

Livestock Interventions in Camps

A Briefing Paper for the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

May, 2013



The Shelter Centre

Livestock Interventions in Camps

A Briefing Paper for the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

May, 2013

The Shelter Centre

Suggested citation:

The Shelter Centre (2013). Livestock Interventions in Camps: A briefing paper for the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards. Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, Addis Ababa

Disclaimer:

This publication was commissioned by LEGS and produced independently by the author. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily endorsed by LEGS.

Cover photo:

Nomadic refugees in Mbera camp (southeastern Mauritania) take their livestock to a drinking reservoir. © Anna Jefferys/IRIN, www.irinnews.org

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Literature review	2
3. Analysis and core themes from stakeholder interviews	5
3.1 Overall LEGS comments and recommendations.....	5
3.2 Institutional issues.....	6
3.3 Programming issues.....	6
4. Case Studies	8
4.1 Fencing grazing areas to erase demographic and social upheaval (Mauritania, 2013)	8
4.2 Veterinary assistance and livestock training in drought emergency (Northern Kenya, 2011) .	8
4.3 Immediate livestock intervention support to refugee hosting communities (Kenya, 2011)	9
5. Summary of Editorial Changes	11
6. Conclusions	12

1. INTRODUCTION

This briefing paper was commissioned by the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) project to provide guidance on options for inclusion of information on livestock support in camp settings in the second edition of LEGS. Such guidance might support camp managers and livelihoods based practitioners supporting livestock dependent refugees and IDPs who have been forced to move from their homes to camps or camp like settings. The briefing paper uses the Camp Management Toolkit (NRC/CMP 2008) and the term 'camp' applies to, *"A variety of camps or camp-like settings – temporary settlements including planned or self-settled camps, collective centres and transit and return centres established for hosting displaced persons"*.¹

Camps form when people are displaced due to conflict or natural disaster, and there is no alternative settlement solution. Camps are seen as a last resort when other settlement solutions are not appropriate. When livestock dependent people are displaced outside of their traditional or pre-existing communities into a camp, a series of issues specific to this situation occur. All of these issues need to be seen in relation to impacts on resilience and livelihoods on livestock keeping residents of the camp.

Key issues

- I. Issues relating to the **context** have been identified regarding availability of livestock feed resources in and around the camp, and sanitation, as well as regarding the political context i.e. access to grazing, land rights, relations with host communities and government, whether people are permitted to bring livestock into camp.
- II. **Camp design** issues relate to shelter, location of livestock in camp, security and protection measures and finally water supply.
- III. Water and air pollution, slaughtering wastes, uncontrolled use of vet drugs and transmission of disease from animals to humans brings important issues regarding the impact of livestock on **public health**.
- IV. Presence of livestock in camp-like settings also has an impact on **animal health**, especially in terms of increased risk of some livestock diseases.

Through highlighting the key issues and illustrating how to integrate them with the technical interventions in the LEGS Handbook, the briefing paper supports the LEGS Steering Group in incorporating good practice, mitigating negative outcomes and enhancing positive outcomes relating to livestock in camps.

This work is conducted in order to help LEGS provide enhanced guidelines for practitioners and camp managers considering how to use the LEGS approach and implement relevant technical intervention such as water, shelter, feed and veterinary care from the LEGS Handbook in camp and camp like settings.

A wide range of camp management and coordination networks and key livestock specialists have been interviewed. Organisations including the global IASC Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster (CCCM), IOM as the CCCM co-lead agency and UNHCR as the global mandated organisation for protection, assistance and solutions for refugees and stateless people and co-lead for CCCM, as well as selected individuals with specific expertise and knowledge within this sector have been interviewed to enhance the evidence base and literature review for this briefing paper.

1 Norwegian Refugee Council (2008) "Camp Management Toolkit", p. 14
<http://sheltercentre.org/library/camp-management-toolkit>

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Executive summary

The overall literature caters for most of the areas linked to livestock interventions in camp based settings: Refugee and Returnees (UNHCR), Camp Management (NRC), Shelter (sheltercasestudies.org), Disease and Environmental Management Risks with Livestock (FAO), ICRC Livestock Study in the Greater Horn of Africa (ICRC) etc.

The literature referring to livestock in camp based setting is, however, scattered between publications and organisations, formulated within their mandate or institutional goals, rendering the livestock aspects too discrete and poorly targeted to be of use coherently in support of operations.

Further publications from the turn of the century to 2005, when the IASC humanitarian reform process was initiated, have since become outdated and therefore no longer useful on the operational or institutional landscape.

Furthermore, the lack of use of recognised standards, such as from the Sphere Project, or concrete indicators in guidelines are a barrier to a consistent understanding of the topic, which may result in continued *ad hoc* programming.

In this context, **LEGS fills an important gap** in simultaneously bringing this current expertise within one handbook while also being a companion to the Sphere standards, which are increasingly recognised as a benchmark for governments, NGOs, the UN system and other stakeholders in the framework of emergencies.

Below is a brief overview of the most relevant publications that may complement, inform or be useful for LEGS editors and users.

Livestock-Keeping and Animal Husbandry in Refugee and Returnee Situations - A Practical Handbook for Improved Management (UNHCR, 2005)²

This Handbook is intended as a user-guide for practitioners and was expected to fill an important gap in the management tools and guidelines available to UNHCR staff and implementing partners, in particular. It considers topics in refugee and returnee situations such as the needs and rights of refugees, minimising environment problems, improving current management and livestock practices through identifying opportunities allowing affected communities to engage more openly and effectively in the livestock sector. This Handbook is mainly a refugee/returnee intervention approach to livestock inclusion in emergencies, covering some of the same topics that are discussed in LEGS with a different focus and narrative intent.

UNHCR Environmental Guidelines: Livestock in Refugee Situations (UNHCR, 1998)³

These Guidelines look at the impact of refugee-related situations on traditional livestock-keeping societies. They also discuss how to prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of livestock on the environment. The Guidelines are a comprehensive documentation of the variables in assessing, planning and implementing a livestock intervention in refugee situations, such as the positive and negative impact of livestock on its environment (natural resources, social conflict, public health and animal health), grazing patterns and concepts of carrying capacity and the prevention and mitigation of negative impacts. Information may however, need updating before being a valuable source of expertise for LEGS and its audience, as it dates back to the 1990s. In addition, it sources the majority of its experience from semi-arid and arid regions of the world (e.g. Sudan, Rwanda and Afghanistan). This implies a concentration on rural and traditional/narrow camp based setting, while not also taking into account numerous other regions which may be affected by other livestock related parameters (e.g. climate, nature of the crisis etc).

Camp Management Toolkit (Norwegian Refugee Council, 2008)⁴

This Handbook is a comprehensive and holistic overview of camp management as a cross-cutting humanitarian sector, incorporating wide and relevant basic information on various aspects of camp operations, including livestock and livelihoods. NRC developed the Toolkit in cooperation with the DRC, the IRC, UNHCR, UNOCHA

2 UNHCR, IUCN (2005) "Livestock-Keeping and Animal Husbandry in Refugee and Returnee Situations – A Practical Handbook for Improved Management", p. 1-79

http://postconflict.unep.ch/liberia/displacement/documents/UNHCR_IUCN_Livestock_Animal_Husbandry_Refugee_Returnee_Situa.pdf

3 UNHCR (1998) "Livestock in Refugee Situations", UNHCR Environmental Guidelines, p. 1-37

<http://home.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp037503.pdf>

4 Norwegian Refugee Council (2008) "Camp Management Toolkit", p. 1-598

<http://sheltercentre.org/library/camp-management-toolkit>

and IOM. It targets both refugee and IDP situations in conflict or natural disasters, outlining key issues, tools and lists of relevant reading in relation to essential issues of protection and service provision in camps and camp-like settings. It provides practical advice for camp management staff on coordination and management of a camp and on how to uphold the rights of displaced persons.

Interestingly, however, they do not go further in defining camps than as camps or camp-like settings as their area of intervention. It remains an advisory manual and not an attempt to develop agency policies or directives, written to complement existing guidelines and standards (Sphere Handbook, UNHCR Handbook for Emergencies, etc.).

It refers to water point segregation, sanitation, disease and veterinary services, fodder and local communities' coordination as key bullet points to be considered but references LEGS for further information.⁵ Livestock are also considered as an important source of livelihoods, as well as a potential source for conflict with host populations⁶. In terms of camp set-up, livestock is seen as an element to keep in mind and to be placed outside the camps⁷, as well as an element to be protected with the camp setting.⁸ Livestock must also be taken into account regarding water sources and relations with host communities, to avoid risks of contamination.⁹

The planned forthcoming revision for 2013 offers opportunities for further potential for emphasis on livestock and further references to LEGS.

Sheltercasestudies.org (led by UNHABITAT, IFRC and UNHCR, 2013)

This website and the series of publications that it supports shares details of nearly 100 case studies of post disaster and post conflict shelter from the past 100 years. They aim to illustrate some of the project options available to organisations working in both post disaster and post conflict situations. The website also exists to support learning from the strengths and weaknesses of different projects, focusing on projects that maximise emergency response funds to support sustainable recovery. Its target audience is primarily humanitarian managers and field shelter programme staff from local, national and international organisations at all levels of experience.

Only the "Ethiopia – 2011 – Sudanese Conflict" mentions livestock as being a concern, especially with respect to its arrival in camps.¹⁰ They dedicate their "Opinions" section to the relations between livestock's and shelter needs and impact and discuss the requirement to incorporate a sustainable livelihoods approach at the emergency phase. Various topics are discussed in this action such as the assumption that livestock sheltering is at the expense of human needs, or is due to a lack of consideration or the security threats that are associated with the presence of livestock and the occurrence of theft, even if livestock can also sometimes enhance protection. The competition between host and displaced communities over grazing and watering points is also mentioned in this section, as well as the reluctance of governments to take issue with livestock as it may connote more permanence of the situation.¹¹

ICRC Livestock Study in the Greater Horn of Africa (ICRC, 2004)¹²

This comprehensive Handbook on livestock in conflict situations considers the related options for interventions from international agencies. Indeed, its aim is to form a comprehensive picture of the livestock/pastoralist and agro-pastoralist populations and future developments, while providing regional livestock assistance guidelines. It only covers interventions in the Horn of Africa, pastoral and nomadic settings (rural), however, and is restricted to conflict affected emergencies. Camp-related information is incidental. It is worth noting its chapter on 'Evolution of Livestock Interventions - Impact, Lessons Learned & Basic Principles of Livestock Intervention Policy in the Horn of Africa', may be a useful document for those operating within the ICRC scope of work (Horn of Africa/ Conflict), while also yielding potential transferable knowledge for other settings linked to LEGS intervention areas.

5 Ibid, p. 179

6 Ibid, p. 194

7 Ibid, p. 207

8 Ibid, p. 478

9 Ibid, p. 171

10 Shelter Projects (2012), "Ethiopia – 2011 – Sudanese Conflict", p. 25

<http://www.sheltercasestudies.org/shelterprojects2011-2012/A08-Ethiopia-Assosa-2011.pdf>

11 Shelter Projects (2012), "Livestock Sheltering in Humanitarian Situations", p. 113

<http://www.sheltercasestudies.org/shelterprojects2011-2012/B03-Livestock.pdf>

12 ICRC (2004) "Regional Livestock Study in the Greater Horn of Africa", p. 1-305

<http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/regional-livestock-study-book.pdf>

Assistance Policy - Doctrine 49 (ICRC, 2004)¹³

The ICRC Assistance Policy Doctrine 49 provides broad guidance, including a strategic approach and defines the core areas of the assistance work of the ICRC. These are used by veterinarians in the field to complement and guide their work.

Minimum Standards for Economic Recovery after Crisis (The SEEP Network, 2008)¹⁴

The focus of these Standards is on strategies and interventions designed to “*promote enterprises, employment, and cash flow and asset management among affected enterprises and livelihoods [...] encouraging enterprises and livelihoods to re-start or improve markets*”¹⁵.

Interestingly, they consider livestock within all standards, whilst not dedicating a separate chapter or sub-section to it, emphasising the need for mainstreaming the issue rather than seeing it as a separate intervention area to emergencies, recovery or development. They do perceive livestock as critical to relief and recovery in crisis environments, notably regarding the vulnerability of certain groups, including women and PLHIV as well as a key leveraging asset toward sustainable recovery.

A Value Chain Approach to Animal Diseases Risk Management (FAO, 2011)¹⁶

The principles highlighted in the publication, i.e. a value chain approach to animal diseases risk management, could be applied within camps to identify critical risk points for all diseases, including zoonotic diseases

Sphere Handbook (2011)¹⁷

Livestock is not extensively mentioned in the 2011 “Sphere Handbook 2011: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response” and when it is, it is mostly merely in referencing LEGS. Whereas the Sphere Handbook does not provide specific standards for livestock, it does offer themes most relevant to livestock (public health, environment, shelter and protection)

Communicating Technical Evidence: supporting people making decisions about shelter after disasters, (HIF, UCL and CARE, 2012)¹⁸

This recent report aims to evaluate the way in which technical evidence is communicated prior to and after emergencies from different perspectives, including local NGOs, international organisations and private sector actors. The project team evaluated 91 documents produced in Pakistan, Peru and Haiti and compared their technical evidence. The report concluded, in particular, that the most useful documents were, in the case of Peru and Haiti, the shortest ones. Such recent academic and humanitarian evidence could be useful for future developments of the LEGS Handbook.

The Good Enough Guide (ECB Project, 2010)¹⁹

This Guide aims to provide field workers with “simple steps to put local people at the heart of emergency responses and measure program impact in emergency situations”. Sourcing its expertise from the work of field staff, NGOs and inter-agency initiatives, it highlights simple and practical solutions to ensure that affected populations are involved in the planning, implementing and review of emergency interventions. It encourages practitioners to choose safe, quick and easily implementable tools. The Guide is a good example of how to formulate straight forward practices to be followed in “plain English”, avoiding complex jargon or academic longevity.

13 ICRC (2004) “ICRC Assistance Policy”, Doctrine 49

14 The SEEP Network (2009) “Minimum Standards for Economic Recovery after Crisis”, p. 1-120

http://www.seepnetwork.org/filebin/pdf/bethany/Econ_Recovery_Standards.pdf

15 Ibid, p. 8

16 Food and Agricultural Organisation (2011) “A Value Chain Approach to Animal Diseases Risk Management”, p. 1-126

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i2198e/i2198e00.pdf>

17 The Sphere Project (2011) “The Sphere Handbook 2011: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response”, p. 1-402

<http://sheltercentre.org/library/sphere-handbook-2011-humanitarian-charter-and-minimum-standards-disaster-response>

18 Humanitarian Innovation Fund, Care, UCL, ARUP (2013) “Communicating Technical Evidence: Supporting People Making Decisions about Shelter After Disasters”, p. 1-24

http://www.humanitarianinnovation.org/sites/default/files/hif_s_2012_054_analytical_report_on_technical_evidence_3.pdf

19 Emergency Capacity Building Project (2010) “The Good Enough Guide”, p. 1-74

http://www.humanitarianforum.org/data/files/resources/702/en/Good_Enough_Guide-en.pdf

3. ANALYSIS AND CORE THEMES FROM STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Interviews have been conducted with:

- Jim Kennedy - Consultant
- Joseph Ashmore – Independent Shelter Consultant, sheltercasestudies.org
- Mohammed Hilmi - INTERACTION
- Randa Hassan – OCHA
- Mathias Frese – ICRC
- Guido Govoni – ICRC
- Sarah-Yen Stemmler and Mutya Maskun - IOM

The main themes from the interviews regarding livestock interventions and relevant resources have been summarized below in order to have a better picture of stakeholders' feedback and expectations.

3.1 Overall LEGS comments and recommendations

It is difficult to generalise exposure of LEGS from the small number of interviews conducted. ICRC programmes use LEGS as their reference and guideline, mainly because they do not have their own relevant policies, other than from the livestock study previously referenced in the literature review.²⁰ Independents also use the Handbook, but more as a communication tool with stakeholders.²¹ While there are numerous Handbooks related to livestock in emergencies available, organisations do not regularly use them as references or as programmatic guidelines in emergencies. This tends to be left to other organisations such as the FAO or local governmental departments, with handbooks informing add-on to programmes.²²

For some of the interviewees, LEGS is used as an awareness raising and communication tool²³ to mainstream livestock interventions and themes. The Handbook is therefore used 'under the radar', in order to support the institutionalisation of livestock topics and to be used as an advocacy tool with governments and other stakeholders. Potentially, therefore, the revision process might become as important as the existence of the Handbook in itself.²⁴

Interviews indicated that the Handbook provides a common ground and standards between generalists, veterinarians and donors²⁵ that makes it even more important to link it to the Sphere Project, as an institutionalised and recognised framework.²⁶ For some interviewees, the main purpose of the Handbook appears to be in offering standards for livestock interventions.²⁷

For others, the Handbook is used as a tool to streamline the steps that lead (or not) to the design of a livestock intervention.²⁸ In cases of uncertainty about the needs of a livestock intervention, the Handbook therefore provides interesting options (i.e. security, increasing risk of conflict within the camp and with the host community, political considerations, etc). It is, therefore, useful for project programming and management level people to consider livestock and be aware of certain standards to be followed.²⁹

Finally, the Handbook serves as a reference tool when faced with the presence of livestock. Due to its clear and simple guidance in form of checklists, decision trees, etc, it appears to be very useful in the field.³⁰ Some experts were interested in having recommendations and key highlights concerning livestock.³¹ It has

²⁰ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

²¹ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore and Jim Kennedy conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype

²² Shelter Centre interview with Randa Hassan conducted on April 16th 2013 in Geneva and Mutya Maskun on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference

²³ Shelter Centre interview with Mutya Maskun conducted on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference

²⁴ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype

²⁵ Shelter Centre interview with Jim Kennedy conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype and with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

²⁶ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore and Jim Kennedy conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype

²⁷ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

²⁸ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

²⁹ Shelter Centre interview with Randa Hassan conducted on April 16th 2013 in Geneva and with Mohamed Hilmi on April 16th via Skype

³⁰ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva, with Guido Govoni conducted on April 17th 2013 via email and with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva

³¹ Shelter Centre interview with Mutya Maskun conducted on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference

been clearly stated, however, that there is a need to be more concise and straight to the point³² (cf. Communicating Technical Evidence Report and The Good Enough Guide as examples).

3.2 Institutional issues

Experts interviewed pointed at the lack of expertise in organisations, which resulted in reliance on external expertise or organisation such as contracted veterinarians or FAO to provide guidelines and programming guidance. They cited the absence of technical knowledge and outsourcing as one of the main issues faced regarding livestock.³³ Some stakeholders referred to displaced populations as a possible solution for such issues, as they might include highly qualified and knowledgeable individuals that would be invaluable when it comes to local herding and livestock keeping.³⁴

This former issue was associated with the absence of institutional or sectoral memory on livestock, in addition to the lack of documentation such as best practices, lessons learnt, or single fiche feedback.³⁵ Inadequate promotion of existing guidance material was also identified as a potential challenge to improving livestock interventions (all stakeholders' interviews).

The need to better understand the role of livestock and the nature of societies informs livestock programming, to a large extent, as well as the expectations of programme managers when a disaster occurs in a given context. For some interviewees particularly, local communities were seen as the best placed to support programming, for example nomadic societies with livestock versus urban societies with smaller groups of cattle coming into camp-based settings will be different.³⁶

Finally, livestock is not mainstreamed into programming as it does not represent an institutional priority and is often an add-on activity, once projects are already running, and interviewees perceived it as a potential concern for future interventions. As internal institutional mandates can clash, livestock support needs to be integrated into all aspects of camp-based humanitarian support.³⁷ This is especially relevant when such an integration failure has caused adverse problems in camps: for example, a poultry shelter in DRC was built between established houses in a settlement, contrary to Sphere standards. This neglect of the livestock issues also has consequences on the amount of funding allocated.³⁸

3.3 Programming issues

The study found that the timeframe of livestock intervention in the disaster cycle depends greatly on field contexts. Such interventions are rarely considered as part of relief work, except when diseased or dying livestock threatens hygiene standards for people, or where livestock has become the only nutritional source for populations.³⁹ Livestock is seen as relevant mainly during recovery phases, as part of development and preparedness efforts before a disaster⁴⁰ and more importantly as cross cutting, reinforcing resilience during chronic and complex emergency. ICRC, however, pointed out their need to incorporate a sustainable dimension to any intervention conducted.⁴¹

Respondents commented that procurement methodologies need better guidance concerning the purchase of goods, such as fodder or medications (local vs. International), including storage, particularly in terms of the selection of sites for camps in order to avoid remote locations, lack of facilities and protection risks.⁴² The storage of procured medication and veterinary facilities are therefore key considerations in camp-based settings, not least because if poorly managed, hygiene and black market resale may occur, undermining local markets.⁴³ Site selection and planning with nomadic societies is also problematic, especially in vulnerable

³² Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva, with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva, with Mutya Maskun conducted on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference

³³ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore on April 15th 2013 via, with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva, with Mutya Maskun on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference and with Mohamed Hilmi on April 16th via Skype

³⁴ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

³⁵ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva, with Mutya Maskun on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference, with Randa Hassan conducted on April 16th 2013 in Geneva and with Mohamed Hilmi on April 16th via Skype

³⁶ Ibid

³⁷ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore on April 15th 2013 via Skype and with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva

³⁸ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

³⁹ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype

⁴⁰ Shelter Centre interview with Mohamed Hilmi conducted on April 16th via Skype

⁴¹ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Shelter Centre interview with Randa Hassan conducted on April 16th 2013 in Geneva

environments, as camp site selection may create overly dense populations of humans and livestock, potentially bringing further issues such as localized overgrazing.⁴⁴

Stakeholders have also identified the need to consider and integrate the concerns of the host community regarding livestock as a key element of livestock intervention programming. This is motivated by the dual nature of host communities, both as beneficiaries of the interventions and decision influencers.⁴⁵ Engagement with governments is therefore a crucial dimension to integrate in programme design.⁴⁶

Finally, attention is required for former nomadic populations integrated into urban settings.⁴⁷ Options for destocking should be considered, as the presence of large livestock populations has a strong influence on human populations. The availability of livestock to trade may, however, enhance the motivation to return.

⁴⁴ Shelter Centre interview with Jim Kennedy conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype, with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva

⁴⁵ Shelter Centre interview with Mathias Frese conducted on April 17th 2013 in Geneva, with Mutya Maskun on April 22nd 2013 via phone conference, with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva, with Mohamed Hilmi on April 16th via Skype

⁴⁶ Shelter Centre interview with Joseph Ashmore conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype with Randa Hassan on April 16th 2013 in Geneva

⁴⁷ Shelter Centre interview with Jim Kennedy conducted on April 15th 2013 via Skype

4. CASE STUDIES⁴⁸

4.1 Fencing grazing areas to erase demographic and social upheaval (Mauritania, 2013)

Background

Following the deterioration of the humanitarian situation due to the military offensives in Mali in mid-January 2012 and continuing instability into the beginning of 2013, large populations of civilians were the direct consequences of the crisis. As of November 2012, approximately 354,000 people have been forced to flee their homes, including some 155,000 refugees hosted in Algeria, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Mauritania, Niger and Togo, and that around 199,000 IDPs.

IOM Mauritania notably observed the displacement of 74,108 Malian refugees into in the Bassiknou area in Mauritania, as of May, 2013.

The displaced people are living in extremely difficult conditions, dependent on humanitarian aid and solidarity of the host family and friends. Furthermore, their arrival exacerbated the effects of the drought that already threatened the local population's subsistence and their herds and put continued pressure on the livelihood and sustainability of the local communities.

Intervention

As part of this on-going intervention, a multi-agency on-site assessment visit to the Bassiknou region found that grazing rights regarding refugee's herds were a major concern for local communities and potentially a major source of conflict between the two populations. Discussions resulted in the implementation of an alternative schedule for grazing. In response to community representatives' claims, IOM's intervention consists of planning the demarcation and restriction of access to the meadows. Such activities aimed to guarantee the division among private areas that, if respected, will reduce the possibility of interference by other herds and ease local populations' grievances, therefore reducing possible conflict between refugees and local populations.

Responding to some of the questions asked by Shelter Centre, IOM Mauritania described their plan to provide intensive veterinary care to the herds to protect livestock against diseases associated with malnutrition and drought. So far, the target of vaccinating 2,400 animals has been set. Veterinary action is considered by IOM as an important concern to respond to; as they consider that a healthy livestock is the main guarantee of the stability of the local populations.

Such livestock oriented interventions are crucial for beneficiaries, as livestock and access to pastures are an essential part of the sustainability of the domestic population, as well as the refugee population. IOM Mauritania is especially concerned that if the economic viability of the community is endangered, local communities may leave the area for the urban centres, or cause conflict with the refugee population.

Conclusion

Actions described in this case study highlight the invaluable need of strong situation analysis and need assessment prior to the intervention, as well as the need to establish discussion with host communities. The creation of discussion channels has made it possible for the local populations to express their fears and concerns regarding the situation with refugee population. It has, therefore, enabled responses to the stated issues with solutions agreed collectively with a long-term perspective. This case study also highlights the central role of site selection, a camp-related activity that has been emphasised in this study.

(Source: IOM Mauritania)

4.2 Veterinary assistance and livestock training in drought emergency (Northern Kenya, 2011)

Background

In May 2011, the Government of Kenya declared the Horn of Africa drought to be a national disaster, with the President directing that immediate interventions be put in place to cushion the affected Kenyans and their livestock. Grazing lands dwindled because of the previous year's drought, ravaging northern parts of Kenya predominantly in the areas of Garissa, Turkana, and West Pokot, resulting in around 13.3 million people in dire need of humanitarian assistance.

⁴⁸ The technical approaches described in the three case studies are not necessarily endorsed by LEGS.

IOM's assessment on the effects of drought and refugee influx on pastoral livelihood systems pointed to the climatic variability, which led to a disruption of livelihoods, a decline in biodiversity, a shortage of food, an increase in human and livestock health problems, rural-urban migration, and dependency on external support. This project came at a time when IOM Kenya had just completed a mapping exercise of both the available resources and of the migratory routes of Somali refugees and the pastoral community in Dadaab district. The assessment revealed that refugee migration had resulted in additional pressures on the host community's resources and grazing patterns.

Intervention

IOM Kenya sought to provide assistance to and build resilience of communities impacted by drought and the Somali refugee influx in northern Kenya and particularly Dadaab, gathering an overall 50,000 households in drought and refugee-impacted host communities. IOM Kenya worked in collaboration with the refugee and semi-pastoralist communities, the government's line ministries and grassroots structures to ensure effective results of the project.

IOM's team in the field carried out a rapid needs assessment in the target areas to identify possible intervention, modalities, sensitization of community and set-up of outreach structures. The intervention included strengthening communities based on improved livestock health service delivery, the selection and establishment of veterinary drug stores, provision of vaccination treatment and de-worming of livestock. A total of 137,285 people were vaccinated to achieve such goals.

A total of 805 beneficiaries attained knowledge and skills on livestock production, health management, disease control, treatment of simple animal diseases and dry season feeding. Artificial insemination kits for cross breeding were distributed to promote the use of improved breeds of livestock and five Friesian cows were procured for cross breeding with the local breed.

The intervention also included the development of pasture to provide further fodder for livestock in the long term. This was achieved through the establishment of 10 community forage nurseries, including 100 beneficiaries working on forage production, feed processing and treatment technologies, enhancement of crop production through identification of stakeholders and beneficiaries, the procurement of and distribution of agricultural inputs, reseeding reclaimed lands with drought tolerant grass, conducting training on crop cultural practices; and following up of field activities carried out by farmers.

Conclusion

According to IOM's feedback, the vaccination intervention contributed to the prevention of a serious livestock disease outbreak and resulted in reducing the number of livestock deaths in the drought-affected communities. The quality of livestock improved and animals became more drought resistant through the artificial dissemination kit distributed. Helping the communities reconstitute plots of land for graze land helped the communities recover from some of the shocking effects of the drought.

Overall, insecurity was one of the great challenges for project implementation in the targeted regions. In Dadaab and Garissa, increased insecurity led to movement restriction which in turn resulted in delays in implementing certain activities. To counter this situation, IOM was in close coordination with security officers and reviewed the work plan regularly and determined project activities every week as required. IOM also entrusted the government counterparts and local institutions to implement activities whenever possible whilst maintaining neutrality whenever possible. Logistical, communication and weather issues were also highlighted by IOM Kenya as hindering access to projects and impeding monitoring and evaluating efforts.

Overall, the involvement of local stakeholders in disputes arising from within the communities has been an important and sensible move to settle competition without jeopardizing the project.

(Source: IOM Kenya)

4.3 Immediate livestock intervention support to refugee hosting communities (Kenya, 2011)

Background

The impacts of the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa region were exacerbated by extremely high food prices, reduced coping capacity and a limited humanitarian response. Crops failed, local cereal prices were very high and substantial livestock mortality occurred. This was the most severe food security emergency in the region, and the humanitarian response was inadequate to prevent further deterioration.

In some areas of northern Kenya and southern Somalia, rainfall was less than 30 percent of the 1995-2010 average (an average that includes several previous droughts as well). Excess livestock mortality of 15-30 percent was reported across the region, with mortality levels as high as 40-60 percent in localised areas such as North Eastern Kenya, especially for cattle and sheep. The combination of extremely high food prices and average to below-average livestock prices and wages substantially eroded purchasing power in pastoral, cropping, and urban areas. Livestock production prospects were bleak in the North Eastern lowlands, as trekking distances for water, pasture and browse were increasingly untenable and close to 20 kilometres in parts of the country. Livestock body conditions were deteriorating due to depletion of grazing reserves, compounded by an influx of large herds of livestock from the neighbouring pastoral districts. Apart from the likelihood of an upsurge in disease, the influx of livestock depressed local livestock prices, compounding worsening terms of trade for households.

The Ministry of Livestock Development reported livestock deaths in several hard-hit areas. Many other thousands of livestock were also reported to have become exceedingly weak, further complicating the lives of their owners. Traders complained of losses as animals continue to die in numbers on their way to slaughterhouses since they were too weak to reach their destination.

Intervention

IOM Kenya's intervention aimed at responding to urgent livestock losses and at restoring the livestock based livelihoods of the most vulnerable people of North Eastern Kenya affected by the crisis, a population estimated as 43,230 individuals.

The project included numerous activities related to LEGS, whose Handbook was used in the process. First, a destocking exercise was carried out in conjunction with the Ministry of Livestock, reaching 251 households with 995 goats and sheep. Water facilities were rehabilitated including sand and sub-surface dams and shallow wells along lagers. 165 health kits, containing notably dewormers, adamicin injectables and sprayers, were distributed to community members who had previously been trained on disease control for migrating animals and herders along migratory routes. The intervention included as well restocking practices aiming at improving breeds, with 330 more resilient camel breeds distributed to 165-targeted households.

Community training was also a strong part of the intervention with 186 community members and relief committees' representatives trained pasture storage, conservation and utilization during both dry and wet seasons, in collaboration with the Ministry of Livestock and animal production representatives. Finally, livestock feed supplements and concentrates were distributed to 800 beneficiary households for very weak animals.

Conclusion

Just like in the intervention described above, security issues and accessibility have seriously impacted the development of the projects. The intervention was however considered a strong improvement in the humanitarian situation by IOM's team in Northern Kenya. Given that this intervention was aimed at meeting the immediate needs of the affected population from the worst drought, the communities were able within a short time to dispose their animals that were emaciated through destocking and provided food, and also gave them a source of income to purchase new animals. The communities also benefited from improved breeds through restocking of the camels, which can withstand drought. The project also helped to build the capacity of the communities through trainings on disease control, which in turn helped them to detect diseases and treat their livestock while migrating through the health kits. The community heavily appreciated the animal feed supplements, especially as there was no pasture for their animals, and these helped to fill in the gap for the lack of pasture.

The IOM team in Kenya especially stressed the importance of having community-based stakeholders to cooperate with, especially regarding security issues at the grassroots-level. They however advised that project staff should be balanced between the local community and non-locals to ensure transparency and inclusivity.

(Source: IOM Kenya)

5. SUMMARY OF EDITORIAL CHANGES

Following the review of the Handbook, the literature review and interviews, key themes were identified related to each chapter of LEGS.

The review identified that issues related to the context of the possible livestock intervention are of major interest. This context or environment includes relations with the host communities and government, as well as the management of resources available. Throughout the review, the **importance of host communities** has been highlighted. Such a consideration should therefore also be highlighted in its relation to camp management. In this sense, sharing resources and services, such as veterinarians, water, fodder, grazing or assistance with local communities, appear to be essential considerations in livestock interventions. The review, specifically through the interesting case studies provided by IOM, also concludes that consultation with local communities regarding their expectations and concerns should therefore also be implemented in relation to refugee camps, or any potential disruption of local markets and customs (i.e. during a destocking intervention).

It was clear that the role of host communities is closely related to the management of resources available, both for the local population and the refugees. Procurement and secure storage of feed and water in relation to livestock, coordination with host communities, access to camps and impact on local markets are all elements to be integrated within a camp management approach to livestock. Destocking can provide further resources to affected population but it needs to be managed keeping in mind long-term effects upon livelihoods. Veterinary intervention will also imply cattle management, to avoid mixing herds and disrupting livestock ownership. The review also highlighted that the relationship between humans and animals in camp settings also implies a separation of resources, as well as the long-term efficiency of interventions.

Camp management and camp design constitute the next major topics that have been identified during the study. The location of livestock, its security and management, as well as water supply location, have all to be included in livestock emergencies in camp-like settings. The study also found that slaughter areas must also be taken in account when designing the camp and places should be available for vaccinating and dipping livestock. Camp design also implies reducing the size of the camp to have broader feed sources, as well as site selection in order to minimise potential conflicts with local populations. The geographical position of local communities and the environmental impact of providing livestock to refugee camps would benefit livestock intervention in camp settings.

The review also suggests integrating more elements regarding **public health** in relation to the presence of livestock population in camp-like settings. Indeed, further detail on measures to mitigate water and air pollution, trans-border and trans-boundary diseases and their impact on public health in the host community and the refugee community would benefit the Handbook. Strict hygiene measures should also be implemented to avoid the transmission of disease through slaughtering waste in relation to destocking practices, especially in a camp-like environment.

Finally, an increased prevalence of some **livestock diseases** and the provision of accurate management practices to avoid the spread of contamination of healthy livestock would greatly benefit this Handbook. The provision of drinking and feeding troughs would prevent mixing stools, hooves and water which would also constitute a great asset from a camp management perspective. The review found that the issue of quarantine, surveillance and hygiene issues within camp settings should also be borne in mind.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the Handbook's thematic content is of a high quality and the content is very relevant to the humanitarian community at large and not only to veterinarians or livestock professionals. Indeed, from the literature review, it is filling an essential thematic and temporal gap in livestock intervention documentation. Furthermore, the Handbook is perceived by all stakeholders as a useful resource regarding livestock programming in emergencies.

The Handbook fulfils a dual role: it works both as a reference tool for livestock interventions but also, and perhaps more importantly, as a mainstreaming tool to communicate the central role of livestock in programming during emergencies. This may be achieved through the current review process, advocating the LEGS Handbook through other forums, and engaging further with stakeholders in order to mainstream and institutionalise the issue of livestock as a cross-cutting theme.

In terms of content, the key themes identified and described above are mostly to be mainstreamed into the various chapters. More information regarding the consequences of camp management and coordination on livestock's environment, camp design, animal and public health would greatly benefit the Handbook.

One key change that may be required, however, concerns the need to elaborate further on key topics and explain livestock in camps in a more coherent manner, with greater contextual explanation of camps and camp-like settings. This would help the readers to understand the camp management component, and indeed the wider humanitarian context associated with emergencies, in a more comprehensive manner. These opportunities for greater detail notably include the differences between a camp and the previous settlement structures people have come from, as well as land use and the impact the different contexts that imply approaching different partners and actors. In this sense, the context and grounding in humanitarian action is missing in LEGS. While mainstreaming the topics discussed may go some way to filling this gap, it is more fundamental to adapt the format of the Handbook in one of two ways: first, Chapter 1 could have a sub-heading that addresses the specific context of camp-like settings; and secondly, dividing Chapter 2 into two subsections discussion human and animal settlement in each standard would clearly highlight the context to camps and camp-like settings that was sought in this study.

Finally, the LEGS format in particular has received very positive feedback from stakeholders regarding its usefulness, however overall recommendations were made to make it briefer and more to the point, in order to be more useable in the field.