Welcome to the seventh issue of "News from Drynet", a newsletter from the Drynet network on global concerns for drylands from local perspectives. This issue is committed to analysing our achievements over the last three years and our plans for the future. As a thematic highlight we want to introduce the topic of livestock keeping and mobile pastoralist in the drylands of the world.

As has been mentioned in previous issues of this newsletter Drynet was initially set up as a three-year project mainly supported by the European Union and the Global Mechanism. With this official project phase of the Drynet network now drawing to an end, the members are presently involved in assessing the results, achievements and impacts of their work over the past three years. During this process of evaluation the benefits and strengths of the network for the individual partners as well as for the communities and the global arena were perceived as being so positive that a continuation and prolongation of the Drynet network and its activities became very desirable.

In order to jointly map all of our achievements and come to a clear understanding on what the follow-up of these should be, Drynet organised its Third Annual Meeting beginning of November in Rome, Italy. The meeting was divided into two main parts, an internal meeting to strategise on the path ahead and a two-day external meeting to which we invited key stakeholders involved in dryland issues and possible strategic partners for future cooperation. This meeting was held at the IFAD building and a number of their staff was able to join us and give valuable input. Further crucial discussions were aided by the presence of amongst others colleagues from the Global Mechanism, the FAO, the European Commission, Swiss and French country delegates and of the International Land Coalition (ILC) and DesertNet. Drynet presented its work of the past years and mapped out the three main areas on which the network wants its focus to be in the coming years. Drynet firstly wants to present itself as a focal point and

“The Drynet team and some of its strategic partners during the Third Annual Meeting in November 2009, Rome, Italy”
GLOBAL NEWS

Bio-cultural Community Protocols: A tool for strengthening livestock keeping communities

Especially in drylands, livestock keepers have stewarded animal genetic resources for food and agriculture for millennia and developed breeds which are optimally adapted to the rigorous demands of their eco-systems. These animals are able to cope with periodic droughts and are also an extremely valuable asset in adapting to climate change – which the high yielding breeds developed by scientists are not. The role of indigenous livestock keepers and their traditional knowledge in conserving breeds is recognized by the Global Plan of Action on Animal Genetic Resources and has been elaborated upon in a recent FAO publication (FAO, 2009). Furthermore, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) also commits signatory countries to support in-situ conservation and to respect and preserve the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities. Despite these international agreements, the in-situ conservation of pastoralists and other communities rarely receives the support it deserves and most conservation efforts focus on ex-situ approaches – in the form of deep frozen semen or on government farms. Equally of concern, livestock keepers are rarely even aware of their rights under the UN-CBD and other international and national legal frameworks. This is where Bio-cultural Community Protocols (BCPs) come in as a very important tool for communities to become aware of and invoke their rights. By establishing a BCP, a community can create a knowledge hub for local and traditional knowledge related to drylands and land degradation, meaning to act as a nexus between local communities and as well policy makers as maybe even more crucially the scientific community. This could help local knowledge getting the attention that it deserves but also opening channels of information flows both ways, trying to get the scientific advances applied where they are most needed. Secondly Drynet wants to continue to strengthen the national stakeholder platforms it has initiated in the past few years in order to create stable and reliable partners for the national as well as international dialogue between at least communities and politicians. And this will feed into the last focus area namely trying to further increase local communities and CSOs input at the international arena.

While all the members and in particular the Steering Committee is still very busy working out the details of what the next phase of our Drynet work will look like we are now confident in saying that our work and combined effort will continue. Drynet’s focus remains to combat the globally felt effects of desertification and our commitment to better the lives of those affected by climate change, drought and land degradation is stronger and more determined than ever. Thank you for your continued attention and participation over the last three years and we as a network are looking forward to future cooperation with you and your organisations.

By Drynet partner: Both ENDS, the Netherlands - drynet@bothends.org

“Pastoralist in India.”

News from Drynet
A global initiative giving future to drylands
munity puts on record its traditional knowledge and the genetic resources that it has been stewarding. It also reflects on its options for the future and is informed about its existing rights in a facilitated process which results in a printed document that summarizes the role of the community in biodiversity conservation and its rights. While the BCPs was developed in the context of the discussion on Access and Benefit-Sharing under the CBD, they provide a legal tool for implementing Paragraph 8j of the CBD on in-situ conservation. Facilitated by Drynet partner Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan (LPPS) and the League for Pastoral Peoples and Endogenous Livestock Development (LPP) as well as the South African NGO Natural Justice, the Raika of Rajasthan were the first pastoralists to develop such a BCP, but others are already following suit. This will change the equation between grassroots communities and outside development agencies.

Further information:

By Drynet partner Ilse Köhler-Rollefson, LPP, Germany

---

**International Agenda 2010**

01 - 04 February 2010 - 1st ICARDA conference “Food security and Climate Change in Dry Lands” in Amman, Jordan. www.icarda.cgiar.org/Announcement/2009/IntlConfmc_FoodSecurity/

21 - 27 February 2010 - Fourth International Conference on Community Based Adaptation in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. The forthcoming conference aims to share and consolidate the latest developments in CBA planning and practice in different sectors and countries in Africa. It will disseminate these lessons learnt at the workshop and through workshop proceedings. Ultimately the aim is to share knowledge and experiences to help those most vulnerable to climate change. http://community.eldis.org/.59b70e86/CBA%20Conference%20Announcement.pdf

21 - 27 February 2010 - Fourth International Conference on Community Based Adaptation in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. The forthcoming conference aims to share and consolidate the latest developments in CBA planning and practice in different sectors and countries in Africa. It will disseminate these lessons learnt at the workshop and through workshop proceedings. Ultimately the aim is to share knowledge and experiences to help those most vulnerable to climate change. http://community.eldis.org/.59b70e86/CBA%20Conference%20Announcement.pdf

28 - 31 March 2010 - Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD) Enhancing Development Impact from Research: Building on Demand in Montpellier, France. GCARD 2010 will be in two parts. The first part will be a summit meeting of invited senior policy makers from governments, international agencies and key stakeholder organisations. These will examine the need and scale of investment in agricultural research and associated institutions required to increase the impact of new knowledge among the poor. The second part, the main session, will involve a cross-section of stakeholders from all sectors involved in agricultural research for development. These will include farmers, consumers, civil society organisations, service providers, input suppliers and market representatives. Those directly concerned with research, and subsequent agricultural inputs in the public, private and international sectors, and the funding bodies that support research and advisory processes, will also take part in the main session. http://www.egfar.org/egfar/website/gcard/2010-conferenceFoodSecurity-AndClimateChangeInDryAreas_2009.htm

16 - 20 August 2010 - Second International Conference on Climate, Sustainability and Development in Semi-Arid Regions (ICID II) in Fortaleza, Brazil. With the goal of promoting secure and sustainable development in the semi-arid regions of the world, ICID 2010 aims to bring together public policy makers, scientists, and members of civil society. Organisers of the event hope to identify and focus action on challenges and opportunities for a better future in the world’s arid and semi-arid regions. The conference will generate, publish, and present recommendations to guide global, regional, national and local analysis and policies aimed at reducing vulnerability and improving the lives of the people of dry lands around the world. http://ictsd.org/i/events/59501/

8 - 11 November 2010 - Third International Conference on Drylands, Desserts and Desertification 8 in Sede Boquer Campus, Israel. This meeting will address the restoration of degraded drylands. http://cmsprod.bgu.ac.il/Eng/Units/bidr/desertification2008/
Excerpt from: No simple solution to livestock and climate change

Simply reducing livestock farming in developing countries will neither cut emissions nor benefit the poor, says livestock expert Carlos Seré. For many people the terms ‘greenhouse gas’ and ‘climate change’ conjure up images of smokestacks billowing noxious clouds, gridlocked traffic, the cracked bottom of a dried-up lakebed, or a polar bear clinging to a melting ice floe. Rarely do you see images of farmers ploughing fields, planting seeds or feeding animals. Indeed, until recently, agriculture – particularly in developing countries – has been largely absent from climate change discussions.

But farming is a significant contributor to climate change, and also a victim. Agricultural activities, including forest clearing, fertilising soils and transporting produce, and indeed livestock farming, account for about a third of global greenhouse gas emissions. Meanwhile farmers, particularly in developing countries, are threatened by climatic changes such as shifting rainfall patterns and more extreme and unpredictable weather.

Livestock certainly deserves the attention of climate change experts. Emissions from animals account for just over half of all agricultural emissions, or about 18 per cent of total emissions. But as negotiators prepare for Copenhagen, the agenda of some lobbyists appears to be driven by a long-standing anti-meat bias that promotes simple solutions to complex problems. There is broad consensus that highly intensive livestock production in rich countries can be medically and environmentally unhealthy as well as inhumane, and should be scaled back.

But those who portray livestock as the main culprit in global warming typically fail to mention the ‘meat divide’ that separates industrial and agricultural economies.

Livestock emissions depend on how animals are raised and fed. Grain-fed, factory-farmed cattle in industrialised countries emit much higher levels of greenhouse gases than the grass-fed, family-farmed cattle in developing countries. Overproducing and overconsuming meat, milk and eggs have become a health hazard in the North, while the South suffers from chronic malnutrition – in part due to underproduction and underconsumption of these foods.

Most people who keep cattle in developing countries are either small farmers who feed their animals grass and other common forage, with seasonal supplements of stalks and other harvested crop wastes, or herders who periodically move their stock in search of new sources of grass and water. Both these groups have very few alternatives for making a living beyond crop and livestock farming and both leave a relatively small environmental footprint. For example, all of Africa’s cattle and other ruminants contribute just three per cent of global livestock methane emissions. And there is scope to cut these emissions by improving the diets of hungry animals, as poor nutrition decreases their value for milk and meat and encourages poor people to keep more animals, instead of less.

But many experts now agree that the biggest concern about livestock production in developing countries is not how much farm animals are emitting but to what extent a hotter and more extreme tropical environment will diminish livestock productivity. Reducing productivity by even a small amount will threaten supplies of milk, meat and eggs to hungry communities that need these nourishing foods the most.

For many people, including more than one billion people living in absolute poverty and chronic hunger, the solution is not to rid the world of livestock but rather to find ways of farming animals sustainably. Many livestock scientists, including those at my own institute in Africa, are looking to develop a ‘third way’ of livestock production, lying somewhere between factory and family farming – one that promises pathways out of poverty without depleting our natural resources, affecting our climate or threatening our public health.

Carlos Seré is director of the International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya
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Scarcity of Natural Resources and Pastoral Conflicts in Northern Kenya: an Inquiry.

A report cited in UN OCHA-Kenya in 2001 described the Horn of Africa as a region of continuous and endemic security problems of cattle-rustling raids and political instability. However, almost all the claims about inter-ethnic conflicts being a result of natural resources scarcity have been based on analysis of only limited incidents. Pastoral conflicts are linked to and influenced by a combination of factors that complicate the nature of the problem, and challenge the understanding of the causal factors and their interaction effects. A case study carried out jointly by the authors, embarked on a thorough historical study (i.e. since the early 20th century) of all reported cases of violence in the Marsabit District in northern Kenya. The main aim was to better understand the problem of pastoral conflict. This particular study was set to investigate long-term trends of inter-ethnic conflicts and empirically test the relationships between resource scarcity and violent conflicts among pastoralist populations in the northern region of Kenya. The key research questions were: Have inter-ethnic raids and incidences of violent conflicts increased with the downward trends in rainfall and substantial decline in livestock wealth in per capita terms? And, do conflicts mainly occur during and after droughts, and during dry seasons? The study considered both seasonality and general long-term trends of the association between natural resources and inter-ethnic conflicts. This approach was inspired by the fact that the problem of inter-ethnic conflicts can be addressed with regard to resource availability (with rainfall amounts indicating the level of availability of range resources), and the dynamic changes in livestock wealth.

The study found a negative correlation between violent conflicts and drought, as well as immediate post-drought periods, although those are the periods when scarcity is experienced most, and show most livelihood tensions in pastoral communities. There are clear indications that violent incidences occur much more often in rainy seasons and during relatively good years, than in dry seasons and during droughts. Further, the evidence shows twice as many persons are likely to be killed in a violent conflict during relatively rainy years (i.e. in a time of relative resource abundance) than in the drought (drier) years. This result also reflects herders’ viewpoints and explanations. They see droughts as difficult times when animals are weak, survival is hard and people are more inclined to stop fighting, patch up their differences, renegotiate access rules and rights, and reconcile to cooperate. These views suggest that when survival becomes difficult as during droughts, people decide to defer actions to raid until an appropriate time in the future. During the rainy seasons animals are in good condition and strong to withstand long distance trek, manpower demand is low, enhanced chance of rain to wash away tracks and rich vegetation cover, each or all in combination, enable raiding and increase the prospects of successful raiding.
In addition, when changes in incidences of conflicts are normalized by the human populations in per capita terms (i.e. conflict incidents in each period are divided by the corresponding human population) to allow comparison of individual incidents over time, there is no evidence that more violence is occurring now than in past periods. Moreover, it was inquired whether previous drought (and high livestock death) years are associated with (violent) conflicts in the subsequent years. Here, too, no evidence was found that devastating droughts in previous years are likely to be related to more violent conflicts or raids in subsequent years without drought, or receiving above-average rainfall amounts. Therefore, evidence from the case-study analysis of the inter-ethnic conflicts suggests that the validity of the claim that the scarcity of natural resources causes conflicts among pastoralists is not supported. Still, where and why pastoral conflicts occur remain intriguing questions. This evidence shifts to the question why people may not fight over resources they do not have or have in short supply; thus hinting at instances of human cooperation in the face of growing scarcity of key resources.

Full article can be found under: www.life-peace.org/default2.asp?xid=316

---

**Excerpts of the article: Mobil Pastoralist by M. Targhi Farvar**

**MYTH ABOUT PASTORALISM**

Regrettably there are myths and misunderstandings concerning nomadic pastoralism abound, at times with a touch of schizophrenic attitude. We can list several myths:

1. **Pastoralism is an archaic form of production not adapted to modernity.** This is simply not true. The rangelands are seasonally productive and need to be grazed seasonally.

2. **All conflicts are caused by mobile pastoralists.** In fact most conflicts are caused by the fact that sedentary rural populations, the private sector and government moved into the land traditionally owned and used by pastoralists. “Protected areas” have been set up without consulting them, military based and mining extraction outfits have been placed in the middle of their pastoral routes and corridors, roads have been crisscrossing the same routes without regard to the need of passage for the animals and the inevitable accidents going to be caused, housing developments have been set up as if urban people were going to use them, and so on. A thousand impediments exist to nomadic lifestyles simply because planners are usually sedentary people who do understand the mobile peoples and their needs. In addition, when conflict happens, instead of the traditional systems of conflict resolution, the police and urban courts (usually well linked to settled people) are now called in as arbitrators. Their judgments often leave the mobile pastoralists spellbound, as their rights are stripped away without any meaningful recourse to remedial action.

3. **Mobile Pastoralism destroys biodiversity and leads to desertification.** Far from being a destroyer of biodiversity, mobile pastoralists of range management system are a prerequisite of biodiversity. Most range that does not receive the benefits of livestock stomping, gentle ploughing, browsing, seed spreading and fertilisation will turn into lower biodiversity wooded shrub land.

4. **Mobile pastoralists overgraze their land.** It is now well known that most drylands are non-equilibrium ecosystems (not least because of unreliable and highly variable seasonal and annual rainfall) requiring a different kind of management than equilibrium ecosystems. This concept, however, is relatively recent and has revolutionised the thinking and practice to range management and...
ecology in the past couple of decades. The conventional carrying capacity calculation for rangelands- too often still practiced- is no longer scientifically valid. The traditional practices of the mobile pastoralists themselves are finally understood as much more technically correct than the calculations of conventional range management experts. In some countries, the single most important negative impact on the ecological health of the rangelands is related to the nationalisation of the rangeland by the state and their ensuing control by technocrats and bureaucrats. The old systems were based on a complex understanding of the ecosystems and their varying carrying capacity coupled with a fine-tuned opportunistic approach to using available resources in micro-environments. A good deal of research in specific local situations is still needed to better understand the ecology and responses of the drylands.

THE WORLD ALLIANCE OF MOBILE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES (WAMIP)

During the 5th World Parks Congress (WPC) in Durban, South Africa, in September 2003, a large number of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (MIPs) came together and formed a caucus. About forty MIPs from four continents, primarily nomadic pastoralists, and some professionals concerned with both conservation and mobile livelihoods took part in a preparatory pre-WPC workshop promoted and supported by IUCN/CEESP. This assembly helped to prepare for a number of further meetings and presentations throughout the Congress (in particular as part of the Governance Stream). The workshop used and refined a number of ideas originally included in the Dana Declaration of 2002. These prepared the ground for analyzing MIPs’ common concerns and priorities, and working together to find solutions for them. Many important results were achieved at the WPC, including a specific recommendation on MIPs and important communication work with the broader conservation community, which had rarely previously heard of the positive conservation impacts of mobile lifestyles. At the end of the WPC, the MIPs formed the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP). A Steering Committee of 7 members was formed by consensus, of which 5 members were again present for the meeting in Kuala Lumpur.

The mission of WAMIP is to assist and empower mobile indigenous peoples throughout the world to maintain their mobile lifestyles in pursuit of livelihoods and cultural identity; to sustainably manage their common property resources and to obtain the full respect of their rights. In such a world, mobile indigenous peoples will enjoy broad social recognition and respect. Enabling legal and policy environments will allow them to determine priorities and strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of their lands, territories and other resources based on their own tenure systems and customary laws. They will be free to maintain and develop their distinct identities and cultural values, and to exercise strong cultural traditions and customs, including social organisation, distinctive juridical customs, and appropriate educational approaches. In addition, they will be free to maintain and develop contacts, relations, and cooperation with other peoples across international borders and, as needed, engage in peaceful resolution of conflict with other peoples and countries.

By M.Taghi Farvar, chairman of the Board of Directors of Drynet partner CENESTA, Iran

Full article can be found under drynet-net.org

Pictures courtesy of CENESTA
The manifesto begins by stating that “the neo-liberal model destroys people through privatisation and the destruction of the natural elements” and condemns this behaviour in different areas such as energy, aquaculture and fisheries, large mining operations, monoculture and agrofuels, among others. That is why the participants in the meeting worked in different areas that threaten the communities that were present. For example, it was agreed to require that large mining companies “fulfil their commitments” and that “new projects are rejected” because “mining is not needed if there are other local options.”

In aquaculture and fisheries, the manifesto says, “we demand that the rights of the communities are defended, considering the lack of democracy and governance in the development of aquaculture and fisheries, and that the culture and history of the territories impacted by salmon monoculture and other industry practices are recovered.”

In the energy industry “we demand the fair use of energy resources” using the necessary means, and the promotion of Non-Conventional Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency. Of course, “we reject the option of thermoelectric, large scale hydroelectric plants and nuclear power.”

The manifesto also “proposes an urban reform to build democratic and sustainable cities,” where democratic and binding processes should be included in land-use planning; the recovery of the concept of neighbourhood, and the promotion of eco-building, ecological neighbourhoods and home vegetable gardens, among others.

On the agroforestry level, “we will put pressure on forest companies to give answers and to assume the accountability for decades of exploitation and destruction.” We demand the promotion of education in agroecology, the abolition of Decree Law 701, the restitution of lands to native peoples, the halting of the process to approve the Plant Breeders Act and the ban on GM crops, among other proposals.

Concerning the next summit in Copenhagen, the meeting attendees expressed that Chile should demand “recognition of the historic debt by northern countries”. Also the government should “give greater prominence to the affected communities in this agreement.”

The “country position” of Chile should demand “that the industrialized countries reduce drastically their emissions”, that the carbon market is excluded, “specifically the Clean Development Mechanism”, and that they “take responsibility as creditors of the debt that has resulted from excessive emissions of CO2 from 200 years ago to date”.

Finally, communities demand that “real and consistent solutions are proposed, that human-scale forms of energy are developed, enhancing the sovereignty of peoples and communities through the protection of their rights and resources”, that a country position on these subjects is “expanded and strengthen from society as a whole, to incorporate the causes of Climate Change”.

*By Drynet partner: OLCA, Chile*