

*Report on the*

## **Poverty, Livelihoods and the Environment**

Policy Workshop, Gauteng, 10-12 September 2001

Supported by UK DFID and focusing on the outputs of the  
**PANRUSA** (Poverty, policy & natural resource use in southern Africa)  
and

**MARENA** (Natural resource management institutions in post-conflict  
countries)

DFID-funded research projects

working in

**Botswana, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Namibia & South Africa**

conducted through

The Universities of Sheffield and Sussex, UK,

working with local partners

*This report summarises activities and outcomes, and is primarily intended for participants at the workshop, who are conversant with the summary project outputs.*

### Contents

Workshop introduction

Introduction to briefing notes

Main project findings

Workshop discussion summary

Overview

List of participants

## Workshop introduction

*The PANRUSA and MARENA projects* were commissioned in 1998 by the London office of the UK's Department For International Development, within the framework of the Natural Resources Policy Research Programme. This programme targets activities to deliver support for the implementation of policies that promote sustainable livelihoods in developing countries.

The two projects were conducted by researchers who were independent both of DFID and the governments of the countries in which research took place. Thus the research teams, based at the Universities of Sheffield and Sussex in the UK and collaborating with local researchers, carried neither any specific agendas of DFID nor any specific agendas of the governments of the countries in which research was conducted, nor of any NGOs working in those countries. The research was therefore *agenda-neutral* in political terms, and did not have targeted outcomes or anticipated findings.

*The workshop* was set up to enable representatives of the governments of the countries in which the research was conducted, NGO staff, the researchers and their collaborators, and DFID staff, to meet and discuss the overall research findings of the projects. Participants were therefore provided with access to briefing notes in advance of the meeting to facilitate such discussion. The workshop itself was part of the ongoing research process, and was not intended to simply agree or disagree with research outputs. By combining two research projects, with different goals and working in different countries, it was hoped to facilitate:

- consideration of generic issues relevant to poverty reduction and sustainable rural livelihood development,
- identifying specific and generic issues affecting the formulation of policies targeted at these goals,
- The exchange of views, experiences and best practices between country representatives.

By combining two research projects in a single workshop, it was hoped to achieve *value-added* dimensions in the discussion and consideration of generic issues relating to livelihoods, poverty and natural resource use, incorporating a wider range of experiences and contexts than if a single project alone had been the focus. A greater diversity of political and environmental contexts was therefore represented in discussions, facilitating a greater range of comparative situations and frameworks.

### *The workshop centred around:*

- A half day of presentations by DFID on the research programme, and by the project teams on their respective key findings;
- A day of breakout groups to discuss generic themes but focussing on the project outputs to inform discussions;
- A half day of plenary discussion on the outcomes of previous sessions and of the projects.

*This report* provides a concise summary of project findings and workshop discussions, for the workshop participants. It should be read in conjunction with the outputs of the research projects and the summaries of talks that were provided to the participants upon registration.

**PANRUSA** conducted research into the impacts of natural resource related government policies on poverty and sustainable natural resource use in drylands in southern Africa. The focus on drylands reflects their extent in the region and their vulnerability to environmental variability and human pressures. Three areas each divided by an international boundary and each with a differing degree of aridity were studied. Each cross-border area therefore embraced two countries, allowing differing policy domains to be explored for their impacts on rural livelihoods and their sustainability. The countries investigated, Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, have different policy legacies and have all ratified the UNCCD. The UNCCD recognises strong links between environmental degradation and poverty, and ratifying countries have the obligation to develop policies that promote sustainable livelihoods, sustainable natural resource use and poverty reduction amongst the rural poor.

**MARENA** conducted research to identify the constraints to, and opportunities for the reconstruction of sustainable and participatory RNR management institutions in post-conflict situations, and their role in environmental rehabilitation. After an initial phase of training, identification and consultation with RNR stakeholders in two case study countries, Mozambique and Ethiopia, and development of an analytical framework, fieldwork was carried out in five study sites in North and South Wello, South Oromia (Ethiopia) and two parts of Manica Province (Mozambique).

## Introduction to briefing notes

PANRUSA and MARENA have produced summary reports of the main project findings, in the form of Briefing Notes. Circulated to participants at the workshop, they are also on the web at:

<http://www.shef.ac.uk/panrusa>

and

<http://www.geog.susx.ac.uk/research/development/marena/>

The briefing notes are written as jargon-free, easily accessible summaries of research methods, finding and implications. PANRUSA briefing notes are thematic, containing examples of findings from the three study countries, Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, and their format and approach has since been adopted by a further DFID funded project in Namibia (the WILD project). Where relevant, subsidiary notes focus on a particular study region. Each note also has short key-points on the front page to allow the main points to be accessed easily. MARENA briefing notes are structured in the same way, but are country specific, reflecting the contrasting situations and findings from Ethiopia and Mozambique.

The series of briefing notes are continually being added to as further analyses reveal new findings.

### *PANRUSA Briefing Notes*

1. PANRUSA - An Overview
  - 1A. Investigating policy, poverty and livelihoods: methods for social research
  - 1B. Rangeland change and land user perspectives: research methods
  - 1C. Nutrients in mixed farming systems: research methods
  - 1D. Using Remote Sensing to Monitor Rangelands
  - 1E. Profile of PANRUSA study area
  - 1F. Community feedback- rationale and methods
2. Poverty, Policies and Natural Resource Based Livelihoods
3. CCD and Frameworks for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable NR Use
4. Land Policies in Communal Rangelands
  - 4A. Land Policies and Livelihoods in Communal Rangelands in the arid southwest
  - 4B. Land Policies and Livelihoods in Communal Rangelands in the semiarid northwest
  - 4C. Land Policies and Livelihoods in Communal Rangelands in the dry sub-humid southeast
5. People, Rangeland Change and Sustainability
  - 5A. People, Rangeland Change and Sustainability in the semiarid northwest
  - 5B. People, Rangeland Change and Sustainability in the arid southwest
6. Soil Fertility and Policy Change
7. Chains of Communication in the Policy Process
8. Managing Risk in Southern African Drylands
  - 8a. Managing Risk in Southern African Drylands in the arid southwest
  - 8b. Managing Risk in Southern African Drylands in the semiarid northwest

- 8c. Managing Risk in Southern African Drylands in the dry sub-humid south east
- 9. Land Reform, Power and Participation
- 10. Policy Intervention, Livelihood Sustainability and the Environment
  - 10A. Policy Intervention, Livelihood Sustainability and the Environment: The TGLP (In preparation)
  - 10B. Policy Intervention, Livelihood Sustainability and the Environment: The FAP
- 11. Policy, Poverty and the Role of Safety Nets
- 12. The Environment, Natural Resources and Livelihoods in Southern Africa
- 13. Community feedback – outcomes and priorities

## ***MARENA Briefing Notes***

### *Ethiopia*

- 1. Conflict, 'post-conflict', and Natural Resource Management
- 2. An overview of Natural Resource Management under the Derg
- 3. Migration, resettlement and return
- 4. Returnees and Natural Resource Management
- 5. Struggles over 'the land of the deceased'
- 6. Government, community and donor relationships in NRM
- 7. Participation: a dilemma for extension agents
- 8. Interpretation of user rights
- 9. Conservation and participation in 'community forests'
- 10. Characteristics of 'traditional' forest management
- 11. Conflict, transition and deforestation
- 12. Identifying the 'community' in a contested woodlot
- 13. Gender and Natural Resource Management
- 14. Inter-group conflict over land tenure
- 15. Participatory paradigms
- 16. Trends in irrigation management
- 17. Conflicts over communal grazing areas
- 18. Forest management in Desse'a

### *Mozambique*

- 1. Conflict, 'post-conflict' and traditional authorities
- 2. Traditional leaders and CBNRM
- 3. Elephants: problem or opportunity?
- 4. Charcoal, hunting and fires
- 5. Spirits and Natural Resources
- 6. Individuals and innovations
- 7. Community representation in CBNRM: the case of Moribane
- 8. Community representation in CBNRM: the case of Tsetserra
- 9. Implementing CBNRM in M'punga
- 10. Conflicting perspectives on the natural resource base

## **Main project findings**

The dissemination of PANRUSA research findings is ongoing and is targeted at different audiences. For the workshop, the focus was on those with a policy dimension. The summary points below are provided with a briefing note reference, where further details can be found.

### ***PANRUSA findings***

- **There are a wide range of policies in all three countries with direct & also unintended indirect rural livelihoods dimensions**

PANRUSA took a bottom-up approach, working *with* rural people (see BN 1A) in understanding their livelihoods and what actually influences them, identifying policies that actually affected rural people and their livelihoods, rather than taking a top down approach of considering what governments intended to happen. This allowed the *actual* impacts of policies to be identified, including incidental unintended effects of national policies. This approach was fully commensurate with the intentions of the UN CCD, which all three study countries have ratified and the conditions of which they have therefore agreed to (see BN 3).

- **Marked differences in policy approaches between neighbouring states (e.g. levels of local empowerment & participation).**

Policy approaches relate to the way in which policies are developed and the way they are implemented, through ‘chains of communication’ (BN7). South Africa is employing an unprecedented level of community consultation in the land reform process, but to date there has actually been only limited actual local empowerment. In the study areas, community consultation and empowerment in Botswana and Namibia has to date been very limited, with policy development and implementation being highly ‘top down’ (BN9).

- **There are cases of contradictions between and within policies, leading to unsustainable/ unintended outcomes.**

A number of research observations support the finding that policy cohesiveness was not always as great as is desirable, and that policies may have significant unintended impacts on the people they are meant to benefit. Sometimes this results from an apparent lack of cross-department/cross-sector coordination in the development of policies in individual countries. For example (BN10), in Namibia communal land resettlement is the domain of one ministry whereas livelihood support is the responsibility of another: the lack of coordination between the two may be one reason why we observed post-resettlement livelihoods in Omaheke to be on downward trajectories (BN4B). In other cases, the actual day-to-day operation of a policy may disadvantage the intended beneficiaries. In North West Province, South Africa, (BN8C) farmers have been able to take out government loans to support development, but inflexibility on the terms of repayment have created severe difficulties for the farmers during droughts when farm income has not been able to meet repayments. In Southwest Botswana, RADP and destitute safety-net policies basically target the same groups of people, but RADP provides greater livelihood support. Consequently people have been moving to settlements where RADP operates and away from those where it does not: this puts marked pressure on resources and support programmes in the former (BN11). **Some**

**policies polarize wellbeing/access to NRs and favour specific livelihood sectors over possibly more sustainable alternatives. A result has been the uneven uptake of policy-generated opportunities**

While this was observed in all three study countries, this problem is well illustrated in Botswana through the effects of TGLP (BN10A), favouring existing cattle owners, and the FAP (BN10B), which favoured the livestock sector over other possible rural livelihoods, in the dry southwest of the country. Because of smallstock marketing issues in Botswana, it is actually the largest stock owners who ultimately benefited most from the FAP rather than the intended small and medium scale beneficiaries.

- **‘Short term’ policies may promote unsustainable NR use practices, and therefore unsustainable livelihoods**

Two issues relate to this finding. The first is the well-attested impact of policies that have encouraged the sinking of increasing numbers of boreholes in dry regions, encouraging permanent settlement/grazing resource use, and consequently the unsustainable use of groundwater (BN5, detailed case studies in 5A and 5B). The second is the impact of ‘safety net’ policies, intended to help the poorest/most vulnerable people through times of especial hardship (e.g. severe droughts). These policies do contribute to their intended aim: the mitigation of short term poverty, but they are also creating dependency in some cases, inhibiting the development of longer term sustainable livelihoods (BN11). In most of the study areas, the dependant sector is significant. While on the one hand short-term dependency is a function of environmental variability (e.g. drought) longer-term dependency seems to be a function of excluded/disadvantaged groups increasing, as a function of policies that favour specific groups/economic sectors.

- **Cross-border implications of some policies are marked**

PANRUSA research specifically targeted border areas in the three study countries, which in many respects are marginal to core-foci of policies and also other research. We found that in some instances policies in one country can impact on the adjacent area of the neighbouring country. This was evident for example in the ‘southeast’ study area (NW Province South Africa and Barolongs, Botswana, BN4C and 8C). Changes in Botswana’s food production strategies and differences in farmer loan opportunities between the two areas have contributed to a marked decline in agriculture, at all scales, in the Barolongs, whereas large scale commercial farming appears vibrant in NW Province. In the arid southwest, the creation of an almost impermeable border between Botswana and South Africa has made life very difficult for small and medium scale Botswanan small stock farmers, who now have real marketing difficulties, limiting their commercial opportunities (BN 4A).

- **Overall, policies are dramatically changing the rural landscapes in all three countries**

Policies are developed to generate change and improved opportunities. Constructing national policies that work in a range of often, harsh environments is challenging and may not always be feasible or may not always have the desired outcomes in all areas. Land reform is clearly a major and critical agenda in the region. In the dryland areas in which PANRUSA has operated, many agricultural policies have lead to the increasingly formalised partitioning of formerly

communally used lands. This partitioning (increasing enforced through fencing), particularly where land units are relatively small, is not necessarily desirable in terms of the development of flexible, environmentally responsive livelihood development. Along with partitioning, the project also identified a growing polarization of well being in the research areas.

The project has however observed two broad categories of response to the opportunities and constraints that policies are bringing to people:

- **Evidence of adaptability to policies: dryland people are resilient**  
Dryland people have always had to be adaptable in their livelihoods, because of the high environmental variability of the places they live in. If they are able to, people do adapt and respond to policy opportunities and constraints. In the Barolongs, people have been diversifying their livelihoods as best they can in response to the declining agricultural sector in the region (BN4C). In Omaheke, communities have been exploiting a 'policy window' where fencing is neither legal nor illegal, to manage their own resources, though this has also reduced minority group's access to land and water (BN4B).
- **Evidence of strong environmental resourcefulness**  
People seem to do 'what is best' despite policies that discourage traditional practices. This is very evident on parts of Botswana where livestock owners on fenced lands drop the fences to allow their animals to have wider access to grazing resources (BN10A). The project also found that where livestock-related environmental degradation is perceived to be significant in scientific terms, land users are identifying some benefits in terms of new animal feed opportunities (BN5A and 5B).

**At the end of the introductory presentation of the PANRUSA project, the following broad questions were raised for consideration by the workshop:**

- Are policies in the study countries really fostering sustainable livelihoods?
- Are they reducing poverty?
- Are their premises based on sustainable principles?
- What policy actions are needed to improve the situation of rural people/environments?

## *MARENA findings*

### **Constraints to the reconstruction of sustainable and participatory RNR management institutions in 'post-conflict' situations**

<i><b>Key finding</b></i>	<i><b>Policy implication/recommendation</b></i>	<i><b>Further information</b></i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Post-conflict' is a problematic notion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers should expect conflict to re-surface in the 'post-conflict' period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET01</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population movement and institutional change are key issues in 'post conflict' periods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participatory policy should explicitly address institutional constraints to RNR management and implementation of projects</li> <li>• Donors should not simply target returnees, or demobilised soldiers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET01; ET09; ET11</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local institutions have not historically focused on RNR management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers need to understand the interaction of RNR management with the social, political and spiritual realms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET12; ET14; MZ02; MZ09</li> <li>• ET14; MZ03, MZ05</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local institutions are subject to dynamic change over time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers need to understand the factors driving institutional change</li> <li>• Donors should be sensitive to heightened differences and contests within communities in 'post-conflict' contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET05; ET12; MZ02; MZ05</li> <li>• MZ09</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legitimacy of formal and informal institutions is contested at local levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers need to understand the historical bases of legitimacy of local institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET12; MZ01; MZ07; MZ08</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intra-community difference creates further problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers need to engage with the specific interests of men and women, old and young, newcomers and original residents, etc.</li> <li>• Donors should not simply target returnees, or demobilised soldiers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET11; ET14; ET17; MZ04</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survival strategies of returnees may negatively impact natural resources though blame of 'returnees' is often disproportionate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy-makers need to understand the legal, institutional and economic factors that underpin survival strategies of returnees and other groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET01; ET09; MZ04</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability of returnees to exercise new capacity (see below) is constrained by access to resources, especially land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies of assistance to returnees and others need to address access to resources in an iterative manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET01; ET03; ET04; ET05; ET11; ET14</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are contradictory policies, which don't reach the local level</li> <li>• 'Participation' means different things to different people</li> <li>• The historical relationship between national and local institutions and people is often highly negative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best role for external agencies, including government, is that of facilitating good RNR management rather than seeking to impose standard rules and policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET06</li> <li>• ET02; ET07; ET15; MZ08; MZ09</li> <li>• ET02; ET06; ET07; ET08; ET11; MZ07</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with gender remains at the level of rhetoric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External agencies, including government, need to shift attitudes on gender as much as local communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ET07; ET13; MZ07; MZ08</li> </ul>

## **(Potential) opportunities for the reconstruction of sustainable and participatory RNR management institutions in 'post-conflict' situations**

Key finding	Policy implication/recommendation	Further information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local institutions have historically played a role in RNR management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy-makers need to identify the historical role of institutions</li> <li>Promotion of separate RNR management institutions at a local level may not be necessary or desirable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET10; ET16; ET18; MZ03; MZ05</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a window of opportunity for new initiatives; ensuring these are participatory is a challenge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy-makers should help communities to seize the post-conflict opportunity for participatory action</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET08</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Periods of conflict and 'post-conflict' superimpose upon or accentuate existing processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy-makers need to identify on-going processes of change, and build on them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET10; MZ05</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Returnees may have new skills, but more importantly, widened experience and capacities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A way needs to be found to mobilise the leadership skills and experience of returnees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET04; MZ06</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donors, governments and NGOs have different attitudes towards working with local institutions and people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rather than seeking just 'decentralisation' on the one hand, or 'policy coherence' on the other, trust needs to be built between stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET15; MZ07; MZ08</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are differing perspectives on the level of degradation of the natural resource base</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different groups 'narratives' of degradation need to be examined, along with their interest in these narratives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ET17; MZ10</li> </ul>

## Workshop discussion summary

### Points from breakout session A

A number of themes and questions, generic to both projects, were posed to different breakout groups. Each box below identifies a theme and its related questions, with discussion point summaries.

#### **CHANGE: *Coping with transition***

*By its very nature, transition (post-conflict, post-independence) is a time when people expect change and expect governments to facilitate it.*

- Does transition provide a window of opportunity for major policy changes that can lead to enhanced livelihood opportunities?
- Or is transition a time of so many changes that such opportunities cannot be exploited beneficially even if identified?
- What is the role of government/NGOs/international organisations in helping people through transition?

*Transitions are not necessarily post-conflict, but can be:*

- a) internal vs. political, with change at the end of conflict;
  - b) externally driven;
  - c) policy driven.
- These transitions operate at different spatial scales, from national to household level to which policy needs to be responsive.

*The legacy of the past is underestimated, but the demand for rapid change is great:*

*Effective policy changes take time to formulate, whereas rapid responses are likely to be solely top-down, which is not generally perceived as desirable today.*

*National governments need to provide an enabling environment:*

This should include more cooperation between different stakeholders in both policy formulation and implementation. But such an environment should also allow for bottom-up changes which are not always government-led but perhaps locally driven in response to needs on the ground.

*Trust is often a determining factor in this process:*

Can trust between the different stakeholders be fostered in this 'enabling environment' and do governments and communities have the capacity or motivation for change?

#### **ENVIRONMENT: *Sustainable practices and policy pressures***

*Sustainable NR use and sustainable livelihoods are an increasing expectation from international (e.g. the UNCCD) to grassroots levels.*

- What are the conflicts between sustainable NR use and wider government priorities?
- Are sustainable NR use, development plans and coping with population pressures compatible goals?
- Are strategies to cope with short-term necessities compromising longer term sustainability?
- Does coping with shock events (e.g. droughts, floods) also compromise sustainable development?

*Can unsustainable actions be acceptable?*

Perhaps yes in the short/medium term, if greater development benefits accrue which can subsequently be used to mitigate the unsustainable actions. But it might be easy to renege on commitments to restore degraded areas.

*It may be necessary to subsidise rural activities to ensure they are sustainable: Wealthy countries well find this desirable (and do it already i.e. the dependency issue amongst poorest rural groups). If we can accept that the environment has a market value, then it is easy to accept the case for subsidies. We might call these ‘smart sustainable subsidies’.*

**COMMUNITIES: *Policies empowering people?***

*For rural livelihoods to be sustainable it has been argued that communities should be empowered in the policy process.*

- What forms can empowerment take?
- Do these work in practice? What are the opportunities and constraints on effective empowerment?
- How can empowerment be enhanced effectively?
- Does the development process both empower and disempower ? If so, how can the development process be made more inclusive?

*There is an ‘action-learning cycle’ that if recognised, can make for better/more effective empowerment.*

*What is empowerment?*

Perhaps it can be defined as: *‘Having the confidence and ability to make informed choices, use ones own resources, and to attract support. We should see people active and involved in managing their own development’.* Communities should be able to meet their own objectives.

*NGOS often replace government and do not really facilitate true empowerment:*

*Participation should be questioned as the only/most effective path to empowerment.:*

The question was raised, ‘who is participating in whose projects?’ Communities are empowered if they can persuade the NGO/government to participate in their projects, not vice versa.

**RISK: *Reducing vulnerability***

*The key to sustainable livelihoods is reducing vulnerability to environmental variability and policy changes.*

- How can the policy process address vulnerability without simply displacing it sectorally or temporally?
- Does environmental variability always lead to greater vulnerability?
- Is Livelihood diversification a realistic way of reducing vulnerability?
- If so, how can the policy process support this?

*Vulnerability is complex and needs to be unpacked: It is not simply linked to poverty or unsustainable practices.*

*We need to understand the thresholds which, when crossed, launch people on a ‘vulnerability trajectory’.*

*Stagnant institutions:* There may be a significant number of stagnant institutions, usually inherited from the colonial past, which inhibit vulnerability reduction. Alternatively, institutions may appear stagnant but in fact be responding dynamically to a changing political environment. However, because these changes do to relate to local conditions, such institutions may not have the desired response on the ground. The accountability of such institutions needs to be questioned.

*Diversification can reduce vulnerability, but government interventions can both encourage and limit diversification.*

*How desirable are NR based livelihoods? Do they contribute to vulnerability?  
HIV/AIDS is an enormous issue that increases vulnerability, especially in rural areas where sick people often return , placing a burden on households that are already vulnerable.*

*Reducing degradation will help to reduce vulnerability.*

*Agency: whose job is it to tackle the vulnerability issue?*

## Points from breakout session B

**SUSTAINABILITY: *Are sustainable livelihoods, sustainable NR use and poverty reduction attainable simultaneously in the development process?***

1. What do you see as the constraints and opportunities of working with other actors?
  2. What should be the role of research in the policy process and does research currently achieve this?
  3. Three policy initiatives mentioned so far in the workshop are
    - Fencing
    - Land redistribution
    - Creation of local CBNRM structures
- Do any or all of these policies contribute to poverty reduction?

Workshop delegates were divided into groups to give different institutional perspectives on the above questions/statements: local and national NGOs; international institutions; government institutions.

*Sustainable livelihoods should be the priority, then sustainable NR use will follow.*

*Sustainable livelihoods and sustainable NR use may be competitive and trade-offs may be required if poverty reduction is to be achieved*

## Working with other actors

<b>NGOs</b>	<b>Int.Institutions</b>	<b>Government I</b>	<b>Government II</b>
Who are the actors? Principally community Also, other organisations - NGOs; CBOs, private bodies; government.	Who are the actors? <i>Actors not identified. Focussed on how they perceived their role to be, and the difficulties they felt they faced.</i>	Who are the actors? Not explicitly identified	Who are the actors? NGOs, CBOs, donors, international organisations, private sector, research and higher education institutions
<b>Constraints</b> Top-down Uncoordinated sectoral approach	<b>Constraints</b> Different agendas and priorities Desire to keep control Competition among donors	<b>Constraints</b> Different agendas and priorities Different structures and operations Different political and ethnic affiliations Colonial legacies Competition and conflict	<b>Constraints</b> Different agendas Funding tied to conditionality NGOs lack tools for appropriate policy guidelines Local communities often lack effective structures

<b>Opportunities</b> Community should decide for themselves	<b>Opportunities</b> Improve transparency Devolving donor money to countries Cofunding allows for large scale support Conflict resolution (e.g. IUCN) Micro-macro links	<b>Opportunities</b> Sharing of resources and experiences Speed of delivery Creativity leading to more opportunities	<b>Opportunities</b> Different roles and functions Different expertise, knowledge, technology (all levels) Partnership and networking Capacity building

### **Role of research in policy process**

*The NGOs:* Advocated research should be demand-led i.e. addressing a real need (identified by whom?), providing information, linked to advocacy.

*The International Institutions:* Suggested that private sector can contribute to research and that research need not involve government.

*The Government Groups:* Suggested that research should support and inform the policy decision making process (development, interpretation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation). Research should guide interventions that follow policy to ensure prompt and relevant decision-making. Key issues identified included: research to support extension services and appropriate implementation and of policy; strengthening of links with government (the clients?); more demand-driven applied and targeted research.

### **Reducing poverty?**

*Fencing* has both positive and negative effects on the environment and on society. It is a complex issue and could be seen as the symptom of deeper rural problems. E.g. *Livestock ownership:* there are three groups of livestock owners in rural Africa: those living off the land who really want to do so; those who invest surpluses from other sectors in livestock (because livestock is a traditional form of wealth); and those who have no choice but to try and live off livestock. Policies ought to focus resources on the first group, provide alternative investment opportunities for the second and develop viable alternative livelihoods for the third.

*Land redistribution* can work with political will and if support structure are in place. Needs to be combined with diverse models of livelihood systems. Land redistribution cannot eradicate poverty on its own.

It can reduce the number of landless and improve social equity. On the one hand it can provide tenural security (e.g. South Africa), but it can also reduce tenural security(e.g. Ethiopia). Land redistribution can also lead to an intensification of conflict.

Land redistribution needs to involve settlement and local livelihood supportwithout compromising the economy, if these conditions can be met, it can contribute to poverty reduction.

*Local CBNRM structures* can work but they need suitable support if they are to contribute to poverty reduction. They must include capacity building, be transparent and have real tangible benefits to the community. Real problems need to be identified and admitted and alternative options/approaches explored.

CBNRM can be seen as a route for communities to take charge of their own development. Can address poverty reduction only in its broadest sense through capacity building, empowerment, securing rights to resources and enhancing food security.

### **Country feedback**

Delegates were asked, in their country groups, to report back on a) what they had gained from the process of collaborative research, b) specific research findings that had poignancy for their country/role in the country, and c) the workshop process as a format for information sharing and dissemination. The following integrates common themes raised across the groups and projects and our responses to them.

***The collaboration process: lessons learned.*** Some participants and researchers felt that certain collaborative aspects of the research process were unsatisfactory. Different people often interpret collaboration in different ways. Therefore at the start of the PANRUSA project, a meeting was held in Windhoek with the key collaborators to determine the role and level of involvement of our collaborating institutions. During the course of the project these roles changed and evolved, and new collaborators joined the project taking on new roles. For the MARENA project, local expertise in Mozambique and Ethiopia was always involved in research design. In each country, research students (nationals of the country and registered at Sussex) took the central role in data collection. They were supported by both local and British supervisors. The details of the research agenda were determined in Ethiopia and Mozambique.

Overall, it is important for collaborators and researchers to recognise that collaboration can occur in several different forms.

- *Research activity collaborators* - took an active role in designing and conducting research activities within the projects. The success of such collaboration varied markedly as some initial collaborators were unable to commit time to the project while others took responsibility for elements of the project.
- *End user and policy collaborators* - specifically interested in research outcomes throughout the life of the projects. Interested in attending meetings and workshops, receiving updates on project activities (to varying degrees) and providing specific technical input of key policy issues/areas. Policy makers from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa participated in this workshop.
- *Local institutions and community collaboration* - formulated and developed actively through the research process in the field sites. PANRUSA community feedback meetings in July 2001 were just one part of the information sharing and dissemination of this collaborative relationship. Given the MARENA project's specific focus on the policy process, close community level feedback was less central.

Overall, collaboration is a two-way process. Understandably tensions arise when different parties feel the other is not making the appropriate efforts at collaborative work, or the collaboration breaks down. UK based research teams and funding bodies

perhaps need to be more aware of capacity issues in partner institutions. Correspondingly, partner institutions should be clear and realistic about *their* commitments to the projects, and the opportunities and constraints under which such collaborative arrangements work.

A formal '*statement of collaboration*' document could be agreed between all partners, and updated as necessary, to ensure the collaborative process remains transparent and productive.

***Information sharing and dissemination.*** As stated throughout the workshop, this event was not viewed as the start or finish of the information sharing and dissemination process of the two projects. Information sharing and dissemination have been ongoing throughout the life of both projects and will continue beyond the official end of the projects (i.e. end of funding). (This latter point is a major advantage that research based in higher education institutions can offer which perhaps private bodies cannot).

Executive summaries (the 'tea towel' approach) of the projects' main findings were requested, and have been produced in different formats for different audiences. The final reports from the two projects will also have executive summaries and will be distributed to all workshop participants. The role of research should be to provide information to assist policy makers to achieve the goals of sustainable NRM and poverty alleviation rather than to make specific recommendations about changes to such policies.

*The workshop.* Some participants expressed regrets that the workshop organisation did not enable sufficient discussion of their particular concerns, and that the agenda was determined in advance. Others indicated that they were left unclear about the findings of the research projects.

The organisers agree that the workshop objectives could have been made clearer/have been reiterated at the start of the workshop. It was evident that some delegates/participants had quite strong agendas that they wanted to meet at the workshop and provision for these to be aired and debated could have been made. Inevitably it was not possible (nor desirable) for the projects to present all the details of their research findings: this was not the aim of the first day presentations. PANRUSA and MARENA presented overviews of their respective research and summaries of the key findings, illustrated with a few specific case studies. Delegates were directed to the briefing note series of each project for more details about specific issues. PANRUSA also emphasised that their research built on previous studies and thus the duplication of data collection was deliberately avoided. Data from previous projects and historical analyses of policy and livelihoods issues *were* integrated in the analysis of the contemporary data collected. This analysis is still ongoing.

## List of Participants

Penny Akwenye  
Directorate of Planning,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural  
Development  
P.Bag 13184,  
Windhoek, Namibia  
Divplan1@iafrica.com

Andy Dougill  
School of Environment  
University of Leeds  
LS2 9JT  
U.K.  
[adougill@env.leeds.ac.uk](mailto:adougill@env.leeds.ac.uk)

Lucy Ambridge  
Department for International  
Development (DFID)  
94 Victoria Street  
London  
[L-Ambridge@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:L-Ambridge@dfid.gov.uk)

James Drummond  
Department of Geography  
University of the North West  
P Bag X2046  
Mmabatho 8681  
South Africa  
jhdgeo@unibo.uniwest.ac.za

Sitiotaw Berhann  
EPA  
PO Box 12760  
Addis Ababa  
Ethiopia  
[Envpa@telecom.net.et](mailto:Envpa@telecom.net.et)

Ian Goldman  
Khanya  
17 James Scott Street  
Brandwag,  
Bloemfontein 9301  
South Africa  
[goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za)

Richard Black  
Marena  
School of African and Asian Studies  
University of Sussex,  
Brighton  
BN1 9SJ  
UK  
[R.Black@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:R.Black@sussex.ac.uk)

Robert Greener  
Botswana Institute of Development  
Policy Analysis (BIDPA)  
Tshomarelo House  
P.Bag BR-29  
Gaborone  
Botswana  
[Rgreener@bidpa.bw](mailto:Rgreener@bidpa.bw)

Andrew Couldridge  
Oxfam Canada  
PO Box 50295,  
80 Bulow Street  
Windhoek  
[Acouldridge@oxfam.org.na](mailto:Acouldridge@oxfam.org.na)

Elizabeth Harrison  
Marena  
School of African and Asian Studies  
University of Sussex  
Brighton  
BN1 9SJ  
UK  
e.a.harrison@sussex.ac.uk

Chris Henderson  
DFID  
DFID SA Namibia Field Office,  
British High Commission  
Box 22202,  
Windhoek  
[c-henderson@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:c-henderson@dfid.gov.uk)

Bertus Kruger  
DRFN  
PO Box 20232,  
Windhoek  
Namibia  
[Bertusk@drfn.org.na](mailto:Bertusk@drfn.org.na)

Antonio Hill  
Policy Department  
Oxfam UK,  
247 Banburg Rd  
Oxford  
OX2 7DZ  
England  
[Ahill@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:Ahill@oxfam.org.uk)

Guilhermina Kumagwelo  
Community Management Unit  
National Directorate of Forestry and  
Wildlife,  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural  
Development, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Praca dos Herois Mozambicanos,  
Maputo, Mozambique  
[guigui@map.gov.mz](mailto:guigui@map.gov.mz)  
[Guigui@dnffb.imoz.com](mailto:Guigui@dnffb.imoz.com)

Mabel Hungwe  
FANRPAN  
PO Box CY2765  
Causeway  
Zimbabwe  
[MHungwe@fanrpan.org](mailto:MHungwe@fanrpan.org)

Mipopi Jonas  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Private Bag 003  
Gaborone  
Botswana  
[MJonas@gov.bw](mailto:MJonas@gov.bw)

Simeon Kandjii  
Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and  
Rehabilitation  
Private Bag 13343  
Windhoek,  
Namibia  
Fax: + 264 61257104

Edward Lahiff  
PLAAS  
University of Western Cape  
Pbag X17  
Belleville 7535  
South Africa  
[Elahiff@uwc.ac.za](mailto:Elahiff@uwc.ac.za)

Naomi Kelesitse  
DFID  
DFID Field Office  
British High Commission  
PB 0023  
Gaborone,  
Botswana  
[n-kelesitse@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:n-kelesitse@dfid.gov.uk)

Andrew Long  
WILD, Namibia  
Directorate of Environmental Affairs  
Ministry of Environment and Tourism  
PB 13306  
Windhoek  
Namibia  
[Salong@dea.met.gov.na](mailto:Salong@dea.met.gov.na)

Ellen Mahlase  
IUCN, South Africa Country Office  
Regional Office for Southern Africa,  
IUCN, PO Box 11536  
8 Roper Street  
Hatfield, Pretoria  
00028  
South Africa  
[Ellenm@icon.co.za](mailto:Ellenm@icon.co.za)

Ndjizi Manyothwane  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Private Bag 003  
Gaborone,  
Botswana  
[Nmanyothwane@gov.bw](mailto:Nmanyothwane@gov.bw)

Richard Moroka  
Dept of Land Affairs  
PB X833  
Pretoria,  
South Africa

Alfons Mosimane  
Social Sciences Division  
Multidisciplinary Research Centre  
P Bag 13301  
University of Namibia, Windhoek  
Namibia  
[Amosimane@unam.na](mailto:Amosimane@unam.na)

Ben Mothusi  
Botswana Agricultural Resources Board  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Private Bag 003  
Gaborone, Botswana

Julie Newton  
Department of Geography  
University of Sheffield,  
Sheffield  
S10 2TN  
UK  
[j.newton@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:j.newton@sheffield.ac.uk)

John Mendelsohn  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Ministry of Environment and Tourism  
PB 13306  
Windhoek, Namibia  
[Mendelso@windhoek.alt.na](mailto:Mendelso@windhoek.alt.na)

Moses Modise  
TRAC  
P.O Box 23773  
Mafikeng 2745  
South Africa  
[Mmodise@gydea.com](mailto:Mmodise@gydea.com)

Ms Moahloli  
Ministry of Agriculture  
PB X250  
Pretoria,  
South Africa  
[SecBID@nda.agric.za](mailto:SecBID@nda.agric.za)

Vuyiiswa Nxasana  
Dept of Land Affairs  
PB X833  
Pretoria,  
South Africa

Alula Pankhurst  
Marena  
P.O Box 1896  
Addis Ababa  
Ethiopia  
[pankhurst@telecom.net.et](mailto:pankhurst@telecom.net.et)

Andre van Rooyan  
Agricultural Research Council  
PO Box 2983  
Kimberley 8300  
South Africa  
[andrevr@kimnet.co.za](mailto:andrevr@kimnet.co.za)

Loide Muttotta  
Land Use Planning and Allocation  
Division, Ministry of Lands, Resettlement  
and Rehabilitation,  
Private Bag 13343  
Windhoek,  
Namibia  
Fax: + 264 61 228240

Crimildo Rungo  
Provincial Services of Forestry and  
Wildlife  
PO Box 42,  
Chimoio,  
Manica Province  
Mozambique  
[Chimanimani@teledata.mz](mailto:Chimanimani@teledata.mz)  
[Crungo@usa.net](mailto:Crungo@usa.net)

Antonio Serra  
Marena  
School of African and Asian Studies  
University of Sussex  
Brighton  
BN1 9SJ  
UK  
[tonyserra68@hotmail.com](mailto:tonyserra68@hotmail.com)

Deborah Sporton  
Panrusa  
Department of Geography  
University of Sheffield,  
Sheffield  
S10 2TN  
UK  
[d.sporton@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:d.sporton@sheffield.ac.uk)

David Thomas  
Panrusa  
Department of Geography  
University of Sheffield,  
Sheffield  
S10 2TN  
UK  
[d.s.thomas@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:d.s.thomas@sheffield.ac.uk)

Chasca Twyman  
Panrusa  
Department of Geography  
University of Sheffield,  
Sheffield  
S10 2TN  
UK  
[c.twyman@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:c.twyman@sheffield.ac.uk)

Penny Urquhart  
Dept of Environment Affairs and  
Tourism  
P.Bag X447  
Pretoria,  
South Africa  
[motswiri@iafrica.com](mailto:motswiri@iafrica.com)

Richard White  
Natural Resource Services Ltd  
PO Box 59  
Tsabong  
Botswana  
[rhwhite@eudoramail.com](mailto:rhwhite@eudoramail.com)

Yonas Yemshaw  
National Tree Seed Project (EARO)  
PO Box 12643  
Addis Ababa,  
Ethiopia  
[Ntsp@telecom.net.et](mailto:Ntsp@telecom.net.et)

