



CARE INTERNATIONAL IN TANZANIA

Terminal Evaluation of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBF)

¹Oliver Wasonga (Lead Consultant)

Email: oliverwasonga@uonbi.ac.ke

¹Francis Juma

²Eligard Massawe

¹University of Nairobi, College of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences

P.O. Box 29053-00625

Nairobi

²Independent consultanat, P.O. Box 55

USA River



© July, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| TITLE | 1 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 2 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 443 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | 663 |
| ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | 773 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 883 |
| 1.1. Context | 883 |
| 1.2 Project objectives and relevance | 993 |
| 2. FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PASTORALIST BASKET FUND PROGRAMME | 10403 |
| 2.1. Methodology | 11113 |
| 2.1.1. Literature review | 11113 |
| 2.1.2. Key informant interviews | 11113 |
| 2.1.3. Focus group discussions (FGDs) | 11113 |
| 2.1.4. Direct observations | 11113 |
| 2.1.5. Data analysis | 12123 |
| 2.1.6. Report outputs | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 2.2. Results | 12123 |
| 2.2.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents..... | 12123 |
| 2.2.2. Project goal and purpose | 14143 |
| 2.2.3. Output 1: A transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania developed and implemented..... | 15153 |
| 2.2.4. Output 2: Increased capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities | 17173 |
| 2.2.5. Output 3: Increased capacity of relevant local government institutions to respond to the demands of pastoralists for quality services..... | 18183 |
| 2.2.6. Output 4: Learning from Pastoralist Basket Fund Program generated, documented and disseminated to influence development policy at local, national and international levels..... | 19193 |
| 2.3. Achievement of outcomes and activities..... | 20203 |
| 2.3.1. Improved livelihood securities..... | 20203 |
| 2.3.2. Opinion of the pastoralist communities on the performance of the CSOs/PBFP | 23233 |
| 2.3.3. Improved quality of life of pastoral communities | 27273 |
| 2.3.4. Civil societies-government partnerships | 30303 |
| 2.4. Sustainability of the PBFP..... | 31313 |
| 2.5. Lessons learnt | 32323 |
| 2.6. Best practices and success stories | 33333 |
| 2.6.1. Exercising land rights and influencing policy at local level..... | 33333 |
| 2.6.2. Networks to address pastoral issues | 35353 |
| 2.6.3. Conflict resolution | 35353 |
| 2.6.4. Lobbying and advocacy..... | 36363 |
| 2.6.5. Indigenous herd improvement | 36363 |

| | | |
|--------|---|--------------|
| 2.6.6. | Livelihood diversification | <u>37373</u> |
| 2.6.7. | The Village Savings and Loans (VSL) and Village Community Bank s (VICOBA) | <u>38383</u> |
| 2.6.8. | Theatre..... | <u>38383</u> |
| 2.7. | Analysis of the programme assumptions | <u>39393</u> |
| 2.8. | Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis of the PBF <u>41413</u> | |
| 2.9 | Exit strategy | <u>43433</u> |
| 3. | CONCLUSIONS..... | <u>45453</u> |
| 4. | RECOMMENDATIONS..... | <u>46463</u> |
| 5. | REFERENCES | <u>49493</u> |
| 6. | ANNEXES..... | <u>50503</u> |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall assessment of the PBFP shows significant impacts both on the partner CSOs and beneficiaries. Although testimonies reveal a myriad of challenges and threats, they seem to be compensated for to a larger extent by the potential far-reaching effects of capacity building activities implemented by the CSOs. CARE international in Tanzania has developed and implemented a transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Tanzania. This has been achieved through the establishment of the Basket Fund Management Team (BFMT) and Basket Fund Governing Committee (BFGC), which have steered and overseen the implementation of the programme. Transparency has been ensured through an interactive selection process that gives opportunity to all qualified CSOs to apply for grants. Since its inception, the Pastoralist Basket fund Programme (PBFP) has funded a total of 46 CSOs in the eleven regions of Tanzania. The key activities of the CSOs include capacity building of pastoralist communities on: Policy analysis and advocacy; land rights awareness and advocacy; land conflict resolution; livestock husbandry; livelihood diversification; and environmental management.

Notable positive impacts of the PBFP include: (a) the increasing pastoralists' awareness on land rights and policies, and ability to exercise the rights and influence policies in their favour; (b) the growing capacity to resolve local conflicts over resources through village conflict resolution committees; (c) declining livestock losses due to diseases as a result of training on livestock diseases control practices and sensitization on available veterinary services; (d) increasing involvement of pastoralist in alternative economic activities such as business enterprises and crop farming; (e) increasing gender awareness and women participation in local decision making organs; (f) increasing access to relatively more grazing land by pastoralists due to their enhanced ability to exercise their rights, negotiate secondary rights for grazing with farmers, and participatory land-use planning at village level; (g) increased network among pastoral CSOs as the number working with the PBFP increases from 13 CSOs in 2007 to 46 CSOs in 2011; (h) improved capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral; (i) change of attitude among CSOs and opinion leaders, which were initially contesting CARE's capacity and suitability to manage the funds, to support the programme.

Despite the foregoing achievements, a lot still need to be done to fully realize the objectives of the programme. These include: working more closely with government's livestock development sector and more participation in policy formulation processes at national level; building capacity of the Local Government Authorities (LGAs) to effectively respond to pastoralists' demands and quality services; enhancement of the capacity of the pastoralists to effectively apply the knowledge and skills acquired through the PBFP's trainings to advocate and claim their rights; up-scaling of best practices and the participatory land-use planning and rangeland management planning initiated by the Sustainable Range Management Programme (SRMP) to other regions. In addition, there is need for: sensitization and more involvement of the decision makers both at local and national levels; supporting of women to engage in viable alternative livelihoods such as small business enterprises in handicrafts, crop production, poultry farming, village savings and loan (VSL), and village community banks (VICOBA). In addition to the current CSOs activities supported by CARE, there is

imperative to recognize and address climate change, being one of the main constraints to livelihood security in the 21st century. The programme should promote climate change adaptation by supporting projects that strengthen adaptation strategies to ensure resilience of pastoral livelihoods and reduced vulnerability to climate change.

Other suggestions to ensure sustainability of the PBFP include: identification or formation of an independent local organization to manage the basket fund after CARE's exit; mainstreaming the PBFP activities into the district agricultural and livestock development plans; securing extension of funding for the PBFP or proactively fund raise for the phase II from other donors; establishment of a strategic grant to bigger organizations to support the smaller ones; and strengthening of CSOs networks and establishment of a national platform for sharing experiences from implementing the PBFP among the pastoral CSOs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to express our gratitude to the pastoralist communities for their support in the course of the evaluation exercise. Special recognition goes to those who found time to answer many questions from us during the individual interviews and focus group discussions. The various support accorded by CSO officials is acknowledged. The team of consultants is grateful for the useful insight on the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) by the Director of Programmes, Dr. Balaram Thapa and PBFP coordinator, Mr. Alex Soko. For the logistics and all the support in the office and the field, we thank the Programme Coordinator and other PBFP staff, Ms. Stella Lyimo Mr. Brandon Manjoli and Mr. Alfred Pilla. We appreciate all those who contributed in one way or the other towards the success of the assignment. We express our gratitude to CARE for the opportunity provided us to undertake the study. Any errors of omission or commission that might be in the content of this report are, however, our responsibility.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|------------|---|
| ASAL | Arid and Semi Arid Lands |
| BFGC | Basket Fund Governing Committee |
| BFMT | Basket Fund Management Team |
| CODERT | Community Development and Relief Trust |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| DALDO | District Agricultural and Livestock Development Officer |
| EMAYO | Ereto Maasai Youth |
| ENVIROCARE | Environmental, Human Rights Care and gender Organization |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| HUDESA | Human Development Strategies Association |
| IRIN | Integrated Regional Information Networks |
| KCS | Kiteto Civil Society Organization |
| LGA | Local Government Authorities |
| M & E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| MKUKUTA | Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umasikini Tanzania |
| MoLDF | Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries |
| NSGRP | National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty |
| BFGC | Basket Fund Governing Committee |
| PBFP | Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme |
| PC | Programme Coordinator |
| RIRA | Rural Initiatives and Relief Agency |
| SDO | Social Development Organization |
| SHILDA | Southern Highland Livestock Development Association |
| SHIMWAJAWA | Shirika la Maendeleo la Wafugaji wa Jamii ya Wataturu |
| SPILL | Strategic Plan for Implementation of the Land Laws |
| TAGRODE | Tanzania Grass Roots Oriented Development |
| TAMPRODA | Tanzania Milk Producers Association |
| TANIPE | Tanzania Network for Indigenous Pastoralists |
| TAPHGO | Tanzania Pastoralists, Hunters and Gatherers Organization |
| TNRF | Tanzania Natural Resource Forum |
| TPCF | Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum |
| UVIMASHA | Umoja wa Vikundi vya Maendeleo Shambarai |
| VSL | Village Savings and Loans |
| VICOBA | Village Community Bank |
| WOWAP | Women Wake Up |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context

Approximately 40 percent of Africa's land surface is dedicated to pastoralism (IRIN, 2007), making it the main source of livelihood for the rural households living in the vast rangelands of Africa. A significant portion of 20% – 25% contribution of livestock sector to agricultural GDP across Africa, comes from pastoral areas (ODI/HPG, 2009), which comprise 10% of the global meat production (Bevan, 2007). In Tanzania, pastoral economy supports about 10% of the country's population and constitutes about 30% of agricultural GDP. Most of the arid and semi-arid areas in Tanzania are occupied by pastoralists, who are found in Manyara, Arusha, Dodoma, Singida, Shinyanga, and Mwanza regions. Other areas where pastoralists are found include Morogoro, Pwani, Mbeya, Rukwa and Tabora. The Maasai are the largest pastoralist ethnic group in Tanzania, followed by Tatoga, Barbaig and Taturu. The agro-pastoralists communities include the Mbulu, Gorowa, Burungi-Khoisan, Gogo, Nyaturu, Sukuma, Nyamwezi, Fipa and Nyakyusa. These groups own approximately 99% of Tanzania's livestock. Pastoralists in Tanzania, like elsewhere, have for centuries demonstrated tremendous ability to cope with resource variability, often employing a number of sophisticated and continually evolving processes and practices to respond to risks and take advantage of new opportunities (Brown et al., 2007). One such strategy is mobility that is necessary for maintaining production and ensuring opportunistic tracking according to vegetation needs and water availability (Dobie et al. 2008; Nyariki et al. 2005).

For pastoralism to remain a viable and sustainable livelihood system, pastoralists require enabling environment including mobility and rights to grazing land, rights of representation in governance and favourable policies. Pastoralists in Tanzania are no exception to the many challenges facing pastoralists in Africa, and are currently faced by diminishing resource base, socio-political marginalization and unfavourable policies. The systematic exclusion of pastoralists from the development mainstream has not only increased their vulnerability, but has led them to migrate to new territories outside their traditional areas with increased conflict with neighboring farming communities. The political and social exclusion over time has rendered them to be the poorest, most excluded and marginalized people in Tanzania.

Over the past six years, Tanzania has undergone rapid policy changes and reforms with direct impact on the prospect for pastoralism. Tanzania Development Vision 2025, the NSGRP/MKUKUTA, the Rural Development Strategy, the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy, a new Livestock Policy, a new Wildlife policy, the Local Government Reform Program, are some of the examples. The rapid process has denied many citizens opportunity to participate in and influence the policies. As a result, many communities have been left behind. This is particularly true for rural people in general and pastoral communities in particular, and has had serious implications on pastoralism. For example, despite the extensive documentation of the efficacy of indigenous pastoral systems in Tanzania, negative perceptions still pervade, especially with regards to livestock mobility and the migration of pastoralists to new territories outside their traditional areas. The policy makers still continue to maintain their consistent view that pastoral production systems need to be modernized through sedentarization. In addition, there has been little effort to translate policy into action to ensure that pastoralists are legally guaranteed access to land

and water. Similarly, many policies that advocate the protection of pastoralist's rights have not been legally enforced.

1.2 Project objectives and relevance

The quest for achieving poverty reduction among rural households is not complete without deliberate efforts to redeem pastoralism through enhancement of pastoral livelihoods security. It is against this background that the Pastoral Basket Fund Program (PBFP) was established to design and implement a program that facilitates pastoralists to seize the opportunities presented in the existing policies. In addition, the programme was envisaged to strengthen the capacity of pastoralists to lobby against those policies which are not working in their favour. The focus of the PBFP is on key constraints to pastoral livelihoods in Tanzania, chief of them knowledge and power gap, marginalization, and unfavourable policies. The overall goal of the program is improved livelihood security of pastoral communities through the development, application and dissemination of effective strategies for support to civil society organizations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism in Tanzania.

The PBFP directly addresses Irish Aid's (IA) overarching objective of "poverty reduction, to reduce vulnerability and increase opportunity" by contributing to sustainable rural livelihoods and growth. The programme encourage sound development policies and good governance; support pastoral communities achieve better social services such as: (a) health and education); (c) promote pastoralist's access to resources (e.g., land, water and pasture); (d) strengthen the capacity of pastoral CSOs to widen opportunities for active engagement in policy processes; (e) promote enhancement of productive capacity; and (f) promote environmental conservation. The goal and purpose of the program are also consistent with IA's Country Strategy Paper (CSP 2007-2010), which aims to promote rural livelihoods and growth; social development and good governance. The program's explicit focus on the situation of pastoralism and pastoralist livelihoods links clearly to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly to the MDG 1 (to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger) and MDG 7 (to ensure environmental sustainability). The program's focus is consistent with the Government of Tanzania's NSGRP, which clearly recognizes pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood that should be protected and promoted. The program is further consistent with the policy of various government's ministries, department and sectors that have the mandate and deal with pastoral is issues in Tanzania. The overall goal of the program is "Improved quality of life of pastoral communities in Tanzania

The expected outputs of the programme are:

- i. A transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania developed and implemented;
- ii. Increased capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities;
- iii. Increased capacity of relevant local government institutions to respond to the demands of pastoralists for quality services; and
- iv. Learning from Pastoralist Basket Fund Program generated, documented and disseminated to influence development policy at local, national and international levels

2. FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PASTORALIST BASKET FUND PROGRAMME

The objective of the consultancy was to conduct a final evaluation to assess the project's performance, as the basis for making necessary adjustments and guiding the way forward. The findings of the study will also form the basis for improving implementation in future interventions, and informing future designs of such programmes by other stakeholders wishing to work and support pastoral sector initiatives. The specific objectives of the evaluation exercise were to:

- i. Evaluate the achievements of the PBF programme to-date against its planned objectives, activities and impact it has generated.
- ii. Identify and assess key gaps in the PBF programme ranging from program development, implementation and monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning,
- iii. Examine appropriateness of PBFP model of working in terms of addressing the inherent problems associated with pastoralists and agro-pastoralist in Tanzania and elsewhere
- iv. Assess management approaches used, mechanism employed, stakeholders and partner interaction.
- v. Evaluate the appropriateness of implementation modalities and strategies, and recommend key changes that may be needed to improve implementation, especially with respect to scaling up potential, long term impact and sustainability
- vi. Assess CARE's effectiveness in managing grants for the PBFP.
- vii. Assess PBFP partners' effectiveness in implementing their designed projects to address pastoralists and agro-pastoralists problems.
- viii. Assess appropriateness of using the proposed CSOs in building the capacity of pastoralists in attaining long term sustainability, scaling up, and enhancing ownership of PBFP model by local institutions.
- ix. Assess the application of knowledge gained by project beneficiaries in relation to program focus of land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism livelihood.
- x. Assess the efficiency and efficacy of programme implementation and how assumptions were addressed or influenced the project.
- xi. Assess the level reached by target CSOs and communities in understanding the link between policy as related to pastoralism and livelihood improvement.
- xii. Assess whether programme objectives and outcomes were achieved and the role of CARE in influencing policy changes. What has been the project contribution to the national policy dialogue on Pastoralism.
- xiii. Assess whether capacity building of local CSOs at the ground has been achieved.
- xiv. Establish the number of beneficiaries reached directly and indirectly through partners.
- xv. Identify key lessons, best practices and recommend their replication and or how they could be used to influence policy.
- xvi. Review the proposed exit strategy for CARE indicating strengths and challenges.
- xvii. Assess how effective the learning and documentation mechanisms has been including the way in which information was collected and disseminated to other stakeholders within and outside the project area.
- xviii. Explore lessons generated and learnt, best practices and challenges encountered during project implementation.
- xix. Examine implementing partner CSOs, perception on effectiveness of PBF in delivering relevant training related to the programme.

- xx. Collect partners and stakeholders comments on impact (both positive and negative) of programme intervention.
- xxi. Document stakeholders' assessment of CARE's strengths and challenges in managing and implementing the project (appreciated areas, that need to change, areas not addressed but important to develop Pastoralism, what they see as future areas for programming).

2.1. Methodology

A combination of various methods were used in to collect data during the evaluation exercise

2.1.1. Literature review

Secondary data was gathered for qualitative analyses. Most of the information sources included the project baseline survey report, annual reports, mid-term review study report and other relevant documents held by CARE, PBF, CSOs, line ministries and other organizations working with pastoralists in the project areas.

2.1.2. Key informant interviews

After the literature review, the gaps identified and information needs identified were framed in the form of open- and close-ended questions for key informant interviews in the project areas. The interviews targeted persons, especially those that have been directly involved in the project activities, PBF staff and CSOs officials. In a study of this nature, stratification is normally recommended due to heterogeneity of populations (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). However, owing to difficult terrain, scattered homesteads and semi-nomadic nature of the pastoral communities, a purposive sampling technique was found to be suitable for gathering the required data. A total of 203 stakeholders were interviewed during the evaluation exercise: Two CARE staff, One IA staff, 101 key informants from pastoral communities; 7 CSO officials and 7 District Agriculture and Livestock Officers (DALDOs); and 85 FGD participants (Annexes XII and XIII)

2.1.3. Focus group discussions (FGDs)

Focus group sessions involving at least 10 participants including men, women and the youth from pastoral communities were conducted in seven of the visited CSOs intervention areas. In total, 85 members of the pastoralist communities, 61 of them men and 24 women, participated in the FGDs. A checklist of questions was used to guide the discussions steered by a moderator. The participants were engaged in discussing the appropriateness, relevance, achievements and sustainability of the project. The FGDs was used to gain insight into the impacts of the project and in the SWOT analysis as well as suggestions on the way forward.

2.1.4. Direct observations

In addition to FGDs, guided field walks to enable direct observations of project impacts were conducted. This allowed the consultants to note important details, and quantify the reported information. The consultants, guided by key informants identified during the FGDs, made observations on any tangible impacts of the project and asked questions to obtain further clarification from the key informants.

2.1.5. Data analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the quantitative and qualitative data. The information gathered during the literature search, FGDs, direct observations were compiled and organized under various themes addressed during the study.

2.2. Results

2.2.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

A sample size of 101 was achieved for individual face to face interviews during the evaluation exercise with at least 10 key informants interviewed in each district visited (Table 1). Most (64%) of those interviewed were men, majority (55%) being in the 31 -50 age bracket. About 87% of the respondents were married, most (48%) of them having no formal education. The average household size in the areas visited was found to be approximately nine persons with Kiteto and Handeni districts having the highest (about 11 persons) household size, and Simanjiro, the lowest (6 persons). The main source of livelihood in the intervention areas visited was livestock production (94%) with a few (3%) households depending on formal employment. About 2% of the respondents were engaged in small trade, and only 1% involved in crop farming (Table 2). These results show the most productive and active age category with no formal education, therefore no formal employment leading to overdependence on livestock production for their livelihoods.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

| Attribute | | Whole sample (N=101) | Distribution of respondents by Districts (%) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | | Handeni (N=12) | Kilindi (N=15) | Kilosa (N=10) | Kiteto (N=12) | Magu (N=11) | Serengeti (N=16) | Simanjiro (N=25) |
| Total number of people in the household | | 9.2 (6.9)¹ | 11.3 (13.0) | 9.7 (3.7) | 7.6 (5.1) | 11.4 (10.1) | 9.4 (8.2) | 11.1 (3.5) | 6.4 (2.6) |
| Number of people employed in the household | | 1.4 (0.6)² | 1.3 (0.5) | 1.0 | 2.0 (0.8) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Age in years (N=100) | Mean (age) ³ | 40.56 (11.5)³ | 33.5 (13.6) | 41.3 (7.5) | 40.2 (14.0) | 44.7 (11.5) | 44.82 (13.0) | 43.81 (9.7) | 37.44 (10.9) |
| | 18-30 | 21.0 | 54.5 | 13.3 | 20.0 | | 9.1 | 12.5 | 32.0 |
| | 31 - 50 | 55.0 | 27.3 | 73.3 | 40.0 | 66.7 | 54.5 | 62.5 | 52.0 |
| | 51 and above | 24.0 | 18.2 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 36.4 | 25.0 | 16.0 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sex (N=101) | Male | 60.4 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 70.0 | 33.3 | 81.8 | 75.0 | 44.0 |
| | Female | 39.6 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 30.0 | 66.7 | 18.2 | 25.0 | 56.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Education (N=101) | Primary | 40.6 | 25.0 | 46.7 | 20.0 | | 72.7 | 87.5 | 28.0 |
| | Secondary | 8.9 | 16.7 | | 30.0 | | 18.2 | 6.3 | 4.0 |
| | Tertiary (college/university) | 3.0 | | 6.7 | 20.0 | | | | |
| | No formal education | 47.5 | 58.3 | 46.7 | 30.0 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 68.0 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Marital status (N=101) | Single | 10.9 | 25.0 | | 30.0 | | 9.1 | 12.5 | 8.0 |
| | Married | 87.1 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 87.5 | 92.0 |
| | Divorced | 1.0 | | | | | 9.1 | | |
| | Separated | 1.0 | | | 10 | | | | |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

¹ Figures in brackets represent standard deviations for the household size variable.

² Figures in brackets represent standard deviations for the number of people employed in the household variable.

³ Figures in brackets represents standard deviations for the age variable.

Table 2: Main sources of livelihood

| Attribute | Distribution by districts (%) | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Whole sample (N=101) | Handeni (N=12) | Kilindi (N=15) | Kilosa (N=10) | Kiteto (N=12) | Magu (N=11) | Serengeti (N=16) | Simanjiro (N=25) |
| Livestock production | 94.1 | 100.0 | 93.3 | 70 | 100.0 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 96.0 |
| Crop production | 1.0 | | | | | 9.1 | | |
| Small scale trade | 2.0 | | 6.7 | | | | | 4.0 |
| Employment | 3.0 | | | 30 | | | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

2.2.2. Achievement of project goal and purpose

The overall goal and purpose of the program is improved livelihood security of pastoral communities through the development, application and dissemination of effective strategies for support to civil society organizations involved in land rights, conflict resolution and pastoralism in Tanzania. Since the inception of the programme a number of changes have been observed that can be directly related to the implementation of the PBF. These are evident in the monitoring and evaluation reports; testimonies by beneficiaries and the CSOs annual reports. Some of the notable positive impacts documented by the PBF are summarized below:

- i. There is evidence of growing capacity to resolve local conflicts among livestock keepers themselves and between livestock keepers and farmers. Having established and strengthened village conflict resolution committees, most conflicts are resolved locally. This is evident in Kilosa and Kilindi, Iringa and Magu.
- ii. There has been growing awareness on land rights after pastoral communities have been trained on Land Act and Village Land Act, 1999. Communities in Serengeti district have been able to present their grievances to relevant authorities thereby saving big portions of grazing land that would have been leased to investors.
- iii. Training of the pastoral CSOs has led to improvement in reporting and general management of projects as compared to their ability at the beginning of the programme.
- iv. There has been increased network among pastoral CSOs as more CSOs join the PBF. The northern pastoral CSOs, which were initially reluctant to apply for funds from the PBF have realized the importance of working with other CSOs. About 70% of the new entrants are CSOs from the north. This change of attitude among CSOs and opinion leaders, which were initially contesting CARE's capacity and suitability to manage the funds, has been due to the observed positive results of the PBF.
- v. Pastoralists are fast accepting improved breeds of livestock introduced by the Pastoral CSOs to upgrade their indigenous herds. Projects implemented by UVIMASHA in Simanjiro have demonstrated this fact. In some cases, pastoralists have contributed funds to buy improved breed of bulls for cross-breeding with their local breeds to get better breed in milk and meat production.
- vi. Gender awareness and involvement is increasing. Women are becoming more active and speaking in public meetings where men have been dominating. In a few cases some women have been brave enough to aspire for leadership positions. Examples from Kilindi and Iringa districts attest to this.

In-depth interview with stakeholders reveal a well managed basket fund, which has supported several pastoralist CSOs to implement various activities since its inception in October, 2007. Pastoralists' awareness of the opportunities for improving their livelihoods, how best to take advantage of the existing resources, opportunities and rights to improve their livelihoods, and the ability to challenge some of the unfavourable policies, were given as positive impacts of the PBFP. Interviews with Government and CSO officials reveal that although livestock diseases are still a constraint to livestock production, incidences have been reduced. Up to 70% reduction in calf mortality has been achieved as a result of deliberate efforts to sensitize pastoralists on good livestock husbandry and their rights to claim veterinary services from the government agencies. Since its inception, the PBFP has supported up to 46 pastoral CSOs out engaged with pastoral communities and creating awareness on their civic rights and responsibilities relevant policies and providing livelihood diversification support. Details of commitment and disbursement of funds to the CSOs from 2007 to 2010 are presented in Annexes II to VI. All the pastoralist communities and CSOs interviewed are aware of the importance of land -use plans, village land certificates and title deeds as away of averting conflicts and ensuring ownership security. However, despite the evident awareness among the pastoral communities of their civic and land rights, there was no significant increase in amount of grazing land accessible to and under control of pastoral communities.

In a few instances, pastoralists have been able to access critical grazing areas through negotiated secondary rights, and participatory land-use planning involving the village land boards, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. In cases where pastoralists have been able to resist sequestration of their grazing for various investments, the security is not assured due to lack of supportive policies exacerbated by absence of government's good will. It is evident from the testimonies gathered among the beneficiaries that a number of them are engaged in various alternative activities to livestock production as a result of training on entrepreneurship skills and livelihood diversification. A considerable number are, however, yet to engage in serious alternative economic activities. All the CSOs visited were found to work directly with the district authorities in implementing their projects. Although, none of them, with exception of one, received financial support from the government, they benefited from technical expertise of the government officials. In some instances, the CSOs received means of transport from the government departments and vice versa within their collaborative arrangements. It was also evident that most of the government departments were willing to harmonize their work plans with that of the CSOs in order to ensure coordinated operations, budgeting and consolidation of resources for implementation of their activities.

2.2.3. Output 1: A transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania developed and implemented

Evidence from programme officials, testimonies from CSOs, government officials and beneficiaries reveal a well managed basket fund with a transparent mechanism for selecting partners CSOs and allocation of funds. The preparation for implementation included an elaborate process of consultation with and direct involvement of stakeholders in livestock production especially in pastoralism sub-sector. This led to formation of the Basket Fund

Management Team (BFMT) and the Basket Fund Governing Committee (BFGC). These two organs ensure that stakeholders are involved at various stages of program planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Other stakeholders include pastoral CSOs; relevant local government institutions, and pastoral community members. The decision on activities of PBFP is overseen by the BFMT consisting of the Program Manager (PM), Sector Coordinator (SC), and Director of Programs (DP). The BFMT advises the BFGC on the day-to-day activities of the PBFP. The BFGC is comprised of one representative from the Irish Aid, two from CARE International, two from government authorities (representatives Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government (MoRALG and the Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries), one from the media, representatives from the pastoral communities, and four CSO representatives (from the lake, northern and Eastern zones). The BFGC is responsible for formulation of the programme's policies. The programme has supported 46 CSOs since April, 2008.

The selection of partner CSOs involves a participatory and transparent process that involves advertisement of call for project concept notes from CSOs on Local Government offices notice boards and printed media. After closure of applications and short-listing exercise by the BFMT, a pre-award workshop for short-listed CSOs to train them on proposal development and requirements for the grant is conducted. This is followed by a detailed evaluation of the short-listed CSOs to ascertain the feasibility, needs and institutional capacity to implement the proposed projects, and approval by the BFMT and BFGC. Upon submission of satisfactory proposals by the CSOs, a memorandum of understanding is signed between successful CSOs and CARE. The grantee CSOs are then required to submit requests for disbursement of funds for the first quarter. The request forms are attached to request letter, work plan for the respective quarter and estimated budget for the tasks in the plan. The documents are then approved by Programme Coordinators, and verified by finance department. The transfer of funds is done to CSO's current accounts through CARE's bank account. Upon receipt of funds, the CSOs acknowledge by issuing an official CSO's receipt. Following release of funds to implementing CSOs, CARE sends the details including the title of the project, its proposed activities, intervention areas and level of funding to the District Executive Director. The funds are released on three months basis and the next quarter disbursements are only made after the CSOs have exhausted at least 75% of the first instalment. A series of trainings are then conducted to build capacity of the selected CSOs and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) to deliver their mandates. Among the trainings offered by CARE include: project design, implementation; monitoring; evaluation and reporting (DIMER); financial management; policy analysis; land rights, advocacy for favourable policies; sustainable pastoralism; and conflict resolution.

Besides training on financial management, other measures put in place by PBFP to ensure effective and efficient management of funds include quarterly supervision and monitoring visits to the respective CSO's office and intervention site; verification of supporting documents by the grants officer and internal auditor; submission of quarterly technical and financial report with reference to submitted work plan. The financial reports are submitted in a standard format shared to all implementing CSOS during pre-award and financial management training. In general, individual CSOs hire their own financial auditors. However, every reporting period a bank statement is attached, and every year an external auditor assigned by the donor (Irish Aid) conducts auditing at the CARE office and sampled

implementing CSOs office and field. For the CSOs that have underperformance or have been unable to use the funds allocated effectively or properly, CARE's has terminated their contracts. Out of the 46 CSOs that have been funded by CARE, 10 have had their contracts terminated for various reasons (Annex X)

The challenge observed is how the basket fund will be managed after CARE has ended her contract. This is because a transparent organ to take over from CARE has not been identified although idea for establishing one is still being discusses among different stakeholders of the basket fund.

2.2.4. Output 2: Increased capacity of pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities

Several PBFP reports indicate a number of training offered by CARE to partner CSOs to build their capacity to critically analyze and influence policies to be responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities. Some of the trainings on civic rights and policy conducted by CARE include:

- i. Training for CSOs and Local Government Authorities (LGAs) on Land Policy and Land Acts with respect to Pastoralist livelihoods conducted in August, 2009. The objectives of this training were to: share experiences and orient the participants on land rights and land laws relevant to villages; create a common understanding on the need to support pastoralists to acquire land legally; and improve participants understanding on the village land rights and land laws governing land acquisition procedures. The training contents included the Land Act of 1999 and its Regulations of 2001; the village Land Act of 1999 and its subsidiary Regulation of 2001; the Land Use Planning Act, 2007; the Urban Planning Act, 2007; and the Land Disputes Courts Act, 2002 and its Regulations of 2002 as well as conflict resolution techniques. A total of 34 participants were trained, 21 CSO officials and 14 officers from the LGAs.
- ii. Training on pastoralism and policy options in Tanzania conducted for CSOs and LGAs representatives in September, 2009 in Arusha. The objective of the course was to improve the participants' understanding of the dynamics of pastoral ecosystems. In addition, the training was meant to familiarize themselves with the existing policies in Tanzania and their weaknesses and opportunities. A Total of 32 participants (6 women and 26 men) drawn from central, Civil Society Organizations and local government participated. Specifically, participants were from Vice President's office – Environment; Ministry of Land; Ministry of Water; Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries; District Agriculture and Livestock Development officers from Iringa Rural, Kilolo, Kilindi, Ngorongoro, Serengeti, Rorya, Musoma Rural Magu and Geita. The purpose of the course was to build the participants' capacity to actively and positively take part in formulation of policies, strategies and plans for improving access to resources and livestock services necessary for improving pastoralist livelihoods in Tanzania.
- iii. Pastoralist policy analysis and advocacy training for 15 CSO representatives conducted in September, 2009. The specific objectives of the training were: to facilitate and enhance participants understanding of the policy environment in Tanzania in relation to pastoralism; provide common understanding and perception on pastoralism as a livelihood system as indicated in MKUKUTA; and to facilitate participants to acquire

basic skills on policy analysis and advocacy in relation to pastoralism.

- iv. The trained contents include main policies like the National Land Policy and Land Acts such as The Land Act of 1999 and its Regulations of 2001, The village Land Act of 1999 and its subsidiary Regulation of 2001, The Land Use Planning Act, 2007, The Urban Planning Act, 2007, The Land Disputes Courts Act, 2002 and its Regulations of 2002. Tables 4 and 5 show the number of CSOs trained by CARE and beneficiaries reached by the CSOs by the end of 2009.

Stacks of policy documents were evident at most CSOs visited, and there was no doubt that the officials understood the various provisions in them that impacted pastoral livelihoods. At the TPCF, for example, the officials clearly explained how the existing village land Act, 1999 and investment policy give a lot of leeway for sequestration of pastoral land. They gave an example of the proposed land-use for the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) and how it will lead to eviction of pastoralists from their grazing lands. Armed with the land-use plan, they have embarked on the awareness creation on the impending eviction among the pastoralist communities in the area. Testimonies from the umbrella organizations such as Tanzania Natural Resource Fund (TNRF) and Pastoralists Livelihoods Task Force (PLTF) and their member CSOs reveal concerted efforts to lobby parliamentarians to raise and address problems facing pastoralists in parliament. These include attending parliament sessions on pastoralism and frequent meetings with the members of parliamentary group on pastoralism (PGP) to lobby them to consider policy actions that would favour pastoral livelihoods. The latest example of such campaigns has been witnessed in Loliondo after alleged plan to evict pastoralists to pave way for the operations of OBC hunting company. The PLTF has been in the fore-front in protesting and creating awareness and sensitizing the public and the community, as well as lobbying the government to reverse the plan. The footage titled “voices from Loliondo” is available on ‘Yu-tube’ (<http://www.youtube.com/watch>). Besides lobbying the government, TNRF and PLTF have also been very active in analysis of current policies. An example is the review of MKUKUTA, among other policy brief for the purposes of sensitization and awareness creation among the civil societies and government agencies.

In another testimony from the officials of SHIMWAJAWA, they were able to secure access to grazing for pastoral communities by lobbying the government. *“.....In 2009, there was conflict between Tanzania National Park Authority (LANAPA) because of restricted access to grazing areas adjoining the Gurumeti game reserve,. SHIMWAJAWA sent three representatives to the president to negotiate for access to grazing land and water in the game reserve. After the meeting, the president instructed the District Commissioner (DC) to convene a meeting and resolve the problem..... now pastoralists can access grazing and water in the area and there is no conflict”. However, we need more grazing land, SHIMWAJAWA will lobby the government for more land-that is the main assignment on our table as of now”*

2.2.5. Output 3: Increased capacity of relevant local government institutions to respond to the demands of pastoralists for quality services

Government authorities have been trained and involved in the implementation of the PBFP at various levels. The Directorate of Pastoralist System Development (DPSD) is represented by the Director at the BFGC. An interview with PBFP staff and CSOs reveal that the DPSD has been very proactive in involving CSOs on important sector policy review meetings.

CARE contact persons from both the Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries, and Ministry of Agriculture are directly involved in the implementation of CSOs activities. Other government departments involved and trained by the PBFP include officers from the Vice President's office in charge of Environment; Ministry of Land; Ministry of Water; and District Agriculture and Livestock Development officers. Through trainings and close working relationship with the CSOs, the responsiveness of LGAs and CARE's contact persons from the line ministries to address pastoralists' needs has been greatly enhanced.

"... coincidentally, in the course of one of the FGDs at Kabita in Magu district, the livestock assistant, who is also CARE's contact person excuses himself to rush and dispense drugs to one of the participants whose cow is sick. Soon the pastoralist is back with two types of medicine, one for the wounds and another to stimulate milk let-down for his cow, which had just calved. "...it is now very easy to access veterinary services because the officer visits us more frequently than before... RIRA has been a blessing to us, he explains". The foregoing notwithstanding, a number of contact persons and CSOs, indicated that there is need for more sensitization of the decision makers, other senior civil servants in the line ministries and village authorities to ensure their support. *"...whereas we are willing and capable of backstopping the activities initiated by the CSOs, without the support from above, all that we are doing is not sustainable. Our seniors need more education than we do because they make decisions...if they are sensitized well, we may have more support and budgetary allocation to complement the activities of the CSOs (Contact person, Mugumu).*

Although there is no doubt about the willingness and the capacity of the government officers to provide the much needed technical support to the CSOs, lack of personnel appears to be a big drawback. Some of the CSOs, for example, UVIMASHA have responded to this need through their capacity building efforts to train the animal health assistants and Community Based Animal Health Workers (CBAHW)/Wahudumu wa Afya ya Mifugo wa Jamii (WAMIJA) for their herd improvement projects to assist specifically in artificial insemination.

2.2.6. Output 4: Learning from Pastoralist Basket Fund Program generated, documented and disseminated to influence development policy at local, national and international levels

The PBFP has distributed a number of learning documents and policy briefs and reviews with the aim of sensitizing the pastoral communities and influencing development policies. Some the reports are among those presented in Table 6. Most of the materials are distributed in form of booklets, brochures and posters. Other forms of dissemination include T-shirts and calendars with important messages about conflict resolution and management; land and civic rights; land-use planning, among others. These materials are mainly distributed to stakeholders during trainings, field visits, as well as picked by partner CSO officials for distribution whenever they visit CARE office. The latest in the list of documented and disseminated learning is the video documentary distributed on the CDs. A total of 5033 learning materials have been disseminated to stakeholders since the inception of the programme (Annex IX). So far, only eight CDs of the documentary on have been distributed. There is need to disseminate more information on 'best practices' through CDs and booklets. This should be done alongside sharing of a compiled experiences and achievements of various CSOs among all the partners CSOs, government authorities, as well

as non-members organizations and potential. Such approach will ensure that learnings are shared across the board and good practices are replicated elsewhere with the ultimate goal of improving pastoral livelihoods in the country. In addition, sharing with potential donors the programme's strengths, opportunities, success stories and unfinished projects may attract more funding into the basket fund.

2.3. Achievement of outcomes and activities

2.3.1. Improved livelihood securities

Interviews with pastoral communities to determine visibility of the PBFP among the pastoral communities show that most pastoralists (86%) are aware of the PBFP, regardless of gender and age. Similarly, they are aware of the programme's activities through the partner CSOs. The PBFP is most recognized for its efforts in creating awareness on land rights and policies (71%); and training on sustainable livestock husbandry that involve disease control and management (48%) (Tables 3 and 4). Magu and Kilosa districts have the highest awareness of the PBFP. These results, however, vary from one district to the other depending on the focus of various CSOs in different regions. The highest level of overall awareness of PBFP activities was recorded among the men (88%) and respondents over 51 years (96) (Table 4).

Table 3: Awareness on the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) and its activities in Tanzania disaggregated by districts

| Attribute | Whole sample (N=101) | Percentage distribution of respondents by districts | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | | Handeni (N=12) | Kilindi (N=15) | Kilosa (N=10) | Kiteto (N=12) | Magu (N=11) | Serengeti (N=16) | Simanjiro (N=25). |
| Aware of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) | 86.1 | 91.7 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 87.5 | 68.0 |
| 1. Unaware of PBFP activities | 2.3 | 9.1 | | | | | 7.1 | |
| 2. Training on proper livestock husbandry(disease control/management) etc | 48.3 | 36.4 | 21.4 | | 10.0 | 63.9 | 57.1 | 52.9 |
| 3. Creating awareness on land rights and policies (land &livestock) | 71.3 | 81.8 | | | 80.0 | 54.5 | 71.4 | 29.4 |
| 4. Training on livelihood diversification (sustainable agriculture, poultry farming) | 10.3 | | | | 10.0 | 36.4 | 7.1 | 17.6 |
| 5. Training on entrepreneurship | 11.5 | | | 10.0 | 10.0 | 18.2 | 14.3 | 23.5 |
| 6. Mobilization of pastoralists to form associations and networks | 3.4 | | | | | | 14.3 | |
| 7. Facilitation of rehabilitation of cattle dips | 4.6 | | | | 20.0 | 18.2 | | |
| 8. Training on conflicts resolution and management (sensitization on peaceful and harmonious co-existence between pastoralist and farmers | 23.0 | | | | 20.0 | 18.2 | | |
| 9. Training on pasture management (establishment of enclosures (<i>Ngitili</i>)) | 4.6 | | | | | 27.3 | 7.1 | |
| 10. Carrying out awareness on HIV/AIDS | 10.3 | | | | 70.0 | 9.1 | 7.1 | |
| 11. Training on gender issues (gender | 1.1 | | | | | 9.1 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|
| violence) | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Facilitation of construction of water pans/boreholes for livestock and households use | 9.2 | 9.1 | 14.3 | | 40.0 | 9.1 | | |
| 13. Supporting women groups/merry-go-round activities | 1.1 | | | | | 9.1 | | |
| 14. Training on environmental conservation | 6.9 | | 14.3 | 10.0 | 20.0 | | 7.1 | |
| 15. Provision of improved goat breeds | 9.2 | | | | | | | 47.1 |
| 16. Supporting formation of village community bank (VICOBA) | 4.6 | | | | | | | 23.5 |
| 17. Supporting Pastoral herd improvement (livestock breeding using improved bulls/AI) | 2.3 | | | | | | | 11.8 |

Table 4: Awareness on the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) and its activities in Tanzania disaggregated by sex and age

| Attribute | Whole sample (N= 101) | Percentage distribution of respondent by Sex and Age categories | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| | | Male (N=54) | Female (N=33) | 18-30 years | 31-50 years | 51 years and above |
| Aware of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) (N=87) | 86.1 | 88.5 | 82.5 | 61.9 | 90.9 | 95.8 |
| Activities of PBFP known | | | | | | |
| 1. Unaware of PBFP activities | 2.3 | 3.7 | | 7.7 | 2.0 | |
| 2. Training on proper livestock husbandry(disease control/management) etc | 48.3 | 53.7 | 39.4 | 30.8 | 50.0 | 56.5 |
| 3. Creating awareness on land rights and policies (land &livestock) | 71.3 | 75.9 | 63.6 | 84.6 | 66.0 | 73.9 |
| 4. Training on livelihood diversification (sustainable agriculture, poultry farming) | 10.3 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 10.0 | 13.0 |
| 5. Training on entrepreneurship | 11.5 | 11.1 | 12.1 | | 12.0 | 8.7 |
| 6. Mobilization of pastoralists to form associations and networks | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.0 | | | 4.3 |
| 7. Facilitation of rehabilitation of cattle dips | 4.6 | 5.6 | 3.0 | | 4.0 | 8.7 |
| 8. Training on conflicts resolution and management (sensitization on peaceful and harmonious co-existence between pastoralist and farmers | 23.0 | 27.8 | 15.2 | 30.8 | 24.0 | 13.0 |
| 9. Training on pasture management (establishment of enclosures (<i>Ng'itili</i>)) | 4.6 | 7.4 | | | 4.0 | 8.7 |
| 10. Carrying out awareness on HIV/AIDS | 10.3 | 7.4 | 15.2 | | 12.0 | 13.0 |
| 11. Training on gender issues (gender violence) | 1.1 | 1.9 | | | 2.0 | |
| 12. Facilitation of construction of water pans/boreholes for livestock and households use | 9.2 | 11.1 | 6.1 | 7.7 | 6.0 | 17.4 |
| 13. Supporting women groups/merry-go-round activities | 1.1 | 1.9 | | | 2.0 | |
| 14. Training on environmental conservation | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.1 | | 10.0 | 4.3 |
| 15. Provision of improved goat breeds | 9.2 | 5.6 | 15.2 | | 12.0 | 8.7 |
| 16. Supporting formation of village community bank (VICOBA) | 4.6 | | 12.1 | | 8.0 | |
| 17. Supporting Pastoral herd improvement (livestock breeding using improved bulls/AI) | 2.3 | | 6.1 | | 4.0 | |

2.3.2. Opinion of the pastoralist communities on the performance of the CSOs/PBFP

The results of the individual interviews show that a larger percentage (53%) of pastoralists think that more should be done by the CSOs and PBFP to properly address the problems they face (Table 5). Most of the pastoralists (84%) in Simanjiro are, however, satisfied with the performance of the pastoral CSOs. Those interviewed indicated diverse interests ranging from sustainable range management to diversification of livelihoods as ways of ensuring livelihood security. Majority (43%) of those

interviewed expressed need for more training to sensitize, create awareness and sustainable pastoralism. While pastoralists in Simanjiro prioritized capacity building through training on sustainable pastoralism (100) and livestock husbandry (75%), those from Kiteto preferred provision of livestock husbandry infrastructure (80%) such as water points, and credit facilities (70%) to enable them diversify their asset portfolios through business. A half of the interviewed females think that the CSOs have done enough to address pastoral problems (Table 6). Similarly, most (52%) of those in the 18 - 30 age category are satisfied with the CSOs' performance so far. The latter age bracket prefer more training on sustainable pastoralism, while majority of the women prioritize provision of credit facilities (55%) to enable them start small scale businesses, and development of water resources (50%).

Table 5: Opinion of the pastoralist communities on the performance of the CSOs/PBFP disaggregated by district

| Attribute | | Whole sample (N=101) | Percentage distribution of respondents by districts | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|---|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | Handeni (N=7) | Kilindi (N=10) | Kilosa (N=7) | Kiteto (N=10) | Magu (N=6) | Serengeti (N=9) | Simanjiro (N=4) |
| The CSOs and PBFP have done enough in addressing problems faced by pastoralists | | 47.5 | 41.7 | 33.3 | 30.0 | 16.7 | 45.5 | 43.8 | 84.0 |
| Suggestions by pastoralists on better ways to address problems faced by pastoralists | 1. More training/seminars on sustainable pastoralism | 43.4 | 57.1 | 30.0 | 85.7 | 20.0 | 50.0 | 22.2 | 100.0 |
| | 2. Construction of water/pans/boreholes/ dams support | 30.2 | | 30.0 | | 80.0 | | 44.4 | 25.0 |
| | 3. Provision/expansion of grazing lands support | 5.7 | | | | | | 33.3 | |
| | 4. Provision of financial support e.g. loans and credits | 18.9 | | 10.0 | | 70.0 | | 11.1 | 25.0 |
| | 5. More training on good livestock husbandry/practices | 11.3 | | 10.0 | | 10.0 | 16.7 | | 75.0 |
| | 6. More training on good environmental practices and management | 1.9 | | | | | 16.7 | | |
| | 7. More training and sensitization of pastoralists on land rights and policies | 18.9 | 42.9 | 40.0 | | 10.0 | 16.7 | | 25.0 |
| | 8. Provision of health services support | 3.8 | | | | 20.0 | | | |
| | 9. Provision of livestock health services (drugs, acaricides etc) support | 5.7 | | | | | | 22.2 | 25.0 |
| | 10. More training on conflict resolution mechanisms | 5.7 | | 10.0 | | 10.0 | 16.7 | | |
| | 11. Support to establish livestock products market linkages | 5.7 | | 10.0 | | | | 22.2 | |
| | 12. Expansion of trainings to cover larger areas and more people | 5.7 | | 10.0 | 14.3 | | 16.7 | | |
| | 13. More training on good pasture management | 1.9 | | 30.0 | | | 16.7 | | |

Table 6: Opinion of the pastoralist communities on the performance of the CSOs/PBFP disaggregated by sex and age categories

| Attribute | | Whole sample (N= 101) | Percentage distribution of respondent by Sex and Age categories | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | Male (N=33) | Female (N=20) | 18-30 years (N=10) | 31-50 years (N=29) | 51 years and above (N=13) |
| The CSOs and PBFP have done enough in addressing problems faced by pastoralists | | 47.5 | 45.9 | 50.0 | 52.4 | 47.3 | 45.8 |
| Suggestions by pastoralists on better ways to address problems faced by pastoralists | 1. More training/seminars on sustainable pastoralism | 43.4 | 54.5 | 50.0 | 70.0 | 41.4 | 53.8 |
| | 2. Construction of water/pans/boreholes/dams support | 30.2 | 21.2 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 34.5 | 30.8 |
| | 3. Provision/expansion of grazing lands support | 5.7 | 12.1 | | | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| | 4. Provision of financial support e.g. loans and credits | 18.9 | 3.0 | 55.0 | 10.0 | 24.1 | 15.4 |
| | 5. More training on good livestock husbandry/practices | 11.3 | 18.2 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 15.4 |
| | 6. More training on good environmental practices and management | 1.9 | 6.1 | | | | 7.7 |
| | 7. More training and sensitization of pastoralists on land rights and policies | 18.9 | 18.2 | 25.0 | 30.0 | 20.7 | 7.7 |
| | 8. Provision of health services support | 3.8 | 6.1 | 20.0 | | 10.3 | 7.7 |
| | 9. Provision of livestock health services (drugs, accaricides etc) support | 5.7 | 6.1 | | | 3.4 | |
| | 10. More training on conflict resolution mechanisms | 5.7 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 6.9 | |
| | 11. Support to establish livestock products market linkages | 5.7 | 3.0 | 10.0 | | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| | 12. Expansion of trainings to cover larger areas and more people | 5.7 | 6.1 | | | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| | 13. More training on good pasture management | 1.9 | 3.0 | 5.0 | | | 7.7 |

2.3.3. Improved quality of life of pastoral communities

Out of the 101 pastoralists interviewed, 86% indicated that their ability to exercise their land rights has increased, most of them in the 18 – 30 years age bracket (Tables 7 and 8). This was more pronounced in Magu and Kilindi where all the respondents showed confidence in exercising their rights. The results of the individual interviews show increased ability of pastoralists to participate and influence policies (79%). Majority of those who showed confidence in their ability to influence policies are those 51 years old and above. Responses from the pastoralists also indicate that diversification of livelihoods has increased among pastoral communities as a result of sensitization and training by the pastoral CSOs. Most of the respondents (87%) are now engaged in alternative economic activities. Majority (90%) of them are women involved in either small business enterprises (retail shops and handicrafts). Although still considered as one of the main constraints to pastoralism, livestock losses due to diseases, has decreased following intervention by the CSOs. As a result of training on conflict resolution by received from the CSOs, 85% of the respondents reported less conflicts over resources. It, however, became apparent that there are still as many conflict as before but most of them are resolved at clan or village level and therefore fewer cases reach the law courts. Due to the increased ability of pastoralists to exercise their land rights and participation in village land-use planning, they have been able to access grazing lands initially out of their reach. The respondents were, however, quick to point out that the increased accessibility of grazing may, however, be short-lived in the absence of commitment of the government and lack of policies and legislation to enforce the ownership rights. Contrary to the positive responses from the pastoral communities on their capacity to exercise their rights and influence policies in their favour, little was recorded on their ability to advocate and secure services from the government. This is evident in their repeated appeal to CARE to provide various livestock husbandry infrastructure including cattle dips, water pans and boreholes, and veterinary services.

Table 7: Opinion on changes observed in the last three years disaggregated by districts

| Attribute | Opinion on changes observed in the last three years | Whole sample (N=101) | Percentage distribution of respondents by districts (%) | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | | Handeni (N=12) | Kilindi (N=15) | Kilosa (N=10) | Kiteto (N=12) | Magu (N=11) | Serengeti (N=16) | Simanjiro (N=25) |
| Ability to exercise your rights (e.g. land rights) as a pastoralist | Increased | 86.1 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 90.0 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 81.3 | 68.0 |
| | Decreased | 1.0 | | | | | | | 4.0 |
| | No change | 12.9 | 8.3 | | 10.0 | 8.3 | | 18.8 | 28.0 |
| Ability to participate in and influence local and national level policy processes | Increased | 79.2 | 66.7 | 93.3 | 80.0 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 64.0 |
| | Decreased | | | | | | | | |
| | No change | 20.8 | 33.3 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 8.3 | | 25.0 | 36.0 |
| Engaged in other economic activities besides livestock production | Yes | 84.16 | 66.7 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 84.0 | 66.7 |
| Incidences of livestock losses due diseases | Increased | 6.9 | 8.3 | | | 8.3 | | 31.3 | |
| | Decreased | 87.1 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 96.0 |
| | No change | 5.9 | | | | 16.7 | | 18.8 | 4.0 |
| Cases of conflicts over resources (grazing land, water etc) | Increased | 4.0 | 8.3 | 6.7 | | | | 12.5 | |
| | Decreased | 85.1 | 66.7 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 62.5 | 88.0 |
| | No change | 10.9 | 25.0 | | | 8.3 | | 25.0 | 12.0 |
| Grazing land accessible/under control of pastoral communities | Increased | 53.5 | 41.7 | 86.7 | 20.0 | 83.3 | 72.7 | 6.3 | 60.0 |
| | Decreased | 30.7 | 41.7 | 13.3 | 70.0 | 8.3 | | 81.3 | 12.0 |
| | No change | 12.9 | 16.7 | | 10.0 | 8.3 | | 12.5 | 28.0 |
| | Don't know | 3.0 | | | | | 27.3 | | |

Table 8: Opinion on changes observed in the last three years disaggregated by sex and age

| Attribute | Opinion on changes observed in the last three years | Whole sample (N=101) | Percentage distribution of respondent by Sex and Age categories (%) | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | Male (N=33) | Female (N=20) | 18-30 years (N=21) | 31-50 years (N=55) | 51 years and above (N=24) |
| Ability to exercise your rights (e.g. land rights) as a pastoralist | Increased | 86.1 | 85.2 | 87.5 | 71.4 | 90.9 | 87.5 |
| | Decreased | 1.0 | | 2.5 | | 1.8 | |
| | No change | 12.9 | 14.8 | 10.0 | 28.6 | 7.3 | 12.5 |
| Ability to participate in and influence local and national level policy processes | Increased | 79.2 | 82.0 | 75.0 | 66.7 | 76.4 | 95.8 |
| | Decreased | | | | | | |
| | No change | 20.8 | 18.0 | 25.0 | 33.3 | 23.6 | 4.2 |
| Engaged in other economic activities besides livestock production | Yes | 84.16 | 80.3 | 90.0 | 76.2 | 89.1 | 79.2 |
| Incidences of animal diseases | Increased | 6.9 | 6.6 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | |
| | Decreased | 87.1 | 86.9 | 87.5 | 90.5 | 83.6 | 91.7 |
| | No change | 5.9 | 6.6 | 5.0 | | 7.3 | 8.3 |
| Cases of conflicts over resources (grazing land, water etc) | Increased | 4.0 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 9.5 | 3.6 | |
| | Decreased | 85.1 | 83.6 | 87.5 | 76.2 | 85.5 | 91.7 |
| | No change | 10.9 | 13.1 | 7.5 | 14.3 | 10.9 | 8.3 |
| Grazing land accessible/under control of pastoral communities | Increased | 53.5 | 47.5 | 62.5 | 47.6 | 54.5 | 58.3 |
| | Decreased | 30.7 | 37.7 | 20.0 | 33.3 | 25.5 | 37.5 |
| | No change | 12.9 | 9.8 | 17.5 | 19.0 | 16.4 | |
| | Don't know | 3.0 | 4.9 | | | 3.6 | 4.2 |

2.3.4. Collaboration between CSOs, government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)

All the government and CSO officials interviewed indicated a better working relationship between the pastoral CSOs, government authorities and pastoral communities than before the PBFP. This is attributed to the transparency exhibited by the pastoral CSOs in sharing their action plans with the government authorities. Through both formal and informal the Public Private Partnership (PPP) arrangements, there are evidences of the two working together towards improved well-being of pastoralist. The PBFP has been engaging the line ministries at different levels. CARE's contact persons at district level are all members of the then, district agriculture and livestock department. At national level the PBFP works very closely with the MoLDF and DSPD. The latter is a member of the BFGC. The government has been reciprocating the good gesture from the PBFP by involving its officials in government's agenda concerning pastoralists. The PBFP was invited to participate in the meeting of livestock sector stakeholders conducted at St. Gasper Conference Center in Dodoma on 24th and 25th January 2011. The main objective of the meeting was to review the Draft Livestock Sector Development Programme (LSDP) developed by the Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries (MoLDF). The Overall goal of the LSD, which is to increase food security, stakeholder's incomes and contribution to national economy conform to the overall objective of the PBFP. The specific objectives of LSDP are to:

- i. Improve the livelihoods of the livestock farmers (pastoralists and agro-pastoralists)
- ii. Enhance the delivery of livestock inputs and services to livestock farmers
- iii. Improve marketing infrastructure and marketing systems for livestock and livestock products
- iv. Strengthen the capacity of livestock farming communities and the private sector
- v. Strengthen national and local government institutions to provide services to livestock sectors

Testimony from Kilindi shows the nature of partnership between the CSOs and LGAs at local levels. The Kilindi District council together with ENVIROCARE conducted baseline survey which identified problems and assessed available opportunities for working together to solve the same. The district has since incorporated into its action plan activities address some of these problems identified during the survey. The council normally invites different development partners during planning process so as to harmonize each other's plans, consolidate resources and avoid duplication of efforts. As required by CARE, for all partner CSOs, ENVIROCARE on the other hand shares its proposals and action plans with the district focal person and district council for comments before submission to CARE. Some of the problems identified in the baseline survey which were critical were land conflicts, shortage of water boreholes, dips and poor veterinary services. Some of these problems have been addressed by PADEP project that used the same information from the survey. It was also evident that, there were frequent land conflicts as a result of poor understanding of the village land Act of 1999. The district in collaboration with EMAYO and ENVIROCARE has been able to sensitize the community on the land Act and conflict resolution. Arrangements are normally made where the CSO provides funding to implement the activities while the district council provides the technical support. This partnership has gone a notch higher with a member of EMAYO, Jeremiah Simon has been selected to be in the Constituent Development Fund (CDF) committee.

In Simanjiro, UVIMASHA works very closely with the district agriculture and livestock departments particularly in the pastoral herd improvement project using improved breeding bulls and artificial insemination (AI). The arrangement is the same as in Kilindi district, where the government officials provide the technical back-stopping while UVIMASHA facilitates the activities. The use of Boran bulls from the National artificial Insemination Centre (NAIC) to upgrade the small east African zebus (SEZ) kept by the Maasai has been largely successful through this partnership. In addition this partnership has been involved in training of the WAMIJA (CBAHW) to ensure sustainability of the project beyond the life of PBFP.

In addition to CSOs-government partnerships, the PBFP has partnered with Kimmage Development Studies Centre in training of government officers on pastoralism and policy options in East Africa. The PBFP has also collaborated with SNV to support SHIMWAJAWA in capacity building on organization management. The programme has worked with the Ministry of Land and Settlement Development on training implementing CSOs and local government officers on Land Act and Conflict Resolution strategy. In addition, PBFP has collaborated with MS-TCDC on training of local government officers and implementing CSOs' on policy analysis and advocacy.

2.4. Sustainability of the PBFP

An assessment of the institutional, technical and financial sustainability indicates potential institutional and technical capacity albeit weak. Financial sustainability of the PBFP seems to be unclear with IA being the main donor to the basket fund at present. At the conception, it was envisaged that many donors and government will contribute to the programme to actualize and operationalize it as a basket fund. An exception is the recent funding of the Sustainable Rangeland Management Programme (SRMP) by the International Land Coalition (ILC) and International Fund Agriculture and Development (IFAD). The SRMP is a collaborative initiative between the Ministry of Livestock Development and Fisheries, the District Councils of Kondoa, Kiteto, Bahi and Chamwino, the National Land Use Planning Commission of the Government of Tanzania, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, CARE International, Irish Aid, the Finnish Government, the Belgian Survival Fund, the Secretariat of the International Land Coalition and other members of the International Land Coalition. The Goal of the project is to promote and support sustainable rangeland management for livestock development. The purpose is to strengthen the linkages between securing land rights, land use planning, rangeland management and livestock development. The financial sustainability of the CSO projects is similarly in doubt with exception of some such as UVIMASHA, which receives contribution from member organizations and is already getting financial assistance from World Vision's Area Development Programme (ADP). None of the visited CSOs, have ever received any support from the government with exception of RIRA, which received Tsh.3 million in 2010 to conduct training on poultry farming; and ENVIROCARE, which benefited from Tsh.13 million from the Constitutional Affairs and Justice under Legal sector reform programmes in 2010 to facilitate training on constitution.

Owing to elaborate efforts by the PBFP to build capacity of the CSO officials and pastoral communities, there is promising technical capacity, which only requires further strengthening. More training will be required to bridge the gap between knowledge and skills, on one hand and application, on the other. This was attested from key informant interviews... *“.....we have just taken the first step ...it will be too soon for us to walk on our own....CARE has just shown us the light, it will be fatal to suddenly withdraw its support”*. *“...As concerns conflict resolution, we have acquired enough knowledge and skills but we still need a lot of education on various issues especially on conflict management to ensure lasting solutions”* (TPCF official). Despite a good network of CSOs working towards a similar goal, there is likely to be a problem without a local umbrella organization capable of taking over the management of grants from CARE. There is an urgent need to form or identify a reputable organization, define its organizational and institutional structure, and build its capacity to take over from CARE.

2.5. Lessons learnt

The implementation of the PBFP has brought to the fore important lessons that need to be considered to improve the performance. The lessons are as well imperative for the success of future programmes of this nature:

- Participatory approach and sensitization of pastoralist on peaceful conflict resolution and management is effective in achieving lasting solutions to conflict over resources. As reported in Iringa, members of pastoral and farmers communities, and the village authorities are involved in land-use planning to delineate areas for cultivation and grazing and livestock routes to dry season grazing and water points. This approach has greatly reduced conflicts between farmers and pastoralists, and shows that community-driven approaches such as active involvement of beneficiaries in finding home-grown solutions to their problems produce sustainable results
- Involvement of all stakeholders is key to success of a programme such as PBFP. Partnership between the government authorities, pastoral CSOs and pastoral communities has the potential of effectively addressing problems facing pastoral livelihoods. There is need for coordinated cooperation between the CSOs and the LGAs in developing the proposal and action plans so as to consolidate resources and avoid duplication of efforts for better implementation as testified in Kilindi and Simanjiro. Financial facilitation of LGAs officers to provide technical inputs motivates them and creates a better working relations and efficiency in their duties as seen in Kilosa and Kabita - Magu. However, transparency, accountability and trust are paramount to success of such a collaboration.
- Pastoralists are marginalized and disadvantaged because of lack of their representation in the village committees and ward councils. Increased representation of pastoralists at these local level decision organs has produced positive results in Iringa, where pastoralist can now voice their concerns and present their interests and are able to influence policies in their favour. One of such example is a case where pastoralist representatives were able to advocate and secure livestock corridors to enable them access grazing and water during the dry seasons. Increased representations of pastoralists in both local and national the decision making organs has the potential of accelerating the realization of PBFP's objectives
- Routine communication and good rapport between stakeholders is vital in building stronger and effective working relationships. Such has been reported in frequent visits, communication and good working relationship between PBFP and partner

- CSOs, district contact persons and pastoral communities. As testified by beneficiaries in Kabita, RIRA has cultivated that close contact with the LGAs and this has enabled them to access timely veterinary services in times of need.
- Pastoralists are yearning for knowledge and change. They have just realized the opportunity cost of not knowing and not having the skills. As they rightly indicated in Mererani, *“...knowledge is power”.... and we need more of that power to be at par with other communities*” (FGD participant, Lengast). Contrary to the widely held view that they are resistant to change, pastoralists are very dynamic and open to ideas and technologies that would improve their livelihoods. *“...They are very receptive, keen and quick to learn new ideas that can improve their lives”* (TAGRODE official in Iringa). *“...if given a chance they can do better than farmers...with little training they are capable of doing a lot...”* (HUDESA official Kilosa).
 - Different age groups and gender have different interests, community-based projects such as those being implemented by partner CSOs of PBFP must, therefore, take into account the different interest groups. The results of this evaluation exercise indirectly shows the interest of women in securing credit facilities to finance their small business enterprises, and improved access to water. On the other hand, men will be more interested in projects that will improve access to grazing and thus livestock productivity.
 - Women tend to be more responsive to development than men. An example is the entrepreneurship training in Magu, which is already making impacts on pastoralist women lives especially in Iringa. A number of them are already engaged in alternative livelihood activities such as operating food kiosks, beadwork, among others. However, despite the widespread awareness, women are not yet fully liberated (still marginalized) especially in pastoral areas
 - Competition among CSOs and NGOs working with communities is common and can be counterproductive. *“...big organizations with a lot of funds to hand-out but limited understanding of pastoral livelihoods make it difficult for smaller grassroot-based organizations with limited funds to succeed in winning the interest of pastoralists to participate in genuine demand-driven projects”* (TPCF official).
 - While it is extremely important to involve all the stakeholders in a programme like the PBFP, managing the group dynamics manifested in divergent interests can be very difficult. This is attested in the failure of the partner CSOs to agree on which of the umbrella organizations to groom so as to eventually take over management of the grants. This, though not a justification, shows why sometime an independent organization such as CARE would be best suited to manage such grants.
 - Capacity building projects among rural communities needs to be gradual and therefore require time. This is evident in the PBFP’s elaborate efforts to equip pastoralists with knowledge and skills in the past three years and yet there is still a lot to be done to ensure that they can effectively exercise their rights and succeed in getting quality services from the government.

2.6. Best practices and success stories

2.6.1. Exercising land rights and influencing policy at local level

Reliable access to grazing and water especially during the dry seasons is very critical to practicing pastoralism. One of the key activities of the partners CSOs has been sensitization

and awareness creation on land rights and policies that affect pastoral livelihoods. The overall objective of such efforts has been to enhance pastoralists' capacity to exercise their rights and influence policies in their favour. Among other approaches that have been used to sensitize the community is the use of theatre, focus groups and plenary discussions with positive results. The case of Serengeti is one of the examples where the communities have been able to use the awareness and knowledge gained to lobby and advocate for their land rights. Following the training on village land Act of 1999 and conflict resolution by TACODEF, the community gained confidence to assert their rights over land which was about to be leased to an investor. A committee of eight members was selected to seek audience with the district authorities over the matter but their bid was not successful. The committee took their case further to the president's office after which the state house secretary directed the district authorities to hold public meetings with the villages to resolve the issue. The land was finally surrendered back to pastoralists. In Kilindi, Mzinga village, large parcels of land had been sequestered 'illegally' by investors. After receiving training on land rights and conflict resolution the communities, through appropriate village fora demanded for the land to be surrendered back to village authority. Finally, the village council met and deliberated on the issue, when it was confirmed that the investors acquired land illegally, ownership was reverted back and now it is under the village control.

Awareness creation and sensitization on land issues and conflict resolution have also had positive impacts in Kilindi. In Kwamwande ward, Losioi village in Kilindi district, for example, though there were land-use plans, farmers encroached the pastoralists' grazing land. The training conducted by EMAYO brought the two parties together to peacefully resolve the conflict. The area under dispute was finally surrendered back to pastoralists for the purpose of grazing. This led to development of land-use plans by most villages in the area. Elsewhere, pastoralists have started negotiating joint land-use planning with other land users. This is evident in Kilindi, Kiteto, Geita and Serengeti where different land-users have agreed and set aside land for grazing land, livestock routes, farming and settlement.

Implementing partners of the PBFP have devoted a lot of resources, time and effort to sensitize and create awareness to the communities to understand their roles and in some cases hold leaders accountable for their responsibilities. Among the factors hindering the ability of the pastoralists to influence policies is the absence of or weak representation in the mainstream political processes and in decision making organs both at local as well as national level. Training received from the PBFP partners CSOs has changed this and pastoralists now have the confidence to contest in different leadership positions and win. In Iringa, for example, pastoralists continue to be elected to leadership positions. Mr. Paani Sandule (Figure 1), was selected to join the district business committee; Lemong'o Moringe of Ilera village in Kiteto, contested for village chairmanship and won. He also registered and contested for the ward councilor's seat successfully. In the past, members of the Taturu community never contested for the local government leadership positions. However, following sensitization by TACODEF (SHIMWAJAWA), three members of the community successfully contested for positions in the village executive committee during the last elections in October 2010. In Tungamalenga village in Iringa, pastoralists have managed to over throw a corrupt chairman through a vote of no confidence.



Figure 1: Mr Paani Sandule (right), explaining how a training on land rights, good governance and conflict resolution has given them confidence to fight for pastoralists' rights.

2.6.2. Networks to address pastoral issues

Pastoralists have established village and wards networks as platforms for a common front to lobby for issues of common interest to pastoralists, among them, land access and ownership rights and representation in decision making forums. Pastoralists networks at ward level have provided excellent forums for discussing pastoral issues. Through these networks, pastoral communities have managed to lobby for acquisition, construction and renovation of livestock infrastructures such as dips and boreholes. For example, in Geita district, Lwenge village, a ward network established with facilitation from CODERT, has succeeded in securing access to a cattle dip which was formerly owned by few individuals to benefit all pastoralists within the ward. In Iringa rural district, pastoralists in Pawaga and Tungamalenga have established a network called UWAKAILO with support from TAGRODE. Through the network, pastoralists have managed to acquire abandoned cattle dips and boreholes from the government, and renovated them. They are currently operational and are managed by committees selected by pastoralist themselves. Members are charged Tsh 100 per each cow and Tsh 50 per each goat or sheep to use the dips. The collected revenue is saved in a bank account to purchase of acaricides and cover other operational costs of the dip. Similar practices have been reported in Geita, in Mwanza district and Kabita village in Magu district.

2.6.3. Conflict resolution

Incidences of conflict among pastoralists and farmers, on one hand and government authorities, on the other hand is common in areas where resources are shared. This occurs when one of the parties encroach on the other's territory. Sometimes, it has been reported that, conflicts arise when farmers or government authorities block routes that pastoralists use to access critical grazing and water points, especially during the dry seasons. With the training and awareness and among the pastoral communities, the villages and ward land tribunals most of the conflicts are resolved at village level as opposed to before when all cases ended up in law courts. In Pawaga in Iringa, conflicts have been reduced after the sensitization workshops on land rights and conflict resolution. Through multiplier effect many pastoralist and farming communities have been reached. Formerly, the conflict resolution committee comprised only farmers. As a result of several training, pastoralists gained confidence to demand their right to be represented in the committee. The committee

was dissolved and new one comprising both farmer and pastoralist representatives was established.

2.6.4. Lobbying and advocacy

In the recent past, however, the most striking form of conflict is that of investors versus pastoralist communities. Leasing of pastoral to investors basically imply denying pastoralists rights to grazing in the sequestered areas or worse their eviction from such areas. Whereas pastoralists and farmers are now able to amicably resolve their conflicts at village level, conflicts between pastoralists and investors backed by government authorities has proved to be difficult to handle. The CSOs and umbrella organizations have, however, made a lot of effort in sensitizing and creating awareness among pastoral communities and the public in general on the implications of the attempts by government to lease land to investors. Worth noting is the role of PLTF in blowing the whistle about the government plan to lease out pastoral land in Loliondo to a hunting company from United Arab Emirates called OBC. Recently, the PLTF took its campaign a notch higher by posting a video footage “voices from Loliondo” on the “YU-Tube”. Though the issue has not been resolved but PLTF’s efforts have met with a lot of sympathy from the public and international community, implying that, in the future, the government will no longer have a free hand in making such decisions without consulting pastoral communities.

2.6.5. Indigenous herd improvement

UVIMASHA has been implementing indigenous cattle breed improvement project among the Maasai communities in Simanjiro. UVIMASHA developed the proposal and shared with it the district council for inputs where both agreed to implement the project in seven wards of the district as pilot area. UVIMASHA facilitated formulation of forty eight (48) pastoral groups. Two people from each group as TOT were selected to attend the two weeks seminar on livestock improvement facilitated by UVIMASHA and the district authorities. Some of the participants of the seminar were again taken to NAIC in USA River, Arusha to learn the production methods of improved breeds through artificial insemination. The Maasai communities in Simanjiro are quickly embracing the project introduced by **UVIMASHA** with technical support from the district authorities in particular the National Artificial insemination Centre (NAIC). In the project, indigenous cattle breeds are upgraded through artificial insemination (AI) and improved bulls (Figure 2). Besides providing expertise in the implementation of the project, the district authorities also provided 100 bulls to be distributed to pastoralists in the pilot project area.



Figure 2: A Boran bull from Mpwapwa, donated by UVIMASHA and Simanjiro District Council to Kandasikra

The pastoral communities are motivated by the fact that through cross-breeding their herds, they can get better breeds with higher milk production, higher body weight at maturity and therefore fetch better prices. This means increased income and food security for pastoral households. Some pastoralists have been impressed with the idea to an extent of buying their own breeding bulls from West Kilimanjaro and Kenya.

2.6.6. Livelihood diversification

In Naberera, Simanjiro district, awareness creation on land rights has gone a step further to give women access rights to land. Both Mr. Francis and his wife Esther attended the training on land rights under Land Act of 1999 conducted by SDO in 2008 through grants from PBF. After being enlightened on her land rights as a woman, Esther Francis applied for a parcel of through the village council. She was allocated 20 acres in 2008 and cleared 10 acres and intercropped maize and beans (Figure 3) from which she harvested 20 sacks (2000kg) of maize.



Figure3: Mama Esther Francis and her son Loserian in her beans farm

2.6.7. The Village Savings and Loans (VSL) and Village Community Banks (VICOBA)

Some CSO have facilitated pastoral communities to form groups for the village savings and loans (VSL). The VSL approach has proved to be very successful in consolidating pastoralists' financial resources to meet their basic requirements for supporting pastoralism and other social-economic activities. Through their savings and loans to members, they are able to support livestock improvement activities and procurement of veterinary inputs. CODERT, for example, facilitated formation of ward and village networks. Through these networks, members were mobilized in groups to pull their savings and raise pastoralist development funds to support their development and income generating activities. A total of 70 agro-pastoralist groups have been formed in five wards of Kasamwa, Ihanamilo, Kagu, Kamuhanga and Nyarugusu with members totalling 1750 (1150 being women and 600 men). The groups have received training on how to manage village savings and loans and education on investment and shares. VSL group members meet every month to do the savings and discuss issues of common interest which affects them. In Nyarugusu, a VSL group of women pastoralists known as "Ufugaji – Biashara" has been formed. The objective of the group is to buy kids fatten them and sell them after three months (as way of creating form utility). Another VSL group the "Kikundi cha Ufugaji – Upendo" have the objective of improving livestock keeping services including veterinary, dipping, and extension services. The results of which are reported to be currently promising.



Figure 4: The KIMISHA, VSL women group supported by RIRA in Magu

In Magu, RIRA has facilitated formation of Village Community Banks (VICOBA), which caters for financial services of agro-pastoralists and farmers. Group member save their money especially during harvests and are allowed to withdraw any time need arises, in most case for purpose of supporting business enterprises.

2.6.8. Theatre

The theatre group and anti-conflict banner (Figure 5) in Kilindi District attest to EMAYO's work in educating the pastoralist as well as farmers against conflicts over resources. In Kibirashi village, the communities after training on land rights and land-use planning by

EMAYO have demanded creation of livestock routes by the LGA to allow pastoralists access water sources. Following their demand, the government has issued instructions to the village councils to oversee the process of establishing stock corridors. As a result of the CSOs advocacy against conflicts and training on peaceful conflict resolution, conflicts between pastoralists and farmers has shown a steady decrease in Kilindi from 73 in 2008 to 37 in 2009 and 6 in 2010 (Mashauri ya Madai ya Ardhi, Myungwe, Kilindi, 2010).



Figure 5: Banner on “conflict free co-existence for the well being of farmers and pastoralists in Kilindi District”

2.7. Analysis of the programme assumptions

A number of the assumptions made in the programme’s proposal have been found to negatively impact on the implementation of the PBFP. Table 9 presents the assumptions, their influence on the programme and the mechanisms undertaken by the PBFP to mitigate the impacts.

Table 9: Assumptions, impacts on the PBFP and mitigation measures

| Assumptions | Actual situation and impact on PBFP activities | Mitigation |
|--|--|---|
| i. Political stability and commitment/support for pro-poor | There is political stability, and policies on poverty reduction e.g. MKUKUTA but lack of specific strategy to improvement of pastoral livelihoods. | The PBFP received negligible support from MLDF for implementing the new livestock policy. The PBFP initiated and facilitated the development of CSOs Pastoralism Strategic Plan (in its 3 rd draft) |
| ii. Political commitment to decentralization by devolution | There are policies on decentralization i.e. the Decentralization and Local Government Reform Program | No mitigation required |
| iii. No natural or human induced disasters | Droughts are common phenomena in the pastoral areas of East Africa. The latest, 2009/2010 drought was one of the most devastating to pastoral livelihoods in the recent past. The drought affected programme implementation in some intervention areas. Meetings and trainings could not be conducted as planned as beneficiaries were busy looking for other ways of | No mitigation measures were undertaken by PBFP. This is because PBFP has to comply to CARE criteria for delivery of such support. The affected areas did not reach acceptable CARE set criteria for getting relief support, it was therefore difficult to take any kind of intervention using programme |

| | subsistence. | funds. |
|---|--|---|
| iv. Development partners' interest in supporting PBFP continues to grow with additional funds contributed to the basket fund | No serious interest to support PBFP from potential donors besides Irish Aid. DANIDA has shown interest but no commitment of funds has been made except from International Land Coalition. (ILC)/IFAD to support the SRMP. Overall, no significant contribution has been received by PBFP thereby slowing down the capacity of PBFP to work with more pastoral CSOs. | The PBFP has been disseminating documents on the programme's activities and achievements with aim of attracting potential donors. Implementing CSOs have been trained on proposal writing and designing of projects to enable them fund-raise from other donors. Letters to introduce the programme and drawing attention to potential donors were circulated to over seven development partners. However, no positive response has been received to date |
| v. Pastoral CSOs in Tanzania continue to grow in quantity and quality | The number and capacity of the pastoral CSOs have improved as a result of the PBFP activities. The fact that every year new CSOs join the programme has meant no ample time to strengthening their capacity by the PBFP. In addition, unwillingness of some CSOs to change has had negative impact on the programme, and sometimes forced the programme to terminate funding to CSOs pre-maturely such as was the case with PAICODEO in Mvomero, Musoma Diocese and SEFA in Serengeti. | Whenever opportunity allowed some CSOs which complied well with program requirements received funds more than once. TAGRODE, SHILDA, RIRA CODERT, EMAYO and TAPGHO are cases at hand. Such measures were undertaken by PBFP aiming at strengthening CSOs especially the smaller ones like EMAYO and RIRA. |
| vi. Policy initiatives undertaken by pastoral CSOs are perceived positively and supported by local government authorities | Most of the CSOs tend to work very closely with the LGAs. However, very few CSOs, have received financial support from the LGAs. This has weakened programme implementation sometimes leading to implementation of parallel programmes thereby causing friction between district councils and CSOs. NGONET, for example, had to pre-maturely wind up their project due to this reason. | The PBFP is encouraging transparency of the CSOs to the district council with respect to action plans to avoid conflict of interests and duplication of efforts. |
| vii. Government continues to support decentralization process including increasing government district line offices accountability to District Councils | There are efforts to decentralize and reform the local government in the Decentralization and Local Government Reform Program. Where the reform has been effectively applied, positive results in favour of the PBFP have been realized. For example in Kilindi district, baseline survey results by ENVIROCARE have been used by the district council to address the problems that were identified in relation to pastoralist demands. | The PBFP is encouraging transparency of the CSOs to the district council with respect to action plans to ensure consolidation of efforts and resources for better results |
| viii. Village Councils, Ward Councils and District Councils encourage participation of poor and marginalized groups especially pastoralists in | There is increasing representation of the pastoralists in village councils where decisions are made at local level. This is, however, only evident in areas where the | No mitigation required |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| development processes in respective areas | PBFP partner CSOs are working. Iringa and Kilindi are good examples where pastoralists have managed to have representation at village and ward levels with positive influences on decision making | |
| ix. Effective coordination and communication between key government ministries/departments that cater to the interests of pastoralists | No evidence of effective coordination and communication between government departments mandated to address pastoral issues. This is also affecting their relationship with the CSOs | PBFP organized two stakeholders meetings and pastoral CSOs meetings where issues of need for coordination and communication between the relevant departments and CSOs were encouraged. The MLDF participated in all meetings. |
| x. Key actors/stakeholders are interested and willing to learn and apply learning generated from the PBFP to improve their policies and practices. | Testimonies from the CSOs, government officials and pastoralists show absolute interest to learn from PBFP and willingness to apply the knowledge to improve their policies and practices | No mitigation required |

2.8. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis of the PBFP

The results of a SWOT analysis conducted to reveal the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the PBFP show critical issues with direct and indirect bearing on sustainability of the programme and the activities of the partners CSO.

Strengths

- CARE as a reputable international organization with wealth of experience in managing big grants has the capacity to effectively coordinate and manage the funds. Testimonies from various stakeholders show that CARE has efficiently managed the basket fund in a transparent and participatory manner as attested by the selection criteria for the implementing CSOs. In addition, the PBFP has dedicated staff with perfect public relation skills. This has led to a very good rapport with both implementing CSOs and pastoral communities.
- The PBFP is addressing real and current problems facing pastoral livelihoods in Tanzania. This makes it possible for the implementing CSOs to tackle the problems in real time.
- Implementation of the PBFP objectives is done by the local CSOs that are familiar with problems facing pastoralists in Tanzania. This makes their projects acceptable to the beneficiaries and thus enhances their success and sustainability.
- Elaborate capacity building, has ensured that the CSOs and LGAs are capable of discharging their duties effectively and efficiently into the future. If the CSOs can effectively apply the knowledge and skills imparted to them they can in future manage huge amount of money.
- A strong working relationship between the CSOs and LGAs has ensured less duplication of efforts and consolidation of resources with more and lasting impacts.

Weaknesses

- The programme has not been able attract additional funding from potential donors, with exception of the International Land Coalition (ILC) in conjunction with

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The ILC/IFAD is funding the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) in Kiteto district in Manyara region and Kondoa, Chamwino and Bahi districts in Dodoma region.

- The programme is yet to identify a competent organization to take over management of grants from CARE. An early establishment of such organization will allow ample time for the process of developing organizational and operational structures and capacity building ahead of CARE's exit.
- The PBFP does not have enough technical staff to follow up on the progress of the numerous projects going on in different parts of the country at the same time. There is need to recruit at least two field assistants with expertise in livestock husbandry or range management to help the existing staff to monitor and evaluate the CSOs activities. Currently, PBFP has one staff who is an expert in livestock husbandry who is overwhelmed with the number of CSOs implementing and dispersed in a vast geographical programme areas.
- Despite the programme's involvement of government officials at different levels and CSOs efforts to influence policies at local level, PBFP's participation in policy formulation processes at national level, and engagement of decision makers at both local and national levels are still weak.
- Besides addressing gender as a cross-cutting issue, the programme's effort to support gender parity and mainstreaming is far from strong.
- The project cycle of one year is too short and funds too little to enable the implementing CSOs realize their objectives. It is apparent that this is occasioned by the limited funds and bidding approach employed in awarding fund to the partner CSOs. However, the CSOs should be funded continuously for at least three years in order to make reasonable impacts. *"...the amount is too little, you can hardly achieve all the objectives with it.CARE should consider increasing the level of funding to the CSOs up to Tsh. 35 million (EMAYO official).*
- The programme continues to fund new CSOs every year thereby diffusing the impacts instead of focusing on already engaged CSOs to ensure tangible outcomes.
- Poor documentation and filing by the implementing CSOs was noted as one of the weaknesses. It was, for example, not possible to get accurate number of beneficiaries from most of the CSOs visited. It was equally difficult for them to even trace some of the documents in their possession.
- The programme has not given climate change the attention it deserves as one of the major constraints to sustainable pastoralism. None of the CSOs supported by the PBFP addresses climate change adaptation as away of reducing vulnerability of pastoral households to adverse effects of extreme climatic events.

Opportunities

- The pastoralist networks provide excellent opportunity for collective bargain and platform for coordinating future development projects. The networks also present good opportunity for the government to initiate development initiatives and provide services to the pastoralists.
- The empowerment of the CSOs and LGAs through training will ensure that they are able to discharge their duties effectively in the future. The DIMER training has equipped the CSOs with skills of project management and proposal writing, the latter which is crucial for fund-raising for on-going and future projects.

- Enhanced collaboration between the LGAs and CSOs presents the opportunity to mainstream the PBFP activities into district government development plans. This is crucial with respect to sustainability of the on-going activities.

Threats

- Reliance on one donor (IA) to implement many projects puts the sustainability of the on-going activities at risk. There is, therefore, need to proactively look for funding from potential donors for the phase II of the programme.
- The absence of an independent local organization to assume the mandate of CARE at the end of the programme.
- Although gender mainstreaming is one of the cross-cutting issues being addressed by almost all implementing CSOs, cultural values continue to prevail and therefore undermine gender mainstreaming.
- Politics has the potential of disintegrating the already formed pastoralist networks, and undermining the collaboration between various pastoral CSOs as well as partnerships between CSOs and government authorities.
- Government's support and relevant policies will determine to a greater extent the sustainability of the gains already made. In the absence of goodwill from the government, favourable policies and legislations to enforce them, the reported successes are likely to be short-lived.

2.9 Exit strategy

When implementing any project, one must contemplate how to eventually get out of it, otherwise referred to as “exit strategy.” Exit strategy refers to how you see the project after some period of time and whether you can exit successfully with significant benefits. However, whatever your particular strategy might be, to be viable and potentially successful, all such exit strategies require you to see things backward. This means that one has to picture the project after some period of time and decide what need to be done to achieve the desired goal.

As part of the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation (MTE), CARE has since developed an exit strategy for the PBFP. The general purpose of an exit strategy is to guide activities and measures necessary for sustainability of a programme. In-built in an exit strategy are deliberate activities, efforts and measures undertaken to ensure institutional, technical, financial and social sustainability of the programme. These include, among others, specific activities to ensure continuous financial support; enhanced institutional and technical capacity of beneficiaries or organizations to continue managing the programme.

One of the strategies used by PBFP to ensure that the partner CSOs are capable of securing funds in the future has been strengthening their capacity through training on proposal writing, project designing, implementing, monitoring, evaluating and report writing skills. However, this is yet to bear any significant fruits, as none of the partners CSOs are yet to get extra funding from other organizations to complement the support from the IA through CARE. Besides capacity building, efforts have been made to identify a coordinating organization to manage the grants upon CARE's exit. This is apparently taking too long and has been largely unsuccessful since partner CSOs are yet to agree on the how the organization is to be selected or formed. Efforts by the PBFP to link smaller pastoral CSOs with bigger CSOs is on-as part of programme activities. Some of these bigger CSOs are

umbrella organizations and it remains the decision of the smaller CSO to register as their members on one side and efforts of the umbrella CSOs to influence and convince the smaller CSOs to become members, on the other hand. The PBFP is also encouraging the umbrella organizations to implement projects related to capacity building of smaller member CBOs and NGOs in management skills. This is aimed at enhancing management and sustainability of on-going projects. Umbrella CSOs implementing PBFP have, therefore, been awarded grants to conduct short courses in project management, advocacy, financial management and other areas to ensure members CSO acquire better management skills. It is hoped that as long as the capacity of the CSOs in management is enhanced effectiveness of the programme activities will also be enhanced and sustained. This approach will, however, require “...allocation of strategic funds to the umbrella organizations for the support of smaller ones” (TNRF/PLTF official). One of the major weaknesses that threaten the sustainability of PBFP has been its inability to attract more donors to contribute to the basket fund. Aggressive dissemination of the programme’s strengths, opportunities, learnings, best practices and success stories have the potential of enhancing visibility, confidence and attracting more donors to contribute to the basket fund.

The exit strategy developed by for PBFP presents a summary of key areas of concern with respect to institutional, technical and financial sustainability of the project. However, it lacks depth with respect to a number of issues that form part of a good exit strategy. A strategy should be ‘SMART’ in the sense that it should have specific activities; measurable and achievable outputs; relevant and time-bound outcomes. The exit strategy should include, among others:

- i. A clear outline of achievements already made by the programme and what more need to be done to ensure that the programme exits effectively.
- ii. A detailed itemization of the strategic activities by the envisaged outcomes or outputs in the programme document. The activities should be disaggregated into embedded and post-programme measures.
- iii. A clear specification activities to be or being undertaken to achieve the specified outputs
- iv. Time frame for the activities (milestones of when certain activities and outputs in the strategy are supposed to be achieved)
- v. Who is responsible for what (role of different stakeholders towards in implementing the strategy)
- vi. Predicted risks and their mitigation measures
- vii. A clear institutional and organizational structure and mandate of a co-ordinating organization to take over management of grants from CARE. This includes how it will be formed or selected; organogram, schedule for capacity building and technical back-stopping
- viii. A clear cut procedure for fund raising from potential donors to actualize, operationalize and qualify the PBFP as ‘basket fund’.
- ix. A complete proposal for the Phase II of the PBFP. By now there should be a complete proposal for extension of the PBFP focusing on the specific activities to ensure sustainability.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The final evaluation results indicate that CARE has succeeded in developing and implementing a transparent mechanism for establishing and managing a basket fund to support pastoral CSOs in Tanzania. The preparatory stage of the programme entailed a participatory approach involving all the stakeholders followed by a transparent selection procedure for the partner CSOs based on meritocracy. The selection process was ensued by elaborate capacity building activities to ensure that pastoral CSOs deliver their mandates effectively. The evaluation exercise exposes good management of grants as one of the main strengths of the PBFP. An in-depth assessment of the PBFP reveals many on-going projects in the CSOs intervention areas, most of them though not completed, are already having positive impacts among the pastoral communities. However, the project cycle of one year was reported to be too short and funds too little to enable CSOs to fully realize their objectives. It was also observed that the programme continues to fund new CSOs every year thereby diffusing the impacts instead of focusing on already engaged CSOs to ensure tangible outcomes. The foregoing notwithstanding, there is no doubt that the programme has had significant positive impact on the partner CSOs and the pastoral communities. The programme has tackled some of the major challenges of pastoralism in Tanzania, among them unclear land rights and unfavourable policies that undermine pastoral livelihoods. The impact is more on capacity building of CSO officials, and sensitization and awareness creation among pastoral communities on land rights and various policies that affect their livelihoods.

The achievements notwithstanding, several gaps, among them, the missing link between knowledge and skills acquired and their applications, necessitate the need for more capacity building especially in lobbying and advocacy for land rights and quality services. Although there is increased capacity of most CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery to pastoral communities, there is need to strengthen the CSO networks to enable them to consolidate their efforts and resources for better results. Despite a lot of progress in fostering a good working relationship between the CSOs, LGAs and pastoral communities, there is need to strengthen the capacity of the LGAs to enable them discharge their duties more efficiently and effectively. This study revealed increasing gender awareness and women participation in local level decision-making organs. However, it is necessary to give more support to pastoral women to engage in alternative economic activities to ensure sustainable income and food security. Although the PBFP has engaged the government livestock sector in its implementation, the involvement of decision makers at all levels and participation of the programme in policy formulation processes at national level are still weak. CARE has so far shared a number of learning documents from the programme with stakeholders. However, there is still need to compile all the best practices and success stories and disseminate them to all stakeholders at local, regional and national levels with the ultimate goal of influencing policies. Conspicuously missing in the agenda implementing CSOs are activities that support and promote climate change adaptation among pastoral communities.

The phase II of the PBFP needs to focus on supporting climate change adaptation strategies to reduce vulnerability of pastoral households to adverse impacts of climatic anomalies. Some of the main weaknesses of the PBFP is failure to attract more donors apart from ILC/IFAD to contribute to the basket fund; and failure to identify or form a local

organization in time to manage the grants upon CARE's exit. These must be fast tracked to ensure sustainability of the programme. Overall, an extension of funding is imperative to accomplish the promising on-going activities; up-scale activities to other areas; realize the full impact of the programme; and form or identify and equip a competent local organization to take over CARE's mandate. "...the PBFP is like a ball that has just started rolling "...it will definitely need a little bit more force to continue rolling" (IPCF official).

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the foregoing conclusions, a number of recommendations are given for the way forward. These are classified into those that require immediate action as well as those that need to be considered in the second phase, subject to availability of funds. Given that the programmes life ends in December, 2011, the recommendations include those measures and activities that need to be undertaken by the end of the programme; those that need to be initiated and completed in the second phase; and those that will entirely be conducted in the second phase.

Immediate activities

- i. **Identification or formation of an independent local organization to manage the basket fund:** There is need for CARE to propose to the partner CSOs the criteria for selection or formation of an independent local organization to take over the management of grants. This is necessary since efforts to get suggestions and consensus from pastoral CSOs has failed to yield positive results. There are three options that seem to be viable. The first option is to register the PBFP as a Community-Based Organization (CBO)... "...called Tanzania Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (TPBFP) with representation from the existing pastoral CSOs, and let it manage the grants as an autonomous entity with initial backstopping from CARE" (TNRF/PLTF official). The second alternative is to identify a strong, reliable and competent organization from the existing umbrella organizations such as PINGOS and TAPHGO to eventually take over the mandate of CARE upon its exit. The third choice is to establish a new organization comprising of selected members from different pastoral CSOs to manage the grants. The three options, however, have their own bottlenecks. While the second choice may seem to be straight forward, it may be quite difficult for the pastoral CSOs to have a consensus on which of the umbrella organizations to take the responsibility of managing the funds. In addition, and similar to the third scenario, it raises the question of capacity to manage grants of such magnitude, and will require more financial resources for capacity building to enable it to effectively exercise its responsibilities. The third option offers more challenges in terms establishment of new administrative structure, new office and equipment. And although it allows pastoralists themselves to own and manage the grants, as in the first scenario, it is accompanied with high operational costs the hard task of harmonizing different interests of representative CSOs.

While seeking to establish an organization to manage the grants after CARE exits, it is important for CARE to pay attention to opinions of the umbrella organizations and opinion leaders among the pastoral communities, especially those from northern Tanzania where there was initial stand-off between the PBFP and pastoral CSOs. This is important because their cooperation is very critical to ownership and success of the programme. Although questions have been raised about the capacity of the existing local

organizations to manage grants of such magnitude, some of the leaders from pastoral communities, still maintain that the PBFP should be managed by pastoralists themselves. *"...something went wrong, the PBFP requires an institutional home....and its extremely important that pastoralists and pastoralism be at the core of the PBFP. CARE as an international organization is handicapped in its mandate and conduct to handle sensitive pastoral issues, a number of them political.* (TNRF/PLTF official).

- ii. **Mainstreaming the PBFP activities into the district agricultural and livestock development plans:** This crucial role for PBFP's institutional, technical and financial sustainability. This can be achieved through a written memorandum of understanding between CARE and the government followed by harmonization of the PBFP action plan and budget with that of the district agriculture and livestock departments. This approach will enhance synergies between the CSOs and LGAs activities. It could also help reverse the current scenario where larger proportions of district development plans and budget are devoted to crop production, even in pastoralism dominated areas of the country. This will require the PBFP to work more closely with the government and more participation in policy formulation processes at national level.
- iii. **Building capacity of the LGAs to effectively respond to pastoralists' demands and quality services:** Despite the improved working relationship between the LGAs, CSOs and pastoralists, there is dire need to build the capacity of to deliver the services more effectively and efficiently.
- iv. **Secure extension of funding for the PBFP or proactively fund raise for the phase II from other donors:** This is necessary because the programme is officially coming to closure in December, 2011, and while the impacts of the programme have already started to manifest themselves, all the initiated activities are far from accomplished and the full impacts are yet to be realized. A fund raising organ need to be established to outsource funds for continuity purposes. Specifically, there is need to secure more funding to enable CARE to undertake the following activities:

Phase II activities

- i. Strengthening capacity of the pastoral CSOs to critically analyze and influence policies for improved service delivery that is responsive to the needs and priorities of pastoral communities. There is need to focus on strengthening networks among pastoral CSOs to ensure collective bargain with respect to various policy advocacy and access to resources and services.
- ii. Enhancement of the capacity of the pastoralists to effectively apply the knowledge and skills acquired through the PBFP's trainings to advocate and claim their rights. Policy analysis and advocacy is still not strong enough. *".... the PBFP activities should focus on imparting pastoralists' skills on how to exercise their rights.....and not awareness creation on what they already know* (TNRF/PLTF official).
- iii. Up-scaling of best practices. During the Phase II of the PBFP, there will be need to replicate all the best practices generated from the first phase in other areas. It will also be important to up-scale the participatory land-use planning and rangeland management planning initiated by the on-going SRMP. All the scattered learning and good strategies for protecting pastoralist rights from the partner CSOs should be compiled and shared among all the CSOs to benefit all the pastoral communities.
- iv. During the phase II of the PBFP it is necessary to increase the level of funding to implementing CSOs to a minimum of TZ 35 million. Likewise, there is need to review

- the project cycle upwards to 3 years to provide ample time for CSOs to accomplish their project activities.
- v. The PBFP needs to focus on the current intervention areas and already engaged CSOs to ensure tangible outcomes, as opposed to ‘spreading thin’ and funding new CSOs every year, thereby diffusing the impacts of the programme.
 - vi. Establish a national platform for sharing experiences from implementing the PBFP among the pastoral CSOs. As proposed in the concept note for extension of the PBFP funding submitted to IA, the ‘National Pastoral Learning Alliance’ (NPLA) will provide a forum for learning and exchange of information as well as fostering the partnership between organizations working with pastoral communities.
 - vii. The PBFP should set aside a strategic grant to bigger organizations to support the smaller ones. This will ensure that small CSOs are nurtured well and their capacity is built to enable them deliver their responsibilities effectively.
 - viii. There is need to focus on sensitization of the decision makers both at local and national levels. This is crucial because as much as the district contact persons are committed to the programme, support from their leaders at national level and village level is critical in sustaining their availability, willingness and participation. *“...CARE should increase should target more villages committee members for capacity buildings (ENVIROCARE).*
 - ix. More support for women to engage in viable alternative livelihoods such as small business enterprises in handicrafts, crop production, poultry farming, village savings and loan (VSL), and village community banks (VICOBA).
 - x. In addition to the current CSOs activities supported by CARE, it is imperative to recognize and address climate change, being one of the main constraints to livelihood security in the 21st century. The programme should promote climate change adaptation by supporting projects that strengthen adaptation strategies to ensure resilience of pastoral livelihoods and reduced vulnerability to climate change.

5. REFERENCES

- Barrow, E., Davies, J., Berthe, S., Matiru, V., Mohamed, N., Olenasha, W. and Rugadya, M. 2007. Pastoralists as shrewd managers of risk and resilience in the Horn of Africa. IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office. *Policy Brief No. 1(of 5)*. Nairobi, 4p.
- Bevan, J. 2007. Between a rock and a hard place: Armed violence in African pastoral communities. *Conference Background Paper*. UNDP.
- Brown, O., Hammil, A. and McLeman, R. 2007. Climate change as the ‘new’ security threat: implications for Africa. *International Affairs* 83(6):1141-1154.
- Dobie, P., Shapiro, B., Webb, P. and Winslow, M. 2008. How do poor people adapt to weather variability and natural disasters today? *Human Development Report 2007/2008. Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world*. United Nations Development Programme. UNDP
- IRIN.2007.Africa: Can pastoralism survive in the 21st century? UN Integrated Regional Information Networks, World Press (available at <http://www.worldpress.org/Africa/2861.cfm>).
- Mugenda, O.M. and A.B. Mugenda. 1999. *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. ACTS Press, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Nyariki, D.M., Kitalyi, A., Wasonga, V.O., Isae, I.M., Kyagaba, E. and Lugenja, M. 2005. Indigenous techniques for assessing and monitoring range resources in East Africa. *Occasional Paper 02*. World Agroforestry Centre.
- ODI/HPG. 2009. Pastoralism and climate change. Enabling adaptive capacity. *ODI/HPG Synthesis Paper*. Overseas Development Institute/ Humanitarian Policy Group.

6. ANNEXES

Annex I: Questionnaire for pastoral communities

Tarehe ya Usaili / Date on interview: ---/---/----

Jina la Msailiwa / Name of interviewee: -----

Kijiji / Village: -----

Kata / Ward: -----

Tarafa / Division: -----

Wilaya / District: -----

Jina la Msaili / Interviewer: -----

Utangulizi / Introduction

Hallo, Jina langu ni, Shirika la CARE inafanya tathmini ya Mfuko wa Programu ya Ufugaji kwenye jamii ya wafugaji. Madhumuni ya tathmini hii ni kufabamu athari au mabadiliko chanya au hasi ambayo imetokana na jubudi mbali mbali za kuboresha maisha ya wafugaji kupitia asasi za kiraia zinazotekeleza miradi ya baki za ardhi, usulubishi wa migogoro na utetezi wa ufugaji asili Tanzania. Taarifa zozote utakazotoa ni siri na zitatumika kwa miadili ya tathmini hii tu.

Kwa rubusa yako, nitanliza maswali kadhaa yanayobusiana na mfuko wa huu. Usaili huu hantachukua muda mrefu..

A. TAARIFA ZA MSAILIWA / SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

| No. | Maswali /na vidokezo / Questions and Filters | Coding Categories |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Age of the respondent (If given age is doubtful, ask for date of birth then calculate the age): Umri | Miaka _____ |
| 2. | Sex of the respondent / Jinsi | 1. Mwanaume 2. Mwanamke |
| 3. | Educational level of the respondent / Kiwango cha Elimu | 1. Primary / Shule ya msingi 2. Secondary / Sekondari 3. Tertiary (college/university) / chuo 4. No formal education / Hajasoma |
| 4. | Marital status of the respondent / Hali ya ndoa | 1. Single / Hajaoa / hajaolewa 2. Married / Ameoa / ameolewa 3. Divorced / Mtalaka 4. Separated / Ameachana na Mwenzi 5. Widowed / Mjane |
| 5. | What is your main source of livelihood? Nini shughuli kuu ya kujikimu kiamaisa? | 1. Livestock production / Ufugaji 2. Crop production / Kilimo cha mazao 3. Small scale trade / Biashara ndogo 4. Employment / Ajira 5. Other (specify) Nyingineyo (taja) ----- ----- |
| 6. | What is the total number of people in your family? Familia yako ina watu wangapi? *Apart from the family members, include non-family members who've been staying in the household for at least 6 months and will probably stay for the next 6 months | No. of people living in household _____ Idadi ya watu katika kaya pamoja na wagini waliokaa zaidi ya miezi sita |
| 7. | How many are employed? Wangapi wameajiriwa? | Idadi ya walioajiriwa _____ |

B. IMPROVED LIVELIHOOD SECURITY OF PASTORAL COMMUNITIES THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT, APPLICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN LAND RIGHTS, CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PASTORALISM IN TANZANIA

| No. | Questions and Filters | Coding Categories |
|-----|--|---|
| 8. | Are you aware of the Pastoralist Basket Fund Programme (PBFP) in Tanzania? Je, unafahamu Mfuko wa Programme ya wafugaji? | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Ndiyo 2. Hapana |
| 9. | If yes in 8 above, what are the activities of PBFP? Kama jibu la 8 ni Ndiyo, taja shughuli za mfuko | Shughuli za Mfuko wa Progra,u ya Wafugaji _____ |
| 10. | Do you know of any Civil Society Organization (CSO) involved in creating awareness on civic rights, relevant policies and providing livelihood diversification support in this area? Je unafahamu asasi yoyote inayojihusisha na uhamasishaji kuhusu haki za wafugaji, sera na namna ya kupanua vyanzo vya kujikimu kimaisha? | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Ndiyo 2. Hapana If yes, list the CSOs / Kama ndiyo, zioreshesha 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| 11. | Has your community received support from any of the above organizations (CSOs)? Jamii yako imepata usaidizi / huduma yoyote kutoka asasi mojawapo | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Ndiyo 2. Hapana |
| 12. | If yes in 11 above, what kind of support? Kama jibu la 12 ni Ndiyo, aina gain ya msaada | 1. Training on land rights/Mafuzo haki za ardhi 2. Training on policies / Mafunzo - Sera 3. Training on livelihood diversification Njia mbadala za kujikimu kimaisha 4. Training on conflict resolution Mafunzo – Usuluhishi wa migogoro 5. Training on entrepreneurship/business Mafunzo ya ujasiri ya mali 6. Other (specify) ----- |
| 13. | Do you think the above CSOs and PBFP are doing enough to address problems faced by pastoralists? Unavyoona asasi na CARE zinafanya juhudi za kutosha katika kupunguza matatizo yanayowakabili wafugaji? | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Ndiyo 2. Hapana |
| 14. | If no in 13 above, what should they do to address problems faced by pastoralists? Kama jibu la 13 ni Hapana, wangepanua nini ili kupunguza matatizo yanayowakabili wafugaji? | |

C. IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE OF PASTORAL COMMUNITIES IN TANZANIA

| No. | Questions and Filters | Coding Categories |
|-----|--|---|
| 15. | What is your opinion on your ability to exercise your rights (e.g. land rights) as a pastoralist in the last 3 years? <i>Nini maoni yako kuhusu mabadiliko ya uwezo wako wa kudai haki za wafugaji ukilinganisha na miaka mitatu iliyopita?</i> | 1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. No change <i>1. Imeongezeka 2. Imepungua 3. Hakuna mabadiliko</i> |
| 16. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 15 above? Unadhani asasi au CARE imechangia katika mabadiliko hayo? | Explain how? _____ Eleza ni kwa namna gani zimechangia? |
| 17. | Has your ability to participate in and influence local and national level policy processes changed in the last 3 years? Uwezo wako wa kuchangia katika uboreshaji wa sera umebadika namna gani katika miaka mitatu? | 1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. No change 1. umeongezeka 2. Umepungua 3. Haujabadilika |
| 18. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 17 above? <i>Unadhani asasi au CARE zimechangia katika mabadiliko ya 17?</i> | Explain how? Eleza ni kwa namna gani? |
| 19. | Have you engaged in other economic activities besides livestock production in the last 3 years? <i>Unafanya shughuli nyingine ya kiuchumi zaidi ya ufugaji katika kama mitatu ya karibuni?</i> | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Ndiyo 2. Hapana |
| 20. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 19 above? Je asasi au CARE imechangia katika mabadiliko hayo? | Eleza /Explain how? _____ |

| No. | Questions and Filters | Coding Categories |
|-----|--|---|
| 21. | What is your opinion on incidences of livestock diseases in last 3 years? Hali magonjwa ya mifugo ikoje katika miaka 3 ya karibuni? | 1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. No change 1. Imeongezeka 2. Imepungua 3. Haijabadilika |
| 22. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 21 above? <i>Asasi na CARE zimechangia katika mabadiliko magonjwa ?</i> | Eleza / Explain how? _____ |
| 23. | What is your opinion on cases of conflicts over resources (grazing land, water etc) in the last 3 years? <i>\Nini maoni yako kuhusu migogoro kwa ajili ya ardhi na maji katika miaka 3 ya karibuni?</i> | 1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. No change 1. Imeongezeka 2. Imepungua 3. Haijabadilika |
| 24. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 23 above? <i>Asasi na CARE zimechangia katika mabadiliko ya migogoro?</i> | Eleza / Explain how? _____ |
| 25. | What is your opinion on the grazing land accessible/under control of pastoral communities in the last 3 years? <i>Nini maoni yako kuhusu upatikanaji ardhi ya malisbo ambayo inamilikiwa na wafugaji katika miaka 3 ya karibuni?</i> | 1. Increased 2. Decreased 3. No change 1. Imeongezeka 2. imepungua 3. haijabadilika |
| 26. | Did any CSO or CARE contribute to the change in 25 above? <i>Asasi na CARE zimechangiaje katika hali ya ardhi ya malisbo</i> | Eleza / explain how? _____ |

Annex II: Application for funds by CSOs during 2007 – 2010 period

| Year | No Submitted | No short listed | No Signed MoU |
|------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 2007 | 53 | 15 | 13 |
| 2008 | 59 | 16 | 11 |
| 2009 | 99 | 22 | 17 |
| 2010 | 107 | 16 | 14 |

Annex III: Funds commitment and disbursement to CSOs during 2007/2008 period

| Sub-grantee Name | Amount (Tshs) | Project Title |
|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| AFREDA | 21,521,900.00 | Advocacy for Peaceful Conflict Resolution. |
| ENVIROCARE | 22,780,304.00 | CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT FOR PASTORALISTS KILINDI DISTRICT |
| HUDESA | 20,597,208.00 | Pastoralist Livelihood improvement In Kilosa District with Reference to Land rights |
| HACOCA | 24,568,056.00 | Land rights for pastoralist in Kilosa District |
| KITETO CIVIL SOCIETY | 24,270,917.00 | Enhancing Pastoralist Awareness and Effective Participation in Village Land Act Implementation |
| MOROGORO PARALEGAL | 23,057,430.00 | Land rights for pastoralist in Mvomero District |
| NAADUTARO | 25,452,625.00 | Pastoral Land Right and Environment Education Project |
| PAICODEO | 18,957,393.00 | Pastoralists Land Rights Project in Kilosa district, Morogoro region. |
| SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT ORG | 21,441,301.00 | Development and Advocacy for Basic Rights of Pastoralist in Simanjiro district. |
| TAPHGO - NGORONGORO | 24,966,916.00 | Advancement of Pastoralist Rights and Dignity in Ngorongoro District |
| TAPHGO - SAME | 24,495,778.00 | The Development and Advocacy for Basic Rights of Pastoralist in Simanjiro district. |

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| UNGO - MOROGORO | 19,060,980.00 | Improving Pastoralists Livelihoods in Kilosa District |
| UVIMASHA CBO | 14,094,556.00 | Uboreshaji wa Ufugaji |
| WOMEN WAKE UP | 25,337,199.00 | Enhancement of Land Rights Advocacy Capacity to Pastoral Communities |
| Total in Tshs | 310,602,563.00 | |

Annex IV: Funds commitment and disbursement to CSOs during 2008/2009 period

| Sub-grantee Name | Amount (Tshs) | Project title |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| Ngorongoro NGO Network (NGONET) | 25,394,000.00 | Enhancing The Advocacy Capacity of Pastoralist Within Ngorongoro Conservation Area |
| Ereto Maasai Youth (EMAYO) | 24,915,800.00 | Promotion of Pastoralists and Agro-pastoralists awareness on Land Right in Kilindi District" |
| Tanzania Grassroots Development Organization (TAGRODE) | 24,966,600.00 | Enhancing Capacity of Pastoralist Communities in Analyzing Land and Livestock Policy for Advocacy and Livelihood Improvement |
| Southern Highlands Livestock Development Association (SHILDA) | 24,937,550.00 | Pastoral Communities Participation Enhancement Project |
| Tanzania Milk Producers Association (TAMPRODA) | 24,984,600.00 | Establishment and Strengthening of Pastoralists' Network in Mvomero and Kilosa districts |
| Taturu Community Development Foundation (TACODEF) | 24,610,000.00 | Uraghibishi wa Haki za Ardhi na Usuluhishi wa Migigoro kati ya Wafugaji, Wakulima na Hifadhi ya Serengeti |
| Community Development and Relief Trust (CODERT) | 22,073,950.00 | Geita Pastoralist Livelihood Security |
| Rural Initiatives and Relief Agency (RIRA) | 24,858,600.00 | Developing livelihood improvement capacity of Pastoralist and Agro pastoralist in Magu district" |
| Tanzania Home Economics Association (TAHEA) - Tarime | 24,289,000.00 | Rorya Pastoralism advocacy project |
| ANGLICAN CHURCH OF TANZANIA - MARA | 24,738,000.00 | Musoma Rural Pastoral Community Project |
| Serengeti Farmers Association (SEFA) | 24,641,930.00 | Sustainable Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Livelihoods for Serengeti |
| Total | 270,410,030.00 | |

Annex V: Funds commitment and disbursement to CSOs during 2010/2011 period

| No | Sub-grantee Name | Location | Amount (Tshs) | Amount (USD) |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Umwema Group Morogoro Trust Fund (UMWEMA) | Mvomero - Morogoro | 24,983,000.00 | 18,855.09 |
| 2 | Maasai Pastoralist Foundation (MPF) | Monduli - Arusha | 24,910,000.00 | 18,800.00 |
| 3 | Dinkwa Women Development Organization Organization (DIWODEO) | Mbulu - Arusha | 24,306,000.00 | 18,344.15 |
| 4 | Peoples Unity for Development in Africa (PUFDIA) | Same - Kilimanjaro | 24,985,100.00 | 18,856.68 |
| 5 | Longido Community development Organization (LCDO) | Longido - Arusha | 24,421,667.00 | 18,431.45 |
| 6 | Women Development for Science and Technology Association (WODSTA) | Arumeru - Arusha | 24,999,575.00 | 18,867.60 |
| 7 | UVIMASHA CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION (UVIMASHA) | Mirerani - Manyara | 24,625,000.00 | 18,584.91 |
| 8 | Kinnapa Development Programme (KINNAPA) | Kiteto - Manyara | 24,979,500.00 | 18,852.45 |
| 9 | Community Economic development & Social Transformation (CEDESOTA) | Meru - Arusha | 24,309,500.00 | 18,346.79 |
| 10 | Hadzabe Survival Council of Tanzania (HSCT) | Mbulu - Arusha | 20,678,042.00 | 15,606.07 |
| 11 | KITUMUSOTE, Arusha | Meru - Arusha | 24,844,000.00 | 18,750.19 |
| 12 | Esiangiki we Ndito Trust (EKWET) | Monduli - Arusha | 23,568,900.00 | 17,787.85 |
| 13 | Tanzania Women of Impact Foundation (TAWIF) | Handeni - Tanga | 25,000,000.00 | 18,867.92 |
| 14 | Community Development Support (CDS) | Meatu - Shinyanga | 24,981,000.00 | 18,853.58 |
| TOTAL GRANTS | | | 341,591,284.00 | 257,804.74 |
| TOTAL GRANTS BUDGETED | | | 361,520,977.00 | 275,970.21 |

Annex VI: Civil society organizations funded by the PBF from 2007 - 2011

| No. | Name Of CSO | Project Title | Location / District | Activities | Contract Budget (TZS) | Funding by Years | | | |
|-----|--|--|---------------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----|-----|---|
| | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | Tanzania grass roots Oriented Development (TAGRODE) | Facilitating the formation and capacity Building of Kilolo and Iringa Pastoral network (KIPANET) | Iringa & Kilolo | NW | 24,996,000 | - | Yes | yes | |
| 2 | Environmental, Human Rights Care and gender Organization (ENVIROCARE) - Handeni | Land rights and Livelihoods improvement for the Pastoralism in Handeni District | Handeni | LR | 25,000,000 | Yes | - | Yes | |
| 3 | Tanzania pastoralists, Hunters and Gatherers Organization (TAPHGO) | Strengthening TAPHGO and Member Organizations network on land Right and Lobbying and Advocacy for Pastoralism: Same, Ngorongoro and Kilosa | Arusha, Ngorongoro & Same | NW | 34,490,430 | Yes | - | | |
| 4 | Southern Highland Livestock Development Association (SHILDA) | Land Policy Analysis and Advocacy Project | Iringa | Adv | 24,976,000 | - | Yes | Yes | |
| 5 | Rural Initiatives and Relief Agency (RIRA), | Mradi wa Kukuza na Kuimarisha Mtandao wa Vikundi vya wafugaji Asili na Wafugaji Wakulima Wilaya ya Magu | Magu | NW | 24,910,500 | | Yes | Yes | |
| 6 | Community Development and Relief Trust (CODERT) | Agro-pastoralists' Land rights Advocacy | Geita | LR | 24,511,900 | - | Yes | Yes | |
| 7 | Kisesa Development Fund - (KDF) | Capacity building of pastoralists on land rights and conflict resolution in Meatu district | Meatu | LR | 24,976,750 | - | - | Yes | |
| 8 | Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRFF) / for Pastoralists Livelihood Task Force | Supporting pastoralist civil society collaboration to strengthen land rights and pastoralist livelihoods | Arusha | NW | 28,200,000 | - | - | Yes | |
| 9 | Sunya Ward Education and Training (SWEAT) | Supporting Pastoralist Civil Society Collaboration to strengthen Land right and Pastoralist Livelihoods | Tanzania | LR | 25,000,000 | - | - | Yes | |
| 10 | Ereto Maasai Youth (EMAYO) | Uraghabishi wa Maslahi ya Jamii za Wafugaji wa Asili wa Mifugo Inayochungwa | Kiteto | Adv | 24,999,000 | | Yes | Yes | |
| 11 | Tanzania Women - Focused Afforestation Organization Trust Fund (TWAOF) | Utatuzi wa Migogoro na Uimarishaji wa Amani kwa Wafugaji Asili na Wakulima - Mvomero na Morogoro Vijijini | Mvomero & Morogoro Rural | NW | 24,990,008 | - | - | Yes | |
| 12 | Human Development Strategies Association (HUDESA) | Usuluhishi wa Migogoro, Ujenzi na Uimarishaji wa Amani kati ya Wafugaji na wakulima kwa njia ya Semina Shirikishi | Kilosa | CR | 24,814,200 | Yes | - | Yes | |
| 13 | SHIDEPHA+ - Kahama Programme | Improving the Livelihood of Pastoralist and Agro-pastoralists in Kilosa with Special | Kahama | LR | 24,856,000 | - | - | Yes | |

| | | Reference to Land Right and Environmental Control | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|------------------|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|--|-----|
| 14 | Tanzania Network for Indigenous Pastoralists and Environment (TANIPE) | Proposal on Participatory training of Pastoralists and Local Authorities in Kilosa District on Pastoralism and Policy Options in Tanzania | Kilosa | P | 24,960,000 | - | - | Yes | | |
| 15 | Kiteto Civil Society Organization (KCS) | Strengthening COS's Capacity in Advocacy Work and Community Empowerment | Kiteto | NW | 46,114,000 | Yes | - | Yes | | |
| 16 | Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum (TPCF) | Villages Capacity Building on Land Rights | Ngorongoro | LR | 25,000,000 | - | - | Yes | | |
| 17 | Serengeti Farmers Association (SEFA) | Sustainable Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Livelihood for Serengeti | Serengeti | P/L | 24,641,930 | - | Yes | - | | |
| 18 | Anglican Church of Tanzania - (ACT-Mara) | Pastoral Community Development Project | Musoma Rural | P/L | 24,738,000 | - | Yes | - | | |
| 19 | Tanzania Home Economics Association (TAHEA) | Rorya Pastoralism Advocacy Project | Rorya | ADV | 24,289,000 | - | Yes | - | | |
| 20 | Tanzania Milk Producers Association (TAMPRODA) | Strengthening Pastoralists Network in Mvomero and Kilosa | Mvomero & Kilosa | NW | 24,984,600 | - | Yes | - | | |
| 21 | Ngorongoro Network (NGONET) | Enhancing Participation of Pastoralists Decision Making in Ngorongoro Conservation Area | Ngorongoro | NW | 25,394,000 | - | Yes | - | | |
| 22 | Taturu Community Development Foundation (TACODEF) | Pastoral Development Community Project | Serengeti | LR | 24,610,000 | - | Yes | Yes | | |
| 23 | Morogoro Paralegal Center (MPLC) | Land rights for pastoralist in Mvomero District | Mvomero | LR | 23,057,430 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 24 | Action for Relief and Development Assistance (AFREDA) | Advocacy for Peaceful Conflict Resolution. | Kilosa | CR | 21,521,900 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 25 | Parakuiyo Pastoralist Indigenous Community Development (PAICODEO) | Pastoralists Land Rights Project in Kilosa District | Kilosa | LR | 18,957,393 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 26 | UNGO-Morogoro | Improving Pastoralists Livelihoods In Kilosa District | Kilosa | P/L | 19,060,980 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 27 | Special Development Organization (SDO) | Development And Advocacy For Basic Rights of Pastoralists in Simanjiro District. | Simanjiro | P/L | 21,441,301 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 28 | Huruma Concern and Care (HACOCA) | Land rights for pastoralist in Kilosa District | Mvomero | LR | 24,568,056 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 29 | Umoja wa Vikundi vya Maendeleo Shambarai (UVIMASHA) | Uboreshaji wa Ufugaji | Simanjiro | P/L | 14,094,556 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 30 | Women Wake Up (WOWAP) | Enhancement of Land Rights Advocacy Capacity to Pastoral Communities | Handeni | LR | 25,337,199 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 31 | NAADUTARO (PASTORALIST SURVIVAL OPTIONS) | Pastoral Land Right and Environment Education Project | Kiteto | LR | 25,452,625 | Yes | - | - | | |
| 32 | Tanzania Network for Indigenous Pastoralists (TANIPE) | Training on Pastoralism and Policy Options in Kilosa district | Kilosa | P/L | 23,940,000 | | | Yes | | |
| 33 | UMWEMA Group Mrogoro Trust Fund | Pastoralist Advocacy on Land Rights and Good | Kilosa | LR | 24,983,000 | | | | | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----------|-----|------------|--|--|--|-----|
| | (UMWEMA) | Governance in Kilosa | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Maasai Pastoralists Foundation (MPF) | Strengthening Pastoralist Capacity in Land and | Monduli | LR | 24,910,000 | | | | Yes |
| 35 | DINKWA women Development Organization (DIWODEO) | Improving Pastoralists Women Livelihood through Better Resource Management and Ownership | Mbulu | P/L | 24,306,000 | | | | Yes |
| 36 | Tanzania Women of Impact Foundation (TAWIF) | Strengthening Pastoralist Women Movement for Pushing Pastoralist Agenda | Handeni | P/L | 25,000,000 | | | | Yes |
| 37 | Women Development for Science and Technology Association (WODSTA) | Pastoralist Empowerment on Land Right and Land Use in Arumeru | Arumeru | LR | 24,999,575 | | | | Yes |
| 38 | KITUMUSOTE - Small Agro-Pastoralist Farmers Development Initiatives Organizations (KITUMUSOTE) | Arumeru Farmers and Pastoralists Conflict Resolution | Meru | LR | 24,844,000 | | | | Yes |
| 39 | KINNAPA Development Programme | Participatory Pastoralists L/R and Environment Project | Kiteto | LR | 24,979,500 | | | | Yes |
| 40 | Peoples' Unity for Development in Africa (PUFDIA) | Pastoralists Land Right Advocacy and Conflict Resolution in Same district | Same | LR | 24,985,100 | | | | Yes |
| 41 | Community Development Support (CDS) | Pastoralists Training on Land Right, Conflict resolution and Advocacy on Better Livestock Service in Meatu | Meatu | LR | 24,981,000 | | | | Yes |
| 42 | Hadzabe Survival Council of Tanzania (HSCI) | Building Land Right Advocacy Capacity to Pastoralists and Hunter Gatherers Communities | Mbulu | LR | 20,678,042 | | | | Yes |
| 43 | Longido Community Development Organization (LCDO) | Pastoralists Livelihood Security Project | Longido | P/L | 24,421,667 | | | | Yes |
| 44 | Esiangiki We Ndito Trust (EKWET) | Pastoralist women Self Empowerment Project | Monduli | P/L | 23,568,900 | | | | Yes |
| 45 | Community Economic Development and Social Transformation (CEDESOTA) | Empowering Pastoralist and Agro-Pastoralist Communities to Improve Livelihood in Meru | Arumeru | P/L | 24,309,500 | | | | Yes |
| 46 | UVIMASHA Civil Society Organization (UVIMASHA) | Uboreshaji Mifugo Asili na usuluhishi wa Migogoro Simanjiro | Simanjiro | P/L | 24,625,000 | | | | Yes |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | P/L = Pastoralism | | | | | | | | |
| | Adv = Advocacy | | | | | | | | |
| | LR = Land Rights | | | | | | | | |
| | NW = Networking | | | | | | | | |

Annex VII: Beneficiaries directly reached by the PBF during the period 2007 - 2009

| Activity | Date | Venue | Female | Male | Total |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| DIMER | Oct., 08 | MuCoBS | 5 | 26 | 31 |
| Land Right workshop | Sept. 2009 | MuCoBS | 4 | 31 | 35 |
| Policy analysis and advocacy workshop | June, 09 | MuCoBS | 7 | 14 | 21 |
| Start-up workshop, Dar | Nov., 2007 | Court yard | 2 | 17 | 19 |
| Start-up workshop, Mwanza | August 2008 | La-kairo Hotel | 3 | 26 | 29 |
| Start-up workshop, Iringa | August 2008 | VETA | 6 | 17 | 23 |
| Pre-award workshop | Feb., 2006 | Uluguru Hotel, Morogoro | 5 | 21 | 26 |
| DIMER workshop | 6-10 July, 2009 | SRI - Kibaha | 6 | 27 | 33 |
| Pastoralism and policy options workshop | 17-21 Aug, 09 | Mapambazuko - Arusha | 6 | 21 | 27 |
| Land rights & Conflict Resolution workshop | 10-14 Aug., 2009 | Mwanza | 6 | 22 | 28 |
| Policy analysis and advocacy workshop | 14-18 Sept., 2009 | SIRI, Kibaha | 8 | 25 | 33 |
| Total | | | 58 | 247 | 305 |

Annex VIII: Beneficiaries reached either directly or indirectly by the CSOs in 2009

| CSO | Awareness meetings | | | Community trainers | VCRC | Training | | Total | Grand total | Women (%) |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Male | Female | Total | | | Male | Female | | | |
| AFREDA | | | | 60 | | 115 | 33 | 148 | 208 | 22.30 |
| ENVIROCARE | 73 | 27 | 100 | 90 | | | | - | 190 | |
| HACOCA | 225 | | 225 | | | 225 | | 225 | 450 | |
| HUDESA | | | 56,985 | 115 | 638 | | | 638 | 58,376 | |
| Kiteto Civil Society | | | - | | | | | - | - | |
| Morogoro Paralegal | 1,546 | 1,252 | 2,798 | 30 | | | | - | 2,828 | |
| NAADUTARO | 608 | 330 | 938 | 33 | | 112 | 81 | 193 | 1,164 | 41.97 |
| SDO | 126 | 50 | 176 | - | | 151 | 107 | 258 | 434 | 41.47 |
| TAPHGO - NGORO | | | - | | | 104 | 52 | 156 | 156 | 33.33 |
| TAPHGO - SAME | | | | | | 50 | 29 | 79 | 79 | 36.71 |
| UVIMASHA | | | - | 65 | | 480 | 270 | 750 | 815 | 36.00 |
| UNGO | | | - | | | | | 3,855 | 3,855 | |
| WOWAP | | | - | | | 5,500 | 3,500 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 38.89 |
| PAICODEO | | | - | 20 | | | | - | 20 | |
| TOTAL | 2,578 | 1,659 | 61,222 | 413 | 638 | 6,737 | 4,072 | 15,302 | 86,369 | 26.61 |

Annex IX: Materials distributed to stakeholders during the programme period, 2008-2011

| Type of document and other materials | Number | Year |
|---|--------|-----------|
| 1. Sheria ya ardhi ya vijiji, Na. 5 ya 1999-booklet | 60 | 2008-2011 |
| 2. Zijue sheria za ardhi na mifugo kwa utatuzi wa migogoro (distributed by ENVIROCARE)-booklet | 100 | 2010 |
| 3. Mwongozo wa sheria ya mahakama za ardhi-booklet | 50 | 2010 |
| 4. Mfuko wa programu ya wafugaji wa asili (mwongozo wa kutoa ruzuku)-booklet | 200 | 2009-2011 |
| 5. Mfuko wa programu ya wafugaji wa asili (mwongozo kwa waombaji wanaotaka kuandaa andiko la mradi (guidelines for grant application)-booklet | 200 | 2009-2011 |
| 6. The land disputes courts Act, Number 2, 2002 and regulations 2003 | 50 | 2010 |
| 7. Tafsiri rahisi ya sheria ya hifadhi ya wanyama pori, 2009 | 200 | 2010-2011 |
| 8. Mwongozo wa kutoa elimu ya sheria ya ardhi ya vijiji, 1999 | 50 | 2010 |
| 9. T-shirts with pro-pastoralism advocacy messages | 500 | 2010-2011 |
| 10. Wall calendars with pro-pastoralism advocacy messages | 500 | 2011 |
| 11. Experiences and best practices during enhancement of pastoral communities participation in planning process (distributed through SHILDA in Iringa | 100 | 2010 |
| 12. Posters on land-use planning | 500 | 201-2011 |
| 13. Posters on good land-use planning (distributed by ENVIROCARE) | 100 | 2009 |
| 14. Leaflets on conflict resolution and village land councils (distributed by HUDESA) | 1000 | 2010 |
| 15. Leaflets on good governance (distributed by HUDESA) | 1415 | 2011 |
| 16. Documentary on the PBF best practices (distributed in CDs) | 8 | 2010 |

Annex X: CSOs whose contracts have been terminated

| CSO | Reason for termination | Amount involved (lost/returned/not disbursed) | Year reported |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Tanzania Women Focused Afforestation Organization Trust Fund (TWAO) | Executive directors died and office closed | Tshs 4,866,950 lost | 2010 |
| 2. Pastoralist Indigenous Community Development Organization (PAICODEO) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Tshs 10,142,300 returned to CARE | Year 1 annual report to donor |
| 3. Ngorongoro Network (NGONET) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | fourth quarter installment not disbursed to CSO (Tshs 7,199,500) | Year 2 annual report to donor |
| 4. Musoma Dioceses (ACT Mara) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Two installments not disbursed to CSO (Tshs 12,799,000) | Year 2 annual report to donor |
| 5. Tanzania Home Economics Association (TAHEA) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Tshs 2,264,000 returned to CARE | Year 2 annual report to donor |
| 6. Serengeti Farmers Association (SEFA) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Fourth quarter not disbursed for underperformance (Tshs 4,590,125) | Year 2 annual report to donor |
| 7. Kissesa Development Fund (KDF) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Fourth quarter not disbursed to CSO (Tshs 17,780,000) | Year 3 annual report to donor |
| 8. Sunya Ward Education Trust (SWEAT) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Fourth quarter not disbursed to CSO (Tshs 5,050,000) | To be reported in year 3 report to donor |
| 9. Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (TNRF) | Unable to exhaust allocated funds | Tshs 7,174,301 returned to CARE | To be reported in year 3 report to donor |
| 10. Tanzania Women Focused Afforestation Organization Fund | Office closed | Tshs 17,618,750 This amount was supposed to be quarter 2, 3 & 4 grants which was not disbursed | To be reported in year 3 report to donor |

NB: In all cases the amount that was not disbursed in the respective year was carried forward and included to the following year budget.

Annex XI: List of FGD participants, CSO official and DALDOs interviewed

| No. | Name | Gender | Village | CSO | Date |
|-----|----------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| 1. | Philip Samida | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 2. | Juma S. Mlyahilu | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 3. | Samuel Mpanga | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 4. | Shilanga Manjale | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 5. | Isack Mabora Juma | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 6. | Zephania Makunja | Male | Manala | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 7. | Happy Jacob | Male | Nyamisingisi | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 8. | Udandu Gwaresy | Male | Nyamisingisi | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 9. | Suzana Taginora | Female | Nyamisingisi | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 10. | Samora Saitoti | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 11. | Imani Kutatwoi | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 12. | Kanunga Lembesei | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 13. | Maningo Sayetwa | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 14. | Kalanga Patimbo | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 15. | Roserian Kutatoi | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 16. | Bertha Michael | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 17. | Lea Maiko | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 18. | Neema Arwapakwa | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 19. | Elizabeth Nundwala | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 20. | Lembris Lomunyoki | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 21. | Laizer Sandeko | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 22. | Lazaro Kutatwi | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 23. | Katarinya Lamnyaki | Female | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 24. | Naitapuraki Lazaro | Male | Lengast | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 25. | Sara Moses | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 26. | Upendo Laitbwaga | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 27. | Laiti Mathayo | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 28. | Neema Edward | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 29. | Suzana Elibariki | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 30. | Edward Sepeko | Male | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 31. | Thomas Sepeko | Male | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 32. | Agnes Maseka | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 33. | Elisifa Isaya | Female | Nasinyai | UVIMASHA | 5/5/2011 |
| 34. | Yusuph Mohammedy | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 35. | Emmanuel Joseph | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 36. | Jane Isanja | Female | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 37. | Mwalimu Gabriel Tuke | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 38. | Michael Samwel | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 39. | Simbile Ali | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 40. | Yakaye Nasunde | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 41. | Elibariki | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 42. | Ibrahim Musa | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 43. | Godwin Nagoli | Male | Kibaya | KCS Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 44. | Joseph Swakei | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 45. | Loserian Kibonde | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 46. | Chasi Joseph | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 47. | Mosipa Mirakusa | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 48. | Lashaine Leshinga | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 49. | Pasinai Mikakusa | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 50. | Matiney Naisenyu | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 51. | Pambai Joseph | Male | Lembapuli | SWEAT | 10/5/2011 |
| 52. | Simoni Ngushani | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2011 |
| 53. | Rashidi Z. Kililu | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2012 |
| 54. | Alexender Kinyasirwa | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2013 |
| 55. | Kereyiani Parsino | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2014 |
| 56. | Saidi A. Mavula Weo | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2015 |
| 57. | Amiri Mussa | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2016 |
| 58. | Semwali Y Mbwana | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2017 |
| 59. | Sanoto Lesuya | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2018 |
| 60. | Athumani Mbota Kioga | Male | Kibirashi | EMAYO | 11.5.2019 |
| 61. | William Eri | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 62. | Theresia William | Female | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 63. | Maria David | Female | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 64. | Rose Mnyingwa | Female | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 65. | Raphael Long'ini | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 66. | Fatuma Simon | Female | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 67. | Matanda Palesho | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 68. | Lemainja Kisota | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 69. | Singaya Keto | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 70. | Leng'ai Siweri | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 71. | Lekomoy Weri | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 72. | Ngahindi Sumaili | Female | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 73. | Ngayoni Saji | Male | Elerai | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 74. | Yusuph Kwingwa | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 75. | Moringe Matema | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 76. | Salimu Dikwanga | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 77. | Ndalo Joe | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 78. | Petro Karao | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 79. | Christina Taiko | Female | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 80. | Neema William | Female | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 81. | Saning'o Matema | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 82. | Philipo Letipo | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 83. | Hidaya A. Mgaya | Female | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 84. | Asha Mtili | Female | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |
| 85. | Bakari Kilango | Male | Parakuyo | TANIPE | 16/5/2011 |

Annex XII: List of CSO and Government Authorities officials interviewed

| No. | Name | Gender | Designation | CSO/District | Date |
|------|----------------------|--------|----------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 86. | Balaram Thapa | Male | Director of programmes | CARE | 29/4/2011 |
| 87. | Alex Soko | Male | Proramme manager | PBFP, CARE | 29/4/2011 |
| 88. | Vincent Akulumuka | Male | Manager, agricultural programmes | Irish Aid | 29/4/2011 |
| 89. | Kidai Susuma | Male | SMS/Livestock health assistant | MoLDF, Magu | 3/5/2011 |
| 90. | Johnson Rollas | Male | Chairman | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 91. | Peter Mugema | Male | Co-ordinator | RIRA | 3/5/2011 |
| 92. | Twazihirirwa Loshiro | Male | Co-ordinator | UVIMASHA | 6/5/2011 |
| 93. | Deogratus Munyera | Male | SMS/Livestock production | MoLDF, Mugumu | 4/5/2011 |
| 94. | Alais Morindat | Male | Chairman | TNRF | 7/5/2011 |
| 95. | Carol Sorensen | female | Co-ordinator | PLTF | 7/5/2011 |
| 96. | Jackson Muro | Male | Co-ordinator | TAPHGO | 7/5/2011 |
| 97. | Lucy Yahini | Female | Chair lady | Dinkwa Women Development Organisation | 7/5/2011 |
| 98. | John Parsambe | Male | Chairman | Tanzania Pastoralist Community Fund (TPCF) | 7/5/2011 |
| 99. | Yusuph Mohammed | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 100. | Emmanuel Joseph | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 101. | Jane Isanja | Female | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 102. | Mwalimu Gabriel Tuke | Male | Co-rodinator | SWEAT | 9/5/2011 |
| 103. | Michael Samwel | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 104. | Simbile Ali | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 105. | Yakaye Nasunde | Male | Chairman | Sunya Ward Education and Training (SWEAT) | 9/5/2011 |
| 106. | Elibariki | Male | Chairman | SWEAT | 9/5/2011 |
| 107. | Ibrahim Musa | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 108. | Godwin Nagoli | Male | Chairman | Kiteto Civil Society (KCS) Forum | 9/5/2011 |
| 109. | Jeremiah Simon | Male | Chairman | EMAYO | 11/5/2011 |
| 110. | Michael Mushi | Male | Co-ordinator | ENVIROCARE | 13/5/2011 |
| 111. | David Sermwenda | Male | Accountant | Human Development Strategies Association (HUDESA) | 14/5/2011 |
| 112. | Rashid Muyumbo | Male | Chaifrman | HUDESA | 14/5/2011 |
| 113. | Olais Ole Mungaya | Male | Accountant | Tanzania Network for Indigenous Pastoralists (TANIPE) | 14/5/2011 |