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1. General introduction to the Learning Route

a. Introduction

The PROCASUR Corporation in Africa in collaboration with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have partnered with the International Land Coalition, the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and Resource Conflict Institute (RECONCILE) to promote the Learning Initiative: **Innovative practices and tools to reduce land use conflicts between farmers and livestock keepers.**

The initiative is promoted under the framework of the PROCASUR-IFAD Programme “Strengthening Capacities and tools to scale up and disseminate Innovations” and it responds to a specific demand addressed by the Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP), a six-year development programme of the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

The Benue State in Nigeria, one of the project areas of the IFAD co-funded project: Value Chain Development Programme (VCDP) has been experiencing in the recent months an increasing escalation of conflicts amongst pastoralists and farmers. VCDP expressed a specific request from the IFAD technical unit to learn about strategies and tools focusing at securing land rights, which may provide learning and practical tools in order to avoid, mitigate and manage conflicts between pastoralists and farmers in their project areas.

The main goal of this initiative is therefore to improve understanding about how to secure land tenure rights and how to reduce land use conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.

In the frame of this learning initiative, a Learning Route will take place in Kenya and Tanzania between the 22nd and the 30th of September 2017 addressing main learning needs of the VCDP programme, its main stakeholders and other relevant partners from Nigeria.

Through a face-to-face learning, this Learning Route promotes a practical learning directly in the field and from its protagonists about some of the best practices, innovative tools and approaches implemented in favour of securing land tenure rights and land use conflict resolution among farmers and livestock users.

Lessons from this Learning Route will be extracted about how to scale up innovations about land tenure security and innovative tools to reduce conflicts over land from selected experiences in Tanzania and Kenya into the VCDP and other main stakeholders’ contexts in Nigeria.
This document is aimed at introducing main objectives, location of selected experiences and presents the agenda of the initiative. Moreover, it provides contextual information and details main analytical aspects of the host cases which will be visited during the Route. At the end, a suggested bibliography will be useful for those who wants to go more in-depth on relevant thematic areas of this initiative.

**b. Why to learn about innovative practices and tools for land use conflicts resolution?**

Land is a factor of production and the need by many to access, use and manage has consistently increased thereby defining different competing interests. Land in this context is a resource that continues to evoke a lot of emotions in Sub-Saharan Africa and mainly in the Horn and Eastern Africa (HEA). Issues relating to access, ownership and transfer of land have a direct bearing on livelihoods for the majority of the people in this region, including pastoralists. Throughout the region, governments are grappling with the challenges of ensuring equitable access, secure ownership and efficient, predictable mechanisms of transfer of interests in land. Policies, laws and institutions are seen to be central to realizing these objectives, and many governments in the region are actively engaged in processes aimed at putting in place appropriate policy, legislative and institutional frameworks.

Conflict over land is highly complex and seldom attributable to one or two factors only. Multiple sources of tension or vulnerability may interact, including poverty, religious or ethnic tension, traditions of cattle raiding, increasing availability of firearms, unclear tenure, corruption and patronage, land and population pressure, industrialization and agricultural expansion, underemployment of youth and many more. Conflict “multipliers” include phenomena such as land grabs, foreign land investments and climate change, many of which are exacerbated by insecurity of tenure. Moreover, environmental degradation, reduced availability of resources, prolonged period of drought, war and occupation, land grabbing, external and internal migrations are all causes that limit availability of land and pastures forcing pastoral communities into farming areas and consequently leading to conflict with settled agrarian groups. The combination of these elements, diminishing livelihoods, governance failures, and continued conflicts, help to stoke violence.

Amongst the rural contexts that are experiencing the same escalation of conflicts in Africa, some local experiences in Kenya and Tanzania are
currently developing innovative approaches and practical tools to secure land rights and reduce conflicts between pastoralists and farmers. Those approaches and tools, jointly with an improved policy dialogue at national and local level, have achieved interesting results in term of conflicts reduction amongst pastoralists and farmers bringing towards an increased land tenure security and better management of natural resources.

**Specific learning objectives:**

1. To identify and analyse **innovative models, tools and approaches** in Kenya and Tanzania to prevent and reduce potential conflicts in sustainable use, management, access and protection of natural resources and promoting peaceful co-existence amongst farmers, pastoralists and other users;

2. To understand how to foster a **collaborative policy dialogue and good governance** for participatory planning, implementation and management of programmes for securing land tenure rights;

3. To extract lessons from the visited experiences in Kenya and Tanzania and to promote the **adaptation, scaling up and replication** of the models, tools and approaches to support farmers and livestock keepers through the VCDP in Nigeria.

**c. The Learning Route’s Objectives**

**Main objective:** to improve understanding on how to secure land rights and how to prevent, resolve or transform land use conflicts between farmers and pastoralists. This initiative has a specific focus on the Value Chain Development Programme, co-funded by IFAD in Nigeria.

A Learning Route is a planned journey with learning objectives that are designed based on i) the knowledge needs of development practitioners that are faced with problems associated with rural poverty, and ii) the identification of relevant experiences in which local stakeholders have tackled similar challenges in innovative ways, with successful results and accumulated knowledge which is potentially useful to others.

The Route allows for the experiential encounter between travellers and hosts, both having mutually useful experiences and knowledge. For more information on LR, visit www.africa.procasur.org
## d. Experiences to be visited during the Learning Rote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Brief</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Case 1. OLKIRAMATIAN GROUP RANCH** | The Olkiramatian Group Ranch is located in the northwest part of Magadi Division in Kajiado County in southern Kenya. It is one of the few remaining undivided communal group ranches in Kenya, since it represents an interesting case of collective management of land and natural resources achieved thanks to an innovative local governance system. This experiences combines the Maasai customary system with the formal system prescribed by the Group Representative Act of 1968, the statute that governs the Group Ranches. | Specifically, what we can learn from the Olkiramatian Group Ranch case is:  
- The group ranch system, its evolution and how the Olkiramatian community is securing their rights to resources and land, management and development.  
- The attempts for overcoming the challenges the group ranch system presents for rangeland in Olkiramatian.  
- The opportunities for linking rangeland management and development with conservation, and the advantages (and disadvantages) of doing so.  
- Understand the Group Ranch model in-built conflict management mechanisms. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Brief</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>OLENGAPA case Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) component 3 of ILC’s National Engagement Strategy (NES) Tanzania</strong></td>
<td><strong>OLENGAPA shares a real Joint Land Use Plan experience and what we will learn from this case is the following:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Kiteto district, Manyara region - Tanzania</td>
<td>OLENGAPA is the protected and certified shared grazing area across the boundaries of the three villages: Olkitikiti, Lerug and Ngapapa. It resulted by the successful adoption of the joint village land use planning process implemented in Kiteto District by local communities, government and facilitated by the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project.</td>
<td>• To understand the Joint Land Use Plan process as a model to solve conflicts among pastoralists and farmers in a semi-arid area of Tanzania where resources that are crucial for livelihood (such as water and pasture) are scarce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The participants during the LR will visit the three villages included in the process, will meet the key actors leading the process at local and national level and the representatives of the main target groups involved in the process in order to share knowledge.</td>
<td>• To learn in depth the implementation process focusing on the involvement and the role of the several stakeholders involved and the process followed to build consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To understand the approach used in order to manage communal resources and recognize individual rights within the collective rights including the in-built conflict management mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To explore tools for managing conflicts between farmers and pastoralists at governmental and community levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Map of the Route

Kenya and Tanzania

1. Nairobi
2. Olkiramatian
3. Arusha
4. Kiteto district
## 3. Learning Route Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Place</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 0</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Thursday 21</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>September</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Nairobi, Kenya</strong></td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS ARRIVAL</td>
<td>Participants Arrival / Pick up at the airport / Reception / Check in hotel in Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Friday 22</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>September</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Nairobi, Kenya</strong></td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP – KENYA</td>
<td>08:30-09:30 Breakfast&lt;br&gt;09:30-10:15 INSTITUTIONAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP – KENYA&lt;br&gt;10:15-10:30 Opening of the Learning Route&lt;br&gt;10:30-10:45 Interventions by the institutions from Kenya&lt;br&gt;10:45-12:00 Introduction of the Nigerian group&lt;br&gt;12:00-12:45 General Introduction on the Learning Route&lt;br&gt;12:45-13:45 Tea break&lt;br&gt;14:00-16:00 Panel of experts on the specific context in Kenya&lt;br&gt;16:00-16:15 Q&amp;A session / Open discussion&lt;br&gt;16:15-18:00 Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNAL WORK</td>
<td>14:00-16:00 Nigerian context analysis workshop / LR objectives and agenda&lt;br&gt;16:00-16:15 Tea break&lt;br&gt;16:15-18:00 Introduction to Scaling up and Innovation Plan work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Saturday 23</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>September</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Olkiramatian, Kenya</strong></td>
<td>CASE STUDY 1: OLKIRAMATIAN</td>
<td>07:00-08:00 Breakfast and check out&lt;br&gt;08:00-12:30 Travelling from Nairobi to Olkiramatian&lt;br&gt;12:30-14:00 Check in hotel / lodge in Olkiramatian and lunch&lt;br&gt;14:00-14:30 Introduction to the Case study 1: Olkiramatian Group Ranch&lt;br&gt;14:30-16:00 Working groups on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Day 3 (Sunday 24 September)</td>
<td>Day 4 (Monday 25 September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td>06:30-08:30 (Breakfast)</td>
<td>07:30-08:30 (Breakfast and check out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15-17:30</td>
<td>08:30-09.00</td>
<td>08:30-10:00 (Case study 1 Analysis Workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-19:00</td>
<td>09.00- 12.00</td>
<td>10:00-10:15 (Tea Break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:00</td>
<td>12:00-13:30 (Lunch)</td>
<td>10:15-16:30 (Travelling from Olkiramatian to Arusha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:30- 15:30</td>
<td>16:30-19:00 (Check in hotel in Arusha and Free time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>19:00-20:00 (Dinner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:00-18:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19:00-20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASE STUDY 1: OLKIRAMATIAN**

**Day 3**
- **Sunday 24 September**
  - Olkiramatian, Kenya
  - **06:30-08:30**: Breakfast
  - **08.30 - 09.00**: Field visit to the learning sites of the Conservation Area: a) Wild Life zone and b) Sampu Lodge
  - **09.00 - 12.00**: Breakfast
  - **12:00 - 13:30**: Field visit to the learning sites of the Agriculture area: a) water point and intake b) Irrigation area/scheme
  - **13:30 - 15:30**: Lunch
  - **15:30-16:00**: Discussion around the learning sites visited and lessons learnt
  - **16:00-18:00**: Coffee break
  - **19:00-20:00**: Innovation Plan working groups

**Day 4**
- **Monday 25 September**
  - Olkiramatian, Kenya – Arusha, Tanzania
  - **07:30-08:30**: Breakfast and check out
  - **08:30-10:00**: Case study 1 Analysis Workshop
  - **10:00-10:15**: Tea Break
  - **10:15-16:30**: Travelling from Olkiramatian to Arusha
  - **16:30-19:00**: Check in hotel in Arusha and Free time
  - **19:00-20:00**: Dinner

**Session Details**
1. Map and History of the Group Ranch (Zonification) (facilitated by Olkiramatian Local Champions)
2. Strategies to solve land conflicts in the Group Ranch (facilitated by Olkiramatian Local Champions)
3. Strategies to solve land issues conflicts in relation with external actors (Conservation) (facilitated by Kenya Wild Life Service)

**Tea Break**
Group discussion / Q&A
Informal talk on case study 1
Dinner in the hotel / lodge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:30-08:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:20</td>
<td>Specific context on land issues in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:20-10:00</td>
<td>Introduction to Ujamaa Community Resource Team – UCRT and conflicts analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
<td>Working groups on UCRT programmes and tools to prevent/reduce conflicts in sustainable use, management, access and protection of natural resources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. User rights (mobility agreements) (facilitated by Local Champions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Group Certificate for Customary Rights of Occupancy (facilitated by Local Champions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Women role rights, Leadership Forum and women role in advocacy (facilitated by Local Champions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Tea break at 11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:30</td>
<td>Q&amp;A session / Discussion (bringing back solutions learnt to the Nigerian context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-16:00</td>
<td>Lunch at UCRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td>Lessons learnt Analysis Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15-18:30</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:00</td>
<td>Innovation Plan working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00-07:00</td>
<td>Breakfast and check out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00-13:00</td>
<td>Travelling from Arusha to Kiteto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-15:00</td>
<td>Check in the lodges/hotels in Kiteto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:15</td>
<td>Opening from the Government and Kiteto District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15:30</td>
<td>The Sustainable Rangeland Management Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>The Village Land Use Planning in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15-16:45</td>
<td>The Joint Village Land Use Planning and the OLENGAPA pilot experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:00</td>
<td>The role of the District in SRMP and in OLENGAPA experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17:15</td>
<td>Closing remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-19:00</td>
<td>Informal talk on the Innovation Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:00</td>
<td>Dinner at the lodges/hotels in Kiteto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00-08:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00-10:00</td>
<td>Field visit at the Olkitikiti dam site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
<td>Field visit at the OLENGAPA sign post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-14:00</td>
<td>Arrival at the School in Olkitikiti, Welcome from the community, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td>Role play and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td>Tea break and closing ceremony organized by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-18:30</td>
<td>Arrival at Kiteto Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:00</td>
<td>Dinner at the lodges/hotels in Kiteto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:30-08:30</td>
<td>Breakfast and check out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-10:30</td>
<td>Workshop with TNRF, KINNAPA and Local Champions: process and tools for managing conflicts between farmers and pastoralists at government authorities and community level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:45</td>
<td>Case study 2 Analysis Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-18:30</td>
<td>Travelling from Kiteto to Arusha (approximatively 6 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:30</td>
<td>Check in the hotel in Arusha and dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:30-08:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-10:00</td>
<td>Technical synthesis of lessons and innovations and open discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
<td>Innovation Plan Fair (Tea Break at 10:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>Closing of the Learning Route (Certificates and Evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Participants Departure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Kenya Overview

The East African nation of Kenya has a population estimated at 46.1 million, which increases by an estimated one million a year. Development challenges include poverty, inequality, climate change, and vulnerability of the economy to internal and external shocks.

Political Context: Kenya is scheduled to hold its second election under the new constitution on October 2017. Devolution remains the biggest gain from the August 2010 constitution, which ushered in a new political and economic governance system. It is transformative and has strengthened accountability and public service delivery at local levels. The government’s agenda is to deepen the implementation of devolution and strengthen governance institutions, while addressing other challenges including land reforms and security to improve economic and social outcomes, accelerate growth and equity in distribution of resources, reduce extreme poverty, and youth employment.

Economy: The World Bank’s most recent Kenya Economic Update (KEU) October 2016 projected a 5.9% growth in 2016, rising to 6% in 2017. The key drivers for this growth include: a vibrant services sector, enhanced construction, currency stability, low inflation, low fuel prices, a growing middle-class and rising incomes, a surge in remittances, and increased public investment in energy and transportation.

According to the latest Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) quarterly report, Kenya’s economy expanded by 5.7% in the third quarter of 2016 compared to 5.8% in the same period in 2015. The quarterly report says that the economic growth was well spread although most of the sectors of the economy recorded slowed growth. The tourism and hotel industry, information and communications, and public administration are among the sectors that registered improved growth during the quarter. Inflation was contained within the Central Bank’s target to average at 6.3% compared to an average of 6.14% during the same quarter in 2015. The slight increase in inflation was primarily due to increases in the prices of food and beverages during the period under review.

Social Developments: Kenya has met a few of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) targets, including reduced child mortality, near universal primary school enrolment, and narrower gender gaps in education. Interventions and increased spending on health and education are paying dividends. While the healthcare system has faced challenges recently, devolved health care and free maternal health care at all public health facilities will improve health care outcomes and develop a more equitable health care system.
Development Challenges: Kenya has the potential to be one of Africa’s great success stories from its growing youthful population, a dynamic private sector, a new constitution, and its pivotal role in East Africa. Addressing challenges of poverty, inequality, governance, climate change, low investment and low firm productivity to achieve rapid, sustained growth rates that will transform lives of ordinary citizens, will be a major goal for Kenya.
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5. Introduction to the Group Ranch System in Kenya

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a brief introduction about the Group Ranch system in Kenya, aimed at framing this peculiar land tenure system in per the most recent legislations which have been approved in Kenya.

In Kenya the community rights to land and effective participation have become enshrined in the constitution through the establishment of a new category of community land under the new constitution, which came into force in 2010. This category includes all forms of community/group tenure systems, including trust land and group ranches.

A group ranch is a livestock production system or enterprise where a group of people jointly own freehold title to land, maintain agreed stocking levels and herd their livestock collectively which they own individually (Ministry of Agriculture, 1968). The group Ranches were created in the early 1960/1970s by the Kenyan Group (Representatives) Act as an exclusive land ownership and rights among groups of Maasai residing within an identified area.

A land title was issued to each group, formalising its collective rights to the land. These “group ranches” were aimed to privatise Maasai land (albeit collectively) and reduce further encroachment and appropriation.

More in details the group ranches were designed by the government in consultation with various members of interested parties, e.g. Maasai elders and financiers to meet the following predetermined objectives:

- increase the productivity of pastoral lands through increased off-take
- to improve the earning capacity of pastoralists
- to avoid possible landlessness among pastoralists in case large tracts of land were allocated to individual ranchers
- to avoid environmental degradation due to overstocking on communal lands
- to establish a livestock production system that would allow modernisation or modification of livestock husbandry and still preserve many of the traditional ways of life without causing social frictions or an abrupt break with traditional ways of life.
5.2 The tenure Implication

The concept of the Group Ranches was accepted, however the entire process was not understood by most Maasai people. However, the overriding factor was a secure land tenure for the pastoralists. This included, preventing the allocation of land to elite Maasai or any other individual or group; and the opportunities to develop water facilities and dips funded through supporting projects influenced the Maasai decision to accept or to be receptive to the concept of group ranches [Galaty, 1980].

McCanley [1976] claimed that the group ranch concept was more honestly recognised as simply the least objectionable means by which to implement changes in the tenure system in Maasailand. The Maasai people viewed the infrastructure build up as a means of increasing their traditional wealth base (livestock) without compromising their culture and hence accepted it.

5.3 The evolution of policy

The majority of Kenya’s dry land was under trust tenure and mainly managed by the county councils. They observed strict control over allocation of land but largely remained unaccountable to the communities. The general land administration system in Kenya were a major concern and therefore were given high premium in the land reforms agenda establishing policy, institutional and legal frameworks for effective management and governance of land in Kenya. The new land framework and constitutional arrangements are premised on the need to promote accountability [Chapter 6 CoK 2010] and participation of citizens [Art. 10, 2 (a)] in general governance. The land policy also established a process that helped define Trust land to be Community land thus the constitution making clear provision that has elevated the same to equal levels with Public and Private land. Group Ranches that were registered under the Group Representatives Act are largely rangelands and are largely occupied by pastoralist and the resources with these land used communally.

5.4 Tenure security of Group Ranches under the new law

The constitution says that: community land vest in and be held by communities identified on the basis of ethnicity, culture or similar community of interest CoK 2010 Art. 63 [1]. Community land is thus defined as: Land lawfully registered in the name of group representative under the provision of any law, Land lawfully transferred to a specific community by any other process of law, any other land declared to be community land by an act of parliament. Others include: land that is lawfully held managed or used by specific communities as community forests, grazing areas, and shrines, ancestral lands and lands traditionally occupied by hunter gatherer communities or, lawfully held as trust land by the county governments. The group ranch is therefore secure under the law, the
policy has also given directives on the process of identifying and registering community lands which has to be jointly with government and communities themselves. To operationalize the functionality of the community land tenure, the government of Kenya has enacted a community land law in September 2016. This law has recognized the multiple user rights and planning as critical in common resources within such lands like group ranches. In this connection ecosystem services that the communities have invested in such as the wildlife, eco-lodges among others would be identified and mechanisms for security agreed on.

The experience of Olkiramatian represents a good practice of group ranches since the area of the group ranch is divided roughly equally into three land use zones, which complement and support each other: a grazing zone where drought-resistant zebu cattle are kept, an agricultural zone, where food and crash crops are produced, and a conservation zone for conservation purposes and ecotourism. A case study about the Olkiramatian Group Ranch experience and how they have addressed land use conflicts is presented below. It includes main lessons which may be considered and applied in the Nigerian context.

Ecosystem services refer to benefits that humans derive from resources and processes that are supplied by natural ecosystems. These services are categorized as provision, regulation and cultural (e.g. of food and water, climate and disease). Ecosystems provide freshwater, fibre, food, forage, pollination, seed disbursal, climate and regulation of water quality.
6. Case study 1: 
Southern Rangelands Olkiramatian Group Ranch
Kajiado County – Southern Kenya

6.1. The Context: Kajiado County

The Olkiramatian Group Ranch is located in the northwest part of Magadi Sub-county in Kajiado County in southern Kenya. The Kajiado County is an administrative County in the Rift Valley Region and it is one of the most important rangeland Counties in Kenya given its richness in wildlife resources.

It covers 20,963 km² which is approximately 11% of the surface area of the Region. The County is divided into four administrative Sub-Counties; the Central Sub-County (1,011,615 ha), Loitoktok Sub-County (652,483 ha), Ngong Sub-County (357,883 ha) and Magadi Sub-County (188,619 ha).

It has a population of 406,054 and it covers an area of 21,903 km². The County borders Nairobi city and extends to the Kenya-Tanzania border further south. It also borders the Counties of Taita Taveta (to the south east), Machakos (to the east), Kiambu (to the north) and Narok (to the west). The County capital is Kajiado. The indigenous peoples living this area are mostly Maasai with an increasing presence of other indigenous peoples. The landscape consists of plains plus some volcanic hills and valleys. The region is very dry with no continually flowing rivers and is officially designated as semi-arid. There are two wet seasons, the ‘short rains’ between October and December and the ‘long rains’ between March and May. In recent years there have been long periods of drought when there has been little or no rain. The has persisted even in the subsequent years and this year, most parts of Kajiado experiencing very severe drought.
The Olkiramatian Group Ranch

The Olkiramatian Group Ranch covers an area of 22,000 acres; it is bordered to the east by Magadi Soda Company concession area (a mining company), to the west by the Nguruman escarpment; to the North by Oldonyio Nyokie Group Ranch and to the south by the Shompole Group Ranch.

It hosts a population of approximately 15,000 individuals; the inhabitants of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch are predominantly Maasai livestock keepers, who primarily depend on their livestock (cattle, sheeps, goats) for income, with a diversification of activities including also trade, cultivation, employment and conservation/tourism. In the area there is a smaller percentage of other ethnic groups including also Kikuyu, the Kamba, the Luo, the Somali and the Sonjo from Tanzania.

Located in a dry and semi-arid area, the Olkiramatian Group Ranch is characterized by two key ecological features:
- the Nguruman escarpment with quite high elevation with respect to others in arid areas;
- three rivers coming down from the Nguruman escarpment, providing permanent water for irrigation/cultivation and for domestic and livestock use: the EwasoNgiro river, the Oloibortoto and Sampu rivers. The EwasoNgiro is the biggest river; it divides the Group Ranch into two climatic zones: a sub-humid to semi-arid climate along the escarpment; and a dry and semi-arid to extremely arid climate in the open plains in the east.

In recent years the climate change has made rainfall even more unpredictable and droughts have become even more frequent than usual; therefore cultivation is only possibly through irrigation.

6.2. What can we learn from the Olkiramatian experience?

The Olkiramatian Group Ranch is a very interesting case of communal land use planning and zonification of the territory in order to reflect requirements for grazing, agriculture and conservation/tourism. It is also the only existing communally owned group ranch in the southern rangelands where most group ranches have been subdivided into individual private lands.

Specifically, what we can learn from the Olkiramatian Group Ranch case is:

- To understand the group ranch system, its evolution and how the Olkiramatian community is using the ranch system to secure their rights to resources and land, manage them and improve their socio-economic development;
- To understand the challenges that the group ranch system presents for rangeland in Olkiramatian including pastoralists and how they are attempting to overcome these;
- To explore the opportunities for linking rangeland management and development with conservation, and the advantages [and disadvantages] of doing so.
- Understand the Group Ranch model in managing communal resources and recognizing individual rights within the collective rights including the in-built conflict management mechanisms.

6.3. Olkiramatian Group Ranch trajectory

In the early 1960/1970s the Kenyan Group (Representatives) Act created exclusive land ownership and rights among groups of Maasai residing within an identified area. A land title was issued to each group, formalising its collective rights to the land through the “group ranches” system, which was aimed at privatising Maasai land and reduce further encroachment and appropriation.

A group ranch is a livestock production system or enterprise where a group of people jointly owns freehold title to land, maintain agreed stocking levels and herd their livestock collectively which they own individually [Ministry of Agriculture, 1968]; normally the selection of members to a particular group ranch is based on traditional land rights.

Therefore the group ranch system consists of private land owned by members of a community which acquire the title of that land, registered as a collective resource with the aim of engaging in development activities. Group ranches are supposed to create local committees to organize and manage their territory. The group ranch concept represented a new approach to pastoral development and was a first attempt to radically transform a nomadic subsistence production system into a sedentary, commercially oriented system.

---

However it should be noted that today the group ranches' system has experienced a lot of land sales, subdivisions leading to individualisation of communal land in Kenya. Central Kenya has one of the best soils for agriculture, the Maasai lost a lot of their land and were pushed from the North to the South Rift, while the Kikuyu and other groups occupied the central Kenya. This has caused numerous problems for pastoralists and other rangeland users such as agricultural and settlement encroachments, loss of key grazing areas, blockage of migration routes and negative social aspects due to the privatisation and subSub-County of communal resources.

In this general framework it should be noted that the Olkiramatian Group Ranch is one of the few remaining undivided communal group ranches in Kenya; it represents an interesting case of collective management of land and natural resources thanks to an innovative local governance system, which combines the Maasai customary gerontocratic system with the rigid formal system prescribed by the Group Representative Act of 1968, the statute that governs the Group Ranches4. The case is also critical since it presented a basis for discussing the Community Land Law which was necessitated after the promulgation of the 2010 Kenya Constitution creating a new Tenure regime called Community land Tenure. In 2016 September, a new law Community land law was enacted thus repealing both the Group Representatives Act.

**a] Before the Group Ranch system:**

To understand the trajectory of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch as it has developed today, it is interesting to consider how the elders of the Olkiramatian community remember their ancestral territory before the Group Ranch system was established.

“The only activity before group ranches was pastoralism, and we have to manage how best keep our livestock, and how we can move our livestock to the best pasture and good areas; the territory was not so much populated as it is today. There were not individual lands, people was free to go everywhere, there were no boundaries. There was a messenger who took messages to the others communities; and only one leader encharged of the community.

The people was living in healthy conditions, our diet was based on milk and meat. We had special places where take care of sick animals. We could put our settlements everywhere, without restrictions”.

---


b) The establishment of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch

The Olkiramatian Group Ranch has been registered in the early ‘70ies and it is owned by 1.300 registered members over a total population in the territory of approximately 15.000 individuals.

The elders of the community recognize as one of the most important changes between the past and the present has been the introduction of boundaries and the loss of traditional mobility and flexibility. However, as a positive factor, the registration of the Group Ranch establishes their ownership on that land through a title, which means rights to land and the possibility of taking decisions on:
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“the boundaries were set up, you can now recognize your area, and make decisions of your area; now people can own the territory, and have the right to this particular land. In the past you were not restricted, you can put settlement everywhere, but you did not own that piece of land, the land was used communally”

With the aim of creating a sustainable land use strategy and creating opportunities for diversified livelihoods, the Olkiramatian Group Ranch has progressively started since the beginning of the ‘70ies a process of zonification of the territory into three main areas and has created rules for regulating land uses:

- **Livestock - grazing area (refer above map):** this is the most large portion of territory, located in the east part of the EwuasoNgiro river. It is constituted by open plains and rich pasture and it is used as grazing area during the wet season. In this zone the Maasai established most of their settlements and bomas (Masai livestock enclosures). Livestock (mainly cattle, sheep and goat) is the major source of livelihood in this area. The grazing area is communally managed, and the livestock is not allowed to be moved from this zone if it is not established by the local committees. In this area there is a weekly livestock market, where the Maasai can perform commercial activities related to livestock and its products.

- **Irrigation-cultivation area:** this area is located in the northwest section of the Group Ranch, very close to the rivers coming down from the escarpment. The rivers guarantee permanent water and irrigation for food crops production, which consists of vegetables, eggplants, ocra, mais, beans, and different species of fruits. The cultivation area has been subdivided in individual plots of land owned by the members of the ranch and managed mostly at familiar level. The medium size of these plots is 8 acres per member.

- **Conservation area:** the community conservation zone was created in 2003 with the aim of valuing, preserving and making
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benefits from the abundance of wildlife in the area by exploring additional sources of income from conservation and tourism activity. The area is located at the base of the Nguruman escarpment and hosts a huge number of wildlife, which can freely move around the different zones. The wildlife is constituted by lions, zebras, giraffa, rainos, baboons, buffalos, monkeys, gazelles, elephants, hyenas, including also a high diversity of birdlife. Since the area constitutes a big potential for tourism, the community decided to build different touristic facilities, those are the Sampu Lodge, one tented camp and the recently established Research Centre, managed by the women’s organization of the community. No permanent human settlement is allowed within the conservation zone, which is also used as strategic pasture area during the dry season. A Conservation Sub-Committee, composed also by community rangers, strictly regulates the access of livestock to this area during the dry season (2 months per year), in order to avoid as much as possible conflicts between humans/livestock and wildlife. The Conservation sub-committee manages all the issues related to wildlife conservation and eco-tourism. The Olkiramatian community accepted easily the idea of zoning the territory through a conservation area, because in the past they were used to manage the territory by preserving the wildlife. However, thanks to the conservation activity, the wildlife is increasing, as well as the conflicts between wildlife and humans, however the community is very aware about the importance of wildlife.

6.4. How is the experience developed?

Local governance:

The local governance established by the Olkiramatian Group Ranch to manage the land and natural resources of the territory is one of the most interesting processes developed by the Olkiramatian community, since it represents a good example of how natural resources are efficiently managed. The community has recognized the importance of preserving the biodiversity and the natural resources, and has developed a governance system that integrates conservation and sustainable use.

Food crops for european markets
Channeling of water for irrigation
Wildlife in the conservation area
can be managed for the benefit of the whole community, by driving for local development. The Olkiramatian Group Ranch established the following local formal authorities which are in charge of managing the territory and take decisions on it:

- **The Olkiramatian Group Ranch Management Committee:** it is composed by a team of 10 people, nominated every 3 or 4 years through democratic elections. The Committee has the main role of planning the activities to be developed in the Group Ranch during the year and discussing topical development issues of the group ranch (infrastructures, education, health, facilities, development projects etc.). The Management Committee also prepares the annual planning, which needs to be endorsed by the 1.300 members, through a general meeting. It also ensures the coordination with the other sub-committees, and is in charge of the comunication and relations with the Kenyan Government, Ministries, NGOs, boardering Group Ranches and other actors.

- **Conservation Subcommittee:** this subcommittee ensures the management of the conservation area, it reports to the Group Ranch Management committee even if it can establish autonomous collaborations with other actors, such as NGOs, governmental departments and research centres. The Conservation Subcommittee is responsible for overseeing the protection of wildlife (avoiding as much as possible human/wildlife conflicts), the development and management of the tourist facilities (mainly the Sampu Camp and the Research Centre) for the benefit of the community, and the regulation of land use within the conservation area together with the other committees. In particular the Conservation Subcommittee establishes when and exactly where the Maasai can bring their livestock for grazing during the dry season. The conservation subcommittee is also benefiting from the collaboration of a number of community rangers (approximately 37) employed by the community thanks to the support of the Soralo Association (Southern Rift Valley Landowners Association). The committee also collaborates in several research projects developed by the ACC-African Conservation Centre.

- **Irrigation Subcommittee:** this subcommittee ensures the appropriate management of water through channelling canals for the irrigation of fields in the irrigation zone; it has the aim of avoiding water conflict amongst farmers for the irrigation of their fields and it takes decision about water access by the different members. This Irrigation Subcommitte works also thanks to the collaboration of smallest water groups, each for any channel, which collaborate to keep the channels cleans and take decisions about the distribution of water to individual plots.
Every subcommittee can work autonomously with other actors [ADB Bank, Ministry of agriculture, government departments], but they have to report to the Group Ranch Management committee about their decisions and activities.

The subcommittee for the grazing area does not exist as a formal institutionalized committee, however the area is managed through traditional rules, promoted by the group of elders and community leaders, which strictly collaborate with the other subcommittee for the functioning of the Group Ranch.

By the way, it should be noted that all the Group Ranch Committees work in strict synergy with the Maasai traditional authorities, mainly the group of elders, which is still very strong in the Group Ranch, especially in relation to livestock management. They exercise their customary power to conform people to rules, in a very dynamic mix of modern and traditional governance. For instance when livestock crosses the conservation area without the authorization of the Committees, there are very stricted rules and traditional systems to reporting those people who do not respect the rules, including also punishments.

Therefore the institutional framework which has been set up in the Olkiramatian Group Ranch is a very interesting and efficient example of local governance aimed at pursuing the development of the territory still preserving the strong pastoralist identity of their inhabitants, and ensuring the collective management of its natural resources.

“This is how we make use of the resources we have, despite the constraints, but valuing what we have, this is a nice development: it’s not only let us map and zone this area, but it really comes from our needs evolving over time, this is a sustainable process because it comes from the community. It is a practice evolved from people5”.

**Diversification of income generating activities**

The management of the Group Ranch through its formal and traditional authorities make possible the communal management of natural resources. The local governance system which has been created in the Olkiramatian Group Ranch has provided an institutional framework for differentiating economic income generating activities, managed in a collective way.

In contrast with other Group Ranches in the country, where this system collapsed because of external pressures to individualize the land and also for the difficulty of thinking about resource management in a profitable way, the Olkiramatian community has succeeded in engaging collective land use activity, such as conservation and eco-tourism, and also by differentiating their activities with agricultural production in combination with the pastoralist activity, which is the most traditional source of income.

5 Interview to John Camanga, Chairman of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch Management Committee
The conservation activity has already given its positive response since the wildlife population in the area has increased. SORALO (Southern Rift Valley Landowners Association) and the African Conservation Centre (ACC) approached the community with ideas for developing community conservation and research projects in the region; therefore research projects are currently under implementation.

As regards tourism, there are three facilities in the Group Ranch: one tented camp, one research centre (newly established thanks to the support received from donors) and one eco-lodge named the Sampu Camp. The revenues of the three touristic facilities are for the benefit of the community. However, as the local committees members lack the expertise to run a profitable tourism activity, they decided to put a manager in charge of the Sampu lodge for marketing and linkages with the tour operators.

The Research Centre is managed by the the Conservation Sub Committee and the women’s organization [see box below], with the aim of hosting researchers interested in collaborating with the development of the Group Ranch through scientific and social researches. In this sense, they have valued the potential of conservation by promoting researches on this issues; in addition they also promoted a niche market for research tourism in the area.

The earnings deriving from tourism are used for the benefit of the community, for instance school buses, education for children, community projects (repair of roads, community hospital, ...).

As regards agriculture, Maasai are traditionally not good farmers, so their skills in agriculture are not so efficient as the ones they have in pastoralism. However the members of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch are experimenting since the beginnings of the ‘80ies a recent involvement in this activity by acquiring knowledge and skills thanks to the practice and the suggestions from other actors. The agricultural production is mostly for consumption use. In recent years the Olkiramatian community members engaged in transnational trade for their horticultural products; however the process is recently started and they do not have established yet profitable market conditions. Some of its members are even growing fish [tilapia] thanks to the support of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Supportive alliances: a multistakeholder approach

The Olkiramatian Group Ranch has a very extensive network of external actors, which are supporting their local development process, many local NGOs, but also research centres are contributing to the development of the territory through channelling funds and developing projects.

Amongst the most supportive external actors, the community recognizes: government
departments (livestock, agriculture, veterinary, education); numerous national and international NGOs, such as: Neighbours Initiative Alliance (NIA); International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE); African Conservation Centre (ACC); SORALO (Southern Rift Valley Landowners Association); Kenyan Wildlife Service (KWS); AMREF; Olaro foundation, and several researchers. Magadi company (Tata), the mining company which has a concession on their territory is also considered by the community as a supportive actor since they have provided funds and support to the community for education, water and for the research centre.

The Olkiramatian community is very sensitive to local development issues and open to get new ideas, partners and collaborators to enhance their model of development.

“People from NGOs are helping us to think in a positive way: diversification of livelihoods, empowerment. Our priority in the present is education and awareness: behind resources and livestock we need education, health centre, we need to be empowered” (workshop with the elders).

However the community always have to preserve their integrity as Group Ranch, since many external actors can endanger their land security and resources management. A case of negative interaction is the one related to the Shompole lodge, a very luxury touristic facility situated on the side of the Nguruman escarpment which has been closed in September 2011, since the local tour operator started a judicial conflict with the Group Ranch, threatening their land.

6.5. Strengths, threats and opportunities

The differentiation of productive activities through a profitable combination of pastoralism, conservation and agriculture, is a successful strategy adopted by the Olkiramatian community to channel a local communal development by valuing and enhancing their natural resources.

“The advantage is the collective management of the natural resources, and their use for different purposes, we are not necessarily sharing the resources. We are still a society, there is a lot of communal sharing, we can cope with risks”.

The strengths of this experience mostly rely on the capacity of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch in maintaining a collective management of the territory despite the diffused process of individualization of land currently occurring in Kenya, which constitutes one of the major threats faced today by the Group Ranch.

“Over 30% of Masai land has been sold in the country: there are many external pressure from people who want to buy lands, families have sold their land from group ranches to individuals, they put fences and animals cannot move freely in the territory, it becomes impossible to keep
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The Olkiramatian Group of women

The Olkiramatian Women’s Group was established in November 2007 and there are currently 170 members. A chairlady and thirteen committee members have been elected. The women reside in four sub locations of Olkiramatian and committee members are elected from each location. Membership dues are required with registration, which add to the new organization’s accruing revenue. After a research site was chosen, the Olkiramatian Women’s Group was given legal ownership of the land. This way the camping fees collected from researchers and educational groups could be put back into the community through various programs which they are still developing. The women have many areas of interest where they would like to use the profits from the Resource Centre. They would like to establish a place where they can do beadwork and sell beadwork to national and international research groups. The centre has already hosted groups from Earthwatch and Earth Expeditions. They would also like to set up bursaries for girls in the community and see the Resource Centre develop into a meeting ground and educational centre for the whole community. SORALO and ACC are actively helping them with land development, and they are now seeking support from outside the community about training in business management.

livestock. It force people to change, they lose their identity, their dignity. This is a tragedy of our time!7"

The Olkiramatian community has its own concerns about the external pressures for the individualization of land, which make them worry about their future. However the efficient communal management of the Group Ranch has ensured up to now that the territory is considered a collective resource by the whole members.

External actors interested in buying their lands give them the perception of losing control of their trajectory. Their main concern is how to maintain their pastoralist way of life, through collective management of the land and natural resources.

Currently, the group is alarmed by a Japanese company and the national government exploring oil which, they say is threatening their pastoral livelihoods.

"Strange people coming to us, other people have other interests"

"If we divide all the area the individuals can own, and anybody can decide, no more collective decisions. The only way we can protect is to making use of the area, manage our resources, because people are able to share problems and benefits together”.

The opportunities of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch consists of continuing experimenting emerging economic activities by consolidating even more their strategy of diversification.

Tourism can be highly empowered by providing skills to local people in managing the tourist facilities and by expanding the cultural potential of tourism in the area and valuing the Maasai culture. More income can be generated by selling handicrafts and traditional tissues, or by showing some cultural aspects of the Maasai inhabiting the area, in order to enhance the ethno tourism component And by valuing the fact that the Masai highly contributed throughout the decades in preserving the wildlife and natural resources in the area.

Moreover, as regards agricultural production, more opportunities could be related to negotiate with market intermediaries better market conditions for those crops which are sold to the european markets.

6.6. Conclusions: challenges and lessons learned

The Group Ranch Model is a system that is able to reduce conflicts amongst and between communities. The Olkiramatian Group Ranch is a good example of how the community is using the ranch system to secure their rights to resources and land, manage them and improve their socio-economic development. The case will also present internal systems of governance

---
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that has facilitated cohesion that has addressed conflict from within and unity in addressing external aggressions. The case also addresses challenges that the group ranch system faces concerning rangeland territories and how they are attempting to overcome these.

It also permits to explore the opportunities for linking rangeland management and development with conservation and the advantages of doing so.

In response to these learning objectives the main lessons likely to be learned from Olkiramatian case are the following:

- **Systems that build community economy and group cohesion;** the importance of adopting a strategic and multifunctional use of land, by diversifying income generating activities in the territory, even maintaining the flexibility of movements and choices as a means to building group cohesion;
- **Proper and functional local structures and governance framework;** the importance of establishing a local governance system based on a good combination of traditional authorities and formal group ranch institutions, both collaborating for the communal management of the land;
- **Alliances and partnership building;** the importance of establishing an extensive network of collaboration including stakeholders and actors at multiple level, in order to get support for the security of their land and as partners in promoting local development processes.
- **Alternative Dispute resolution Mechanisms;** the group ranch system as a multi functional system that have self regulating conflict management system combining customary/traditional systems and legal formal systems and institutions.

Amongst the main challenges and opportunities for the future to be faced, there are the changes occurring at the national level in the land tenure system. In 2010, the Kenyan government adopted a new constitution, which is very progressive in its contents.

Group ranches and trust lands are considered both as Community lands. As concerning the Group Ranches system, this change in the constitution means that group ranches’ owners do not have to register as members of the Group Ranch, but that all the individuals living in that territory will acquire legal rights to that land, in a more inclusive way.

The way in which the Olkiramatian Group ranch will manage this change will be a further challenge for their future in terms of collective management of land and natural resources. The new community land law is a new management framework which communities will engage with in the coming years with the potential either securing the integrity of group ranch model or introducing a more statutory management system.
7. Tanzania Overview

The East African nation of Tanzania has an estimated population of 50 million as of 2016. The country has maintained relatively stable, high growth over the last decade (averaging 6%–7% per annum). While the poverty rate has recently declined, the absolute number of the poor has not changed given the fast pace of population growth (over 3% per annum).

Political Context: Political stability remains the cornerstone of Tanzania’s strong economic performance. In October 2015, John Pombe Magufuli, was elected the fifth President of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Economic Overview: Overall for 2016, the Tanzanian economy has shown resilience amid flagging growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. Real GDP growth for the year is estimated at nearly 7% despite a softening of growth in the second half of the year. Agricultural production increased over the previous year. Non-manufacturing industrial growth softened as a whole as the substantial deceleration of construction and slump in the generation of electricity more than offset strong growth in the mining and quarrying sub-sector. Services maintained solid performance overall.

The inflation rate has remained low and near the authorities’ medium-term target of 5%, although it has trended upward in recent months following a tightening of the food supply and rising energy costs. The current account deficit narrowed significantly in 2016 as exports grew modestly and imports fell significantly, especially for capital goods. Domestic revenue mobilization has been bolstered by strong measures to reduce tax exemptions and curb tax evasion and corruption.

Social Context: Though the poverty rate fell from 60% in 2007 to an estimated 47% in 2016, based on the $1.90 per day global poverty line, about 12 million Tanzanians still live in extreme poverty earning less than US$ 0.60 per day. Many hover just over the poverty line and risk falling back into poverty in the event of socio-economic shocks. Universal education, scrapping contributions for primary and secondary school, has drastically increased primary school enrolment.

Development Challenges: The prospects of the economy lean on investing in bottleneck-releasing infrastructure; improving the business environment; increasing agricultural productivity and value addition; improving service delivery to build a healthy and skilled workforce; and better managing urbanization. With approximately 800,000 youth entering into labor force every year, nurturing a vibrant private sector to provide productive jobs to those new to the labor market is critically important.
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8. Introduction to Tanzania context: land use institutional framework and conflicts

In Tanzania, the constitution clearly states that all land is government land whereas citizens have rights of use. Government is therefore the final authority. However, since the 1990s, progressive legislation has been enacted to ensure effective community participation in decision-making on land. Mechanisms have since been put in place to allow community members to participate at the smallest administrative unit. To enable that participation, the government established a new set of formal institutions, which have been embedded into the statutory hierarchy on land in the country.

There are three categories of land in the country: village land, which is land registered to a village; reserved land, which includes national parks, wetlands, and other land set aside for special purposes; and general land, which is land that is neither village land nor reserved land.

In the early 1990s, a commission of enquiry was set up to deal with corruption. The findings of this commission led to major land reforms, including the establishment of the Land Policy (1995), which emphasizes sustainable land use and community participation as a requirement; the Village Land Act No. 5 (1999), which promotes community participation and allows individuals and groups to hold land; the Participatory Land Use Planning Act No. 6 (2007), which empowers village councils through their village assemblies to prepare, approve and implement village land use plans; and the Guidelines for Developing Participatory Village Land Use Planning (2011), which provide stepwise guidance on how to go about participatory land use planning.

By establishing official channels the community level for participation in resource management and conflict resolution, government has promoted effective grassroots participation in land use decisions. However, the policy and legal framework has still to face some challenges such as double allocation of land, competing laws and legislations that provide loopholes for authorities to reallocate land for other purposes despite title deeds, and high levels of corruption and political interference.

8.1 Land use conflicts between pastoralists and farmers

Among these challenges the land-use conflicts between pastoralists and farmers in Tanzania has been a problem for decades. Over the years, the media has periodically reported on murders, the killing of livestock and the loss of property resulting from these conflicts. A number of factors contributing to this conflicts, including the lack
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of land use planning, green grabbing, large scale agricultural investments, weak policy and institutional frameworks, climate change, corruption and the government’s failure to recognise pastoralism as a viable livelihood option⁸.

After crops, the livestock industry is the second largest contributor to Tanzanian agriculture, representing 5.5% of the country’s household income and 30% of the Tanzania’s agriculture GDP. As with farming, livestock-raising is primarily undertaken by smallholder farmers. Pastoralists play a dominant role in this sector, contributing greatly to Tanzania’s economy: according to government records, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists rear approximately 98 percent of the country’s some 21 million cattle and 22 million small stock and produce most of the milk and meat consumed nationally⁹.

Pastoralists have used the rangelands in what is now Tanzania for hundreds of years, developing a land management system adapted to variable ecological, social and economic conditions. Currently, there are approximately 1.5 million pastoralists spread among five pastoral tribes and communities, with the Maasai being the largest and most well-known. They are facing a number of acute challenges including a shortage of land for grazing and dispossession of their land holdings, which has reduced the area available to them for livestock production.

8 G. E. Massay, “In search of solution to farmer-pastoralist conflicts in Tanzania”, South African Institute of International Affairs, Occasional paper 257, May 2017

8.2 The Village Land Use Planning

The planning at the local level is regulated by the Village Land Act (VLA) No. 5 of 1999 and the Land Use Planning Act No. 6 of 2007. The VLA (sections 12 and 13) grants power to Village Councils (VCs) and their institutions to prepare participatory Village Land Use Plans (VLUPs). The LUP Act (sections 18, 22, 33, and 35) provides for the formation of planning authorities, functions, and procedures of developing participatory VLUPs and approval processes, and grants power to VCs to prepare those plans. The Tanzania National Land Use Planning Commission’s Guidelines for Village Land Use Planning, Administration and Management (the NLUPC Guidelines – April 2013 revised version) detail six main steps to follow when developing participatory VLUPs.

Despite this system of regulation and guidelines, many problems remain related to the management and the administration of land within villages and across their boundaries with the consequence that the village land use planning rarely gets beyond Step 4 out of the six.

The Village Land Act provides for the management and administration of land within village boundaries. It recognises communal land for certain groups, but is vague when it comes to titles for traditionally held customary land. Despite perceptions to the contrary, the authority of Village Councils (VCs) covers only certain rural lands, and a large portion remains under the
control of traditional systems of land allocation and tenure. A potential conflict exists between village authorities and traditional authorities in terms of land management, and there are problems in defining pastoral tenure and practice. Moreover, there is a danger that common lands are assumed to be under open and uncontrolled access subject to management by village authorities, raising the concern that pastoralists could be dispossessed of their grazing lands.

8.3 Conflicts over boundaries: the Joint Village Land Use Planning

In situations where villages share resources, such as grazing areas and water, conflicts over boundaries are very common. Lands held by individual villages are generally not sufficient to sustain rangeland production systems such as pastoralism, and so demand a sharing of resources across village boundaries. There is low awareness on land use planning amongst district governments and communities, and conventional land use planning tends to limit the mobility of pastoralists and others such as hunter-gatherers, whereas the semi-arid and arid environment of these areas demands that this mobility is retained. To face this challenge the Joint Village Land Use Planning (JVLUP) and the provision of group Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) - an additional innovation provided by law in Tanzania (the VLA 5/1999 section 11 and the LUP Act 6/2007) - are more appropriate than individual ones.

Due to a lack of resources and capacity, the implementation of these to date has been limited, particularly in ‘difficult’ areas where land-use conflicts occur. Indeed, in 2013 only 1.28 million hectares or 2.1% of the 60 million hectares of rangelands were protected as grazing, with 479 villages in 69 districts (21 regions) having allocated land for grazing in VLUPs.
9. Case study 2: OLENGAPA and the Joint Village Land Use Planning process
Kiteto District, Manyara region, Tanzania

9.1 The Sustainable Rangeland Management Project

In 2010 the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project was established with support from IFAD, ILC and other donors, and implemented by a consortium of NGOs working closely with the Government of Tanzania with the aim to assist a certain number of villages to carry out the VLUP.

Over the following years, SRMP facilitated the undertaking of a number of village land use plans as well as piloted the process of joint village land use planning. In 2016 the project entered a new phase where the SRMP is embedded as a component of a country-wide National Engagement Strategy (NES) facilitated by the ILC and financially supported by IFAD, Irish Aid, ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute) and ILC. This NES provides a coordination mechanism for connecting, mobilising and influencing different actors on land issues including large-scale commercial investments and rangelands. With component 3 of this NES focusing on rangelands and encompassing the SRMP, its implementation is led by ILRI in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF), the National Land Use Planning Commission, local CSOs and local communities.

Between 2010 and 2015, SRMP assisted nine villages to carry out village land use planning, and successfully piloted the implementation of joint village planning across three of these: Orkitikiti, Lerug and Ngapapa. The three villages are located in Kiteto district, Manyara region and they share boundaries and grazing resources. The process, started in 2013, led to the protection and certification of a shared grazing area that has been called “OLENGAPA”, which includes elements of all three village names (Orkitikiti, LErug and NGAPAp).
9.2 The context in Kiteto District

The total area of the three villages is 59,007.5 hectares. Orkitikiti is the biggest village (38,931.5 ha), followed by Lerug (17,455 ha) and Ngapapa (2,621 ha). The total human population is 4,644, made up of 1,101 households. The majority of inhabitants in these villages are Maasai pastoralists (98%) and the remaining inhabitants (2%) are Ndorobo hunter-gatherers, with some farmers, most of whom are seasonal migrants.

The total livestock population in the three villages is estimated to be around 25,000 cattle, 15,000 sheep and goats, and 1,300 donkeys with the majority found in Orkitikiti and Lerug. Animals are kept for milk and meat, and also serve as a cash reserve to meet basic needs.

Average annual rainfall is between 800mm and 1,000mm per annum, with rain falling between November and April, and there is a very short reliable growing period (around two months). Soils range from well drained, moderately deep sandy clay loams to sandy clays with weak or moderate structures and low natural fertility. The natural vegetation cover is characterised by closed and open acacia bushland and bushy grasslands. Open forests are found on hill slopes while “miombo” forests are associated with the sandy soils found in Orkitikiti and Lerug villages. Orkitikiti village shares a boundary with the SULED0 Forest Reserve, a forest managed jointly by five villages in Lengatei ward. The greatest threat to the vegetation cover and forests in the area is clearance for crop farming. The area is best suited to extensive grazing.

There are no permanent rivers flowing through the OLENGAPA villages. Surface water collects in chaco dams (traditionally hand-dug fed by e.g. an underground spring) and ponds, but these dry up quickly with the onset of the dry season. The only permanent and dependable surface water source in OLENGAPA is Orkitikiti Dam, constructed in 1954. The water here usually lasts through the dry season and is therefore an important dry season water source for livestock not only for OLENGAPA villages but for other villages as well. Groundwater potential is said to exist, but to date this has not been significantly exploited. A series of traditional wells have been dug in the foothills of Ngapapa and Lerug, as well as along the valley running from the north to the southeast of the area in Orkitikiti village through Kiponyi. However, these wells tend to dry up in the dry season.

Due to the characteristics of the context it is immediately clear, on the one hand, that mobility is central to the survival of the pastoralists and takes place across the three villages, as well as beyond them, and, on the other hand, the big pressure and the challenges in regulating the scarce-shared resources. In recent years, the number of conflicts between pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and small-scale crop farmers increased registering in Kiteto district more than 34 people killed as a result of such conflicts between 2013 and 2015.
9.3 What can we learn from OLENGAPA experience during the Learning Route?

OLENGAPA presents an innovative character; it is the result of a pilot implementation in Tanzania of the Joint Village Land Use Planning experienced in Kiteto District. The whole process was complex and involved many stakeholders, among which the community played a central role. The facilitation process led to agreement over the individual village land use maps and plans, as well as the joint village land use map and plan. The greatest merit of the OLENGAPA experience, in comparison with another JVLUP tentative made by the SRMP in Chema District, is to arrive to develop the Joint Village Land Use Agreement (JVLUA) as a legally recognized and registered document of the decision made.

Specifically, what we can learn from the OLENGAPA experience is:

- To understand the Joint Land Use Plan process as a model to solve conflicts among pastoralists and farmers in a semi-arid area of Tanzania where resources that are crucial for livelihood (such as water and pasture) are scarce
- To learn in depth the implementation process focusing on the involvement and the role of the several stakeholders involved and the process followed to build consensus.
- To understand the approach used in order to manage communal resources and recognize individual rights within the collective rights including the in-built conflict management mechanisms.
- To explore tools for managing conflicts between farmers and pastoralists at governamental and community levels

9.4 OLENGAPA Joint Village Land Use Planning process

In the OLENGAPA area, villagers were supported to carry out the six-steps process of the Joint Village Land Use Planning. As a first step of the process the community members of the three villages were brought together in one place to conduct the Participatory Rangeland Resources Mapping of the different resources in the villages and their distribution. Drawing the map together offered an opportunity to discuss the sharing of resources and conflicts of interest, and it was
noted a clear overlap of resource access and use. This was used to develop, as a second step, a base map for the Individual Village Land Use Plans of the three villages, including showing which resources are shared by the villages and where they are situated. During this phase, it was reached a common agreement about the understanding of the official boundaries.

The process led to the first Tanzania’s Joint Village Land Use Agreement developed and then signed in November 2014 assuring that no single village can make changes to the areas identified for the sharing of resources without the consensus of the three villages. The agreement, signed by all three villages, has a high value for the whole process. It was witnessed by the DC legal officers and is a legally binding document. To add weight to this document, the JVLUA is being registered with the Registrar of Titles in the Ministry of Land, Housing and Human Settlements Development. The three individual village land use plans of the three villages (registered by the Minister of Lands) also provide details of the Agreement.

A Joint Resource Management Committee made up of 5 members from each of the three villages was established. This committee is responsible for planning, management, enforcement of by-laws and coordination of the implementation of the OLENGAPA land use agreement and land use plan.

In addition, a Livestock Keepers Association was established including 53 founding members with most households from the three villages being associate members. A constitution was developed for the association, and the association was officially registered on 11 September 2015. In January 2016, the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements approved and registered the village land boundary maps and deed plans for the three villages. The district council has issued the village land certificates and the next step is for village councils to begin issuing CCROs. The shared grazing area will require three group CCROs to be issued to the Livestock Keepers Association—one from each village for the part of the grazing area falling under its jurisdiction. Signboards and beacons marking the boundary of the shared grazing area are also being put in place.

Reaching agreement entailed a protracted negotiation process between the villages and within villages between different interest groups, involving many community meetings and a significant amount of resources. The several steps of the process presented several disagreements and conflicts among the different users, the different villages and the different authorities involved. The process was facilitated by two well experienced Civil Society Organizations who provided their technical assistance. It is important to mention on the one hand, the Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF) led the conflict resolution
process among the governmental and traditional authorities and leaders at local level involved in the process (Villages, Wards and District level). On the other hand, KINNAPA facilitated all the participatory steps of the process with the communities of the three villages.

TANZANIA NATURAL RESOURCE FORUM

TNRF is a collective civil society-based initiative to improve governance and accountability in Tanzania’s natural resource sector to achieve more sustainable rural livelihoods and better conservation outcomes. As a member-driven NGO, TNRF works to improve policy and practice for the better, by helping to bridge the gap between:

- People’s local natural resource management needs and practices; and
- National natural resource management priorities, policies, laws and programs

TNRF supports its members by improving communication, sharing information, promoting collaboration and strengthening collective action. TNRF has a growing membership of more than 3,800 people and organizations, supporting professional staff, and a steering committee drawn from the membership.
It aims to bring about improved natural resource governance in Tanzania by being a demand-driven network of members and partners that helps people to bridge the gap between people’s local natural resource management needs and practices, and national natural resource management priorities, policies, laws and programs.

TNRF played a crucial role in facilitating the meetings with the different level of the local government authorities governing the three villages involved in OLENGAPA. Acting as a neutral actor TNRF conducted and facilitated the negotiation among the village land offices and the traditional leaders fostering the dialogue among the conflicting authorities to arrive to agreed village boundary maps.

www.tnrf.org/en
KINNAPA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

KINNAPA Development Programme is a Community Based non-profit making organization. It was set up in the early 1990s by six villages to deal with land encroachment issues facing pastoralists and peasants in the district of Kiteto. It was officially registered on 31st January 1992. The name KINNAPA is an abbreviation of the names of those founding six villages, which are Kibaya, Kimana, Njoro, Ndaleta, Namelock and Partimbo. In Maa, the language of the Maasai people, the word means, “we help each other”. Its main mission is to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life for pastoralists, hunter-gatherers and peasants in Kiteto District, while ensuring community participation in development projects, gender balance and sustainable resources management.

To implement its mission, KINNAPA has set priority areas, focused on the following objectives:

• To support gender awareness creation and strengthen women’s position and child survival in development.
• To undertake community based livestock and agriculture development initiatives towards food security and poverty alleviation.
• To support community water supply systems and good hygiene and sanitation practices.
• To enhance community capacities in environmental issues and natural resources management.
• To facilitate community access on education provision, including human resource development through training.
• To undertake institutional capacity building of KINNAPA to manage its mission.

Its activities and programmes are now spread in all the 63 villages of Kiteto District involving more than 20,000 people annually and it plays a crucial role in facilitating and mediating conflicts among different users in the management of natural resources, mainly land and water.

KINNAPA played a crucial role in facilitating the meetings with communities belonging to the three villages involved in OLENGAPA process and mediating with conflicts among them; they are a point of reference for OLENGAPA members and in managing the shared grazing area and the access to resources.

“A Profile of Kinnapa Development Programme”, 2011
9.5 OLENGAPA land allocation

The three villages have allocated 32,148.89 ha of land for shared grazing – that is, around 54% of the total area of the villages. This grazing area is connected across the three villages, including across the disputed boundary between Lerug and Orkitikiti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>AREA IN HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORKITIKITI</td>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>24,168.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle tracks</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orkitikiti Dam</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaco dams</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiponyi /Olkalili Wells</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hills forest reserves</td>
<td>1069.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LERUG</td>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>7,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle tracks</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaco dams</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olmotikinyi/ Nendrigish Wells</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lerug Hills forest reserves</td>
<td>1,451.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGAPAPA</td>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>1,108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle tracks</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaco dams</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngapapa Hills forest reserves</td>
<td>2521.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Shared Resources included in the OLENGAPA Joint Village Land Use Agreement

All water sources are protected by a minimum 60-metre buffer zone; combined, these zones total 40 hectares. The Orkitikiti Dam is located in the SULEDO Forest Reserve and is thus protected, even without the buffer zone around it. The management plan will help to ensure that there is water available all year round in the area.

Efforts have been made to ensure that all bomas (settlements) have access to the grazing area and water sources by means of 30 metre-wide livestock routes. There is an interconnected network of 30 livestock routes covering in total 1,349 hectares. Some routes lead outside the villages. All will be surveyed and marked to protect them from encroachment and blocking. A total of 10,949 hectares have been allocated to forest reserve; SULEDO accounts for 65% of this area. Although they are not formally part of the JVLUA, the villages have agreed to ban grazing and crop cultivation on hill tops, hill slopes, and foothills and to use these instead for forest conservation. The forests also provide space for the Ndorobo hunter-gatherers to live and maintain their livelihoods.

This leaves around 11,564 hectares – or 20% – of the village land for crop farming and 2,008 hectares for settlement. The area used for crop farming has been expanding yearly, and there was a heated discussion about how much land should be allocated for this use. Pastoralists themselves agreed that each household should be provided with enough land to grow crops
adequate to fulfil household needs, as well as a small surplus for sale. This helps them spread the risks by not relying on a single livelihood production system. The average landholding in the villages is between 7 hectares and 10 hectares. It will be necessary to increase productivity from these household plots in order to sustain the growing population.

9.6 Strengths, threats and opportunities

Thanks to the JVLUP process village members came to agreement over the individual village land use maps and plans, as well as the joint village land use map and plan, and the joint village land use agreement. These detailed and ultimately protected the shared grazing area, water points,
livestock routes and other shared resources. In the end each village assembly approved the JVLUA, which allocated 20,706.73 ha of land for shared grazing—i.e. around 40% of the total area of the villages.

The community members living in the three villages reported\textsuperscript{10} that thanks to OLENGAPA their livelihood standard increased, in particular in terms of reduced conflicts, increased awareness of collective benefits, increased land for grazing and better access to water sources through the corridors, better health conditions and reduced mortality of their livestock, and increased incomes. “My cattle have now more place to graze, they becoming fatter and fatter and I can sell them to a better price then in the past..... beyond 800,000 Tshs. The distances to access water now decreased thanks to the corridors. In the past I used to loose almost the 50% of the cattle due to the distances of pasture and water, now it decreased around 10-20 animals per year”\textsuperscript{11}

Despite the positive results highlighted, calculations suggest that the amount of grazing allocated is not enough for the numbers of livestock in the villages and that pasture improvement will need to be carried out to improve the carrying capacity of the shared OLENGAPA grazing area. SULEDO Forest Reserve will continue to be an occasional-use drought season grazing reserve and movement to Kilindi district for grazing will continue. It was agreed by the villagers that all farms located in the grazing area, in forests, or close to water sources would be relocated.

Moreover, many development challenges remains to be faced in the area to face the scarcity of water sources, the lack of sanitary services for livestock, the need to improve access to markets and to build resources learning centres.

SRMP has now entered its third phase (2016-2020), with the financial support of International Fund for Agricultural Development of the United Nations, Irish Aid, the International Land Coalition (ILC), International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the government of Tanzania. This phase focus on the scaling-up of the joint village land use planning approach in several new clusters of villages, as well as expanding the original ones. This includes the securing of grazing areas through the provision of CCROs - Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy - and improving the management of the areas by the established Livestock Keepers Associations through action research on rangeland rehabilitation, and on intensification of rangeland and livestock productivity.

Building on SRMP, IFAD and the Government of Tanzania have started the design of the Drylands Development Project that will support integrated

\textsuperscript{10} As reported during the systematization visit held in Kiteto District from 10th to 13th of July 2017, the participatory workshops and the interviews held with the OLENGAPA community members and the PLUM members.

\textsuperscript{11} Interview with Yiacob Olosiati Lematwa, Chair member of the Olkitikiti Village Committee (Olkitikiti on 13th of July 2017)
rangeland-based livelihoods while providing ecologically sound strategies for resolving conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.

Figure 4: Participatory workshops during the Systematization held in July 2017 with OLENGAPA members
10. Other relevant stakeholders: The Ujaama Community Resource Team

A crucial actor with an extensive advocacy activity towards securing land rights of pastoralist and hunter-gatherers in Tanzania is the Ujaama Community Resource Team (UCRT). It is a non-profit environmental and social justice organization, whose vision is to: “Strengthened livelihoods and social justice for pastoralist, hunter-gatherer and agro pastoralist communities through security over land and natural resources, and sustainable community-based natural resource management.”

UCRT develops its activities in many districts in the Northern Tanzania, an area where there is a crossroad of different cultures and indigenous peoples with ancient heritage and UCRT works in support of hunter-gatherers and pastoralists communities inhabiting these areas. Some of the main indigenous peoples which have benefited from UCRT work are: the Hadzabe (ancient hunter-gatherers), the Iraqw (agro-pastoralists), the Maasai and Barabaig (semi-nomadic pastoralists); the Bantu speaking Sonjo (hunter gatherers), the Akie (hunters-gatherers).

UCRT started its activities in 1997; until 2002 it worked under the auspices of another NGO called Tazama Trust. In 2002 UCRT has been officially registered as a trust organisation, with its own board of directors. In 2010 it was re-registered as a not for profit company, the Ujamaa-Community Resource Team (UCRT). In 1998 there were only 3 founders members; while in the last years the organization has highly increased its personnel, currently employing forty five staff, most of whom are based in the rural communities on the ground. Its head quarter is based in Arusha.

10.1 What can we learn from UCRT experience?

UCRT has an extensive advocacy activity towards securing land rights of pastoralist and hunter-gatherers giving a special focus on women role in advocacy.

Specifically, what can we learn from UCRT experience is:

- how to promote peaceful co-existence and preventing/reducing potential conflicts in sustainable use, management, access and protection of natural resources;
- how to add value in livelihood initiatives and programmes different users;
- how to promote governance for inclusiveness and representativeness at every decision-making levels; by using several conflicts management approaches and tools such as the mobility agreements and the group Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy.
10.2 UCRT main axes of intervention

The organizations’ main axes of intervention are the following:

**Land rights activities:** this component is aimed at securing land rights to communities and indigenous groups under the existing legislative national framework, in particular by demarcating, planning, and legally formalizing ownership over their land through Certificates of Village Land (CVL) and Communal Certificates of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs).

5,850 hectares were formally secured with a Certificate of Village Land for Mungere village in Monduli in 2016. 12 communal CCROs have been issued to communities in Lake Eyasi, providing a total of 20,132.25 hectares for use by Hadza hunter-gatherers and Datoga pastoralists. 5 villages received the land titles, of which five are for Hadza hunter-gatherer use, two for retained natural forest and five for grazing.

**Community Natural resource Management:** this component is aimed at facilitate the common management of natural resources. UCRT supports the local communities in identifying locally available resources that can be used for economic development, local control and use of resources. It facilitates community formulation of natural resources management plans; the adoption of village by-laws in support of land use planning and natural resource management plans. Moreover, UCRT supports and advises villages to ensure fair contracts and agreements with investors.

**Lobby and advocacy:** UCRT works in order to make sure that pastoralists and hunter-gatherers are trained about current laws and existing legislations concerning land use and natural resources management. UCRT trains communities about how to advocate for their rights, and how to interface with local and regional governments in order to secure their rights to land and natural resources management. It also provides training to communities on good governance, conflict resolutions and transparent financial management. Under this component, UCRT also promote interventions at community level in order to strengthen traditional local authorities, through the “Community Forums”, which are mostly based on traditional systems of leadership. UCRT also facilitates inter-villages meetings amongst Community Forums of different villages, and by promoting Community Forums’ meetings at ward and district level.

**Women empowerment projects:** traditional leadership system in the communities supported by UCRT are mainly leaded by men: UCRT developed mechanisms to promote women’s empowerment and involvement in decision-making. The support to women is provided mainly through: 1) economic programmes for women in order to facilitate women’s economic empowerment, especially widows; 2) training on
good leadership and facilitate the establishment of women’s forum to make sure that women are represented in all the authorities’ levels and participate in crucial decisions regarding land and natural resources 3) cross cutting issues, such as HIV and gender measures are introduced in all the other programmes.

3,048 women are engaged in CCRO processes in Simanjiro, where Women’s Rights & Leadership Forum [WRLF] representatives in Narakauwo village are leading the development of land use plans and land titles for their area

Educational support programmes: UCRT supports the communities to give their children scholarships to facilitate their access to schools [secondary and colleges]; moreover, it promotes specific trainings for the Hadzabe and Akie communities.

UCRT’s work impacts over 300,000 pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in Northern Tanzania.

The management of conflicts related to land and resource management is a further crucial key activity developed by UCRT in support of pastoralist communities, with the aim of securing their management of natural resources. The cross boarder land use plan is the tool used by UCRT to manage cross boarder land use. It consists of making the communities use their bordering areas in the same way (grazing, conservation etc.) in order to avoid conflicts between villagers.

Figure 5: Map of Land Use Planning in Mongo wa Mono Village and in Yaeda Valley
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12. Definitions of innovation

WHY INNOVATE?

Objective

To present basic definitions concerning the process of innovation, which will provide users with the conceptual tools for developing an Action Plan, through the review of the main ideas on innovation that are present in current debate on the subject

“For perhaps the first time in history, Humanity has the capability to create more information than anyone can take in, to encourage more interdependence than anyone can manage, and to promote change with a velocity than no one can keep up with”. Senge [1992].

Globalization has increased both competition and the exchange of information, while technological advances and changes in social and market demands mean that one needs to move quickly in order to stand one’s ground and develop in today’s world. This interactive and complex reality puts us face to face with the constant challenge of adapting adequately, and obtaining greater efficiency in the use of our organization’s resources and in the contributions we make to the welfare of the poor.

In a broad sense, innovation refers to introducing a novelty, that is, a positive adaptation to the changes taking place in today’s world. That is why innovating requires us mainly to develop creative capacities that will let us detect opportunities in an organizational setting and in a dynamic environment.

Innovation, then, means improving the capacity of our organizations to respond to the social, organizational, and market needs, by generating new ideas that will be translated into new products, services, or processes, capable of exploiting internal and external opportunities that improve organizational performance.

The challenge to innovate will lead us to become agents that generate and transform the reality of our organizations in the first place, and then of our communities and societies, making strategic contributions to the processes of rural development and to improving people’s welfare.

What is innovation?

The debate surrounding innovation has undergone a marked evolution over the last several decades. It has evolved from an economic notion related exclusively to
economics, technological advance and business, towards other, wider meanings, in which the context is highly relevant, as are the participation of local agents, their practices, and their ways of learning within the process of innovation.

This evolution implies a change from the notion of innovation as a product to a view of innovation as a process that is a central and permanent factor in the life of an organization.

The concept of innovation

“The introduction, and the application or procedures, within a role, a group, or an organization, on the condition that it be new to the entity that has adopted it, and that it has been designed to significantly benefit the individual, the group, the organization, or society in general” West and Farr 1990.  

Innovation is an action that is intentionally designed and directed to generating change within a role, a group, or an organization, which, when applied, will result in benefits, not only of a financial nature, but also to the organization and to society. Innovation does not happen by chance, it is a planned action, aimed at improving an existing situation.

Rural innovation is not limited to technological or methodological change; it includes new ideas or processes for managing and guiding human resources, new ways of using previous knowledge, the creative application of models of action that have been used elsewhere, and the administration of social or development processes that will result in greater benefits to an organization, a rural community, or society as a whole.

Many countries in the Global South have shown great capacity to learn, adapt, and apply innovations in original and effective ways, in their fight against poverty and in the promotion of modern rural development. It is important to showcase and leverage the positive impact of successful rural innovation, and extend its positive effect to other poor communities.

12 This definition is discussed at length in the text by America Gonzalez V: “Innovación Organizacional. Retos y Perspectivas” [Organizational Innovation: Challenges and Perspectives], CLACSO, which is part of the bibliography.
Scaling Up

Scaling up refers to the challenge of extending the impact of a rural innovation which has shown itself to be effective on a micro scale (often limited to a small number of communities or sectors within these communities), to larger geographical areas or the population within the latter.

Scaling up is understood as an end because it aims at producing more benefits for more people in a wider geographical area, and in a more lasting manner; it is also a means to create and strengthen local capacity – institutional, organizational and communal – to plan, implement and assess development activities.

That is why scaling up is a learning process which mobilizes and reinforces rural communities’ resources, agents, and capacities at the local and country levels, and extends their impact and makes it more sustainable.

It is important to point out that an innovation need not be an absolutely new idea, but it must be new for the entity or - partnership of entities- that adopts it. In other words, we can also speak of innovation when an organization adopts an idea or a technology that has been applied in another context, as long as it is new to the entity that adopts the innovation.

In this process, the application of the innovation is a crucial element, because it implies the transformation of knowledge or information into a practice which embodies new benefits to those who develop it.

Innovation is not the same as invention. The mere generation of novel ideas is not sufficient to create innovation: an idea is not innovative until it has been used to satisfy a concrete need. An innovative idea must be appropriate to the organization that implements it, and to the organization’s members who incorporate it into their work practices, validating it as a tool to improve their internal performance and/or the responses to the surroundings.

Innovation then, is doing things in a new or different manner, in the context where our activity takes place, whether in the organization’s internal levels, or in specific rural communities. Innovation implies a novelty that is put into practice and confirmed by the organization as a valid and beneficial response to certain needs, problems, or challenges. The nature and quality of an innovation are relative to the context where it is introduced.

An important element for an innovation, is its validation through use, in other words, an innovation has meaning because a rural community or society uses it, makes it theirs, incorporates and develops it. It is new knowledge, around which social agents will be mobilized,
and which has an impact on the community, the organization, or society as a whole.

Nevertheless, innovations also need to be validated by experts, or evaluated to check the innovative nature of a process and its contribution to the development of an organization or community. This is done using methods which identify the relevant elements in a process of innovation and provide criteria to judge progress or setbacks, and indicators of impact.

Lastly, innovation is a social construct that involves processes of interaction and interchange among diverse agents and institutions having different, and often conflicting, interests and unequal quotas of economic, social and political power. As a result, the introduction of innovations is not free of conflicts, since it involves the transformation of longstanding models or ways of doing things, which have determined how benefits are distributed in a given organizational or social context. Therefore, communication and setting up alliances and agreements among various actors and interests are important in implementing and sanctioning an innovation.

**SUMMARY**

1. An Innovation is an action that is purposefully designed and intended to generate changes within a role, a group or an organization, of a kind that will bring about multiple benefits, not only of a economic nature, but also on the personal, organizational and social levels.

2. Rural innovation is not limited to technological change; it involves the knowledge and expertise of rural communities that act in novel and effective ways in their efforts to improve their quality of life.

3. Innovation does not require absolute novelty; it is subjective: the idea must be new to the entity that adopts it.

4. The mere production of new ideas is not enough to generate innovation; there must be application towards a concrete need, and appropriation on the part of the people or community involved.

5. Scaling up refers to the challenge of extending the impact of a rural innovation which has shown itself to be effective on a micro scale (often limited to a small number of communities, or to sectors within these communities), to greater geographical areas and populations.

6. The sources of rural innovation are diverse, including scientific research and knowledge, the opinion of experts or specialists, and also the practical experience and knowledge gathered by the rural organization.
7. Innovation is a dynamic process that includes the following steps: assessment or identification of the needs for innovation; the creation, search, or adaptation of an innovative experience to respond to such needs; the preparation of a project or plan for innovation; the implementation of the innovation and its appropriation in the organizational context where it is applied; and the dissemination and learning of the innovative experience.

The role of the agent of change

“You will not find anything happening anywhere, from experimental school courses to a new clinic in a hospital to an operation in the private sector, which does not have a committed person behind it. This is of no interest to me. The problem is not to employ committed people but how to convert average people within these organizations into such committed champions; I believe that this is the key” (Peters, T. 1988).

There is always someone – or some people – behind a successful innovation process. No innovation is possible without the personal involvement of those who will implement it, both those who generate the idea and those who have to implement it.

Those who are involved committed with an innovation process become agents of change. To set out on the road to something new requires energy and persistence, born of committed involvement; a desire and a will to persist in the face of the difficulties, failures or errors which appear during the process.

The role of the agent of change is to identify the problems of, and provide a new focus on, the traditional activities of an organization, and to propose ideas designed to improve and transform them.

Concepts such as “intrapreneurs”, “idea generators”, indicate that it is the individual, or group of individuals, that brings new ideas or focuses to the activities of an organization.

This process necessarily implies a rupture, since organizations tend to protect themselves against instability and change, and thus it is seldom the organization which decides, on the basis of its accumulated knowledge and experience, that its established procedures or rules can be improved. It is important that whoever is championing an innovation process must be committed to the problem and not to the project. In other words, the commitment must be to the purpose or objective of the change sought, not with the process, route or plan of action drawn up to achieve it. This allows him/them to make variations and to introduce new plans or actions in unsolved areas of a problem, when it becomes clear that the
planned strategy is deficient or ineffective. The logic of the actions and solutions designed must remain partially open, and must be flexible to adaptation, for the innovation to be successful.

People who generate interesting problems, who discover new ways of looking at the organization, the rural community or society, are the true discoverers of niches for the development of innovations. They are the greatest wealth of the organization; as creative primary capital, their contribution is invaluable.