



POLAC INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECON & MGT SCIENCE (PIJEMS)
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL-KANO



ANALYSIS OF THE CONFLICT SENSITIVITY OF CONCEPTUALIZING AND IMPLEMENTING THE KACHIA GRAZING RESERVE LAW IN KADUNA STATE AS A CONFLICT PREVENTION STRATEGY

Joseph Atang Institute of Governance and Development Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi

Abdullahi N. Liman, PhD Institute of Governance and Development Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi

Abstract

The prevention of the longstanding conflict between transhumance pastoralists and farming communities, as well as the need to improve the health conditions of pastoralists and their animals for optimal and healthier animal productivity, is the main goal of creating the Kachia Grazing Reserve in Kaduna State. However, if not properly conceived, a grazing reserve can exacerbate or bring about conflict. Anchored on the Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Theory, this paper therefore places the establishment of the Kachia Grazing Reserve on the scale of conflict sensitivity in conceptualization. In other words, it looks at whether the idea was properly conceived in terms of process and intended output. Through primary and secondary data, the paper has found that there was no deliberate and systematic mainstreaming of conflict sensitivity in conceiving the reserve. The Kachia Grazing Reserve was conceived in contravention of the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965 (adopted by the Kaduna State Government); the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law 1996 (backdated to 1988); the Kaduna State Grazing Reserve Regulations 1987; and the Land Use Act 1978. More importantly, even these instruments were found not to be conflict sensitive enough. It has also been found that even in their deficiencies, these instruments are still extant. Communities from which the land for the Kachia Grazing Reserve was taken were not engaged in most of the activities for establishing, and are not involved in most of the management and monitoring activities of the grazing reserve. The paper therefore recommends that in order to stem the rising tide of conflicts between inhabitants of the Kachia Grazing Reserve and their neighbouring indigenous farming communities, the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965 (adopted by the Kaduna State Government); the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law 1996 (backdated to 1988); and the Kaduna State Grazing Reserve Regulations 1987 are more than due for revision after decades of their existence. The study also recommends that all stakeholders must be actively involved in the review of those instruments. Specifically, all stakeholders should be duly and actively engaged in the consequent review of the nature and management of the Kachia Grazing Reserve.

Key words: Conflict; Conflict Sensitivity; Kachia Grazing Reserve Law; Conflict Sensitive Planning; Conflict Prevention.

Introduction

Desertification and population explosion have pushed transhumance pastoralists southwards into Kaduna state with resultant increase in cases of conflict between them and farming communities. Most livestock routes in the central area of Nigeria pass through Kaduna State. During the dry season, therefore, nomadic Fulani pass

through the state to and from other states. This worsening conflict situation, along with the need to sedentarize pastoralists for higher and healthier yields in animal products, has necessitated the establishment of grazing reserves for pastoralists in the State. One of these grazing reserves is the Kachia Grazing Reserve.

This study, therefore, analyses the process of grazing reserves policy formulation in Kaduna State with specific reference to the Kachia Grazing Reserve. The main objective is to establish how conflict sensitive the grazing reserve was conceived and planned. This is done by putting the planning/conceptualization process on the scales of the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965 (adopted by the Kaduna State Government); the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law 1996 (backdated to 1988); the Kaduna State Grazing Reserve Regulations 1987; and the Land Use Act 1978. In other words, this study aims to examine whether the root source of the challenges therefrom is the planning. Is the idea of creating the grazing reserve in itself (the policy) faulty? This study is, therefore, predicated on the proposition that the most meaningful approach to the challenges of creating grazing reserves in Kaduna State is a critical re-examination of the idea.

The main objective of this paper is to identify the conflict sensitivity in conceptualizing and implementing the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law. The specific objectives are:

- i. to determine the conflict sensitivity in conceptualizing the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law;
- ii. to determine the conflict sensitivity in implementing the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law;
- iii. to determine the conflict sensitivity in the management of the Kachia Grazing Reserve;
- iv. to make recommendations for the conflict sensitive management of the Kachia Grazing Reserve.

Conceptual Clarifications

Grazing Reserve

A grazing reserve is a track of land that is specially set aside and developed by government for the purpose of raising livestock animals such as cattle and other ruminants. A typical grazing reserve consists of more than just pastureland for cattle. It includes homes for the settlement of cattle breeders, fallow land, and other infrastructure. A typical grazing reserve would involve investment in roads and fire breaks, water development,

housing and buildings, office equipment, stock handling and veterinary facilities, motor vehicles, medical facilities, tractors and equipment (Ingawa, Tarawali, and Kaufmann, 1989). Grazing reserves in Nigeria are established at the three government levels (Federal, State and Local Government), as well as Community and Family levels.

Conflict

Conflict studies scholarship and practice give different but complementary definitions of conflict. However, one definition that captures the essence of this paper is the one by Coser (1956). Coser defines conflict as:

“a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals.”

Conflict Sensitivity

Conflict Sensitivity is the ability to (i) understand the context in which one is intervening by doing a conflict analysis and updating it regularly; (ii) understand the interaction between one's intervention and the context by linking the conflict analysis with the programming cycle of planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation; (iii) and act upon the understanding of this interaction in order to avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts by planning, implementing monitoring and evaluating the intervention in a conflict-sensitive manner (including redesigning intervention when necessary).

Conflict Sensitive Conceptualization

Conceptualization of a project is the starting bloc for planning of that project. Planning has to do mainly with the way the project is conceived. Therefore, conflict sensitive planning of a project depends heavily on how conflict sensitive it is conceived. Planning is the process through which certain problems are identified, their causal linkages analysed, and effective solutions developed. The result of this process is often embodied in a programme designed with predetermined objectives, activities, implementation process and veritable indicators of progress. Conflict sensitive planning incorporates the conflict analysis (profile, causes, actors

and dynamics of a conflict) into traditional planning. The intention is to have a constructive impact on the context to avoid further deterioration and promote more peaceful and effective solutions.

Theoretical Framework

Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Theory

Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Theory was propounded by Mary Anderson in 1999 (Anderson, 1999). It provides for a good understanding of the two-way interaction between development, peacebuilding, or humanitarian interventions and the context in which the intervention is taking place, and acting to minimise the negative impacts of the intervention on conflict. The principle of Do-No-Harm (DNH) forms the core of Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Theory. An intervention that avoids exacerbating the problem that is intended to be solved or creates other additional problems is a DNH intervention; in other words, an intervention that is conflict sensitive.

The Peace and Conflict Sensitivity Theory has its origins in development and humanitarian activities. Development is good and it is the essence of government. However, if not handled properly, development can cause conflict, which can ironically stop, reverse or hinder development. As a measure to increase agricultural productivity by cultivators and to impact positively on animal husbandry and animal productivity by pastoralists in order to achieve food security, grazing reserve development is an endeavour in development. As a mechanism for resolving or mitigating conflict, grazing reserves development is a peacebuilding mechanism. Conflict sensitivity in development and peacebuilding, therefore, is the deliberate planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of development and peacebuilding projects and programmes to avoid causing conflict. Conflict sensitivity in development and peacebuilding therefore entails:

1. understanding the context/environment in which a project is intended to be sited in terms of its geographic and social peculiarities;
2. understanding how the project and the context impact on each other;

3. being guided by the understanding of the interaction between context and project or intervention in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the project.

By the first requirement above, it is obvious that conflict analysis is central to and, therefore, the first task in conflict sensitive development and peacebuilding programming. In conflict analysis, the context for which the development or peacebuilding intervention is intended is analysed. This entails a critical analysis of:

- (a) the actors or parties to the pre-existing conflict where the intervention is a peacebuilding project or all stakeholders where a development project is intended;
- (b) the causes or sources of the conflict where intervention is intended;
- (c) the profile of the conflict; and
- (d) the interaction dynamics between and amongst them.

The key question is how the context may affect, affects or has affected the intervention and vice versa. The Theory of Peace and Conflict Sensitivity is the theory used in this paper because the development and management of grazing reserves has to be done in such a manner as to not create or exacerbate conflict.

Literature Review

Grazing Reserves Development in Kaduna State

In order to prevent and mitigate the farmer/herder conflicts, as well as ensure easier and more productive animal husbandry in the State, the Kaduna State Government has adopted the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law, 1965. Section 3 of the Grazing Reserve Law 1965 defines the lands that may be constituted into State or Local Government grazing reserves in accordance with Section 12 and subject to sections 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 to be:

- (a) Lands at the disposal of Government or native lands;
- (b) Any lands in respect of which it appears to the Commissioner that grazing such lands should be protected or reserved or grazing management should be practised.”

The procedure for establishing grazing reserves in the 1965 Law is such that:

A State or Local Government upon decision to acquire lands as specified under (a) and (b) above, the Commissioner at the State Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources or Chairman of the Local Government Council (if the reserve is to be Local Government owned), shall inform the Local Land Use and Allocation Committee of the area, the Government intention to create a grazing reserve, indicating the area involved. The Land Use and Allocation Committee shall carry out preliminary investigations into the land uses of the area, consider its suitability, consult the people of the locality and obtain their views. The Committee after consultation with the people of the locality and obtaining their views prepares a sketch map with description of the area, showing large farms and villages (enclaves), compile a preliminary report for submission to the Chairman of the Local Government Council for consideration. The report is sent to the State Land Use and Allocation Committee for consideration and approval (if the Land is over 5,000 hectares) and forwarding to the Commissioner, Section 6(2) of Land Use Decree 1978.

Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Grazing Reserves Law, 1965 make the following provisions for Notification of intention to a create reserve:

The Commissioner or Local Government Chairman after receiving the Land Use and Allocation Committee's report shall publish in the gazette a notice in the following manner:

- (a) Specifying as nearly as may be the situation and limits of the lands;*
- (b) Declaring whether the Lands are at the disposal of Government or are native lands coming within paragraph (b) of section 3;*
- (c) Declaring that it is intended to constitute such Lands a Government grazing reserve, either for the general purpose of Government or for the particular use and benefit, wholly or in part, of any class of persons or for the benefit of any native Community or native authority;*
- (d) Appoints a Reserve Settlement Officer who shall inquire into and determine the existence, nature and extend of any rights claimed by or alleged to exist in favour of any persons or Communities or brought to*

the knowledge of the said officer affecting the lands or any other rights in or over the lands.(This responsibility may be carried out by the Land Use and Allocation Committee as the Commissioner or Local Government Chairman may deem fit).

The Law also prescribes that an order constituting the Grazing Reserve must be made as follows:

On completion of inquiries and reaching agreement on the lands, the area shall be surveyed, demarcated and final maps and detail report prepared. The maps and detail report are then sent to the Attorney General of the State for Legal consideration and drafting of the order. The final draft order is then sent to the State Military Governor for final approval and appending signature. The order is then published in the official gazette of the State.

The Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965 must, however, be read in conjunction with provisions of the Land Use Act 1978 on acquisition of land for agricultural purposes. Section 6(6) of the Land Use Act 1978 makes room for compensation where land is acquired for agricultural purposes. It states that:

"Where land in respect of which a customary Right of Occupancy is revoked under this decree was used for agricultural purposes by the holder, the Local Government shall allocate to such holder alternative land for the same purpose".

Under the purview of the The Grazing Reserves Law 1965 of Northern Nigeria, backed by official gazettes for each grazing reserves, the Kaduna State Government has designated 14 areas for the creation of Grazing Reserves and three (3) areas for the development of pasture (pasture reserves) in the State. The Kachia Grazing Reserve is one of the 14 grazing reserves proposed by the Kaduna State government. It straddles the three LGAs of Zangon Kataf, Kajuru, and Kachia with a gazetted size of 33,411 hectares (3,341.11 square kilometres).

The Kachia Grazing Reserve was gazetted via the Kachia Grazing Reserve Order under The Kaduna State Grazing Reserves Law (CAP. 62 1991) in a Kaduna State of

Nigeria Gazette No. 8, Vol. 30, 25th April, 1996. The “Date of Commencement” of The Kachia Grazing Reserve Order 1996 was, however, backdated to 1st July, 1988. In the 1980s, Government planned to expand the Kachia Grazing Reserve to 73,411 hectares, the Damau Grazing Reserve to 110,000 hectares and the Gayan Grazing Reserve to about 40,000 hectares. The proposed expansions have not been done yet.

Section 22 of the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law, 1965 leaves the formulation of regulations for pastoralists in grazing reserves at the discretion of the Governments establishing them. In Kaduna State, The Grazing Reserves Regulations, 1987, with a Commencement Date of 5th May, 1987, was gazetted in Kaduna State of Nigeria Gazette, No. 11, Vol. 21, 25th June 1987 (KD.S.L.N No. 3 of 1987). Based on these general provisions, 27 regulations have been enacted for the Kachia Grazing Reserve. The regulations are outside the purview of this seminar paper as they concern the management of grazing reserves after establishment and not the conceptualization and planning of the grazing reserves.

Methodology

This research is descriptive and inferential in design. It aims to systematically describe the establishment of the Kachia grazing reserve from conceptualization through implementation to monitoring and evaluation in order to establish how conflict sensitive it is. This research is concerned with what, where, when and how, rather than why the Kachia grazing reserve was established. Primary and secondary data were gathered and analysed through questionnaires and interviews. The data collection methods used in this research were, therefore, survey Questionnaires and Key Informant Interviews.

There are 1,322,226 farming households in Kaduna State. However, the population of this study comprises farmers in the three LGAs hosting the Kachia Grazing Reserve (Kajuru, Kachia and Zangon Kataf) as well as the pastoralist inhabitants in the Kachia Grazing Reserve. The total population of farming households in the three LGAs is 102,397, comprising 10,397 for

Kajuru LGA; 27,397 for Kachia LGA; and 64,603 for Zangon Kataf LGA (Abdul-Qadir and Umaru, 2019). Since there was no record of individual farmers in the study area, this research estimated an average of 4 members of each farming household based on cultural considerations, making a total population of 409,588 farmers.

There are 22,000 pastoralist inhabitants within the grazing reserve (NCNE, 2022). These numbers increase during the wet season and diminish during the dry season when outmigration of people and animals takes place in search of pasture and water. This makes a total combined study population of 431,588.

The Qualtrics XM Sampling Technique was used to determine the sample size for this study. The Qualtrics Sample Size Calculator was used to calculate the sample size. The Probability Sampling method was used whereby each member of the research population has an equal chance of being a part of the sample population for the research. The Qualtrics XM Sampling Technique does not impose a fixed confidence level and margin of error. This study therefore got its sample size based on 95% Confidence Level and 5% Margin of Error, making the total combined sample size for farmers and pastoralists in the three LGAs 500.

Being a descriptive survey of process, the primary sources of data for this research were Survey Questionnaire and Key Informant Interviews, thereby targeting the beneficiaries of the grazing reserve and the policy actors. The KII questions were Semi-structured and Open-ended. The survey questionnaire was a Structured Questionnaire administered on different stakeholder groups. Because most respondents were only fairly educated and/or not familiar with the Conflict Resolution language register, the structured questionnaire consisted of open-ended questions on a Likert scale. Secondary sources of relevant data included appropriate documents and records in relevant Local, State and Federal government agencies, non-governmental organizations, as well as the mass media.

Because peace and conflict studies and practice are fairly new in the study area, the researcher personally carried out the Key Informant Interviews. This was to avoid misinterpretation of questions and misrepresentation of information obtained by Research Assistants who were not familiar with the peace and conflict studies language register. It also ensured that gaps in informants' responses were identified, and appropriate follow-up questions were asked.

People indigenous to the research area were employed as Research Assistants to administer the questionnaires. While some of the questionnaires were self-administered because their respondents were literate in the English language, Research Assistants were guided on how to administer questionnaires on illiterate respondents in the English language.

This study is descriptive and inferential and, therefore, content analysis technique was used. Specifically, Phenomenological Data Analysis technique was employed. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982, p.145), phenomenological analysis entails "working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned". This study adopted the Empirical Phenomenological Data Analysis (EPDA) procedure developed by Karlsson (1993) and used by Giorgi (1997); Friman, Nyberg and Norlander (2004); and Adisa (2008).

There are three target population categories in this study: (i) government officials involved with agricultural policy formulation and implementation; (ii) pastoralist inhabitants of grazing reserves; and (iii) farming communities. Data from these target population categories was analysed in line with the aforementioned themes. A comparative analysis of the data from all target population categories was thereafter done. Identification of the major findings of the study conclude the data analysis.

Citations from the Key Informant Interviews and Questionnaires have been used to validate the findings of the research.

Analysis of the Conflict Sensitivity of Conceptualizing and Implementing the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law as a Conflict Prevention Strategy

There were four instruments that were already in place when the Kachia Grazing Reserve was being conceptualised by the Kaduna State Government. These are the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965; the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law 1996 (backdated to 1988); the Kaduna State Grazing Reserve Regulations 1987; and the Land Use Act 1978. Those instruments are still in existence today. Therefore, conceptualising the Kachia Grazing Reserve was mainly a matter of following the requirements and processes in these instruments. It means, therefore, that the conflict sensitivity of establishing the KGR depended on how conflict sensitive those instruments were. The conflict sensitivity of planning the establishment of new Grazing Reserves will also depend on the conflict sensitivity of those instruments as they are.

The first test of conflict sensitivity in conceiving the Kachia Grazing Reserve is that although the Kachia Grazing Reserve Order under The Kaduna State Grazing Reserves Law (CAP. 62 1991) in a Kaduna State of Nigeria Gazette No. 8, Vol. 30, was dated 25th April, 1996, the "Date of Commencement" of The Kachia Grazing Reserve Order 1996 was, however, backdated to 1st July, 1988. The legal status of the Kachia Grazing Reserve is, therefore, questionable.

The second test of sensitivity to conflict is the currency of the instruments for establishing the grazing reserves themselves. The Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law has been in existence for 59 years; the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law is 28 years old; the Kaduna State Grazing Reserve Regulations are 37 years old; and the Nigerian Land Use Act is 48 years old. None of them has been reviewed. Many provisions of those instruments are obsolete and unrealistic, and, therefore, impracticable or not implementable.

Also, the Kachia Grazing Reserve is located in three LGAs: Zangon-Kataf, Kachia and Kajuru. Management is however wholly by Kachia LGA. This is already a source of conflict between the LGAs and the traditional Chiefdoms of Ikulu and Adara. This is even in spite of Government acceptance in its White Paper on the Report of the Committee on Demarcation of Boundaries Between the Newly Created Chiefdoms in Kaduna State 2001 of the Committee's recommendation that Ladduga District should remain in Ikulu Chiefdom and directed as such.

There is therefore serious confusion and controversy about the responsibilities of each of the Local Government Areas to the Kachia Grazing Reserve. As at

the time it was created, the Reserve was in Kachia Local Government Area. However, over the years, the Kachia Local Government Area has been split into three LGAs: Zangon Kataf, Kachia and Kajuru. The Government has not helped matters by pitching administrative policy against electoral policy on the Grazing Reserve. Administratively, the Ladduga traditional District which is part of the Kachia Grazing Reserve is in Ikulu Chiefdom in Zangon Kataf Local Government. Zangon Kataf LGA pays the salaries of the District Head, his Village Heads and all supporting staff, as well as administer and fund the health and primary school systems. Electorally, the District constitutes a ward in the Ikulu Chiefdom in Zangon Kataf LGA, but all of its polling booths were recently re-delineated to Agunu electoral Ward in Kachia LGA.

Table 1: Respondents' satisfaction with the location of the Kachia Grazing Reserve

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Undecided		Satisfied		Very satisfied	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.6.1	182	38.16	91	19.08	42	8.81	67	14.05	91	19.08
Q1.6.2	168	35.22	100	20.96	24	5.03	70	14.68	110	23.06
Q1.6.3	166	34.8	71	14.88	54	11.32	91	19.08	91	19.08
Q1.6.4	169	35.43	59	12.37	33	6.92	85	17.82	124	26
Q1.6.5	219	45.91	113	23.69	43	9.01	46	9.64	53	11.11
Q1.6.6	231	48.43	128	26.83	57	11.95	19	3.98	27	5.66
Q1.6	109	22.85	126	26.42	133	27.88	93	19.5	14	2.94

The data on satisfaction with location of Kachia Grazing Reserve was analysed and results presented in Table 1. The respondents are generally dissatisfied with the location of the Kachia Grazing Reserve (items Q1.6.1 to Q1.6.5). The highest level of satisfaction was observed on item 1.6.4, "The Kachia grazing reserve is part of the Ladduga district in Ikulu Chiefdom but traditionally pays allegiance to Kachia Chiefdom". The lowest level of

satisfaction with location of Kachia Grazing Reserve was observed on item Q1.6.6, "Adequacy of any compensation paid to my community". The overall satisfaction with location of the Kachia Grazing Reserve score is relatively low, 49.27 percent were very dissatisfied or dissatisfied, 22.44 percent were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the location of the reserve.

Table 2: Respondents' familiarity with what a grazing reserve is

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very unfamiliar		Unfamiliar		Undecided		Familiar		Very familiar	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.1.1	63	13.21	59	12.37	36	7.55	161	33.75	125	26.21
Q1.1	63	13.21	59	12.37	36	7.55	161	33.75	125	26.21

The study has also found as shown in Table 2 that a good number of the local population of the study are not familiar with what a grazing reserve is.

Five points Likert scale was used to determine familiarity of respondents with Q1.1. "What a grazing reserve is" where, 1=Very unfamiliar, 2=Unfamiliar, 3=Somewhat familiar, 4=Familiar and 5=Very familiar. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 2. Accordingly, 33.75% and 26.21% of the respondents were familiar and very familiar respectively with what a grazing reserve is. 13.21% and 12.37% were very

unfamiliar and unfamiliar with what a grazing reserve is. This shows that most of the respondents were at least familiar with the concept of a grazing reserve. However, this number is inadequate considering the sensitivity of the issue of taking ancestral land from communities to settle pastoralists, some of whom are not indigenous to the environment. Land is an extremely sensitive resource in Nigeria. Some of the conflicts are due to lack of knowledge of the lofty ideals for and nature of a grazing reserve. Consultation with and sensitization of the local communities would have taken care of this.

Table 3: Respondents' awareness of creation and management instruments for grazing reserves in Kaduna State

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very unaware		Unaware		Undecided		Aware		Very aware	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.2.1	128	26.83	127	26.62	24	5.03	133	27.88	62	13.00
Q1.2.2	102	21.38	108	22.64	31	6.50	159	33.33	72	15.09
Q1.2.3	104	21.80	150	31.45	49	10.27	114	23.9	57	11.95
Q1.2.4	106	22.22	181	37.95	49	10.27	80	16.77	47	9.85
Q1.2	72	15.09	147	30.82	100	20.96	101	21.17	56	11.74

The study also established that a majority of the research population are not aware of the existence of the legal and administrative instruments around the Kachia Grazing Reserve. This is shown in Table 3. Five point Likert scale was used to measure the respondents' level of awareness of Q1.2.1 "The Kaduna State Gazette 1991 establishing the Kachia Grazing Reserve"; Q1.2.2 "Existence of the Kachia grazing reserve"; Q1.2.3 "The Grazing Reserves Regulations for inhabitants of grazing reserves in Kaduna State"; Q1.2.4 "The management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve, where 1=Very unaware,

2=Unaware, 3=Undecided, 4=Aware and 5=Very aware. 48.91% of the respondents were either very unaware or unaware of the instruments for creating and managing the Kachia grazing reserve. 39.91% of the respondents were either aware or very aware of the instruments. 20.96% could not ascertain their level of awareness of the instruments. This indicates that the respondents reported ignorance of the creation and management instruments for the Kachia grazing reserve.

The study has also established that there was no consultation with and sensitization of the local communities in conceptualizing the Kachia GR as demanded by the various legal instruments. Neither was their consent sought as provided for in law. The Kaduna State Government inaugurated the Kaduna State Peace and Reconciliation Committee on January 25, 2012. The State Government further complicated the issues of the size of the grazing reserve and compensation to the host communities in its presentation to the Peace and Reconciliation Committee. In his presentation as reported in the Ikulu communities of Katul, Gateh, Aduma and Yadeh/Akupal Communities petition (2012), the Permanent Secretary of the Kaduna State Ministry of Agriculture stated that the land acquired initially for the grazing reserve was 74,000 hectares but only 34,000 hectares were gazetted; the land was donated to the Government by the Kachia Local Government with no expectation for compensation by the host communities; and that the communities started claiming compensation only after they were paid compensation for the NNPC oil pipeline that passes through them. However, government records show that the decision not to pay monetary compensation to any individual or group in respect of land or economic trees that fall within the acquired area and that prohibited farming and hunting activities in the Reserve was made in the State Executive Council meeting of July 1, 1988.

In reaction to the Permanent Secretary's submission, the Ikulu communities of Katul, Gateh, Aduma and Yadeh/Akupal Communities stated in a letter to the Committee that they:

...never donated our land to the Government. Those lands were forcefully taken from us. The land initially earmarked for the Kachia Grazing Reserve by the powers that be was 73,411 hectares, not 74,000 hectares. What remained of the 73,411 hectares reverted to us the host communities. We hasten to state that our claim to compensation precedes the NNPC pipeline issue. So to say that the pipeline triggered our claim is false and

unfounded. His submission has heightened tension and can cause a breakdown of law and the peace that the Committee is working hard to restore. Our demand is as old as the reserve itself.

In a letter to the District Head of Zangon Kataf District in February 1983, the neighbouring communities to the grazing reserve besieged the District Head "to please help us appeal to the authorities concerned to pay us compensation for a large stretch of land acquired ... for a forest reserve." In their letter to the Technical Committee on the Ladduga Boundary in 2008, the Ikulu Community of Zangon Kataf LGA, (2008) alleged that:

The land was compulsorily acquired after subjecting the Anchuna Village Head, Akwital Dama, and his ward heads: Gidan Ali (Bako Jirayi), Yadeh (Mazadu Ruku, Ungwar Gimba (Shuaibu Gimba), and Dutsen Bako (Likita Atiku) to duress and intimidation to sign the agreement to that effect at the Chambers in Kachia. ACDA/IDA made strong written observations to constituted authorities against the move then."

The Ikulu Community claimed that the intimidation was easy because both the Chairman of the bigger Kachia LGA was from Kachia LGA and the District Head of the larger Zangon Kataf District was not of the Ikulu ethnicity. The Anchuna branch of the Ikulu Development Association lodged a complaint via a letter to the Chairman of Kachia LGA dated 14th March, 1988.

Because there was no consultation of the communities to be affected by the grazing reserve as provided for in the four instruments cited above on the process of creating grazing reserves, there is currently an uncertainty about the current size of the KGR. There is a claim by inhabitants of the grazing reserve and within government circles that the Kachia Grazing Reserve has been expanded from 33, 411 hectares to 73,411 hectares. Table 4 captures the responses of respondents to the question of the size of the grazing reserve.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by awareness of the size of the Kachia Grazing Reserve

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very unaware		Unaware		Undecided		Aware		Very aware	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q2.1.1	167	35.01	171	35.85	21	4.4	57	11.95	56	11.74
Q2.1.2	179	37.53	177	37.11	34	7.13	46	9.64	31	6.5
Q2.1	127	26.62	199	41.72	63	13.21	50	10.48	34	7.13

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of respondents for items Q2.1.1, “Awareness of the size of the Kachia grazing reserve at inception in 1991”, Q2.1.2, “Awareness of the current size of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q2.1, overall across a 5-point Likert scale. Most of the respondents were unaware or very unaware of Q2.1.1, “Awareness of the size of the Kachia grazing reserve at inception in 1991”, 70.86 percent; and Q2.1.2 “Awareness of the current size of the Kachia grazing reserve”, 74.64 percent. Fewer were very aware: Q2.1.1:

11.74 percent; Q2.1.2: 6.5 percent; Aware: Q2.1.1: 11.95 percent; Q2.1.2: 9.64 percent; and Undecided on Q2.1.1: 4.4, and Q2.1.2: 7.13. The overall Kachia Grazing Reserve size awareness score indicates a mean of 2.29, suggesting a tendency towards unawareness.

The study has also found that only a few of the local communities were compensated as required by the law. Those communities that were compensated consider the compensation inadequate.

Table 5: Respondents’ perception on issues concerning compensation for the land on which the Kachia Grazing Reserve was created

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.4.1	204	42.77	147	30.82	46	9.64	49	10.27	30	6.29
Q1.4.2	225	47.17	140	29.35	43	9.01	40	8.39	27	5.66
Q1.4.3	271	56.81	120	25.16	39	8.18	22	4.61	21	4.4
Q1.4.4	229	48.01	147	30.82	57	11.95	16	3.35	24	5.03
Q1.4.5	221	46.33	142	29.77	67	14.05	27	5.66	17	3.56
Q1.4	211	44.23	154	32.29	77	16.14	27	5.66	7	1.47

Compensation paid for Kachia Grazing Reserve land was analysed and the result presented in Table 5. Generally, most of the respondents (73.59%) strongly disagree that “Consent of our community was sought before acquiring our land for the Kachia grazing reserve” (Q1.4.1); 16.56 percent of the respondents were in agreement and 9.64 percent were undecided. Thus mean equals 1.876, approximately 2, disagree. On the item that “My community fully and willfully gave consent to the acquisition of the land to establish the Kachia grazing reserve”, the respondents were in disagreement by 76.52

percent, in agreement by 14.05 percent and 9.01 percent were undecided. The respondents strongly disagree (81.97 percent) that “All members of my community were paid full compensation following their consent for the Kachia grazing reserve to be sited on our land” (Q1.4.3); 9.01 percent were in agreement and 8.18 percent were undecided. 78.83 percent of the respondents either strongly disagree or disagree that “Only some members of my community were paid full compensation following our consent for the Kachia grazing reserve to be sited on our land” (Q1.4.4). Only

8.38 percent of the respondents either agree or strongly agree while 11.98 percent were undecided. Lastly, on Q1.4.5, “Only some members of my community were paid partial compensation following our consent for the Kachia grazing reserve to be sited on our land”, 46.33 percent strongly disagree, 29.77 percent disagree, 5.66 percent agree and 3.56 strongly agree, 14.05 percent

were undecided. Generally, 76.52 percent either disagree or strongly disagree that compensation was paid for the Kachia Grazing Reserve land. Only 7.13 percent of them either agree or strongly agree that compensation was paid for Kachia Grazing Reserve land, while 16.14 percent of them were undecided.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents’ perception on the adequacy of compensation paid for the land on which the Kachia Grazing Reserve was created.

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very inadequate		Inadequate		Undecided		Adequate		Very adequate	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.5.1	177	37.11	128	26.83	121	25.37	21	4.4	21	4.4
Q1.5	177	37.11	128	26.83	121	25.37	21	4.4	21	4.4

Adequacy of compensation was analyzed and the result presented in Table 6. The result shows that 37.11 percent of the respondents say the compensation was very

inadequate, 26.83 percent say the compensation was inadequate. 4.4 percent of them say compensation was adequate and very adequate respectively.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents by perception of the level of participation in planning the Kachia Grazing Reserve.

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q2.2.1	278	58.28	114	23.9	35	7.34	24	5.03	24	5.03
Q2.2.2	269	56.39	124	26	36	7.55	18	3.77	27	5.66
Q2.2.3	276	57.86	121	25.37	31	6.5	19	3.98	26	5.45
Q2.2.4	281	58.91	112	23.48	38	7.97	15	3.14	29	6.08
Q2.2.5	258	54.09	131	27.46	39	8.18	21	4.4	24	5.03
Q2.2.6	158	33.12	107	22.43	48	10.06	80	16.77	69	14.47
Q2.2	162	33.96	232	48.64	38	7.97	24	5.03	20	4.19

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of the perception of the respondents’ participation in planning the Kachia Grazing Reserve as in items, Q2.2.1 – Q2.2.6 across a 5-point Likert scale. Most of the respondents tend to disagree or strongly disagree on items Q2.2.1, “My community participated in planning the establishment of Kachia grazing reserve”, Q2.2.2, “My community participated in the formulation of the Kachia grazing reserve gazette”, Q2.2.3, “My community participated in

deciding the current size of the Kachia grazing reserve”, Q2.2.4, “My community participated in designing the Grazing Reserve regulations”, Q2.2.5, “Members of my community participated in establishing the management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q2.2.6, “Members of my community are inhabitants of the Kachia grazing reserve”, with 82.18, 82.39, 83.23, 82.39, 81.55 and 55.55 percents respectively. Overall

participation in planning score indicates a mean of 1.97, suggesting a tendency towards disagreement.

Table 8: Respondents' perception on issues concerning enclaves in Kachia grazing reserve

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly agree	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q1.3.1	58	12.16	47	9.85	34	7.13	188	39.41	149	31.24
Q1.3.2	73	15.3	68	14.26	45	9.43	148	31.03	141	29.56
Q1.3.3	61	12.79	54	11.32	45	9.43	128	26.83	186	38.99
Q1.3	27	5.66	60	12.58	103	21.59	169	35.43	117	24.53

Analysis of results on enclaves of farming communities in Kachia Grazing Reserve (Q1.3) is presented in Table 8. Accordingly, most of the respondents, 70.65 percent, agree or strongly agree that there are enclaves of local farming communities within the Kachia Grazing Reserve (Q1.3.1), while 22.01 percent disagree or strongly disagree that there are enclaves of local farming communities within the grazing reserve and only 7.13 percent of the respondents were undecided. On “Immigrant pastoralists do not accept that enclaves of local farming communities are part of the Kachia

Grazing Reserve” (Q1.3.2), majority, 60.59 percent, of the respondents were in agreement while minority, 29.56 percent, were in disagreement. Similarly, majority (65.82%) were in agreement that “Immigrant pastoralists do not allow local farming communities to cultivate their farms” (Q1.3.3), while only 24.11 percent were in disagreement. 9.43 percent were undecided. Overall, the respondents were in agreement with the existence of enclaves of local farming communities in the Kachia Grazing Reserve.

Table 9: Distribution of respondents by awareness of the management infrastructure of the Kachia Grazing Reserve

Scale	1		2		3		4		5	
	Very unaware		Unaware		Undecided		Aware		Very aware	
Items ID	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Q3.1.1	191	40.04	176	36.9	26	5.45	47	9.85	26	5.45
Q3.1.2	183	38.36	199	41.72	23	4.82	36	7.55	28	5.87
Q3.1	153	32.08	193	40.46	70	14.68	25	5.24	28	5.87

Table 9 shows the result of the analysis of awareness of management infrastructure items, Q3.1.1, “Awareness of the management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q3.1.2, “Awareness of capacity building in conflict management in the Kachia grazing reserve and surrounding farming communities”. Many of the respondents, 76.94 percent and 80.08 percent for items Q3.1.1, “Awareness of the management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q3.1.2, “Awareness of capacity building in conflict management in the Kachia

grazing reserve and surrounding farming communities” respectively, were unaware or very unaware of management infrastructure. Fewer were aware or very aware of management infrastructure, 5.45 percent and 4.82 percent for Q3.1.1, “Awareness of the management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q3.1.2, “Awareness of capacity building in conflict management in the Kachia grazing reserve and surrounding farming communities”, respectively. Up to 9.85 and 7.55 percents were undecided for Q3.1.1, “Awareness of the

management structure of the Kachia grazing reserve” and Q3.1.2, “Awareness of capacity building in conflict management in the Kachia grazing reserve and surrounding farming communities”, respectively.

The Kachia Grazing Reserve was conceptualized without taking local farming communities within the area designated as the grazing reserve into consideration. The farming communities within the grazing reserve are therefore facing intense pressure by the pastoralists from different parts of the country and West Africa who have been settled in it to leave the grazing reserve and its surroundings. This has brought about perpetual tension leading to mutual killings and destruction of farmlands.

Conclusion

This study has established that the mainstreaming of conflict sensitivity into the conception of the Kachia Grazing Reserve was not adequate. This was partly because the instruments that guided conceptualization of the reserve are defective in conflict sensitivity themselves. These are the Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserve Law 1965; the Kachia Grazing Reserve Law 1996 (backdated to 1988); the Kachia Grazing Reserve Regulations 1987; and the Land Use Act 1978. It is also partly because of the lack of adherence to some of the important provisions of the instruments, especially consultation with the host communities, getting the consent of the host communities to cede their land, compensation to host communities for land acquired, openness about the size of land acquired, and incorporation of host communities within the designated area as enclaves of the grazing reserve.

References

Conflict Sensitivity.org. “Conflict sensitive approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack”. www.conflictsensitivity.org...conflict-sensitive-approaches-development

Fulani Community in Various Locations of Chikun Local Government Area (2012). “Memoranda Submitted to the Kaduna State Peace and

Also, neither Conflict Analysis (CA) nor Environmental Impact Assessment (AIE) was done to avoid negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on the context.

Recommendations

In order to stem the persistent conflicts between inhabitants of the Kachia Grazing Reserve and their neighbouring indigenous farming communities, and amongst the inhabitants of the grazing reserve, the conceptualization of the grazing reserve should be reviewed, starting with the legal and management instruments for establishing grazing reserves in the State. All of the four instruments in which the creation of the Kachia grazing reserve was rooted are obsolete and impracticable. Specifically, provisions in the four instruments dealing with consent of the original inhabitants of the land on which the grazing reserve is situated, compensation paid and alternative lands allocated to them, their participation in the management and monitoring of the reserve, guidelines for inhabitants of the grazing reserve, as well as benefiting in comparative terms in government facilities and amenities as inhabitants of the reserve as provided in these laws should be revisited.

Considering that the Kachia Grazing Reserve has already been established, mistakes can only be corrected. Therefore, a Review Committee should be set up comprising mainly of agriculturists and conflict resolution experts, as well as representatives of farmers and pastoralists to be saddled with that assignment. Meanwhile, appropriate Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanisms should be engaged by government as well as peacebuilding organizations.

Reconciliation Committee.” Tuesday 3rd day of April, 2012.

Fulbe Development Association (2002): “Request for Adjustment/Merger.” 7th November, 2002.

Government of Northern Nigeria (1965). *Northern Nigeria Grazing Reserves Law, 1965*

Habila Gadoh (2010): “Encroachment on the Land of Old Grazing Reserve by CI Field Wing NASA.” 9th November, 2010

- Habila Z. Gadoh (2012): Report of Illegal Activities Within the Gazetted Area of Kachia Grazing Reserve. 27th November, 2012.
- Ikulu Community (2007): "Ladduga: A Time Bomb Ticking Away." 7th March, 2007
- Ikulu Community of Zangon Kataf L.G.A Kaduna State (2008): "Resolutions of Ikulu Community on the Ladduga Grazing Reserve Dispute. 2nd April, 2008.
- Ikulu Community (2012): "Submission to the Kaduna State Peace and Reconciliation Committee on Government Evident Neglect of the Concerns of the Ikulu Community Over Governance Structures and Compulsorily Acquired Lands". February 2012.
- Ikulu Development Association, Anchuna Branch (1988): "Acquisition of land for Grazing Reserve at Kurmin Biri and Surroundings." 14th March, 1988.
- Ikulu Traditional Council and Ikulu Development Association (2005): "Ladduga: A Call for Your Urgent Intervention." 21st November, 2005
- Ikulu Traditional Council (2010): "Further Reminder on the Need for a Just and Fair Resolution of the Long Lingering Ladduga (Grazng Reserve)". 24th February, 2010
- International Alert et al. (2004): "Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack."
- Kaduna State Government (1987). *The Grazing Reserves Regulations Law, 5th May, 1987.*
- Kaduna State Government (1988). Executive Council Conclusion No. C 11 (88) 6. C (i-x) 1st July.
- Kaduna State Peace and Reconciliation Committee (2012). "Report of the Kaduna State Peace and Reconciliation Committee, 2012."
- Kaduna State Ministry of Internal Security and Home Affairs (2023). *The Security Situation in Kaduna State, 1st January to 31st December 2022.*
- Katul, Gateh, Aduma (entire) and Yadeh/Akupal Communities (2012): "A Memo to the Chairman of the Kaduna State Peace and Reconciliation Committee on the Encroachment of Neighbouring Communities Farmlands by the Pastoralists: A Threat to Peaceful Co-existence."
- Katul, Gateh, Aduma (entire) and Yadeh/Akupal Communities (2012): "Misrepresentation of Facts by the Permanent Secretary, Kaduna State Ministry of Agriculture." 26th September, 2012.
- Ladduga Development Association (2012): "Memorandum on Creation of Ladduga Chiefdom for Rebuilding Peace and Reconciliation in Kaduna State". March 2012.
- Mary Anderson (1999). *Do No Harm: How aid can support peace – or war.* Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, U.S.A. 1999.
- Ministry of Agriculture (2012): "Memo for the Kaduna State Executive Council's Information of the Status of Grazing Reserves in Kaduna State". 15th August 2012.
- Miyetti Allah Cattle Breeders Association of Nigeria (MACBAN), Kaduna State Chapter (2012): "Memo Presented to the Kaduna State Government through the Peace and Reconciliation Committee on Behalf of the Pastoralists in Kaduna State."
- Permanent Secretary, Kaduna State Ministry of Agriculture. As reported in Katul, Gateh, Aduma (entire) and Yadeh/Akupal Communities (2012): "Misrepresentation of facts by the Permanent Secretary, Kaduna State Ministry of Agriculture." 26th September, 2012.