

Pastoralists and conservation - who benefits?

Katherine Homewood
Pippa Chenevix Trench
UCL Anthropology
Dan Brockington
SED, University of Manchester

Pastoralists and conservation in East Africa

Pastoralist poverty: Widespread + deep

Rangelands biodiversity: high /in sharp decline

Potential for +ve synergy?


Conservation <-> poverty reduction?

Conservation contribution to poverty reduction

- Positive:
 - » Ecosystem services protected
 - » NR-based livelihoods enhanced
 - » Tourist revenue to protected areas
 - » Diversification -> livelihood security
- Negative:
 - » Inequitable distribution of benefits
 - » Displacement/Loss of access

Pastoralists and conservation in East Africa

- Conservation
 - Considerable land conserved
 - » High earning PAs sited in pastoral areas
 - » PAs more than 30% TZ land area;
 - Competition for space and resources
 - Wildlife/tourist impact on key resources
 - Loss of mobility
- Tourism revenue
 - ~USD 1 billion/yr each (Kenya and Tanzania)
 - Pastoralist areas = fastest growing destinations
 - Distribution of costs and benefits?




Pastoralists and conservation in East Africa

- Conservation
 - Considerable land conserved
 - » High earning PAs sited in pastoral areas
 - » PAs more than 30% TZ land area;
 - Competition for space and resources
 - Wildlife/tourist impact on key resources
 - Loss of mobility
- Tourism revenue
 - ~USD 1 billion/yr each (Kenya and Tanzania)
 - Pastoralist areas = fastest growing destinations
 - Distribution of costs and benefits?

What does conservation contribute to households?

- Household livelihoods activities/income
 - » PA-adjacent Maasai communities
 - » Comparative cross-border Kenya/Tanzania
 - » 5 sites/ Long-term studies
 - » >1000 households
- Relative contributions
 - » Livestock
 - » Farming
 - » Off farm
 - » Conservation/tourism-based


Homewood, Kristjanson and Trench 2009 (eds) *Staying Maasai*. Springer



Maasai incomes and poverty

<i>Total gross income</i>	Mara	Kitengela	Amboseli	Longido	Tarangire
\$/h/h/yr ± sd	2625±2892	2511±2497	1583±1655	733±1518	2317±2150
\$/person/day	0.84	1.78	0.48	0.16	0.85



- Immense within- and between-site variability
- Means skewed upwards by a small number of high incomes
- Median < 1/2 mean = truer picture of poverty levels



Livelihoods of PA-adjacent Maasai

- Livestock remain central
 - » 91-100% hh own livestock
 - » ~ /> 50% income, all sites
 - » Households across all wealth categories buy livestock
- Off-farm income
 - » 2nd most important income stream
 - » Diversification despite difficulties
- Cultivation despite low returns
 - » Food security
 - » Commercial investment
 - » Tenure strategy
- Conservation income:
 - » ~20% for Mara households
 - » minimal (<5%) in 4/5 sites
 - » Few households (3-14%) in 4/5 sites

Mara vs Longido: scale and equitability of conservation income



- Wealth quintiles
- Mara:
 - wealthiest site
 - Livestock > 60% income
 - Conservation >20%, all quintiles
 - Top quintile: 75% cons income
 - Conservancy guarantees income
 - Few farm/ off-farm
- Longido:
 - poorest site
 - Livestock + off-farm
 - All farm but low returns
 - Conservation <3%, few hh
 - 90% land of 7 villages → WMA



Mara:
Top conservation earners
invest in commercial cropping

Longido:
Forest-edge farms
on Mt Ki tum beine
underpin food security



Conservation and poverty in pastoral communities

Five problems

1. Tourist sector shares revenues badly
2. Problems of governance locally and nationally
3. Histories founded on suspicion and loss
4. Conservation lobbying
5. Faith in conservation enterprise