

Pastoralism in the New Borderlands: Cross-border Migrations, Conflict and Peace-building

Zoe Cormack and Helen Young
2012

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Political and legal issues</i>	3
Legal Demarcation.....	3
Militarisation of the Border	3
Oil	4
Pastoralist Citizenship.....	4
<i>Implications for Livelihoods and for Pastoralists in Particular</i>	5
<i>Different border trajectories and the implications for pastoralists since July 2011</i>	6
Abyei and Northern BeG/South Darfur	7
Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile.....	10
Recent Agreements and Implementation	10
<i>Recent initiatives to promote dialogue and understanding of the issues</i>	10
<i>Conclusions</i>	12
<i>References</i>	13

Introduction

Cross-border livelihoods are transnational, in that they extend and operate across national boundaries, in order to be sustainable. Pastoralists frequently cross borders in order to access seasonal pastures and water, to move away from climatic and soil conditions or pests that are to the detriment of their livestock, or alternatively crossing borders enables access to trade routes, markets and opportunities for labour migration, seasonal labour and trading opportunities, (or even to participate in key social and cultural events).

The north-south border between the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan has only recently become an international border, and unlike some of the other borders of Sudan, which are uninhabited, this new border cuts through multiple socially, economically and environmentally active regions. It is the longest international border in Africa (2,100km), and the adjacent area is home to more than 25% (12 million) of the combined total population of Sudan and South Sudan. For the Republic of Sudan it is an economically important area including an environmentally rich savannah belt, with many mechanized farms and a wealth of lucrative natural resources, including oil and gum arabic. The border passes through grazing lands containing important migration routes, especially for northern pastoralist groups, enabling them to access their favoured dry season pastures in the south. Many different pastoral groups in particular are affected as

seen in Table 1 and the map in Annex 1, which provides a map of major livestock migration routes along the north south border.

This is in every sense a pastoralist border. As well as pastoralists crossing an international border, most of the South Sudan border area is the home of Dinka and Nuer pastoralists.

Table 1 Pastoralist groups that are affected by the new border (Tufts/FIC, SOS Sahel, UNEP and IIED 2011; Anon 2010)

Pastoralist Group	Location
Misseriya Humr	South Kordofan/Abyei/Unity State
Baggara Rizaygat	South Darfur/Northern Bahr el-Ghazal
Al Ahamda	White Nile/Upper Nile/South Kordofan (Western bank of Nile)
Al Silaim	White Nile/Upper Nile (Western bank of Nile)
Awlad Hiemid	White Nile/Upper Nile (Western bank of Nile)
Sabaha	White Nile/Upper Nile (Eastern bank of Nile)
Nuzi	White Nile/Upper Nile (Eastern bank of Nile)
Dar Mirahib	White Nile/Upper Nile (Eastern bank of Nile)
Subha	Sennar/Upper Nile
Kinana	Sennar/Upper Nile
Mbororo Felata	Unity State; Blue Nile/Upper Nile (Maban)
Wajdab	Blue Nile/Upper Nile (Maban)
Nabmo	Blue Nile/Upper Nile (Maban)
Kibishuab	Blue Nile/Upper Nile (Maban)
Hallieb	Blue Nile/Upper Nile (Maban)

There are two sets of issues of immediate concern for pastoralists; first the high profile and hugely important political and legal issues, including for example, border demarcation, citizenship and national agreements on oil, and second, the implications of these issues for cross-border livelihoods and pastoralism more broadly. While a review of the literature provides a good background and preliminary understanding on the former, it falls well short of answering the many questions on the impact and implications for livelihoods of those who live or depend on access to land in the border regions. It is this latter area in which research is urgently needed to inform and influence the former debates. However, while we might want at one level to treat political issues and livelihood issues as analytically different, it is increasingly clear that cross-border livelihoods and high

level border politics are inseparable. This is particularly clear in the case of Abyei, the most politicized part of the border, as the resolution to the current political stalemate and the future of Missirya grazing rights is bound up together (Craze 2011:58)

In the six months following South Sudan's Independence the pressing issues facing pastoralist groups on the border began to solidify. This is a very long border and it has become clear there are very different political and social trajectories at different parts of it and not one discreet set of challenges for pastoralists. In the light of these developments, this paper outlines (a) the different (but interrelated) political and livelihood issues facing pastoralists around the border and (b) the patterns emerging at different parts of the border.

Political and legal issues

Legal Demarcation

For the most part, it has been agreed that the international border will revert to the border between northern and southern provinces at the time of Independence in 1956. However, some areas remain contested and pastoralists are caught up in these disputes. One factor causing the stalling of the border demarcation is that the 1956 border has taken on a mythic status. The main disputed areas are:

- Renk/Jabalain (Upper Nile/White Nile).
- Megenis (Upper Nile/South Kordofan)
- Kaka Town (Upper Nile/South Kordofan)
- The Bahr el-Arab/Kiir River (Northern Bahr el-Ghazal/South Darfur)
- Kafia Kingi (Western Bahr el-Ghazal/South Darfur)
- Abyei

For more details of these disputes see ICG (2010) and Johnson (2010).

In March 2012, an initial agreement to demarcate the border (and on nationality) was signed in Addis Ababa by North and South Governments (Sudan Tribune 14.03.12).

Militarisation of the Border

There are many reports and satellite images showing troop build ups along the border, particularly in Abyei. A significant army presence is certain to cause problems for pastoralists who want to pass with their livestock. Army presence is already a problem for pastoralists in South Kordofan; Missirya Zuruq have had their migration routes in SPLA occupied areas blocked by the SPLA who have allegedly blocked grazing and exorted taxes with impunity (HSBA 2010, 2). Prior to this increase in hostilities, analysts warned that there would be a return to larger scale conflict if the interests of local actors were not perceived as being met, partly as a result of the increasing militarized culture and proliferation of arms (Anon 2010).

Oil

Pastoralists have already complained that they have lost grazing land to oil fields and oil is critical to political relations between Sudan and South Sudan. South Sudan succeeded without a comprehensive plan for managing the oil industry between Northern and Southern governments. Oil production continued amid intense political manoeuvring up to 20 January of 2012 when South Sudan announced, after accusing Khartoum of stealing oil, they were indefinitely shutting down production (Sudan Tribune 20.01.12). At present all major pipelines run through the north-south border areas, if oil production begins again in its previous form, the industry (and industry revenues for both of the governments) depends on the stability of these areas (ECOS 2010, 12). However, the likelihood of this is uncertain. Juba has reportedly reached an agreement with Kenya to build a pipeline and export through the port of Mombasa. However, there is as yet no timeline on when this will start (BBC 25.01.12). Given the deteriorating security situation in South Sudan, if and when oil production starts again it is possible that oil companies will bring in their own private security (if the government is unable to ensure security). The experience of this elsewhere in Africa, for example in the Niger Delta, has been very bad for local communities. As well as oil, parts of the border region are rich in copper and potentially uranium (Western Bahr el Ghazal/South Darfur) and gold (Mabaan/Kurmuk) (Anon 2010).

Pastoralist Citizenship

Mobile pastoralism presents challenges for definitions of citizenship in most legal systems, as these tend to favour sedentary groups who can claim a fixed, stable point of origin. The discourse of autochthony and claims to land are becoming increasingly politicized across the African continent. This trend is significantly undermining the status of pastoralists and their claims to nationality as they are frequently perceived as 'wanderers', latecomers or outsiders (Hickey 2007, 84). Many of whom effectively live outside the legal framework for citizenship and attendant rights and responsibilities in their countries of residence (Manby 2011, 26).

Manby (2011) argued the likeliest and simplest option is for pastoralists who cross the border to retain citizenship in the Republic of Sudan even though they spend a considerable amount of the year in the Republic of South Sudan. This is because they would either retain the status quo (with the option to change their nationality at a future point should that be an option according to GOSS citizenship laws), or because 'habitual residence' (one of the criteria for citizenship) would most probably be tied to their 'dar' or the area they spend the rainy season/have permanent residences, which would be north of the new border (Manby 2011, 29).

Dual citizenship would solve a lot of these problems for pastoralists, although recently, the possibility of dual citizenship was ruled out by the NCP (Anon. 2011). The opportunities for citizenship in South Sudan are more ambiguous. Pastoralists might theoretically obtain naturalized citizenship in South Sudan. The draft constitution of South

Sudan article 45 (6) stipulates that a non-South Sudanese can obtain naturalized citizenship (ROSS 2011, 14), although article 45 (1) stipulates only those born to a South Sudanese mother or father “shall have an *inalienable* right to enjoy South Sudanese citizenship and nationality”(ROSS 2011, 14). The draft constitution does not go into detail about who qualifies as ‘South Sudanese’. Many South Sudanese are extremely reluctant to see groups such as the Misseriya be counted as ‘South Sudanese’ because of their association with war and slave raids into the South.

Each of the pastoralists groups in Table 1 faces a slightly different set of post-referendum challenges, but almost all suffer from the same negative perceptions being seen as wanderers, constant migrants with no ‘real’ home; suspicion from neighbouring groups and politicians; marginalization and involvement in paramilitary activities. Often there is mystery, fear and suspicion surrounding the pastoralist groups in both Sudan and South Sudan (e.g. the Mbororo are believed to be witches, able to turn people into cows etc). However, in many parts of Africa, pastoralists regularly cross borders and there is already legislation that supports this (Manby 2011, 29). There are already a considerable number of international borders that are regularly crossed by pastoralists so this should not be seen as an insurmountable problem. Bilateral legislation in West Africa through ECOWAS is considerably more forward thinking, when it comes to cross border pastoralist movements than in East and Southern Africa (COMESA), although there are indications that COMESA policy will be brought into line with ECOWAS (COMESA 2010). However, at present the early indications from Juba suggest that proposals of an entirely soft border allowing free movement for pastoralists are unrealistic. In Abyei at least, SPLM officials have said that there will be military checkpoints and a highly policed border (Craze 2011:59). Before South Sudan’s independence officials from both governments affirmed that cross-border pastoral migrations should continue (ICG, 2013) and that local agreements were reached by leadership participating in border conferences (Concordis, 2010).

Implications for Livelihoods and for Pastoralists in Particular

While local livelihood issues may seem peripheral to the outstanding political questions and enormous challenges of transition following secession, they are in fact central to the future peace and stability of the region, and to national economic prosperity, environmental sustainability and social integration. The most interesting academic work on borders in Africa sees them not as empty peripheries, but as productive social and economic spaces (Catley et al, 2012; Homewood, 2008).

There remain many unanswered (and some unasked) questions on the effects and implications of these huge political events on the communities living in the border areas for all or part of the year, in particular their implications for:

- ***Migration and transhumance***, access to water and pasture for livestock, demarcation of livestock routes, social and cultural cohesion including cross-border local agreements, herding arrangements and local security, impact of

increased pressure on grazing resources in Sudan as a result of reduced access to pastures in the South etc.

- **Markets, customs and livestock trade** in an emerging border economy (see Aklilu 2001, 56). What will the emerging border economy look like, and who will control it? For example, the cross-border cattle trade into Uganda from Eastern Equatoria is monopolised by the (mainly Dinka) SPLA and this is leading to serious tensions with non-Dinka residents (Walraet 2008).
- **Oil** and private security arrangements, implications for land use, and specifically for transhumance. According to Pantuliano et al., (2009), pastoralists feel cattle have suffered as a result of oil extraction and they have not been properly compensated. In particular, as a result of losing grazing lands in the concessions to oil companies, and in addition to the changes in drainage systems, flow of water and distribution of resources caused by earthworks associated with oil industry
- **Access to basic services** and local governance (veterinary services, public health, education). A 2005 UNDP assessment of pastoralism in southern Kordofan initiated because of the lack of information and analysis on pastoral production concluded that lack of vet services and lack of water or problems with access to water were major problems (UNDP 2006). A sister case-study of various settled pastoralists living in the New Halfa scheme area documents the complete lack of a wide range of services (UNDP 2006).
- **Small-arms proliferation and militarization**, linked with ongoing conflict, and also linked with safeguarding larger concentrations of herds. There are reports that Missiryia pastoralists migrating through Abyei during the 2012 dry season are more heavily armed and may be co-ordinating with SAF (Small Arms Survey 2012).
- **Adaptation, and diversification of livelihoods** – how will pastoralists respond and adapt to the significantly altered political landscape? How will this play out in terms of inter-relations between livelihood groups including pastoralists? Pantuliano et al (2009) provide one of the most comprehensive reviews of this question and describes the potential negative impact of the CPA on the livelihoods of Misseryia youth, for example through the dismantling of the PDF, and loss of the lucrative war economy (Pantuliano et al. 2009).
- **Mal-adaptations** by pastoralists and implications for other livelihoods, and spiralling localized conflict, as revealed in our own study of pastoralists in the Darfur region (Young et al. 2009).

In conclusion, most of these livelihood issues in the borderlands have not been well studied. While research should focus on the impact on local level livelihoods, inevitably these are also matters of national importance, from the point of view of national peace and security and also the national economy (GDP and livestock exports).

Different border trajectories and the implications for pastoralists since July 2011

A crude and preliminary categorization of different parts of the border would look like this:

Abyei – Political bargaining, closed border, increasing risk of maladaptive livelihood strategies. Very high profile but may not actually be that representative of what is happening for pastoralists on the rest of the border.

Northern Bahr el Ghazal/South Darfur – a major migratory route for Rizeigat, a potential success story, improved dialogue and relations between Malwal and Rizeigat pastoralists.

South Kordofan/Blue Nile – Not directly related to the border, but since June 2011 secession related war between the SPLM-N and Sudan Armed Forces has affected hundreds of thousands of people. Members of different pastoralist groups are turning to mal-adaptive livelihood strategies, switching sides and supporting different armed groups as militia in an increasingly intransigent conflict.

Kafia-Kingi/Raja County - Military build-up and aerial bombardments with impacts for pastoralists.

In 2013, the entire border region has been dubbed “the new South” – part of a spreading region of insecurity caused by unresolved political and legal issues (ICG, 2013). Since secession this escalating conflict has brought the two countries to the brink of all-out war.

Abyei and Northern BeG/South Darfur

The western and eastern ends of the River Kiir (Bahr el Arab) are both crossed by pastoralists migrating from the north to dry season grazing in South Sudan. A comparison of two different parts of the river shows the different experiences of these pastoralist groups since South Sudan’s Independence. Without denying that there are significant and important challenges in each place, the comparison shows that, while most international attention is on Abyei, it should not be taken as representative of the challenges for pastoralists on the whole border. In other areas there are processes of working out some border issues, some progress seems to be being made and useful lessons could be learnt.

Abyei

Johnson (2010) provides a helpful review of events and Abyei’s chequered administrative history from the eighteenth century to the current crisis. Decisions made under the Anglo-Egyptian condominium to include the “nine Ngok Dinka Chiefdoms” in Kordofan Province rather than Bahr el-Ghazal with the other Dinka, have taken on huge significance. 1905 is now seen as the date when part of the ‘south’ was transferred to the ‘north’. This period marked good relations between Ngok and Humr. The Humr were therefore allowed to expand grazing into Ngok areas, but during the period of the Anyanya war (1955-1972) these good relations were broken down by conflict. Skirmishes between Anyanya troops and Humr lead to the destruction of many of the northernmost Ngok villages. The 1972 Addis Ababa Agreement included a provision for areas “culturally and

geographically” similar to the south to have a referendum, which entitled the Ngok Dinka to vote on joining the newly formed Southern region.

During the interwar period (1972-1983), investments in development for the Ngok Dinka (based on the assumption that underdevelopment was the root cause of the Anyanya war) was a period of marginalisation of the Misseriya Humr. Their local governance was further undermined by the abolition of the Native Administration by the government in Khartoum. Seasonal movements and access to pastures were restricted, mechanised agriculture expanded around Babanusa and Laghawa, while at the same time the area south of Bahr el-Arab/Kiir came under Southern regional authority. The proposed referendum never took place and the Ngok settlements were attacked. Raids and counter raids took place between the Ngok and Misseryia.

Abyei and the Misseriya were at the centre of the government’s militia strategy during the second civil war (1983-2005), whereby the Misseryia were armed and formed into Murahalin and Popular Defence Force units characteristic of the North’s counter insurgency strategy against the SPLA and civilian population. This led to demographic shifts, with many Ngok displaced and more Misseryia forced further South and settled in former Ngok Dinka territory. According to Johnson (2010 p 36) “the war in Abyei Area was the result of the direct failure of the Addis Ababa agreement that ended the first civil war and the subsequent marginalization of the pastoralist population through changes in the political economy of the nation”.

During the CPA Negotiations (2002-2005) Abyei was excluded from the Machakos Protocol (which was essentially a ceasefire agreement), even though Abyei was part of the war. The Abyei oilfields were also excluded from the Wealth Sharing Protocol (2004), because Abyei was part of a separate set of negotiations and protocol for the Three Areas. The Abyei Protocol (2004) established an Abyei administrative body and guaranteed a referendum on becoming part of the South. However, there was still no agreement on the territorial boundary of Abyei.

The Abyei Boundary Commission (ABC) was established by provisions in the Abyei Protocol to determine how far north the Abyei area would extend. There was a lack of agreement within the ABC, and thus international experts recommended taking the 1905 area of “nine Ngok Dinka Chiefdoms” as a baseline. This recommendation of the ABC was rejected by the NCP and the Misseryia. Subsequently in July 2009, the Permanent Court on Arbitration (in the Hague) (PCA) decided on a much narrower definition of Abyei’s borders (including only permanent Ngok Dinka settlements but excluding the oilfields). The PCA made an important ruling, that in accordance with general principles of law, this decision on border demarcation did not “extinguish traditional rights to use of land” (PCA, 2009. p260). This brings us to the present impasse, with Abyei being claimed by both the North and South and the outbreak once again of brutal conflict and human rights abuses, in which local livelihood groups are inevitably caught up.

Since the CPA, Misseriya migrations have become increasingly difficult. Despite the assurances of the Abyei Protocol in the CPA that nomadic peoples retain their traditional rights to graze and move their animals in the Abyei area, the Misseriya report that since

2005 they have experienced systematic blockages and increased taxation (Craze, forthcoming). According to Pantuliano et al, (2009) from 2005-10, the Missiriya found their grazing routes into South Sudan increasingly fraught, and many smaller herders could not afford to travel. The 2010-2011 November to April migrations were the first in living memory to not reach the river Kiir (Craze 2011:6) as a result of increasing hostilities.

The violence in Abyei in 2011 was the worst since the end of the civil war, with more than 100,000 residents in Abyei fleeing across the border into South Sudan, and subsequently the border was closed to all traffic, both commercial and pastoral (OCHA, 2011). During the subsequent 2011-12 grazing season, the Missiriya southwards migrations to the Bahr el Arab (River Kiir) apparently passed without problem (Craze, 2013). Meanwhile some Ngok Dinka tentatively began to return to their villages around Abyei. The UNISFA force are attempting to monitor the Missiriya to discourage them from entering Abyei town (Small Arms Survey 2012).

Abyei is a special case. The sensitivities are not just about oil, as there isn't that much oil left in Abyei. It has become the most important political bargaining tool between northern and southern governments, which both sides are using to manoeuvre and gain ground on other issues. The implications for pastoralists in Abyei are huge. As a recent Small Arms Survey report points out, seemingly local issues about grazing rights, local justice and compensation claims cannot be separated from the broader political processes. National political processes have disrupted local courts to the extent that they cannot operate and compensation payments to last season's deaths cannot be made. Both the SPLM and the NCP have used flare ups of local grievances to mask their own political interests in the area. (Craze 2011:21,58). The situation in Abyei is now a political deadlock, and the future of pastoralists grazing and livelihood inseparable.

Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Southern Darfur

Contrary to the situation in Abyei, there has been more communication between the Malwal and Rizeigat. At a peace conference in late 2011, leaders from each group agreed to resolve disputes using local courts, maintain clear communication, freedom of movement and even discussed joint livestock markets (Radio Tamazuj 23.01.12). Despite this, there are serious tensions along this part of the border, and there is a SAF and SPLA presence along respective sides.

The border between the two communities, like Abyei, is historically problematic. The Bahr el Arab (River Kiir) is the focal point of the boundary dispute and itself forms part of the boundary between Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Southern Darfur. The disagreement is over whether the boundary between Dar Rizeigat and the Malwal Dinka lies at the river (as the Dinka claim it does) or 22 miles south of the river (as the Rizeigat claim) (ICG 2011:8). Again, this is a historic disagreement and disputes over access to the area go back generations. Historically, annual tribal conferences were arranged to settle disputes and chaired by tribal chiefs from both sides. In the post secession context the governments of both countries entrusted the border administration to semi-military officials instead of the traditional native administration systems.

Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile

There is fighting between SPLM-N and SAF along the border and evidence that PDF fighters are working alongside SAF in this conflict. PDF in this area are historically recruited from pastoralists groups, suggesting that the conflict may be providing maladaptive livelihood opportunities for some (HSBA 2011).

One major consequence of the conflict in Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile is the movement of refugees across the border into South Sudan.

Recent Agreements and Implementation

An agreement signed on 27th September 2012 in Addis Ababa committed Sudan and South Sudan to cooperate on border security and demarcation, economic and trade deals and citizenship rights. This Agreement supported the rights of pastoralists to access seasonal pastures, but actual terms of commitments by both sides are vague and committees intended to oversee them have not yet been formed (Craze, forthcoming, p24).

After six months of stalling a Matrix Agreement (signed on 8th March 2013) pushed forward implementation of the September arrangement. It also stipulated an immediate withdrawal of forces from the border and established a demilitarized zone between the two countries. This appears to be happening, but, worryingly, South Sudan has accused Sudan of fresh attacks on civilians near the border (Sudan Tribune, 2013). Abyei remains a serious impediment to implementation.

Recent initiatives to promote dialogue and understanding of the issues

The build-up to the final stages of the CPA and secession generated increasing concerns about the political issues and related challenges outlined above. Southern officials have frequently stated that cross-border pastoral migrations from north to south, should continue (ICG 2010). Although recent studies indicate the situation along the border in different states is highly variable (Milner, 2012; Craze, forthcoming).

One recent paper describes a series of grassroots tribal peace conferences held during 2011 between the Malual Dinka on one side and Misseriya and Rizaighat on the other, with a joint conference in Aweil in February, 2012. This culminated in the signing of a joint protocol (Abdalla, 2013). The most important recommendations included:

- *Immediate restart of border trade*
- *Delineation of migration routes during seasonal entry and exit with strict observance to farming plots, water points and agricultural lands*
- *Disarming of all pastoralists while the two communities intermingle during the dry Season (Ibid p. 5)*

No doubt, there are many other local initiatives between tribes or even just between local groups of herders and residents, although documented information on these is seriously lacking.

The international community has been supporting a raft of initiatives to promote dialogue on these issues, some of which are described in Box 1. While useful, these talks have their limitations, particularly given the difficulties ensuring the right people are present, that talks are well informed and based on the current realities and evidence, and that solutions are pragmatic and not simply an aspirational wish list.

Box 1 Examples of recent initiatives to promote understanding and dialogue on North-South cooperation and peaceful co-existence

Cross-Border Forum: The Tamazuj (intermingling) forum, bring together leaders of each of Sudan’s North-South border states as well as Abyei, to work toward greater economic, social, security and development integration. The forum is supported by the National Council for Strategic Planning, UNMIS –Civil Affairs, the US government Assessment Evaluation Commission (AEC)(ICG 2010).

Study on Conflict Drivers, (Anon, 2010): In 2010, Concordis International undertook a study on drivers of conflict in the North-South border areas and related initiatives. This was combined with seven workshops each at State level along the North-South border, and one subsequent national workshop in Khartoum (Anon 2010). Workshop participants were asked to consider the issues and come up with proposals in relation to security and justice; movement, rights and citizenship; trade and economics and infrastructure. The non-participation of senior Misseryia was problematic and many subsequent resolutions were aspirational, although there were firm commitments to further meetings (2010, pers comm).

Pastoralism and Citizenship project and national symposium (UNHCR, 2010): UNHCR are specifically interested in issues of citizenship, related legal rights, natural resources and the border economy and security. In November 2010 they organized a symposium in Khartoum, and reviewed issues of citizenship for pastoralists. There was a dearth of actual information and evidence about the current situation of pastoralists, with some presenters claiming that ‘the north–south annual movement has not changed over the years’ (UNHCR 2010)p 16.

Mapping of nomadic issues by the Crisis and Recovery, Mapping and Analysis Unit of UNDP (CRMA): The CRMA initially focused their attention on Darfur, although more recently have held a total of 44 workshops in South Kordofan, Blue Nile, Abyei, Gedaref, Kassala and Red Sea States, plus 7 States in South Sudan. The information gathered is used for mapping challenges and prioritizing areas for intervention.

UNMIS Civil Affairs Unit (2010) have supported a number of national consultancies and international consultants to review issues related to grazing rights and pastoralist migrations to the south.

Several organizations have recently planned studies or assessments in southern Kordofan, some of which have stalled or been postponed as a result of the recent conflict and restricted access. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, released a preliminary report in August 2011 on violations of international human rights and humanitarian law in Southern Kordofan during June 2011 (OHCHR 2011). In other regions, such as South Darfur there have been no known assessments or studies chiefly because of the problem of access, particularly for study teams which include international members. Access and security remain the two major challenges to undertaking field research in these areas. It is known that a number of organizations and donors have planned various livelihood studies, although most are now stalled or have been postponed e.g. AECOM, a

study funded by the Dutch. AECOM are also working on the border regions in South Sudan supporting local level dialogue in 2012 AND 2013.

Conclusions

The new border between Sudan and South Sudan runs through a large number of pastoral migration routes. Continued instability and heightened tensions as well as outright conflict along this border area are affecting the ability of pastoralists in the region to have full access to the rangelands they need to sustain their livelihoods. This in turn can only increase conflict in the region.

Systems to protect the rights of citizens are complicated for these pastoralists who spend significant time on both sides of a border. They risk losing access to key rangelands to which they have traditionally had access. Some groups even risk statelessness if neither country will grant them citizenship.

The very high profile of the sovereignty issues and access to petroleum proceeds has overshadowed these other local, but equally critical issues. If these local issues are not resolved, groups who feel their survival is threatened but are not being heard through peaceful channels will be forced to resort to violence. Even if this conflict is "local", it will have the impact of destabilizing the border region, affecting the revenues and stability of both governments, and risking a return to large-scale conflict.

In the six months following South Sudan's Independence the border assumed, as many people expected, great importance in political relations between the two Sudans. In some places, like Abyei, negotiations between the two sides have reached near deadlock. In South Kordofan and Blue Nile, full scale conflicts related to unresolved border issues have emerged. To the far west, in Raja County, SAF have been bombing South Sudan but full scale conflict has not erupted. On the border between Northern Bahr el Ghazal and South Darfur, peace talks and negotiations about migratory movements are taking place despite significant military build-ups.

There are a number of examples of where cross-border livelihoods have been supported through regional systems supported by international agreements, most notably ECOWAS in West Africa and COMESA in Eastern and Southern Africa. However, no attempt has been made to seriously study how either system could be applied in the two Sudans. The most significant barrier to an agreement currently is getting full engagement by the right people within the concerned parties, those who truly represent and can speak for their parties.

The only way to assure stability in the border region is to give increased support and attention to the livelihood needs of the pastoralists and recognise their unique needs. A review of other borders in which pastoralists must cross would be helpful as well as increased support to those initiatives already underway. To neglect the needs of these pastoralists is to risk continued instability in this critical region and the spread of conflict.

References

- Abdalla, A. J. (2013) 'People to people diplomacy in a pastoral system: A case from Sudan and South Sudan', *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice*, 3(12).
- Aklilu, Y. 2001. An Audit of the Livestock Marketing Systems in Kenya, Ethiopia and Sudan, Volume I. Nairobi: AU-IBAR.
- Anon. 2010. More Than a Line: Sudan's North-South Border. Concordis International.
- Anon. 2011. Bashir Rules Out Dual Citizenship for Southerners. *Sudan Tribune*, 08.01.11. BBC 25.01.12 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-16720703>
- Catley, A., J. Lind, et al. (2012). *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins (Pathways to Sustainability Series)* Routledge.
- COMESA. 2010. Legislation to Support Cross-Border Livestock Mobility. Policy Brief 14 February 2010. COMESA.
- COMESA (2009). Hidden Value on the Hoof: Cross-border Livestock Trade in Eastern Africa. Policy Brief February 2009. *Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme*.
- Concordis. 2010. More Than a Line: Sudan's North-South Border: Concordis International.
- Craze, Joshua. 2011. Creating Facts on the Ground: Conflict Dynamics in Abyei. Small Arms Survey, Geneva. June 2011 <http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/pdfs/HSBA-SWP-26-Conflict-Dynamics-in-Abyei.pdf>
- Craze, J. (Forthcoming) 'Living the Line: Life along the Sudan-South Sudan Border. '. Small Arms Survey.
- ECOS. 2010. Post-Referendum Arrangements for Sudan's Oil Industry: How to Separate Siamese Twins. Utrecht, The Netherlands: European Coalition on Oil in Sudan.
- Hickey, Sam. 2007. Caught at the Crossroads: Citizenship, Marginality and the Mbororo Fulani in Northwest Cameroon. In *Making Nations, Creating Strangers: States and Citizenship in Africa*, edited by S. Dorman, D. P. Hammett and P. Nugent. Leiden: Brill.
- Homewood, K. (2008). "Ecology of African Pastoralist Societies."
- HSBA. 2010. Arms Flows to North and South Kordofan. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.
- HSBA Small Arms Survey <http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/pdfs/facts-figures/armed-groups/three-areas/HSBA-Conflict-in-SK.pdf>
- ICG. 2010. Sudan: Defining the North South Border. Policy Briefing. Juba/Khartoum/Nairobi/Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- ICG. 2013. Sudan's Spreading Conflict (I): War in South Africa Report No 198: International Crisis Group
- Johnson, D. H. (2010) 'When Boundaries Become Borders: The Impact of Boundary Makers in Southern Sudan's Frontiers', *Contested Boundaries*. London, Rift Valley Institute.
- Manby, Bronwen. 2011. International Law and the Right to a Nationality in Sudan. Open Society Foundation.
- Milner, C. (2012) 'Crossing the line: transhumance in transition along the Sudan South Sudan border'. Concordis International.
- OHCHR. 2011. Preliminary report on violations of international human rights and humanitarian law in Southern Kordofan from 5 to 30 June 2011. Thirteenth periodic report of the United Nations
- Radio Tamazuj 23.01.12 <http://radiotamazuj.org/en/article/rizeigat-and-dinka-malwal-conclude-conference-coexistence>

- Rights on the situation of human rights in the Sudan. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Pantuliano, Sara, Omer Egemi, Babo Fadlalla, Mohammed Farah, and Mohammed Elamin Abdelgador. 2009. *Put Out To Pasture: War, Oil and the Decline of Misseriyya Humr Pastoralism in Sudan*. London.
- ROSS. 2011. *The Transitional Constitution of the Republic of South Sudan, 2011*. Juba: Government of South Sudan.
- Small Arms Survey – Abyei Update <http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/facts-figures-abyei.php>
- Sudan Tribune 20.01.12 <http://www.sudantribune.com/South-Sudan-shuts-down-its-oil,41353>
- Sudan Tribune. (17.03.2013). South Accuses Sudan of Launching Attack Despite Agreement *Sudan Tribune*.
- Sudan Tribune 14.03.12 <http://www.sudantribune.com/North-South-Sudan-sign-agreements,41906>
- Tufts/FIC, SOS Sahel, and IIED. 2011. *Pastoralism Policy Options: Workshop to test and validate the Eastern Africa Training Course for use in Sudan. Validation Workshop Report.*, May 5th, 2011, at 3-7 April 2011, Wad Medani, Gazira State, Sudan.
- UNDP. 2006. *Nomad's Settlement in Sudan: Experiences, Lessons and Future Actions (Study 1)*. Khartoum: UNDP Sudan.
- Repeated Author. 2006. *Pastoral Production Systems in South Kordofan (Study 2)*. Khartoum, Sudan: UNDP.
- UNHCR. 2010. *Symposium on Citizenship Issues in Sudan. Summary of Proceedings and Related Documents*. Khartoum 6 - 7 November, 2010.
- Walraet, Anne. 2008. Governance, Violence and the struggle for Economic Regulation in South Sudan: The Case of Budi County (Eastern Equatoria). *Afrika Focus* 21 (2):53-70.

Useful Resources

- <http://www.scribd.com/Sudan%20North-South%20Border%20Initiative>
- <http://radiotamazuj.org/en>

