



# KUJENGA MAISHA EAST AFRICA-KUMEA TURKANA DROUGHT RECOVERY PROJECT



## LIVESTOCK DISTRIBUTION REPORT

“Scaling up Drought mitigation  
mechanism”

**March, 2019**

Report prepared By  
Peter M. Okaka, Project Coordinator -KUMEA



## TABLE OF CONTENT

ITEM	PG
1.0 Executive Summary.....	2
2.0 Geographical setting of the project.....	3-4
3.0 Community Lifestyles & Coping mechanism.....	4
4.0 Purchase & distribution of Shoats.....	4-5
5.0 Scope of livestock officer.....	5
6.0 Animal Inspection & verification process.....	5-6
7.0 Key recommendations & way forward.....	6
<b>Annex 1: List of beneficiaries for the drought recovery &amp; livestock restocking</b>	
<b>Annex 2: Project Photos of activities undertaken</b>	

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Drought is often one of the most devastating but least understood weather phenomena, largely because of its slow onset and its accumulating impacts over time. Although definitions vary depending on the context, drought is generally an extended period of months or years in which precipitation is less than the annual average and results in severe water scarcity (Wilhite 2000; Downing and Bakker 2000; Whetherald and Manabe 2002). According to the World Meteorological Organization (Hounam et al. 1975), droughts are classified as either meteorological (lack of Precipitation over a region for a period of time), hydrological (a period with inadequate surface and subsurface water resources), agricultural (a period with declining soil moisture and consequent crop failure due to lack of surface water resources), or socioeconomic (failure of water resources systems to meet demands, which impacts human activities both directly and indirectly). The Kenya Meteorological Service (2010) defines normal meteorological drought as a situation in which rainfall over an area is less than 75 % of the climatologically normal (that is, a rainfall deficiency of at least 25 %). This definition is extremely crude as it gives little information about the temporal distribution of rainfall (Wilhite and Glantz 1985). On the other hand, one could define optimal rainfall as sufficient

The adaptation strategies of pastoral communities to changing environmental conditions have been studied for decades. This literature show that the livelihoods of most pastoralists have evolved to some extent under variable climatic conditions in arid and semiarid environments (Blench 2000; Little 2003; Notenbaert et al. 2007; Thornton and Gerber 2010). The African Union (2010, p. 21) reports that pastoralism has “evolved over generations as a response to marked rainfall and temperature variability,” and that flexible and mobile pastoralism has great potential for reducing poverty, generating economic growth, managing the environment, and promoting sustainable development. Other research has shown that pastoralists have an intimate relationship with their environment and a rich knowledge that enables them to both protect and exploit the changing rangeland conditions on which they depend (McGahey et al. 2008; Notenbaert et al. 2012).

Understanding how pastoral communities adapt to and cope with extreme climatic conditions, particularly drought, becomes even more important as pastoralism in northwestern Kenya already faces environmental, political, and socioeconomic marginalization (Schilling et al. 2012). The project therefore intends to support communities to address drought mitigation through livestock restocking for sustainable livestock development and livelihoods.

The project aims to empower over 60 families to improve their livelihoods, as well as increase the food security and adaptive capacity of their households and the resilience of their communities. The project will purchase Shoats for the participating families then facilitate capacity building to enhance their capacity in animal husbandry & management. It is expected that this will increase productivity in livestock-related markets, where women are actively involved, such as meat and milk and improve household food security. This will only be achieved if the shoats are in good and healthy condition.

## 2.0 GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING OF THE PROJECT

Low-lying plains with isolated mountains and ranges of hills dominate the western part of the county. Turkana County ranges in altitude from 369 m near the shores of Lake Turkana to 900 m at the foot of escarpment near the Ugandan border to the west. According to the 2009 census report, the Turkana population stands at 855, 399, or 2.5 % of Kenya's total population (Kenya National Bureau of Standards 2010). Rainfall is bimodal, highly variable in space and time, with a long-term mean of 216 mm. The region is characterized by frequent drought events from 1950–2012, with generally below-average annual precipitation. Annual mean maximum temperatures experienced in the area range between 23 and 38 °C with a long-term mean of 30 °C. The northern part towards southern Sudan and Ethiopia is more arid than the western region towards Uganda, which is semiarid. Turkana County lies in agro ecological zones (AEZ) IV (Semi humid to Semi arid) and V (Semiarid) (Jaetzold and Schmidt 1983), and is hot and dry throughout most of the year.

The vegetation is widely varied and ranges from patchy annual grassland and herbaceous plants interspersed with woody shrubs to riverine woody trees species, although most parts of the district have dwarf shrubs and bush species. The density of plants, such as *Acacia reficiens* and *A. mellifera*, increases as one moves away from the settlement areas, especially in poor range conditions where soil moisture is more limited (Kariuki et al. 2008). *A. reficiens* and *A. mellifera* are both dominant and critical to pastoralists. The dominance of these tree species may have been favored by their tolerance to range soil and deep root systems for accessing soil moisture. Both plant species produce leaves and seed pods that contain (relatively speaking) high protein and fiber content. The trees are preferred by goats and camels as browse resource, and play a critical role during drought conditions. *A. mellifera* is also considered a good honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) forage and used for construction of livestock bomas<sup>1</sup> and fencing; they are also good firewood. Spatial profiling of vegetation in Turkana by Coughenour and Ellis (1993) indicates that woody species were dominated by *A. tortilis* in the riparian zones, with *A. senegal* mainly occurring on hilly and rocky sites, and *A. reficiens* on non riparian sites with fine soils. *A. tortilis* is popular for its protein-rich pods locally known as sakaram that are particularly important in maintaining livestock body condition during droughts (Coughenour and Ellis 1993).

## 2.0 COMMUNITY LIFESTYLES AND COPING MECHANISM

The Turkana, a Nilotic ethnic group, is the dominant community in the project area. Pastoralism is their principle livelihood and their nomadic system is believed to have evolved under variable climatic conditions, marked by multiple livelihood strategies deployed to meet changing environmental conditions (Blench 2000; Notenbaert et al.

2007). The Turkana people traditionally occupied 19 territories and were grouped into 28 small clans, each occupying a defined territory. For centuries, no individual rights to forage have existed, and crossing into or crossing over nearby grazing territories requires permission from the elders and the emuron (seer) of each territory. But even when observed rights of access to pasture

and water exist, these traditional rights may not translate into secure access and use due to both threats of livestock raiding from neighboring communities and actual theft with violence.

For example, the area around the village of Loya is a conflict hot spot between the Turkana and the Pokot, since both groups claim communal preferential access rights and try to enforce their authority (Schilling et al. 2012). Based on an analysis of a local conflict database, Schilling et al. (2014) report an average raiding frequency of six raids per month in Turkana between 2006 and 2009. The raids not only cause human suffering directly, but they also impact negatively on household adaptation and coping strategies of herding units in the raided area (Bett et al. 2009). Turkana pastoralists, like other nomadic communities, have traditionally used risk-spreading strategies over the years that include moving livestock to access the best quality pasture and water available, keeping species specific herds to take advantage of the heterogeneous nature of their disequilibrium environment, and diversifying economic strategies to include agriculture, wage labor, and beekeeping among others (Swift 2001; Watson and van Binsbergen 2006). Other strategies employed include keeping herds containing a mixture of different livestock species as insurance against total loss of livestock in case of drought. The livestock species kept include camels, cattle, sheep, goats, and donkeys, all of which have different forage and water requirements and variable levels of resilience to drought. The camels, cattle, and goats provide milk, which is consumed by the households. The small stocks are sold when cash is required to meet other domestic requirements such as to purchase food or to pay school fees. For a long time, a majority of the Turkana community raised their livestock mainly to meet subsistence and socio cultural obligations. However, this practice has been changing in response to ecological and socioeconomic change dynamics (Schilling et al. 2012) as households increasingly embrace the market economy and offer more animals for sale than before.

## 4.0 PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SHOATS

KUMEA project team on 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2018 to 8<sup>th</sup> November, 2018 purchased/distributed a total of 126 shoats for 63 families. The goats were sourced from livestock vendors who sold a total of 126 goats to Kujenga Maisha East Africa-KUMEA. The distribution was done in the following 60 families in the following villages and locations

LOCATION	SUBLOCATION	VILLAGES
1. Nakwamekwi	Nakwamekwi	1. Nanyangakipi 2. Nakwamekwi 3. Mt. Sayuni
2. Lodwar town	Lodwar	4. Lodwar
3. Napetet	Napetet	5. Napetet
4. Nawoitorong	Nawoitorong	6. Napuu 7. Kadunyangole
5. Kanamkemer	Kanamkemer	8. Kanan 9. Kanamkemer 10. Mesewan

The project engaged middlemen to source the livestock which in away also augments the market systems of the target community thus strengthening their resilience as well. The distribution of the livestock was done for 63 families from 2 locations of Turkana Central sub county and drawn from 10 villages.(See annex for the distribution list). The identified beneficiaries were selected

based on vulnerability /low income households. The distribution was done per village and based on population density.

Equally, the project engaged a Livestock Production Officer from Turkana County to carry out inspection in order to determine the health, body condition and age status of the livestock before distribution. In that regard, all the shoats meet the health and age requirement criteria. The following are locations and villages that benefited from the project

## 5.0 SCOPE OF THE LIVESTOCK OFFICER

The Livestock Officer will be responsible for the following activities:

- a) Determine the healthy status of shoats before purchase and distribution to the beneficiaries.
- b) Prepare report regarding the health status of the purchased shoats
- c) Participating in daily debriefs discussing questions, challenges and giving recommendations.
- d) Ensure safety of any distribution materials assigned to him/her.

## 6.0 ANIMAL INSPECTION AND VERIFICATION PROCESS

### Methodology

#### a) **Physical examination**

During the physical examination the following parameters were taken into consideration i.e. temperatures, pulse rate of the animal and the texture of the shoats skins. Most of the shoats selected during the physical examination exhibited the following signs.

- i. A smooth shiny coat
- ii. Bright eyes
- iii. Good appetite
- iv. Easy quick movements
- v. Rest and chew cud regularly
- vi. Normal passing of faeces and urine
- vii. Normal body temperatures of 40 degrees Celsius
- viii. Normal respiration rate of 12-15 breath per minute (Faster in kids)

After physical examination the shoats were selected based on the following characteristics

- i. Healthy state of the shoats
- ii. Good body condition and it should not be deformed

## **7.0 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD**

- 1. The project in liaison with County livestock production officers will enhance the integration of the project in County strategic and emergency drought mitigation plans/programs for effective partnership and sustainability of the project**
- 2. Provision of capacity building and community sensitization to improve animal husbandry and management of the shoats**
- 3. Periodic follow ups to the beneficiaries to assess the impact of the project at various levels. The follow ups need to integrate department of livestock for adequate support and provision of technical support.**
- 4. Beneficiaries of the shoats should be supported by provision of supplementary feeds e.g. the range cubes and survival mash for this will help reduce the incidences of mortality to the animals**
- 5. Distribution of the shoats will be embedded in the County policy on emergency and drought restocking program which advocates each families to get at least between 5-10shoats to enhance production impacts and also distribute the offspring to other group members to reduce in-breeding.**

## ANNEX 1: LIST OF BENEFICIARIES FOR THE PURCHASED SHOATS

NAME	ID/NO.	NO. OF SHOATS
1. ESURON LONGOR LOKWAMOR	4805441	2
2. AKADELI DAVID LOKWAWI	0239488	2
3. EMUKUNYO LOTHIGIRIA LODOME	4781374	2
4. ESTHER IKARU SAMAL	32484807	2
5. LOKWEI LOMEKWI EKWON	859440	2
6. JOSEPH EKALE EKAI	10987448	2
7. DANIEL EYANAE LOSURU	9672638	2
8. PETER LOPUSKI OGOMA	4254589	2
9. MERCY EDAPAL NGIMOE	33156923	2
10. PAULINE EIPA EWESIT	31463840	2
11. REGINA LOROO	22580557	2
12. SAMMY EPEYON	21370032	2
13. EKAI EBEI LOKIEL	0842371	2
14. NAPUS NACHIPON ERENG	20859761	2
15. NAKWAWI KAMAIS	21326114	2
16. NAKURE LOCHII ECHWAA	4781799	2
17. MARY NGAKUJAN ELOS	27806512	2
18. EKIDOR EKENO EPEOT	4776545	2
19. TIYA EBEI KAMAIS	7870257	2
20. SELINA ATABO EKIRU	21614136	2
21. EBENYO NAKWANI ENYAMAN	8564485	2
22. RUTH ESEKON EWOI	30830881	2
23. KAMAN EKENO LOOTE	7477580	2
24. SELINA AKAI EPUNGURE	6582395	2
25. CECILIA APIR	9720756	2
26. MAGDALINA NGICHORIN LOMILIO	4780164	2
27. AKATAPAN RUBEN EKOLIA	4760170	2
28. MARY ASEKON	20259429	2
29. CHARLES EKALALE LOKAALE	31374730	2
30. SARAH LOKWAWI NAKAIO	24866941	2
31. JOSEPH LOLAI	22332826	2
32. REBECCA IRIA LOKWAMOR	12434463	2
33. VERONICA AKILELENG EKALI	29055865	2
34. MARY LOPETON EKIRU	7274733	2
35. ESTHER AMEYEN	24863144	2
36. EKUTAN NAWAWI KIRIO	32456461	2
37. LODWEL EDAPAL LOMURIA	8562347	2
38. MARGARET NANYAIT	23882993	2
39. MARY IKAI	25864127	2
40. LEAH INGOLA		2
41. FAUSTINE LOKAKALA	3313307	2
42. LOKWANG EWORON	24332739	2
43. DAVID LOKERIS	23120765	2
44. BONIFACE EKIRU LONGOR	22779041	2
45. MARIKO KUCHAL	13648965	2
46. LOSEKON ECHAKARA		2
47. PETER LOKALA	12182619	2
48. DOMINIC EREGAE		2
49. JOHN EDOME LOKUCHA	4760961	2
50. LOKWAWI KIYONGA MACHARNGOLE		2
51. ROSEMARY AKALEKA	20991128	2
52. JOHN SAMAL LOPOR	4771771	2



53.	ALICE AKIYOKORI	27845980	2
54.	JAMES EREGAE AMINY	290855320	2
55.	ALICE APUA	211491551	2
56.	SABINA CHERUTO SAMUEL	12820312	2
57.	GLADYS MUKA	37297374	2
58.	SIMON EKAL	23059416	2
59.	LAWRENCE KOLOI	30254656	2
60.	EKERU LOPUTHIKI	4807840	2
TOTALS			120

## **ANNEX 2: PROJECT PHOTOS**



**1. Livestock officer carrying out verification of the shoats before being purchased**



**2. KUMEA team checking the shoats to be bought**



**3. Checking & selecting the shoats to be purchased**



**3. Selection of the shoats for purchasing**



**4. Beneficiaries with purchased shoats**



**5. Livestock being taken home by the beneficiaries**



**6. Beneficiaries with purchased shoats ready to take them home**



**7. Beneficiaries with the various shoats they have received from the project**



**9. Some of the beneficiaries with the shoats they received from the project**



**10. Women beneficiaries with shoats received from the project**



**11. Elderly women arranging to take their shoats to their homes after receiving them from the project staff**