community meetings and input directly into the discussion.

Many women emphasised that they are capable of making a meaningful contribution to the household economy and to community affairs. For example, women in Dambi Hara said that they considered themselves as female-headed households even if married because their productive activities sustained their families. In Lataka, women said that their involvement in NRM activities, working with men as a team to clear the area, enabled them to demonstrate that they can engage in manual work and in activities outside their traditional roles.

These processes of change around gender relations, roles and expectations were met with mixed feelings by men. Women's greater involvement in income-generating and NRM activities was perceived as valuable and positive. However, many men felt that the changes were destabilising entrenched gender roles, and felt threatened. For example, in Lataka men highlighted their wives' increasing workload since opening small home-based shops using loans from the GS&L groups. Some complained that their wives weren't cooking properly, or that the men themselves were having to cook and take care of children. Some also commented that community meetings could go on for hours because of disagreements and debates between men and women.

6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Profound changes are taking place in the study areas. These include wealth differentiation as a result of recurrent livestock losses; greater sedentarisation as a result of losing access to vital pasture lands and the unavailability of basic services such as mobile education to accommodate the needs of a mobile population; growing frustration with repeated livestock losses and dissatisfaction with pastoralism as a viable livelihood system and lifestyle; increasing demand for education and livelihood diversification; and changing gender roles. In a context of livestock depletion driven by repeated drought-induced shocks and deepening poverty, a livestock-centred livelihood was perceived by the vast majority as too risky. In contrast, education and livelihood diversification were thought to be immune to drought risks, and there was great faith in their potential to minimise risks, improve living standards and enhance resilience.

However, these expectations are largely unrealistic. Most people struggled to attain primary or secondary education; many who did have an education, including university degree holders, were reportedly unemployed, unable to find a job or open a business in either pastoralist settlements or urban centres.

The RREAD programme has supported the resilience of targeted communities by strengthening their coping capacity (through NRM and EW activities and training) and their adaptive capacity (through GS&L activities). In light of the limited diversification options available in the drylands, NRM and EW efforts which support pastoralism as a viable livelihood system are important and relevant. However, the study found that programme strategy and activities need to be better tuned to the evolving context, trends and dynamics, and to changing livelihood options. For the many households in the study areas who suffered serious depletion of livestock assets and have been plunged into poverty, it is unlikely that NRM and EW activities will address their immediate needs and priorities.

There is also a need to better acknowledge and understand the socially differentiated nature of resilience. Efforts to support livestock-based livelihoods need to be premised on wealth profiling and livelihood analyses to ensure that project activities take into account and respond to the needs of different people within communities. Local level initiatives such as RREAD should more prominently engage with the priorities, interests and aspirations of different community members: men, women, boys and girls, youth, and other population groups. There is a need to jointly explore what options are realistically viable in pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and urban areas, and to have realistic discussions on the opportunities and challenges that pastoralism and alternatives to pastoralism may offer in thinking of diversification.

On the basis of the above key findings, the study makes the following recommendations on the three basic elements – the CMDRR approach, livelihoods diversification and adaptation and the cross-border approach – that made up the theory of change that guided the fourth phase of RREAD.

ON THE CMDRR APPROACH

- There is a need to move away from simplistic categorisations of communities and their livelihoods (e.g. pastoralists, settled, urban, dropouts) and to better acknowledge the complex reality on the ground, and dynamics and trends, including the wide array of livelihood activities that different people are taking up to subsist, minimise climatic risks, and survive in the face of structural drivers underpinning their vulnerability.
- Local-level assessments and analytical exercises conducted through CMDRR or other approaches should seek to do the following:
  - Understand the socially differentiated nature of resilience: in particular, what different people in the community are doing in the face of a changing environment, what their plans are for the future, and how they can best be supported in assessing viable and sustainable livelihood opportunities.
  - Understand the context and processes of change. Ensure that programme strategies and activities are in line with local needs and priorities, especially those of the poorest and most vulnerable.

- Highlight the root causes of vulnerability. The linkages between people's weakened resilience and the contributing structural, institutional, political and cultural factors should be a key element of the PDRA&A and other assessment exercises, and should be clearly captured and discussed in related written outputs.

- Existing PDRA&A, contingency, and community development plans should be:
  - reviewed to take the above into account;
  - more systematically linked up with government plans (e.g. CIDPs in Kenya) and other stakeholders (e.g. national and international NGOs).

ON LIVELIHOODS DIVERSIFICATION AND ADAPTATION

- Reflecting on the future of pastoralism in the face of limited livelihoods alternatives both in the cities and in pastoralist areas, and the growing disillusionment, particularly among girls and boys and youth, should be a first step for initiatives in pastoralist areas.

- While acknowledging that business opportunities will ultimately represent a viable livelihood for a minority of the population only, there is a need to better understand market dynamics and trends, demand and skill gaps, market players, and value chains for livestock and livestock products, to identify new business opportunities and understand which ventures may hold the most potential to be sustainable.

- Building people's capacity must be seen as a long-term endeavour.
  - If and where appropriate, training could develop a more substantial focus on business management and development, accounting and bookkeeping, and other business-related topics.
  - Training targeting illiterate people should make use of visual tools, such as drawings or pictures, to facilitate their learning.
  - On the basis of the findings of market and value chain analyses, targeted and relevant vocational training and skills development could be provided to build capacity to fill market gaps. The involvement of government or other entities, e.g. the private sector, in the delivery of such training could be explored.

- Facilitating access to capital for enterprise development and business ventures, for example through micro-finance institutions, could be explored to provide better and longer-term support to new and existing businesses.

- In Ethiopia in particular, sales of livestock products are increasingly providing an important source of income for poor families. Together with discussions at community and household levels in both Kenya and Ethiopia, restocking options could be explored for the most vulnerable. However, there is a need to shift from the traditional way of restocking and destocking. Restocking is not viable if carried out by external organisations such as NGOs; however, if communities sell their stocks at the most appropriate time and restock themselves, this can be viable. Creating or recreating dependency should be avoided.

- More explicit focus is needed on boys and girls and youth, both males and females, as well as other population groups, to better understand and engage with their needs, priorities and aspirations.
  - On the basis of the findings of market and value chain analyses, some youth could be helped to find employment or business opportunities in the pastoralist areas, and their skills enhanced as needed.
  - Awareness sessions and discussions with youth groups could engage, and attempt to change, their pessimistic outlook towards pastoralism (especially in Kenya) and identify ways in which they could be involved in livestock-keeping activies, where feasible. For example, supporting them to engage in livestock trade by building their capacities in business development skills and linking them to access to financial institutions/credit facilities.
  - Visits of youth from pastoralist areas to urban centres could help to prepare them for a possible future life in the city, and to consider issues such as the challenges and opportunities of urban lives and livelihoods, and market and skills gaps in the urban economies.

ON THE CROSS-BORDER APPROACH TO PROGRAMME DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

- Without sustained efforts at higher levels of policymaking to develop cross-border or regional approaches to NRM, EW, conflict resolution, etc.,

the potential of local level efforts and initiatives to bring about lasting change is limited. There is a need to acknowledge the limitation of this approach and understand the appropriateness and implications of stepping up higher level engagement to complement local cross-border initiatives.

REFERENCES

Abdi, S (2011) *Community managed disaster risk reduction (CMDRR): Cordaid's strategy for building resilient communities in dryland areas of East and the Horn of Africa*, Cordaid/REGLAP.

African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (2011) *Drought in the Horn of Africa: Challenges, opportunities and responses*. Fourth special session: Meeting of the Expert Group, Bamako, Mali, 13–14 September 2011.

Demombynes, G and Kiringai, J (2011) *The drought and food crisis in the Horn of Africa: Impacts and proposed policy responses for Kenya*, Economic Premise, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network (PREM) Number 71, November 2011, World Bank.

DFID (2011) *Defining disaster resilience: A DFID approach paper*.

Dida, H (2013) *Draft document on indigenous early warning indicators in Borana*, CARE Ethiopia (unpublished).

Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) (2012) *East Africa crisis appeal: Kenya real-time evaluation report*, January 2012.

Gitonga, K, McDowell, S, Bellali, J and Jeffrey, D (2014) *Changes in the arid lands: The expanding rangeland, Regional synthesis report and case studies from Kenya, Ethiopia and Somaliland*, SCF, IFRC, NRC, Oxfam.

IIED and SOS Sahel UK (2010) *Modern and mobile: The future of livestock production in Africa's drylands*.

Levine, S (2011) 'Here we go again: Famine in the Horn of Africa', HPG Blog, 6 July 2011, ODI.

Levine, S, Pain, A, Bailey, S and Fan, L (2012) *The relevance of 'resilience'?* HPG Policy Brief 49, September 2012, ODI.

Ludi, E, Getnet, M, Wilson, K, Tesfaye, K, Shimelis, B, Levine, S and Jones, L (2012) *Preparing for the future? Understanding the influence of development interventions on adaptive capacity at local level in Ethiopia*, Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) Ethiopia Synthesis Report.

Muir, A (2007) *Customary pastoral institutions study*, SOS Sahel and Save the Children US Pastoral Livelihoods Initiative, March 2007.

Pain, A and Levine, S (2012) *A conceptual analysis of livelihoods and resilience: Addressing the 'insecurity of agency',* HPG Working Paper November 2012, ODI.

Pantuliano, S and Pavanello, S (2009) *Taking drought into account: Addressing chronic vulnerability among pastoralists in the Horn of Africa*, HPG Policy Brief 35, May 2009, ODI.

Pavanello, S and Levine, S (2011) *Rules of the range: Natural resources management in Kenya-Ethiopia border areas*, HPG Working Paper September 2011, ODI.

Save the Children and Oxfam (2012) *A dangerous delay: The cost of late response to early warnings in the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa*, Joint Agency Briefing Paper, 18 January 2012.

UN-OCHA (2012) *Strengthening human security in the border communities of Turkana, Kenya: Drought resilience: A regional priority one year after the Horn of Africa drought crisis*, OCHA Kenya.

ANNEX 1: RESEARCH TOOLS

Focus group discussions, in-depth interviews and key informant interviews were conducted using semi-structured guides developed by the author.

In-depth interviews	
Traditional weather forecaster	3
Married man, beneficiary	1
Married woman, beneficiary	2
Young male beneficiary	3
Young male non-beneficiary	2
Elder, beneficiary	1
Young female beneficiary	1
Young female non-beneficiary	1
Married woman, non-beneficiary	2
Shop keeper	2
Total	**18**

Focus group discussions	
Married men, beneficiaries	3
Married women, beneficiaries	3
Elderly beneficiary	1
Young male beneficiaries	3
Young female beneficiary	1
Elderly non-beneficiary	1
Young male non-beneficiaries	2
Married women non-beneficiaries	2
Total	**16**

Key informant interviews (KIIs) were carried out with representatives from local government, the Kenya Meteorological Office, INGOs, donors, and UN agencies as well as RREAD programme staff.

ANNEX 2: CHECKLISTS

FGDs/IDIs with beneficiaries

CONTEXT/SITUATION ANALYSIS

- What are the [risks, shocks, stresses, problems, etc.] that you are faced with on a day-to-day basis?
- What are the three ones that affect you the most?

STRATEGIES

- How do you manage the above problems (refer to what has been said as a response to the two bullets above)? What do you do when you are faced with the above problems, situation, shock, stresses, etc.? *(Capture both positive and negative strategies.)*
- What are you doing (or have you thought of doing something) so that you can change the situation/problems above and avoid being faced again (and again) with the above situation, problem etc.? *(i.e. what are the steps that people are taking to change their lives so they are not faced with the same problems any more?)*
- What are the consequences/outcomes/effects in the short, medium and long term of the above strategies *(coping, both positive and negative, and adapting)* on individual, household, intra-community levels, and inter-community relations (e.g. across the border)?
- Now that you have explained all the above strategies, would there be other strategies that you think you could use which could be better suited to deal with the above problems, situations, shocks? If not, why not? If yes, what are the constraints to the adoption of these other strategies?

RREAD

- I understand that RREAD has supported 'so and so' activities in this village. Before the start of RREAD were you/the community spontaneously doing GS&L or EW activities (but also NRM and other activities) already? If yes, what were you doing differently (than what RREAD had done)? If not, why not? *(Also check if they were doing it in the past (e.g. NRM, EW activities) and then abandoned these practices, and why)*
- Have EW/GS&L activities helped you to better prepare/plan/think ahead for the problems, shocks and stresses that you mentioned above?
- Have RREAD activities (EW/GS&L/others) helped you to face or avoid the problems, shocks, stresses that you mentioned above?
- Have they helped you to reduce or avoid negative coping strategies?
- Which activities do you feel have helped you/the community the most? Why? *(Capture throughout also the cost-opportunity eventually involved.)*
- What other type of support/help have EW/GS&L/other activities provided to you/your household/community/beyond?
- What is different now in your life (and that of your household/community/beyond) today as a result of EW/GS&L/other activities?

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- Is there any other type of project/support that you think could better help you to prepare and face the problems, shocks, stresses that you currently face, as mentioned above?
- What are your plans for the 'future'? What would you like to do and where would you like to be in 5-10 years' time?
- Do you think that this/another type of project (GS&L, EW, other) could still help you? Why?

www.care.org

CARE International UK
89 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TP
UK
www.careinternational.org.uk

Registered charity number 292506

JUNE 2015: CARE INTERNATIONAL