Is settling pastoralists a viable livelihood strategy? Implication for policy dialogue
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Pastoralism in east Africa is facing social, environmental, economic, and policy challenges. Similarly, Ethiopian pastoralists were encountered with three main problems: poverty, vulnerability, and political marginalization. The government’s strategy was to develop the abandon lands in the arid and semi-arid regions of the country through large scale private and public projects; while settling pastoralists near rivers. This paper tries to provide an answer to whether settling pastoral society is viable or not based on review of literature. Some argue that the government is robbing people of their ancestral lands; others as if it’s inappropriate strategy, and still others appreciate that it is a viable strategy. This review investigated that settlement by itself does not seem to be viable as evidenced from some communities. The argument of this paper is that pastoral livelihoods are diverse and policy needs to consider this diversity. Thus, one side does not fit for all. The conclusion is thus settling was a necessary condition for development of pastoral lands, but it is not a sufficient condition for development of pastoralists.
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INTRODUCTION

The future of pastoralism is the subject of national and global discussions. The concerns are catalyzing the scientific community to generate knowledge and share experiences and best practices that may offer solutions for the survival of pastoralism and the millions of people dependant on this livelihood (Galaty et al, 1981; Kisiangani and Aziz, 2011). According to Swift (1988) pastoralists are households where more than 50% household income / consumption is derived from livestock or livestock related activities, either as a result of sales of livestock products or of direct consumption, and agro-pastoralists as deriving 25-50% income/consumption from livestock produce. The pastoralist management system involves a complex set of elements that are linked together by a requirement for land and a responsibility to safeguard it. They include: Mobility, keeping or possessing large herds of livestock, herd diversification and splitting, and focused mutual assistance systems (PFE, 2010).

Pastoralism and agro-pastoralism are the dominant livestock production systems in most parts of sub-Saharan Africa’s arid and semi-arid zones, including Ethiopia. But grazing lands are being lost due to drought, increasing population pressure and restricted access to land. This is forcing more and more pastoralists to settle and grow crops, resulting in considerable reduction in grazing lands (Kisiangani and Aziz, 2011).

Ethiopia is home for more than 12- 15 million pastoralists and agro pastoralists who reside in 61% of the nation's landmass (PFE, 2008). The pastoral areas are estimated to comprise 42% of the national total livestock population. Livestock and livestock products provide about 12-17% of Ethiopia's foreign exchange earnings, out of which hides and skins contribute about 90%. It contributes about 33% to the agricultural GDP and 16% to the national GDP (figure 1). It makes a significant contribution to the national economies both in terms of supporting their own households and export earnings. Moreover, the pastoral areas are rich in biodiversities, mineral and water resources as well as energy resources, and untapped tourist attractions (Belachew, 2004; PFE, 2002: 2008).

Similar to other sub Saharan countries the Ethiopian pastoralists have been subjected to political marginalization. Policies have favored externally-imposed development schemes which often alienate and expropriate pastoral lands in favor of large-scale commercial activities (Eyasu and Feyera, 2010). They are the most deprived areas of the country in terms of access to development opportunities, infrastructure and
services (Gebru, et al, 2004; Mohammed, 2004). They tend to be perpetual famine relief clients (Helland, 2006). Pastoralist livelihoods are increasingly under pressure and caught in a downward spiral of resource depletion, and diminishing resilience against drought (UNOCHA, 2007); loss of livestock and shrinking rangelands (PFE, et al, 2010); break up of traditional governance; lack of market linkage, education, public health, veterinary services, and water both for human and for livestock and rural finance are the least developed (Pavanello, 2009; PFE, 2002).

The settling of formerly mobile pastoral populations is occurring rapidly throughout East Africa. It has been encouraged by international development agencies and national governments to alleviate problems of poverty and food insecurity (Fratkin, et al, 2006). With similar argument, the government of Ethiopia opted for resettling pastoralists in order to mitigate their problems. However, it is not convincing development practitioners whether this is a viable livelihood strategy or not. Thus, the main aim of this paper is to bring into dialogue the issue of settling pastoralists with focus on Ethiopia. The rest of this paper is organized as problems of pastoralists, reasons for settlement, arguments of settlements and conclusion.

**Problems of pastoralists: Poverty, vulnerability and marginalization**

Pastoralists across the world suffer serious problems of poverty, vulnerability to shocks and political marginality. In Ethiopia, despite decades of pastoral development programmes and a plethora of policies designed to improve livelihoods, the vast majority of pastoral people still face a multitude of problems (Hasse and Odhiambo, 2001). The main problems encountering pastoralists can be poverty, vulnerability and political marginalization.

**Poverty**

Worldwide pastoralists constitute one of the poorest
population sub-groups, and among African pastoralists the incidence of extreme poverty ranges from 25 to 55 percent (ALIVE, 2007). The literature dealing with pastoral poverty in Ethiopia is limited, reflecting the lack of an appropriate and reliable household survey data that would allow targeting. Since the early 1990’s, periodic household surveys have been conducted that have facilitated the analysis of both urban and rural poverty (Tesfaye, 2006); however, pastoral poverty is not well understood or appreciated by governments, policy makers, donors, development practitioners. Both pastoralism and poverty are dealt with as simple categories, almost synonymous, with no need for internal differentiation (Nori, et al, 2008; Saverio, 2001).

Most studies on poverty indicate that the incidence of poverty is higher in rural compared to urban Ethiopia with respect to head count ratio of 39.3% and 35.1% respectively (MoFED, 2006); The manifestation lies in that pastoral areas are marginal in terms of access to basic services, and vulnerable to various shocks. Obviously one can understand that pastoral areas are poorer than rural areas. The existence of both transitory and chronic forms of poverty has a long history in pastoral areas of the country (Bekele, 2008). Many believe that pastoral poverty is growing, not declining (Hailu, 2008). However, there is a perception among some government and donor experts that “Pastoralists aren’t poor because they have so many animals. It is obvious that studies done with different methodologies sometimes reach conflicting conclusions, with one study claiming poverty is increasing, another that it is diminishing (Swift, 2004). However, Devereux (2006) noted the “paradox of wellbeing and vulnerability” in Somali region by reference to food security indicators. Although apparently wellbeing, the region still had a child stunting level of 48% and child wasting of 11.7% in 2002. Poverty measures indicate that more than half of the households in south omo (Adugna, et al, 2011); , about 56% of the total population in Afar region is classified as poor and around 275,000 citizens of Afar Region are chronically food insecure (PFE, 2009) were poor.

Although the results of many contradict, the fact is that poverty is persistent in pastoral lands of Ethiopia. Saverio (2001) indicated that, pastoralism and poverty are often associated by force of logic. They are believed to depend on food relief for their survival. Indeed, food relief distribution provides a strong argument to the view that the pastoral way of life is structurally flawed and pastoralists cannot even feed themselves ( Hesse and Odhiambo 2001, Hailu, 2008). In support of this, the report of Adugna, et al (2011) indicated that access to grazing land and the trend in the number of livestock holding has been declining in pastoral societies of southern Ethiopia. Sedentarization and reduced mobility in turn reduces productivity of livestock and increases the vulnerability of pastoralists to drought, which leads to a downward spiral of poverty (ALIVE, 2007).

**Vulnerability**

Vulnerability is a term used to describe exposure to hazards and shocks. Vulnerability may be related to particular livelihood systems, to wellbeing status, or people’s social or political status. People are vulnerable when they lack the resilience to resist to an external shock.

African pastoral systems in the last several decades have experienced extreme vulnerability to recurrent livelihood shocks and negative trends that have substantially implied secular deterioration in pastoralist welfare. The sustainability of the pastoral mode of production has been significantly undermined due to recurrent exposures to exogenous pressures of natural shocks, especially recurrent droughts, violent conflicts, and inappropriate interventions, (Devereux 2006). Evidence of this vulnerability is found in the long record of catastrophic droughts in Africa causing mass mortality of livestock, most of it belonging to pastoralists (Morton, 2008). The recent drought crisis in northern and north-eastern Kenya has profoundly affected the lives of pastoralists leading to appeals for emergency assistance and increased attention to long term investment in the region (Table 1).

At present, more than 50% of the chronically drought affected population in Ethiopia are from the pastoral areas. The frequency of drought recurrence is greater than before, manifested once every two to three years and, at times, once every year, affecting either big areas or small pockets. Although the degree and impact of the drought varies across the pastoral groups, it remains a major cause of asset losses and resource degradation leading to poverty. It also increases vulnerability of livestock to death and equally threatens the pastoralist’s livelihoods (Bruk, 2004; PFE, 2002). As a result drought, pastoral communities are highly vulnerable to food insecurity as well (Bushell, 2009; FDRE, 2002; Morton, 2008). One of the damaging impacts of such a trend is related to the observed degradation of the indigenous social support capacity of the system, critical water shortage and waterborne diseases are rampant in pastoralists.

The frustrating issue is that climate change in much of the tropics will be manifested in increased frequency and severity of drought, and pastoralists will more and more become victims of this, further calling into question the fundamental sustainability of pastoralism as a livelihood. There are also fears that pastoralists, as purchasers of cereals on the market (and thus ultimately on the world market) will be vulnerable to increasing world grain prices (Morton, 2008). Some argue that it is not meteorological drought that makes the pastoralists more vulnerable; rather, it is the increasing marginalisation of their drought-response mechanisms especially the mobility of people and animals, are the main reason for this (Bruk, 2004, Devereux 2006; Odi, 2010; UN OCHA, 2006).
The other source of vulnerability in pastoral areas is that of conflict prevalence. Recent conflicts between pastoral groups, as between Borena and some Somali clans (the Geri and Degodi), have been serious. The major cause of this conflict is competition over grazing land and watering points that remained under dispute for many years. The conflicts between the Borena and Hamar pastoralists and the Borena and Arbore pastoralists have been ongoing for many years and have still not been resolved. Conflict is sometimes caused by traditional beliefs and institutions, specifically those associated with cattle raiding. Some groups which have access to superior weapons try to raid others and snatch livestock, sometimes causing human death. Border conflicts also affect the livelihood of the pastoralists. For instance, the Afars, Somali and Borena pastoralists have lost their livestock and faced displacement due to Ethio-Somali and Ethio-Eritrean border conflicts (Mohammed, 2004).

### POLITICAL MARGINALIZATION

Pastoralists are not just poor and vulnerable, they are also marginalised. In most African countries pastoralists belong to ethnic minorities and not to the politically, economically and culturally dominant ethnic groups.

In recent years the Government of Ethiopia has become more decentralized. Pastoral rights are now protected in the Constitution and pastoral issues are debated in Parliament. However, the positive statements in these policy documents are rarely translated into actions and strategies that deliver on their promises (Gebru, et al, 2004; Odi, 2010). The Government has also acknowledged, in almost all its policy documents, the existence of a persistent knowledge gap on the development of pastoral areas. Article 40 of the Ethiopian constitution recognizes “pastoralists to free land for grazing” and not to be displaced from their own lands”. Article 41, asserts the right of pastoralists “to receive fair prices for their products that would lead to improvement in their conditions of life”. On the basis of this constitution, while the government has, in the past few years, issued different strategies, plans and programs, the majority of them, however, didn't dwell on pastoral issues with any depth (Mohammed, 2004, Odi, 2009, UNOCHA, 2007).

Yet many policymakers in Ethiopia and also in other countries still think that sedentarisation of pastoralists is the best way forward, and that mobile pastoralism is backward and primitive and a cause for poverty and land degradation. However, the restructuring of tenure arrangements in pastoral societies may be seen as an aspect of the general process of marginalization of pastoral society in Ethiopia (Helland, 2006). Severe restrictions on the traditional mobile pastoral production systems results in an increased number of pastoralists inability to cope with and recover from drought and other shocks (Odi, 2010). This also lead to intensification of conflict, stricter control over cross-border trade, a land-tenure policy that disadvantages pastoralists, lack of political power among pastoralists, and policy maker's disregard of indigenous knowledge, skills and customary institutions (Beruk, 2003, PFE, 2002). In Ethiopia rural and urban lands, including the pastoral areas, belong to the state but in pastoral areas land holding arrangements are not clear. There are no clear rules giving security to the people who have used and cared for the land over generations (PFE, et al, 2010).

It's not only marginalization in terms of participation, benefit sharing and development. Pastoral societies were generally illiterate or possess very small school achievement, which further inhibit their active participation in public affairs and secure better jobs.
Reasons of settlement

Pastoralists settle for a variety of reasons, both in response to “pushes” away from the pastoral economy and to “pulls” of urban or agricultural life. The focus of this paper is to present why pastoralists were settling mainly from the view of both push factors.

Livelihood diversification

Rural livelihood diversification is defined as ‘the process by which rural households/pastoralists construct an increasingly diverse portfolio of activities and assets in order to survive and to improve their standard of living’ (Ellis, 2000; Ellis, 2007). According to Little, et al (2006), livelihoods diversification in pastoral areas is: ‘the pursuit of any non-pastoral income-earning activity, whether in rural or urban areas. Available evidence on rural household income portfolios witnesses the prevalence of livelihood diversification (Ellis, 2007).

According to Odi (2010) there are four dominant livelihood systems in pastoral areas across the Horn of Africa: Livestock-based livelihoods; agro-pastoral livelihoods – these combine extensive livestock rearing and rain-fed cereal production; Sedentary farmers – practice mixed farming, cultivating food crops with modest sheep and goat herds; Ex-pastoralists – these are households who have lost their livestock and now depend largely on human labor.

Evidence from sub Saharan Africa has shown that decreasing farm size caused by sub-division at inheritance; increasing inability of young people to access enough land to take up farming as their main occupation; poor farm performance; and increased climatic variation, causing greater extremes across seasons and years (Ellis, 2007). Similarly, in southern Ethiopia pastoralists are moving from pure pastoralism to agro-pastoralism due to environmental conditions, poor pasture and livestock productivity, and population growth (Kejela, et al, 2007).

Contemporary livelihoods in pastoral areas are also more diversified and more integrated with the cash economy than ever before, with most households having access to one or more sources of income that are not derived from livestock production and marketing. For instance, off farm income sources accounts for more than 17% of income of pastoral households in southern Ethiopia (figure 1). This figure is expected to rise in the future due to advancement of infrastructure and public services in the area (Adugna, et al, 2011). Pastoral households themselves will continue to diversify to include waged employment, agriculture where this is feasible, and trading activities as supplements to livestock-based incomes (Little, et al, 2010).

Population growth

In developing world the population growth is expected to rise. Sandford (2006) stated that human population in the rangelands of the Horn is growing rapidly. Small and medium-sized towns will continue to grow in pastoral regions, outpacing the growth in rural populations, and will help to spur an increasingly diversified economy (Little, et al, 2010). Similarly, human population was expected to grow alarmingly in pastoral areas of Ethiopia for two reasons. The first is due to low family planning services and the second is illiteracy. However, due to lack of evidence on human population growth rates in pastoral areas; this study only presents the general trends of human population in Ethiopia. The rate of human population growth was forecasted at 3% per annum (Figure 2).
Deterioration of pastoral livelihoods

Pastoral livelihoods is considered sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, while not undermining the natural resource base (Chambers and Conway, 1992). Deteriorated livelihood is unsustainable livelihood that did not withstand risk.

Traditional mobility within the pastoralist system is compromised by declining access to rangeland resources. This is occurring due to a number of reasons, including the alienation of pastoral land, the conversion of wet season pasture to other land uses and conflict and insecurity, which have rendered some areas inaccessible. This study revealed their traditional practice will never move them long distances than opting for improving livelihoods through modern means. Since, traditional pastoralism is not sustainable by itself linking market opportunity to local growth, diversification of livelihood options and establishing new activities outside pastoralism is of paramount importance, which causes sedenterization to be real.

Government policy

Unfavorable government policies towards traditional pastoralism are widespread in developing nations. Government policy in the Greater Horn of Africa was, for much of the twentieth century, geared towards making pastoralist groups stay in one place in the interests of drawing borders, establishing nation states and “modernizing”. This, so the theory goes, would allow the provision of education, water and all those other benefits of progress. The continuing upheaval by the Ethiopian government of settlement of pastoralists along rivers is one example of such policy inertia (Morton, 2008). In Ethiopia much debate and policy advice is still based on assumptions that see a sedentary lifestyle as the desirable development outcome for pastoralist communities (Fikadu and Korf, 2008).

In policy documents in Ethiopia, it is acknowledged that settlement is a must in order to bring about “accelerated and sustainable development” that can improve the livelihood of the pastoralists (Mohammed, 2004). The PASDEP calls for ‘necessary measures to be put in place to encourage pastoralists to settle voluntarily’ and many in government think that it would be in the interest of pastoralists to settle and become engaged in rainfed farming (PCDP, 2006). In the Somali region, which has just under 1.5 million people out of about 5 million in need of food aid, the idea is to create villages near rivers and build irrigation systems, roads, health clinics, and schools. The government sees this as a life-saving measure and as a way to help the pastoralists benefit from Ethiopia’s double-digit economic growth. In the dry regions of Somali and Afar, the government hopes 500,000 people in each will resettle, while in the western states of Gambella and Benishangul-Gumuz it wants 450,000 to move. But some activists say the programs overseen by local governments will be coercive and rob people of their ancestral lands (Davison, 2011).

Arguments on pastoral settlement

Much of the literatures on the issue of settling pastoralists are against the efforts by governments and aid agencies that supported and encouraged sedenterization. The argument on pastoralism that it has immense potential for reducing poverty, generating economic growth, and managing the environment has convinced most anthropologists and sociologists. They recommend just the provision of the necessary support to enhance pastoralists own production systems and participating them in decision making; avoiding sedentarization as a general solution to pastoral development problems (McPeak and Little, 2003). In line with this argument, some indicated that there is lack of evidence that settlement would help strengthen livelihoods or reduce vulnerability like could aggravate the conflict situation in pastoral areas (Mohammed, 2004). If settlement expansion continues, it is probable that wildlife populations will decline drastically in the rangelands around (Lamprey and Reid, 2004).

Others economists and development economists strongly recommend the designed intervention of governments to develop the pastoral areas. Such policies focused on ‘modernising’ the livestock sector, sedentarising pastoralists and privatising land tenure (Odi, 2010). In agreement with this argument, whether it is viable or not settlement of African pastoralists has become a reality. Under the banner of socioeconomic improvement and modernization, they therefore attempt to settle their nomadic populations by providing them with plots of land and housing. This has happened for instance in Sudan, Israël Jordan and China (Fratkin, et al, 2006; McPeak and Little, 2005, Ptackova, 2011). These sedenterization increased household’s access to public education, health facilities, and larger markets. It has been shown that sedentarization of families have considerable advantages in terms of access to services. The promoters of the idea view nomads’ settlement as a policy for achieving end goals for the nomads, by securing their continued physical presence in their habitat areas, access to social services and other benefits, resulting in their effective contribution to local governance (UNDP, 2006).

Contrary to policy expectation, some empirical evidences in Africa indicated that the consequence of settlement is not as expected. For instance, Fratkin, et al (2006) from a three-year study of pastoral and settled communities in northern Kenya investigated that
Table 2. Consequences of settling pastoralists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pastoral groups</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rendille communities</td>
<td>Challenged sedentarization without reducing the high mobility of livestock herding</td>
<td>Xiaogang (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai</td>
<td></td>
<td>livestock holdings on the ranch have now fallen to three livestock units/ adult</td>
<td>Lamprey and Reid (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Raids and skirmishes pastoral community</td>
<td>Lack of full commitment to address the needs of settled pastoralists</td>
<td>UNDP, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herd loss and milk reduction</td>
<td>ALIVE (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Tibetan nomad society</td>
<td>The lack of mobility caused by enclosing the living space of people and livestock adds also to the severe grassland degradation that currently occurs; loss of important cultural aspects of the nomadic society; and dependence on governmental subsidies in the settlements, having lost their own source of income</td>
<td>Ptackova (2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Milk output from mobile and sedentary herds, Southern Sudan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Mobility</th>
<th>Average yield per cow per day</th>
<th>Source: ALIVE, 2007 (as cited from Niamir, 1982)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry season</td>
<td>Wet season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nutritional, health and growth status of pastoral children were significantly better than settled ones. Dietary change represents a fundamental difference between mobile pastoral and settled communities. Similarly, Ekpo, et al (2008) in Nigeria indicate that there is high prevalence of malnutrition among settled pastoral Fulani children, possibly due to changes in food habits and lifestyle occasion by the transition from nomadic to sedentary living. (Table 2). The experience of nomads settlement in Sudan has also shown that the initially opted level of service delivery did not achieved. For instance, water supply services only 11%, no electric services provided, education 28.8% coverage with high dropout rates (UNDP, 2006). Oxfam from practical experience concluded that pastoralists were much better off than their sedentary fellows and Pastoralism proved itself more suited to the area than farming (ECHO, 2009).

By encouraging pastoralists to settle and pushing them towards sedentary lifestyles, many governments in the region worsened rather than improved the lot of their constituents (ECHO, 2009). Thus, it is possible to argue that efforts to develop pastoralists through settlement are misguided attempts. Settlement and a progressive involvement in agriculture can however be an option for pastoralists who have lost their livestock and need to look for alternative livelihoods, including in urban areas, but it should not be considered for successful pastoralists. The many unsuccessful attempts to settle pastoralists in East Africa and the Horn do not need repeating (Pantuliano and Wekesa, 2008).

It has been documented that reduced mobility has a relationship with increased herd loss. Evidence from Sudan has shown that the more mobile herds lost only 5 percent of their herds, whilst the more settled herds lost up to 85 percent over the drought period March 2000 to September (ALIVE, 2007). Settlements of pastoral people increase the pressure on the fragile resource base. This leads to a pattern of localized degradation that further diminishes the productivity of the livestock held by the town-based poor. Evidence from southern Sudan indicated that milk per cow per day for mobile livestock is almost double of sedentary both in dry and wet seasons (Table 3).

Policy advises to Ethiopian pastoralists like that of Little, et al (2010) emphasized the need to sustain the efficient use of variable dry rangelands by protecting the importance of pastoral mobility and avoiding sedentarization as a general solution to pastoral development problems; and recognizing existing tenure systems that insure pastoralists access to land and water resources, so they can produce their tradable products. Contrary to Litteles comment, Sandford (2006); on his
too many people too few livestock thesis argued that the future of pure pastoralism is unviable due to human, livestock and environment mismatch and recommended that emigration from pastoral areas: development of irrigation and diversified income sources in pastoral areas, and reducing population pressure as a way forward. But, there is no evidence that indicate a proof for viability of emigrating pastoralists from their own lands.
One of the opponents of Sandfords thesis was that cultivation of crops in small holding and fragmented land has not yet acknowledged for its failure of addressing food security goal. Added to this, the arid and semi arid pastoral environment is uncomfortable for cropping, albeit it is considered a poor choice to cultivation particularly since the drylands they occupy are uniquely suited to rearing of livestock (Ekaya, 2005; Morton 2008).
This paper brings a new insight that condemn both of the extreme arguments; i.e, absolute appreciation of traditional pastoralism and complete support for mass settlement. The evidence that pastoralists were under poverty and vulnerability urge the need for new strategy to improve their livelihoods. It is also ensured that pure pastoralism does not feed all of the pastoral groups (the poor, destitute, widowed women etc) as pastoral livelihoods are diverse. There must also be an equilibrium that balances the extreme arguments by settling those poor households and others who have already exercised sedenterization, while allowing access to mobility to the better off households with large herd size. Otherwise, the effort to provide education, health, and water facility to pastoral society deserves wide appreciations.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pastoralist populations are under pressure induced by natural and environmental forces. They are facing challenges of poverty, vulnerability and political marginalization. Research findings are largely in agreement that pastoralism uniquely well adapted to dry lands than cultivation. However, evidence has shown that traditional pastoralism is not sustainable. In spite of the arguments against settling pastoralists; evidence from the already settled groups has shown that the livelihoods of settled pastoralists were not improved as one expects. The conclusion is thus settling was a necessary condition for development of pastoral lands, but it is not a sufficient condition for development of pastoralists.

Pastoral livelihoods are diverse and pastoralists are far from homogeneity. Rather than imposing a single solution (mass settlement) on all pastoral groups’ policy-makers should provide appropriate support to whichever pathway particular groups choose to follow. Thus, the government has to first settle poor, food insecure and destitute pastoralists, but provide support in improvement of range land, conflict management and skill improvement; strengthening pastoralists’ access to markets and livestock trade, improved veterinary services device to wealthy pastoralists, and still provide diverse options of livelihood portfolios to others choice since one size fits does not serve all.
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