

Kempf, Isabell; Byamukama, Nathan Mwesigye; Singo, Stephen Mwachofi

## Working Paper

Security, environment and development in Zone 3 of International Conference on the Great Lakes Region: A case study on an integrated approach to sustainable peace in borderlands

UNRISD Working Paper, No. 2022-3

## Provided in Cooperation with:

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva

*Suggested Citation:* Kempf, Isabell; Byamukama, Nathan Mwesigye; Singo, Stephen Mwachofi (2022) : Security, environment and development in Zone 3 of International Conference on the Great Lakes Region: A case study on an integrated approach to sustainable peace in borderlands, UNRISD Working Paper, No. 2022-3, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/273857>

### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

### Terms of use:

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

---

WORKING PAPER 2022-03

---

# **Security, Environment and Development in Zone 3 of International Conference on the Great Lakes Region**

## **A Case Study on an Integrated Approach to Sustainable Peace in Borderlands**

Isabell Kempf, Nathan Mwesigye Byamukama,  
and Stephen Mwachofi Singo

December 2022

Prepared for the UNRISD project on

DEEPEN: The Development-Environment-Peace Nexus in Borders and Borderlands

*UNRISD working papers are posted online to stimulate discussion and to raise critical comments.*



The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) is an autonomous research institute within the UN system that undertakes multidisciplinary research and policy analysis on the social dimensions of contemporary development issues. Through our work, we aim to ensure that social equity, inclusion and justice are central to development thinking, policy and practice.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations  
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland  
Tel: +41 (0)22 9173060  
info.unrisd@un.org  
www.unrisd.org

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)

This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD website ([www.unrisd.org](http://www.unrisd.org)) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.



The project is funded by the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA).

## About UNRISD's DEEPEN Working Paper Series

This paper is part of a series of outputs from the UNRISD research project on the Development-Environment-Peace Nexus (DEEPEN) in Borders and Borderlands.

The project has the following objectives:

- Facilitate the exchange and co-production of knowledge and experiences on development, environmental protection and peace-making in borders and borderlands
- Contribute to setting an agenda for an integrated and transformative approach to borders and borderlands
- Deepen understanding and enrich discussions around the dynamics and synergies between development, environment and peace in borders and borderlands
- Help policy decision makers and practitioners imagine and design development cooperation programmes and projects that respond to the specificities of borders and borderlands.

The working papers in this series present case studies selected to reflect diversity in terms of geography, culture, history and political systems. In addition to incorporating gender as a key lens of analysis, the series features case studies specifically dealing with women and girls in borders and borderlands.

Lessons drawn out from the case studies through comparative analysis highlighted the successes and difficulties of implementing integrated approaches and helped to identify opportunities and challenges for policies and practices that integrate the development, environment and peace dimensions in borderlands. Findings and lessons from the case studies were synthesized to produce the Guidelines on the Integrated Approach to Development Projects in Borderlands—the main publication output of the project.

Series Editor: Ilcheong Yi

## Abstract

This study examines and provides reasons for the stalled implementation of an integrated approach to addressing security, environment and development challenges in Zone 3 of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR). Zone 3, which covers the borderlands connecting Uganda, Kenya and South Sudan, is characterized by the proliferation of illicit small arms and light weapons, cattle rustling, and persistent cross-border inter-communal conflicts and human rights violations. The zone experiences extreme climatic conditions ranging from prolonged drought and environmental destruction to frequent related food shortages and famine. It is an area with rugged terrain, with little or no infrastructure: good roads, electricity and water are scarce. The area suffers from years of marginalization and high poverty levels, with very little government presence owing to its remote location and distance from state capitals.

In 2006, regional member states signed a treaty that established a regional organization, the ICGLR, together with its integral protocols and programs of action—all binding on member states and designed to effectively address threats to security, environment and development in Zone 3. However, the implementation of these instruments has been disappointing. Countries of Zone 3 preferred standalone, piecemeal, national initiatives focused on state security over holistic human security issues across these borderlands. Consequently, militarism and forced disarmament without effective stakeholder participation delivered no meaningful outcomes to people's security. The study concludes that a paradigm shift towards a collaborative, regional multisectoral and holistic integrated approach is required to tackle both Zone 3's combined persistent problems and widespread underdevelopment and poverty, as well as the general lack of concerted joint action by the three governments. It provides policy recommendations for designing and implementing integrated approach-based projects within Zone 3 and in the surrounding regions beyond.

## Contents

About UNRISD’s DEEPEN Working Paper Series.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Contents .....	iii
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Cross-border issues in Zone 3.....	1
2. Methodology.....	3
3. Mixed results of integrated approaches in the Great Lakes peace process.....	4
4. The setback of Integrated Approaches and the Consequences for the Great Lakes Region ...	5
4.1 Going back to bilateral interests and support.....	6
4.2 Competing and shifting mandates.....	6
5. ICGLR Integrated Approaches in Zone 3 .....	6
6. The Kenyan approach to Zone 3.....	8
6.1 Kenya’s Zone 3 border security initiatives .....	9
7. Uganda’s approach to Zone 3.....	10
7.1 Uganda’s Policy Context in Karamoja .....	11
7.2 The Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (2007-2010) .	12
7.2.1 Lack of attention to regional dynamics surrounding disarmament.....	13
7.2.2 Missing environment in integration of disarmament and development .....	13
7.2.3 Insufficient and security-framed empowerment of women.....	14
8. Lessons learned from Kenyan and Ugandan cases .....	15
9. Conclusion .....	17
References .....	19

## **1. Introduction**

Since independence of various neighbouring countries, the Great Lakes Region (GLR) of Africa has been marked by recurrent cross-border conflicts while environmental degradation goes on unabated due to human (in)action. Since 2006, many cross-border projects for integrated peacebuilding have been developed in the 12 zones identified by countries of the Great Lakes of Africa in the signed and ratified Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region (2006).

Member countries recognized these 12 zones not only as fertile ground for cross-border conflicts owing to their location being far away from capitals but also as spaces of opportunities for concerted integrated action by Member States to enhance peace and development. Zone 3 is one of the 12 security zones of GLR (CGLR 2006).

While there were a number of projects in Zone 3 both at the national and the regional level, most of them have paid little consideration to the environment whose threats are equally detrimental to human security and have to be firmly integrated into developmental policy frameworks for sustainable peace in borderlands. This case study examines the cases of Zone 3 with a focus on Kenya's Turkana and Uganda's Karamoja, and draws lessons from these two cases for other border areas where security, environment and development are interdependent.

### **1.1 Cross-border issues in Zone 3**

Zone 3 (or the ICGLR (International Conference on the Great Lakes Region Security Zone 3) is a naturally integrated but politically dissected triangle tied together culturally, economically, environmentally, historically, geographically and socially. In addition, the areas in Zone 3 also share similar threats and challenges to other zones. The border communities and the countries belong to the same regional economic communities. And they are bound by same regional and international instruments and affected by the similar challenges that they have historically endeavoured to share and resolve. Zone 3 (which in the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) language is "Karamoja Cluster" (UNDP 2020), is an area straddling the borders of three countries namely: Northeast Uganda, Northwest Kenya and South-eastern South Sudan. The area is inhabited by the same Ateker family composed of the Turkana, Pokot (Kenya), Karamojong's (or Karamojong's) Dodoth, Pokot, Jie (Uganda) Toposa, Didinga and the Nyangatom (South Sudan) (UNDP 2020). Most of them are pastoralists and have linguistic and cultural ties with each other.



The current situation in Zone 3 borderlands is characterized by insecurity, cross-border conflicts, illicit small arms proliferation, environmental degradation, poverty and a general lack of concerted joint action by the three governments. The geopolitical situation has rapidly changed, marked by the entry of terrorist organizations notably Al Shabaab which is said to be associated with the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF). Cross-border trafficking of Small arms and Light Weapons (SALW) is linked to these new geopolitical realities, which have driven Kenya and Uganda to contribute troops to the Africa Union's peacekeeping mission in Somalia, aimed at neutralizing Al Shabaab.

On the South Sudan side of the border, the situation mirrors that in Kenya and Uganda, with the area characterized by poverty, SALW proliferation and general underdevelopment. The attainment of independence by South Sudan in July 2011 has not brought about any visible changes in approaches to the challenges of her side of the border, making it urgent for the three states to work closely together to tackle the security and development challenges facing the borderlands of Zone 3. An integrated approach to tackling the challenges facing the region is an urgent way to effectively restore peace, restore the environment and transform the region into spaces of prosperity and stability.

The borderlands of Zone 3 are characterized by widespread underdevelopment and poverty owing largely to years of marginalization and neglect by the governments. The marginalization of this area is historically linked to British colonialism, which regarded the region as a space that provided little returns to the colonial economy, owing to its harsh climate conditions and remoteness. It is also linked to the pastoralist way of life which combined traditional livestock rearing with culturally rooted practices such as cattle rustling, whose commercialization in recent years has intensified SALW proliferation and inter-communal conflict. After independence of Uganda (1962) and Kenya (1963), neither government took any deliberate steps to address the development challenges of the region, electing to maintain the status quo. As the example of Kenya shows, British colonial policies manifested in the Special Districts Act of 1934 (repealed



63 years later in 1997) and the Government of Kenya's Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 (replaced 47 years later in 2012 by sessional paper No. 8 of 2012) continued under neo-colonial policies that created an official attitude of marginalization to Northern Kenya (UNDP 2020).

Environmental challenges in Zone 3 are also serious. Zone 3 continues to experience environmental deterioration and desertification in parallel with a decline in biological productivity in the area. Zone 3 borderlands are generally semi-arid and arid land made up of volcanic plateaux, low acacia bush and shrublands, and a few isolated mountains islands topped by receding forests. Except for the mountain areas and along some of the river valleys, little or no cultivation is practiced. These environmentally marginal lands are largely occupied by pastoralists and a few agro pastoralists. It can be argued that problems in Zone 3 emanate from and reflect particular environmental challenges in that Zone. Zone 3 suffers from what has been described as "climate change -migration -conflict" where "chasing water" and pasture wherever it is, has defined the way of life of the people. The Zone has fragile ecosystems complicated by increasing incidences of floods and extreme weather situated on the sociological and ecological border between the Nile and Turkana basins. The sweeping escapement from Karamoja runs down into lake Turkana basins. Turkana (Kenya) people to the east seek access to the more plentiful water and grazing resources in Karamoja (Uganda) to the west. Climate change is increasing environmental degradation enhanced by a number of mal-adaptations and reflected in poor development indicators compared to other parts of Uganda, Kenya and South Sudan.

More than 60% of the population derives their incomes from livestock-based activities, and there are few alternative livelihood options. Non-livestock alternatives such as harvesting woody biomass (firewood) and charcoal burning makes the already fragile environmental situation worse. Common are drought followed by large numbers of livestock wiped out, livelihoods systematically undermined, and food and health insecurity owing to the environmental realities of the Zone. In the dry season or during drought, huge losses among the herds are evident due to the limited water and pasture to keep the animals nourished. The impact of harsh conditions coupled with privatization of land make traditional transhumance and pastoralism inviable (Kempf, 2004).

## 2. Methodology

The purpose of the study is to share knowledge and experiences on regional integration, integration of security, environment and development goals including, combating illegal armed groups and exploitation of natural resources, climate change and environmental restoration in border areas of the Great lakes region; and deepen understanding of how integrated -approaches can effectively address complex border issues. Through the analysis of what has worked and what has not, it identifies opportunities and challenges for policies and projects and provides guidance for future integrated and transformative approaches.

The study draws the lessons on the success and failure to implement integrated approaches in Zone 3 of the GLR through the experience and documents of the International Conference on the GLR. It will look at the ICGLR Zone 3 border security projects and development approaches implemented by Kenya and Uganda. The three authors of the case study were part of the initial team responsible for the implementation of ICGLR Pact on Security, Stability and Development, signed in 2006, in the areas of Peace and security, cross-cutting issues (including

gender and environment) and human rights and have long-standing experience in designing and implementing cross-border projects. The case study will draw on the experience of the authors as practitioners, the relevant literature and evaluations of the Great Lakes Peace pact projects.

### **3. Mixed results of integrated approaches in the Great Lakes peace process**

The idea to organize the ICGLR originated in response to regional crises in the 1990s, particularly the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1097, adopted unanimously on 18 February 1997, was one of the motivators of the ICGLR asking for the settlement of the conflict in the region through political dialogue and the convening of an international conference on peace and security in the GLR that resulted in the adoption of the Pact on Security Stability, and Development in the Great Lakes Region in 2006.

The root causes of conflict in the GLR have continuously afflicted the peace process since 2006. These unaddressed causes of friction are strongly related but not limited to the cross-border nature of the conflict, weak governance systems, the proliferation of armed groups, and persisting socioeconomic inequalities (UN 2020a). Border demarcation plays a significant role as past conflicts over land and political use of ethnicity continue to challenge the construction of trust among countries. The illegal exploitation and trafficking of natural resources combined with the lack of government control over some border areas impact on the human rights of the population in these areas, which reproduces inequality structures and increases their vulnerability towards different hazards, from natural disasters, including environmental degradation, to manmade conflict.

The spreading of armed groups from the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo, Southern Sudan, Somalia, Central African Republic, as well as pastoralist conflicts over water and grazing land in Zone 3 threatens the lives and livelihoods of citizens and communities. They also entail sexual violence against women and girls, violation of human rights including destruction and plundering of private property and illegal exploitation of the natural resources that serve as their means of subsistence and potential socioeconomic survival.

The use of an integrated approach in the Great Lakes peace process has been at the core of the ICGLR since the Dar-Es-Salaam Declaration (ICGLR 2004). The same approach was further emphasized throughout the negotiations and implementations of the Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region signed in 2006, the legal and action framework of the ICGLR. Both milestones, the Declaration and the Pact, orientate the implementation of actions and protocols toward the root causes of conflicts and the obstacles to regional development. In both instances, member countries committed themselves to promote joint and participatory projects on peace and security, humanitarian and social issues, economic integration and democracy and good governance while addressing cross-cutting issues like human rights, environment, youth, gender, HIV/AIDS, and human settlement.

Integration also meant the participation of a wide range of actors including government officials, armed forces, political and grassroots leaders, and representatives from civil society (youth, women religious authorities) and media. Especially the women, civil society and youth fora have had a permanent influence on the peace process in the GLR and were able to put specific issues

on the agenda, such as Special Summit on Zero Tolerance for Sexual Violence in December 2011 whose outcome was the Kampala Declaration on Sexual and Gender Based Violence of 15<sup>th</sup> December 2011. However, reliable funding for these fora has been absent.

The regional protocol and project against the illegal exploitation of natural resources was a flagship project of the ICGLR which started with an integrated approach including human rights, gender and the environment as important dimensions. However, the project came to have a narrower focus on the certification of origins to make sure that minerals did not come from conflict areas. This was due to the fact that some partners feared that there would be no political agreement if the project become too complex. The narrowing focus of the project was influenced by the Dodd-Frank Act passed in 2010 by the U.S. Congress. The “conflict minerals” provision—commonly known as Section 1502 of the Dodd Frank Act—required U.S. publicly-listed companies to disclose whether they use “conflict minerals” (tin, tungsten, tantalum and gold) and whether these minerals originate in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) or an adjoining country. This Act was a de facto embargo on minerals produced in the region, which made partners of the project based on an integrated approach narrow down the project focus to certification of minerals

Again, this more short-term response meant a lost opportunity to make the project address the root causes of the illegal exploitation of natural resources and related human rights and environmental violations such as trafficking. However illegal trafficking of natural resources continuously undermined the original integrated approach idea of the project. As certificates can be easily falsified because of the widespread illegal trafficking, the project has increasingly focused on the certification of the origin of natural resources, not on the human rights violations associated with their production and trafficking.

Another structural human rights concern in Zone 3 is the lack of recognition of the cultural identity and mode of production of pastoralists, which has led to repeated conflicts in the region where pastoralists live. The exclusion of large parts of the population from development discourse and decision making and the resulting poverty constitute the sources of major human rights violations in nearly all countries of the region. For instance, the failure to realize the right to meaningful participation in political affairs has been one of the root causes of the civil war in Sudan, leading to the independence of South Sudan (see Kempf, 2011). In this case study, we will examine how and why integrated responses to cross-border conflicts among pastoralist communities, including environmental challenges, became less successful in Zone 3.

#### **4. The setback of Integrated Approaches and the Consequences for the Great Lakes Region**

During the negotiations of the 2006 Peace Pact, economic integration in the region, or the establishment of regional regime for development, was one of the major demands coming from Member States. Further, Member States expressed interest in railway lines linking several countries of the region and in the upgrading of existing hydropower stations such as Inga in the DRC which has the potential to provide electricity to many of its neighbouring countries. The Group of Friends (including countries on the African continent such as South Africa and Egypt and also worldwide such as Canada and the Netherlands) who were coming together as a collective to support another collective (the Member states of the ICGLR) were vital for bringing

together Member States as well as civil society actors during the design of the peace pact. However, as explained below, the economic integration or the regional regime envisioned was gradually dismantled.

#### **4.1 Going back to bilateral interests and support**

The donors, however, did not continue their support for the implementation of the Pact and stopped their collective support once the Pact was signed. The Great Lakes Fund for Reconstruction and Development, one of the major agreed actions of the Pact, which was often dubbed as a new Marshall plan for the region, never received any major funds apart from initial seed funding from some of the Member States. This was because, with the shift of focus of bilateral agencies from multilateral to bilateral cooperation, bilateral donors started to provide bilateral support to countries of their choice instead of supporting regional cross-border initiatives. This trend was enhanced by the fact that many UN agencies are working at the national level under the auspices of the UN country teams and have no cross-border mandates and thus also no funding for multi-country projects.

#### **4.2 Competing and shifting mandates**

Other incidents which affected the implementation of the ICGLR cross-border projects and the effectiveness of its operations, was the establishment of Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the Region (PSC Framework) adopted in 2013 which mainly focuses on the DRC and its Eastern neighbours and the reopening of the UN Office for the Great Lakes (Office of the Special Envoy of the Secretary General for the Great Lakes region) focusing on security issues in Nairobi. The PSC Framework and the Office started to compete with the ICGLR and divert political attention and funding.

Politically also, attention shifted away from the regional ownership and efforts concentrated rather on the DRC through the international intervention brigade used to eliminate the rebel forces in the Eastern DRC and the Kampala peace negotiations between the government of DRC and the M23 rebels in 2012-2013. As a result, the focus of ICGLR was placed upon the DRC, Rwanda and Uganda involved in peace negotiations. Despite their important mediator role in the past when they were an active part of the Great Lakes region as part of the ICGLR, other countries such as Angola and Republic of Congo were gradually excluded from the focus of donors and the attention to the cross-border projects based on integrated approach became diluted.

### **5. ICGLR Integrated Approaches in Zone 3**

When the ICGLR was conceived in the early 2000s, one of the underlying objectives was to secure the region by addressing security challenges experienced along border zones. While emphasizing that regional stability depended on securing common borders, the ICGLR noted that border zones continue to constitute security threats to states and communities in the entire GLR. These include cross-border attacks by armed groups and communities straddling the borders, smuggling, motor vehicle thefts, drug trafficking, flow of small arms, land mines and threats of terror networks. Border spaces are made ideal for these activities by existing obstacles to accessibility (terrain, forests, and deserts) and absence of penetrative transport and

communication (ICGLR 2006a:1). In particular, the proliferation of SALW in the region was identified as one of the enduring challenges in ICGLR's Zone 3.

The overarching objective of the ICGLR programmes and projects, however, was much broader than these security related goals. It was to ensure regional stability and human security through disarming pastoralist groups, strengthening state and community capacities and security, enhancing economic development in the region (ICGLR 2006b:1).

In 2006, the ICGLR executive secretariat was established in Bujumbura, Burundi with the mandate to coordinate implementation of the programmes of action developed during the preparatory phase of the ICGLR mechanism. An immediate concern was the absence of a project implementation budget for the various programmes and projects developed for each thematic cluster. For Zone 3, it was left to the secretariat to mobilize member states to discuss the modalities to implement the project.

Following the meeting in Kampala in April 2008 that established a road map for the implementation plan of ICGLR priority project on "Disarmament of Armed Nomadic Pastoralists and the promotion of sustainable development in Zone 3", it was agreed that the project would be implemented in the framework of the Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Program (KIDDP). The ICGLR Conference Secretariat signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Office of the Prime Minister in Uganda who would be coordinating the KIDDP. Meetings between government and civil society representatives in Zone 3 agreed that a similar programme would be established in other countries to facilitate concurrent disarmament and development exercises in Zone 3. On 21st January 2009, a Regional Disarmament Committee (REDICOM) comprising 15 member representations from Members States, civil society organizations and regional bodies namely the East African Community (EAC) and Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) was formed to monitor the implementation of KIDDP. At the meeting to form the REDICOM, the participants agreed to "put in place programs to fight desertification, environmental restoration and provision of water as activities in the dry pastoralist areas of Zone 3". According to the project design there should be Inter Ministerial Working Committees at national levels reporting to the Joint Technical Committee and the Zonal Ministerial Committee and finally to the Heads of State summit of the Zone.

In 2010, the REDICOM held a Leaders Conference in Naivasha, Kenya, to take stock of the challenges and opportunities in the implementation of the KIDDP and to agree on a road map of implementation. The conference also sought to enlist the support of the traditional leadership structures of Zone 3 member states with regard to disarmament and development initiatives. The leaders conference resolved that henceforth member states would adopt KIDDP model in their strategies to deal with the challenge of disarmament and development in Zone 3, specifically with regard to infrastructure support, food security, micro-investment, and capacity development (ICGLR 2011). It also adopted practical disarmament guidelines developed by the Regional Centre on Small Arms. However, nothing concrete in terms of specific integrated border security project activities was jointly undertaken following the leaders conference. Member states, such as Uganda and Kenya, which had borne the brunt of cattle rustling which then induced inter-communal conflicts, continued their activities and projects separately, often ignoring the regional approach to fostering border security. With their national initiatives, while Uganda is noted for her achievements in executing the KIDDP programme, Kenya adopted a

mix of state security centred approaches on her side of the common border. Below is a brief review.

## **6.The Kenyan approach to Zone 3**

Kenya has grappled with the problem of inter-communal violence fed by the proliferation of SALW for a long time. By and large, the Kenyan governments adopted approaches that emphasize the primacy of the state: sovereignty, territorial integrity and political control over human centered approaches that highlight human and community security. Based on this state-centred approach, the government has adopted several policy decisions underpinning its commitment to address the development challenges in Northern Kenya (which is a part of Zone 3).

First, the government launched sessional paper No. 8 of 2012, which created a Ministry of Northern Kenya, with the mandate of allocating resources and paying special attention to the hitherto marginalized northern Kenya counties including Turkana and West Pokot that straddle the western border with Uganda and South Sudan. Second, the government's Vision 2030 policy blueprint stated its plan to develop the entire country, with emphasis on transforming "special circumstances of previously marginalized communities" (Abraham 2019). Third, Kenyan government has also introduced the LAPSSET (the Lamu Port and South Sudan – Ethiopia Transport corridor) as an attempt to "open up" the "closed-up" region that encompasses the northern counties that straddle ICGLR's Zone 3. The LAPSSET Corridor Program is a regional flagship project intended to provide transportation and logistics infrastructure aimed at creating seamless connectivity between the Eastern African Countries of Kenya, Ethiopia and South Sudan (Government of Kenya 2016). The LAPSSET combines the construction of infrastructural projects including an Oil pipeline from Lamu along the Kenyan coast to the Turkana oilfields at Lokichar and onto to Hoima in Uganda and Juba in South Sudan, as well as roads, railway, and international airport. Its implementation is underway with the attempts to build the Lamu port, while an international Airport is complete in Isiolo. In addition, the government has recently completed rebuilding of the Northern corridor road that links Eldoret with Kitale, Lodwar, and Lokichoggio on the border with South Sudan, a key link road connecting Kenya, South Sudan and Ethiopia. Given the inaccessibility of these pastoralist border zones in the past, these infrastructure developments have proved instrumental in opening the area for development, including tourism, the hospitality industry etc.

Fourth, the constitution of Kenya in 2010 introduced devolution, which meant devolving power to the counties (Republic of Kenya 2010). The 2010 Constitution allowed county governments to have power to allocate more resources for different sectors that have been devolved such as health, roads, agriculture, and social services among others. While authority for security was not devolved, county governments have power to construct roads, health centres, drugs, markets, and in some cases even processing plants for value addition of food crops. In Turkana and West Pokot counties, some residents witnessed tarmac roads and decent hospital facilities for the first time since independence more than 55 years ago. The development of infrastructure, partly accelerated by the devolution, has reduced the frequency and impact of attacks by rival pastoralist communities by cutting down on the time taken by law enforcement institutions to recover stolen animals. Access to improved medical facilities has further transformed these hitherto marginalized spaces.

## 6.1 Kenya's Zone 3 border security initiatives

The Kenya government has implemented several multiple initiatives in the northern borderlands of ICGLR's Zone 3 that are aimed at addressing the root causes of pastoralist conflict. One of these initiatives is community disarmament. The government has deployed forced and voluntary disarmament strategies to remove unauthorized arms from civilian possession. The government preferred forced disarmament to voluntary one. Dubbed "operations", government activities to disarm civilians have been undertaken regularly and involved police, general service units and sometimes the military. For instance, in 2006 and 2007, the government launched Operation Okota, where police and the military took the remaining arms by force. Some 2,298 firearms and 4,418 rounds of ammunition were recovered (Achuka and Gisesa 2019). These operations mostly resulted in the collection of only a small fraction of guns since holders hid them from authorities well before the start of operations. Communities decried the brutality of these operations, and community leaders often appealed to the government to understand the human security dynamics prevailing in pastoralist areas that necessitate taking up arms by communities to secure themselves and their cattle from hostile neighbors (Achuka and Gisesa 2019).

The government has also adopted a voluntary disarmament strategy within its border zone. For instance, between 2005 and 2010, the government launched Operation Dumisha Amani with a view to integrate development with disarmament. The two-stage exercise began with border communities being encouraged to surrender their guns. According to the Kenya National Focal Point on Small Arms, between 2017 and 2020, Kenya under the African Union (AU) "*silencing the guns*" initiative successfully implemented the amnesty month campaigns on voluntary surrender of illegally held weapons. The interventions realized a collection of 9,645 illicit firearms which is not a significant number but not a small number given that it was the result of voluntary disarmament (UNPoA 2021).

In parallel with these disarmament initiatives, the Kenyan government also adopted the initiative to integrate development with disarmament to address the development challenges in the hitherto marginalized border areas. Since the onset of devolution, the county governments of Turkana and West Pokot have invested in infrastructure projects, the construction and upgrading of security roads while at the same time investing in social services including health and water provision. The construction of water pans by military units during disarmament operations has been hailed by local leaders for bringing communities together as some of them are constructed along inter-communal boundaries. Another government initiative is grassroots peacebuilding. A combination of strategies was the characteristic of the government approach to peace within the Kenyan borderlands of Zone 3. In addition to disarmament initiatives and integrated initiatives, these include community policing, *nyumba kumi*, peace committees and peace caravans. For instance, community policing committees have been established in at least 8 police stations along the common border in both Turkana and West Pokot counties as well as Nyumba Kumi units at the community level, leading to enhanced information sharing and early warning regarding cattle rustling. The government has partnered with civil society to provide training to these committees to ensure all members understand their roles.

Another initiative that can be described as integrated approach is building partnerships with civil society organizations to promote peacebuilding and development initiatives (OSSREA 2022). Civil society organizations have partnered with government to support implementation of security and development programmes, funding of education programmes, creation of awareness

and sensitization of communities on the dangers of SALW proliferation and use, support to grassroots peace committees, support to agricultural programmes and other food security initiatives and public health. Notable examples include Saferworld, Reinvent, ACT, The Fellowship of Christian Councils and Churches in the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa (FECCLAHA), Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC), and Plan International among others. Partnership with donor organizations notably United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Food Programme (WFP), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Finnish Church Aid, Norwegian Church Aid, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has significantly aided the governments peace and development objectives in Zone 3 (OSSREA 2022).

However, the government efforts to pacify Turkana, West Pokot and other Northern Kenya counties have not gone without challenges. One of these is the continuing proliferation of SALW, despite efforts being undertaken to deal with the menace. Reports published by Small Arms Survey show a steady increase in the overall number of illicit firearms circulating in the region. Another challenge is the increasing number of pastoral conflicts which have become bloodier and more protracted, thereby contributing to a continuous spiral of retributive violence. For instance, in September 2022, 11 people including 8 police officers, a chief, and two civilians were killed in a bandit attack in Turkana country (BBC News 2022). Over time they have also become entangled with outside political and commercial interests and potentially regenerating into interstate wars (Small Arms Survey 2021).

## **7. Uganda's approach to Zone 3**

The Karamoja region is a summation of seven districts in Uganda. Regionally, it borders South Sudan to north and Kenya to the east and northeast. Until the 1990s, Karamoja was the second largest district in Uganda. At the largest size of approximately 27,200 sq. kms, Karamoja has only a population of about 1.2 million people (Uganda Investment Authority 2022). Thus Karamoja is a very big area with a very small population much of which is neither arable nor habitable. Not all the land is utilized by the people. While the geographical boundaries detach the Karamojong from their neighbours, the neighbours actually are “cousins” and share the same origin (Byamukama 2006).

The multiple challenges in Karamoja region can be well articulated by the concerns of an integrated approach and the framework of Human Security Approach where individuals and communities have the options necessary to mitigate or sufficiently adapt to threats to their human, social and their environmental rights. In both approaches, people have to be empowered to have the capacity and freedom to exercise available options and actively participate in pursuing these options.

Specifically, according to the United Nations, human security has seven dimensions namely (i) Political security, (ii) Personal security, (iii) Economic security, (iv) Environmental security, (v) Food security, (vi) Health security and (vii) Community security. When applied to Karamoja and Zone 3 in general we can identify and link types of insecurities and their root cause (Odhiambo 2003) as below:



<b>Type of insecurity</b>	<b>Root causes</b>
Community Insecurity	Proliferation of SALW, cross-border and inter-ethnic (cattle) raids
Personal insecurity	Physical violence in form of killings, rape (sexual violence)
Environmental insecurity	Environment degradation, resource depletion/extraction, natural disasters
Food insecurity	Hunger, famine, drought, cattle raids, high food prices
Health insecurity	Poor sanitation, poor nutrition, epidemics and lack of access to healthcare
Economic Insecurity	Poverty, unemployment, lack of education facilities and alternative livelihood, illegal exploitation of the natural resources
Political insecurity	Violations of human rights during forceful disarmament

Source: UN Trust Fund for Human Security Report 2016:7. Table customized for Karamoja/Zone 3 situation.

Uganda's multiple policies and program interventions in Karamoja have probably been more than any other of the countries in Zone 3 (UN 2020). These interventions have, however, produced disappointing outcomes. Despite more than three decades of Uganda government's consistent financial and political commitment to pacify and develop Karamoja, and with support of development partners, the region remains insecure and underdeveloped. Communities that had been disarmed were rearmed quickly. Stability has not been sustained and peace seems to be just a lull between battles in the region. Famine is chronic and the Karamojong still depend on food aid for survival. The two neighbouring Turkana and Karamojong continue with retaliatory attacks on each other using SALW that had previously been contained. The dry lands of Karamoja are increasingly becoming degraded by the government interventions. The Ugandan government troops that camp in Karamoja for disarmament competed with the Karamojong (particularly women and girls of Karamojong) over firewood for cooking hence speeding degradation of the environment. Environmental, security and development nexus has largely been ignored in the conceptualization, implementation and monitoring of government projects in Karamoja. Disappointing results are in part due to the nature and approach of intervention, namely state-centric approach preoccupied with securing the security of the state rather than adopting a more comprehensive integrated human security approach and implementing it, both at national and regional levels.

## **7.1 Uganda's Policy Context in Karamoja**

Since colonial days the state has attempted to put in place policies presumably to stabilize and develop Karamoja. Along the way the policies were either abandoned, found to be ill-conceived or failed to produce the intended outcome (Muhereza 2018). One of the main reasons for this disappointing outcome is a lack of understanding of the context of Karamoja by the central government and the big gap between the problem recognition and solutions of the central government and the Karamojong. The central government has understood the problem of Karamoja as fundamentally that of possession of illegal guns while the Karamojong sees the gun as the instrument of protection in absence of state protection from threats posed by neighbours. There have always been attempts, right from the colonial days, to deal with the issues of conflict in Karamoja but all of them lacked careful integrated thought, planning and execution. Since colonial days, emphasis has largely been on controlling, subduing and disciplining what the state saw as "stubborn and ignorant marauding pastoralists who must be disarmed and forced to be

modernized and sedentarized (Muhereza 2018). The colonial state, for example, attempted, without success, to discipline what they saw as a backward group in Karamoja (Government of Uganda 1961).

After independence, the state's approach towards Karamoja remained militaristic and at times ruthless. Under Idi Amin regime (1971-79), for example, Karamojong was forced to grow cotton as well as to abandon their traditional way of dressing. It was a community under siege. It was not surprising therefore that when Idi Amin regime fell in 1979, the Karamojong raided the military barracks and made off with the guns to start raiding the neighbors using those guns (Muhereza 2018). The period between 1980-1985 is described in the Uganda Human Rights Commission Report as a period where "the campaigns did not result in disarmament or improvement of security in Karamoja; instead, it led to alienation of the Karamojong from the government in Kampala" (Muhereza 2018).

Of all the regimes in Uganda, the National Resistance Movement/ Army (NRM/A) with longevity in power has probably been the only government that has given Karamoja consistent attention with several policies and programmes put in place for Karamoja's stability, security and development. This, however, has not fully worked out in any sustainable manner. Instead, pastoral conflicts have become increasingly bloody and protracted, thereby contributing to a continuous spiral of retributive violence within and across the region. In general, the NRM/A's approach has been also about securing state security without corresponding interest in human security. Even when the programmes are planned as "integrated" (Office of the Prime Minister 2021), the praxis on the ground has either remained disjointed or has missed crucial components (such as environment) that are central to stability and development.

## **7.2 The Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (2007-2010)**

KIDDP aimed to contribute to human security and promote conditions for recovery and development in Karamoja. It was a specific project conceived after realizing that Karamoja had specific needs emerging from cattle raiding whose consequences were far worse than recovering from battles with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). KIDDP represented an integrated approach by Government of Uganda "to integrate development interventions, conflict management and peacebuilding from bilateral and multilateral development partners, international and national NGOs and CBOs" (Office of the Prime Minister 2021).

Of all the intervention by government in Karamoja, the KIDDP (2007-2010) was probably the most comprehensive as it focused on creating conditions for promoting human security and recovery in Karamoja. KIDDP was Karamoja specific and emphasised (a) military operations for both voluntary /peaceful disarmament and forceful disarmament (b) conflict management and peace building and (c) development intervention for social economic transformation including schools, health centres and livestock markets. The KIDDP was followed by the Karamoja Integrated Development Programme (KIDP) whose objective was agricultural modernization and commercialization of livestock production under Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPES) 2009-2014.

It is noteworthy that Uganda put in place a conducive environment for the ongoing development interventions by all actors including development partners aimed ultimately at making positive change and bringing peace and stability to the region by other actors including Karamoja

Projects implementation Unit (EU/KPIU), sectorial programmes on roads, water and education. There are also multilateral donor initiatives by others including the Lutheran World Federation, DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency), USAID, GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit), and Oxfam. Other factors have also contributed greatly to the peace effort in Karamoja. Of significance are several civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations as well as religious organizations. Uganda also adopted a “Rangelands Management and Pastoralism Strategy” in 2017 which offers framework for sustainable management of range resources (Aleper 2017). It also offers guidance on livestock management, climate change mitigation, improved agro-pastoralism practices, biodiversity protection, respect for indigenous knowledge and promises to engage communities in decision making and development processes.

The Uganda government with the support of partners invested in providing infrastructures such as roads, electricity, water, health centres, schools and police posts among others. There is evidence of increased construction of primary, secondary and tertiary schools, and training institutions that include supporting school feeding programmes. The first ever tarmacadamized road in Karamoja following the bituminization of Moroto- Nakapiripirit that was completed in 2015 at a cost of US\$ 80 million (Muhereza 2018:336).

However, these projects and developmental efforts have been conducted still within the government’s security-centred approach. Peace, environmental and development challenges remain. As explained below, integration of these many projects utilizing huge resources within the framework of safeguarding national security as opposed to state security has largely failed because of the sole national focus on security without regional consideration, lack of attention to the roles of women and girls and failure to integrate security, development and environmental goals in addition to strong intervention focus on security (Muhereza 2018:336).

### **7.2.1 Lack of attention to regional dynamics surrounding disarmament**

The region is aware that disarmament is a regional imperative where regional collaboration and cooperation are key in denying any group’s weaponry advantage over the other. This understanding was firmly embedded in the IGAD’s *Karamoja cluster* and ICGLR’s *Zone 3* projects. For various reasons, however, regional collaborative initiatives have either been insufficient or have failed to take off altogether leading to some frustration on the part of governments and the people affected. It is now an established fact that when the Karamojong are disarmed without simultaneously disarming their “cousins”, the Turkana across the (porous) border in Kenya automatically subjects the unarmed group to vulnerability and encourages rearmament. For example, after relative calm that the region had witnessed since the last disarmament, the Turkana warriors crossed into Uganda in March 2022 to raid and actually killed innocent researchers and soldiers on the Ugandan side. That reignited a new spate of rearmament and raids across as well as heightened military involvement in disarmament.

### **7.2.2 Missing environment in integration of disarmament and development**

Karamoja is a semi-arid region and it is the driest part of Uganda with the lowest annual rainfall of 600mm (25 inches) and the longest dry season of six months. As in most dry areas of east Africa, pastoralism in such conditions has been the main activity as compared to arable agriculture. The Karamajong practises transhumance during the dry season. When it rains, water becomes available but disappears quickly. Thus the area is in perpetual water shortage for crops,

animals and human beings, except for areas with boreholes which are neither many nor enough as compared to the needs and demands of the people of Karamoja

The Karamajong are primarily pastoralists because of the poor and variable rainfall that makes it impossible for them to practice crop farming on a large scale. The contribution of cultivation agriculture to their livelihood is limited and is only proportionate to the amount and regularity of annual rainfall. The nomadic-pastoral nature of the Karamojong, which is in accordance with the ecological conditions, forces them to move long distances in search of water and pastures for their animals.

The scarcity of water and pasture for the Karamajong is further compounded by competition for land with wild game (e.g Kidepo National Park) and the preservation interests of environmentalists. Karamoja's arable land is gazetted for forest and wetland preservation and game and hunting reserves. The gazetted area represents a big portion of Karamajong and this has been a major source of conflict. The shrinkage of pastures and water sources has also been worsened by the conflict which has rendered vast areas of otherwise suitable range land unusable due to the formation of security belts or "no man's land" between warring clans. There are a number of areas where no human settlement or land use is possible or evident. Yet in the last 20 years the population of Karamoja has increased by almost 30% as land remains constant.

It is imperative that the government gives priority to the environmental concerns of the people of Karamoja since environmental conditions directly impact their survival and livelihood and also have an implication on the security of the entire region. The no-man's land and the borderlands are spaces where big valley dams and environmental restoration activities can be undertaken. It would also be prudent to consider de-gazetting of some land in Karamoja to take into account the ecological and human survival issues.

In the dry season or during drought, huge losses among the herds are evident due to the limited water and pasture to keep the animals nourished. The impact of harsh conditions coupled by ever increasing population and by new administrative boundaries that have changed the context in which the traditional transhumance (mobile) pastoralism systems are in Karamoja and the Zone 3 in general have aggravated the insecurity. As the UN observed in the case of the Turkana, it is equally correct to state for Karamoja that "as pastoralists struggle to eke out a living under such unfavorable (environmental) conditions, crime and violence flourish beyond reach of government structures and law enforcement systems along the region's porous national boundaries ...as a consequence, the population has resorted to acquiring arms, which has accelerated the proliferation of SALW in the region (UN 2018).

Yet, Uganda's most integrated project on Karamoja, the KIDDP (2007-2010), does not give attention to environment as a core component of the project (Office of the Prime Minister 2021). A review of KIDDP shows that the environmental issues are ignored in the narrative and only mentioned in passing under the project Logframe "to support Environmental Management Institutions where they exist and for communities to demand Environmental Restoration Orders from the investors" (Office of the Prime Minister 2021).

### **7.2.3 Insufficient and security-framed empowerment of women**

While KIDDP promises to empower women in Karamoja and there is evidence of women empowerment from the earlier programmes in Northern Uganda including Karamoja, interventions did not support women's food and agricultural requirements while at the same time

leaving them vulnerable to sexual violence during raids (Muhereza 2018). Women issues are reportedly mainstreamed under KIDDP but largely to the extent that they supported and influenced disarmament not in human security considerations (Office of the Prime Minister 2021). In Karamoja, men's traditional role as head of households and bread winners has been increasingly weakened. Men exercise their control over livestock to ensure everything else is catered for. However, increasing insecurity and loss of livestock, masculinities are being affected negatively. Women are now *de facto* bread winners as they hustle for their children (without husbands) by engaging in artisanal mining, charcoal burning, wood collection for money to buy food for their children in markets. According to Muhereza (2018), in Karamoja "women have become husbands and men". Therefore, women and girls should have spaces where they can meaningfully participate in all processes and activities beyond disarmament which address insecurities in various dimensions of development such as food, health, education, economic activities and environment.

However, the role of civil society organizations in empowering women and girls is notable. Where the state and regional organizations are absent in Karamoja, they stepped in to provide various projects to empower women and girls. For instance, EASSI (Eastern Africa Sub-regional Initiative for the Advancement of Women) has done tremendous work in mobilizing civil society effort to improve the living conditions of Karamajong by engaging civil society near borderlands for conflict prevention (EASSI 2020). In particular, working with IGAD, EASSI has highlighted the plight of women pastoralists who suffer harsh conditions and their role as agents of change and the need to establish project involving women in the development discourse.

## **8. Lessons learned from Kenyan and Ugandan cases**

Focus on security goal alone is based on the misunderstanding of the socio-economic, political and cultural contexts of people and space. As Ugandan case shows, from the colonial dates, Karamoja problem has been understood as fundamentally that of possession of illegal guns which threatens security. Forced or voluntary disarmament was the primary goal and other supportive policies such as strengthening policing, infrastructures, health and education have not been fully integrated into the development framework for Karamoja. Gun control (disarmament) should not be seen as an end in itself but as part of the integrated solution to complex problems as we can see in the failed attempts in Karamoja.

Successful implementation of disarmament and sustainable development initiatives in the Kenyan border areas of Zone 3 has involved mainly the government of Kenya in partnership with civil society actors. The involvement of civil society actors has been crucial for mobilization of the population. The lesson learned was that cross-border challenges cannot be tackled by government alone as we can see in the disappointing results of the forced disarmament initiative but it must involve all stakeholders including local communities and CSOs at a regional level.

It highlights the importance of good communication between the government and local people. The government should consult with key stakeholders, in particular local people who are directly and indirectly affected by the programmes before implementing programmes that may antagonize the population. Otherwise, the government programmes may end up being counterproductive. Implementation of forced disarmament operations in Turkana and West Pokot counties of Kenya has not borne the desired results owing to its non-participatory nature.

Communities view it as punishment by a government that is insensitive or does not understand the communities' security needs. The lesson is that government should consult widely with the target population of its policies.

The regional approach based on integration of development with disarmament and environment is the best one for dealing with regional challenges like small arms proliferation in the regions such as Zone 3. Concerted regional approaches that integrate state, non-state actors, and multi-level initiatives provide the most effective means for tackling border security challenges. Lack of regional initiative or attention to regional dynamics in Ugandan interventions is well demonstrated in the two contrasting remarks by the President of Uganda, Yoweri K Museveni. He was once quoted observing that

“... good bilateral relations and cross-border security mechanisms with the regional leaders of East Africa community, particularly the Republics of Kenya and South Sudan can help to follow them and hold them accountable” (Vision Reporter 2022).

However, as if to confirm failure to galvanize regional efforts he told the army and Karamojong leaders while camping in Karamoja to oversee disarmament that

“The issue of guns in Kenya and South Sudan should not concern us. The problem is internal. Because if you tie our internal security problem with what happens in neighboring countries, we shall never get peace” (Kazibwe 2022).

This cannot be true, and he knows it. It was another way of saying regional collaboration is not working out at the moment. It is therefore essential that regional organizations such as the ICGLR convene regional leaders to focus on collective effort to disarm nomadic pastoralists in Zone 3 and to fully implement regional projects they had committed to.

Absence of regional perspective or approach results in the absence of activities related to cross-border trade. A dynamic and complex market exists in the Zone 3 with a network that has penetrated more deeply into north-eastern Uganda, North-western Kenya and south-eastern South Sudan and is most developed along the Uganda-Kenya border where cross-border trade in livestock, grains, and other commodities especially between Lokiriama in Kenya and Nakapiripirit in Uganda and Moroto and Nakiloro in Kenya has increased (UNDP 2021). Regional perspective or approach can nurture such networks of cross-border markets and trades for peace, development and prosperity.

Lack of attention to regional approach based on integration of development with disarmament and environment is also found in Kenyan case. Kenya needs to design and implement an integrated programme that is regional in character as opposed to the disjointed, piecemeal implementation of peace, environment and development initiatives.

Empowerment of women and girls are particularly important in the areas where the traditional roles of male and female is rapidly changing. More women assume the role of breadwinners and heads of the households but still lack the opportunity to play a role of agent of change. Although NGOs play a significant role in empowering women and girls as we can see in the case of EASSI in Karamoja, more systematic approach based on the cooperation between multiple development partners at various levels should be developed. Integrating women organizations in security, environmental and development initiatives is recommended for gender mainstreaming in policy formulation and implementation for Karamoja and Zone 3 in general.

Last lesson is about the missing opportunity to learn from neighbouring countries due to nationally focused programme or project design and implementation. Uganda developed its KIDDP programme which has been implementing in a silo within its own side of the border. Kenya and Sudan have separately been addressing their challenges, despite the existence of the well-designed ICGLR Zone 3 project. Even with the establishment of REDICOM, no concerted joint action was implemented on the ground save for a few meetings held in Kenya and Uganda. This nationally focused programme and project design results in the loss of valuable opportunity to exchange information and learn from each other.

## 9. Conclusion

Despite individual countries' national efforts at policy and legislative level, Zone 3 borderlands still face serious security, environmental and development challenges. It is clear that there were commitments to regional approach expressed under the ICGLR and IGAD. Regional approach, however, requires regional collaborative effort to address these challenges. Three countries have not shown concrete measures for regional approach yet. In this regard it is imperative that member states of ICGLR and IGAD, as an obligation, establish their presence in the Zone and implement their commitments under regional and international instruments. Furthermore, ministries, departments and institutions dealing with various issues such as security, development and environment in each country have to be mobilized, resourced and deployed to the borderlands of Karamoja and Zone 3. In this case ministries and departments of youth, environment, education, water, minerals, gender, health, children, agriculture and pastoralism must be part of the integrated system for the development and stability of the borderland.

Under regional frameworks, member states have committed to relevant instruments related to Zone 3. The regional bodies have the convening power and they can coordinate the implementation of those obligations. The ICGLR in particular has to be encouraged to implement projects that were approved by the Heads of State in 2006 (with amendment). In which case, cattle rustling as regional security threat has to be addressed through a joint coordinated and concurrent disarmament efforts by all the three counties - Kenya, Uganda, Sudan. And Ethiopia should also join this group of counties as had been envisaged under Project No. 1.1.2.

Project 1.1.2 envisaged, among other components, having Border Security Roads (BOSERS), Border Security Social Networks (BOSSONS) and Border Security Economic and Environmental Networks (BOSEENS). BOSEENS is particularly notable recommendation since it clearly provides the framework of integrated approach in the region. It says, the project within the framework of BOSEENS “revolves around construction of economic regenerating and environment sustaining activities. Among these are activities such as the building of market shelters, irrigation canals, boreholes, dams, roads, environmental protection i.e. reforestation”. These are activities with long term impacts on communities and environment in the region. In order to create sustainable solutions, the disarmament efforts of the pastoralist must be accompanied by the provision of alternative livelihoods that is consistent with their way of life.

In addition, state security disarmament will need to be integrated into a broader framework such as human security framework where reconstruction and rehabilitation of social and physical

infrastructure in the Zone is conducted to address people and environment in the region, in particular youth and their economic security challenges.

Development partners, international community and other friends of the region complement and provide necessary support to government upon request so that governments' capacity to respond to the existing and emerging threats can be strengthened. They include: UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, European Union, USAID, GIZ, DANIDA, SIDA, Irish Government, Action Aid, FARM Africa, Save the Children plus regional and national civil society organizations. In addition to provision of resources, they also should collaborate with each other to plan, implement and monitor the projects together. For organizations that have no regional mandate, they can still be encouraged to support the national component of a regional borderland programme which when integrated will contribute to regional outcomes.

While Zone 3 has been on the marginal and isolated borderlands of the four countries and not fully integrated into national economies- recent discoveries of natural resources such as gold, copper, platinum, lead, limestone, uranium, marble, graphite, gypsum, iron ore, wolfram, nickel, copper, cobalt, lithium and tin (in Karamoja); oil and amethyst (in Turkana) have brought about both opportunities and also threats to the Zone. Part of the threat is the dispute over ownership of Illemi Triangle with “the potential existence of hydrocarbons and other strategic minerals, of which every country in the Zone has a claim of ownership on recent discovery of oil in the Turkana which “has hardened both local and state actors” (UNDP,2020:8). While the Turkana, Dassanach, Nyangatom and Toposa use the area for herding and hunting, and in the case of Nyangatom, cultivation and permanent settlement, only the Turkana are permanent residents of Illemi at the moment while in the past, Uganda and Sudan (now South Sudan) had jurisdiction. This can be a source of conflict in the future, but also an opportunity. If the Zone is fully integrated into the regional economies where an integrated approach can address security, development and environment, the natural resources can be a source of sustainable development and prosperity for all these countries. A good signal is the emergence of various forms of regional forums such as the Karamoja cluster Regional Women Forum of IGAD. Regional Women Forum’s progress towards integrated approach may call for new forms of regional organizations contributing to integrated approach involving private sector and civil society through which state-civil society interventions can be harmonized.

An integrated approach to peace, stability and development is the surest way to achieve sustainable peace and development not only in Zone 3 but also in other border zones of ICGLR. Neighboring countries of the Zone 3 must abandon lone ranger tactics and embrace joint, integrated initiatives at the centre of which are the communities of Zone 3, who should be consulted widely and involved in the programmes aimed at uplifting the security, environment and development status.



## References

- Achuka, Vincent and Nyambega Gisesa. 2022. “Why disarming northern Kenya is not a walk in the park”. *Nation*. Last modified 19 July. <https://nation.africa/kenya/nation-prime/why-disarming-northern-kenya-is-not-a-walk-in-the-park-229732>
- Aleper, Daniel and Martine Nagamand. 2022. “Status and Trends of Range lands in Central Karamoja, Recommendations for Enhancement of Livestock Production” Last modified 19 August. [https://karamojaresilience.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/study\\_on\\_rangeland\\_management\\_in\\_selected\\_areas\\_of\\_central\\_karamoja\\_april\\_2017.pdf](https://karamojaresilience.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/study_on_rangeland_management_in_selected_areas_of_central_karamoja_april_2017.pdf)
- Byamukama, Nathan. 2006. Conflict in Karamoja: Bridging the Information Gap through Human Rights Based Approach, In *Media in Situations of Conflict: Roles, Challenges and Responsibility*. Edited by Aldolf Mbaine. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Dalle, Abraham. 2022. “New Frontier for Development and the Politics of Negation in Northern Kenya.” Last Modified 10 July. <https://www.theelephant.info/features/2019/11/15/the-new-frontier-for-development-and-the-politics-of-negation-in-northern-kenya/>
- EASSI (Eastern African Sub-Regional Support Initiative for the Advancement of Women). 2022 “The “Invisible Women” in the Karamoja Cluster.” Last Modified 4 March. <https://eassi.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Gender-Perspectives-in-the-Karamoja-Cluster-Invisible-Women.pdf>
- Finn Church Aid. 2014. “The Problems of Northern Kenya arise from Poverty. Last Modified 22 September . 2014, <https://www.kirkonulkomaanapu.fi/en/latest-news/articles/the-problems-of-northern-kenya-arise-from-poverty/>
- Government of Kenya. 2010. Constitution of Kenya, Nairobi: Government Printers.
- ICGLR. 2004. Dar-Es-Salaam Declaration on Peace, Security, Democracy and Development in the Great Lakes Region. Bujumbura: ICGLR.
- ICGLR. 2006. Protocol on Non-Aggression and Mutual Defence in the Great Lakes Region. Bujumbura: ICGLR.
- ICGLR. 2006. Regional Program of Action for Peace and Security. Sub-Program of Action for Joint Security Management of Common Borders. Project Number 1.1.1. Disarmament And Repatriation of all Armed Groups in Eastern DRC. Bujumbura: ICGLR, .
- ICGLR. 2006. Regional Program of Action for Peace and Security. Sub-Program of Action for Joint Security Management of Common Borders. Project Number 1.1.2, Disarmament of Armed Nomadic Pastoralists and Promotion of Sustainable Development in Zone 3. Bujumbura: ICGLR.
- ICGLR. 2012. “The Pact on security, stability and development for the Great Lakes Region.” Last modified November. [https://www.icglr.org/images/LastPDF/Pact\\_EN-Modified\\_2012.pdf](https://www.icglr.org/images/LastPDF/Pact_EN-Modified_2012.pdf)
- Kazibwe, Kenneth. 2022. “Museveni Camps in Eastern Uganda to Command Operations against Karamoja warriors”. Last modified 9 June. <https://nilepost.co.ug/2022/06/09/museveni-camps-in-eastern-uganda-to-command-operations-against-karamajong-warriors/>

- Kempf, Isabelle. 2004. Needs or rights? The case of the Maasai in Kenya. Madrid: University Complutense de Madrid.
- Kempf, Isabelle. 2011. "Bridging the Great Lakes: Implementing the human rights dimension of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region." In *Regional Dimensions of Conflict in the Great Lakes*, edited by Nyambura Githaiga. Pretoria: ISS.
- LAPSET Corridor Development Authority. 2016. "Brief on LAPSET Corridor Project," Last modified July. <http://vision2030.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/LAPSET-Project-Report-July-2016.pdf>
- Muhereza, Emmanuel Frank. *The Transformation of Karamoja: Sedentalization of Pastoralists*. Kampala: Makerere University.
- NewVision. 2022. "Museveni vows to end Cattle rustling in Karamoja". Last modified 14 June. <https://www.newvision.co.ug/category/news/museveni-vows-to-end-cattle-raids-in-karamoja-136187>
- Novelli, Bruno. 1998. *Origins, Impact and Solutions*. Nairobi: Oxfam.
- Office of the Prime Minister (Uganda). 2021. "Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Program (KIDDP)" Last modified 17 March. <https://opm.go.ug/karamoja-intergrated-development-programme-kidp/>
- Office of the Prime Minister (Uganda). 2007. *The Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme: creating Conditions for Promoting Human Security and Recovery in Karamoja*. Kampala: Republic of Uganda.
- OSSREA. 2022. "The Roles of Civil Society in Conflict Management and Peacebuilding in Eastern and Southern Africa. Last modified 2022. [http://www.ossrea.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=458%3Athe-roles-of-civil-society-in-conflict](http://www.ossrea.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=458%3Athe-roles-of-civil-society-in-conflict)
- Uganda Human Rights Commission. 2004. *Karamoja: Searching for Peace and Human Rights*. Kampala: Uganda Human Rights Commission
- Uganda Investment Authority. 2022. "Home Page." Accessed 18 October 2022. <https://www.ugandainvest.go.ug/>
- Uganda. Karamoja Security Committee. 1961. *Report of the Karamoja Security Committee*, Kampala: Republic of Uganda.
- United Nations (UN). 2020. *The United Nations Strategy for Peace Consolidation, Conflict Prevention and Conflict Resolution in the Great Lakes Region*. New York: UN.
- United Nations (UN). 2020. *Action Plan of the UN Strategy for the Great Lakes, 2021 – 2023*. New York: UN.
- UNDP. 2020. *Mobility and Migration in the Karamoja cluster*. Africa Borderlands Centre, Nairobi: UNDP.
- UNDP. 2021. *Informal Cross-Border Trade along the Uganda- DRC*. Borderland Policy Briefing Series. UNDP Africa Borderlands Centre. Nairobi: UNDP.
- UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UNPoA). 2021. *National Report on the Implementation of*

the Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons (PoA) and the International Tracing Instrument (ITI). Kenya. 7th Biennial Meeting of State parties to the UNPoA. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.

UNTFHS (United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security). 2016. Human Security Handbook: An integrated approach for the realization of Sustainable Development Goals and the priority areas of the international community and the United Nations system. New York: UNTFHS, 2016