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Summary

Prior to conducting a baseline survey in 14 communities of the North West Region of Cameroon where the project 'In Search of Common Ground' would be executed by MBOSCUDA, it was agreed that expert interviews be conducted to inform the design of the study. The major objective of the expert interview was to gather information that would inform the design of questionnaires for baseline survey with emphasis on the agro-pastoral system, causes of farmer-grazer conflicts, severity of the conflicts and mitigation practices adopted by the stakeholders in reducing the incidence of conflicts among farmers and grazers. The findings would also go to increase the validity of the baseline survey through the generation of complementary, reliable and in-depth data from the experts. Expert interviews were conducted with 28 knowledgeable experts drawn from five (5) administrative divisions (Mezam, Momo, Bui, Boyo and Donga Mantung) of the North West Region of Cameroon. Among these experts were farmers, grazers, administrators, traditional authorities and delegates of technical ministries.

The analysis shows that food crops and cattle production are carried out on separate pieces of unofficially allocated land. Cattle rearing is a free range activity principally carried out by sedentary pastoralists. Cattle owned by women and youths are protected in household heads’ herds. Other small ruminants (sheep, goats, etc) are also reared and are responsible for some damages on crops hence conflict. Female crop farmers mostly carry out agricultural activities (crops grown include beans, potato, maize and some vegetables). Some of the Mbororos on their side are also involved in backyard agriculture where they hire labour from the camp of crop farmers for agricultural activities. Cases of alliance farming were registered in some of the conflict communities of Baijong (Fundong) & Ashong (Batibo), Binsnha (Nkambe) and Nyengno (Mbengwi). This is particularly so in transhumance areas like Nyengno where some farmers and grazers agreed on a win-win situation over the use of natural resources especially land and water. Success stories were also reported in Kedjom Ketingo (Mezam) where night paddocking led to significant increases in the production of vegetable (huckleberries) as well as contributing significantly in reducing farmer-grazer conflicts. Night paddocking followed by farming on the premises around the habitats of Mbororo grazers are other cases where livestock and crop production are associated. Yields are generally reported to be very high in these situations because of the cow dung. The use of improved pastures in animal husbandry is very limited though isolated cases were reported in Baijong, Baba II and Binsnha.

The causes of these conflicts are many and principally human. The farmers, grazers, nature and the policy environment are all responsible for the causes of the farmer-grazer conflicts in the areas covered by the study. For instance, the grazers could be held responsible for the destruction of crops by cattle, negligence of herdsman, failure to construct cattle proof fences, retaliation, attitude of elite grazers, nonchalant habit of some pastoralists and the invasion of pastures by other cattle in communal grazing areas. On the other hand, the farmers could also be held accountable for blocking or destroying water points, encroaching into grazing land, failing to construct cattle proof fences, portraying a dominant power attitude towards the grazers as well as that of some elite farmers. Furthermore, the policy environment or its application for farmer-grazer conflict is not conducive for the resolution or limitation of conflict. The agro-pastoral commission does not perform all functions attributed to it and funds are not allocated for their functioning by the state as required by the law of 1974. The persistence of farmer-grazer conflicts, in some situations, might be an economic opportunity to the agro-pastoral commission members. In this situation, the financial burden is borne by farmers and grazers who are unlawfully forced to satisfy the economic interest and functioning of the agro-pastoral commissions.

Moreover, there is pressure on the use of natural resources due to growth in human and cattle population. The pressure on the use of land depletes the fertility of the soil and demands more space thereby pushing farmers to go in search of fertile soils in grazing areas hence conflicts.

Farmer-grazer conflicts have devastating effects on humans and particularly the property of the disputing parties. This is characterized by incidences of cattle injuries, poisoning of animals, and the destruction of crops and in extreme cases the development of dominating power attitude by the crop farmers against the Mbororo grazers or the manifestation of financial capability of the herders over the crop farmers. Furthermore, some sedentary Mbororo grazers were displaced from their homes or community due to farmer-grazer conflicts.
Stakeholders use Dialogue Platforms, farmer-grazer committees, traditional council, the judiciary and the agro-pastoral commission to resolve farmer-grazer conflicts in the area of study. The agro-pastoral commission and the judiciary are the legal entities officially mandated to resolve farmer-grazer conflicts or examine the criminal acts resulting from such conflicts respectively. However, the former three conflict resolution options are considered attempts for amicable settlements highly encouraged by the experts including the agro-pastoral commissions. Mitigation through the agro-pastoral commission and judiciary are often very costly to the disputing parties and more so reported to be inefficient. This is why other emerging conflict resolution strategies such as the use of dialogue platforms and farmer-grazer committees emerged.

Recommendations

Future studies in the North West region of Cameroon should provide more quantitative statistics on farmer-grazer conflicts. Such studies should prioritize the causes of conflicts, their severity and (preferred) mitigation practices. More details should be provided on how conflicts could be associated to the current land tenure system, resource extortion by the agro-pastoral commission, cattle and agricultural production data and the characteristics of the agro-pastoral system. It will also be of great importance for a gender perspective to be given to future studies in the subject matter. The disaggregation of gender data will provide information on ways of better providing solutions to disfavoured persons in situations of conflicts. Meanwhile, the following recommendations could guide the project implementation.

In addition to issues related to the design of baseline survey questionnaire, the following be taken into consideration during the implementation of the project “In search of Common Grounds”:

- Organize exchange visits to learn about the functioning of Dialogue platforms and pasture improvement programs in communities where these exist. It may also pay to share the experience in Baijong where stakeholders agreed to use land in what can be described as communal alliance farming;
- Organize sensitization campaigns to create awareness on the consequences of conflict and encourage mutual existence and equal right over natural resources;
- Advocate for the smooth functioning of the Agro-pastoral commission with emphasis on budgeting their running cost in the state budget of the Ministry of Lands and the full fulfilment of their functions as required by the law;
- Some of the farmer-grazer conflict hotspots earlier identified for the project may be revisited because major hotspots have changed over time in some of the sub-divisions. For instance, Pinyin is a major conflict hotspot than Akum and Baba II in Santa.
- The land tenure law of 1974 deprives youths from having access rights to land by allowing only those who occupied the land before then to apply for land certificates. Moreover, even if you were born before 1974, you need to show evidence that you occupied the land before 1974. This is why it is expected that any new land law (already in process) should be flexible enough allow youths access right to land. MBOSCUDA should lobby for their contributions to the new law be fully taken into consideration;
1. Context and justification

Conflict between ethnic Mbororo cattle herders and non-Mbororo subsistence farmers otherwise described as Farmer-Grazer conflict is a general phenomenon around agro-pastoral areas in the world and the North West Region of Cameroon in particular. These disputes are principally due to competition over the use of land and water resources for agricultural and non-agricultural use (Rashid, 2012; Kelsey & Knox, 2012), increase in human & animal population (Gefu & Kolawole, 2002) as well as resource access rights, inadequacy of grazing resources, values, cultures & beliefs.

The Mbororo Cultural and Development Organisation (MBOSCUDA) and international partners (Village Aid, EU, Comic Relief, etc.) have been working relentlessly to mitigate this problem in Cameroon and the North West region especially. The recent initiative targets 14 communities in the North West Region of Cameroon.

This current initiative under the caption ‘In Search of Common Ground' is a project to reduce conflict between Mbororo cattle herders and subsistence crop farmers in the region. It intends to set up and encourage agricultural interventions (alliance farming) that can help reduce conflict and the scramble over scarce resources. It hopes to address two fundamental gaps in existing services: the exclusion of marginalized Mbororos in poverty reduction strategies in Cameroon and failure to recognize their collective rights to access land, security of persons and property and the improvement of grazing conditions. This has created barriers to accessing vital services and resources like land and water.

Secondly, existing service provision for addressing farmer/grazer conflict (the agro-pastoral commission established by the Farmer/Grazer Act of 1978) is known to be inefficient. It does not address the root causes of farmer/grazer conflicts but rather increases competition and conflict between farmers and grazers through the encouragement of litigation and compensation. Several mitigation practices have been adopted across the globe and even in some communities of the North West Region of Cameroon to mitigate farmer-grazer conflicts (see literature review annexed).

The present expert interview carried out under the leadership of a consultant (Nchinda Valentine), following a competitive selection process undertaken by MBOSCUDA and village aid, hopes to lay down the groundwork for the successful implementation of the project “In Search of Common Grounds”. The objectives set forth for the expert interviews are presented below.
1.1 Objectives of Expert Interview

The goal of the expert interview was to inform the development of the project/indicators and an increase in the validity of the baseline survey through the generation of complementary, reliable and in-depth data from a wide range of stakeholders (including the under privileged) at regional, (sub-)divisional, local and community levels.

The specific objectives of the expert Interviews would be to:

- Identify Key issues (climate, economic, social, legal, demographic and political) accounting for the severity of farmer/grazer conflict on alliance farming, equitable access to clean and safe water, water conservation and the livelihood of herders and farmers in the project catchment area;

- Identify stakeholders’ (farmers, grazers, administration, traditional leaders, Ardo’s) behaviour and agro-pastoral system practices in conflict prone situations in the project area

- Identify current stakeholder practices in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, sustainable natural resource management, equitable access to clean and safe water in the project catchment areas

- Identify inclusive (gender equity and under privilege considerations) and empowerment practices or lapses under farmer/ grazer conflict prone areas for better gender mainstreaming and analysis of gender disaggregated data

- Identify the strengths, weaknesses of stakeholders, opportunities and threats in Mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, access to clean and safe water and sustainable management of natural resources for improved livelihood of farmers and herders in the project area
1.2 Expected Output of expert interview

It is expected that upon completion of the expert interviews the following outputs would have been achieved:

- A two page summary of the main findings of the expert interviews

- Knowledge acquired through expert interviews would be documented in a report with highlights on the causes and effects of conflict on livelihood or Key indicators (climate, economic, social, legal, demographic and political) accounting for the severity of farmer/grazer conflict on alliance farming, equitable access to clean and safe water, water conservation and the livelihood of herders and farmers in the project catchment area;

- Key indicators required to measure project implementation progress, outcome and impact are available and used by the principal evaluator in designing baseline survey questionnaires

- Stakeholders behaviour, practices and agro-pastoral systems in the context of farmer-grazer conflicts documented

- Stakeholder coping practices in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, sustainable natural resource management, equitable access to clean and safe water documented

- Inclusive and empowerment practices or lapses under farmer/grazer conflict prone areas documented for better gender and equality mainstreaming

- The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of major stakeholders involved in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, access to sustainable natural resource, equitable access to clean and safe water documented, empowerment of the beneficiaries identified.
2. Methodology

2.1 Areas covered and experts interviewed

The expert interviews were conducted with 28 knowledgeable experts in the subject matter drawn from five (5) administrative divisions (Mezam, Momo, Bui, Boyo and Donga Mantung) or subdivisions of Santa, Mbengwi Central, Bamenda central, Nkambe, Mbven, Jakiri, Batibo, Fundong and Bamenda Central. Some of the experts were farmers and/or grazers drawn from some of the project communities such as Baba II, Baijong, Nkambe central (Konchep, Bih, Binshua) and Barare. The choices of experts from the administration, traditional authorities, grazers, crop farmers and communities (annex 3) were made to capture the scope and breadth of the research questions. The study was carried out over a period of six weeks running from November 18 to December 31, 2013.

2.2 Topics discussed during the expert interviews

The topics discussed with the experts during the interview could be grouped into four: agro-pastoral system practices in the conflict prone areas; causes of conflict in the retained areas; mitigation practices or strategies used by the stakeholders in the resolution or limiting of farmer-grazer conflicts. The last point on the guide (annex 2) focused on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats surround the mitigation of farmer grazer conflicts in the North West Region of Cameroon. A Review of secondary literature and field observations during the study also beefed this last section of the interview guide.

2.3 Analysis of expert interviews

Data gathered from 28 experts were documented in the form of transcripts following the format of the interview guide. The interviews recorded were also replayed to capture some key issues raised by the experts in question. The data from all the experts concerning each of the thematic area discussed were then analyzed qualitatively with the help of Nvivo 10. The analysis was also enriched with literature reviewed. The analysis focused on key issues discussed with the experts such as the agro-
pastoral system, causes, severity, policy environment and a SWOT analysis of the farmer-grazer conflict in the North West Region of Cameroon.

2.4 Limitations of the expert interview

Generally, the expert interviews went on excellently well as planned without major incidences recorded. However, a few experts earlier identified were unable to receive the research team because they were busy with official assignments. This was the case with some Senior Divisional Officers and traditional authorities that were committed at the time of the interview. Nevertheless, such appointments were re-scheduled or the said authorities delegated their subordinates to entertain the research team.

The interviews were intended to be captured using audio recorders. However, some of the experts interviewed denied that the interview be captured with an audio recorder. The risk of this refusal could have been loss of important detailed information from the experts. However, in situations where the experts denied recording during the interview, everything discussed was noted with all the necessary details.

3. Findings of expert interviews

3.1. Agro-pastoral system in conflict prone areas of the North West Region of Cameroon

A range of crops are cultivated essentially by crop farmers in the conflict areas such as maize, cocoyam, yams, plantains, solanum potato, beans, sweet potato, cassava and vegetable. Livestock production covers a range of animals that happen to be responsible for the destruction of crops leading to conflicts. Cattle, sheep and horses are reared principally by the Mbororos. Other small ruminants including goats, pigs and fowls are reared. Though cattle are essentially responsible for most of the crop destruction registered, small ruminants were also held accountable for some of the destructions recorded.
Cattle rearing activities are principally carried out by the sedentary pastoralist called the Mbororos on the hillsides in communities where they are settled. Livestock production is principally extensive (free range). Women subsistence crop farmers carry out agricultural activities essentially. Some of the Mbororos on their side are also involved in backyard agriculture where they hire labour from the camp of crop farmers for agricultural activities. On the other hand, cases of alliance farming were registered in Bajong & Ashong (Batibo), Binshua (Nkambe) and Ngyenombo (Mbengwi). This is particularly so in transhumance areas like Ngyenombo where farmers and grazers agree for a win-win situation over the use of natural resources especially land and water. The outcome is largely beneficial to both farmers and cattle rearers because cow dung fertilizes crop production and cattle graze on plant residues thereby permitting the optimization of the use of resources and increase productivity.

“...at times there is agreement between farmers and the grazers over the use of the same piece of land for grazing and cultivation. When this happens, the farmers cultivate and harvest before the cattle are brought in for grazing. The agreement is officiated by the administration through the Divisional Officer who indicates the grazing period and that of farming. During transhumance, the cattle are taken to Bonkisu, Itung and Baisung [transhumance communities]. Fencing of concessions with barbed wire, difficulties in accessing water and improving pasture for cattle remains a great problem to the grazers. Dialogue with farmers has been initiated and is often rewarding to both parties.

On the other side, night paddocking followed by farming on the premises around the habitats of Mbororo grazers are other cases where livestock and crop production are associated. Yields are very high in this situation and the crops grown are basically beans, potato, maize and some vegetables. Success stories were reported in Kedjom Ketingo where night paddocking led to significant increases in the production of vegetable (huckleberries) as well as contributing significantly in reducing farmers-grazers conflict.

The use of improved pastures in animal husbandry is very limited though isolated cases were reported in Bajjong, Baba II and Binshua. This techniques of pasture improvement were introduced to the grazers by different institutions including MBOSCUDA, Heifer International Cameroon and the Netherlands Development Organization among others found in literature. The MINEPIA service also promote the use of improved pastures.
Generally, grazers that do not have access to improved pasture, or, are exposed to dry season shock move out of the community grazing areas in search for grazing premises in what is described as transhumance. Transhumance periods range from the last week of December to April as the case may be. This consists of moving cattle to lowland areas where there is access to grazing fields and water. Cattle move to the areas where agricultural activities were carried out previously. Agricultural activities (except those in lowland areas) are generally carried out between March and December after which room is given for transhumance activities.

3.2. Youths and women in farmer-grazer conflicts of the North West Region of Cameroon

The analysis of the agro-pastoral system and practices of livestock and crop production activities show that men, women and youths carry out these activities differently. However, the fundamental gender issues surrounding farmer-grazer conflict landscape in the North West Region of Cameroon would be to show how the practices empower women and youths in farmer-grazer conflicts prone areas.

Fundamentally, cattle production is essentially owned and carried out by men with youths and children serving as herdsman. The role of women in cattle rearing is only limited to milking of the cows. However, it must be noted that where women own cattle, they are included in the herd of the male household heads. The case argued by Baba II expert describes the prevailing situation as to how youths and women are protected among the Mbororo communities. For instance, one of the experts puts it that:

“... cattle owned by youths and women are included in the herds of household heads. It is estimated that in 80 cows, 30 are for the youths and women. Girls are given a cow (or cows) at marriage provided they would be husband is of good moral standing. However, the elderly take the lead to ensure that youths have access to land and exploit on same piece of land as the other Mbororos. However, there are no consensus strategies accepted to both Mbororos and crop farmers to permit youths have access to land resources”. Furthermore, another expert felt that “the rules aimed at protecting youths and women are general and no special measures are taken. With us in our community, we have

---

1 Some transhumance communities identified include Nguyenmbo, Mbaw plain, Ako plain, Ndumbu, Baisong, Bonkisong, Babungo, etc.
The inclusion of the cattle owned by youths and women in those of the household heads is done to protect and ensure sustainability and proper management of the cattle. This could be considered as part of their culture that targets to protect the interest of the women and youths as well as the valuable asset (cattle). Cattle is “everything” they have got to pass on from one generation to the other. This is one of the reasons why the cattle would be passed on to a girl at marriage whose husband is supposedly “responsible”. Meanwhile, communal grazing is a common practice among the Mbororo grazers and each of the grown up is given the possibility to graze.

On the other hand, the laws regulating agro-pastoral activities are not tailored to give special preference to youths and women. This is particularly the case with the law of 1978 regulating agro-pastoral activities. Furthermore, the law regulating the acquisition of land does not favour the youths as

*“the 1974 national law on lands states that all who occupied land before 1974, have the right to apply for land certificates. The law as of now deprives youths from owning landed property because they were not born before 1974. However, there are provisions in the law to apply for concession based on a well elaborated project”* (Barrister Von).

However, capacity building programs are provided by public and private institutions to improve on the technical know-how of youths and women in the region. Special pastures improvement programs are being promoted to improve milking in cows by SNV (Menchum, Ngoketunjia and Donga Mantung divisions). MBOSCUDA on their side has trained and empower women in livelihood improvement activities including show-case drama.

3.3. Causes of farmer-grazer conflicts in the North West Region of Cameroon

The North West region is known for conflicts resulting from friction between the grazers and crop farmers of the region. These farmer-grazer conflicts are characterized by violence, abuses, threats, power dominance with all the consequences that it has on the population and disputing parties. Discussions held with experts including farmers, grazers and the divisional/sub-divisional delegate of agriculture, livestock, and administrators revealed that farmer/grazer conflicts in the North-West
Region in general and in particular, the conflict hotspots of (Mezam, Bui, Momo, Boyo and Donga-Mantung divisions) emanate from the following sources:

**Destruction of crops by cattle:** Cattle generally graze extensively or in paddocks. Extensive grazing is usually left in the hands of youths who serve as herdsmen. Negligence on the side of herdsmen, sometimes, lead to cattle moving out of track into crop farms thereby destroying crops. This negligence on the side of herdsmen also happens when they are hired to accompany cattle to the market or transhumance areas. For instance, conveying cattle from Donga Mantung Division to Bamenda (Mezam, Division) where the major regional cattle market is located. As they move along cattle corridors and road, the cattle destroy crops on their part if not controlled. In some situations, the cattle break through fences into the crop fields where they feed on crops.

**Negligence of herdsmen:** Herdsmen who are generally youths are responsible for taking care and directing cattle as they graze on grazing fields, are transported to the market, move to transhumance communities. These hired workers sometimes fail to take their responsibility thereby permitting cattle who cannot control themselves to break bounds into farmland thereby destroying crops as earlier explained.

**Demographic pressure** and an increase in the demand for food, meat and water: Competition over the use of land and water is meant to meet the demand for the needs of inhabitants of the communities and beyond. Farmers and grazers compete to use these resources to produce crops or rear animals in order to generate income required to meet their own basic needs. Where one party steps on the toes of the other, it becomes a source of conflict.

**Encroachment by farmers into grazing land:** Demographic pressure and competition over the use of land both for habitation and farming accounts for the encroachment of farmers into grazing land. This is further explained by the need for more grazing land as the population of cattle has also increased over the years. There is the need for more space for grazing and farming alike. Though this problem is seen from the perspective of farmers encroaching into grazing land, it is just a consequence of the farmer-grazer conflicts failing to map out these lands to meet the needs of the population as required by the law of 1978 regulating farming and grazing activities in Cameroon and the North West Region in particular.

**Failure to construct cattle proof fences:** Some farmers and grazers fail to construct cattle proof fences thereby exposing farmlands to cattle or allowing these cattle to step out of grazing land to feed on crops. When this happens, it may provoke conflict.
Blockage or destruction of water points/catchment: Farmers also compete with the grazers over the use of water for farming and grazing. In some communities, farmers carry on farming activities around water points where grazing activities also take place. In some situations, water points are blocked hence conflict.

In search for fertile ground: Our analysis following interviews with experts also show that the encroachment of farmers into grazing land can also be explained by the fact that the fertility of farmlands have dropped over the years. They then seek to move to grazing areas where the soil is more fertile as a result of grazing activities carried out in such locations over the years.

Retaliation: When cattle destroy crops, the crop farmers in some circumstances and out of frustration, retaliate by poisoning, inuring or even killing the cattle. In Baba II for instance, the crop farmers destroyed a water catchment that was constructed for the Mbororo community from own contribution and external funding. Retaliation also occurs when the decision of the agro-pastoral commission does not favour the crop farmers either because the where influenced financially by the herdsmen or out of sentimental judgment. These are all retaliatory actions that are criminal and not recommended.

Economic interest: The members of some of the agro-pastoral commission are reported to have economic interest in the sustained existence of farmer-grazer conflicts especially as their functioning is supported financially by the parties in dispute. One of the DOs [name withheld] described the situation as follows:

“There are situations where some DOs take upon themselves to go to the field without being accompanied by the other members of the agro-pastoral commission. There is the situation of a farmer whose crops valued at 1,000,000fcfa were destroyed by cattle and a DO went to the field single handedly and got a cow from the grazer in question. He then bullied at the farmer and cared less about the event because he had already collected bribe.

On the other hand, lawyers come in to cause grazers to file in complaints because of financial interest even when amicable settlements have been agreed upon. They give the impression that the agro-pastoral commission is out to extort money through amicable settlement. Consider this example: A grazer’s sheep destroyed the crops of eleven (11) farmers and the farmers ushered the cattle/sheep to the DO’s office. Upon discussing with the disputing parties, the grazer agreed to pay the farmers 712,900fcfa. When the date for settlement reached, instead of the grazer settling the farmers the said amount, he instead brought a petition written by a lawyer. The matter was taken up to the SDO who examined the report of the agro-pastoral commission just to
realize that the grazer had earlier agreed for an amicable settlement. When asked why he could not settle the issue as earlier agreed rather than follow what the lawyer is vying for, the grazer had this to say: “when those lawyers write, does one read again?”. Behold, the lawyers do not do a job like this for free. The grazer paid for the services and in significant sums of money. In the situation cited, the SDO ordered the grazer to compensate for the crops. You see how much time and resources were wasted!

The services of the judiciary are not free of charge indeed. The barrister interviewed agreed with this as he declared that justice, though meant to be free, is not for the poor. The reason why amicable settlement was highly encouraged by all the experts including the legal person interviewed.

**Dominance attitude and Power relation:** The relationship between the crop farmers and the grazers (Mbororo) range from a very cordial one as it is the case in the transhumance community of Ngyenmbo to a strained one in Nkambe central. Where this relationship is strained, one of the experts declared that the “…natives have nascent hatred for grazers [Mbororas]. “They are seen as second hand citizens, the reason why they [Natives] keep on chasing them [Mbororas] out of the grazing land they occupy”. The attitudes of some of the Mbororo-grazers are not also appreciated by the farmers as declared:

“The pastoralist are very stubborn and don’t like to take care of their animals. When the animals destroy crops few of them are willing to negotiate with us the farmers. The act occurs repeatedly because they are stubborn and don’t care about food crop production. Some of them prefer to go and pay greater amount of money to the government administration instead of compensating the farmer whose crops have been destroyed”.

On the other hand, some grazers use their financial powers to influence decisions of the agro-pastoral commissions in their favour as expressed by the expert quoted above. When this happens, it strains the relationship between the grazers and the farmers.

**Elite farmers/grazers:** Some of these elites are big farmers and when land is allocated to them, they use it for other reasons and then encroach into areas that are not theirs. These elite somehow count on their financial or political powers to claim large piece of land against the interest of the poor farmers.

**Nonchalant attitude of some pastoralists:** This category of herders feel they cannot negotiate with farmers and rather think of bribing the administration or the judiciary as the way forward. These are those who count on their financial powers over the crop farmers who are reported to
be economically weak to challenge the latter. Some experts from the administration describe the atmosphere that reins between the grazers and farmers as follows:

“The relationship between the grazers and crop farmers is friendly but becomes very complicated in some situations when conflict exists over the use of land”. Another expert feels “…there are some grazers that are good and are working amicably with farmers. They even go to report themselves to the farmer when their animals destroy crops to seek for an amicable solution. They are in the minority but a majority of grazers still feel they will use the administration to subjugate the farmers. Farmers are cordial towards the grazers and are willing to work with them”.

Land tenure system and land ownership claims by the non-Mbororo “natives” farmers/grazers who claim that all the hills around their villages are owned by the community and can cultivate where and whenever they want.

Invasion of improved pasture paddock within community grazing land: Conflict is not only between the farmers and the grazers. Few cases of conflict were recorded among the Mboror-grazers themselves over the use of community grazing resources. This was particularly the case in situations whereby cattle of one grazer break through into an improved paddock of another fellow Mbororo grazer. This also happens between the crop farmers that happened to be grazers and/or farmers.

Wrong application of the law: Some experts hold that the wrong application of the law in itself is the persistent cause of conflict in the region. The agro-pastoral commission is reported to have neglected two of its functions to dwell only on farmer-grazer conflicts. “Addressing the first two functions would completely limit or eradicate farmer-grazer-conflicts”, one of the experts claimed.

The causes of farmer-grazer conflicts enumerated above are responsible for the numerous shocks that the farmers like the grazers have on their livelihood. The section that follows captures the severity of these conflicts on the household and community at large.

3.4. Severity of farmer-grazer conflicts on livelihood of disputing parties in the North West Region of Cameroon

Though most of the experts interviewed reported a drop in the number of conflicts reported in their areas, the situation is still critical in others. For instance, the Livestock department of Donga
Mantung registered over 500 conflict cases for the last three years. The severity or impact of these conflicts on the livelihood could be very devastating. The section below provides some livelihood shocks emanating from farmer-grazer conflicts. The effects of these conflicts range from social to economic shocks as presented below.

**Economic shocks:** The economic shocks on household could be traced from the loss of crops and animals that are worth much money to the disputing parties. In situations where the agro-pastoral commissions must intervene in the resolution of conflicts, disputing parties are charged for the services to assess damages caused to the crops and animal. The transportation of members of the agro-pastoral commission to the field depending on the distance and accessibility ranges between fcfa 15,000 to 100,000. All the parties concerned pay the said amount and in cases where farmers are unable to pay their own share of the commissions' charges, the grazer bears the entire burden. These charges by the commission are normally supposed to be borne by the state budget.

The victims of farmer-grazer conflicts also incur property losses or damages. In Batibo for instance, it was noted that goats destroyed crops which were evaluated by the agro-pastoral commission to worth a million francs (1,000,000 fcfa). In Ashong (one of the targeted communities), two (2) cattle valued at 600,000Fr were killed in 2010 as a result of farmer-grazer conflicts. In Akum, a grazer compensated farmers for crop destruction valued at 712,900fcfa even after spending money and time following the intervention of the lawyers.

**Social impact:** Although the relationship between farmers and grazers in areas where no conflicts exist might be cordial some dominance relationship exists in most of the communities. The crop farmers consider the grazers (Mbororos) to be visitors and exercise their dominance powers on them. In other situations, the Mbororos are bound to pay allegiance to the Fons or chiefs as the case may be. For instance, in Baba II Mbororo-grazers claim to pay the sum of one hundred and fifty thousands (150,000) fcfa to village chief annually. In addition, a young grazer in the same community claimed to have paid the a sum of five hundred thousand (500,000) francs cfa before he was allowed to use an area of 600m² as a starting point for his own home. This is a piece of land that was used by his family for over 50 years.
Furthermore, grazers collectively pay allegiance to village chief in transhumant areas such as in Ngenombo, Ashong and Njati zones respectively. Another example of extortion is seen in Nkambe central sub-division where cattle grazer make double allegiance payment to two village heads in Bih and Binshua respectively.

**Forced displacement:** The aftermaths of these farmers/grazers conflicts in some cases is that many families lose their homes and are forced to move out to a new environment. The affected parties end up becoming refuges in their own communities. An example is a recent farmers/grazer conflict situation in Baijong (Boyo, division) where some Mbororo grazers’ compounds were destroyed by a mob of neighboring farming community. In Mamba Kungi in Nkambe central sub-division, the Mbororos were chased out of their compounds and the community at large. Only the non-Mbororo grazers were allowed to graze in that community. However, this did not address the prevailing farmer-grazer conflict as the expert states that “Although pastoralist Mbororos have been sent away from the village by native farmers, the relationship between natives’ pastoralists and farmers is far from cordial. There are only four local pastoralist but they are always in conflict with farmers”.

**Neighborhood conflict:** Border and inter-village conflicts emanate as a result of farmer-grazer conflicts. This was the situation that happened between the grazers and crop farmers from Baba II and Alateneng in Santa sub-division. In Nkambe area, grazers from neighboring Nigeria cross over to graze in Cameroon. This sometimes leads to tension especially when conflict emanates. It therefore put the neighboring grazers and their Cameroon counterparts at loggerheads.

**Food security concerns:** Farmers who are essentially women are scared to grow crops in conflict areas. This goes to reduce the volume of crops produced. This affects women mostly since agriculture is an issue of women in the region, The destruction of crops and displacement of grazers goes to raise food insecurity concerns. Crop and livestock productivity is hampered by recurrent conflicts between farmers and grazers as a result of competition over the use of land and water, natural resource depletion, non-demarcation of grazing land from farmland, misunderstanding and lack of dialogue between farmers and grazers, etc.
3.5. Policy environment of farmer-grazer conflicts in the North West Region of Cameroon

**Acquisition of land:** In Cameroon unlike in Burkina Faso, land is state property unless one acquires a titled deed for it, permit or concession as the case may be. Every Cameroon without exception has the right to acquire land following the official procedure. In some communities, the Mbororos are perceived as outsiders and do not have right over what is described as community land. On the other hand, the traditional authority and the so-called “grafee” claim over land ownership is also illegal. The Mbororos on their side do not also attempt to acquire this land following the procedures in place.

Nevertheless, The land tenure system in Cameroon is considered somehow cumbersome for private individuals to acquire title deeds because it is a costly process and have long administrative procedures that only the wealthy can afford. According to a United States Agency for International Development country profile on Cameroon’s property rights, titled “Property Rights and Resource Governance”, “only approximately 3% of rural land is registered, mostly in the names of owners of large commercial farms”(Nfor, 2013). This is not too far from the 5% of registered land in the North West reported by one of the experts interviewed.

**Legality of conflict resolution strategies adopted:** The experts from the administration, law, private institutions, farmers and grazers unanimously agree that amicable settlement should be highly considered in a situation of conflict. Unfortunately, amicable settlement is not legal binding. The only “officially” recognized body mandated to resolve farmer-grazer conflicts is the agro-pastoral commission. Furthermore, the services of the court are also recognized when criminal acts are associated to conflicts in question. In the case of farmer-grazer conflict, there might be property destruction. This becomes a criminal offence that can be tried by the court. However, it must be noted that the criminal court tries only criminal offences and the agro-pastoral commission is responsible for determining payments related to property destroyed. The use of dialogue platforms, traditional councils or specialised committees is considered an attempt for amicable settlement that is highly encouraged by all the parties involved including the legal expert who concludes that:

“The intervention of traditional councils in the settlement of farmer-grazer conflicts have no jurisdiction in the entertainment of the conflicts. If they do so, it can be considered as an attempt to amicably resolve the matter...
within the community but not that they are legally justified to do that. The chiefs and Ardos are members of the agro-pastoral commissions so they cannot go and set up their own commission again to settle land matters. The setting up and functioning of dialogue platforms to mediate in farmer-grazer conflict situations is laudable initiative to resolve their conflicts. In fact, this initiative may be coming up because the system in place cannot properly solve their problem”.

It is important to note that in the conflict resolution process referred to by the legal expert, local arrangements are made to resolve farmer-grazer conflicts at the community level. These problems are taken up to the agro-pastoral commission only when local initiatives fail. The expert considers these initiatives laudable but not legal as the law of 1978 recognizes only the agro-pastoral commission as the entity eligible to intervene in case of farmer-grazer conflicts.

**Challenges in the application of the law:** The law regulating agro-pastoral activities in Cameroon provides for mapping out grazing and farm lands. Consequently, an area is called a grazing area or farmland only when it has been allocated by the agro-pastoral commission. Unfortunately, in all the subdivisions of the North West region there are no well-defined grazing areas with maps as required by the law. These are the responsibilities of the ministry of lands that happens to be a member of the commission. Furthermore, the agro-pastoral commissions do not have running budgets due to the fact that the ministry of lands fails to budget for these activities as stipulated by the law of 1978 regulating the functioning of the commission. The commission tend to unlawfully shift the financial burden to the disputing parties.

**Unlawful extortion of funds from disputing parties:** Funds are extorted by the different stakeholders from the farmers and grazers in situations of conflicts. For instance, one of the experts from the technical ministry puts it this way:

“...the use of the agro-pastoral commission in conflict resolution can be very expensive. The parties in dispute have the responsibility to cover the expenses of the commission. The DO decides how much the parties have to pay. When this happens, each service head is given between FCFA 10,000 to 15,000 each for the appraisal mission”. Another, grazer among others, that they “…spent money in resolving these cases. We have to pay various charges and often travel long distances. Resolving these conflicts really deplete our resources”, he continued.

This is unlawful! This is also one of the reasons why amicable settlements are encouraged because failure to settle matters amicably would require a lot of resources and time especially when it matter goes to the court. The justice system is normally associated with little or no cost. However, because
of the prevailing situation of the police, investigators and lawyers, complainants are often required to pay a service fee for the matter to be examined.

3.6. Farmer-Grazer conflict mitigation strategies in the North West Region of Cameroon

The following five farmer-grazer conflict mitigation practices were identified to abate conflicts;

• Dialogue platforms
• Farmer-grazer committees
• Traditional council
• Agro-pastoral commission
• Judiciary

The Dialogue Platform (DP) was identified as an alternative to the agro-pastoral commission. The promoters or advocates of this platform or forum deemed it necessary because of the argument that agro-pastoral commission was inefficient in the way farmer-grazer conflicts were handled. Institutions that have experimented this approach include MBOSCUDA and the Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV). The latter instituted the DP after reflecting on the prevailing farmer grazer-conflict in the North West Region. The Dialogue Platform defined by one of the experts as “…a forum where farmers and grazers exchange on issues or problems of farmer-grazer conflicts in order to come out with amicable settlements”. Despite some challenges reported (resistance of the administration to accept the role of DPs), the approach has been successfully used in mitigating conflicts between 2006 and 2010. Studies carried out by SNV for instance, reveal that this approach has led to a 40% decrease in farmer-grazer conflicts in Donga Mantung, Ngoketunjia and Menchum divisions respectively. In addition to resolving farmer-grazer conflicts, the DP also takes preventive measures as it is a forum where the principal parties in conflict meet to seek solutions to their problems. The experts consider this to be an opportunity to sustainably solve conflicts:

“When there is dialogue, farmers and grazers start seeing themselves as complementary. The output of dialogue platform leads them to alliance farming. Grazers see farmers as those they can benefit from in terms of access to crop residues after harvest. Farmers equally see grazers as those from whom they can benefit in
Another local initiative identified in Bui division was a constituted farmer-grazer committee by the youth wing of the village Development Association in one of the project conflict areas (Barare, in Jakiri Sub Division). The idea to constitute this committee stems from the sustained prevalence of farmer-grazer conflicts in the community. The youths constituted the committee that organizes sensitisation campaigns as well as resolve some farmer-grazer conflicts. This plausible initiative was recorded only Barare and was initiated because of the magnitude of farmer-grazer conflicts in the area. In Baijong that happens to be one of the targeted communities, the farmers, grazers, Ardo, Chief and the administration agreed over the use of a conflict area alternately for grazing and farming. This is what can be described as “communal alliance farming”. This arrangement curb down the conflict that often occur on the piece of land.

The traditional councils in various conflict prone communities are other forums through which conflicts are handled. It is made up the Village Head, some traditional notables and the representatives of the pastoralist community, in some situations, as it was the case in Baijong. It has no judicial premise and therefore considered as an attempt to resolve conflicts amicably. However, the results are not generally satisfactory to all parties especially the pastoralists in Baba II and Baijong just to mention a few. In Baijong, the expert declared that

"the traditional council meets to settle farmer-grazer disputes and ensures that justice is done. Both farmers and grazers are represented in this council that works to set up a minimum acceptable balance in decision making. The administration is equally advocates for peaceful settlement amongst the litigants. By so doing, conflict cases are settled by the traditional council and in situations where the defendant is not satisfy or does abide by the decision of the traditional council, the matter is taken up to the Divisional Officer. When the case is taken up to DO, the fines levied are increased. For instance, it may be moved from fcfa 20,000 to 30,000. Alternatively, the parties may be asked to go and settle the matter amicably".

The officially recognized medium for the resolution of farmer-grazer conflict is the agro-pastoral commission set up in each (sub-)division as per the law of 1978 regulating farmer-grazer activities in Cameroon. The commission is made up of the Senior Divisional officer or the Divisional officer, the delegates of lands, technical ministries (agriculture, livestock), the Village Head (Fons) and the head of pastoralist communities (Ardo). The commission has three main functions as summarized by Barrister Fon: allocation of grazing land, permanent control over farming and grazing activities
and lastly resolution of farmer-grazer conflicts. The commission has some limits in their functioning. Two experts like others concluded from experience that

“The agro-pastoral commission is the official medium through which farmer-grazer conflicts are managed. The commission encourages amicable settlements as much as possible. Farming and grazing can and should cohabitate. This is the reason why the commission always encourages amicable settlement. The agro-pastoral commission, headed by the DO is made up of a representative of land tenure system, Sub-delegates of livestock and agriculture, chiefs and Ardos of the communities concern and notables as the situation may be. Meanwhile another expert holds that “…the agro-pastoral commission concentrates or focuses only in carrying out the last function that has to do with the resolution of farmer-grazer conflicts. They fail to carry out the first two functions whereas if those functions were properly carried out, farmer-grazer conflicts would be minimal or completely inexistence. “…the parties in conflict therefore bear the burden of sponsoring all expenses of the agro-pastoral commission geared at resolving reported farmer-grazer conflicts. In some situations, the farmer may not even have the money to pay for the intervention of the commission. Most often, the grazer would want to pay for his own and that of the farmer concerned. Of course, if this happens the farmer will be uncomfortable and the decision of the commission may be tilted towards the grazers who support most of the expenses”.

The fact that the agro-pastoral commissions do not have running budgets is pure negligence on the side of the ministry of lands that is expected to budget for these activities as stipulated by the law of 1978 regulating the functioning of the commission.

The agro-pastoral commissions exist at the sub-divisional and divisional levels headed by the senior divisional and the divisional officers respectively. The decisions of the agro-pastoral commission are also rendered enforceable by prefectoral orders following reports forwarded to the SDO by the head of the agro-pastoral commission at the divisional level. However, it must be noted that some of the decisions taken by the administration are not implemented by the parties as a results of limited resources for follow-up.

The SDO renders enforceable the decisions of the agro-pastoral commission. A prefectoral order cannot be challenged. These orders include injunctions on disputed farming or grazing land, injunction to deceased from farming or grazing activities or injunction to construct cattle proof-fences or may be to ask grazers to pay damages caused by stray animals.
The final conflict mitigation opening is the judiciary that handles only criminal aspects resulting from farmer-grazer conflicts. This is not considered the best option to follow by all the experts interviewed including a legal expert who advises as follows:

“In all conflict situations, mediation should be the first thing despite the fact that we may hold different legal positions. The worst scenario case in court or the best scenario case in court is worse off than the worse amicable settlement that we have. So, the best decision in court is worse off than the worse amicable settlement that we have. So, amicable settlements are better than legal settlement. This is particularly so because in our system, the legal environment is very complicated. In fact, it can even said that justice is for the rich. So, amicable settlements are highly encouraged”.

3.7. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats for farmer-grazer conflict mitigation in the North West Region of Cameroon

**Strengths**

- MBOSCUDA has well trained para-legals in the project areas who could be very instrumental in the delivery of field activities especially as concerns the search for common grounds for grazers and farmers;
- Some projects with related activities were earlier implemented in the past by institutions such as SNV, HPI and Mboscuda. These experiences include pasture improvement programs and dialogue platforms. Building on past experiences would enhance the implementation of the on-going project;
- Previous experiences of pasture fields exist in some of the communities. Some grazers have been trained on techniques of setting up pastures. CDENO, MBOSCUDA, SNV among others provided this training even setting up pastures in communities such as Ashong, Acha Tugi, Baba II, Baijong and Binshua. Building on this experience coupled with judicious exploitation of year round water sources could enhance the setting up of pastures;
- Constructing fences is a practice adopted by both the Mbororos and indigenous population in conflict prone areas.

**Weaknesses**
• The agro-pastoral commission does not have a running budget allocated. This is why the cost of supporting the functioning of the commission have been passed on to the disputing parties. The amount varies depending on the distance, commission’s demands. This is an irregular situation as the law of 1978 regulating its functioning clearly state that the running budget of the agro-pastoral commission should be introduced in the state budget. This in itself is a coping mechanism developed by the administration because they fail put this on state budget. The financial handicap also makes it difficult to implement decisions taken by the agro-pastoral commission or prefectural orders.
• Inability to manage pastures. Previous pasture fields introduced in some Mbororo communities were abandoned because of simple reason that cattle break into the field. This is probably a management issue that needs to be checked and rectified.
• No evidence has been established from literature and field experience where year round natural water sources have been exploited for pasture improvements as a way to mitigate farmer-grazer conflict
• The technical ministries and the administration do not monitor and report the incidence of farmer-grazer conflicts for better management. The complaints submitted by complainants are not analysed for better conflict management

Opportunities

• There is a conducive policy environment to challenge the causes of conflict in Cameroon and the North West Region in particular. The freedom to get involved by participating in the politics could be an opportunity to build on in order to face vexing problems of farmer-grazer;
• On-going and documented experience in the area of mitigating farmer-grazer conflicts exist. These experiences could be sourced to drive the project and development agenda. Some of these institutions include (but not limited to) SNV, Heifer, MBOSCUDA, Tugi Silvopastoral project, etc;
• Human right groups and legal advisers operate in the areas of the project that could be used to fight for the interest of the Mbororos in case need be;
• Water points and water catchments exist in some communities that could be used for pasture improvement especially given that some of the water points do not dry up during the dry season or periods of transhumance
• The Mbororos under-utilize the cow-dung. Experience from previous projects notably the “Pilot Project on Domestic Biogas in the Western Highlands of Cameroon” executed by HPI shows how this resource is used for generating cooking gas, manure for agriculture through the slurry as well as electricity for charging of phones and energy supply in poor households.

• Some initiatives have already been taken towards the construction and use of biogas plants in the North West region of Cameroon. SNV and HPI have both undertaken such initiatives already. Consequently, the accrued experience of SNV and HPI could be sourced. The use of trained biogas plant construction and maintenance technicians could be used for the implementation of this program.

• The climate has somehow favoured the grazers at least in few of the communities where rainfall prolonged until late November over the past three years. For instance, it rained until 15 December this year (2013). This left the fields green until January. Grazers went on transhumance later in January instead of December. Rainfall in these areas also started earlier than usual in February.

• There is some experience of alliance farming between farmers and grazers especially in transhumance areas. Capitalizing on this experience will go to enhance agricultural productivity and livestock production.

• There are ongoing reforms [at least on paper] of the Cameroon land ordinances and agropastoral code. A more acceptable and definite definition of grazing land may come out of this reforms as a result of civil society participation.

• Pasture improvement can be carried out on vast land available.

• There are technical services in the ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industry responsible for the extension of pasture improvement technologies. The technical service of MINPIA is competent and can be used for the development of pastures in the project areas. CDENO for instance is a specialized public institution whose mission includes contributing to the conservation and improvement of pastures and development of basic grazing infrastructure such as the drinking trough, cattle dips, etc.

• All experts interviewed members advocate for dialogue and amicable settlement between the farmers and grazers. They sensitize farmers and grazers to opt for an amicable settlement in case of crop destruction or attack on cattle. The grazers and farmers generally accept amicable settlements of disputes. The willingness to settle disputes outside the administrative and traditional cycles is an opportunity to build on for conflict mitigation.
Threats

- The shift of power relation from the traditional council, agro-pastoral commission to the Dialogue Platforms could be perceived as a threat because of the economic interest that the former has in situations of conflict. This should be tactfully handled with the participation of the traditional and agro-pastoral commission.

- Unpredictable climatology puts to question some of the transhumance and grazing periods ordered for in some of the communities. This experience was shared by some of the experts who witness changing periods of rainfall in the last two years that have completely distorted the transhumance period in the Momo division of the North West Region of Cameroon.

- The perception by most crop farmers generally described as villagers or indigenes that Mbororos are strangers and have no right to own land.

- Insufficient availability of wood for the construction of fences and pressure on wood for firewood is a threat to promote the construction of fences

- There is the misuse of powers by the traditional authorities (Fons and Ardos). The Fons claim ownership of land whereas it is known that all land belongs to the state unless a title is issued. Some Ardos on their side tend to hire out land for grazing.

- The use of political powers sometimes by big wigs might be a threat to the mitigation of conflict and its re-occurrence

- Dependence on the farmer-grazer commission and judiciary that are highly costly to the disputing parties

- Dialogue platforms perceived as a threat under situations where the agro-pastoral commissions’ economic interest is at stake.

4. Conclusion and way forward

The major goal of the expert interview was to lay down the groundwork for the successful implementation of the project “In Search of Common Grounds” by gathering information that would inform the development of project/indicators via a questionnaire for baseline survey. Consequently, it intended to increase the validity of the baseline survey through the generation of complementary, reliable and in-depth data from a wide range of stakeholders.
Farmer-grazer conflicts have devastating effects on humans and particularly the property of the disputing parties. This is characterized by incidences of cattle injuries, poisoning of animals, and the destruction of crops and in extreme cases the development of dominance attitude by the crop farmers against the Mbororo grazers. Similarly, some Mbororos are also displaced from their homes/community due to farmer-grazer conflicts. The causes of these conflicts are many and principally human. The farmers, grazers, nature and the policy environment are all responsible for the farmer-grazer conflicts in the areas covered by the study.

The agro-pastoral commission and the judiciary are the legal entities mandated to resolve farmer-grazer conflicts or examine the criminal acts resulting from such conflicts. This is often costly to the disputing parties and more so inefficient. Other emerging conflict resolution strategies include the use of dialogue platforms and farmer-grazer committees. The traditional council also intervenes in the resolution of conflicts at community level. Amicable settlement of conflict is highly encouraged by all the experts interviewed.

Alliance farming and improved pasture are now practiced in some communities as a way to limit farmer-grazer conflicts. Several strengths (eg, past experiences) and opportunities exist that could be used to develop conflict mitigation strategies. Improving on the weaknesses identified would also go a long way to enhance conflict resolution in the North West and the study areas in particular.

The use of the agro-pastoral commission, as a conflict resolution mechanism has not been entirely very successful in resolving farmer-grazer conflicts in the region. The government administrators who are supposed to resolve conflicts have rather used them as means to exploit farmers and grazers often-fuelling conflicts in many circumstances. This has rendered the farmers (especially women who constitute the bulk of crop farmer) and grazer poorer, more divided and uneasy able to cohabit peacefully.
4.1 Critical issues to guide project implementation

- The land tenure law of 1974 deprives youths from having access rights to land. The law of 1974 allows only those who occupied the land before then to apply for land certificates. Moreover, even if you were born before 1974, you need to show evidence that you occupied the land before 1974. This is why it is expected that any new land law should be flexible enough to also allow youths to have access right to land;

- Organize exchange visits to learn about the functioning of Dialogue platforms and pasture improvements programs in communities where these exist. It may also pay to share the experience in Baijong where stakeholders agreed to use land in what can be described as communal alliance farming;

- Organize sensitization campaigns to create awareness on the consequences of conflict and encourage mutual existence and equal right over natural resources;

- Advocate for the smooth functioning of the Agro-pastoral commission with emphasis on budgeting their running cost in the state budget of the ministry of lands as required by the law;

4.2 Key lessons learned for the baseline survey and future studies

One of the expected outcomes of the expert interview was to point out facts that need to be incorporated in the design of the baseline survey questionnaire. After examining the issues raised by the expert interview, the following key issues could be taken into consideration by the baseline survey questionnaires and eventually future studies.

1. The gender perspectives and the way farmer-grazer conflict in the North West region of Cameroon affect youths and disabled persons should be closely examined. Gender disaggregated data should characterize agricultural activities and ownership of livestock by women and possibly show how conflict affect their activities;

2. The baseline survey should gather more detailed information across the study areas emphasizing on the extent and benefits that alliance farming brings to grazers and farmers alike. The knowledge and use of plant residues in grazing activities and cow dung for biogas and manure should be quantified to show the proportion of farmers/grazers concerned;
3. The working relationship between the farmers and grazers appear to differ in some of the study areas so are the causes of farmer grazer conflicts. It may be useful to prioritize the causes, provide information on the severity of the conflict as well as inform the readers how the conflict was managed or attitudes adopted under the tense situation and policy environment;

4. It is also imperative that more quantitative information be provided to clarify some key issues related to the policy environment. Emphasis should also be laid on the land tenure system, severity of extortion of resources from parties in conflict (where this exist), cattle and agricultural production data for an average household, household structure and characteristics and

5. This opportunity should also be used to assess the visibility of MBOSCUDA and her actions on the ground. This may go a long way to help the structure to better strategize their actions in the future.
4. Annexes

5.1 Annex 1: Literature Review

Problem and causes of farmer-grazer conflict

The competition over the use of natural resources such as land & water is at the centre of sustained conflict between ethnic Mbororo cattle herders and non-Mbororo subsistence farmers around the world and the North West Region of Cameroon in particular. These disputes are principally due to competition over the use of land and water resources for agricultural and non-agricultural use (Rashid, 2012; Kelsey & Knox, 2012), increase in human & animal population (Gefu & Kolawole, 2002) as well as resource access rights, inadequacy of grazing resources, values, cultures & beliefs. Disputes over ownership of resources and climate change are also responsible for farmer-grazer conflicts (Sone, 2012; Arias and Ibanez, 2012; Ajuwon, 2004; Fasona and Omojola, 2005). For instance, the migration of the Fulbes to the South due to drought in some countries like Mali and Nigeria resulted in farmer-grazer conflicts (Fonjong et al., 2010). Davidheiser et al. (2002), Aredo (2005) and Gefu (2008) concluded that farmer-grazer clashes are due to the destruction of farmlands following seasonal movements of pastoralists and their flocks. This is especially serious in areas with high cattle and human populations, ecological and climate changes. Most causes of conflicts in the North West Region of Cameroon, particularly around Mechum and Donga Mantung administrative areas were attributed to the latter.

Sone (2012) attributes the re-occurrence of farmer-grazer conflicts in the North West region of Cameroon to scarcity of land, climate change and the ‘poor’ application of statutory laws guaranteeing landownership. This is the case when farmers’ cannot have their right to control land during contention or wealthy grazers are favoured against the law.

On the other hand, the relationship between the two categories of persons is also important. The dominant relationship characterized by power and authority within and between the Mbororos and farmers also cause conflict. Fonjong et al. (2010) see this issue in terms of power relations whereby the farmers have no financial power to influence administrative decisions than do the herdsmen in what is described as the rent seeking habit of the administration or a system marred by bribery and
corruption. In one of the district areas of the North West Region Menjo (2002) reaffirms this by concluding that “…public officials continue to take advantage of the ignorance of the local population to perpetuate their rent-seeking behaviour”.

Moritz (2013) came to the same conclusion following the fact that traditional and administrative authorities shy away from resolving farmer-grazer conflicts in Northern Cameroon because of economic interest.

The production system of both grazers and farmers, the allocation of economic rights over resources and the beliefs especially given the difference in religious beliefs and culture are other major causes of these conflicts (Blench, 1984).

Others attribute farmer-grazer tension to the absence of fair compensation framework in situations where crops mostly grown by women are damaged by herds (Davidheiser et al. 2008). The fact that female crop farmers do not have land rights obliges the grazers not only to move with their cattle because of scattered rains, but also try to displace these women. Farmers on their side block cattle routes, corridors or water points leading to cattle scourge hence conflicts. Farmers on the other hand encroach unto cattle routes and sometimes on water points thereby exposing their crops to cattle destruction (Fonjong et al., 2010). Yet, poor pasture management is also seen as the principal cause of conflict (Harsbarger and Nji, 1991). These conflicts are particularly rampant in the dry season between December to March.

The administrative policies are also blamed for causing conflict especially in the North West Region of Cameroon. Mbah (undated) examined the roots of conflict from a historic perspective and concluded that land/boundary disputes in the region have their roots in colonial administrative policies that were disruptive on inter-village boundaries as well as failures of post-colonial administrative policies to judiciously address the problem of inter village boundaries.

**The effects of farmer-grazer conflicts**

The effects of these conflicts can be very devastating and range from loss of assets (physical, economic, social, lives), insecurity, food crises to sustained poverty. Conflict also limits the integrative capacity of crop farmers and their neighbouring grazers (Pelican, 2012). Rashid (2012) also reported that conflict has far-reaching economic, production and socio-psychological effects on the households. In Nigeria word such as ‘settler’, ‘native’, ‘non-native’, ‘host community’, ‘foreigner’, ‘native
foreigner’, ‘stranger element’, ‘squatter’, ‘non-squatter’, ‘immigrant’, ‘migrant’, ‘indigene’, ‘non-indigene’ are used daily to describe, stigmatise or stereotype the “other” as a category who “does not belong” (Umar, undated)

Also, it even limits milk production (Ndambi et al., 2008) that happens to be an activity principally carried out by Mbororo women. This is why Fonjong et al. (2010) argue that sustained farmer-grazer conflicts undermine women’s ability to ensure household food security.

In fact, it was shown that farmer-grazer conflict in Bauchi state of Nigeria had negative effects on the families involved and the nation as a whole. The income of families exposed to conflict was significantly (P<0.05) lower than those in non-conflict areas. Significant losses in monetary terms, reduction in production, social insecurity and children not going to school are some of the consequences of farmer-grazer conflicts in Bauchi state (Sulaiman and Ja’afar-Furo, 2010). The farmers and the grazers also lose financial resources as they are required to pay a fee of US $40. Different practices were adopted to curb farmer-grazer conflicts in Cameroon and around the world. These remedies have proven their worth as far as mitigating farmer-grazer conflict is concern.

**Watershed management:** Amidst competition over the use of water and conflict resulting thereof, there is degradation of water quality (World Bank, 2012). In some areas it becomes scarce and continues to deteriorate in both quality and quantity and may soon become a critical limiting factor for economic development, food security, and basic health and hygiene services for a steady growing population. Water shortages and quality deterioration due to degraded watersheds are among the problems which require greater attention (Global Water Partnership TAC, 2000) especially in the management of watersheds.

**Mitigation practices and benefits**

In one of the conflict prone areas of the North West region of Cameroon, the use of fodder banks to supplement grazing and the rehabilitation of pastures reduced the age at which animals reach the market (500kg Body Weight) from 7.2 years to 4.1 years (World Bank, 2012). On the other hand, Ndikintum (2008) found out that adopted *Night Paddock Manuring* system contributed positively by reducing conflicts between farmers and grazers in Small Babanki of the North West region of Cameroon. The study also concluded that night paddock manuring benefits both crop farmers and grazers households by means of improving productivity and reducing poverty. Dry season
grazing on farm fields followed by crop production in the rainy season (Gefu et al., 2002) is an example of a win-win agreement between grazers and farmers to mitigate conflict. This arrangement was also made in the rice fields of Ngoketunjia division of the North West region of Cameroon. Farmers / grazers under the supervision of the traditional and administrative authorities adopted this win-win agro-pastoral system.

Other coping mechanism involves the clear distinction between grazing and farmland. Reduction of herds size and fencing by herdsmen are some of the mitigation practices. For instance, the building of fences and instituting controlled rotational grazing in Tugi community in the NW region of Cameroon (World Bank, 2012). Furthermore, the integration of animals, crops and trees (agrosilvopastoral system) is a sustainable way for land use and diversification of farm produce hence improvement in food security and alleviating poverty (Ibrahim et al. 2011).

The benefits of these practices are real. Production per hectare for growing animals would increase up to six times if animals had access to rehabilitated pastures and up to ten times if fodder banks were used to supplement grazing in the rehabilitated pastures during the dry season. This also yielded a positive internal rate of returns (World Bank, 2012). The World bank innovation transfer initiative funded project in Tugi of the North West region of Cameroon was complemented by capacity building based on a Farmer Field School approach.

Sone (2012) recommends that the “government of Cameroon needs to establish structures that ensure the equitable management and ownership of this vital resource, including, if necessary, further amendment of its laws. Gaps in the law and between legal institutions should be filled through reforms that will lead to the rational allocation of land. In addition, the adoption of dialogue, mediation, and conciliation by all stakeholders in landownership disputes is vital for conflict resolution, prevention, and management”.

Efforts are also being made to create a conducive policy environment to challenge the causes of conflict in Cameroon and the North West Region in particular. This is why Ibrahim (2011) considers the democratization and the political participation of the Mbororos in the Western Highlands regions of Cameroon to be a step towards facing the problem of conflict and fighting for the interest of the marginalized groups like the Mbororos. These advances among others were also documented in over seventeen countries around the world (IUCN, 2011). Nevertheless, some authors still consider the Mbororos in Cameroon to be politically marginalized and economically exploited minority.
In order to encourage co-existence in North West region of Cameroon, grazing areas are distinguished from farmland, transhumance tracks and areas are identified and demarcated. Dates of cattle movement are set and announced widely in the North West Region (Dafinger and Pelican, 2002).

Though land rights is in the hands of the state in Cameroon, participatory rights-based approach was adopted in the North West Region of Cameroon to empower pastoralists and create a conducive environment for them to fight for their right over land (Duni et al., 2009). It must also be noted that the initiative to acquire land is the prerogative of the farmer or grazer who is in need.
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Annex 2: Expert Interview guide

EXPERT INTERVIEW GUIDE

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Expert: ________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________ Telephone: __________________
Main occupation: ________________________________________
Division: ____________________ Subdivision: ______________________Village: __________________
Date: ____________________ Time started: ___________________ Time completed: ______________
Interviewer(s): ____________________________________________

A) AGRO-PASTORAL SYSTEM PRACTICES IN CONFLICT PRONE AREAS

What can you tell me about the Livestock and agricultural systems in conflict prone area in your community? Can you please describe [Probe: e.g., about the community in general]

a. What major or kinds of crops and animals are grown or reared in conflict prone areas?

b. Explain any association between crops grown and animals reared with respect to the use of natural resources (land & watersheds) in conflict area? (probe for seasonality of crop and livestock production systems)

c. Any prefectural orders imposing a kind of system for use of resources in farming and animal husbandry? Explain. What approaches/ measures are adopted towards a rational and equitable use of resources (watersheds & land) in conflict prone areas, Transhumance

d. Any specific behavior of stakeholders (farmers, grazers, Ardos, leaders, administration) about agro-pastoral system and conflict outbreaks in the concerned areas

e. Land ownership: How is land acquired by the grazers and farmers (right over land)

B) HISTORY, DESCRIPTION AND CAUSES OF CONFLICT IN YOUR COMMUNITY

a. What can you say about the relationship between the cattle rearers and crop producers in conflict community referred to?

b. Can you give me a comprehensive history of farmer-grazer conflict in your community? Nature, periods, frequency of occurrence, role of influential persons (cattle rearers, leaders & big farmers)

c. What were the immediate causes of each of the conflicts that occurred? (probe for natural resources contested, climate, economic, social, legal, demographic and political causes)

d. Can you tell us how severe the conflicts were? (Effects on livelihood of farmers and Mboloros: loss of property and lives, Value of losses (provide statistics where possible)). How did these conflicts affect women and youths?

C) CONFLICT MITIGATION PRACTICES
a. What strategies or practices are/were adopted or instituted for stakeholders to mitigate farmer/grazer conflicts, (intervention of SDO, justice, ministerial departments, Innovation plateforms (IP)),

b. Are the mitigation practices working? If not, what are the limits of these measures? [bribery and corruption, rent seeking habits, power relationship between and within the Mbororos and farmers]

c. What measures have been taken to ensure the rational and equitable use of natural resource, equitable access to clean and safe water in the project catchment areas

d. Are there special measures taken in facilitate the access of women and youths to natural resources or limit effects of conflict on their livelihood?

D) SWOT ANALYSIS OF FARMER-GRAZER CONFLICT ENVIRONMENT FOR LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT

a) CONFLICT MITIGATION ENVIRONMENT (Observe, prob and gather from literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEAKNESSES</td>
<td>THREATS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN CONFLICT PRONE AREAS
(Observe, probe (water & land management committees) and gather from literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEAKNESSES</td>
<td>THREATS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.2 Annex 3: List of experts interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alhadji Musa Adama</td>
<td>Baba II</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>77319162</td>
<td>Grazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asanga John</td>
<td>Baba II</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>77863893</td>
<td>Member of traditional council &amp; Head quarter Mbororo quarter, Delegate of Fon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DIYEN Jam Lawrence</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>75844691</td>
<td>District Officer for Santa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Che Samuel Kejem</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-divisional Delegate of livestock for Santa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adang Georges</td>
<td>Mbengwi</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Mbengwi central</td>
<td>73198603</td>
<td>SDD MINADER, Mbengwi Central (member of agropastoral commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anchie Joseph</td>
<td>Mbengwi</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Mbengwi central</td>
<td>77586935</td>
<td>DO Mbengwi Central (member of agropastoral commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ijang Bertha</td>
<td>Njikwo</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Mbengwi central</td>
<td>78916393</td>
<td>Crop Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mbah Lucas Atawah</td>
<td>Njikwa</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Mbengwi central</td>
<td>77451943</td>
<td>SDD MINADER (member of agropastoral commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Djamo Wayang</td>
<td>Mbengwi</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Mbengwi central</td>
<td>96491308</td>
<td>SDD MINEPIA Mbengwi Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mformi Jacob</td>
<td>Mamba</td>
<td>Donga</td>
<td>Mantung</td>
<td>70014478</td>
<td>Crop farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Josephine Ndoko</td>
<td>Njima</td>
<td>Donga</td>
<td>Mantung</td>
<td>75158231</td>
<td>Crop Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bawe George</td>
<td>Nkambe</td>
<td>Donga</td>
<td>Mantung</td>
<td>77784868</td>
<td>SDD MINADER, Nkambe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mbome Charles</td>
<td>Nkambe</td>
<td>Donga</td>
<td>Mantung</td>
<td>77695711</td>
<td>Chief of Section for Animal Production SDD MINEPIA, sitting in for the Divisional Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Gahdasi Walters</td>
<td>Kumbo</td>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>Kumbo</td>
<td>70705883</td>
<td>Divisional delegate of MINEPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FUCHI THOMAS</td>
<td>Kumbo</td>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>Kumbo</td>
<td>77634249</td>
<td>Divisional Delegate of MINADER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HAAN GODHEART LUKONG</td>
<td>Mbiame</td>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>Mbven</td>
<td>77161393</td>
<td>SUB DELEGATE for Agriculture MBIAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mallam EGIH DAIRU</td>
<td>Barare</td>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>Jakiri</td>
<td>77345325</td>
<td>Grazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LUKONG ERIC</td>
<td>Jakiri</td>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>Jakiri</td>
<td>77171314</td>
<td>SUB DELEGATE for Agriculture JAKIRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Festus Achire</td>
<td>Batibo</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Batibo</td>
<td>77571262</td>
<td>Sub-DELEGATE For AGRICULTURE Batibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Alfred Njai Forba</td>
<td>Batibo</td>
<td>Momo</td>
<td>Batibo</td>
<td>75264778</td>
<td>Assist Sub-divisional officers for Batibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ardo Yusufa</td>
<td>Fundong</td>
<td>Boyo</td>
<td>Fundong</td>
<td>77234214</td>
<td>Pastoralist &amp; Ardo, Baijong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Atanga Melrose</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Delegate for MINEPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Charles Kacho Tah</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>98009406</td>
<td>SNV, Advisor for pastoralist activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CDENO</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>HPI (Sali &amp; Bassam)</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Robert Fon</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>77755559</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Atanga Melrose</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Delegate, Land tenure system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fru Alfred Ngufor</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>Mezam</td>
<td>Bamenda</td>
<td>77125608</td>
<td>Chief of service for Pastures and Pastoral hydraulics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Annex 4: Terms of Reference

TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL TENDER FOR EXPERT INTERVIEW WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PROJECT ‘IN SEARCH OF COMMON GROUND’ IN THE NORTH WEST REGION OF CAMEROON

Principal Evaluator: Nchinda Valentine P.
Evaluation Expert/Senior research officer
Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD) Bambui
Box 80, Bamenda Cameroon
Tel.: +237 77 69 36 55
E-mail: petentsebe@yahoo.com

1. Rationale and objectives

The competition over access to natural resources is at the centre of sustained conflict between ethnic minority Mbororo cattle herders and most of the population of subsistence farmers in North West Cameroon. The Mbororo Cultural and Development Organisation (MBOSCUDA) and international partners (Village Aid, EU, Comic Relief, etc.) have been working relentlessly to mitigate this problem. The recent initiative is to scale up their conflict mitigation initiative to other 14 locations (see methodology section) in the North West Region of Cameroon.

This current initiative under the caption ‘In Search of Common Ground’ is a project to reduce conflict between Mbororo cattle herders and subsistence crop farmers in North West Cameroon with emphasis on the causes of the conflict. It also intends to set up and encourage agricultural interventions that can help reduce the cause of the conflict and the struggle over scarce resources. It hopes to address two fundamental gaps in existing services: the exclusion of marginalized Mbororos in poverty reduction strategies in Cameroon and failure to recognize their collective rights to access land, security of persons and property and the improvement of grazing conditions. This has created barriers to accessing vital services and resources like land and water.

Secondly, existing service provision for addressing farmer/grazer conflict (the commission established by the Farmer/Grazer Act of 1978) is known to be inadequate. It does not address the root causes of farmer/grazer conflicts but rather increases competition and conflict between farmers and grazers through the encouragement of litigation and compensation. Furthermore, corruption is prevalent in systems set up to resolve conflicts and officials involved benefit, so it is not in their interest to see disputes resolved.

It is therefore expected that at the end of the five years project the following outcomes would be met:

- Conflict Resolution: a reduced incidence and severity of conflict between crop farmers and cattle herders (through dialogue and collaboration) resulting in more equitable access to natural resources and an improved environment for exercising basic rights
- Sustainable Natural Resources: Improved skills in sustainable farming methods leading to better crop and livestock yields, greater cooperation between crop farmers and cattle herders and increased awareness of the need for environmental protection
• Clean and Safe Water: Equitable access to clean water contributing to reduced conflict between farmers and grazers and more sustainable use of a vital natural and economic resource
• Strong Organizations: Mbororo people have greater capacity to exercise their rights, leading to more responsive legislation, reduction in human rights violations that they experience and improved opportunities for social and economic development

2. Objectives of Expert Interview

The goal of the expert interview is to inform the development of the project/indicators and an increase in the validity of the baseline survey through the generation of complementary, reliable and in-depth data from a wide range of stakeholders (including the under privileged) at regional, (sub-)divisional, district, local and community levels.

The specific objectives of the expert Interviews would be to:

• Identify Key issues (climate, economic, social, legal, demographic and political) accounting for the severity of farmer/grazer conflict on alliance farming, equitable access to clean and safe water, water conservation and the livelihood of herders and farmers in the project catchment area;

• Identify stakeholders’ (farmers, grazers, administration, traditional leaders, Ardo’s) behaviour and agro-pastoral system practices in conflict prone situations in the project area

• Identify current stakeholder practices in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, sustainable natural resource management, equitable access to clean and safe water in the project catchment areas

• Identify inclusive (gender equity and under privilege considerations) and empowerment practices or lapses under farmer/grazer conflict prone areas for better gender mainstreaming and analysis of gender disaggregated data

• Identify the strengths, weaknesses of stakeholders, opportunities and threats in Mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, access to clean and safe water and sustainable management of natural resources for improved livelihood of farmers and herders in the project area

3. Expected Output of expert interview

It is expected that upon completion of the expert interviews the following outputs would have been achieved:

• A two page summary of the main findings of the expert interviews

• Knowledge acquired through expert interviews would be documented in a report with highlights on the causes and effects of conflict on livelihood or Key indicators (climate, economic, social, legal, demographic and political) accounting for the severity of farmer/grazer conflict on alliance farming, equitable access to clean and safe water, water conservation and the livelihood of herders and farmers in the project catchment area;

• Key indicators required to measure project implementation progress, outcome and impact are available and used by the principal evaluator in designing baseline survey questionnaires
• Stakeholders behaviour, practices and agro-pastoral systems in the context of farmer-grazer conflicts documented

• Stakeholder coping practices in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, sustainable natural resource management, equitable access to clean and safe water documented

• Inclusive and empowerment practices or lapses under farmer/grazer conflict prone areas documented for better gender and equality mainstreaming

• The strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and threats of major stakeholders involved in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, access to sustainable natural resource, equitable access to clean and safe water documented, empowerment of the beneficiaries identified.

3. Methodology

3.1 Target areas and experts

The expert interview shall involve 20 knowledgeable people or experts from five (5) administrative Districts, nine (9) sub-districts or any of the 14 project communities (Akum, Baba II, Bainjong, Achain, Acha Tugi, Njaetu, Ashong, Mbakam, Konchep, Bih, Binshua Barare, Mbonso and Nkowe (Table 4). These are the same communities where the baseline survey targets. The choice of these communities is because by design the findings of the expert interviews would guide the designing of questionnaires and explanations of some key findings. It will also be an opportunity to triangulate the information generated hence increase in the validity of the findings.

3.2 Steps in conducting the expert interviews

The first two steps in conducting expert interviews shall be same as those earlier proposed for the baseline survey: the inception and desk review/literature search phases.

Phase 1: preparation and planning phase

The first step of the expert interview shall consist of re-negotiating the terms of the consultancy, planning, organizing and meeting up with administrative formalities for the smooth kickoff of the expert interviews. The terms of the qualitative evaluation shall be discussed and agreed upon with the commissioner of the study (MBOSCUDA) in collaboration with Village Aid as the case may be. Prior to signing the contract, a joint meeting will be organized to define the involvement of each institution/stakeholder. The potential logistical and cultural constraints and mitigation strategies shall also be discussed and coping mechanism adopted. The involvement of the MBOSCUDA at all the phases of the evaluation process is critical for feedback, ownership of the process and use of findings.

The preparatory meeting will be organized (in Bamenda) during which information on the evaluation methodology will be shared to all the parties and a work plan adopted by the stakeholders (lead Consultant, MBOSCUDA & Evaluation Steering Group (ESG). Also, the key stakeholders would be consulted in the course of identifying key informants, communities and reports relevant to
the evaluation as well as inform the beneficiary communities/key informants about the upcoming evaluation. MBOSCUDA will take a lead role to create the awareness on the forthcoming evaluation via paralegals, community volunteers, Ardos, traditional rulers or councils.

**Phase 2: Desk review/secondary data collection**

This phase consists of reviewing all the relevant literature that could inform the expert interview process. This is the same phase as the desk review phase in the baseline survey. A desk review shall be done to have a thorough understanding of some of the prevailing key issues surrounding farmer-grazer conflicts and their consequences on equitable access to clean and safe water and the sustainable management of natural resources.

Documents may be exploited and could include (but not limited to) the SNV report on livestock in the NWR, reports of government technical services (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER), Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industries (MINEPIA), Ministry of Water and Energy (MINEE), Ministry of Social Affairs (MINAS), Ministry of Regional Planning and Territorial Development (MINEPAT), Ministry of women empowerment, SNV, Administrative Reports from the Districts and Governor’s Office). The Comic Relief funded project reports and the current project document will also be consulted.

The exploitation of all these literature and the identification of key information to be gathered would pave the way for the formulation of expert interview guide or questions. This will be done by the principle consultant who has an excellent knowledge in qualitative studies using PRA tools or instruments in collaboration with team members (gender/conflict specialist and Water management specialist). This would be shared with MBOSCUDA and Village Aid focal point persons prior to using it in the field. The generic expert interview questions will all be related to the main objective of the study with possibilities of introducing follow up questions.

**Phase 3: Formulation of Expert Questions or guide**

In this phase of the expert interview, a guide would be prepared to facilitate the work in the field. This elements of the guide (Table 3) shall bear the basic guidelines/questions to follow when interviewing identified experts. This shall be in the form of key issues or questions to be addressed.

**Phase 4: Identification of Knowledgeable experts**

The starting point for the choice of experts to be interviewed in the communities shall be MBOSCUDA staff in Bamenda, traditional leaders (including the Ardos), leaders of grazers associations, North West grazers’ federations, MBOSCUDA’s paralegals (7), knowledgeable people with disabilities, key informant grazers and farmers, administrative officials of technical ministries. This shall include knowledgeable experts from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER), Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industries (MINEPIA), Ministry of

---

2 The number of experts to be interviewed may be sized down because of budgetary reasons. This has to be discussed with MBOSCUDA/Village Aid and agreed upon
Water and Energy (MINEE), Ministry of Social Affairs (MINAS), Ministry of Regional Planning and Territorial Development (MINEPAT) and MINDAT. The *snowball sampling procedure* (Biernacki and Waldorf, 1981) would then be employed to identify other knowledgeable experts in communities where the interview would be conducted. This consists of asking previously identified informants to direct us to another knowledgeable person in the community. The choice of the experts to be interviewed shall be decided upon based on his/her knowledge on the subject matter under consideration, experience in the area concerned and ability to answer the questions properly. The language will not be a barrier in this case as we are going to make sure that people who understand the local language like Fufulde (Mbororo), Ngemba, Meta, Kom, Nkambe, Esu, lamzo, etc. are included in the team.

**Phase 5: Expert interviews proper**

The previous phase and this one goes on concomitantly. The key informants once identified would be interviewed with the help of earlier prepared questions or guides. Appropriate PRA tools would be used. An *audio recorder* will be used during this interview in order not to miss some important details. Interviews will be digitally recorded pending permission from the participants. During the interview, notes shall also be taken alongside the recording. At the end of each day during the data collection from the experts, researchers will analyze field notes to identify the key issues and concepts discussed. Follow up questions shall be asked during the interview to get in-depth explanations of major issues and concepts raised by experts interviewed. However, it should be noted that the consultant would be a facilitator or moderator and will not influence the answers provided by the experts.

**Phase 6: Data transcription and analysis**

All data will be analyzed using *NVivo 10 software*. This qualitative analysis software enables the use of thematic coding to identify the key issues related to farmer grazer conflicts, effects on welfare and coping mechanisms. The digital recording for each interview will be transcribed and then translated into English in MS-Word document. Notes taken during the expert interview will be used to develop transcripts. Prior to coding the data, an initial reading of each transcript shall be done to gain a sense of important themes such as causes of farmer/grazer conflicts, effects on livelihood, coping mechanisms etc. Recurring themes and concepts then become the categories used throughout the coding process. This is known as “organizational coding” (Maxwell, 2005). Coding categories are used to organize, summarize, and reduce the data (Saldana, 2009). As coding progresses, broad categories or “tree nodes” of various subthemes related to the key concepts and issues identified will be created. This process, known as substantive coding (Maxwell, 2005), enables the development of more descriptive codes to analyze the relationships between concepts. Results of the coding can then be analyzed based on selection criteria and socioeconomic, socio-demographic, and sociocultural factors (i.e., gender, etc.).

---

3 Provided experts interviewed accept

4 We will like to share complete information about this package with MBOSCUDA. This will go to strengthen their IT capacity as intended in the project. Free versions of this software are available on the internet
Phase 7: Writing of Expert interview Report

The analyzed primary data collected through expert interviews would be documented in the form of a report whose outline will be proposed, discussed and agreed upon with MBOSCUDA & ESG. A first draft would be written and the final one after receiving feedback from MBOSCUDA and ESG. Alternatively, the expert interview report could be included in the baseline survey. Again, this has to be discussed and agreed upon with MBOSCUDA & ESG.

4 Management of the expert interview and quality Assurance

a) Human Resource and management

The expert interview will be carried out under the leadership of the principal evaluator/senior researcher with expertise in qualitative research methods and use of PRA tools. Four other researchers (specialised in gender and conflict, data transcription, water management and knowledgeable in Mbororo culture, tradition and language) will be associated in the interview process to increase efficiency. The team members and their responsibilities are spelt out in table 1.

Table 1: Resource persons, responsibilities and time input for the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource persons</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>% input Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nchinda Valentine (Senior Agriculture Economics Research Officer)</td>
<td>*Masters in Development Evaluation and Management (Belgium) *Agricultural Engineer: Major in Economics and Rural sociology (Cameroon)</td>
<td>-Development Evaluation and management -programme/project design -Impact evaluation -design of M&amp;E -Agricultural Economics -Use of PRA tools and qualitative data analysis using NVivo 10, -Statistical analysis SPSS, STATA &amp; Excel Scientific Writing</td>
<td>*Principal Evaluator (consultant), Leads, Coordinates and supervises the entire process and ensures the respect of evaluation principles and ethics *Design expert interview guide *Conduct expert interviews with focus on impact of conflict on livelihood *Cleaning &amp; data analysis using NVivo 10 *Reporting of findings *Work directly with MBOSCUDA &amp; partner</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Precillia (Senior Research Officer)</td>
<td>*Masters in Governance and Development in Sub-Sahara Africa (Belgium) *Masters in Economic Policy Management (Cameroon) *Agricultural Engineer: Major in Economics and Rural sociology (Cameroon)</td>
<td>*Conflict management, *Farming system sociology, forest livelihoods, *governance and marketing * Scientific writing</td>
<td>*Design expert interview guide *Conduct expert interviews with emphasis on farmer grazer conflicts/gender *literature review *assistance in data analysis</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus CHE (Community Development)</td>
<td>Agricultural Engineer: Major in Economics and Rural sociology (Cameroon)</td>
<td>Data Transcription, Community development</td>
<td>*Writing of daily notes in word document for Nvivo analysis</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource persons</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>% input Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Transcription of data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon CHI</td>
<td>Masters in Water management (Cameroon)</td>
<td>Water management expert</td>
<td>*Conduct expert interviews with focus on water and natural resource management</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shidiki Abubakar Ali (MBORORO ORIGIN)</td>
<td>MSc. Natural Resource Management (awaiting), University of Dschang; M.Tech FBE, Fed. University of Technology Yola, Nigeria</td>
<td>-Fululde language, -PRA tools and methods -Natural Resource management,</td>
<td>*Translation from Fululde to English and vice versa *mediate between research team and Mbororo community</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** Shidiki (CV included) has published several articles in international peer review journals and has a Mbororo background both culturally and linguistic and would be very instrumental for both expert interviews and baseline surveys. Other Mbororo brothers have already been identified and would be used. THE OTHER CVs in the baseline document remain part of this tender.

b) Organization and quality assurance:

A planning meeting will be organized at the beginning of the expert interview to harmonize our understanding of the expert interview as well as on the PRA tools to be used. The guide/questions developed would be shared with MBOSCUDA and Village Aid focal persons for appreciation and input. At the end of each day, daily review meetings will be organized. The daily notes and audio recorders go to improve on the quality of data collected and ensure the proper recording of all data. During Expert interviews, we will like each team member to focus on his area of expertise. The involvement of a Mbororo expert in the team will facilitate communication and build confidence with the herders. He will translate from the local language to English/pidgin and vice versa.

### 6. Experience in Expert Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person</th>
<th>Title of project</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nchinda Valentine</td>
<td>Assessment of economics and biosecurity situation of small commercial poultry farming in Cameroon</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nation</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Will be completed by the end of this month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nchinda Valentine</td>
<td>Diagnostic survey of rice production hubs in Cameroon</td>
<td>AfricaRice</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nchinda Valentine</td>
<td>IFAD/FAO/INFPD Smallholder Poultry</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>Mixed methods (expert interview and survey). Three articles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Duration and the work plan

This expert interview will be carried out in October and part of November 2013 as on table 2.

**Table 2: Time-frame for expert interviews in the project areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Activity</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>TIME-FRAME</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review/secondary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Expert Questions or guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Knowledgeable experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert interviews proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transcription and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write first draft of Expert interview Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Diff. Projects at national and international level | Different donators | Different durations | Extended experience as on CVs of participants carry details |

Nchinda Valentine
- Evaluation of the Eru (*Gnetum Spp.*) Chain Development Project in the Support Zone of the Korup National Park, South West Region, CENDEP-Cameroon
- CENDEP
- 2 Months
- Mixed methods used

**Other team members**
- Different projects at national and international level
- Different donors
- Different durations
- Extended experience as on CVs of participants carry details

5. Duration and the work plan

This expert interview will be carried out in October and part of November 2013 as on table 2.

**Table 2: Time-frame for expert interviews in the project areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Activity</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>TIME-FRAME</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review/secondary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Expert Questions or guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Knowledgeable experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert interviews proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transcription and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write first draft of Expert interview Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nchinda V.P.
- Assessment of ticks and tick bonne diseases in Cameroon
- AusAid/CORAF WECARD
- 2 YEARS
- Mixed methods used

*5. Duration and the work plan*

This expert interview will be carried out in October and part of November 2013 as on table 2.

**Table 2: Time-frame for expert interviews in the project areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Activity</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>TIME-FRAME</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review/secondary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Expert Questions or guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Knowledgeable experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert interviews proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transcription and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write first draft of Expert interview Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase/Activity Time Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/Activity</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feedback &amp; write final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>To take place at same time as the baseline survey restitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baseline survey</em></td>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** *The first two phases of baseline survey go together with those of expert interviews*

### 6. Budget for expert interview

#### HONORARIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity (Mandays)</th>
<th>Unit Cost (FCFA)</th>
<th>Total Cost (FCFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Consultant (Senior researcher &amp; evaluation expert)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management &amp; Gender expert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water management Expert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbororo expert/facilitator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript expert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>364,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PERDIEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity (manday)</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the entire team (6 persons 21 days)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>126,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Vehicle hire and fuel (per day)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LOGISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity (days)</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging Principal Evaluator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management &amp; Gender expert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert with Mbororo background</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging of conflict and water specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript expert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers (cartoon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of working documents &amp; Reports (ink, photographs, copies...)</td>
<td>(Lump sum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HONORARIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity (Mandays)</th>
<th>Unit Cost (FCFA)</th>
<th>Total Cost (FCFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Mobilisation (telephone, internet, …)</td>
<td>(Lump sum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total (subtotal 1+…5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>783,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment modalities: **100% upon signing of the contract.** This is so because the money can barely be used to do the work.

### References


### Annex

**Observations on tender**

- A complete expert interview would require that we talk to more than twenty (20) experts identified in Table 4. This is a limiting factor because the required resources are insufficient.

**Table 3:** Some guiding key Indicators and instruments for expert interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicators to be developed</th>
<th>Tools/instruments to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify stakeholders’ (farmers, grazers, administration, traditional leaders, Ardo’s) behaviour and agro-pastoral system practices in conflict prone situations in the project area</td>
<td>- List of stakeholders per community and administrative unit</td>
<td>Snowball, Observation, Archive review, Historical analysis of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Categorization and Cartography of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Map local government area and specific conflict zone and the occurrence of conflicts…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Categorize the types of conflicts by area and occurrence (political, chieftaincy, land matters, droughts and famine, and subordination)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify current stakeholder practices in mitigating farmer/grazer conflicts, sustainable natural resource management, equitable access to clean and safe water in the project catchment areas</td>
<td>- Number of conflicts reported and handled</td>
<td>document review Key informant/expert interviews, group cohesion and power structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results of conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Present status of conflict communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholders activities and seasonality of conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coping strategies of conflict affected people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Key issues (climate, economic, social, legal, and political accounting for the severity of</td>
<td>Physical Characterization of conflict areas (description of area of land surfaces, vegetation, water, …) Causes of conflict and their magnitude</td>
<td>Key informant/expert interview, Observation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer/grazer conflict on alliance farming, equitable access to clean and sage water, water conservation and the livelihood of herders and farmers in the project catchment area;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic cost of past conflicts between farmers and grazers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impact of conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term effects of conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropping land and farming system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools/instruments to use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping and characterization of past conflicts and conflict areas,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the strengths, weaknesses of stakeholders opportunities and threats in addressing the issues raised to improve livelihood of farmers and herders in the project area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts (damages) caused by conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield, Household resources, Social support, Stored products, Job status, Self-esteem, Income, Family/personal health Knowledge, Quality of relationship, household adaptation strategies to conflict effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify inclusive (gender equity and under privilege considerations) and empowerment practices or lapses under farmer/grazer conflict prune areas for better gender mainstreaming and analysis of gender disaggregated data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources/Opportunities for gendered groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social consideration of farmers and grazers, women in both communities, traditions and customs, and relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Audio recorder to be used through the entire process to capture necessary details

Table 4: Different levels and sources of experts to be interviewed and possible tools for data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative level</th>
<th>Place/Level of data collection</th>
<th>Type of actor to meet/expert</th>
<th>Possible Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor's office</td>
<td>North West Governor's office</td>
<td>Conflict and litigation department</td>
<td>Expert interview+ archive review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Offices</td>
<td>Boyo, Momo, Donga Mantung, Bui</td>
<td>Divisional officer, Gendarmeries, police, agriculture, livestock, social welfare</td>
<td>Key informant interviews + archival review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub divisional offices</td>
<td>Santa, Fundong, Mbengwi, Batibo, Nkambe, Jakiri, Mbven, Noni</td>
<td>Sub Divisional officer, Gendarmeries, police, agriculture, livestock, social welfare</td>
<td>Expert interview + archival review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Akum and Baba H, Bainjont and Aehain, Acha Tugi and Njaetu, Ashong, Mbakam, Konchep, Bih and, Binshua, Barare Mbonso, Nkowe</td>
<td>Graziers leader, farmers leaders, Women's leaders, chief of post of agriculture and livestock (if any), quarter heads of conflict affected quarters, Village chiefs, local development committee leader</td>
<td>Expert interview, Map and characterise conflict areas, types and local impact of conflicts. Grey literature, local governance indicators (power structures and power analysis, group cohesion...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSCUDA, SNV, Heifer</td>
<td>North west region</td>
<td>Conflict or rural development expert</td>
<td>Expert interview an document review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Vitae of Resource persons

Curriculum Vitae of Shidiki Abubakar Ali

Name: Shidiki Abubakar Ali

Address: New layout Bamenda, P.O Box 221 Bamenda, Cameroon

Nationality: Cameroonian

TEL: (237)-77634483 / 96215954

E-MAIL: shidikia@gmail.com

VISION:

To see a developed world, where there exist no inequality in terms of rights and livelihoods; a place more suitable and convenient for people to develop.

CAREER OBJECTIVE:

To find a challenging position to meet my competencies, capabilities, skills, education and experience, and to use my research skills and interdisciplinary academic background to attain the organizational objectives set before me, and ascend to the top of the ladder responsibly.

KEYS OF SUCCESS:

• Integrity & Ethics
• Leadership
• Teamwork
• Training
• Recognition
• Communication
• Bilingual (English and French)
• Continuous Improvement
• Familiarity with computer software applications

EXPERIENCE:

Consultant, November, 2010 to date: H&B Consulting USA,

Socio-economic and need assessment researcher, team leader for field survey, in charge of analyzing the questionnaires and writing of the socio-economic report for the following projects.

• Environmental Social impact assessment studies for SARGRI (SOACAM AGRO-INDUSTRIAL) in Littoral region of Cameroon March 2012
• Environmental audit and risk assessment report for Aes-sonel four Hydro-electric power and fourteen thermal plant across the ten regions of Cameroon (November 2011- January 2012)
• Environmental Social impact assessment report for Sustainable oils Cameroon (SG SOC) at Nguti, Toko and Mundemba Plantation sites. Feb 2011.
• Environmental Social impact assessment studies for HEVECAM in Kribi and Lokongji sub-divisions in south region of Cameroon. June 2011.
• Environmental Social impact assessment studies report for United Textile USA SARL at Ngaoundere Adamawa region Cameroon. June 2011.
• Environmental Social impact assessment study for CEMECAM at Foumbot quarry site Noun division of the western region of Cameroon.

June 15th, 2010 To July 18th 2010 Research assistant for Dr Adam Higazi

Project founder: FRIEDRICH-EBERT-STIFTUNG

Research Project Title: “THE JOS POLITICAL CRISIS” for its discussion paper series in 2010

Responsibilities:

1. Translate Hausa interviews in to English language.
2. Interview non English speakers
3. Prepare and arrange for interviews.
4. Make call and arranged for a meeting place
5. Attend and participate in interview and meetings.
6. wrote a report at the end of program

Agricultural Technician October 2009 To November 2010:

Interfaith Vision Foundation Cameroon (IVFCam)

HIV/AIDS, Human Rights and Sustainable Livelihood Program for Grassroots Widows and Orphans

Responsibilities

Oversaw all project activities and acted as main contact point for the donor and the field staff. Ensured project activities comply with the policies and regulations of the donor organization. Ensured the development and execution of project, led project planning, budgeting, action plans and monitoring processes. Developed and submitted activity reports, meeting minutes and financial reports on regular basis to the donors.

February 2006, Research assistant, Dr Adam Higazi
March 2008

Center for research on inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity,
University of Oxford, UK

Responsibilities:

a. Translate Hausa interviews into English language.
b. Interview non English speakers
c. Prepare and arrange for interviews.
d. Attend and participate in interview and meetings.
e. Wrote a report at the end of program.

January, 2005 - December, 2005
Dukku local Gov’t Area Gombe State, Nigeria

Responsibilities:

- Work as a Nursery Assistant.
- Forest extension agent to the Local Government Council.
- Forest supervisor to a forest reserve.

EDUCATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Labor Organization (ILO) Yaoundé</td>
<td>Certificate on entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Dshang, Cameroon</td>
<td>MSc. NRM (awaiting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. University of Technology Yola, Nigeria</td>
<td>M.Tech FBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. University of Technology Yola, Nigeria</td>
<td>PGD Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. College of Forestry Jos, Nigeria</td>
<td>B.Tech Forestry Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. College of Forestry Jos, Nigeria</td>
<td>ND. Forestry Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Jos, Nigeria</td>
<td>Diploma in Computer A/Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCHS Kumbo, Cameroon</td>
<td>GCE A/ Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS Elack-Oku, Cameroon</td>
<td>GCE O/ Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Mbem, Cameroon</td>
<td>FSLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Mbem, Cameroon</td>
<td>ECL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POST OF RESPONSIBILITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President Bui Youth Entrepreneurs Network (BYENET)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH INTEREST

Ecological and Environmental research.

Rural Sociology and Socio-economic research

Forestry and rural livelihood development.

HOBBIES: picnic, reading and Music

LANGUAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Speak</th>
<th>Write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfulde</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal Publications (Available on the net)


I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information on this CV is true, correct, and complete, and made in good faith.

REFEREES:

Mrs. Hama B Salamatou, CEO H&B consulting USA, Yaounde- Cameroon. E-mail: bakosalamatou@hotmail.com, Tel: (237) 99926707

Dr. Adam Higazi, University of Cambridge UK, Email: ah652@cam.ac.uk, Tel: +447796622636

Dr. Jatau D.F PG Coordinator Federal university of Tech. Yola, Nigeria P.M.B 2019, Jos E-mail: fmehiwadavid@yahoo.com, Tel: (234) 8066852574