

IPSI Case Study Summary Sheet

Basic Information

Title of case study <i>(should be concise and within approximately 25 words)</i>			
Improving natural resource management and biodiversity conservation in the Laikipia county ecosystem, Kenya			
Submitting IPSI member organization(s)			
Laikipia Wildlife Forum			
Other contributing organization(s) <i>(IPSI members and/or non-members)</i>			
Author(s) and affiliation(s)			
Josephat M. Musyima (Laikipia Wildlife Forum)			
Format of case study <i>(manuscript or audiovisual)</i>	Manuscript	Language	English
Keywords <i>(3-5 key concepts included in the case study)</i>			
Kenya, Laikipia county, Livelihood, Landscapes, Ecosystem			
Date of submission <i>(or update, if this is an update of an existing case study)</i>	25 August 2016		
Web link <i>(of the case study or lead organization if available for more information)</i>	https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:5769/SEPLS_in_Africa_FINAL_lowres_web.pdf		

Geographical Information

Country <i>(where site(s) or activities described in the case study are located – can be multiple, or even “global”)</i>									
Kenya									
Location(s) <i>(within the country or countries – leave blank if specific location(s) cannot be identified)</i>									
Laikipia County									
Longitude/latitude or Google Maps link <i>(if location is identified)</i>									
https://www.google.com/maps/@0.2902972,36.2392133,9z?hl=en									
Ecosystem(s) <i>(please place an “x” in all appropriate boxes)</i>									
Forest	x	Grassland		Agricultural	x	In-land water	x	Coastal	
Dryland		Mountain		Urban/peri-urban		Other <i>(Please specify)</i>			
Socioeconomic and environmental characteristics of the area <i>(within 50 words)</i>									
The Laikipia ecosystem is centered on the upper Ewaso Ngiro river system, with over thirty rivers and streams feeding into the Ewaso Ngiro river, which flows into northern Kenya. Land tenure in Laikipia is characterized by both private and communal land ownership.									
Description of human-nature interactions in the area <i>(land-use, traditional resource management practices etc. – within 50 words)</i>									
The livelihood systems reflect the ecological and climatic characteristics of the area. Livestock-based livelihoods dominate in most of Laikipia, through large-scale ranches and nomadic/transhumant pastoralists. Small-scale cultivation can be found along the rivers where irrigation occurs and on the west and south of Laikipia.									

Contents

Status (<i>“ongoing” or “completed”</i>)	Ongoing	Period (<i>MM/YY to MM/YY</i>)	
Rationale (<i>why activities or policies described, or information shared in the case study are needed – within 50 words</i>)			
There is high pressure on natural resources, notably rangeland resources and river water, in the more densely populated pastoralist and smallholder cultivation areas. The Laikipia ecosystem is critical for the supply of provisioning ecosystem services including food, fuel, plants of medicinal value as well as serving as a source of livelihood for the resident communities.			
Objectives (<i>goals of activities or policies described, or of producing the case study – within 50 words</i>)			
The Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF) is a community-based organization trying to balance the livelihood needs of the people and the ecological integrity of their ecosystem. LWF focuses on participatory forest, pasture, and water resource management, aiming to enable local communities to maintain and restore the health of the ecosystem and increase land productivity.			
Activities and/or practices employed (<i>within 50 words</i>)			
The LWF has focused on building the capacity of forest users to participate actively in management. Programs have accordingly been established for PFM, pasture management, and water resource management. Another approach involved supporting Group Ranches around the Mukogodo forest to develop and implement grazing management plans. Water Resource User Associations (WRUAs) are legally mandated community-based organizations involved in the management of the water resources on which their livelihoods depend.			
Results (<i>within 50 words</i>)			
Leaders of the group ranches surrounding the Mukogodo forest were trained to broaden their understanding of the group ranch’s responsibilities with respect to resource management. The LWF has successfully supported the formation and strengthening of 26 WRUAs in the Laikipia ecosystem, with work ongoing to develop Sub-Catchment Management Plans (SCMPs) to guide future water resource management activities within each sub catchment.			
Lessons learned (<i>factors in success or failure, challenges and opportunities – within 40 words</i>)			
Few people understand the importance of good forest management for their livelihoods; besides, there is little understanding among community members of the relationship between the health of the forest and the health of the ecosystem as a whole, in particular the role that forests play in water availability beyond the locality. Although various approaches are considered to help in the reversal of negative trends in SEPLS, the engagement of the local communities is essential.			
Key messages (<i>within 40 words</i>)			
Management of SEPLS must incorporate sound decision-making processes and embrace holistic management strategies that are of direct relevance and value to the given ecosystem. There is need to ensure sufficient cooperation between users within the SEPLS. The identification and training of a core team of people to lead the process in each community enhances the uptake of the approaches			
Relationship to other IPSI activities (<i>if the case study is related to any other IPSI collaborative activities, case studies, etc.</i>)			
This case study originally appeared in the publication “Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes in Africa”.			
Funding (<i>any relevant information about funding of activities or projects described in the case study</i>)			

Contributions to Global Agendas

CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets (<https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the CBD’s Aichi Biodiversity Targets respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

Strategic Goal A				Strategic Goal B					
●	■		■			●			
Strategic Goal C			Strategic Goal D			Strategic Goal E			
■			●					■	

UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the SDGs respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

	■						■	
		●			●			