

Second Annual Meeting of CELEP

Kimmage Development Studies Centre, Dublin: 16th to 18th June 2010

Day 1: Wednesday 16th, 2pm - 5pm

Paddy Reilly, Executive Director of Kimmage Development Studies Centre (KDSC) welcomed all participants to the Centre and the meeting, and gave some brief explanations about the work of KDSC and how we see its relevance to the CELEP agenda. Participants then introduced each other and their respective organisations.

Eamonn Brehony, (Adjunct lecturer, KDSC) and general coordinator and facilitator of the meeting then led a discussion to clarify the objectives of meeting and the agenda and schedule to be followed.

Inge Barmentio, Program Officer of Cordaid and Focal point CELEP gave a presentation of "Achievements of CELEP" which included a short history of CELEP and recap of June 2009 meeting at Cordaid and a review of the 20 pledges from the first meeting - participants were invited to clarify from their respective organisations what they had managed to do. Many pledges had been achieved or partly achieved. Discussion included some concern about integration of CELEP work within 'normal' workflows and about the effect of the current funding climate on achieving CELEP pledges.

The presentation also reviewed other CELEP actions taken - EU lobbying, establishing first entry points - framing CELEP objectives in way that resonates with MEP agendas - emphasis on the importance of 'knowing your audience'. Conclusions on some of the positives - an interest in pastoralism issues with EU MP's - potential to link Southern and Northern actions for positive effect. Looking at some challenges - balancing CELEP work with 'normal work' - not enough lobby capacity within CELEP members - not all participants 'active' - difficulty of staff changes, how to make it more sustainable - issues with formality and informality of organisation - not a lot of reaction to position papers circulated - how to broaden 'membership'.

Discussion groups on four questions:

1. How to balance CELEP work with other work - ideas and solutions?
2. How to maintain active participation of all 'Members'?
3. How to link North and South: Issues of presentation and skills (eg lobbying and activism)?
4. Any issues / challenges overlooked?

The meeting concluded with brief summary feedback from each of the groups with further questions and discussion held over until Day 2.

Day 2: Thursday 17th, 9.30am - 5pm

People who were not present yesterday introduced themselves and then everybody present gave a quick round of introductions.

Summary of previous day's meeting. This included the following points:

- **Embedding CELEP within our work:** the need to place CELEP in the action plans of our organisations; the need to be creative in way pastoralism is addressed in institutions; Individual members - what opportunities exist for those to be part of CELEP?
- **Management/Administration of the work:** to have a revolving chair/focal point for the coalition?; to have clear "SMART" targets; to explore the possible establishment of a secretariat - maybe one part time paid position? But then a number of participants need to contribute to this for shared ownership.
- **Separate themes/specialised sub groups:** To divide tasks by location/organisational specialisation; it was also agreed that lobbying issues should be generated by partners in the South; the need for facilitated focal points for some thematic issues, and the need for smaller specialised thematic groups.
- **Participation:** we need to maximise participation; while informal content important, we need to choose concrete practical ideas, but the agenda needs to stay "broad" enough to keep different types of participants with different mandates cooperating together.
- **Linking North and South:** it was agreed we need for more mapping in East African region. This however is responsibility of Southern CSO's; there was a continuing need to track EU progress; to find ways of having more (participants from South) in meetings between North and South but each with their own role (and level of intervention) in the process.
- **Additional points/suggestions:** to use fora such as the World Social Forum; the UN periodic review (UPR); the need for CELEP to have a web presence; clear objectives required for future work; and the need for mechanism to sign in and out (of discussions, and of CELEP itself).

Plenary Discussion:

Discussion after this summary recap focused upon first upon the question: how do we run CELEP? The focal point for the first year was provided by Cordaid, and which required a lot of voluntary input.

Focal Point / Secretariat idea:

The question of a formal Secretariat was explored - was there a need for this? There was a need to keep the good networking aspect we seem to have at present

- might this be lost if a paid person is 'tracking' everyone's activities? The question of whether there is a problem with the current arrangements was examined. The general view was that they worked reasonably well, e.g. The development of the position papers in 3 areas; the consultation within EU on food security policy and pastoralism - members got involved, a draft text was devised, went out to members of CELEP, focal point and members played key role, but the challenge then is: how to sustain this level. There was a need it was argued for a (resourced) focal point so actions can be kept sustainable over time This needs institutional commitment from all the participants in CELEP, and a focal point with a comprehensive terms of reference. Another question articulated was: Is a resourced focal point premature? This is an informal network/coalition: however the work balance issue needs to be addressed. Another point raised was that a lot is happening in (Southern/Northern) governments, organisations, donors - and we need to act now to get in on this (Southern actors in South and European actors at Europe level). It was also suggested that CELEP should consider applying for funding under EU Public Awareness which could provide budget for f.i. the (rotating) focal point.

Other comments included the need(s) to: develop a more practical network - pledges exist - work to them - be open to more structure - follow activities to structure - have people prepared to go that extra mile - maybe a funded focal point should be longer term? There are lessons to be learned from other networks - knowledge sharing, lobbying - what is the reasons behind their successes? Maybe fundraising premature, it may sap the energy that exists within the group. However some smaller organisations may find it difficult to provide the same support as Cordaid have done to date (A big thank you to Cordaid!)

Linkages between North and South:

Not a question of either/or taking lead - needs to be interdependent - EU policies flow through delegations - need to find a way to target from all angles (EU, South...) in order to capture objectives. As a network we need to narrow down to realistic objectives which can be achieved - to break objectives down to specifics, act on them and learn - the whole group work on one issue. If CELEP takes up one main issue - with voices together it will be heard. Concrete case studies can help people envisage why pastoralism matters, specific local issue, not necessarily as CELEP but via regional/local organisations. However, the general agenda/objective (see the CELEP mission statement) needs to be broad enough to keep all actors participants in CELEP on board. So we could work via specialised groups on more specific issues

Other points raised included: a fear is working with ngos who may have access to internet and contacts but don't have people on the ground, rarely have ideas or local opinion about issues on the ground. When they lobby the governments send people in and find there is a gap between lobby issue and reality on ground. It was important to have a clear mapping of who was (credibly) doing what - lots of ngos in East Africa working on important issues - need to expand network, magnify voices, make contact with key ngos. Role southern CSO's to make such a mapping. Also European CELEP participants do have their partners in South.

In Tanzania, it was pointed out, there is a threat to lives of pastoralists - lobbying network needs to achieve at higher level to protect life and rights - locals need to be involved - to avoid a gap between objective and security of pastoralists. The EU system is open - citizens can lobby openly - it is the opposite in South. If CELEP talks to Northern governments then they in turn will talk to governments in the

South. CELEP can perhaps request assistance to meet governments in South in order to create space for dialogue, but we need to identify people in South and help them engage with their government. If we come in as EU lobbyists and don't involve local groups, don't bring people and government together, then a chance for peace is missed and lives may be lost. Lobbying needs to take place both North and South, together, supported.

Need concrete, broad issues - could form specialist sub-group with mandates - stick to issues selected last year - if we become too specialised some ngos will drop out because it is no longer within their remit.

Land issues - if we are going to talk, whose voices are we representing? Land issues vary across countries - pick cases, focus on one - spearhead specific ngos - governance issues frightens South governments - lobbying can result in negatives if we don't engage both North and South in such issues.

Process issues - relationship between EU and government of Tanzania - doesn't allow for dialogue - maybe work on creating space for dialogue so people can find a voice.

Internal lobby process - as soon as EU engages it dictates how you act - needs to be broadened to table the issue - then focus on concrete issues. Lobbying done in Brussels - work then done in South - strength should be the ability to shift from North to South and vice versa - depending upon strategic importance.

An example of last year why CELEP offers a unique opportunity - both North and South involved in land issues - "land grabbing" - local groups come to speak together in one voice - Tanzanian government was not listening but because of collaboration with Northern ngos and pressure in North the matter was addressed by UN - letter sent from UN and African Union to Tanzanian government - this created a force to ensure Tanzanian government met to discuss the issue. There are four main issues and pastoralism is a black spot - now the Tanzanian government needs to discuss because of pressure from the North - space has been created for dialogue - results on ground - for first time Maasai were invited to speak with government on a key issue - resulted in: being listened to, land issue addressed, inclusion in national strategy and party inclusion - proof that collaboration works - without the North they couldn't have influenced UN or Tanzanian government - North and South need to work together. Therefore we need to be both general and specific - to work together at different levels.

Additional points/suggestions: the point about other fora such as the World Social Forum was highlighted as a potential way of broadening connections EU wide and within East Africa - as an opportunity to get people together on a platform. The UN Periodic Review was also highlighted - this reviews human rights at country level every 4 years, wherein government behaviour can be raised for scrutiny and action taken and ensures we are in an International arena to highlight human rights abuses at this level.

Case Study Presentations

Ambrose Dbins Toolit (currently studying at KDSC) presented a case study of the Karamoja Region, Uganda. Keypoints:

- government policy/action aims to prevent mobility

- government closed border areas of Karamoja Region
- Communal land ownership with land tenure system - government trying to change to private ownership targeting communal lands
- WFP have been in the region for 30 years, suits government to continue on this level with no progress
- Kenya to Uganda grazing - security issues - internal conflict issues
- International ngos directed by government approach - if ngo raises human rights issues or stray from government policy approach they risk expulsion
- Irish Aid needs to be challenged on programs which they fund that promote sedentarization and ranching etc.

Marcel Rutten - (African Studies Centre, University of Leiden), presented a case study of Community Based Conservation, South Kenya. Keypoints:

- Access to/control over grazing land
 - Water source depletion
 - Stress coping
 - Levels of wealth
 - Land reforms solidify poor/rich members
 - Sense of community/harmony gone
 - Draft constitution - land perspective - communal land vs. group ranges - freehold land
- Those who didn't sub-divide had different levels of success depending on resources available, conservative groups, disease and fear (which is driving people to own land)

Alais Morindat - (KDSC East Africa) gave an informal (i.e. without slides) presentation of a Tanzanian perspective:

- Policies in Tanzanian differ from those in Kenya and Uganda
- Wisdom around the theory of development needs to be challenged
- Communal life in drylands facing extinction
- Tanzanian national parks land grabs - who benefits?
- Large farmers - agriculture is being embraced - cultivation of sisal and jatropha
- Large tracts of land grabbed for army camps and training bases

- Land sold to private individuals/companies for hunting blocks - shooting everything
- Settlement and urbanisation strategy
- Lloliondo case - Arab investors given land of 12 villages - UAE Empire built on traditional Maasai land - lucrative business for investors - who benefits?
 - CSOs on the ground tried to map out a liberation agenda - requires commitment
- Knowledge gap in policy - need data to back up cases
- Needs to be an educational process - use research - dialogue with CSOs to identify and address root causes - mobilise people - get international people on board
- Requires commitment, resources and numbers

Ikal Angelei - (Friends of Lake Turkana) - (similarly to Alais, without a prepared powerpoint presentation) gave a brief overview of her case study of Ethiopian Hydropower Project:

- Sale of land to foreign investors will result in mass displacement and regional instability
- Research - Hard data required
- Kenyan government has been challenged in courts
- There is a lack of policy coherence - she highlighted how policy can lead to regional instability - conclusion: misplaced policies

[Afternoon Session]

Govert van Oord - (Entree Advies / Cordaid) presented a paper prepared by **Michael Odhiambo** (who was unable to attend the meeting) regarding the development of a regional lobby network and required strategy and skills in Eastern Africa. Keypoints:

- Lobbying in EU - the Overall goal - recognition of economic role of pastoralists and pastoralism in East Africa
- Moving from information to awareness
- Relating to the EU agenda
- Mapping of policies and programs
- Exposure
- Bring in beneficiaries and experts for personal contacts
- Start political discussions - informing becomes commissioning

- Get political endorsement for EU involvement
- Working on Options, why the EU?
- Based on mapping of options, CELEP can make recommendations and proposals towards EU programs
- Work out programs with commission staff
- African network with EU delegations/embassies
- Work towards the opinions of EU decision makers that the EU has a 'special' contribution for the Pastoralist issue
- Internal information - lobbying from within - experts and specialists - need to be willing to act on call
- Pastoralists now viewed as important based on their economic value. Despite the neoliberal view/agenda, value in terms of economics opens the door to regional involvement as most regional interventions are economically driven. Using economic language as an 'in', need to brand pastoralists as actors, not victims. Need to get beyond economics in terms of main products.
- Getting it on the Road - requirements =
 - Get programs approved and financed
 - Assure civil participation in GO
 - Monitor implementation
 - Feed back to decision makers - content
 - And don't forget the thank-you!

Discussion on EU Lobbying presentation:

A variety of points were raised in exploring the challenges this provoked. These include:

- Member states and CELEP - there is a need for lobby work with EU member states - missing link for CELEP co-ordination? We should identify officials who set relevant policies within each Ministry and within EU and South (South being the responsibility of Southern partners).
- It would be important to link with existing work ongoing - lobby offices in Brussels - are they communicating? Are we mapping possibly already done within ngos such as CONCORD? An example: AU lobbying - Oxfam office accredited to AU so that is an existing resource. We need to have a 'Voice' in Brussels - connections are there - need to get well organised.
- Link with North and South and how to organise it: a horn of Africa pastoral network, Read - should be an organisation very soon which links North and

South, pastoralist groups tired of being 'represented' without their input, need for all inclusive network.

- Need for connection with pastoralists need for local organisation for pastoralists of which they have ownership and control - certain names will put pastoralists off - discredited by the pastoralist community. Who can speak as a pastoralist? Who are legitimate spokespersons - need to identify - this will ensure the position will be confirmed across the network. Responsibility of Southern CSO's
- Input of all relevant regional ngos required but organisation is required to ensure representation. Speak in one voice yet in a range of complexities and interests - maybe diversity must be celebrated to create a really strong movement - in order to move forward issues need to be addressed (rather than specifics) - requires revolving leadership, strong training and capacity development, strong research.
- Public image of CELEP
 - Need to address public image long term in terms of lobbying - need to be able to identify specific person as point of communication
 - Need to get everybody together - which Southern actors to connect with, link with within countries regions - need to identify which ngos to start off with.

Discussion on preparation for meeting with EU MEP Gay Mitchell scheduled for Day 3:

Eamonn proposed discussions around what CELEP intends to present to Gay Mitchell and stressed the need for clarity and consensus on the issues to be presented. Eamonn also identified specific points in the charter which CELEP could highlight as areas of shared interest:

- Protection of natural resources
- Exploitation of natural resources
- Stewardship of Natural Resources
- Conflict prevention and Reconciliation

We need to frame issues in specific, focussed recommendations, e.g. water as aspect of protection/exploitation of natural resources - management of water resources - stewardship of water.

The question we discussed was what are expectations of the meeting tomorrow? - Advice of MEP on how best to influence policy. This person has already shown interest in pastoralist issues - so it's an opportunity to build relationship. What support does he require in order for him to make the argument for pastoralism? We considered that we should update him on what has happened (within the work

of CELEP) since the February meeting¹. We need to be able to ask him whether pastoralism features at all in EU discourse. What do we want him to leave with? We need him to champion this issue.

Update on what has happened since we last met = create a link for him - what has happened on commitments made with regard to land rights and financing? Is EU interested in code of conduct for EU investment bank projects? There is one being drafted at present on land tenure and governance, focuses on private lands, does not address pastoralism.

Finally we explored how best to format the presentation to Gay Mitchell. It was agreed that Paddy would give an introduction - reinforce who CELEP is, its mandate, the value of pastoralism, link to EU policy, brief points from position papers, threats to natural resources, etc. We would stress that it is a 'round table' discussion and not an "inquisition" - since he is the only MEP able to attend! We wanted him to be part of a discussion and to ask questions of us as well. We decided we would present 2 case studies briefly as examples of what happens in practise - addressing land, water, conflict.

Some key issues we wanted to communicate included the point that policy makers need to understand that often their well intentioned policies are detrimental to so many people. We see it as an opportunity to present case studies as more than localised issues - they are also regional issues, and therein, potential conflictual and instability issues.

The session ended with details of a venue chosen for meal and traditional music in Dublin for those able to attend.

Day 3: Friday 18th, 9.30am - 5pm

Eamonn facilitated a discussion for the initial session before the visit of the MEP, focussing upon "Who, What, When" questions in terms of our agenda going forward.

It was confirmed and supported that Cordaid will continue to offer the focal point service to CELEP for another year (so not hiring an extra part time person for this) . It was agreed we should redefine the so-called 'core group' as a **Reference Group**.

Stuart Coupe of Practical Action stated they were willing to host the next meeting of CELEP in the UK, with the collaboration of IIED. Stuart will check with his senior management if they also agree and will let the focal point know this by September 2010. If PA/IIED are not able to do it, VSF-Belgium can organise it in Belgium, Brussels.

1 He was present at a book launch *Mobile and Modern*, (produced by Ced Hesse, IIED) organised by CELEP at this time

Edward Flynn (Vivat International) suggested that it would be useful to have UN involvement, and is willing to follow up on this, talk to people, open doors and guide to the right people.

Other elements of the discussion would be returned to after the meeting with the MEP.

Meeting with Gay Mitchell MEP (Coordinator of DEVE committee of European Parliamentarians):

Paddy introduced Gay Mitchell and gave him a brief overview of the main work of CELEP since it was established one year ago, and stressed some key points as guided by the meetings yesterday, and contained in 3 concept papers CELEP has produced. These included the need to recognise the role and value of pastoralism - highlighting the concept of total economic value (TEV) of pastoralism as a livelihood system, and the contribution made by pastoralists to the wider economy and society. We wanted to get away from the perceptions of pastoralists solely as 'victims'. Secondly the focus on the need to "facilitate" livestock mobility - and the trans-border implications and challenges of this within a regional context. Thirdly, the access to management of natural resources, and the relevance of this to policies which would prevent conflict between agricultural and pastoral people. He emphasised we wanted to present an accurate, realistic and positive account of pastoralism which reveals their role in the stewardship of the environment, and yet, also CELEP's role in identifying the negatives which would include the threats to livelihoods and natural resources and overall a grave risk of conflict and regional instability.

Eamonn then asked all present to introduce themselves to Gay Mitchell before asking Marcel and Ambrose to represent summarised versions of their case examples from yesterday. This was followed by a lively session of questions and discussions.

In his initial response Gay Mitchell spoke about how his own perspectives and beliefs have been influenced and informed by the Irish cultural and historical experience. He gave an overview explanation of the legal context of the European Parliament (EP) and his (and other MEPs) role within this. Not least he stressed how time consuming and long-duration some of the negotiations can be, an agreement he was party to on development cooperation took 2.5 years. Nevertheless he was an optimist, and cited the falling of the Berlin Wall as one of the miracles we all thought would never happen. He clearly fervently believes that the EU and the EP as a key institution within, play an important role in terms of strengthening peace and stability in Europe and moreover this can be extended in terms of its influence globally. He referred to the ACP-EU linkages which he was familiar with. In terms of advising CELEP, he stressed the importance of networking - this could not be underestimated, as this was something MEPs were familiar with and themselves did all the time. He himself was consulted by several other government agencies, and made a pointed reference to the fact that he was surprised that no one from Irish Aid had ever been in touch with him during his role of rapporteurship within the development committee! He clarified that as an elected MEP from the Fine Gael party in Ireland, he was a member of the EPP (European Peoples' Party - Christian Democrats) group. He candidly 'put his cards on the table' so to speak, by declaring he was pro-life, pro-enterprise, favouring social justice and land ownership.

Contributions from the group in terms of questions/comments:

1. pastoralists don't have a voice regarding things that are happening to them; many EU funded bodies, e.g. ECHO even ignore the term pastoralism, or don't allow it in their documentation.
2. Pastoralism is a specialised production system within the drylands; some modernisation approaches - water drilling etc are counter-productive and harmful to the environment, and the local communities living there.
3. There is an absence of policy, plus erroneous assumptions for example, around land use, e.g. Flower farming (as in Marcel's case study) displacing other systems of livelihood.
4. There is a need for gradual, carefully moderated change (in terms of any options pastoralists may wish to take) not the abrupt, rapid changes being implemented e.g. In Karamoja.
5. A land tenure system (which Gay Mitchell alluded to in his Irish historical example) needs to be carefully clarified in its own contexts. It is different for people living in cross-proximity to one another in rural or semi-urban settings.
6. One question was with regard to how the development commission of EU monitors spending of certain funding programmes e.g. ECHO.
7. A land tenure system (as shown in the example of Marcel's presentation) can be very problematic regarding mobility. Good examples however could be found e.g. In West Africa, of communal systems.

Gay Mitchell highlighted that the 2 development commissioners we had in EU at present were very good and will respond if CELEP contact them. The agenda of the EP was very open, very democratic, very active re: legislating - moreso than some national parliaments! The EP reviews Country Strategy Papers and has a regional strategy. It would be important for example, to be aware of when they do a mid-term review of CSPs. The EP can influence the agenda, e.g. hold money 'in reserve' - i.e. locked away from any bodies seen as misusing funds. Pointedly, he remarked that we needed a 'champion' - someone who would represent our case. He also mentioned the importance of identifying the various umbrella groups in the EP and secretariats, these well worth networking with, finding out what are their positions on these issues.

He questioned whether CELEP are defending things simply because of how we see things or how they were (clinging to the past)? Moreover, he asked are there other ngos that don't share our opinion? One of our members responded that this was not the case. We are supporting pastoralism/ists because it makes sense to support their case, to help them raise their voice, because they had proven a capability to adapt to the uncertainty of climatic variability, demonstrating an ability to abide constructively with the ecosystem, displaying tremendous diversity, great dynamism and coping strategies. Gay concluded by saying that although he was not yet fully 'convinced' on this issue, if we can convince him, he would be our champion.

We concluded with a coffee break and a group photograph with Gay Mitchell.

The remainder of the meeting, morning and post-lunch sessions, saw us deliberating upon the next steps and what were the realistic pledges and commitments undertaken for the the year ahead. This involved discussing issues of structure (the adoption of Cordaid's willingness to continue offering the focal point to CELEP), networking, and a shared/joint "action plan"(see underneath) for the next 12 months.

The various activities and commitments made were as follows:

- Cordaid will continue offering the focal point service to CELEP for one year (Cordaid, Inge and Alba).
- The next annual CELEP meeting - will be coordinated by Practical Action and IIED (hosted by PA to be held in the UK, Rugby, if the management of PA agrees). If PA management not agrees, VSF Belgium will organise it in Brussels - [decision to be made by PA and date to be determined by **September 2010**]
- European Financial Institutions & their impact on pastoralism - lead: Ikal (Friends of Lake Turkana) & Marcel (ASC) [**beginning August 2010**]
- Get MEPs to bring pastoralism to bear in mid-term reviewing of CSPs - lead: Govert (Entree Advies), Stuart (Practical Action), & Ced Hesse (IIED) - [**ongoing**]
- Further scoping of (EU) opportunities in a pro-active way:-lead: focal point / Cordaid (Inge and Alba) + Entree, together with support of all CELEP participants [**ongoing**]
- Support “re-active” lobby agendas, such as last year for Northern Tanzania (e.g. Human rights violations, conflict issues etc) [**ongoing and all participants who see “possibilities/suitable cases/situations”**]
- Continuation of pledges made last year meeting on forming of specific European country networking groups for The Netherlands, UK, Ireland and Denmark - to seek to have a joint country strategy on policy influencing on pastoralism by June 2011 (e.g. respectively: For NL: Cordaid/Both Ends/IKV-Pax Christi, ASC, ETC, Agri-Profocus. For UK: - IIED/Practical Action - For Ireland: KDSC/Oxfam), For Denmark: IWGIA (Inge to check with them) [**ongoing**]
- Further develop advocacy and lobbying plans at European level linked with relevant research (Research coming a.o. from CELEP knowledge institutes participants)- lead: focal point (Cordaid, Inge and Alba , together with participants) [**ongoing**]
- Continue the pledge made during the last year CELEP meeting on: developing strategy on policy influencing by southern actors on the Karamoja Cluster - lead: Practical Action East Africa, Cordaid, IKV/Pax Christi, REGLAP, Reconcile, Friends of Lake Turkana, VSF-Belgium) [**ongoing**]
- Continue with the pledge made last year: Enhancing lobby capacity in the south (Pastoralists MP’s Tanzania and Kenya, meeting) Cordaid, Reconcile, Entree (October 2010)
- Develop CELEP Funding Proposal (for Secretariat) preparation for the EU Public Awareness call- lead: Stuart (Practical Action)with Cordaid. Also Stuart agreed to be a focal-point for Fund Raising. [**Dec 2010- July 2011**]
- Develop CELEP webpage - lead: Paddy (KDSC) with help from Jean Blaylock (ACORD) [**September 2010**]
- Voluntary Code Issues - (FAO) - (lead: Karen, Both Ends with ACORD) [**ongoing**]
- Mapping of “relevant” East Africa CSOs/networks - (lead: Marco (REGLAP) / Ikal, (Friends of Turkana) [**September 2010**]
- Production of “glossy” CELEP position paper: “Pastoralism, the Future: the value of pastoralism” (lead: Jean (ACORD) + Ced (IIED) [**September 2010**]
- Achieve Institutional 'Buy-In' of all participants -Focal point will monitor this (Cordaid, Inge + Alba) [**ongoing**]
- Write comprehensive TOR for focal point: Cordaid (Inge)+ IIED (Ced)

- Participants in the Core/reference group: IIED (Ced), IWGIA (Marianne, to be confirmed/checked by Focal point), Kimmage (Paddy), Reglap (Shadrack, to be confirmed by focal point), VSF-Belgium (Brian), IKV/Pax Christi (Sara, to be confirmed by focal point)

-----[End of Sessions]-----

List of those who attended the Second CELEP Meeting, June 16-18, 2010

CELEP 2010 meeting, Kimmage Dublin Studies Centre, Dublin

<i>Name (surname /firstname)</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>E-mail</i>
Angelei, Ikal	Friends of Lake Turkana	ikalangelei@gmail.com
Barmentio, Inge	Cordaid NL	Inge.Barmentlo@cordaid.nl
Blaylock, Jean	ACORD	jean.blaylock@acordinternational.org
Brehony, Eamonn	KDSC	ebrehony@gmail.com
Campbell, Tom	KDSC	tom.campbell@kimmagedsc.ie
Coupe, Stuart	Practical Action	Stuart.Coupe@practicalaction.org.uk
Dbins Toolit, Ambrose	KDSC	atoolit@yahoo.com
Espinoza Rocca, Alba	Cordaid NL	Alba.Espinoza.Rocca@cordaid.nl
Flynn, Edward	Vivat International	edward2@eircom.net
Getahun, Tezera	Pastoralists Forum Ethiop.	tezerag@yahoo.co.uk
Harty, Malachy	Concern Worldwide	malachy.harty@concern.net
Hesse, Ced	IIED	ced.hesse@iied.org
Lesukat, Marko	RREAD	lmarko@css.care.org
Morindat, Alais	KDSC East Africa	alais.morindat@kimmagedsc.org
Nugent, Brian	VSFBelgium	bnugent@vsfb.or.ke
O'Donnell, Kate	Oxfam Irl	kate.odonnell@oxfamireland.org
Parsons, Michael	Nomadic Peoples	mparsons101@gmail.com
Penollar, Fiona	Irish Aid	fiona.penollar@dfa.ie
Reilly, Paddy	KDSC	paddy.reilly@kimmagedsc.ie
Rooney, Niamh	KDSC	niamhi73@yahoo.ie
Rutten, Marcel	African Studies Centre	marcel.rutten@telfort.nl
Taratara, Gervase	Spiritans	gtaratara@hotmail.com
Thompson, Alfred	KDSC	althompson@ireland.com
van Oord, Govert	Entree Advies / Cordaid	govertvo@entreeadvies.nl
Witsenburg, Karen	Both Ends	kw@bothends.org