

RAPID Task Order 1 (Policy and Design) Activity

Rangeland Management in Lesotho

Report on Assessment of Needs for Reintroduction of Grazing Fees

by
Oliver Chapeyama

**Submitted by:
Chemonics International, Inc.**

**Submitted to:
Regional Center for Southern Africa,
U.S. Agency for International Development**

Gaborone, Botswana

June 2004

USAID Contract No. 690-I-00-00-00149-00

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	3
1.0 Introduction	4
2.0 Causes of Land Degradation	4
3.0 Responses to Land Degradation	6
4.0 Current Status of Rangeland Management	10
5.0 Institutional Framework for range Management	11
6.0 Technical capacity of Institutions	12
7.0 Economic Considerations in Rangeland Management	13
8.0 Conclusions	14
9.0 Recommendations	15
10.0 References	17

List of Acronyms

AU	Animal Unit
CNRM	Community Natural Resources Management Project
EEC	European Economic Commission
GA	Grazing Association
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GOL	Government of Lesotho
LDS	Livestock Development Services
LHDA	Lesotho Highlands Development Authority
LAPSP	Lesotho Agricultural Development Support Program
LRCD	Land Conservation and Range Development Project
RMA	Range Management Area
RMD	Range Management Division
VDC	Village Development Council
VGA	Village Grazing Association
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

1.0 Introduction

The Government of Lesotho (GOL) has been concerned about the degradation of rangelands for a considerable time now. Rangelands degradation has resulted in reduced livestock productivity and increased soil erosion. With support from a number of donor organizations, they have introduced a variety of policy measures to control numbers of livestock. Among these was the grazing fees introduced in 1992 under the Lesotho Agricultural Support Program (LAPSP) implemented with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Grazing fees were withdrawn in 1993 in the run up to the elections that ushered in a civilian administration in Lesotho as political opponents of the government turned the issue into an election issue accusing the government of imposing a tax on Basotho on a resource that was their inalienable birth-right. Since the withdrawal of grazing fees however, the problems of uncontrolled grazing resulting in increasing erosion and rangeland degradation have resurfaced.

The GOL has approached the Government of the United States through the Embassy in Maseru for assistance with the reintroduction of grazing fees as a way of controlling stocking levels on rangelands and stemming widespread soil erosion.

This report documents the findings of consultations held in Lesotho between May 17 and May 21, 2004 on the issue of the reintroduction of grazing fees. The list of people consulted is given in Annex 1 to this report.

2.0 Causes of Rangeland Degradation

“This fertile country, where the grass attains such a height that it is necessary to destroy it every winter by means of fire, possesses scarcely any large trees. The possession of pastureland is subject to rules, founded on the exigencies of good neighbourhood. It is understood that, as far as possible, the inhabitants of one locality should prevent their flocks from grazing on ground which good sense and the first principles of equity pronounce to belong to another hamlet.”

E. Casalis, “The Basutos”, 1861

The above quotation from the nineteenth century clearly demonstrates the social and economic value of rangelands to the economy of Lesotho. Rangelands cover 63% of total national territory of 30,140 sq.km. Livestock farming is therefore a predominant agricultural activity in Lesotho. Most of the country’s mountain regions are used primarily as rangelands as arable use is limited by both geography and climate. Crop farming in these regions is restricted to sheltered valleys. Most of the crop farming in Lesotho takes place in the lowlands to the south and west of the country. The extent to which this sector can be developed is however limited by the fact that only 13% of the country’s land area is suitable for crop production while most soils across the country are amenable to serious erosion.

Access to and use of land has been guided first by the customary Laws of Lerotholi of 1903 that stated that access to land was a birthright to every Mosotho. Land was vested in the Basotho nation and could not be sold or bought. Subsequent land law has largely maintained this status quo. Although the Land Law of 1979 took some bold steps towards changing land tenure in Lesotho through the introduction of leases and provisions for inheritance of land, there are still two primary forms of land holding in the country- private land for fields and homesteads and communal land which is held in common by residents and provides access for all to the resources on such land. In urban and peri-urban areas land can be held under free or leasehold title. With up to 90% of Lesotho's population resident in rural areas, the impact of these provisions for land holding on the population is minimal.

Communal access to land has resulted in overgrazing and land degradation as communities increase livestock numbers in an effort to maximise individual benefits from common resources. In turn, land degradation has led to poor pastures for livestock with the net effect of reduced productivity. Table 1 below shows trends in cattle numbers in Lesotho's rangelands.

Table 1: Evolution of livestock numbers (units in thousands)

Category	1991/1992	1992/1993	1993/1994	1994/1995	1995/1996	1998/1999 (present estimate)
Cattle	699	658	577	579	539	580
Sheep	1,382	1,176	1,276	1,130	951	1,132
Goats	649	811	875	749	732	749
Horses	-	106	112	100	98	98
Donkeys	-	139	140	146	153	153
Animal Units Equivalents	(est.) 780	742	702	677	633	679

Source: B.O.S

Carrying capacity is in the order of 582,000 A.U indicating an overstocking rate of 17%.

Until recently, the Chiefs played an important role in administering land allocation in Lesotho. They could also withdraw rights of access from nationals that did not utilise land allocated to them for a continuous period of three years. This authority is rarely used. Transhumance ensured stratified and integrated utilisation of lowland and mountain grazing resources. Political developments have introduced competing sources of authority. New administrative systems, such as elected Development Councils, were introduced to manage development planning at local level. This saw the role and influence of the chiefs gradually getting eroded resulting in uncoordinated management of resources such as grazing. Control of the previously stratified system of transhumance collapsed. While lowland farmers could send their stock to summer grazing in the mountains (meraka), mountain communities could not take their livestock to the lowlands for grazing in winter. This inequity resulted in

increased animal pressure on mountain grazing with the resultant widespread soil erosion.

3.0 Responses to Rangeland Degradation

The Government of Lesotho has long been concerned about the degradation of rangelands in the country and has introduced a variety of policy and legal measures to stem the problem over the years. The Land Husbandry Act of 1969 (Act no. 22 of 1969) had provisions for “prescribing the principles to be adopted in the reduction of livestock numbers to be grazed on specified land as well as control grazing and introduce veld or pasture management.” The Rangeland Management and Grazing Control Regulations of 1980 (Legal Notice 39 of 1980) and Rangeland Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations (Legal Notice No. 144 of 1986) gave Principal Chiefs and their representatives special authorities over grazing land and institutionalised the traditional rotational grazing systems through legally recognising the chief’s right to set aside Leboela. These same regulations also provided for regulation of livestock numbers.

Legal Notice No. 79 of 1992 introduced the Development Councils to take the place of the Chief in range resource administration and control. Development Councils Orders No. 13 of 1992 and No. 18 of 1994 empowered the councils to allocate land, through Land Allocation Committees with an elected chairperson instead of the chief (Order No. 18). The Local Government Act of 1996 stipulates that grazing control will be the responsibility of the Urban Councils, Rural Councils and Community Councils wherever the case may be. See Table 2.

Table 2: Changes in Administration and Control of Range Resources 1979 to present

Management Body	Period	Responsibilities
Principal Chiefs and Area Chiefs	1979-1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside maboella (closed areas) • Empound trespass stock • Collect pound and trespass fines • Issue grazing permits
Development Councils	1992-93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside maboella • Empound trespass stock • Collect pound and trespass stock • Collect grazing fees • Open bank accounts for development fees • Issue grazing permits
Development Councils	1993-1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside maboella • Empound trespass animals • Collect trespass and pound fines • Open bank accounts for

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development fines • Issue grazing permits
Urban, Rural and Community Councils	1999 onwards after Elections of local Government Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside maboella • Empound trespass animals • Collect trespass and pound fines • Open bank accounts for development fines • Issue grazing permits

Source: Government of Lesotho: National Livestock Development Study, Phase 1 Report, 1999.

In addition to these policy and regulatory measures for control of overgrazing and widespread soil erosion, the Government of Lesotho also realised the need to improve the technical capacity of its soil erosion control and livestock management advisory services and embarked upon projects to build this capacity with support from donor organizations. Between 1973 and 1982 the Government of Lesotho implemented the Thaba Bosiu Rural Development Project (No. 632-0031 (1973-1979)) and the Land and Water Resources Development Project (No. 632-0084 (1975-1982)) with support from the United State Agency for International Development (USAID). As a build up from these two earlier projects and in direct response to the problem of rangeland degradation and depressed agricultural productivity, the Land Conservation and Range Development Project ((LCRD) Project Number: 632-0215) was implemented between 1980 and 1987, also with support from USAID. The purpose of the project was “to strengthen institutional capability within the Ministry of Agriculture and to arrest degradation of croplands and rangelands.” In addition to staff training, a prototype range management area (RMA) was established at Sehlabathebe in Qacha’s Nek District to demonstrate the principles of rotational grazing, animal disease control and marketing of livestock. A Grazing Association made up of the eleven villages in the district was also established under the project.

Following the implementation of LRCRD and the apparently successful institutionalisation of RMAs and Grazing Associations in the livestock sector in Lesotho, donor support for the agricultural sector focussed on improving productivity and efficiency through policy reform. In 1988 USAID entered into an agreement with the government for the implementation of the five year Lesotho Agricultural Policy Support Programme (LAPSP) to assist Lesotho with bringing into closer balance herd sizes and grazing potential. Livestock farmers were to be encouraged to take into account the costs and benefits of open grazing through payment of grazing fees. Improvement of livestock marketing was also expected to result in increased off-takes from the range and benefit rangeland conditions.

Through this support given under LAPSP, GOL introduced policies and regulations that saw the introduction of grazing fees to regulate livestock numbers on the country’s rangelands (Rangeland Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations, 1992: Legal Notice No. 78 of 1992). Table 3 below shows the schedule of fees set in 1992. Village Development Committees collected these fees for use to fund a variety of development programmes at local level. LAPIS also contributed to

the creation and strengthening of local level institutions that promoted the decentralisation of decision making in the country.

A Grazing Fee Implementation Plan for Lesotho was prepared by the Livestock Policy Implementation Committee set up under LAPIS. The committee was made up of representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, Cooperatives and Marketing and the Ministry of Interior, Chieftainship and Rural Development. LAPSP also promoted the development of local participation through support to the organization and empowerment of grassroots structures mobilized to address crosscutting environmental and development problems through self-help.

Table 3: Schedule of Grazing Fees Introduced in 1992 (Maloti)

Livestock Category	Fee	US\$ equivalent
Cattle	3.0	1.00
Equine	5.0	1.70
Small Stock	0.5	0.17

Estimate: US\$ 1= M 3.00 in 1992

Source: Third Schedule: Range Management and grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations, 1992

The grazing fee programme was more than just a fee. It was also made up of other measures including: rangeland adjudication, livestock inventory, installation of a fee administration unit within the ministry of agriculture, enacting the enabling legislation, training and organizing Village Development Councils to collect fees and manage fee utilization; and educating and sensitising the public on the program.

Rangeland Adjudication was intended to demarcate the boundaries of cattle post grazing and allocate it to the villages closest to such grazing. Livestock data was collected to facilitate the allocation of adequate grazing to adjudicated RMAs. This regulation of grazing areas could not be implemented in an environment where livestock owners grazed their stock freely. The system of transhumance that had hitherto been practiced was therefore revisited and banned to allow the new system to work.

The implementation of LRCD and LAPSP created four RMAs (Sehlabathebe, Ha Moshebi/Ha Ramat'seliso, Pelaneng/bokong and Sanqebethu/Mokhotlong) covering a total land area of 132, 940 hectares and involved 73 villages with a population of over 17,000 people. Significant improvements in the quality of rangelands were recorded in these areas with concomitant increases in livestock off-takes for market. Training at both post-graduate and diploma level was provided to staff in the Department of Livestock Services as part of the programme.

The process of setting up RMAs and GAs under LAPIS had always been top-down with Government entities and technical advisors provided by the donor organisations driving the process. There had been little institutional support and involvement at grassroots level thereby adversely affecting the sustainability of the programme. The success that was recorded could therefore have been because there was a military

administration in Lesotho at the time. In 1992/1993 there were political changes in Lesotho that resulted in the re-establishment of civilian rule. In the run-up to the elections grazing fees became a major political campaign issue. Political parties used the issue of the grazing fee (tifello) as a campaign matter and characterised it as a tax (khafa) or levy (leketo) reminiscent of the poll tax charged during colonial days. Rangelands were every Mosotho's right and were not supposed to pay a tax for accessing and using their birthright. Not wanting to be seen to continue with unpopular decisions made by previous administrations, the new government in Lesotho withdrew the provision for grazing fees through the promulgation of the Range Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations 1993 Legal Notice Number 150 of 1993. In response USAID cancelled the LAPSP agreement on July 27, 1993 as the conditions precedent had been breached by the GOL.

Despite the cancellation of LAPSP, both GOL and USAID saw merit in continuing with the implementation of the Livestock Development Strategy through which Range Management Associations and Grazing Associations had been set up. A Community Natural Resources Management project (CNRM) was introduced in 1992 with a focus on addressing the issue of grassroots involvement that had not been adequately handled under previous projects. Through CNRM, an additional 18000 hectares of rangeland was to be brought under the management of RMAs. The goal of the project was to improve management of natural resources and restore and improve rangelands. This was to be achieved through the establishment of effective community grazing associations that would manage rangelands at sustainable carrying capacities for livestock. Primary beneficiaries of this project were to be individual livestock owners who had grouped themselves into associations for the purpose of managing their range resources for the common good of participating stockowners and other members of Lesotho's mountain community.

The project involved the provision of technical assistance, training and commodities. To insure greater sustainability, CNRM focused on training community leadership in programme and financial management. Community organization and training were made major features of this new programme.

Up to 250 person months of short-duration training programs in southern Africa region was provided for government extension agencies that support livestock management in Lesotho. Some Degree level training, and provision of skills in rural sociology, geographic information systems, was also provided for under this programme.

Donor coordination was also considered under this new programme with USAID working with the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA) and the European Economic Commission (EEC) in developing new initiatives. LHDA support was for the development of RMAs in the areas adjacent to the major dams that they were building in the Mokhotlong District in the north of the country. The RMAs would serve partly as a catchment management programmes but also as part of the Authority's social responsibility programme through which they compensated communities for loss of their traditional grazing lands. The EEC worked to develop RMAs in the south of the country. See Table 4.

Table 4: STATUS OF RANGE MANAGEMENT AREAS/GRAZING ASSOCIATIONS

Name	District	Size (ha)	Year of Declaration	No. of Villages	Status (1999)
Sehlabathebe	Qacha's Nek	33,000	1982	12	Active
Moshebi/ Ramatseliso	Qacha's Nek	10,082	1988	9	Dormant
Pelaneng/ Bokong	Leribe	36,500	1989	17	Active
Mokhotlong/ Sanqebethu	Mokhotlong	52,440	1991	37	Active
Malikamatso/ Matsoku	Leribe	38,355	1994	18	Active
Qhoali	Quthing	15,305	1997	19	Dormant
Liseleng	Mkhotlong	8,385	1997	13	Active
Mofolaneng	Mokhotlong	14,988	-	12	Proposed
Tsehlanyane	Leribe	15,902	-	49	Proposed
Tsikoane/ Bokong	Leribe	-	-	-	Proposed
Ketane	Mohale's Hoek	7,800	-	3	Proposed
Phamong	Mohale's Hoel	-	-	-	Proposed
Libibing	Mokhotlong	-	-	-	Proposed

Source: National Livestock Development Study, March 1999

4.0: Current Status of Rangeland Management

In a country where more than 80% of the population reside in the rural areas, agriculture still plays a dominant role in the lives of the people. There are however serious limitations in the capacity of the sector to satisfy the development needs of the country. Less than 10% of the country's land surface is suitable for arable agriculture. The bulk of the country's rangelands are badly degraded due to poor grazing practices and serious levels of stocking. Limited scope exists for alternative economic activities although recent investments in the textile industry seem to have provided some relief to levels of unemployment that had been worsened by retrenchments from the mines in South Africa. It is therefore clear that for the foreseeable future, Lesotho will have to invest in the agricultural sector to make it more productive.

The Agricultural Sector Strategy of 2003 recognises that proper management of areas of special advantage could lead to competitive output of a number of agricultural products. The livestock sector is one such sector that through improved management could contribute more meaningfully to the economy of the country. Although productivity in this sector has shown signs of decline in recent years primarily due to poor husbandry practices, declining range productivity and soil erosion, intensification of cattle production in the lowlands of Lesotho and improved rangeland management in the foothills and highlands of the country would result in improved performance of this sector.

Although the Division of Range Management has maintained a presence in the rangeland areas and is working to institutionalise the system of RMAs and GAs, there are still a number of problems that affect the productivity of this important resource. Some of the major problems and suggested solutions are summarised in Table 5 below:

Table 5: PROBLEMS IN RANGELAND MANAGEMENT IN LESOTHO

Problems and Issues	Solutions
TECHNICAL PROBLEMS	
<p>Degraded Rangelands : - Decline in vegetative and faunal diversity and quality, bush encroachment, decrease in forage quality Poor grazing control: - Overall lack of viable grazing control systems - Unrestricted grazing practices Reducing area of rangelands:</p>	<p>Establish Range Management Areas and Village Grazing Areas; Develop and apply viable grazing systems including grazing fees, targeted training of community groups, and improved enforcement of rangeland regulations.</p>
IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS	
<p>Poor sense of responsibility for rangelands - Boundary delineation is unclear and disputes arise regarding ownership of rangelands. Low community involvement in decision-making.</p>	<p>Need for viable delineation of rangeland boundaries; Continued setting up of RMAs and GAs; Encourage increased community participation in decision-making.</p>
<p>Poor training and capacity in Grazing Associations</p>	<p>Train and build capacity of GAs.</p>
<p>Limited capacity in extension services</p>	<p>Train staff in extension services</p>
<p>Poor legal controls</p>	<p>Develop legal instruments for rangeland management and enforce them.</p>

Adapted from: Government of Lesotho Agricultural Sector Strategy 2003.

5.0: Institutional Framework for Rangeland Management

The GOL has developed a comprehensive policy in range management whose objective is the establishment of sustainable grazing management systems and the rehabilitation of rangelands. It is intended through this policy to ensure that all rangeland areas in Lesotho are covered by RMAs and that Grazing Associations are established to control grazing in these areas. A national rangeland adjudication project is underway to establish the basis for control of the rangelands. The objectives and activities involved in this activity are discussed elsewhere in this report.

The implementation of this policy is however made intractable by an unclear institutional framework. Although the responsibility for administration of rangelands officially rests with Village Development Councils, the majority of Basotho still regard the chiefs as the custodians of the land although they might be sceptical about their capacity to effectively administer grazing programs. There is therefore constant conflict between the administrative and traditional authorities when it comes to the

administration of regulations relating to rangeland management. These conflicts persist despite chiefs being members of VDCs. The presence of conflict was clearly evident during a field visit to Mohale's Hoek where the Mpharane Village Grazing Association has been stalled in their efforts to develop their grazing programme by the area chief. The roles and responsibilities of VDC, WDCs and Area and Principal Chiefs need to be clearly articulated to allow for effective administration of RMAs and GAs.

Membership of Village Grazing Associations is still voluntary and allows non-members to benefit as much as members do since all nationals have inalienable rights of access to land resources. Voluntary membership of grazing associations negates the potential benefits of managed grazing. Continuing benefits to non-members provides no incentives for them to join and pay fees. In keeping with the need to ensure all contribute to management of grazing lands, membership should be made mandatory/obligatory for all residents in RMAs or non-members should be excluded from enjoying benefits.

Until recently, rangeland management fell under the purview of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Department of Livestock Services and its Rangeland Management Division (RMD) in the Ministry thus handled rangeland development and management issues under one administrative authority. Recently GOL reorganised government ministries and departments resulting in the RMD being moved to the new Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation. This institutional arrangement splits the responsibilities for range management and livestock development. These responsibilities should ideally be housed under one Ministry for more effective coordination. It is instructive that the Lesotho Agricultural Sector Strategy refers to range management as an area needing attention out of their recognition that there can be no sustainable livestock development without sustainable rangeland management.

6.0: Technical Capacity of Institutions

The GOL has received assistance with rangeland management in various forms over the past twenty years. Most of the assistance packages have included training of staff at various levels. Academic training of staff was a component of LRCD, LAPSP and CNRM. Under LRCD, thirteen staff members were trained at junior degree level while one was trained at senior degree level. Six members obtained diplomas in range management through this support. An additional three staff were trained under the LAPSP project. As happens with most institutions though, the majority of trained staff has since moved to other responsibilities both in government and in the private sector. Such developments usually result in calls for additional training of staff as is happening now.

Technical capacity also comes in the form of systems that are put in place to provide data and information for management. Over the years, GOL through the Ministries responsible for Agriculture and Rangeland Management has received support with the development of systems for rangeland management. Initial phases of LASPS assisted with this through the establishment of prototype RMAs/GAs. Technical staff provided through these programmes also introduced systems such as Rangeland Adjudication that the RMD is still implementing today. The knowledge base within the Department however remains a major limitation. It is clear for example that RMD does not have

information on the exact extent of rangelands, range productivity levels and intensities of use of the range around the country.

7.0: Economic Considerations in Rangeland Management

Given the value of rangelands to Lesotho's agriculture sector and the economy in general it does not make economic sense to continue considering rangeland resources common property where all have rights of access and no responsibility for management. Rights also entail responsibilities. Since land is a national resource in both an economic and socio-economic sense, the right to land access carries with it a share of the national responsibility to use land in ways that are consistent with national land ethic. This means that landholders are expected to: (i) put land resources to optimum use while avoiding their degradation, and (ii) husband the resources and protect them for future generations. Free land allocations to individuals privatise the income and benefits from the land. It is therefore appropriate that landholders should return a portion of their benefits to society. The application of "user fees" as a management tool is consistent with the principles that, for equity considerations, require that user fees be levied not only on communal rangelands, but also on arable land. (Phororo, Daniel R. In Lesotho National Livestock Development Study-Phase I report-part II Technical Report N: Land tenure and land use).

The level of fees to be levied on users of grazing resources can only be established after consideration of the following factors, among others;

- Value of the nation's rangelands in terms of contribution to GDP;
- Value of rangelands to individual livestock owners;
- Value of conserved rangelands in terms of reduced erosion;
- Nature of services to be funded from grazing fees.

Even after establishing the level of fees from these technical considerations there will be need to engage with community groups to negotiate a mutually acceptable fee. Individual farmers are already paying considerable sums of money for leased grazing in South Africa. While it is difficult to estimate a fee level, the fees that were levied in 1993 will need to be reviewed to bring them into line with inflation and align them with costs of services today. Since grazing fees are an effective way of controlling stocking levels, consideration could be given to introducing a fee structure that escalates with increasing livestock numbers. This would result in those with larger herds paying more for the additional resources they exploit.

In this connection it is also useful to note that community members interviewed indicated a willingness to pay for grazing. The Mpharane community in Mohale's Hoek has continued paying for grazing fees despite their withdrawal. They intend to build infrastructure such as watering points for their livestock with the fees they collect although some outside help might be needed for this to be realised.

Representatives of the Wool and Mohair Growers Association that were interviewed expressed the view that the withdrawal of grazing fees had been motivated by uninformed political considerations. They also felt that people had expressed impromptu feelings without giving the potential benefits of grazing fees adequate thought. The fact that some farmers were paying fees to have their livestock graze in

South Africa was evidence enough that farmers would be willing to pay for grazing if it was properly regulated. The same members felt that whatever fees were introduced needed to be reasonable and be reviewed after livestock owners had got used to the idea of paying. Fees levels of M 3.00 for small stock, M 5.00 and M 10.00 for equines were suggested as being appropriate.

A general feeling expressed was that the collection and administration of grazing fees through development councils was more efficient than collections through the traditional leadership structures.

8.0: Conclusions

In Southern Africa complex sets of land use competition and conflicts have developed in communal areas. Expanding human populations and their dependence on livestock are central to this situation. Livestock are of great importance to the economies and social and economic well being of most rural populations resulting in many individuals increasing their livestock holdings without consideration for the impacts of their actions on the rangelands that they depend upon. Most rangelands are overused and deteriorating adversely affecting other land uses. The introduction of the grazing fees package in Lesotho has resulted in dramatic improvements in the quality of rangeland resources and reductions in soil erosion. Market values of stock from RMAs have been higher than for those from outside. The realization of these benefits has now led to increased political will for the reintroduction of the grazing fees package. The request from the GOL for support with this process should therefore be seen within this context.

Range management in Lesotho has been influenced to a large extent by changes in government with the introduction of civilian rule rolling back the gains that had been made towards control of stocking rates through grazing fees. Local administrative set-ups have also influenced the effectiveness with which rangelands have been managed over the years. The replacement of chiefs as the custodians of rangelands by development councils has resulted in uncoordinated approaches to rangeland management. Previously controlled processes such transhumance have been replaced and incidents of stock theft have increased. However most of those interviewed expressed the view that they preferred that development councils collected fees if they were to be reintroduced as this increased opportunities for community participation in the administration of the schemes.

Government institutions responsible for livestock management and rangeland management that previously were under one ministry have now been split up with the creation of the Ministry of forestry and Land Reclamation. Coordinated approaches to range management will be adversely affected by this split. This development militated against effective technical support to rangeland management especially given the limitations in financial and human resources. While there might be need for additional training of government officials, the need for increased community ownership of the range management processes point to the need for increased capacity building efforts at the RMA level. Such efforts will guarantee greater sustainability of the processes since skills imparted will remain within the community.

9.0: Recommendations

1. It is clear that rangeland management in Lesotho needs to be regulated and managed if the problems of degradation and soil erosion are to be mitigated. The Agricultural Sector Strategy emphasizes the need to maximise efforts at developing those sectors of Lesotho's economy that hold special promise and identifies livestock management and the management of rangelands as one area with potential. It is also evident that the GOL now has the political will to reintroduce management systems aimed at increasing rangeland productivity, including grazing fees. GOL Ministers and other senior government leaders need to be seen to be promoting the reintroduction of the grazing fee package and to encourage its adoption by livestock owners. It is encouraging that the Minister of Forestry and Land Reclamation has already started visiting RMAs around the country promoting the idea. There is need to encourage his counterparts to work together with him in this effort. The Ministers of Agriculture and Food Security and Environment, Tourism and Culture and Natural Resources are obvious cases in point in this regard.

2. GOL has received a lot of financial and technical assistance with rangeland management from a variety of donor organizations over the past twenty-five (25) years. Donor and development organizations that have provided support include USAID, the EEC the LHDA and the World Bank. There is therefore no real need for classic development aid programs to assist Lesotho with the reintroduction of the grazing fees package. Considerable expertise already exists in the country to manage rangelands and the livestock industry that they support. What is needed now is technical assistance with the development of capacity within government entities for them to be able to provide quality service to livestock owners. Government officials and community representatives working in RMAs need to be exposed to experiences from other parts of the world where similar initiatives have been undertaken. The United State of America has had considerable experience with the implementation of leased grazing programs and could provide useful venues for peer exchanges.

3. The policy environment within which range management is being implemented in Lesotho is not very clear. With the splitting of functions and responsibilities for range management among various institutions, the situation has only been made worse. Assistance needs to be provided for the development of comprehensive range management policies to guide the processes that are required to reintroduce the grazing fee package. Of particular importance in this regard is policy regarding responsibilities for allocation of grazing land especially given the fact that new development councils will be elected in forthcoming local government elections. Building the capacity of these local level institutions will further engender decentralization of responsibility for natural resources management to community groups. Resources should be made available for this process.

4. A major concern in livestock development in Lesotho is the problem of stock theft that has reached alarming cross-border proportions in recent years. The Department of Livestock Services are in the process of introducing a system of marking and registering livestock. The department believe that reductions in stock theft will encourage livestock owners to invest in proper management of their herds resulting in increased benefits to such farmers. This will in turn encourage farmers to pay fees for

grazing their animals. Support should therefore be considered for assistance with the introduction of livestock marking and registration.

5. Responsibilities for range management are spread across a number of sectors in government. RMD now falls under the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation, while Livestock Development Services is in the Ministry of Agriculture and food Security. Other initiatives also dealing with rangeland resources include the Conserving Mountain Biodiversity in Southern Lesotho (CMBSL) initiative and the Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation and Development Project both of which are managed from the National Environment Secretariat of the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Culture. There presently is no mechanism through which these efforts are coordinated so as to ensure the delivery of a comprehensive package to the end users. The National Project Coordinating Committee of the Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation and Development Project could provide a useful starting point for such coordination of effort across government and non-governmental entities working towards properly managed rangelands in Lesotho. Its status outside government line functions and its location within the National Environment Secretariat project an appearance of independence that would encourage representatives of the various ministries to attend meeting called by the project. The Ministers of Agriculture and Food Security and Forestry and Land Reclamation see a lot of merit in the idea of a coordinated approach to range management.

6. RMD is facing a lot of problems with building a knowledge system on rangeland management through the rangeland adjudication project. A National Range Inventory is needed so as to establish the following information:

- Extent of rangeland broken down by community council areas;
- Trends in rangeland management since 1988;
- Establish carrying Capacities of rangelands.

This work will supplement work that has been done by LHDA in the watersheds affected by Katse and Mohale dams. RMD had also done some work on these issues but records were destroyed in the 1998 disturbances and need to be replaced.

7. The Division faces serious financial limitations for the completion of this critical process that would provide baseline data for sustainable management of Lesotho's rangelands. Further, human resource constraints have stalled progress with some elements of this initiative. Training is therefore needed to upgrade skills of staff in RMD and LDS to enable them to complete the tasks that were started under the rangeland adjudication activity.

10: References

Department of Livestock Services, 1999: National Livestock Development Study: Technical Report A: Range Management

Department of Livestock Services, 1999: National Livestock Development Study: Technical Report N: Land Tenure

Government of Lesotho: National Livestock registration marking and Information Project Report

Land Husbandry Act 1969 No. 22 of 1969

Lawry, S. (International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA)) 1987: Communal Grazing and Range Management: The case of Grazing Associations in Lesotho

Livestock Policy Implementation Committee, March 1991: Grazing Fee Implementation Plan for Lesotho

Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, 2003: Agriculture Sector Strategy: Statement of Policy and Strategy in the Agricultural Sector

Planning for Management of Communal Natural Resources Affected by Livestock: Proceedings from a Workshop for SADC Countries held in Mophale's Hoek May 28-June 1, 1990

Range Management and Grazing Control Regulations 1980 (Legal Notice No 39 of 1980)

Range Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations 1986 (Legal Notice No 144 of 1986)

Range Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations 1992 (Legal Notice No 78 of 1992)

Range Management and Grazing Control (Amendment) Regulations 1993 (Legal Notice No 150 of 1993)

USAID Lesotho, 1991: Community Natural Resources Management Project Paper

USAID Lesotho, 1995: Development Management in Africa: The Case of Land Conservation and Range Development Project in Lesotho Evaluation Special Study No.31

USAID Lesotho, 1993: Agricultural Policy Support Program Evaluation

Annex 1

LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

NAME	POSITION
Hon. L.R. 'Mokose	Minister of Forestry and land Reclamation
Mrs Nkareng	Principal Secretary
Ms Leonia M. Thulo	Director, Range Management
Mr. Pshabane Moeletsi	Range Management Officer
Mr. Sello Rasello	Range Management Officer
Ms. Mosa Marakabei	Senior Range Mgt. Officer

MOHALE'S HOEK (MPHARANE) VILLAGE GRAZING SCHEME COMMITTEE

NAME	POSITION
Leeto Masita	Morena
Mamolise Damane	Molula Setulo
Manthabeleng Seboka	Mongali
Mamoleko Lenyolosa	Ramatlotlo
Mafa Mafa	Setho
Ramontsi Molefe	Setho
Moena Masita	Setho
Tsekelo Moremoholo	District Range Management Officer

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

NAME	POSITION
Hon. Dr. D. Phororo	Minister of Agriculture and Food Security
Mr. Tieiso Khalema	Deputy Principal Secretary
Mrs. 'M'antho Motselbane	Director, Ag. Planning and Policy Analysis
Dr. Motebang Pomela	Private Secretary to the Minister
Mr. Mohale Sekoto	Director, Livestock Services
Mr. Thulo Mafisa	MOA/LHDA Ag. Projects Coordinator
Mrs. 'M'apheello Makosholo	P.C. SADPMA (IFAD)

DRAKENSBERG/MALOTI TRANSFRONTIER PARK

NAME	POSITION
Mr. Chaba. Mokuku	Project Coordinator
Mr. Lepono	Project Ecologist
Mr.	Conservation Specialist
Dr. P. Mamini	Project Sociologist

MINISRTY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

NAME	POSITION
Mr. Masasa	Director of Planning
Mabuti Buti	Commissioner of Lands
Mr. T. Mohlomi	Town Clerk (a.i) Maseru City
Mr. M. Phaila	Chief Planner (a.i) Maseru City
Ms. K. Lethunya	Economic Planner
Mr. M. Monethi	Chief Economic Planner
Mrs. Malane M.P. Green	Physical Planner
Ms. Masetori Makheta	Chief Physical Planner

Mr Makena

Acting District Secretary Mmaseru

Mrs Kapeng

Rural Development Officer

WOOL AND MOHAIR GROWER'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. Nkune Phiri

Marenang Nalete

Mameopelo Mokalake