



LAIKIPIA  
CONSERVANCIES  
ASSOCIATION

Laikipia Conservancies  
Association  
Draft Scoping Survey Report

28<sup>th</sup> March 2024



RADNOR CONSULTING  
Your Transformation Partner

### **Disclaimer:**

The information provided by Radnor Consulting is for general informational purposes only. All information on the Report is provided in good faith, and we make no representation or warranty of any kind, express or implied, regarding the accuracy, adequacy, validity, reliability, availability, or completeness of any information in the Report.

The Scoping Study Report maintains editorial independence and aims to present unbiased and objective information. The opinions expressed in articles, commentaries, or user-generated content are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect our views or opinions. We do not endorse or promote any specific political, commercial, or ideological agenda. Readers should consider multiple sources and perspectives to form their own opinions.

The information provided in this Report does not constitute investment advice, financial advice, trading advice, or any other sort of advice and you should not treat any of the Report's content as such. Further due diligence will be required and consult your financial advisor before making any investment decisions.

# Contents

---

1. Executive Summary.....	5
2. Background and Overview .....	8
2.1. Background of the Scoping Study.....	8
2.2. Approach and Methodology .....	8
2.3. Overview of the Current Initiatives.....	9
2.3.1. Initiatives Overview – Community Conservancies .....	10
2.3.2. Initiatives Overview - Private Conservancies.....	21
2.4. Implementation Experience, Lessons learnt and agenda for LCA.....	25
2.4.1 Land-use Planning and Properties Management. ....	25
2.4.2 Common threats – insecurity, land tenure and poor enforcement.....	26
2.4.3 Laikipia ecosystem conservation strategy.....	27
2.4.4 Economic diversification .....	27
2.4.5 Transformational Education .....	28
2.4.6 The Need for a Supportive Legal and Regulatory Environment.....	29
2.4.7 Need For Landscape-wide Performance Standards and Data Sharing.....	29
3. Proposed Initiatives and Considerations .....	30
3.1. Introduction.....	30
3.2. Recommended initiatives for scaling and development.....	30
4. Appendices.....	36
Appendix 1.....	37
Appendix 2.....	39
Appendix 3.....	41
Appendix 4.....	43

Table of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
AGM	Annual General Meeting
AI	Artificial Insemination or Intelligence (depending on context)
APLRS	Association of Private Land Rhino Sanctuaries
ARES	African Ruggedized Education System
BMO	Business Membership Organisation
CFA,	Community Forest Association
CLA	Community Lands Act
CLMC	Community Land Management Committee
DRIVE	De-risking, Inclusion and Value Enhancement of Pastoral Economies in the Horn of Africa
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
GIS	Geographical Information System
KLEE	Kenya Long-term Exclosure Experiment
KWCA	Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
LWF	Laikipia Wildlife Association
M <sup>3</sup>	Metres cubed
MEL	Monitoring Evaluation and Learning
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NRT	Northern Rangelands Trust
NYS	National Youth Service
OPC	OI Pejeta Conservancy
SAPA	Social Assessment of Protected Areas
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollars
USFS	United States Forest Service
WTTC	World Travel and Tourism Council

# 1. Executive Summary

---

This report has been prepared after an extensive scoping study commissioned by the Laikipia Conservancies Association (hereinafter “LCA”) to understand which conservation, rangeland management and livelihoods initiatives have succeeded in the past, and how these might be aligned to the membership endorsed strategy and scaled for more impact and sustainability.

The report has been prepared after a collaborative process where interviews, focus-group discussions and workshops were held with community and private conservancies, the county government and other partners who have been involved in supporting conservancies in Laikipia. The fieldwork was preceded by a comprehensive review of documents from LCA and other partners to understand the current state of the Laikipia landscape, initiatives undertaken and their impact on the conservation, rangeland management and livelihoods across the conservancies.

The implementation experience of different initiatives has been varied and some have failed to achieve their stated outcomes and most of the challenges that were to be addressed by these initiatives have not been mitigated or eliminated. Nonetheless, there are successful initiatives that need to be scaled up to become more effective. LCA can play a significant role in supporting these initiatives as a convener of different stakeholders across the landscape to drive a ‘joined-up’ approach. Such an approach is aligned to the strategic vision of LCA as a platform for the conservancies to tackle shared challenges.

The key challenges identified during this study include persistent land degradation despite efforts to restore the land to its original state. The various initiatives range from removal of invasive species, re-generation of bare land and gully filling, planned grazing to reduce soil erosion and provide vegetation for livestock and wildlife, and managing the number of livestock allowed on the landscape. These initiatives have faced various challenges; key amongst them is a piecemeal approach to implementation that is not sustained after the end of a funding cycle, and invasion by pastoralists from neighbouring counties which disregards the agreed upon grazing plans. Worsening and unpredictable weather patterns that catch many of the pastoralists unawares leading to distress grazing, and human wildlife conflict as wildlife compete for the same resources. Water scarcity driven by reduced rain, increased demand for water and poor reticulation of water across the community conservancies also plays a part. This contrasts with the successful rangeland management and water provision efforts in the private conservancies.

A second challenge is the management of the community conservancies. Despite efforts to formalise the management of the community conservancies, there is still a lot that remains to be done to make these conservancies financially viable to support the communities that live on them. There is a need for a meaningful change in mindsets on income generation activities that can guarantee a significantly better standard of living. The management of community conservancies is yet to be professionalised and corporatised to drive productivity and sustainability that maximises returns while driving better conservation efforts. The Land Act 2019 recognises Community Land Management Committees as elected officials who oversee the management of community land. While this approach ensures that community member interests are represented, they are often unable to manage the conservancies professionally and attract the required investment to benefit from the conservation and alternative income generating activities that can be undertaken in these conservancies. As a result, the community conservancies are poorly managed and underutilised for the benefit of the membership, leading to over-dependence on donors. While donors have consistently provided support to conservancies, this is not sustainable, as most projects are disjointed and instances of piecemeal implementation of various initiatives aimed at improving conservation efforts and rangeland management are neither replicable nor scalable. This in turn, leads to an accelerating rate of land degradation and poverty amongst the community members.

These challenges are further exacerbated by poor security. Laikipia has witnessed persistent invasion and clashes between communities as they compete for reducing pasture. This has impinged on the private conservancies through distress grazing and stock theft. The national and county government are responsible for maintaining security across the county. The deployment of national police reservists is inadequate and therefore ineffective in quelling the insecurity. Without security, investors are disincentivised to invest in community conservancies.

This leads to overreliance on pastoralism which leads to overgrazing and further land degradation. Additionally, a weak regulatory environment and poor enforcement of laws makes it difficult to address security issues.

Though the situation may seem grim. There are many opportunities for LCA to support the conservancies to become financially viable and sustainable. As a business membership organisation, LCA will need to create a platform where challenges facing the conservancies can be addressed. The following are some of the key interventions that LCA should consider.

Firstly, LCA should become a convenor of conservancies and other stakeholders to address the policy and regulatory environment. A robust policy and regulatory framework backed up with the necessary enforcement will be a key to improved security in the county. The various policies and interventions proposed have been included in the relevant section of the document.

Secondly, supporting the community conservancies to implement a professionalised and corporatised management approach will be critical to unlocking the various alternative income options. These include alternative income generation activities ranging from conservation tourism, precious stones mining, honey production, intensive livestock production and value addition, bio-trade, and research among other activities. The professionalisation of the community conservancies would lead to coherent land management approaches that are both sustainable and capable of supporting both the livestock and wildlife. Such a management approach would also lead to better land-use planning that allows for communities to settle in designated areas within the conservancies where they can access water, electricity and other amenities, and have access to social services such as health centres and education services, while living in secured settlements. This would in turn release land for conservation, pasture development and other economically viable activities.

Thirdly, there is a need for a common approach to the provision of potable and adequate water. This will require that LCA develops, alongside its membership, a water masterplan that drives collaboration between conservancies, the county government and other partners to source and reticulate water across conservancies in a manner that is sustainable. This should include designated water provision for human and livestock as well as ensuring access to water for wildlife.

A fourth intervention is the development of tourism as a viable business across conservancies, particularly community owned conservancies. This would include a collaborative approach to tourism between community and private conservancies. LCA should convene and develop the Laikipia Conservation and Tourism masterplan which outlines a tourism circuit across the conservancies with curated experiences, further securing Laikipia as a premier tourism destination, marketed globally as such. This approach would also support learning from successful private conservancies and enrich a tourist's experience. The tourism masterplan would support the development of de-risking mechanisms to improve the investment across both community and private conservancies. This fund should underwrite perceived risk in investing in the conservancies. Conservation is a key economic activity given the abundant wildlife in Laikipia, with increased land pressure, there is an opportunity to manage wildlife consciously and scientifically.

A critical intervention for the success of the other initiatives is transformative education. LCA should play a more instrumental role in harmonising private and community conservancies scholarship and institutional support. Education is key to changing mindsets and opening avenues for alternative income generation, better leadership, and business management. Such a program should identify and mentor future leaders from primary, through to secondary and tertiary education levels. Increased investment in the conservancies would also require skilled workers who can only be developed through deliberate programs supported by LCA and well-established education institutions. A diversified education program would also reduce dependence on livestock production and graduate households to higher value activities, while improving livestock production practices through better breeding, pasture provision and value addition. In addition, there is an opportunity to drive vocational training to provide critical skills such as welding, carpentry, among others to support the development of the county, and provide alternative income streams to households.

The executive summary gives an overview of the key findings and proposed interventions that LCA can undertake to meet the needs of the member conservancies. We urge you to read the rest of the document to

gain a deeper understanding of how these interventions will drive the strategic vision of LCA and her membership.

The rest of the document is arranged as follows:

2. Background and overview – discuss the overall objective of this study, the approach to the study, key findings, and impact.
3. Survey findings and implications – outlines the initiatives undertaken and their impact on the landscape as well as whether they have been successful or not. It identifies the proposed initiatives that should be considered for scaling.
4. Initiatives and Implementation Considerations – discusses the prioritised initiatives and details the implementation considerations.

## 2. Background and Overview

---

### 2.1. Background of the Scoping Study

This study was commissioned by the LCA, with funding from the Darwin Initiative Project called *'Increasing the Ecological and Socio-economic Resilience of the Upper-Ewaso Ng'iro North Ecosystem.'* The project is funded through the Fauna and Flora International. It targets 580,000 hectares of the Upper Ewaso Ng'iro North Ecosystem which is located between Mt. Kenya catchment forest and the Aberdare Ranges, which transverses Nyeri, Meru, Laikipia, Isiolo, Samburu and Nyandarua. Counties.

The outcome of this project is to ensure “Sustainable natural resource management increases water security and ecosystem functioning in the Upper-Ewaso Ng'iro North Ecosystem, supporting key species, reducing conflict, increasing human wellbeing, and adaptation to climate change.” This outcome is broken down into six key objectives:

1. Building capacity for sustainable natural resource management
2. Facilitating adoption of nature-based solutions to deliver economic benefits.
3. Habitat restoration to reduce water scarcity.
4. Building resilience to climate change
5. Increase peaceful co-existence for people and wildlife.

The LCA is a membership organisation made up of thirty conservancies within Laikipia County. As part of this project, the LCA sought to undertake a scoping survey to identify the various initiatives that had been undertaken by different member conservancies across Laikipia. The scoping survey aimed to understand the initiatives that have been successful, and as such can be scaled up to benefit the over 1.2 million residents of the county, improve conservation efforts and support the livelihoods.

This study, which was undertaken between February and March 2024, therefore collected data and information from the conservancies on the initiatives they had undertaken, the outcomes of those initiatives and lessons learnt during the implementation. The insights gathered were then used to develop more ambitious initiatives that could be scaled across the county sustainably.

### 2.2. Approach and Methodology

The scoping study was undertaken across LCA member conservancies in Laikipia County. The aim of the study was to understand which livelihood, conservation and rangeland management related initiatives have succeeded in the past and how these might be aligned to the membership endorsed LCA strategy. The identified initiatives were evaluated for effectiveness and scalability.

The insights gathered from this scoping study were also used to redesign the successful initiatives or develop new initiatives that could be implemented across the county with a focus on transformational improvements in conservation and rangeland management which would lead to a thriving biodiversity alongside livelihood activities. The initiatives were also evaluated considering the role and purpose of LCA in the landscape, which as a 'business membership organisation' brings together thirty privately owned and community conservancies. LCA offers a platform where shared challenges and opportunities can be pursued and all conservancies can enjoy the strength of a unified voice to engage various stakeholders such as the government, NGOs and other organisations working in the landscape.

The scoping study was undertaken in phases:

**Phase 0:** Project Kick-off was held on the 8<sup>th</sup> of February 2024. During the meeting, LCA management team, a representative from the Darwin Initiative reviewed the proposed approach and methodology, agreed on the stakeholders to be interviewed and specific areas of enquiry. In addition, the proposed implementation plan was discussed and updated reflect the fairly short time that remained to undertake the assignment. The updated plan is included in [Appendix 2](#) of this report. During this meeting, it was agreed that the consultants with support from the LCA team would visit all the eight community conservancies and undertake physical or virtual meetings with



the privately-owned conservancies. A full list of the conservancies visited is included in [Appendix 2](#), as well as a high-level implemented plan.

**Phase 1:** Literature review that informed the hypothesis on what data needed to be collected and how the initiatives would be prioritised for scaling and funding. A bibliography of documents reviewed has been included in the appendix of this report. (see [Appendix 1](#)). This literature review guided the development of the data collection tool template. This is contained in Appendix 3.

**Phase 2:** Data collection and fieldwork – the consultant and LCA team held both physical and virtual meetings with conservancies. The team met and spoke with all eight community conservancies CLMCs. In addition, the consultants visited six private conservancies, namely Mugie, Ol Maisor, Suyian and Lolldiaga, Segera, Ol Pejeta, and Mpala.

The consultants also interviewed the following NGOs and partners: Northern Rangelands Trust, Laikipia Forum, Space for Giants, Africa Nature Investments, AgWild, True Range/ Kuponu, Natural State and Grevy's Zebra Trust. Please see [Appendix 4](#) for a complete list of private conservancies, NGOs and partners interviewed and highlights of their feedback. This feedback has been used to inform the recommendations in this report.

The aim of this data collection process was to establish the initiatives underway, determine their success to date and draw lessons from their implementation experience. During this phase, the conservancies also shared their priorities going forward at micro (conservancy/property) and macro (ecosystem wide) in the County. A full list of those interviewed is included in the appendix of this document.

**Phase 3:** Draft Report development and facilitation of a Validation and Visioning Workshop – The literature review and fieldwork outputs were then used to develop a draft scoping report. This report was presented at two Validation and Visioning Workshops on March 11th, 2024, for Community Conservancies and the second on March 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 attended by both community and private conservancies. The aims of the workshop were to validate the findings from the fieldwork and build a consensus around the initiatives that should be prioritised and the implementation modalities. The workshop brought together conservancies' representatives, and other stakeholders. Please see the full attendance list of this workshop in the appendix of this document.

**Phase 4:** Funding Options – The outputs of the workshop were then used to develop funding options and further refine the implementation modalities and priorities. These outputs have been included in this final report of the Scoping survey. It should be noted that accurate and reliable data was difficult to obtain during this short assignment. There is a significant need for LCA to develop a regularly updated database that acts as a sole source of truth for its membership. This report also recommends that LCA strengthens its monitoring and evaluation function to scientifically establish the impact and sustainability of initiatives undertaken across the landscape. This information would be useful in establishing the correct funding requirements for further initiatives as well as an objective assessment of the impact of interventions.

## 2.3. Overview of the Current Initiatives.

Laikipia County is unique, since wildlife lives and migrates across privately owned land, rather than public parks. Laikipia is a region that is justifiably famous for its innovative conservation work, wildlife, and wilderness. However, as a region, it faces many existential threats that if not addressed at a systemic level, could result in the long-term collapse of the ecosystem and its ability to sustain both people and wildlife. LCA is well placed to act in the interests of its members and the entire region to develop, resource and support the implementation of long-term plans to address the challenges that need to be overcome.

The Laikipia Conservation Strategy, 2012-2030 developed by the Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF) highlights the threats and opportunities facing conservation in Laikipia. These threats have shaped the interventions and initiatives across the conservancies. They include the significant threats of land-use change, insecurity, habitat loss, barriers to wildlife movement, lack of unity among local stakeholders and human-wildlife conflict, among others. The conservation strategy identified the following strategic initiatives:

1. Secure space for wildlife.
2. Strengthen security for wildlife.

3. Maintain and enhance habitats and connectivity to maximise species diversity, ecosystem services and human wellbeing.
4. Promote effective collaboration among stakeholders to enable effective wildlife conservation; and
5. Minimise costs of living with wildlife.

Progressively, the conservation strategy has included development of social-economic programs for communities within community conservancies and neighbouring conservation areas. These interventions include education, healthcare, and income-generating activities such as improvement in livestock breeds, development of infrastructure, trading and tourism facilities and related activities such as beadworks.

The following section gives an overview of the initiatives among the community conservancies in two parts. Part one (2.3.1) highlights the common initiatives and programs that have been undertaken in community conservancies, the implementation experience and performance to date, as well as recommendations for scaling through the LCA. Part two (2.3.2) discusses the initiatives that private conservancies have undertaken, their performance to date and opportunities to scale. These two parts, while separate in this section, should not suggest that the community and private conservancies are separate, it simply highlights the different challenges faced by the community conservancies as opposed to those faced by the private conservancies. The two types of conservancies face the same underlying issues such as increasing insecurity, overgrazing and water scarcity.

### 2.3.1. Initiatives Overview – Community Conservancies

The Community Conservancy initiatives are structured into eleven themes or programmatic areas covering organisational formation, security, wildlife conservation, land use and rangeland management, tourism, social amenities, and livelihoods and enterprise development. We provide brief highlights of the key programs and initiatives extracted from the available conservancies management plans and programs, interviews, and focus-group discussions with the CLMCs and other partners working within the county.

#### 2.3.1.1. Rangeland Management

The conservancies are large pieces of land that receive low rainfall and often suffer from “the tragedy of the commons” because of destructive land use by residents and outsiders. Common problems are low or no vegetation cover resulting in soil erosion, gulleys, invasive species, and unplanned settlements. The common land management and reclamation and restoration projects include:

Categories	Activities
Development and enforcement of land use plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Creating awareness and involving communities to designate areas for various activities – settlement, grazing, wildlife</li> <li>● Enforcing the maintaining approved plans</li> </ul>
Land reclamation and restoration – for pasture to serve both livestock and wildlife.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Operationalizing the grazing plans</li> <li>● Use of livestock bunching and bomas on degraded areas</li> <li>● Restoration of pasture/productive vegetation cover by re-seeding and gully filling.</li> <li>● Removal and destruction of invasive plants which includes – mechanical and manual removal as well as removal and use of cochineal insects.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Rangeland management initiatives implemented in the community conservancies.

#### a. Implementation experience and performance to date.

Observations and discussions with the community leaders indicate that rangelands management has not been successful. This is further confirmed by [USFS Study \(2021\)](#), that reported 70% of conservancy rangelands to be highly degraded based on the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) data from 2017-19. The degradation is

manifested through an increase in bare ground and a replacement of perennial grasses by invasive species, such as *Acacia reficiens* and *Opuntia stricta* (Liao et al., 2020).

While land degradation is visible, the interviewees did not provide maps or metrics used to estimate the degraded areas, and this report recommends a mapping exercise to establish these and other parameters. *Muthaka, J.M. et al (2021)*, wrote in '[Mapping Opuntia stricta in the Arid and Semi-Arid Environment of Kenya Using Sentinel-2 Imagery and Ensemble Machine Learning Classifiers](#)' that quantitatively and spatially, *Opuntia stricta* was found along riverbanks, flood plains, and near settlements but was limited in forested areas. The study found that the degradation had reduced forage for livestock and changed hydrological and biogeochemical processes, threatening pastoralists' food security and economic viability of keeping livestock. Reduced pasture in turn causes migration to private and public land that ends up being degraded.

The USFS study found that rangeland restoration initiatives such as grazing plans, perennial grasses reseeding, clearing invasive species with mechanical removal or cochineal, and filling gulleys have not been effective. Conversations with the community conservancy leaders indicated that degradation has been caused by poor land use management and poor enforcement of grazing plans. This has led to uncontrolled grazing by members and encroachment by outsiders, from Samburu, Isiolo and Baringo Counties. In addition, given the fact that land is communally owned, there is no personal gain or loss for a member that incentivizes better land management. As such, members seek payment to rehabilitate their rangeland, which is then funded by a wide range of donors. This lack of personal responsibility also means that long-term strategic planning for land-use and rehabilitation have not been developed and most interventions are simply opportunistic depending on the focus of the over 406 NGOs operating across the county.

While there have been numerous rangelands restoration programs by Government and NGOs, these efforts have been piecemeal and have not addressed the root cause of degradation. The root causes are that not all conservancies have land use plans, and where they exist, they are not enforced. Invasion by outsiders often destroys what has been preserved, while members believe they have options of grazing on other public and private lands. Grazing on young grass that has not taken root during the rainy season, often leads to the removal of grass stubs reducing regrowth rates. Pastoralism as a way of life, may no longer be sustainable as human populations rise, climate change leads to drier weather conditions and grasslands shrink.

***b. Key recommendations - based on the proviso that security and sanctity of land tenure can be established***

1. CLMCs to implement Section 19 of Community Land Act (CLA) of 2019 that provides guidelines on the implementation of the community land use and development planning. This entails mapping the soils and biomass to quantify the scope of land rehabilitation required, and the appropriate economic activities for various parts of the landscape.
2. Conservancies to establish the optimal livestock holding capacity for the land reserved for livestock production. This will define the grazing, fodder production and water provision. In addition, the conservancies can consider offering concessions and leases for any members, groups, or private entities to grow fodder on the land and sell to members or other livestock owners. The same entrepreneurs can establish a livestock trading entity to offer the services to members at a fee. Upon establishment of the optimal livestock holding capacity, CLMCs should implement section 28 of the CLA<sup>1</sup> to end overgrazing and protect the land from further degradation.
3. Apply science and proven commercial models for pasture regeneration, grazing and selection of fodder species that match the agro-ecological zones to the appropriate production systems.

### **2.3.1.2. Creation and Development of Conservancies Organisations**

Community conservancies were formerly group ranches, with membership drawn from the same community or clans and registered as companies limited by guarantee. The members comprise those who reside on the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Navajo Nation Grazing regulations, 2005 for a model.

land and the non-residents, referred to as “diaspora” members. The organisational development initiatives consist of:

- Education, mobilisation, and the registration of members who become shareholders of the community conservancy with voting rights at the Annual General Meeting (AGM)
- Election of a representative board that aims for fair distribution of positions across villages or locations, gender, youth, and persons with disabilities
- Development of operational plans which include land use and business plans
- Development and training for staff and boards members to implement various initiatives
- Acquisition of assets and procurement of services such as tourism lodges, bandas and manyattas and security respectively

**a. Implementation experience and performance to date**

The community conservancies are in a state of flux, with weak governance and management capabilities, and struggling to live with the duality of meeting the demands of an expanding population’s individual economic interests and conserving wildlife. The unresolved issues include implementation of legal and regulatory requirements, development of robust organisational structure and ways of working, and conflicts between individual versus commons interests. These issues are discussed below in detail and include the recommendations for their resolution.

*i. Legal and Regulatory Requirements*

The next generation of the conservancy organisation is prescribed by the Community Land Act (2016) and the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act (2013). It aims to meet the demands of a growing population, a rich biodiversity and the need for incomes to meet the needs of a growing population against fixed land resources. These Acts address themselves to the following issues: ownership and governance of community land, planning, allocation, management, and enforcement of various land “uses” of the community land, allocation of user rights to members or shareholders and distribution of accruing benefits for the “uses” of land.

**a. Ownership and governance of community land is by the Community Land Management Committee.** Until implementation of the Community Land Act (CLA) of 2016, the Land Committees regulated these community lands according to the Group Representatives Act. The Community Land Act Part 11, Section 15 directs the Administration and Management of Community land as follows:

- Section 15(1,2,3) – establishes the ‘Community Assembly’ consisting of adult members of the community, who shall elect between seven and fifteen members to constitute ‘Community Land Management Committee (CLMC)’.
- Section 15(4) provides that the functions of the CLMC shall be to:
  - i. Have responsibility over the running of the day-to-day functions of the community
  - ii. Manage and administer registered community land on behalf of the respective community
  - iii. Coordinate the development of community land use plans in collaboration with the relevant authorities
  - iv. Promote the cooperation and participation among community members in dealing with matters pertaining to the respective registered community land; and
  - v. Prescribe rules and regulations, to be ratified by the community assembly, to govern the operations of the community

The CLMC is the executive arm of the community assembly, authorised by law to administer and manage community land on behalf of the members. Entities registered as companies limited by guarantee to help manage the land-use should therefore be subordinate to the CLMCs in accordance with the CLA. The CLMCs should be granted mandates to competitively recruit competent persons, from among members or non-members, to join boards of the registered entities and hire the appropriate staff members to run the conservancy effectively and sustainably.

**b. Planning and allocation for ‘the uses’ of the Community land.** Section 13 of the CLA authorises the community through County Assembly to allocate land for communal purposes (13,1) and to reserve

special purpose areas including areas (13,3) for — (a) farming; (b) settlement; (c) community conservation; (d) cultural and heritage sites; (e) urban development; or (f) any other purposes as may be determined by the community or respective county government or national government for the promotion or upgrading of public interest.

Under 13,4, 'such area reserved for special purposes under subsection (3) shall be used exclusively for the intended purpose'. The allocated uses can be managed by the community, a group of persons or individuals granted the rights by the community. The conservancies have designated by tradition parts of the land for reserved uses. Il Ngwesi, Lekuruki and Shulmai have developed land use plans or management plans that have been partly implemented. Other community conservancies have not developed these plans and are therefore not clear on how they can improve the land use for conservation and other activities.

In tandem, section 19 of CLA requires the community, of its own accord or at the request of the county government, to submit to the county government 'a plan for the development, management and use of the community land administered by the registered community for approval'. Such a plan shall consider any conservation, environmental or heritage issues relevant to the development, management or use of the land, and relevant physical development plan.

In the context of this assignment, wildlife conservation is a 'use' of the land, and it will be necessary for the communities to prepare the land use plan, allocate and ratify specific locations of their land to be used for conservation. Given 'conservation' is a land use, the proportion (part of whole) of the land allocated needs to be published.

- c. ***Management and enforcement of 'the uses' of the Community land.*** Section 37 of CLA provides for the Community to make rules and by-laws subject to this Act and any other written law, for— (a) the regulation of investments on the land; (b) the determination of terms of any leases granted for purposes of investment; (c) the conservation and rehabilitation of the land; (d) land use and physical planning; and (e) any other relevant matter.

The mandate to make rules and by-laws to manage or regulate the 'uses' of the land provides for the establishment of subsidiary or independent entities by the community or individuals who have been granted leases. In this context, the differentiation of administration control, and management of the uses can help resolve the current dilemma of the constitution and powers of the existing 'conservancy organisations' versus the CLMC. Effectively, the CLMC, with authority of the Assembly can exercise the option to incorporate other entities or individuals for 'management of the uses' thereby enhancing professionalisation of 'use' or 'enterprise' boards.

- d. ***Allocation of user rights to members or shareholders for prescribed 'uses'*** – CLA provides for broad principles of equity, non-discrimination, and responsible use in line with the Constitution and applicable laws and policies for reserved uses. Section 29 of CLA provides for the community to designate use rights in community land reserved for special purpose areas (section 13), or any other purpose as may be determined by the community, county government or national government for the promotion of public interest. In addition, section 28 provides for administration and enforcement of grazing rights, which includes the designation of grazing areas, development of grazing plans, determining the number and kind of livestock, offences, and penalties. There is room to seek enforcement support from the Government security system by seeking gazettelement of the uses and rights and responsibilities by the relevant Cabinet Secretaries<sup>2</sup>.
- e. ***Distribution of accruing benefits for 'uses' of the land*** – while the broad principle is for the members to enjoy benefits accruing from the land, Part IV of the CLA provides for determination of access, participation, and entitlements or share of benefits. The CLA also allows the community to lease land to individuals

---

<sup>2</sup> See Navajo Nation regulations for economic activities.

or groups to undertake economic activities concurrent with designated ‘uses’ of land (Section 27). Read together with section twenty-nine, the Act creates the platform for enterprising members to seek authorization to use parts of community land for feasible economic activities and pay contracted fees to the community, while enjoying tenure protection.

### 2.3.1.3. Wildlife Conservation

The registration and management of conservancies is aimed at ensuring that the residents and their livelihoods are protected, alongside the proper management and conservation of wildlife. The table below highlights the key initiatives that have been undertaken under wildlife conservation.

Category	Common projects
Reducing human-wildlife conflicts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Minimising human-elephant conflict around water points and settlements.</li> <li>● Increased use of predator proof bomas</li> <li>● Training and employment of rangers in each settlement area</li> <li>● Speedy response by Conservancies and KWS to conflict incidents involving human death or injury.</li> </ul>
Improving security for wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ensuring conservancy rangers are well equipped to respond to poaching.</li> <li>● Creating strong partnership with KWS and neighbouring ranches to address poaching.</li> <li>● Creating awareness on wildlife conservation among community and penalties for poaching</li> </ul>
Conservation areas effectively managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Establishing corridors and conservation areas boundaries for unfettered access by wildlife.</li> <li>● Creating &amp; implementing management plans for the conservation areas</li> </ul>

Table 2: Wildlife Conservation initiatives implemented.

#### a. Implementation Experience and Performance to date

Conservation is regulated by the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013, that allows any landowner or lessee to apply for registration as a wildlife conservancy or sanctuary under section 39 of the Act. There was broad appreciation and acceptance that the members will continue to coexist with wildlife and have an obligation to promote conservation on the community lands. The conservancies have identified, and for some such as Il Ngwesi and Lekuruki, designated conservation areas where they have established lodges. Il Ngwesi has established a sanctuary for black rhino, and Lekuruki has applied to do the same. In Naibunga Lower, an elephant fence has been erected to keep the elephants off the settlement areas and reduce human-wildlife conflict. The communities are aware of wildlife corridors and plan their grazing and socio-economic activities to minimise conflict. The community conservancies are not fenced and, save for specific excluded areas, allow for free movement of wildlife. Whilst some private conservancies have fenced boundaries with clearly marked migration corridors, there is a county wide effort to open migration corridors across all conservancies.

Three community conservancies viz. il Ngwesi, Lekuruki and Maiyanat have developed conservancy management plans. These are however yet to be gazetted by the Cabinet Secretary.

Community conservancies have been assisted by various donors through the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) and private conservancies to establish security measures. The support includes training and equipping residents to work as rangers, payment of their salaries and operations, establishment of security posts and accommodation for the rangers, and acquisition of vehicles or motor bikes. The security teams patrol, monitor and protect the wildlife from poachers, protect the grazing areas from invaders and stop illegal exploitation of forests and other protected plants in cooperation with Government’s security agencies. The conservancies expressed the need to increase the number of rangers and operating sites (outposts), acquire equipment, vehicles, and communication systems.

While it was difficult to obtain data on wildlife distribution and effectiveness of the conservation projects, respondents indicated there has been a reduction in the number of illegal wildlife activities. Nevertheless, the communities have faced constant livestock thefts and invasion of grazing areas from heavily armed herders from Samburu and Isiolo Counties.

**b. Recommendations**

1. LCA coordinates the development of the Laikipia ecosystem masterplan that conservancies need to align to and localise on their properties
2. As part of the land-use plans development, CLMCs should develop or update their conservation management plans to align to the proposed ecosystem masterplan and submit them for review and gazette by the Cabinet Secretary.
3. LCA to coordinate the refinement of the ecosystem security strategy in conjunction with KWS and the security agencies. This should include a resourcing plan for the security strategy. Among the low hanging fruits are improving intelligence gathering, reporting, and coordinated response.

**2.3.1.4. Tourism and Facilities Development**

The community conservancies recognize the value of the rich biodiversity, rolling and scenic rangelands as tourist attractions. They are keen to establish lodges, bandas or cottages, and camping sites in the conservation areas directly or through leases to investors. Il Ngwesi and Lekuruki have built lodges, Naibunga has bandas and cottages, and Il Mamusi have camping sites, all established with donor funding. In addition, Il Ngwesi hosts an annual trek dubbed 'Walking Wild' which they co-host with Lewa Conservancy.

The tourism facilities also provide a platform for showcasing Maa culture, and the sale of accessories such as beaded handicrafts. This is indicative of a need to formalise the management of these activities to understand how they can be scaled.

**a. Implementation experience and performance to date**

While tourism provides income diversification opportunities for community conservancies, the community's facilities earn significantly less revenue per visitor compared to the facilities in private conservancies. Among the reasons mentioned for this was insecurity, poor site selection, poor design and workmanship undertaken at the facilities. In addition, there is chronic underinvestment in the products and services offered at these facilities as they lack clear business and operating models, standard operating procedures as well as professional staff to improve tourist experience. The current management teams do not have the experience and market networks to grow occupancy, and often rely on references from private conservancies. It was the view of respondents that there was a need for support in the areas mentioned above with a conservancy level strategy to unlock the potential of each conservancy, as well as an ecosystem-wide tourism masterplan which includes all the conservancies.

**b. Recommendations**

1. As an output of the conservation strategy and land use planning, LCA should convene the Laikipia Tourism strategy stakeholders such as the Laikipia Tourism Association, County of Laikipia and Kenya Tourism Board. The plan will generate differentiated attractions, offerings, and investment cases as well as 'joined-up' marketing and sales plans. The aim of this strategy would be to make Laikipia a premier destination for tourism.
2. LCA to raise funds for investment advisory services that will support the community conservancies to become investor-ready and engage with different investors.
3. LCA should work with the County Government and Ministry of Tourism to train young people from the conservancies on tourism business management.
4. LCA should also consider collaborating with partners to set up an investment derisking fund to make the conservancies more attractive to investors. The fund will function as a loss guarantee for investors should the perceived risks of insecurity or invasion materialise.

### 2.3.1.5. Water Management and Supply Development

The conservancies in the Laikipia landscape receive an average 300mm – 700mm of rain annually. The rivers are seasonal and dry most of the year. With exception of the Makurian Water project that has piped water from Mt. Kenya to parts of Mukogodo East, the majority of the conservancies' residents draw water from boreholes, rivers (when they run), wells, water pans, rock, and sand catchments. Table indicates the Distribution of Conventional Households by Main Source of Drinking Water, 2018-2022 in Laikipia County.

Source of Water	2018		KPHC 2019		2020		2021		2022*	
	No. of HH	Per cent (%)	No. of HH	Per cent (%)	No. of HH	Per cent (%)	No. of HH	Per cent (%)	No. of HH	Per cent (%)
Pond	-	-	1,166	0.8	1,145	0.8	1,181	0.8	1,218	0.8
Dam/ Lake	14,698	10.5	8,309	5.7	8,160	5.7	8,418	5.7	8,675	5.7
Stream/ River	24,498	17.5	30,613	21.0	30,061	21.0	31,012	21.0	31,960	21.0
Protected Spring	-	-	1,749	1.2	1,718	1.2	1,772	1.2	1,826	1.2
Unprotected Spring	-	-	2,478	1.7	2,434	1.7	2,511	1.7	2,587	1.7
Protected Well	24,358	17.4	12,683	8.7	12,454	8.7	12,848	8.7	13,241	8.7
Unprotected Well	-	-	3,936	2.7	3,865	2.7	3,987	2.7	4,109	2.7
Borehole/ Tube Well	27,157	19.4	15,015	10.3	14,744	10.3	15,211	10.3	15,676	10.3
Piped into Dwelling	42,976	30.7	18,222	12.5	17,894	12.5	18,460	12.5	19,024	12.5
Piped to Yard/ Plot	-	-	28,718	19.7	28,200	19.7	29,092	19.7	29,982	19.7
Bottled Water	-	-	583	0.4	573	0.4	591	0.4	609	0.4
Rain/ Harvested Water	5,319	3.8	8,455	5.8	8,303	5.8	8,565	5.8	8,827	5.8
Water Vendor	-	-	4,373	3.0	4,294	3.0	4,430	3.0	4,566	3.0
Public Tap/ Stand Pipe	-	-	9,475	6.5	9,305	6.5	9,599	6.5	9,892	6.5
Others	980	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>139,986</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>145,776</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>143,150</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>147,677</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>152,192</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: KNBS-KPHC 2019 and Department of Water, Environment and Natural Resources, County Government of Laikipia

\*Provisional

Table 3: Distribution of Conventional Households by Main Source of Drinking Water, 2018-2022, Laikipia County

The conservancies (see Laikipia North data) therefore rely on boreholes and rainwater harvesting as outlined in table 4 below:

YEAR	Constituency	Water sources								Number
		Boreholes	Dams	Water supply	Water springs	Water pans	Rock catchments	Head pumps	Surface water projects	
2021*	Laikipia East	73	66	5	0	43	0	22	22	
	Laikipia West	77	62	8	17	27	0	29	11	
	Laikipia North	66	55	1	3	12	10	16	14	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>47</b>	

Table 4: Operational water sources - Source: Laikipia County Statistical Abstract, 2022

#### a. Implementation Experience and Performance to date

Respondents indicated that the water sources are not dependable throughout the year due to abstraction of water upstream from the Ewaso Ng'iro river, drainage, and evaporation from water pans, dams, and rock catchments and poor maintenance of boreholes. In addition, water has not been reticulated to households. It should be noted that an up-to-date record of the water projects funded by donors, number of households served, and the deficit to be addressed is not available. As such, there is a need to create a comprehensive water supply plan for the conservancies based on these parameters.

Water supply to the community conservancies face several challenges. These include reliance on seasonal rivers and surface water, upstream abstraction from rivers such as Ewaso Ng'iro, poorly designed and maintained water pans, boreholes with low yields (some as low as 0.5M<sup>3</sup> per hour) Further, there has not been



efficient coordination of the water sector stakeholders and agreement or an effort to plan and coordinate implementation and maintenance of the projects.

#### ***b. Recommendations***

Reliable and accessible water supply for people, livestock, wildlife, and farming is among the top priorities for community conservancies and requires coordination in delivery and maintenance. Following are the key recommendations.

1. In line with the land use planning, LCA undertakes a survey of conservancy water supply facilities and needs, current performance, and optimal supply plan. This will form the basis for coordinated water supply management.
2. LCA convenes the national and county water sector actors and the conservancies to develop the water supply plan to sustainably meet the needs of people, livestock, and wildlife. This will necessarily require better land-use planning which will delineate settlement plans in the conservancies and support the reticulation of water to these settlements, as well as designated watering points for livestock and wildlife.
3. LCA coordinates fund-raising for conservancy water supply planning, and partners with water management organisations to ensure that the plan is implemented in a coordinated manner, while minimising practices such as unplanned abstraction and poor operation and maintenance of water infrastructure.

#### **2.3.1.6. Livelihoods**

Livestock herding is the most prevalent economic activity, with shoats being dominant, followed by cattle, camels, and donkeys. According to *Mwangi, Veronica, et.al (2020)*<sup>3</sup> the main breed of cattle kept by the majority (73%) of the pastoralists are “zebu” type.. Cows constituted a high proportion (65%) of the pastoralists’ cattle herd. Respondents indicated that the average holding per household was ten shoats, while not all members owned cattle. The members have retained traditional pastoralism and few if any have employed the commercial ranching practices found on the privately-owned ranches. Among common initiatives to date are:

- Grazing zones established for dry & wet seasons.
- Crossbreeding through introduction of Borana bulls
- Trading at local markets
- Sale to or through commercial ranchers on a revenue sharing basis.
- Distress and organised grazing schemes with neighbouring private ranches/conservancies
- Vaccination programs supported by Government, private conservancies, or NGOs

#### ***a. Implementation experience and performance to date***

- *Livestock ownership:* Livestock are the most widely owned asset among the community members. A census undertaken in mid-2023 however reported fewer households owned cattle, while all owned shoats. The respondents also indicated that livestock holdings have significantly reduced owing to low pasture due to land degradation, frequent droughts, and insecurity. Shoats are popular for being easier to rear and sell to meet regular domestic expenses and emergencies. Nevertheless, shoats tend to ‘mow’ the rangelands, uprooting the grass stubs that make regeneration difficult when it rains.
- *Grazing/feeding:* While the conservancies are expected to create and manage dry and wet grazing fields, these arrangements are rarely enforced. Respondents indicated that the majority of the livestock are grazed outside the community ranches on unsettled private land, on private ranches via grazing or trading arrangements, and in forests. Distress and periodic grazing arrangements between private ranches and

---

<sup>3</sup> Beef Production in the Rangelands: A Comparative Assessment between Pastoralism and Large-Scale Ranching in Laikipia County, Kenya.

pastoralists are also available either for free or at a fee. Discussions with private ranchers indicated that these arrangements are often abused, with pastoralists bringing in more cattle than what was agreed upon leading to overgrazing. Secondly, this arrangement may reduce over time, given that the private ranches own their own livestock and are prioritising wildlife conservation. Pastoralist livestock is often not vaccinated and tends to cross-infect the host's livestock. Further, the distressed grazing has been a disincentive for the community conservancies members to take care of their land.

- *Pasture development:* A few conservancies such as Il Ngwesi, Lekuruki and Maiyanat have developed boma Rhodes pasture funded by donors, ranging from fifty acres to one hundred acres in size. The produce is either sold to members at discounted prices or to other purchasers. Pasture development is a key to more intensive and commercialised development of livestock enterprises and may well be the future of livestock production for Laikipia to help manage the land degradation and increase productivity and access to markets with consistent high-quality beef and beef products.
- *Employment:* While livestock ownership is prevalent, only a low proportion of the population are full-time herders. Amaso, Edwin A., et.al (2018), in their study, *Pastoral Resilience among the Maasai Pastoralists of Laikipia County, Kenya*, found that *livestock owners (especially men)* had employed 'morans' (young men) as herders, freeing themselves to seek employment in towns and commercial agricultural enterprises in the neighbourhoods.
- *Livestock trading:* the majority of residents sell their livestock to brokers on farm and neighbouring markets, or through finishing and trading arrangements with commercial ranches. There are several livestock marketing associations formed by residents to aggregate livestock for sale and to seek better prices from economies of scale, though their effectiveness could not be verified from the interviews and literature review. There have been several livestock trading initiatives by private ranches singly or jointly that offer grazing, finishing and management services for livestock in consideration for a monthly management fee and share of revenue. Initiatives by AgWild and NRT Trading to buy, fatten and sell pastoralists cattle have not been profitable, owing to inconsistent supply and low-quality meat. Without improvements in quality from crossbreeding, sale of younger cattle, timing, and consistent volumes, the promoters indicated that these livestock-to-market initiatives are not sustainable.
- *Livestock sale margins:* with exception of distress sales caused by drought, studies indicate that pastoralism is profitable, given the inputs (grass/pasture, labour) are low compared to commercial feeding operations. A study by Mwangi, Veronica et.al (2020) estimated pastoralists cost of production at USD 2.72 per head of cattle per month for pastoralists who do not purchase pasture and USD 3.20 for those who purchase pasture during the dry months. At an average selling price of USD 255.16 per head of cattle and a cost of production of USD 163.10 at the time of sale for pastoralists who did not purchase pasture and USD 192.25 for pastoralist who purchased pasture during the dry months. Pastoralists therefore earned a modest gross margin per head of USD 92.03 and USD 62.90 respectively, on sale of cattle. On the other hand, with a sale price of USD 1.62 per kg (live weight) and by which time the steers weighed about 400 kg, a large-scale ranch made a revenue of USD 653.18, returning a good margin of USD 422.35 on sale. This indicates that large-scale ranches obtained up to six times more gross margins per head of cattle than pastoralists.

This study found that while traditional pastoralism is profitable when there's abundant free grass, these free grazing fields have been reducing over time due to degraded lands and increasing competition from herders from neighbouring counties. Any prolonged dry periods or droughts have led to loss of livestock. The future therefore is to graduate to commercial livestock production models, with enhanced security, planned land use that matches carrying capacity with managed grazing and pasture production.

## **b. Recommendations**

1. LCA should become the champion of changing mindsets of the community conservancy members towards commercialization of livestock production, and economic diversification to alternative income generating activities.
2. LCA should support the community conservancies to develop commercial models for livestock value improvement in partnership with County and National Government by tapping into the DRIVE Project funds – that would include among others, breed upgrades, disease management, stocking, and better feeding regimes.
3. Community conservancies should be supported to reach the standards required by private ranches such as Ol Pejeta and AgWild. This would then give them access to better structured livestock finishing and trading arrangements as well as access to larger consistent markets.
4. In the mid-term, facilitate harmonisation of the grazing arrangements among private and community conservancies for equitable distribution of the grazing quotas and to enforce the contracts.

### 2.3.1.7. Beadworks and Accessories

The Maasai are known globally for creating intricate and colourful beaded personal adornment objects: ear flaps, earrings, necklaces, bracelets, belts, headbands, sandals, among others. These products are made by women and sold through tourism facilities and traders. At the national level, the Government launched the Ushanga Initiative in 2022 to document the producers, build their capacity and develop sales channels that offer competitive prices to women sustainably.

#### *a. Implementation experience and performance to date*

In Laikipia, NRT has been running a beadwork project with similar objectives as the national initiative. Respondents mentioned that NRT's beadworks project had trained and provided several women with beads production kits. The respondents did not provide the number of beadwork makers, units made, customers and revenues. This is indicative of a need to formalise the management of these activities to understand how they can be scaled.

The accessories and leather apparel products offer feasible economic diversification opportunities for the youth. Training is required on tanning hides and skins, design, production, marketing, and sales of leather products.

#### *b. Recommendations*

1. LCA should convene producers and traders of indigenous fashion accessories, these include the Ushanga Initiative and other commercial beads makers, for example Kazuri.
2. LCA should also support the development of an 'Accessories Development and Commercialization strategy in the Brand Laikipia Tourism Master Plan'.

### 2.3.1.8. Honey and Bioproducts

Respondents indicated they have been harvesting wild honey, and there is growing interest to procure modern bee hives to increase output. For instance, Dupoto Honey Cooperative Society in Maiyanat Conservancy has eighteen groups with 180 hives, producing an average of two tonnes of honey annually. Bee hives are in the forests and near settlements. The respondents however had not quantified the scope of current or potential honey outputs and value.

The growth of the honey and other bioproducts will depend on the land and forestry management practises to maintain or generate diversified vegetation for nectar. It is therefore important that LCA raises funding for detailed assessment of the bio-products production potential and its commercial feasibility.

### 2.3.1.9. Social Services

There are on-going efforts to provide health and education services within the conservancies as shown in table five below:

Category	Common projects
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of classrooms,</li> <li>• Provision of bursaries</li> <li>• Provision of education materials, equipment</li> </ul>
Health services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and equipment of dispensaries and health centres,</li> <li>• supply of medical &amp; non-medical commodities</li> </ul>

Table 5: Social services initiatives

#### a. Education and training implementation experience and performance to date

Laikipia North community conservancies have lower literacy rates compared to the rest of Laikipia. According to the 2019 census data, 49.2 percent of the population in Laikipia North were illiterate. Among the causes were cultural practices that did not value education, fewer schools close to the settlement areas that often lacked learning material, equipment, and trained teachers. Over the years, conservationists have funded development of school facilities and awarded bursaries to children from poor households in their neighbourhoods. For instance, NRT has been providing bursaries to community conservancies, while Segera, Ol Pejeta and Loisaba offer bursaries and develop learning infrastructure such as classrooms, for neighbouring communities.

Respondents also indicated that some youth had been taken through NRT's 'Ujuzi Manyattani' workshops, which provided vocational training. Community conservancies leadership teams were also trained on leadership and management by NRT and other donors implementing projects in their conservancies. Suyian conservancy runs rangelands management training for community grazing committees.

There is goodwill among private conservancies and donors to support education, vocational skills, and life skills as catalysts for the society's transformation. Nonetheless, the initiatives are not coordinated, and it was difficult to get data on the impact of the education programs.

It is important that all the education and training initiatives are harmonised and coordinated to drive the required transformation in community conservancies management. Education and training are also critical to driving the development of alternative income generation activities which will need to be preceded by a change in mindsets.

#### b. Recommendations

1. LCA convenes the education and training sponsors, funders, and providers to explore development of a coordinated landscape level approach to education for life strategy and management. This will function as a forum to work with the Government for complementarity and avoid duplication in the development of education infrastructure, provision of bursaries, and to generate customised vocational education and life skills programs.
2. LCA advocates that education for transformation components be incorporated in all initiatives by state and non-state actors in Laikipia. These components are key to opening opportunities to other industries and driving diversification of incomes. There is an explosion of technological advancement that can provide incomes to well-trained youths in the communities

### 2.3.1.10. Health Services

The common projects have been construction and equipping of health facilities that are then handed over to the County Government. Further, conservancies such as Loisaba have an active health services project that runs two outreach clinics per month, arranges referrals of patients to other health facilities and responds to emergencies such as accidents, disease outbreaks, natural disasters, among others. The study could not establish

the cumulative data on the number of facilities and patients served, or the impact of the current services or deficit of health services required by the communities.

Without the necessary data, it is difficult to determine the availability of health services in the community. Suffice it to say that there is still a significant need for health facilities, equipment, and personnel to effectively serve the community. It is recommended, just like in education, that the LCA convenes a forum of the health service providers, determines the gap in the provision of services and defines needs and how they will be met.

#### 2.3.1.11. Carbon sequestration

Carbon sequestration refers to the process of carbon storage in biomass and soil organic matter. The objective of carbon projects in rangelands is to improve the rangelands health by restoring vegetation on bare land to increase the biomass to absorb above and below ground carbon (*Izaurre et al. 2001*). Carbon sequestration also provides associated ecosystem benefits such as increased soil water holding capacity, better soil structure, improved soil quality, nutrient cycling, and reduced soil erosion. The sequestered carbon is then commoditised and sold as carbon credits in the global carbon markets.

NRT has an active carbon credits trading project for Il Ngwesi, Lekuruki, Mukogodo Forest/Il Mamusi CFA, Naibunga Lower, Naibunga Central and Naibunga Upper, and started making payments to them in 2023. LCA is developing a similar project for Maiyanat and Shulmai conservancies. Conversations with the community conservancies leaders found they did not understand how the carbon sequestration project works and the basis of the payments they have received. In addition, it is not clear how the efforts to restore the landscapes and reduce land degradation are connected to the carbon payments they have received. As a result, the efforts may be lost if this connection is not better explained and reinforced by the implementers of the programs.

The team designing the carbon sequestration project for Shulmai and Maiyanat indicated they target to find carbon credits buyers that can prepay part of the forward value to support investments necessary for rangelands restoration to sequester carbon.

While carbon sequestration has gained interest among the conservationists, the structure of the market is evolving, and the expected payouts are not explicitly predictable. Nevertheless, we find the LCA's initiative to create a platform (as a developer) for member conservancies is positive, to promote knowledge sharing and transparency in these transactions, and ensure the conservancies get a fair deal in share of revenues raised.

### 2.3.2. Initiatives Overview - Private Conservancies

This section focuses on the privately owned conservancies, to identify the key areas of challenge and opportunity where LCA could and should play a leading role in forging innovative solutions and partnerships. This overview attempts to summarise the wide range of conservation, economic and social projects and initiatives that are either currently in implementation or have been previously trialled across the privately owned conservancies of Laikipia. A detailed response for each of the privately-owned conservancies and partners interviewed is included in [Appendix 4](#).

#### 2.3.2.1. Kenya Rhino Range Expansion

The privately owned conservancies of Laikipia are well known for their work to recover and protect the eastern black rhino (*Diceros bicornis michaelii*) and the southern white rhino (*Ceratotherium simum simum*). Nationally, the success of rhino recovery programmes has led to over-stocking within those areas where rhino populations are protected, including Laikipia. Consequently, to achieve national population growth targets, new adequately secured areas into which growing rhino populations can expand must be found.

On that basis the Association of Private Land Rhino Sanctuaries (APLRS), using funds in part raised and administered through the LCA, have developed a **draft** plan for rhino habitat expansion within Laikipia, entitled "The Kenya Rhino Range Expansion: Central Project." Whilst yet to be finalised this plan, once completed and adopted, will offer a blueprint for the staged development of rhino habitat across many of the conservancies of Laikipia, both privately and community owned.

The plan has support from well-resourced conservancies, their networks, the global conservation community, and other major stakeholders. On that basis it is felt that the role of the LCA should be to continue to support and advocate for the plan, without necessarily taking a leading role to drive the plan forwards. The LCA could continue to function as a conduit for funding to implement the plan and a convenor of the different interest groups (see the Carbon and Rangeland Restoration plan below) operating across the landscape to ensure proper communication, collaboration, and coordination.

### **2.3.2.2. Landscape Restoration Carbon Project.**

Strongly supported by The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the LCA has led and coordinated the process to develop a carbon project based on nature restoration for its members. Whilst still in development and complex, this project offers a potentially significant opportunity to address rangeland degradation at a systemic level and transform the revenue generating prospects of LCA members in return for their support to the restoration plans that evolve, particularly in the community conservancies.

Given that the project is already well resourced with good capacity and financial support, it is again felt that the role of the LCA should be to continue to support and advocate for the plan, without necessarily taking a leading role to drive the plan forwards. The LCA could continue to function as a conduit for funding to implement the plan, a convenor of the different interest groups (see the Rhino Range Expansion Plan above) operating across the landscape to ensure proper communication, collaboration, and coordination. Importantly the LCA could also play a leading role in the development and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation that will be required across the landscape to ensure the success of the nature restoration project.

### **2.3.2.3. Laikipia Fence, and the Mitigation of Human - Wildlife Conflict**

Over many years the so-called “Laikipia fence” has evolved across the landscape, and continues to be developed, with support from [Space for Giants](#). The fence aims to reduce human-wildlife conflict, particularly from elephants, and acts to demarcate and separate areas that are “reserved” as wildlife habitat from those that are set aside for human settlement. The fence has been developed on a piecemeal basis, with varying arrangements for maintenance (vested with private conservancies wherever possible) and is now largely complete. On that basis, aside from continuing to offer its support to the fence program, the LCA should continue to support its implementation wherever possible.

### **2.3.2.4. Grant administration**

The LCA is positioned to function as a “one-stop-shop” for organisations and donors wishing to support a strategy designed, endorsed, and supported by a membership comprised of all the conservancies in Laikipia. Thus, as already happened with several grants (e.g. grants from USAID and the US Fish and Wildlife Service), the LCA can create more simplicity and direction for supporters of the landscape, acting as a conduit for the coordinated use of financial resources, applied with the support and assistance of the membership.

In principle this should better position Laikipia to raise the significant funding for the work required to achieve the strategic outcomes across the region that are envisaged. As such, without becoming the “implementer” of projects, the LCA should continue to play the role of receiving and directing donors, as well as receiving and administering donor funding on behalf of its membership.

### **2.3.2.5. Addressing Water Scarcity**

General water scarcity and the increasingly seasonal nature of major rivers are a major long-term threat to all conservancies resulting from:

- the poor management of catchment areas that are often outside Laikipia.
- unregulated sand harvesting
- degraded rangelands within Laikipia
- more regular prolonged dry periods (although there is little tangible evidence to support this)

Whilst responsibility for the management and equitable distribution of water at a regional level vest with local and national government, the institutions concerned tend to be poorly resourced and unable to fulfil their mandate. This despite the existence of management plans for most of the water catchment areas that supply the Laikipia region, and the existence of appropriate legal mechanisms to involve stakeholders in an integrated approach to water management.

On that basis there have been efforts over the years by individual conservancies to address or support the management of water resources. Whilst a small number have been successful (for example the work done by the Ngare Ndare Forest Trust), many have tended to focus on individual conservancy needs, with little attempt to address the systemic reasons that sit behind the water scarcity that affects people across the broader landscape.

The comparatively well-resourced private conservancies have also made considerable investments to reduce their reliance on unreliable river flows that are impacted by external factors across the wider catchment area, whilst NGO and government interventions to manage water resources at a landscape level and supply water to the community conservancies have been sporadic, opportunistic, and often short lived.

In summary, approaches to water planning and management by the government in collaboration with the LCA membership and other stakeholders appear disjointed and inadequately resourced.

#### **2.3.2.6. Wildlife and Wilderness-Based Tourism.**

Wildlife and wilderness-based tourism has been successful in Laikipia and offers potential for well- managed growth across the landscape. A recent report by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC - see [here](#)) suggests the likelihood of rapid growth within the African tourism sector over the next decade, and Laikipia is already an established and globally recognized tourism destination.

Within the community conservancies the development of tourism enterprises offers clear potential for economic development and employment, as part of a professionally managed and marketed Laikipia “tourism circuit.”

However at the current time most successful tourism or related ventures are located within private conservancies and it has been difficult for the community conservancies to capitalise on this opportunity as a result of many factors, not least the perceived risk of making investments into areas where land tenure arrangements often cannot be adequately assured, insecurity remains an ongoing issue, the rangeland is heavily degraded and wildlife is consequently scarce, and governance and management structures are inadequate.

Where community conservancies have managed to develop tourism facilities these are often donor funded and struggle for profitability, due to capacity constraints within conservancy management. The more successful ventures tend to be those that are supported by neighbouring private conservancies and/or other organisations such as [The Big North](#), although even these struggles for commercial success.

If the tourism potential of the community conservancies is to be realised in future, this will require effort to improve their “invest-ability” through a variety of de-risking mechanisms and to improve community-based tourism management capacity. The private conservancies have significant expertise and industry networks and could be positioned to support the development of tourism within the community conservancies as part of a de-risking approach to attract investment.

Ensuring wildlife connectivity and preventing landscape fragmentation across Laikipia will be required to maintain the long-term quality of the wilderness product. On that basis the LCA should continue to support the implementation of the Laikipia fence (see above) and may wish to take an active role in securing strategic corridors.

#### **2.3.2.7. Access to Education, Capacity Building and Alternative Livelihood Opportunities**

Most private conservancies provide education related support to their neighbouring communities in one form or another, and improving access to quality education is accepted as a major need across Laikipia. Similarly significant portions of the incomes received by community conservancies are allocated towards education related support.

The support for education provided by conservancies takes many forms but tends to be focused primarily on the provision of scholarship funding for pupils attending secondary schools and infrastructure development support

to schools near conservancy boundaries. There are also some examples where conservancies have assisted in other initiatives such as the provision of stocked libraries, boreholes, and kitchens. One initiative of particular note is the [African Ruggedized Education System \(ARES\)](#), although it is not clear to what extent this could continue to be scaled.

Additionally, there are several emerging training facilities within the landscape focused on delivering training in nature restoration, rangeland management and regenerative agriculture such as Kupona/Natural State, the Laikipia Learning Centre, and the School for Rangeland Management. However, as with many initiatives across the landscape there is no coordinated approach to the provision of educational support from the conservancy movement of Laikipia, with initiatives and programmes varying from conservancy to conservancy.

That said it is generally acknowledged that access to quality education will be required to create the capacity necessary for sustainable economic progress and livelihood diversification in Laikipia, particularly within the community conservancies, and there is an opportunity for LCA to take the lead in developing a coordinated landscape level approach to supporting the education sector and the emergence of properly skilled leadership for Laikipia. This could be coupled with a study to identify alternative livelihood opportunities within the conservancy landscape that are commercially viable and sustainable, this would further assist to move people away from over-reliance on livestock keeping.

#### **2.3.2.8. Landscape Level Monitoring**

The availability of high-quality data and information from the Laikipia landscape is poor. There have been sporadic attempts to gather economic and productivity data in the past, but these have been largely ad hoc and incomplete. Consequently, the conservancy movement has struggled to demonstrate its value, sometimes to the detriment of local and national sentiment.

Currently there are a sizeable number of initiatives that could be grouped under the banner of “Landscape Monitoring.” These include the work by Space for Giants, 51 Degrees and others to roll out EarthRanger on individual conservancies, and to link this system across conservancies to create an overall real time picture of what is happening within the environment from a wildlife, security, human resource, and asset management perspective.

Additionally, there has been discussion within the LCA around the creation of a centralised “data hub” that could make use of EarthRanger data as part of a tourism information centre in Nanyuki. Furthermore, as various initiatives such as the carbon restoration project, the rhino expansion project, the development of a tourism circuit and the water master plan for the region start to gain momentum there will be an increasing need to demonstrate impact across a range of different metrics, all measured regularly and cost effectively.



## 2.4. Implementation Experience, Lessons learnt and agenda for LCA.

There has been a commendable effort to develop conservancies out of group ranches and other private holdings. The design and implementation experience provides important lessons to building the next generation of conservancies. However, the design and implementation of many of the initiatives within the landscape has been disjointed and as such not sustainable with many initiatives ending at the end of a funding cycle. The landscape has seen at least 406 partners and non-governmental organisations working on various initiatives some of which have either overlapped or were short lived, with some even leading to deleterious outcomes. There is an urgent need to have a coordinated implementation of the initiatives to ensure that they have a positive and transformative impact on the communities. Bringing all conservancies under a single conservation and management standard, including a standardised security system and ranger force, and the digitisation of all conservation assets with a central management hub has been mooted with increasing regularity over the past few years. The Rhino Range Expansion project (see above) may naturally start to move participating conservancies in this direction.

There is also a significant need to collect data that can inform the strategic and long-term planning across the landscape and in this way consolidate resources and expertise to drive a more resilient landscape. LCA will need to develop the capacity to monitor and evaluate the impact of programs and collect data that they can use to drive thought-leadership, sequence interventions and ensure that the intended impact is achieved. This is especially important as the pressure on the natural resources increases with rising populations, changing climate and insecurity. To address these challenges will require meticulous planning that will drive coordinated action to achieve the highest productivity and impact with the resources available from different partners, donors and implementers.

In this section, we highlight the land-scape wide experiences from the initiatives to date, as well as the shared challenges and opportunities.

### 2.4.1 Land-use Planning and Properties Management.

Laikipia ecology is fragile and requires proper land use management to promote diversified economic opportunities. The lessons learnt is that land use must be mapped and controlled through managing the location of various economic activities Viz. conservation, tourism, grazing, farming, settlement, and other economic activities.

The key challenge to the community conservancies is enforcement of land use plans by incentivizing members to accept good land management practices, given they all stand to benefit when land is healthy and lose when it is not productive. In addition, as the population grows and the youth are no longer interested in herding, the community conservancies are facing pressure to subdivide the land. Experience to date from the subdivided ranches, commonly referred to as abandoned lands, is that small plots are not economically viable compared to effectively managed large holdings.

The Community Land Act, when applied innovatively together with the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, provides the legal tools to maintain the large-scale holdings while incentivizing individual members and the private sector to create thriving conservancies. There is therefore a pressing need for the conservancies to develop strategic plans which contain land-use plans and business-plans geared towards sustainable conservation and income generation.

The Laikipia County Government with support of the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), has developed a Spatial Plan for the County based on Geographical Information Systems (GIS) mapping. This spatial plan should form the basis for developing land use plans and commons governance<sup>4</sup> strategy.

---

<sup>4</sup> FAO (2016). Governing Tenure Rights to Commons A guide to support the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security

The use of livestock, primarily cattle, but also sheep, goats, and camels, as a “tool for ecological management” has been widely recognised across the Laikipia region for many years. Whilst long term research into this aspect of rangeland management is scarce, some published work is available for review (e.g. the Mpala Research Centre KLEE experiment - see [here](#)).

By contrast the rangelands outside the privately owned conservancies (the “commons”) tend to be degraded, primarily because of the mismanagement of livestock over a period of many years. Efforts over the years by the private conservancies to implement programmes to manage livestock more efficiently from both an ecological and economic perspective within the community conservancies and other neighbouring areas, have consistently failed to address the systemic reasons for rangeland degradation for the following key reasons:

- Livestock related projects are often applied with little coordination between individual private conservancies, are short lived and inconsistently applied, and often fail to address the fundamental reasons for poor rangeland management in the communal areas. So-called “relief” or “emergency” grazing provided to pastoralist communities during dry periods, a practice adopted by many in the private sector, acts simply as a stop gap measure and may in fact exacerbate livestock related pressures in the future.
- Larger more ambitious programmes (e.g. the “Linking livestock markets to wildlife conservation” programme developed by the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) and the Ol Pejeta Conservancy (OPC) in 2009) failed to acknowledge the core extrinsic reasons for rangeland degradation and therefore failed to achieve scale, the adoption of a so-called “contingent approach” to reward good “conservation practice”, and to address social issues.

Furthermore, there are numerous efforts across the landscape to demonstrate and scale methodologies to rehabilitate degraded areas. These include the use of techniques such as semi-circular bunds, re-seeding, gully, and bare land reclamation among others, but most are small-scale, dependent upon short-lived donor funding and, again, fail to address the systemic reasons that sit behind rangeland mismanagement.

In addition to rangeland rehabilitation efforts there are also several initiatives to remove invasive species from large areas of Laikipia, with a particular focus on the removal of *Opuntia sp.*, or so-called “prickly pear” cactus. For example, Loisaba Conservancy has developed a programme that combines biological and mechanical control that not only removes this species from the land but uses it (on a limited scale) to produce biogas for cooking. However, the Loisaba methodology costs an estimated USD 180 per acre and, with *Opuntia* now covering huge swathes of the Laikipia landscape, particularly those areas from which grass cover has been removed because of livestock mismanagement, it is unlikely that this approach is scalable to the extent required.

With all the above said, the private conservancies as a collective recognize their vulnerability in the face of the worsening environmental, economic, and social situation that surrounds them, and there is general acknowledgement that large scale recovery of the degraded rangelands of Laikipia (and further afield) must be made.

#### 2.4.2 Common threats – insecurity, land tenure and poor enforcement

Insecurity is a problem for everyone within the Laikipia landscape and surrounding areas to the east, north and west. In some places the level of insecurity has now reached near catastrophic levels, arising from a complex web of historical and current events that have drastically altered the social, political, economic and - most notably - the ecological landscape, as evidenced by widespread rangeland degradation.

The situation has been further compounded by rapid loss of traditional pastoralist grazing lands due to land settlement, permanent water infrastructure and reappropriation for crop farming, urbanisation, national parks, game reserves, wildlife conservancies and ranches. Their loss, coupled with massively increased human and livestock populations, exacerbated by climate change, all combine to form an exponential problem for the region and Kenya as a whole.

This problem is further complicated by the lack of clear land tenure arrangements in some areas, associated with poor governance structures as well as marginalisation, political corruption, the proliferation of small arms and money laundering.

As the remaining land that supports pastoralism along with its customs and traditions dies, so does pastoralism as a sustainable livelihood option. Coupled with the degradation of the rangelands and associated resource scarcity, this continues to lead inexorably to increasing levels of poverty, famine, conflict, criminality, extremism, mass migration and a loss of cultural identity.

There is consensus that the insecurity and poor enforcement of property rights are threats to development of long-term investment plans in the landscape. Respondents indicated recurrent cases of livestock theft and encroachment of lands. These invasions occur often following incitements by politicians and during drought created uncertainty. This has led to many would-be investors seeing Laikipia as a high-risk area. The perception that there is 'free grass,' and that herders can invade and occupy private property with impunity must end. While the landscape is vast, collaboration among the conservancies' security and the Government security agencies, as well as collaboration of citizens to provide intelligence is necessary to create a security firewall along the county boundaries.

Ending insecurity will also require that the absentee landlords take possession and control of their land. Absentee landlords own approximately 25% of Laikipia. These lands are not formally occupied and therefore used as free access resource by local people, particularly pastoralists but also charcoal burners, subsistence hunters and others. It is comprised of between 25 to 30 former large-scale ranches, now subdivided and owned by private land-buying companies whose members are from Central Kenya (It also includes a great deal of public land, such as that held by the Settlement Trust Fund (e.g. large parts of P&D), National Youth Service (NYS MarMar) and the Laikipia County Government (Kirumun National Reserve). These lands are currently degraded, while squatters occupy other parts. Between 2009 and 2015, there were efforts supported by Conservation donors to establish options for incentivizing these absentee landowners to consolidate the land for concessioning to private investors.

### 2.4.3 Laikipia ecosystem conservation strategy

It has been twelve years since the publication of the Laikipia Conservation Strategy (2012-2030) by the Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF), and that was before the enactment of the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act of 2013. Along the way, there has been development of species-specific conservation plans for endangered species such as Grevy Zebra and Black Rhino. Currently, several conservancies have teamed up to create the Rhino Expansion program. The members recommended the development of the Laikipia Ecosystem Conservation Plan like the Amboseli & Maasai Mara Conservancies. The proposed plan is expected to leverage the opportunities presented by the Community Land Act (2016) and related policies and laws that have been amended to comply with the Constitution of Kenya 2010, as well as National and County climate change adaptation plans.

It is recommended that LCA convenes the Conservation stakeholders and raises funds to develop the Laikipia Ecosystem Conservation Strategy.

### 2.4.4 Economic diversification

The move towards economic diversification is urgent. The scoping study has highlighted the threats to traditional pastoralism and the opportunities for changing mind-sets and acquiring progressive skills for commercialising livestock production and accessories trade, tourism, bio-products trade, and establishment of off-farm businesses. The study found there's room for the members to learn from each other and collaborate to create synergies for transformation. The report recommends that LCA convenes 'economic diversification' working groups from among the members to share lessons, select the priority enterprises and implement them.

As discussed above several innovative approaches to rangeland management based on the judicious management of livestock are beginning to emerge across Laikipia. These include an initiative being led by True Range Limited and Natural State in collaboration with Borana Conservancy, Lollidaiga Hills Conservancy and Enasoit, with the support of Africa Nature Investments and The Nature Conservancy. This approach has a vision of developing a commercial livestock business, owned as a shareholding by neighbouring private and community conservancies to be run professionally, under regenerative and holistic practices, as a mechanism to connect and

uplift people, landscapes, and economies. Whilst complex and likely to face considerable challenges within pastoralist communities, local and national governments, the project offers innovation that, critically, incorporates the systemic approach to problem solving that has been sorely lacking in all previous attempts to solve the widespread issues of land degradation resulting from poor livestock management.

Given the stated intention of Natural State and others to support the delivery of education and training around rangeland restoration, coupled with a proposal for a school of rangeland management developed by Borana Conservancy, it is felt that in addition to working to improve insecurity and resolve land tenure issues, the most effective intervention that the LCA can make to resolve the long term issues of overgrazing and rangeland degradation, is to support the delivery of education and training for capacity development, particularly within and around the community conservancies of Laikipia. This is discussed further in “Transformational Education” below.

Whilst conservancy level initiatives to support pastoral livestock management systems will need to continue in the immediate term as something of a stop-gap measure, they are unlikely to offer long term alternatives at the scale required. Instead, it is felt that a longer-term approach to education and training around alternative methods of livestock production that offer opportunities for rangeland rehabilitation and new methods of earning revenue from land (so-called “biodiversity credits” or “biodiversity investing”), will likely be the best chance of creating the systemic changes that are now needed to pastoralist livelihoods.

Further development of the tourism sector offers significant potential, particularly within the community conservancies on the basis it is recommended that the LCA to work across its membership and a range of different stakeholders to develop the Laikipia Conservation Tourism Master Plan that:

It is likely that other economic and business opportunities exist across Laikipia that could assist to help diversify livelihood strategies in a sustainable manner. Whilst it will be important to implement a long-term approach for capacity development to manifest these opportunities (see Transformational Education below), it is recommended that the LCA take some immediate steps, as follows: LCA to lead a feasibility study to understand what other alternative economic and revenue generating business opportunities could be developed and scaled across the landscape, particularly within the community conservancies. Based on the results of the feasibility study, LCA to support the resourcing and implementation thereof with members and key partners

#### 2.4.5 Transformational Education

A combination of poor access to quality education and an almost total reliance upon traditional pastoralism has made it difficult for the community conservancies to progress socially and economically. In the long-term education will be the key to changing mindsets and opening avenues for alternative income generation, better leadership, and business management. A diversified education program will also reduce dependence on livestock production and, over time, graduate households to higher value activities, while supporting more sustainable livestock production practices through better breeding, pasture provision and value addition.

On that basis this report recommends that the LCA builds upon the myriad of educational support programmes currently being provided by all the conservancies, and takes a deliberate and proactive approach to convening, creating, and implementing a long-term landscape level plan that develops people with the appropriate leadership and technical skills, to ultimately transform the region. To achieve this the LCA should work with partners that can offer educational and development expertise at scale, including the government, to include the identification of young people with high potential within the secondary school sector, and active planning and resource mobilisation to support those people to become the skilled leadership that will be required for Laikipia’s future.

Furthermore, the LCA should work to understand and assist to address the needs and resource requirements of the emerging and nascent training facilities within the landscape, especially those focused on delivering training in nature restoration, rangeland management and regenerative agriculture such as Kupona/Natural State, the Laikipia Learning Centre, and the School for Rangeland Management. Properly operationalised, these facilities could then be woven into the LCA educational and capacity development plan to maximise their impact.

#### 2.4.6 The Need for a Supportive Legal and Regulatory Environment

The members raised concerns about the numerous National & County Government taxes, fees and levies imposed on the Conservancies. Of immediate concern is the need to lower the property rates proposed in the draft valuation roll report, which do not reflect the proposals presented by LCA members. In addition, the members expressed the need for the conservation sector to retain the levies charged on members to develop the sector. Advocacy for an enabling business environment is the core business of LCA, and the report recommends:

1. LCA to establish a conservation policy and legal advisory unit to generate advisories and presentations to Government agencies and influential stakeholders for an enabling operating environment.
2. LCA to continue lobbying members of the assembly and the County Executive in setting non-punitive rates and levies for conservation properties and businesses.
3. LCA coordinates the drafting of an enabling County conservation policy and law, and to engage the necessary stakeholders for approval of the same.
4. LCA, in partnership the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA) continues to advocate for the necessary National policies and laws that will support the success of conservation in Laikipia.

#### 2.4.7 Need For Landscape-wide Performance Standards and Data Sharing

The scoping study found there were hundreds of organisations working in Laikipia, but the targeted beneficiaries (community conservancies) had limited documentation on these projects. The study was informed that there had been instances where different organisations would claim credit for the same project. The community leaders could only mention the donor or the implementing agency. Given the missing data, it was difficult to assess the effectiveness of the various projects and programs across the landscape. The privately owned conservancies, however, had records and could demonstrate the application of the funds from various donors.

Given the paucity of high-quality data across a wide range of critical areas (ecological, social, economic), and the importance of properly collated up to date data for the LCA to be able to:

1. Represent the interests of its members.
2. Position the landscape for emerging opportunities around biodiversity investments.
3. Prove to donors and supporters that their support is having the desired results.

LCA should consider working with key partners such as Natural State (ecological), Space for Giants (general conservation information and related) and others (economic data, data collations, AI analysis, data presentation) to build a landscape level monitoring system that feeds into a centralised data hub, enabled with artificial intelligence (AI) to provide analysis of the data being received. As well as being valuable as a tool to provide real time information to various stakeholders (including government), the hub could become a marketing tool for both donors and people visiting Laikipia.

The section that follows refines the discussion in the preceding chapters into five initiatives that have been prioritized through workshops, focus-group discussions, and interviews with stakeholders across the Laikipia County and the membership of LCA.

## 3. Proposed Initiatives and Considerations

---

### 3.1. Introduction

The foregoing chapter outlines findings and recommendations shared by both private and community conservancies as well as partners who have worked in the landscape. The emerging expectations from the member conservancies was that LCA needs to assume its role as a business membership organisation (BMO), that brings together all the conservancies and acts as a singular voice and source of truth to support the ecosystem development of the conservancies. A key role for LCA is to create several masterplans that will function as blueprints for all actors within the conservancies of Laikipia County. In addition, LCA will be the representative of the county conservancies to private, public, and non-governmental partners who want to support conservancies in Laikipia. In this way, they will ensure that initiatives undertaken within and without the conservancies are beneficial conservancies and their impact is cumulative and sustainable.

The recommended initiatives in the section that follows have been distilled from the scoping study findings and discussed at two stakeholder meetings held in March 2024. These five initiatives, if implemented successfully will have the effect of lifting the livelihoods of communities within Laikipia, ensuring security for both people and wildlife and a sustainable land-use approach. The scoping study set out to understand the initiatives that were successful and could be scaled across the members of LCA. It was clear that there was a difference between the needs of the community conservancies and those of privately-owned. The community conservancies needed to support their members to access more economic opportunities that diversify their incomes from livestock production, whereas the privately owned conservancies needed better representation from LCA and a long-term lasting solution to insecurity. Both community and privately owned conservancies, will benefit from better security management and stronger representation. Access to diverse economic opportunities would significantly improve the livelihoods of communities living in and around the conservancies and reduce the pressure on land which would significantly improve the rangeland health.

### 3.2. Recommended initiatives for scaling and development.

This section highlights the five key initiatives that should be undertaken by LCA. These initiatives are also aligned with LCA's strategic direction and provide a unique value proposition to members of LCA as well as the Laikipia landscape.

#### 3.2.1. Economic Diversification

##### 3.2.1.1. Conservation and Tourism

Laikipia County offers a significant opportunity to develop a world-class tourism experience and become a premier destination in the world. To achieve this outcome LCA must take the lead in developing a Conservation and Tourism Masterplan that defines the following:

1. Outlines a tourism “circuit” across the conservancies.
2. Describes a landscape level approach to public relations and marketing, to further establish Laikipia as a globally important wilderness destination.
3. Includes mechanisms for a collaborative approach to tourism between community and private conservancies, leveraging private sector expertise and networks.
4. Includes the development of a range of de-risking mechanisms and partnerships to improve the opportunities for investment across community conservancies.
5. The intended outcomes of the plan will need to be clearly defined, and will include but not be limited to:
  - a. The establishment of a vibrant and growing tourism economy within the community conservancies of Laikipia
  - b. Increasing recognition of the Laikipia region as a safe premier wildlife tourism destination of global significance
  - c. Identification and garnering of support for the acquisition or securing of key wildlife corridors within the conservancy landscape, each supported by appropriate management plans.

### **3.2.1.2. Alternative income generation schemes**

There is a need to understand what other income generation schemes can be implemented in the conservancies. There is already demonstrated potential for honey production, precious stones mining, and development of other cottage industries in line with the tourism industry described above. The LCA therefore needs to undertake studies to determine where these activities can be undertaken and determine their viability and proposed resources required to drive the income generation envisaged from such activities. To this end, LCA should:

1. LCA to lead a feasibility study to understand what other alternative economic/revenue generating business opportunities could be developed and scaled across the landscape, particularly within the community conservancies.
2. Based on the results of the feasibility study, LCA to support the resourcing and implementation thereof with members and key partners

### **3.2.1.3. Livestock commercialisation**

It has been demonstrated that the current pastoralist lifestyle will face significant headwinds in the coming years as pasture becomes scarce and land tenure enforcement takes root. Participation in the beef and other meats markets will also require that livestock production demonstrates traceability and consistency in both supply and high-quality. This can only be achieved through a deliberate effort to improve the livestock breeds and manage the costs of production. To this end, it is critical that the LCA convenes various stakeholders across the landscape to support better production practices and drive up the quality and consistency of production from both community and privately owned conservancies.

1. Support the current initiatives that aim to commercialise livestock production by creating a platform where leading practices can be shared, and conservancies can benefit from each other.
2. Market the Laikipia beef brand as a premium product.
3. Support the conservancies to access markets for livestock through a 'joined-up' marketing platform. This way Laikipia will be known for its supply and quality consistency.

## **3.2.2. Policy, Legal and Regulatory Framework**

Working closely with local and national government, other relevant stakeholders, and appropriate expertise, the LCA should lead in the resourcing and development of plans or "white papers" that: identify key areas of policy and legislation that will be required for the successful management of the Laikipia conservancies in future. Outline how the LCA and its membership might work in support of the government to significantly improve the security of the landscape. In addition, identify and recommend approaches to finally resolve the issue of abandoned lands, building upon previous experience within the landscape.

Thereafter the LCA to take a lead in advocating and building support for the official adoption of the plans and recommendations therein, and thereafter seek to work in partnership with all key stakeholders to mobilise the resources and capacity that will be required. Key areas for consideration should include:

1. Enforcement of the rule of law – all rights being enforced (Constitutional Rights being enforced – right to life, livelihood, water resources, property, wildlife, and environmental conservation et al)
2. Security management - coordination of intelligence, response to attacks and violations and prosecution of offenders.
3. Coordination with county and national government (rates, rents, local policies development and enforcement – county conservation policy)

## **3.2.3. Land use planning and management.**

Based on the lessons learned over the years, several innovative approaches to rangeland management based on the judicious management of livestock are beginning to emerge. These include an initiative being led by [True Range Limited](#) and [Natural State](#) in collaboration with Borana Conservancy, Lolldaiga Hills Conservancy and Enasoit, with the support of [Africa Nature Investments](#) and The Nature Conservancy. This approach has a vision

of developing a commercial livestock business, owned as a shareholding by neighbouring private and community conservancies to be run professionally, under regenerative and holistic practices, as a mechanism to connect and uplift people, landscapes, and economies. Whilst complex and likely to face considerable challenges within pastoralist communities, local and national governments, the project offers innovation that, critically, incorporates the systemic approach to problem solving that has been sorely lacking in all previous attempts to solve the widespread issues of land degradation resulting from poor livestock management.

In the short-term, LCA needs to convene a working group with the County Government of Laikipia and the Ministry of Lands and Physical planning to develop the road map for generation and gazetting of the conservancy's land use plans.

In the mid-term, LCA should:

- raise funds for development of community conservancies organisations; county landscape and conservancy level land-use plans – to ensure coherence across the landscape.
- coordinate the gazetting of specific land use plans.
- coordinate development of Land use planning and management training programs for the CLMCs, managers and residents

#### **3.2.3.1. Abandoned lands, security, and connectivity corridors.**

The enforcement of land tenure and property rights are critical to the establishment and management of the Land-scape wide conservation plan by securing the necessary migratory corridors.

It is therefore recommended that LCA:

1. Scales up its role of the advocate for the conservancies to affirm the fundamental rights to life, property, protection of wildlife and assets.
2. Works with the County Government and National Government to get the absentee landlords to take possession of their land and put it into productive use or sell.
3. Collaborate with the security agencies for effective security planning and enforcement of the rule of law to assure security for all.
4. Raise funds for the enforcement of the conservancy's rangers, security infrastructure and structure inter-conservancies collaboration for gathering of intelligence and response to warnings and incidents.
5. Support its members to secure key "corridors" that are critically important for the "wildlife connectivity" of the Laikipia conservancies. The LCA has already raised significant funding to support the implementation of the Louniek corridor between the Makutan and Mugie conservancies in western Laikipia, but other critically important corridor areas remain to be secured. The corridor that links Ol Pejeta Conservancy to the remainder of Laikipia, comprising the Mutara Conservancy and the Laikipia National Park, needs to be actively addressed. If successful, this could in future open an opportunity to link Laikipia to the Aberdare National Park, through the Solio Conservancy in the south.

#### **3.2.3.2. Access to Water**

LCA to raise resources and take a lead in convening all stakeholders, including its membership, to develop a 'Water Master Plan' for the "conservancy landscape", that is endorsed by local and national governments (time frame to be agreed, but must be long term: likely at least 10 years) and fits in with the Conservation & Tourism Master Plan .

The objective of the plan will be to identify ways to manage water resources sustainably and equitably across the landscape, for the benefit of the LCA membership and the communities living within and near the conservancies. Once the plan is in place and officially endorsed, the role of the LCA will be to support the implementation of the plan, including the resourcing thereof. It will do this by:

1. Acting as a convener for organisations and bodies in the water sector to collaborate with member conservancies to drive sustainable water practices and management.



2. Supporting individual member conservancies to implement the masterplan at a local level (resourcing, provision of expertise, government support)
3. Establishing a monitoring and evaluation process to measure agreed metrics on a regular and affordable basis, to demonstrate the achievement of planned outcomes.
4. The define and manage the intended outcomes of the plan, and will include but not be limited to:
  - i. Improving access to potable water in ways that are aligned with the ecological and rangeland management objectives of the landscape.
  - ii. Reducing the current seasonality of rivers that were previously considered to be permanent.
  - iii. Improving capture and storage of water run-off during periods of high precipitation
  - iv. Regulating the harvesting of sand from seasonal rivers to ensure their long-term sustainable management.

#### **3.2.4. Development Effectiveness, data sharing and performance management**

The LCA as a BMO has the strategic mandate of coordinating and harmonising the activities of conservancies and partners that work within the landscape. This calls for better management of data required to make the right decisions. LCA should therefore build the capacity to collect, collate and analyse data to support decision-making. To this end, LCA will need to implement a monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) capability that will be responsible for developing thought-leadership from lessons learnt and driving high performance standards across the initiatives undertaken across the landscape. In this regard, LCA should become the sole source of truth for conservancy related initiatives and interventions.

Following are key recommendations on monitoring, evaluation, data collection, collation, and analysis to develop insights and thought leadership.

1. LCA invests in the capacity for monitoring and evaluation to drive data collection as well as impact assessment and document lessons learned for future interventions.
2. LCA publishes the Conservancy's priorities to influence the nature and structure of current and future initiatives.
3. LCA sets up an advisory services unit to assist the conservancies design and manage programs, and for negotiating favourable terms with organisations proposing to work in their properties.
4. LCA partners with research organisations to develop performance standards that targeted beneficiaries and implementing agencies commit to apply in selection, design, and implementation of development initiatives.
5. LCA creates the conservancy programs data hub to receive, process and analyse the data submitted by the organisations for public view, and to help the practitioners improve the effectiveness of initiatives.
6. LCA to support the widening, consolidation and analysis of [SAPA](#) (Social Assessment of Protected Areas) surveys. This should include regular re-assessment and follow up of SAPAs findings across both the community and private conservancies. This will form the basis for a more coordinated approach to the community support provided by private conservancies and donors.

#### **3.2.5. Organisational Development and Strengthening**

##### **3.2.5.1. LCA Internal Organisational Development and Strengthening**

There is a significant need to develop the organisational capacity of the LCA to achieve its mandate. This includes a review of the current capabilities against its strategic objectives and the initiatives highlighted in this scoping study report. The interventions will further be defined with the development of a new strategic plan that further details the implementation and funding of the initiatives included herein. At a minimum, the LCA should develop an MEL function that can be the custodian of data and information across the membership.

It is recommended that LCA develop a strategic plan covering 2025 – 2030, that will define a new operating model and organisational structure that adequately covers its roles as a convenor and facilitator for the non-negotiables for which LCA was formed. These include:

1. LCA to prioritise work with partners to become a convenor of conservancies and other stakeholders to address the policy, regulatory and security environment and, critically, the enforcement thereof.
2. LCA to support its membership to continue to support the government to reduce and manage current levels of insecurity across the landscape, building upon existing initiatives within the region, including the coordinated deployment of EarthRanger.
3. LCA to continue to raise resources to support organisational development, governance, and capacity building across all conservancies - with a focus on community conservancies.
4. Working closely with local and national government, other relevant stakeholders, and appropriate expertise, the LCA to lead in the resourcing and development of plans or “white papers” that:
  - Identify key areas of policy and legislation that will be required for the successful management of the Laikipia conservancies in future.
  - Outline how the LCA and its membership might work in support of the government to significantly improve the security of the landscape.
  - Identify and recommend approaches to finally resolve the issue of abandoned lands, building upon previous experience within the landscape.

Thereafter the LCA to take a lead in advocating and building support for the official adoption of the plans and recommendations therein, and seeking to work in partnership with all key stakeholders to mobilise the resources and capacity that will be required.

#### **3.2.5.2. Conservancy Organisational Development**

As outlined in the assessment section of this study, there is a need to support conservancies to professionalise and corporatise the management of their holdings. This is aimed at ensuring that five initiatives outlined in this section can be implemented at the individual conservancy level. LCA should undertake the following activities to support conservancies in this area:

1. Support conservancies to develop strategic plans that include their business plans, land-use plans and envisaged revenue targets for households and conservation outcomes among other parameters.
2. Develop appropriate business processes and organisational structures with a clear workforce plan that defines job-descriptions and key performance indicators for staff indicators and based on this, support the conservancies to recruit the right personnel.
3. Ensure alignment between these strategies and ecosystem-wide masterplans.

#### **3.2.5.3. Transformational Education**

A critical area of intervention for the LCA is education for the community within and without conservancies. Education has been mentioned as a key driver for earning higher incomes from alternative sources of income and changing mindsets to thrive in the technological advanced economies. LCA will need to assume the role of long-term planning to define the right types of education that are required to deliver better living standards for communities, better conservation and rangeland management and adoption of new ways of working and living that anticipate and respond to changes in Laikipia, nationally and internationally. LCA should undertake the following:

1. Harmonise and further resource the support provided by private and community conservancies to the education sector.
2. Create, resource, and drive the implementation of a program that identifies and mentors’ future leaders from secondary through to and tertiary education levels.
3. Support the development and resourcing of nascent training facilities within the landscape such as Kuponu/Natural State, the Laikipia Field School, and the School for Rangeland Management

The intended outcomes of the plan will need to be clearly defined, and will include but not be limited to:

- i. Evidence to show that livestock management across currently degraded areas has started to move towards more sustainable land management practices, resulting in improved rangeland conditions at a scale that can be considered meaningful.

- ii. Strong indications that the community conservancies have begun to move away from traditional pastoralism, instead embracing alternative economic opportunities to develop new businesses that are successful.

### **3.2.6. Financing the initiatives.**

The initiatives outlined above will require significant funding which can only be determined once these initiatives are adapted and developed into clear implementation plans. There is a significant amount of data that needs to be collected, collated, and analysed to inform the funding requirements. These will then be distilled into proposals for funding or pitchbooks targeted at investors locally and globally. It may also be necessary to create funding vehicles for example for the establishment of a derisking mechanism to attract investors; a centralised education fund to drive the transformational education.

The positive side is that feedback from the members and review of literature have indicated Laikipia attracts significant interest and funds from multi-lateral, bilateral, philanthropies and commercial institutions. What has been missing is strategic targeting, coordination, and accountability to demonstrate the impact resources raised to support community conservancies. It is therefore possible that funding cases will be generated as LCA develops a comprehensive strategy to implement the recommendations highlighted in this report.

LCA will also need to tap into the members' current and planned initiatives by creating 'initiatives working groups' from among the LCA members to synchronize their programs and develop funding and implementation plans for both commercial and public goods initiatives. For instance, AgWild & Ol Pejeta can be convenors of the livestock commercialization initiative given their experience and ongoing commercial route-to-market and value addition investments. Further, the members convening the Rhino expansion program to consider including development of ecosystem conservation strategy and generation of GIS land use plans for inclusion in the ongoing Laikipia spatial plan in Rhino project budget. Laikipia Farmers Association, among whom LCA shares cross-membership, has been working with the County Government of Laikipia and FAO to digitize the registry index maps (RIMS) and generation of the County spatial plan. FAO has funded the spatial plan and County GIS lab development. The expected outputs of these working groups will be projects and financing plans.

The second step will be for LCA to convene a meeting of the various National and International funding organizations active in Laikipia to present these priorities and propose to them to align their current and planned programs to fit these initiatives. For instance, LCA should generate a schedule of projects and lobby for their funding by the National and County Governments' entities for the FY23/24.

# 4. Appendices

---

## Appendix 1

---

### Selected bibliography

1. Austin A Scheetz et al 2022: *Effects of a grazing permit market on pastoralist behaviour and overgrazing in Kenya*. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 17 035002.
2. Ezra Rosser (2019). *Reclaiming the Navajo Range: Resolving the Conflict between Grazing Rights and Development*. American University Washington College of Law.
3. Food & Agriculture Organization (2016). *Governing Tenure Rights to Commons: A guide to support the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security*.
4. Galvin, K.A; et.al. 2021. *Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) Rangelands Program Assessment*. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service report, supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development.
5. J.D. Derner and G.E. Schuman. *Carbon sequestration and rangelands: A synthesis of land management and precipitation effects*. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, Volume 62, Number 2.
6. Kariuki, R.W., et.al. *Assessing Interactions between Agriculture, Livestock Grazing and Wildlife Conservation Land Uses: A Historical Example from East Africa*. *Land* 2021, 10, 46. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10010046>
7. Laikipia Conservancies Association. *Landscape Restoration Carbon Project Concept Note*, October 2023.
8. Laikipia Wildlife Forum. *Wildlife conservation strategy for Laikipia County, 2012-2030*
9. Lesirma, S.S. et.al. *Constraints in Water Access in Laikipia County, Case of Ewaso Ng'iro River Basin in Kenya*. *East African Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation*, Vol. 2 (2): March 2021
10. Northern Rangelands Trust - *Rangelands Strategy, 2019-2022*
11. Oburah, K.O. et.al. *Does the Community Conservancy Model Work for Pastoralists? Insights from Naibunga Conservancy in Northern Kenya*. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 7772. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147772>
12. Otianga-Owiti, G.E. et al *Governance and Challenges of Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya*, *Wildlife Biodiversity Conservation*, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64682-0\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64682-0_4)
13. Parslow, John. *Individual transferable quotas and the "tragedy of the commons"*. NRC Research Press Web site at [cjfas.nrc.ca](http://cjfas.nrc.ca) on 3 November 2010
14. Robinson, L., and Fiona Flintan. *Can formalisation of pastoral land tenure overcome its paradoxes? Reflections from East Africa*. *Robinson and Flintan Pastoralism* (2022) 12:34 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13570-022-00250-8>
15. United States of America Department of Interior. *Navajo Partitioned Lands Grazing Permits*, 2005.
16. USAID (2006). *The role of property rights in natural resource management, good governance, and empowerment of the rural poor*.
17. USAID (2017). *Lewa Wildlife Conservancy – Northern Rangelands Trust Support Program (Phase II): Final Performance Evaluation*.
18. Witt, A.B.R., et.al, 'A preliminary assessment of the presence and distribution of invasive and potentially invasive alien plant species in Laikipia County, Kenya, a biodiversity hotspot,' *Koedoe* 62(1), a1605. <https://doi.org/10.4102/Koede.v62i1.1605>

### Other unpublished documents reviewed.

Other documents reviewed during consultancy. These documents were provided by different conservancies, partners and NGOs working in Laikipia County.

1. [Rangeland Management and Rehabilitation Programme for LCA](#)
2. [A plan to resolve the pastoralist crisis in Laikipia \(Ol Pejeta Conservancy\)](#)
3. [Exploring differences in soil properties across open grazed pastoralist systems in Laikipia](#)
4. [Laikipia County Rangelands Management Policy 2022](#)
5. [Collaboration to secure scale, impact, and sustainability in the central rangelands of Kenya](#)
6. [Effects of holistic grazing management on milk production, weight gain, and visitation to grazing areas by livestock and wildlife in Laikipia County, Kenya](#)
7. [Laikipia County spatial plan, situational report analysis sums up](#)
8. [Amplifying conservation impact through strategic partnerships and collaboration](#)

9. [LCA concept note on continued partnership with USAID](#)
10. [Laikipia Conservancies Economic Impact](#)
11. [Linking livestock markets to wildlife conservation](#)
12. [Conservation Education Programme, Laikipia](#)
13. [The politics of forest governance in a changing climate: Political reforms.](#)
14. [Conflict and socio-environmental changes in Laikipia, Kenya](#)
15. [MOU between Natural State and the Laikipia Conservancies Association](#)
16. [Empowering women and youth through livelihood projects in Laikipia County through scoping program for LCA](#)
17. [Executive Summary of the LCA carbon scoping report](#)
18. [Adapting to climate change in the semi-arid northern Kenya](#)
19. [Maiyanat Community Conservancy: Capacity needs assessment, grazing plan review and development, business plan, and participatory rangeland monitoring and action plan reports](#)
20. [Status of \*Opuntia\* invasions in the arid and semi-arid lands of Kenya](#)
21. [Laikipia county spatial plan, final draft](#)
22. [Impacts of Laikipia ranches on the local economy](#)
23. [National Landscape restoration workshop](#)

## Appendix 2

Conservancies & Organisations visited and interviewed and a dated workplan.

<b>Community Conservancies CLMCs Interviewed</b>	
1.	Maiyanat
2.	Shulmai
3.	Naibung'a
4.	Naibung'a Upper
5.	Naibunga Lower
6.	Il Mamusi/ CFA
7.	Lekurukki
8.	Il Ingwesi

<b>Private Conservancies</b>	
9.	Loisaba
10.	Sejera (physical visit)
11.	Mukutan
12.	Borana
13.	Mpala (physical visit)
14.	Ol Pejeta
15.	Mugie (physical visit)
16.	Sosian
17.	El Karama
18.	Ol Jogi
19.	Lolldiaga (physical visit)
20.	Ol Maisor (physical visit)
21.	Suyian (Physical visit)

<b>NGOs and Other Partners</b>	
22.	Laikipia County – Ms. Leah Njeri – CECM (Water, Environment & Natural Resources)
23.	Space for Giants – Max Graham
24.	AgWild – Harry Brainch
25.	True Range/ Kupona – Richard Van Aardt
26.	Natural State – Dr Jonathan Baille
27.	Grevy's Zebra Trust – Ms. Belinda Mackay
28.	Northern Rangelands Trust – Aloyce Lekutan
29.	Laikipia Wildlife Forum – Ms. Celine Achieng'

Validation Workshop on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, in Nanyuki – Community Conservancies

1.	<b>Maiyanat</b>
2.	<b>Shulmai</b>
3.	<b>Naibung'a Central</b>
4.	<b>Naibung'a Upper</b>
5.	Naibunga Lower
6.	Il Mamusi/ CFA
7.	Lekurukki
8.	Il Ingwesi

Validation Workshop on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, in Nanyuki – Conservancies

Workshop Attendants
1. Maiyanat
2. Shulmai
3. Naibung'a Central
4. Naibung'a Upper
5. Naibunga Lower
6. Il Mamusi/ CFA
7. Lekurukki
8. Il Ingwesi
9. Mpala
10. Borana
11. El Karama
12. Ol Pejeta
13. Segera
14. Ol Jogi
15. Loisaba - Absent with Apologies
16. Lolldiaga
17. Mugie
18. Ol Maisor
19. Suyian

Dated Implementation Plan

Activity	From	To
<b>Inception Meeting</b>	<b>07 February 2024</b>	<b>07 February 2024</b>
Stakeholder Mapping		
Document Request List		
Agreed Scope and Methodology		
Project Governance		
Hypothesis Development		
Project team meeting	07 February 2024	07 February 2024
<b>Assessment &amp; Diagnosis</b>	<b>09 February 2024</b>	<b>07 February 2024</b>
Literature Review	08 February 2024	13 February 2024
Data Collection Tool Development & Approval	13 February 2024	15 February 2024
Field Visits	13 February 2024	23 February 2024
Data Analysis and Collation	26 February 2024	29 February 2024
Development of Draft Report & W/shop Material	03 March 2024	08 March 2024
<b>Stakeholder Workshop</b>	<b>11 March 2024</b>	<b>11 March 2024</b>
Update Report with W/shop Feedback	12 March 2024	15 March 2024
Submission of Draft Report	18 March 2024	18 March 2024
Review by stakeholders	18 March 2024	22 March 2024
Finalisation of Report	25 March 2024	28 March 2024
<b>Project Close</b>	<b>31/03/2024</b>	<b>31/03/2024</b>



## Appendix 3

### Data Collection Tool for Community Conservancies



#### SCOPING STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE/INTERVIEW GUIDE

#### A: Guidance to the interviewees - Conservancies initiatives survey – Scope of work (from ToR):

##### A1: Aim of the scoping study

To conduct a scoping study across Laikipia to understand which conservation/rangeland management and livelihood related initiatives have succeeded in the past, and how these might be aligned to the membership endorsed LCA strategy and built upon for future scaling.

##### A2: Role of consultants

- To document the initiatives and performance (results) to date.
- To identify and document the methods and impact of those initiatives that have been successful, and which show potential for long term sustainable impact and scalability.
- To recommend up to five initiatives for LCA to prioritize.
- To propose financing strategies for the selected initiatives.

##### B3: Expected Outputs:

- A summary of previous or current conservancy level initiatives that have been undertaken, their performance against targets, and alignment with the over-arching LCA strategy and show potential for long term sustainable impact and scalability.
- Five conservation/rangeland management and/or social/livelihood programs accompanied by financial models for each.

#### B MEMBER BIO

1. Conservancy name, land size and ownership (private, community)			
2. Year registered	-		
4. Regulatory licenses/permits held			
5. Annual (operating) budget	Budget line	Annual (KES) - 2022	Financed by
	Operations (office, salaries, logistics)		
	Programs		
	Investments		
	Other		
	Total		
6. Land size and use	<i>Land use (socio-economic activities)</i>	<i>Detail (202)</i>	<i>Size (Ha)</i>
	Settlement (villages & #Households)		

	Livestock – livestock retained in the Conservancy		
	Livestock– members livestock outside the Conservancy		
	Wildlife (top five species)		
	Farming (crops) – top three crops		
7. Vegetation cover	<i>Classification – by economic value</i>	<i>Estimated size of land (%)</i>	<i>Utilization</i>
	Healthy (covered with beneficial vegetation)		
	Bare/degraded		
	Invasive species		

### C. INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN TO DATE (CLOSED OR CURRENT)

8. Conservation & socio-economic initiatives	Programs/initiatives		Results achieved. (up to 2022) & rating – as per project metrics	Scale-up proposals/plans
	Initiatives/Programs	Projects/Activities (up to 2022)		
			Results  Rating:	
		•		
		•	Results:  Rating:	
				•
			Results:  Rating:	•
			Results  Rating:	•

### D: RECOMMENDED INITIATIVES FOR PRIORITIZATION BY LCA

9. Top three priorities	Initiatives/programs	Target results/impact	Budget
	1.		
	2.		
	3.		

## Appendix 4

Specific responses from privately owned conservancies and other partners in the landscape.

	Responses	Key outcomes
<b>Conservancies</b>		
<b>Loisaba</b>	Email correspondence, this conservancy is well known to the consultants; Community engagement, Opuntia control report and SAPA report were key docs considered for the report. Loisaba also forms an important part of the Laikipia Rhino Range Expansion project	LCA is critically important; Rhino Range Expansion programme (of which Loisaba is a key part) should be supported; LCA/private sector will remain important in efforts to stabilise local communities and support community conservancies; believe that all elements of Loisaba community programme are scalable (?), more effort should be made to solve the Opuntia problem
<b>Segera</b>	Consultant visited 7th February, plus held discussions with tourism manager, ranch manager and community manager and met with a number of community groups. Also engaged in email correspondence with Jochen Zeitz, owner, around the Rhino Range Expansion Project and the report commissioned by Segera on the issue of abandoned lands	Rhino Range Expansion is important and should be supported in collaboration with the carbon/rangeland restoration project; the issue of abandoned lands remains an unresolved issue and LCA should take a leading role in findings ways to address the problem for the long term; education and capacity building within the local communities will be critical for future success; remain interested in working with community groups in the development of alternative livelihood strategies
<b>Mukutan</b>	Email correspondence: delayed responses curtailed information gathering. Consultant still aiming for follow up meeting in week beginning 8th April 2024	Interesting project around sustainable charcoal but this is not scalable around other parts of Laikipia; also support to micro-enterprises such as honey production, avocado production, and essential oils - as noted in the final report, alternative livelihood strategies will be important in Laikipia's future; cattle programme in support of local communities is scaling - but is it really addressing the root cause of rangeland degradation?
<b>Borana</b>	Not very responsive; however, their cattle work (in conjunction with TrueRange and AgWild) well known to Consultant, as is their community support work in Mukogodo and Ngare Ndare. Consultant did have some discussions with Michael Dyer at the report validation meeting in Nanyuki	A lot to admire in Borana's continued leadership of Laikipia and support to local communities. In particular Borana involvement in Lolldaiga Conservancy, the Kupona initiative and its plans for a Rangeland Management School - firmly believe that long term capacity building is critical for future success in Laikipia; believe LCA should be playing a leading role in convening its membership to address security issues across Laikipia, especially Mukogodo; also believe that LCA has a major role to play in supporting community conservancies - rangeland restoration, governance and management
<b>Mpala</b>	Consultant visited Mpala on 18th February and met with CEO - Winnie Kiiru - on 16th February in Nanyuki.	Mpala are something of an outlier in Laikipia - no involvement in tourism, no desire to be part of the Rhino Range Expansion programme (despite their strategically important geographic location from a connectivity perspective). Focus is very much on education and research, believe this is the greatest contribution they can make to the future stability of Laikipia - in collaboration with other research and educational institutions. Community focus is primarily on education and offering grazing for cattle

<b>Ol Pejeta</b>	Consultant knows this property well. Email interaction with CEO and meeting with Head of Conservation and Head of Community Programme. Consultant also visited Mutara Conservancy (managed by OPC) and Laikipia National Park (formerly Eland Downs) for a fact-finding mission - given the strategic importance of this "corridor" to OPC, Solio and Laikipia	OPC see the Rhino Range Expansion Programme as a critically important project for Laikipia; believe - rightly - that "conservaiton" should become a driver of economic growth, underpinned by high quality governance; see education and capacity building as key components of their 2030 community engagement strategy; risk becoming isolated from the rest of Laikipia if the current land tenure/use issues on the Mutara Conservancy and the Laikipia National Park are not resolved, with clear consequences from an ecological perspective; efforts to secure landscape level connectivity across Laikipia considered important, including the possible re-linking of Solio to the greater landscape (feasibility study in progress); see technology applications to make conservation work more effective (e.g use of drones, remote fence monitoring etc) as an area where OPC can lead innovation
<b>Mugie</b>	Email correspondence with CEO, this Conservancy well known to Consultant who has worked here as an advisor/consultant in the recent past	See need for a longer term more scalable approach to the lissue of managing community livestock and assisting pastoralist communities to move towards more sustaianble livelihood practices; keen to promote "seed grands" to micro-enterprises (alternative livelihoods) that show promise; see SAPA as a tool that should be used to encourage collaboration across the landscape to identify common challenges and identify scalable solutions that can be approached in a "unified way"; stressed the need for ongoing efforts to ensure landscape level connectivity between conservancies (e.g Louniek corridor); stressed the need to continue to enhance conservancy:government collaboration to address security issues; stressed the need to gather and report data more effectively across the landscape; agreed that LCA has an important role to play as a convenor of and advocate for the Laikipia conservancy movement
<b>Sosian</b>	Spoke to CEO, email exchange	Strongly believe that a "more coordinated livestock trading scheme as that is one thing that we all have in common, and the community conservancies could really benefit from"; big advocate for the work now being done by Kupona/TrueRange/AgWild as a possible long term and sustainable route to addressing the Laikipia livestock management issues; assert that stress grazing schmes merely perpetuate Laikipia's rangeland management problems and should not continue
<b>El Karama</b>	Interviewed Bella	Conservancy runs tourist facilities - key amongst them El Karama Lodge and Kyoto Lodge. Livestock has been successful but very low margins, breeding calves for sale has however been more profitable. In addition, in 2011 started a dairy farm producing 100 - 400 litres a day. 800ha are under hay which are rainfed for sale and back-up incase of droughts. For the last 12 years have also kept dopper sheep which ranges between 300-400 heads. Importantly, built a 28-acre dam which has been sufficient for water requirements at the conservancy though not for irrigation. Water is a key area of concern. Community engagement includes lending bulls, offering grazing land for distress grazing, milk value chain that runs through the community and employment of community members. Though well positioned in the middle of Laikipia, security is still a concern and keen to support any initiatives set up for this purpose.

<b>Ol Jogi</b>	Email exchange with GM, again Consultant knows this property well	Leader in the development of the Rhino Range Expansion programme (Jamie Gaymer is GM and Chairman of the APLRS - Association of Private and Community Land Rhino Sanctuaries) and therefore a big champion of the same; see a need for a more collaborative approach to landscape level management - security, SOPs, training, EarthRanger/data gathering/data management, livestock, community support, communications, fundraising - that would all lead to better outcomes and more efficiency; would like to see more investment in SAPA with collations of the results for a collaborative way forwards across the landscape; community conservancies require ongoing support for capacity development, improved management and governance; see importance of LCA as a convenor of and advocate for Laikipia conservancies
<b>Lolldaiga</b>	Consultant visited in March (as a visitor staying at Safari Series, met with Philip Ihenacho (Africa Nature Investments) twice and, together with the other consultant, visited the Kupone initiative to meet with Richard Van Aardt (owner and manager of TrueRange)	Lolldaiga is currently being managed by Borana Conservancy - as such the views and approach of Borana are likely to be replicated on Lolldaiga; strong feeling that in collaboration with the work being done by Kupona and Natural State that a new scalable approach to livestock management across Laikipia is starting to evolve; a general feeling that tourism could offer a major opportunity for the community conservancies but needs to be properly planned and strongly supported by the private sector; nothing meaningful will happen to resolve Laikipia's issues until such time as issues relating to security and land tenure are resolved, suggest LCA has a major role to play in this area; strong advocate of a long term approach to capacity development and vocational training to create skilled future leadership for the landscape; see the Rhino Range Expansion programme as very important for the landscape, and likely to lead to more collaboration over time
<b>Suyian</b>	Consultant spoke to Max Graham who organized purchase of Suyian, lives on the property and is the founder and CEO of Space For Giant (SFG) s who are highly active within the Laikipia landscape	Suyian should ultimately become a rhino sanctuary as part of the Rhino Range Expansion project; SFG (and by extension Suyian) advocate for a more collaborative landscape level approach to conservation management against a commonly agreed set of standards, including data gathering and the management of assets and ranger forces (data and decision hub), as well as a coordinated approach to tourism planning and livestock management; would like to see completion of the so-called Laikipia fence as a means to manage human wildlife conflict (HWC) - agree that much of this will naturally come into place with the implementation of the Rhino Range Expansion project; also make the point that much more work is required to understand patterns of HWC across Laikipia;
<b>Enasoit</b>	Did not meet, not considered a major player in the landscape	Enasoit are working closely with TrueRange to consider a collaborative approach to livestock management; also support and wish to be part of the Rhino Range Expansion programme
<b>Ol Maisor</b>	Met with Warren and discussed the farming operation	Ol Maisor has focused more on farming cattle for beef. Slaughterhouse used is in Timau. 1000ha has been leased to Sasumua for commercial farming of wheat, barley and canola which is on-sold to millers. Possibility of communities doing the same with Sasumua offering inputs and off-taking production. Managed livestock populations to maintain the rangeland. Sometimes removal of bulls necessary to control the birth-rates. Feedlots not very viable due to inputs required. Its more profitable to farm grain (maize) and sell for human consumption

		rather than run a feedlot. Important to fence, manage water and security for prosperity in Laikipia.
<b>NGOS/ Partners</b>		
<b>Space for Giants</b>	See above under Suyian	See above under Suyian
<b>ANI/Philip Ithenacho (Lolldaiga)</b>	Consultant met Philip (founder of Africa Nature Investments - organized purchase of Lolldaiga and Ole Naishu), investor on Borana	Primary wish to to see the region operating more collaboratively at a landscape level, with better monitoring/data sets and a coordinated approach to achieving "best in class" tourism. Sees commercialisation of "non timber forest products" (under heading of "alternative livelihoods) as a major opportunity for Laikipia (and other wilderness areas); big supporter of the Rhino Range Expansion programme
<b>AgWild</b>	Consultant all met Harry Brainch, recently departed head of AgWild	Stressed that AgWild (including its subsidiary Well Hung Butcher) is primarily a commercial organization with a number of shareholders drawn from the privately owned member conservancies of the LCA - it is not an NGO and is not in a position to countenance support programmes to local communities that are semi or fully charitable in nature. However, would like to work with partners to develop a reliable supply of high-quality livestock from community conservancies - currently this is not possible with conservancy cattle production being unpredictable and low quality. Suggested the creation of a model community conservancy that could be developed as a reliable quality supplier of beef, to act as an example that others could follow. Strongly supportive of the work/thinking of TrueRange and Kupona
<b>True Range/Kupona</b>	Consultant met with Richard Van Aardt at the site of the proposed Kupona programme	See above under Lolldaiga; the innovative thinking that is emerging under the leadership of True Range across the Borana/Lolldaiga/Enasoit landscapes around the monitored rehabilitation of rangelands using collectively managed herds for effective production and ecological benefit represents a clear opportunity for a solution to the pastoralist related issues that currently beset Laikipia; this is further supported by the positioning of Kupona as a training centre for Laikipia, in support of long term capacity building; Van Aardt was quick to point out that the current insecurity issues in Laikipia must be resolved if any progress is to be made with any initiatives across the landscape
<b>Natural State</b>	Spoke to CEO Dr Jonathan Baillie, thereafter, engaged in email discussions; the Consultant has previously visited Natural State and understands their work/objectives	Jonathan Baillie made the following key points: Laikipia should be the global center of excellence for Nature Based Solutions (NBS). LCA should work with Natural State to explore a range of nature based financial mechanisms for this landscape, including measurement and verification; LCA could take a lead in raising funding for Laikipia based students/community members to take a series of courses on NBS, restoration and regenerative agriculture; LCA could take a lead in raising funding for people in Laikipia to launch their own regenerative and restoration initiatives - post training; LCA could raise organizations such as Natural State to develop impact monitoring systems in the Laikipia landscape
<b>Lion Landscapes</b>	No response	Operate across the landscape in a series of agreements negotiated with individual conservancies; an example of an NGO that needs to work closely with LCA to support efforts at better coordination and collaboration across the landscape

<b>Grevys Zebra Trust</b>	Spoke to CEO Belinda Mackay	This Trust (GZT) wishes to coordinate its activities with LCA, focused around: connectivity, rangeland recovery and monitoring, Grevys zebra monitoring, general data collection and monitoring
<b>TNC (Matt Brown)</b>	No response received	TNC is a major player in Laikipia supporting the acquisition of important conservation land, as well as providing strategic grant support - e.g support to the Laikipia carbon/nature restoration project. Given their involvement in the landscape, LCA should continue to liaise closely with TNC, keeping them involved in all strategic decisions
<b>Laikipia Forum (LF)</b>	Interviewed Executive Director - Ms. Celline Achieng'	It would be worthwhile LCA developing a close(er) relationship with LWF as part of the process of coordinating major project areas to enable collaborative scaling up; LWF has the following focus areas; wildlife, tourism, water, rangeland management, conservation education and land use - all being addressed with small scale projects but nevertheless aligning with some of the key focus areas for LCA; in particular LWF has significant partnerships in the water management sector (Mount Kenya Ewaso Water Partnership, Water Resource User Associations, Community Forest Associations) that will form an important component of the recommended water masterplan; similarly the LWF played a leading role in the developing the Laikipia tourism plan given they host the Laikipia Tourism Association,
<b>Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)</b>	Interviewed Aloyce Gonzaga Lekuton - Regional Director.	NRT has supported the establishment of community conservancies with establishment of organizations, development of land use/management plans, rangelands management, education and water, carbon project, payment of staff and security staff and operations costs. Lessons learnt include: transitioning to Community land management committees hasn't been easy, it's difficult for members to fundraise on their own for lack of capacity; security, especially against external aggressors needs to be strengthened; need to diversify conservation funding to get direct budget support by County Governments (for instance NRT is working with Samburu, Laikipia & Isiolo County Governments to pass Conservation laws); and the need for technical/vocational training of the youth to diversify revenue sources. NRT seeks to continue collaboration with LCA given the community conservancies are members of NRT.
<b>Henry Van Der Does</b>	Met with Henry on multiple occasions to understand the programme he is leading on behalf of LCA	This programme has yet to gain real traction amongst the membership, but is making steady progress having completed the pre-feasibility stage and now embarking on the feasibility study - hoped to be completed within the next nine months (December 2024), funded by TNC; interventions could start happening next year; very important that this project is coordinated closely with the Rhino Range Expansion project; also important to note that project will be very difficult to implement in the absence of adequate security/enforcement of land tenure