

**Rural Livelihoods, Diversity and Poverty Reduction Policies:
Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Kenya**

by

Frank Ellis

LADDER Working Paper No.1

September 2001

ABOUT LADDER

LADDER is a research project funded by the Policy Research Programme of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) that seeks to identify alternative routes by which the rural poor can climb out of poverty. LADDER is working with nearly 40 villages and 1,200 households in Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Kenya to discover the blocking and enabling agencies in the institutional environment facing rural people that hinder or help their quest for better standards of living for themselves and their families.

This working paper represents work-in-progress and the reader is advised that it has not been subjected to academic quality control, nor edited for errors of fact or interpretation. The paper forms part of a mosaic of research findings that will contribute towards an overall picture of rural livelihoods and micro-macro links to poverty policies in the case-study countries. The findings and views expressed here are solely the responsibility of the authors and are not attributable to DFID.

All available Working Papers and Village Reports can be downloaded from the project website: <http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/odg/ladder/>, which also details other information about the project. For any further enquiries, please email j.mims@uea.ac.uk.

Rural Livelihoods, Diversity and Poverty Reduction Policies: Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Kenya

by

Frank Ellis*

Summary

This working paper sets out an overview and background to the research, and is an edited version of the Inception Report to the funding body presented at the start of the research process in October 2000. The purpose of releasing it in the current format is to provide the reader with information about the entry points of the research, as well as early ideas about the components and methodology of the research approach. Of course, some of these ideas were modified or adapted in practice and the factors that became interesting to pursue in detail changed as the research gained momentum. An account of the generic fieldwork methodology applied in all four countries is provided as Working Paper No.2 of this series.

This paper contains an updated list of the districts and villages in which field research was conducted (Annex Table 1), the collaborating institutions and individuals in each country with which the project is working (Annex Table 2), a list of UK researchers and their contact details (Annex Table 3) and a list of intended working papers (Annex Table 4).

Project summary

The purpose of the research is to identify and promote policies to reduce the vulnerability of poor rural people in low income countries. This purpose is pursued through the theme of policy reform options to support livelihood diversification in rural areas. The project is being undertaken in Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Kenya¹, and comprises three field locations in each country linked to natural resource management issues as well as the examination of micro-macro economic and institutional links affecting livelihood diversification in each country and location. Project outputs will comprise involvement of key national agencies in the examination of the factors that enable or inhibit livelihood diversification, guidelines on practical policies to promote more diverse livelihoods, a set of working papers prepared jointly with partners, and a set of dissemination pathways by which policy relevant findings and processes are given wide exposure within and outside the case-study countries. The project intends to contribute to DFID's goals of promoting sustainable livelihoods and enhancing management of the natural environment.

* School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK. email: f.ellis@uea.ac.uk

¹ Note that work in Kenya was added to the research programme in mid-2001, and was commissioned by ICRISAT, not by DFID

Statement of intended research contribution

The reduction of poverty ultimately requires that individuals and families are able to participate in productive economic activities that enable them to generate an adequate and secure standard of living. In the past it was often believed that agriculture on its own could achieve this goal, primarily by raising agricultural productivity continuously over time, but also by redressing issues of access to key resources such as land by land tenure reform and other devices. It has become apparent, however, that agriculture on its own often cannot provide the means of escaping poverty for the majority of the rural poor (see Ellis, 2000). The poor are observed to diversify income sources in order to cope with risk, seasonality and other adverse factors in agriculture, but almost no recognition has been given to this behaviour by the policy processes hitherto unfolding in low income countries. In particular, diverse livelihoods require quite different enabling contexts from those directed at improving people's prospects in single sectors. More attention needs to be given to the barriers that reduce people's mobility, discourage them from taking a broad view of opportunities and make it difficult for them to deal with spatially dispersed transactions. This research intends to redress this neglect of livelihood diversification as a personal and family strategy to achieve sustainable rural livelihoods and to tackle the critical issue of policy contexts that facilitate mobility and diversity rather than block or undermine these livelihood attributes.

Livelihood diversification as a policy issue for rural poverty reduction

A growing literature identifies the diverse livelihood strategies followed by rural households as a phenomenon the proper recognition of which could lead to an improved policy environment for tackling rural poverty. A number of considerations seem to lead in this direction: rural livelihoods are verified as diverse by numerous studies (Reardon, 1997; Francis, 2000); this diversity may be growing over time in sub-Saharan Africa (Bryceson & Jamal, 1997; Bryceson, 1999a); diverse livelihoods cut across orthodox economic sectors as well as across the rural-urban divide (Jamal, 1995); governments tend to be ill-equipped to service or support diversity because they are organised along sectoral lines.

Research on livelihood diversification to date has tended to be preoccupied with four main aspects. One is the determinants of diversification i.e. the factors that cause families to adopt more diverse livelihood strategies, rather than switching between full-time specialised occupations (Ellis, 2000). A second is the asset basis of livelihoods that permits this diversification to be more or less easily accomplished (e.g. Dercon & Krishnan, 1996). A third is the income distribution effects of different patterns of diversification (Reardon *et al.*, 2000); and the potential to identify different income sources as having equalising or disequalising effects on rural incomes (Adams & He, 1995; Leones & Feldman, 1998). The fourth is whether diversification has beneficial or detrimental effects on farm output and productivity (e.g. Evans & Ngau, 1991).

Starting with some brief points on the causes of diversification, the general sub-Saharan Africa case is for this to occur when natural resource-based livelihoods are no longer able to provide a secure long-term livelihood on their own for a variety of reasons. Some of these are (i) land sub-division at inheritance causing plots to become less viable for family food security, (ii) adverse environmental change or cyclical trends that increase the risks associated with natural resource-based livelihood activities, (iii) declines in agricultural markets relative to non-farm wage levels, making agriculture less viable as a source of livelihood, (iv) rises in input costs due to the removal of subsidies under adjustment

programmes, and (v) deterioration in access to rural public services such as health or education due to poor economic performance, civil war, or cost-recovery policies under SAPs. These reasons are in addition to what might be called the “classic” or generic reasons for diversification, namely, mitigating seasonality and spreading risk in order to reduce individual and family vulnerability to adverse events and trends (Ellis, 2000).

The proposition has been advanced by Bryceson (1999a, 1999b) that livelihood diversification in sub-Saharan Africa has been accelerated by the negative impacts on the viability of natural resource-based livelihoods of structural adjustment programs. This process is referred to as “deagrarianisation”. Some causes that fit into this hypothesis have already been mentioned in the preceding paragraph, viz. removal of agricultural price supports, removal of input subsidies, higher price risks due to market liberalisation and cost-recovery in rural service delivery. It must be remarked, however, that this proposition is quite difficult to verify. There exist very few reliable longitudinal studies that would permit the inference that livelihoods are more diverse now than they were, say, twenty years ago. Some researchers have reached different conclusions, for example, that SAPs have enabled positive diversification, by choice, rather than due to negative impacts on farm-based livelihoods (e.g. Booth *et al*, 1993).

Findings on other aspects of diversification yield some interesting insights. Diversification can certainly improve food security in the face of high risks of drought or other climatic disturbances (Reardon *et al*, 1992). Indeed it is those most reliant on agriculture in marginal areas like the Sahel that are most vulnerable to such risks. The capability to diversify is enhanced by human capital in the form of higher education level (Dercon & Krishnan, 1996). However, wealth in virtually any capital e.g. land, or cattle, or education confers a greater ability to diversify (Dercon, 1998) because this overcomes barriers to access faced by the asset poor (lack of financial resources, inability to navigate officialdom). Education level is a critical determinant of the type of labour markets in which diversification takes place. Those with more education can gain jobs in skilled and salaried labour markets, while those with less education must often make do with casual, unskilled and part-time work in low wage labour markets.

This latter consideration helps to answer a frequent finding in diversification studies, namely that the poor and the better off may display the same proportional degree of diversification out of agriculture (e.g. non-farm income corresponding to 60 per cent of total income), yet the absolute level of non-farm income of the better off will be several times that of the poor (see Reardon *et al*, 2000). Whether participation in non-farm labour markets equalises or disequalises rural incomes depends on both asset and activity considerations (Adams & He, 1995). For those having little or no access to land (in Asia, the landless rural poor), improved access to non-farm income sources may have a beneficial effect on rural income distribution overall. However, improving the income streams of activities that depend on assets that only the better off are likely to possess will have an opposing effect.

In sub-Saharan Africa, in general, there are marked gender and age differences in occupational mobility, so that women and children often continue to reside in the rural homestead, while men seek work in distant labour markets. In the past, this feature has been held to explain lack of success in achieving rises in farm productivity (Low, 1986). More positively, it may be male migration that ensures the food security of the rural homestead (David *et al*, 1995) given high levels of environmental uncertainty (*c/f* Reardon *et al.*, 1992). A pertinent finding of the David *et al* (1995) study in the Sahel is that migration did not alter

patriarchal patterns of decision making, nor the normative gender divisions of labour at household and village level. Key resource allocation decisions remained in the domain of male household heads despite their prolonged absence working in distant or urban labour markets.

The results of studies that have examined in detail the relationship between diversification and farm productivity are fairly mixed. On the one hand, there has been the observation for some locations that cash resources generated off-farm may be used for on-farm investment and therefore results in positive environmental change (Tiffen *et al*, 1994). Other researchers have found similar results, especially related to the positive impact on risk reduction that is conferred by having diverse income sources (Evans & Ngau, 1991; Taylor & Wyatt, 1996; Carter, 1997). On the other hand, there is the widespread recognition that removal of able-bodied labour from the rural setting can result in diminished ability to respond to adverse environmental trends; it also alters the participatory structure of community institutions, a point which is pertinent to one of the two major research questions that inform this project.

Relevance to sustainable improvement of livelihoods

From the foregoing it may be inferred that there are two aspects of rural livelihoods that are critical for the sustainable improvement of livelihoods and that remain relatively under-researched. The first of these is to do with the policy and institutional context of diversification; the second is to do with the relationship of diversification to natural resource management institutions. In the following paragraphs, these two policy issues are explored in more detail.

Little is known about policy and institutional contexts that facilitate or encourage rather than inhibit or block diversification. Clearly local level initiatives like microcredit or microenterprise development are designed to help people to create new forms of self-employment, or, at a larger scale, to start up businesses. However, these initiatives are often limited in scope and they take as given the wider policy and institutional context. There is a whole area around licensing and regulation, traditional authority, decentralised government authority, governance in decentralised institutions, and related policy and institutional factors that may hinder or help people who wish to diversify their livelihoods (Hussein & Nelson, 1998; Johnson, 1997; Leach *et al.*, 1997; Mosse, 2000). There may be hidden barriers that give some people routes out of poverty while denying similar routes to others. Dimensions of gender, ethnicity, religion and age may often prove significant in this regard.

Decentralisation, in particular, represents both an opportunity and a threat to the achievement of sustainable rural livelihoods in the case-study countries and elsewhere. It is an opportunity to the extent that top-down directives from central government are replaced by responsive district policies guided by knowledge of local-level needs and democratization of decision-making processes. In theory, space should be created for policies that are better informed about local needs and constraints, and that permit the poor a “voice” in determining priorities. However, opposing dangers are also present. Decentralisation could result in a proliferation of poorly remunerated local officialdom with a blocking rather than enabling view of rural livelihood contexts, bye-laws may be passed that constrain rather than open up choices and opportunities, local revenue generation may impose burdens on local enterprise and stifle local initiatives rather than providing resources that support and expand these efforts. The research will explore the experience hitherto of decentralisation and related processes and

will seek to identify best practice for opening up livelihood possibilities rather than closing them down.

An important implication of diversification is that natural resource-based activities may become more or less permanently “part-time” in character, rather than the full-time job that is often implicitly or explicitly assumed about work or employment. Hence part-time fishing, part-time farming, part-time reliance on forest products, etc. may become more the norm than full-time engagement in these things. The part-time nature of natural resource activities may alter the way they are managed, the technology that is appropriate for them and the relevance of community institutions that govern access to them. The latter is an important issue in the case-study countries because community natural resource management is being widely adopted within them in the fisheries, forestry, irrigation and wildlife/tourism sub-sectors.

Diversification has implications for natural resource management institutions (both traditional and advocated), that need to be considered quite carefully. For example, the advocacy of community management may not work for the rural poor where diversity and mobility are cornerstones of their ability to construct viable livelihoods. Some considerations are:

- (a) community management places a premium on residence and participation as the basis of resource access decisions;
- (b) this may exclude those whose lifestyles are based on mobility and diversity, reducing their access to key resources;
- (c) an example drawn from lakeside communities are fishing livelihoods that depend on the ability to move to where the fish are to be found; here territorial use rights established under community management institutions may result in a reduction of access and therefore in a reduction overall in the capability of fishing as an activity to contribute to the livelihoods of the poor; and
- (d) diversity and mobility are also often associated with ethnic or cultural differences, for example, the ethnicity of those who have sedentary lifestyles may differ from those who have mobile lifestyles, and community management could potentially result in social exclusion on that basis.

The relationship of diversification to natural resource management institutions, especially institutions that are being advocated or put in place while the research is proceeding, thus constitutes the second important area about which we have little systematic knowledge at present. The research design explicitly recognises this, exploring both the nature of people’s livelihoods in selected locations (differentiated by wealth categories) and the relationships to the natural resources to which they have access and the institutions that determine or modify access to these resources for different people.

Proposed research activities

This section sets out the research activities that are proposed during the period October 2000 to March 2003. This period broadly falls into three main phases. The first phase involves the conduct of fieldwork and related activities in the three case-study countries and is designed to be completed by October 2001. The second phase comprises analysis, writing up and dissemination across the four countries to take place from October 2001 to October 2002. A third phase occurring in the final six months of the project involves cross-country comparisons and an international conference.

At this point it is worth emphasising that the research is principally conducted by partner institutions in each country, including establishing research teams, conducting fieldwork, entering data, analysing data and writing up results. The main research partners are the Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) in Uganda, the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) in Tanzania, and the National Economic Council in Malawi (see Annex Table 2). However, these are not the only partners: policy and livelihood-oriented NGOs are involved in each country, as also are personnel from relevant government departments. The role of the UK researchers, who will visit each country for relatively short periods, will be to engage in jointly agreed decisions about the conduct of the research, to provide inputs into start-up workshops for research teams, to provide inputs into data analysis and to assist in the joint production of working papers and other research materials.

While allowing for inter-country variation in the research process arising from partner priorities, it is nevertheless intended that a broadly replicable research methodology will be applied across countries and research locations. The purpose of this is to facilitate cross-country comparisons and contrasts, in addition to those that are observed within country. In what follows, general features of this methodology are set out first, followed by a more detailed description of research activities that are specific to each country.

The general approach of the research is to combine micro-level livelihood studies, with exploration of micro-macro links, and engagement in ongoing policy processes that are evolving simultaneously in all three case-study countries. Key generic features are as follows:

- micro-level livelihood studies undertaken at three locations in each country
 - purposive selection of locations in order to explore key natural resource management issues that vary between locations (e.g. fisheries, forestry, farming, etc.)
 - purposive selection of 3 villages in each location to represent differing facets of the natural resource management problem being addressed
 - qualitative research in each village and location designed especially to examine the institutional context of livelihood diversification
 - livelihoods sample survey comprising 35 households in each village, thus 105 households in each location, 315 households in each country and 1,260 households overall
 - stratification of sample by income-wealth groups in order to bring out clearly the critical constraints experienced by the rural poor in particular
 - analysis and writing up of micro-level studies conducted jointly by UK and partner researchers
- studies of key micro-macro policy links in each country
 - tracing the relationships between micro-level outcomes (as discovered by the micro studies) and macro level policy processes
 - investigation of the micro-macro economic links between macro reform policies on the economic side and livelihood outcomes at micro level
 - investigation of the micro-macro institutional links between decentralisation and related policies on the institutional side and the institutional context of livelihoods at micro level

- engagement in ongoing policy processes in each country
 - interaction with the key agencies and individuals involved in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP) process in each country
 - feeding of preliminary research findings and results into PRSP processes
 - interaction with the key agencies and individuals involved in the decentralisation process in each country
 - interaction with sector-wide approaches (SWAs) to agriculture in each country, especially the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda which is cross-sectoral and multi-disciplinary in concept and intent
 - interaction with community resource management initiatives in each country, particularly those occurring in fishery, forestry, and wildlife/tourism management and parallel issues that arise with respect to irrigation management and community initiatives with respect to service delivery in agriculture

Summary

In summary, the key research questions addressed by this project, the basic research design and the research methods utilised are as follows:

Main Research Questions

- A. linking from micro up to macro, what are the policy contexts that enable or disable, encourage or discourage, livelihood diversification?
- B. what are the links, positive and negative, and mediated by wealth, income, location, gender, etc., between livelihood diversification and natural resource management policies?

Research Design

- 4 countries: Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Kenya
- 3 locations: representing different natural resource management concerns
 - Uganda: farming, livestock, fishing
 - Tanzania: farming, small-farm irrigation, wildlife
 - Malawi: farming, forestry, fishing
 - Kenya: farming, fishing, livestock
- micro-macro links: economic
- micro-macro links: institutions and processes

Research Methods

- *each location*: qualitative – policy, processes and changing institutional context
- *each location*: quantitative – assets, activities and changing vulnerability context

- *analysis of micro-macro links*: macroeconomic policies and structural adjustment
- *analysis of micro-macro links*: decentralisation, governance, institutional contexts
- *all locations*: gender; on-farm, non-farm and cross-sectoral diversification options

References

- Adams, R.H. and J.J. He, 1995, *Sources of Income Inequality and Poverty in Rural Pakistan*, Research Report No.102, Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Booth, D. *et al.*, 1993, *Social, Cultural and Economic Change in Contemporary Tanzania: A People-Oriented Focus*, Stockholm: SIDA
- Bryceson, D.F. and V. Jamal (eds), 1997, *Farewell to Farms: Deagrarianisation and Employment in Africa*, Research Series No.1997/10, Leiden, Netherlands: African Studies Centre (several chapters)
- Bryceson, D.F., 1999a, 'African Rural Labour, Income Diversification and Livelihood Approaches: A Long-Term Development Perspective', *Review of African Political Economy*, No.80, pp.171-189
- Bryceson, D.F., 1999b, 'Sub-Saharan Africa Betwixt and Between: Rural Livelihood Practices and Policies', *De-Agrarianisation and Rural Employment Network*, Afrika-Studiecentrum, Leiden, Working Paper No.43
- Carter, M.R., 1997, 'Environment, Technology, and the Social Articulation of Risk in West African Agriculture', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol.45, No.3, pp.557-591
- David, R. *et al.*, 1995, *Changing Places: Women, Resource Management and Migration in the Sahel*, London: SOS Sahel
- Dercon, S., 1998, 'Wealth, Risk and Activity Choice: Cattle in Western Tanzania', *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol.55, No.1, pp.1-42
- Dercon, S. and P. Krishnan, 1996, 'Income Portfolios in Rural Ethiopia and Tanzania: Choices and Constraints', *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol.32 No.6, pp.850-875
- Ellis, F., 2000, *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Evans, H.E. and P. Ngau, 1991, 'Rural-Urban Relations, Household Income Diversification and Agricultural Productivity', *Development and Change*, Vol.22, pp.519-545
- Francis, E., 2000, *Making a Living: Changing Livelihoods in Rural Africa*, London: Routledge
- Jamal, V., 1995, 'Adjustment Programmes and Adjustment: Confronting the New Parameters of African Economies', Ch.1 in V. Jamal (ed), *Structural Adjustment and Rural Labour Markets in Africa*, London: St Martin's Press, pp.1-37
- Johnson, C.A., 1997, 'Rules, Norms and the Pursuit of Sustainable Livelihoods', *IDS Working Paper*, 52, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Leach, M., R. Mearns, and I. Scoones (eds), 1997, 'Community-Based Sustainable Development: Consensus or Conflict', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 28, No.4

Leones, J.P. and S. Feldman, 'Non-farm Activity and Rural Household Income: Evidence from Philippine Microdata', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol.46, No.4, 1998, pp.789-806

Low, A.R.C., 1986, *Agricultural Development in Southern Africa: Farm Household Theory and the Food Crisis*, London: James Currey

Mosse, D., 2000, *Kingship, Bureaucracy and Participation: Competing Moralities of 'Decentralisation' in South Indian Irrigation*, Unpublished draft paper

Reardon, T., 1997, 'Using Evidence of Household Income Diversification to Inform Study of the Rural Non-farm Labor Market in Africa', *World Development*, Vol.25, No. 5, pp.735-747

Reardon, T., C. Delgado, and P. Matlon, 1992, 'Determinants and Effects of Income Diversification Amongst Farm Households in Burkina Faso', *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol.28, No.2

Reardon, T., J. E. Taylor, K. Stamoulis, P. Lanjouw and A. Balisacan, 2000, 'Effects of Non-farm Employment on Rural Income Inequality in Developing Countries: An Investment Perspective', *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 51, No.2, pp.266-88

Taylor, E. and T.J. Wyatt, 1996, 'The Shadow Value of Migrant Remittances, Income and Inequality in a Household-Farm Economy', *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol.32, No.6, pp.899-912

Tiffen, M., M. Mortimore and F. Gichuki, 1994, *More People, Less Erosion: Environmental Recovery in Kenya*, Chichester: John Wiley

Annex Table 1

LADDER Field Research Villages 2001

| No | Village | NR Feature | Division ¹ | District |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| UGANDA | | | | |
| 1 | Bukhasusa | coffee-banana | Butiru | Mbale |
| 2 | Buwopuwa | maize-cotton | Butiru | |
| 3 | Bunabuso | coffee-banana | Bududa | |
| 4 | Iyingo | fishing & farming | Kagulu | Kamuli |
| 5 | Kinamwanga | fishing & farming | Kidera | |
| 6 | Kiribairya | fishing & farming | Buyende | |
| 7 | Kabbo | coffee-banana-livestock | Kasambya | Mubende |
| 8 | Kansambya | coffee-banana-livestock | Maddudu | |
| 9 | Kalangaalo | coffee-banana-livestock | Bulera | |
| TANZANIA | | | | |
| 10 | Chanzuru Kati | farmer irrigation | Kimamba | Kilosa |
| 11 | Chanzuru Darajani | farmer irrigation | Kimamba | |
| 12 | Chanzuru Chekereni | farmer irrigation | Kimamba | |
| 13 | Chakwale Kilimani | semi-arid maize | Gairo | |
| 14 | Kongwa Kibungo | wildlife-tourism | Mvuha | Morogoro |
| 15 | Duthumi-Bonye Sogea Mbele | wildlife-tourism | Bwakira | Rural |
| 16 | Sesenga Kibungo | wildlife-tourism | Bwakira | |
| 17 | Mlali Gudugudu | rainfed maize | Mlali | Morogoro |
| 18 | Pinde | upland vegetable | Mgeta | Rural |
| 19 | Nyandira Lundi | upland vegetable | Mgeta | |
| MALAWI | | | | |
| 20 | Kanyezi | maize-tobacco | Pemba | Dedza |
| 21 | Kunsinja | maize-groundnuts-dimba | Pemba | |
| 22 | Lumwira | maize-vegetables | Kasumbu | |
| 22 | Chiwamba | forest management | Kasumbu | |
| 24 | Mpango | forest management | Kasumbu | |
| 25 | Phomula | maize-woodland | Kachindamoto | |
| 26 | Katanda | fishing & farming | Kuntumanji | Zomba |
| 27 | Saukaphimbi | fishing & farming | Mwambo | |

continued.

| KENYA ² | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|------------------------|---------------|-------|
| 28 | Kapsoya | tea & pyrethrum | Bomet Central | Bomet |
| 29 | Kiptunoi | maize & livestock | Songiroi | |
| 30 | Kiplabotwa | semi-arid maize | Sigor | |
| 31 | Mengit | semi-arid maize/millet | Longisa | |
| 32 | Siwot | hillside mixed crops | Longisa | |
| | | | | |
| 33 | Nypuodi | maize, beans, sorghum | Lambwe | Suba |
| 34 | Makende | maize, beans, sorghum | Central | |
| 35 | Roo | fishing & farming | Central | |
| 36 | Gingo | fishing & farming | Central | |
| 37 | Nyaranda | fishing & farming | Mbita | |

Notes:

- 1 Sub-County in Uganda, Division in Tanzania and Kenya, Traditional Authority (TA) in Malawi
- 2 The research in Kenya was funded by ICRISAT/UNDP

Annex Table 2

LADDER Research Teams in Uganda, Tanzania and Malawi

| Name | Institution | Role and Skills |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| UGANDA | | |
| Godfrey Bahiigwa | EPRC | Team Leader |
| Arsene Balihuta | Institute of Economics | Micro-macro economic |
| Sallie Simba | Faculty of Social Sciences | Micro-macro institutional |
| Andrew State | Faculty of Social Sciences | Social anthropologist |
| Josephine Ahikire | Dept of Gender Studies | Gender specialist |
| William Nanyenya | NARO | Livestock specialist |
| Godfrey Kayoby | NARO | Field supervisor |
| Agnes Akwang | NARO | Field supervisor |
| Godfrey Turiho | Dept of Agric Economics | Research officer |
| TANZANIA | | |
| Ntengua Mdoe | Agric Economics (SUA) | Team Leader, fieldwork |
| Fulgense Mishili | Agric Economics (SUA) | Fieldwork deputy |
| D. Mwaseba | Edu & Extension (SUA) | PRA expert |
| Anne Mbughuni | Inst Dev Management | Institutions |
| Joyce Lyimo-Macha | Inst Cont Education | Gender |
| David Kapinga | Dev Studies Inst (SUA) | Institutions and AIDS |
| Kazuzuru | Faculty of Science (SUA) | Statistician |
| Sam Wangwe | ESRF | Micro-macro policy links |
| HKR Amani | ESRF | Micro-macro economic |
| Joseph Semboja | REPOA | PRSP process |
| Brian Cooksey | TADREG | Agricultural sector review |
| MALAWI | | |
| Milton Kutengule | National Econ Council | Team Leader |
| Alfred Nyasulu | LADDER Malawi | Fieldwork deputy |
| Bellings Langa | LADDER Malawi | Logistics |
| Nick Osborne | CARE Malawi | CARE field support |
| Archangel Chinkunda | Ministry of Finance | Micro-macro economics |
| Dennis Kayambazinthu | Forestry Research Institute | Forestry co-management |

Annex Table 3

LADDER UK Researchers and Contact Details

| Name | Institution | Role and Skills | Email Address |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| MAIN TEAM | | | |
| Eddie Allison | ODG | Artisanal fishing and rural livelihoods | e.allison@uea.ac.uk |
| Caroline Ashley | ODI | Wildlife & tourism management and livelihoods | c.ashley@odi.org.uk |
| Steve Ashley | IDL | Livestock in rural livelihoods | lidsa@compuserve.com |
| Piers Blaikie | ODG | Community natural resource management | p.blaikie@uea.ac.uk |
| Catherine Dolan | ODG | Gender and rural livelihoods | c.dolan@uea.ac.uk |
| Frank Ellis (Project Leader) | ODG | Rural livelihood diversification | f.ellis@uea.ac.uk |
| Paul Francis | ODG | Institutions and rural livelihoods | paul.francis@uea.ac.uk |
| Bruce Lankford | ODG | Farmer-managed irrigation | b.lankford@uea.ac.uk |
| Catherine Locke | ODG | Community forestry management | c.locke@uea.ac.uk |
| John McDonagh | ODG | Farming systems and livelihoods | j.mcdonagh@uea.ac.uk |
| Kunal Sen | ODG | Macro-micro economic links | k.sen@uea.ac.uk |
| OTHER RESEARCHERS | | | |
| Sholto Cross | ODG | Decentralisation in Malawi | sholtoc@mweb.co.za |
| Robert James | - | Institutions (Research Student) | robert.james@uea.ac.uk |
| Sylvie Koestle | - | HIV/AIDs (Research Student) | s.koestle@uea.ac.uk |
| John Mims | ODG | Senior Research Officer | j.mims@uea.ac.uk |
| Lou Reynolds | ODG | Research Officer | lou.reynolds@uea.ac.uk |

Annex Table 4

LADDER Working Papers (Version September 2001)

(in collaboration with in-country co-authors)

| | PROPOSED WORKING PAPERS | Author | Date Due |
|----|---|---------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Rural livelihoods, diversity and poverty reduction policies | FE | October 2001 |
| 2 | Methods manual for fieldwork | Team | October 2001 |
| 3 | Institutional context of rural livelihoods in Uganda | PF | October 2001 |
| 4 | Decentralisation in Malawi | SC | October 2001 |
| 5 | Livelihoods and Rural Poverty Reduction in Uganda | GB & FE | October 2001 |
| 6 | Macro-micro economic links: Uganda | KKS | October 2001 |
| 7 | Rural livelihoods and illnesses: Tanzania and Malawi | SK | November 2001 |
| 8 | Community natural resource management: a critical review | PMB | November 2001 |
| 9 | Institutional context of rural livelihoods in Tanzania | RJ | November 2001 |
| 5 | Institutional context of crop marketing: Tanzania | BC | November 2001 |
| 11 | Fisheries management policies and livelihoods: Uganda | EHA | November 2001 |
| 12 | Crop-based farming policies and livelihoods: Uganda | JMD | November 2001 |
| 13 | Livestock policies and livelihoods: Uganda | SA | November 2001 |
| 14 | Water management policies and livelihoods: Tanzania | BAL | November 2001 |
| 15 | Rural livelihoods and adaptability | DB | November 2001 |
| 16 | Macro-micro economic links: Tanzania | KKS | November 2001 |
| 17 | Gender and diverse livelihoods: Uganda | CSD | December 2001 |
| 18 | Macro-micro economic links: Malawi | KKS | February 2002 |
| 19 | Institutional contexts of rural livelihoods in Malawi | SC | February 2002 |
| 20 | Livelihoods and rural poverty reduction in Tanzania | FE ++ | February 2002 |
| 21 | Gender and diverse livelihoods: Tanzania | CSD | March 2002 |
| 22 | Wildlife and tourism management: Tanzania | CA | March 2002 |
| 23 | Fisheries management policies and livelihoods: Malawi | EHA | March 2002 |
| 24 | Crop-based farming policies and livelihoods: Malawi | JMD | March 2002 |
| 25 | Forest management policies and livelihoods: Malawi | CHL | March 2002 |

continued.

| | | | |
|----|---|-------|------------|
| 26 | Livelihoods and rural poverty reduction in Malawi | FE | March 2002 |
| 27 | Institutional contexts of rural livelihoods: comparison | RJ/SC | June 2002 |
| 28 | Macro-micro economic links: Comparison | KKS | June 2002 |
| 29 | Livelihood strategies in Uganda, Tanzania and Malawi | JM | June 2002 |
| 30 | Policy contexts for rural poverty reduction in eastern Africa | FE | June 2002 |

Note: The numbering of these WPs is provisional and they may appear in a different sequence and a different numbering from the list given here