

RRI's Pastoralist and Mobile Peoples Methodology



RRI's Pastoralist and Mobile Peoples Methodology

Table of Contents

Background	3
Understanding of Pastoralists and Other Mobile Peoples Under the Methodology	3
Indicator Layers	3
Unit of Analysis	4
Sources of Law	5
Country Selection for First Assessment	5
Caveats	6
Pastoralist and Mobile Peoples Indicators	7
A. Mobility	7
Legal Indicators	7
Implementation Indicators	7
Gender A. Women's Mobility Rights—Legal Indicators	7
Gender A. Women's Mobility Rights—Implementation Indicators	8
B. Access and Use	8
Legal Indicators	8
Implementation Indicators	9
Gender B. Women's Access and Use Rights—Legal Indicators	10
Gender B. Women's Access and Use Rights—Implementation Indicators	11
C. Management and Governance	11
Legal Indicators	11
Implementation Indicators	11
Gender C. Women's Governance Rights—Legal Indicators	12
Gender C. Women's Governance Rights—Implementation Indicators	12
D. Consultation, Extending to FPIC	12
Legal Indicators	12
Implementation Indicators	13
E. Due Process, Compensation, and Dispute Resolution	13
Legal Indicators	13
Implementation Indicators	14

Background

This methodology assesses the strength of the mobility and tenure rights of pastoralists and, as applicable, other Mobile Peoples—including Indigenous pastoralists and otherwise mobile Indigenous Peoples and local communities—as well as the rights of women within these communities, under national legislation.

It adapts RRI's [Bundle of Rights Methodology](#) to the distinct realities of pastoral and mobile systems. Rather than categorizing tenure strength based on strict ownership or sedentary occupation, it assesses alternative approaches to land and resource governance grounded in mobility, reciprocity, shared access, and collective responsibility, recognizing pastoral and other mobile systems on their own terms rather than against a model built for fixed, sedentary landholding.

The methodology addresses key issues identified in UNDRIP, UNDROP, the Dana Declaration, the Dana+20 Manifesto, and the UN Special Rapporteur's report on Mobile Indigenous Peoples, mapping pastoralists' and other Mobile Peoples' rights within their own tenure paradigms.

This methodology is an evolving framework, refined through practice and engagement with pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' communities, in-country experts, academics, and policymakers.

Understanding of Pastoralists and Other Mobile Peoples Under the Methodology

This methodology addresses pastoralists and other Mobile Peoples, understanding pastoralism and mobility, as applicable, broadly as a livelihood system practiced by Indigenous Peoples and local communities based on the extensive management of livestock through seasonal or periodic movement across landscapes.

Following the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' report A/79/160 on Mobile Indigenous Peoples, this methodology adapts the terminology and uses “Mobile Peoples” to refer collectively to nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples, including Indigenous pastoralists, and Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation and initial contact. What unites these otherwise diverse communities is their reliance on mobility as a core element of their livelihoods, cultures, and relationships to land and resources, rather than sedentary occupation of fixed territories. It also applies a broader understanding of rightsholders as pastoralists and Mobile Peoples, additionally encompassing local and customary communities that practice mobile-based livelihoods and maintain traditional connections to their territories, but may not self-identify as Indigenous. This is not intended to dilute or conflate the distinct rights of Indigenous Peoples, but to recognize the full diversity of communities that share these vulnerabilities. Each group's rights remain grounded in its own respective legal instruments—UNDRIP, UNDROP, and ILO Convention 169—and in rightsholders' own advocacy for their inherent rights. This distinction is reflected directly in the methodology by separately tracking those tenure regimes explicitly applicable to pastoralists, Mobile Peoples, or herders; those applicable to Indigenous Peoples; and those applicable to local communities.

As the UN Special Rapporteur's 2024 report on the Situation of Mobile Indigenous Peoples also identifies, **many states fail to recognize pastoralists as Indigenous, and in some contexts, pastoralists face genuine risk if they assert that identity.** For example, in Mongolia and Tanzania, herders and pastoralists have been subject to sustained state assimilation policies. This methodology's country-level findings should be read with this context in mind since the absence of state recognition does not reflect an absence of self-identification or of the underlying claim to distinct rights.

Indicator Layers

This methodology is designed to systematically assess critical dimensions of the state recognition and realization of pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' systems, including rights to mobility; access and use; management and governance;

consultation, extending to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC); and dispute resolution, due process, and compensation. The methodology also assesses the specific rights of women within pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' systems.

Data for each country was collected by in-country experts against a common set of indicators grouped in two layers:

- **Legal indicators** examine whether a right is recognized in national law or in binding transboundary agreements in the case of indicators monitoring the status of transboundary mobility. Legal indicators were scored against dedicated answer options developed for each question to capture nuances instead of having a single generic scale applied uniformly.
- **Implementation indicators** examine the following:
 - Sociopolitical conditions under which a right can be exercised, allowing for the assessment of key enabling conditions and barriers.
 - Whether a right is realized in practice through budgets, ministerial portfolios, dedicated support, policies, and other implementing actions.

Implementation findings were gathered narratively and, given their inherently qualitative and context-specific nature, were not assigned a comparable systematic score. Instead, these are threaded throughout the guide in narrative form.

In-country legal experts grounded their analysis in legally binding national legislation and regulations, complemented by bilateral and multilateral agreements for transboundary indicators, secondary sources, and communities' lived experiences. They validated their findings by working directly with pastoralist and mobile communities through dedicated consultations as well as previously collected interview and consultation data. Several of the in-country experts contributing to this dataset are pastoralists or Mobile Peoples themselves. The methodology was refined through multiple rounds of consultation and rightsholder interviews and adjusted in direct discussion with in-country experts to reflect the realities encountered once data collection was underway, and it remains an evolving framework rather than a fixed instrument.

Score standardization for Legal Indicators. Where applicable, Legal Indicator scores are standardized using the following terms, consistent with RRI's other Tenure Tracking methodologies:

Score	Definition
Full Credit	The right in question is fully and unambiguously recognized in national law.
Partial Credit	The right in question is only partially recognized, is recognized without a key protection (e.g., a right to consultation without a corresponding requirement of consent), or is recognized but carries some restriction (e.g., governance is only through co-management or shared arrangements with other actors).
No Credit	The right in question is not recognized in national law.
Discriminatory	National law or policy actively restricts, limits, or works against the right in question.
Case-by-Case	More than one legally applicable regime governs the same right, such that the outcome depends on which regime applies to the community or circumstance in question.
Not Applicable / Not Addressed	The underlying right measured by this indicator is not applicable or is not addressed within the national legal framework assessed.

Unit of Analysis

This methodology's unit of analysis is the **Tenure Regime**: a distinguishable set of national, state-issued laws, regulations, and, where applicable, transboundary agreements that regulate any aspect of the interdependent rights essential to pastoralist and mobile livelihoods, including mobility, resource access, use, management, and customary governance, held at the community level.

How pastoralists and Mobile Peoples relate to a given tenure regime varies considerably across the countries studied, due in significant part to historical differences in how colonial and state structure policies transformed pastoralist land tenure regimes and legal systems in each state. For instance, in Mongolia, the socialist legacy and structure of the state result in a unified land policy without possibility for ownership by herders. In some countries, a dedicated legal regime exists specifically for pastoralist communities (Niger and Nepal). In others, the structure of the national legal system does not allow pastoralists' or herders' rights to be identified as a distinct category at all, and their rights must instead be extracted from general land and territorial legislation (Mongolia). In most countries assessed to date (Kenya, Peru, Bolivia, and Tanzania) pastoralists and Mobile Peoples access rights through a broader tenure regime shared with other rightsholders such as Indigenous Peoples or local communities rather than one recognizing them specifically.

Sources of Law

Analysis underpinning this methodology's legal indicators is grounded in national-level, legally binding sources of law, including national legislation and regulations addressing the rights of pastoralists and Mobile Peoples; Indigenous Peoples and local communities; land; forests; agriculture; property; succession; marriage; and other subjects related to women's tenure rights.

Non-legally binding documents are referenced where they add to or clarify the manner in which binding sources of law are to be implemented. In the analysis of this methodology's implementation indicators, a variety of additional sources are relied upon, including non-legally binding documents, institutionalized norms and practices (i.e., socially and politically accepted norms that may not yet be reflected in legal documents), community experiences and narratives, and customary arrangements.

To assess transboundary mobility and rights, bilateral or multilateral treaties and agreements are considered. Expert opinions and information found in the literature may provide guidance on the interpretation and interaction of the laws cited.

NOTE: During the research period underlying this methodology's initial application, Mongolia was in the process of revising and passing several new laws; the impact of these reforms on pastoralists' rights is not yet known and should be monitored as this legislation is finalized and implemented.

Country Selection for First Assessment

The seven countries assessed in this first application of the methodology (Bolivia, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Peru, and Tanzania) were selected according to five criteria:

- **Presence of the RRI coalition:** Selected countries span Asia, Africa, and Latin America, reflecting the geographic reach of RRI's coalition and ensuring that in-country partners with established relationships with pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' communities were available to ground findings.
- **Presence of pastoralists and Mobile Peoples:** Each country hosts a substantial pastoralist or otherwise mobile population whose rights and livelihoods are materially affected by the national legal frameworks assessed.
- **Presence of applicable legal frameworks:** Each country has an identifiable body of national law bearing on pastoralist or Mobile Peoples' tenure, whether through dedicated pastoralist legislation or through broader Indigenous or local community land law.
- **Advocacy opportunities:** Countries were selected where there is an opportunity to use this methodology's findings to inform ongoing or emerging legal or policy reform processes.
- **Diversity of legal regime approaches:** The seven countries were selected to capture a diversity of approaches to the legal recognition of pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' rights, such as including dedicated pastoralist-specific legal regimes, recognition folded into Indigenous or local community law, or national

legal systems that do not identify pastoralists or herders as a distinct category. This diversity allows the methodology's findings to speak to a broad range of legal contexts rather than a single regional or legal tradition pattern.

The exclusion of other countries and regions from this first assessment does not mean that pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' rights are not applicable or relevant in those geographies. This initial assessment of seven pilot countries does not preclude RRI from expanding the database to additional countries and regions in the future.

Caveats

The following caveats should be noted:

- Legal indicator analysis is limited to the formal content of written, government-issued national laws and regulations and, where applicable, binding bilateral or multilateral transboundary agreements and decisions of the highest national court; sub-national legal instruments are not systematically analyzed.
- Implementation indicator analysis draws on a broader range of sources, including non-legally binding documents, institutionalized norms and practices, community experiences and narratives, and customary arrangements, as set out under Sources of Law above.
- This methodology's focus on government-issued laws does not imply or endorse the notion that pastoralist or Mobile Peoples' rights emanate from the state, or that the state possesses legitimate authority to deny or revoke the customary, Indigenous, or community-based rights of pastoralists, Mobile Peoples, or the individual members of these communities. These categories are not mutually exclusive and may intersect. For example, a community may be both Indigenous and pastoralist, and this methodology's tenure regime tracking is designed to reflect such intersections rather than force communities into a single category.
- References to "pastoralists" and/or "Mobile Peoples" are not meant to equate or conflate these communities with Indigenous Peoples or local communities broadly, nor to ignore the differentiated rights that specific communities may hold under national or international law. This terminology is used to encompass the diversity of peoples and populations that practice mobile-based livelihoods and self-identify in a myriad of ways that may or may not correspond to how their rights are recognized by national governments. While the primary focus of this methodology is the rights of pastoralists and other Mobile Peoples specifically, some of the tenure regimes identified may also pertain to Indigenous Peoples' or local communities' rights more broadly, reflecting the integrated nature of collective tenure recognition in many national contexts.
- Legal interpretation can vary and may be subject to debate. Data collection for this methodology involves an expert review process during which preliminary data is submitted to individuals with country-level expertise, including pastoralist and mobile rightsholders themselves, to verify accuracy and completeness. RRI welcomes feedback concerning its approach, data sources, and data, both for retrospective correction and for improving future monitoring and analysis.
- This methodology assesses the rights that pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' communities hold under national law. The systematic assessment of the realization of those rights in practice is addressed through this methodology's Implementation Indicators, but is inherently more qualitative, context-specific, and subject to change than the Legal Indicators, and should be read accordingly.

Pastoralist and Mobile Peoples Indicators

A. Mobility

Legal Indicators

A.1. Fundamental Right to Mobility

Is pastoralist-specific mobility recognized as a fundamental right in national law?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Pastoralist mobility is recognized as a right.
Partial Credit	There is no explicit right to pastoral mobility, but relevant laws create a legal foundation from which such a right can be argued or advanced
No Credit	There is no recognition of the right.
Discriminatory	Law or policy forces sedentarization.

A.2. Transboundary Mobility

Do pastoralists have the legal right to move freely across national borders?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Yes, and there is a reciprocal agreement between states.
Partial Credit	Yes, but there is no reciprocity agreement.
No Credit	No transboundary mobility right is legally recognized, although informal agreements may be in place.

Implementation Indicators

A.3. Barriers to Mobility

What are the barriers to mobility (e.g., social, political, and economic boundaries; land use conversion; infrastructure projects; conservation areas)?

- Narrative answer

A.4. Mobility and Climate Adaptation

Is there a law or policy explicitly recognizing and protecting pastoralists' mobility rights as a climate adaptation strategy, including provisions for seasonal movement, drought response, or access to alternative grazing areas during climate emergencies?

Full Credit	The legislation/policy contains explicit provisions linking mobility rights to climate adaptation, drought management, seasonal variation, or emergency grazing access.
Partial Credit	The legislation/policy includes climate-adaptive measures or programs, but these are not explicitly tied to pastoralist mobility rights.
No Credit	There are no climate-specific provisions related to pastoralist mobility.

Gender A. Women's Mobility Rights—Legal Indicators

GA.1. Pastoralist Women's Mobility Rights

Do provisions on pastoral mobility contain specific considerations for women?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Pastoralist women's mobility rights are explicitly recognized.
No Credit	There is no explicit recognition of pastoralist women's mobility rights.
Discriminatory	The law explicitly restricts or limits women's mobility rights.

Gender A. Women's Mobility Rights—Implementation Indicators

GA.2. Gender-Sensitive Corridor Design

Are mobility corridors designed with women's needs?

Full Credit	Gender-sensitive planning methods are employed.
Partial Credit	The needs of pastoralist women are considered on an ad hoc basis.
No Credit	No gender lens is applied during planning processes.

B. Access and Use

Legal Indicators

B.1. Right to Access Land

Does the law recognize pastoralists' rights to access the land?

Note: Please note any differences in access rights between public and private lands.

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	The law explicitly recognizes pastoralists' rights to access land, or recognizes certain communities' (Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities) rights to access land, and pastoralist communities identify within those groups in the country.
No Credit	The law does not recognize pastoralists' rights to access the land.

B.2. Distinct Human/Livestock Access Rules

Are there different rules for human and livestock access?

Score	Criteria
Yes	Distinct rules exist for human and livestock access.
No	No distinct rules exist.

Note: Narrative answers capture the level of distinction and differing restrictions that exist.

B.3. Nature of Access

Are access rights exclusive or shared?

Score	Criteria
Exclusive Access	Only exclusive access rights are guaranteed.
Shared Access	Only shared access rights are guaranteed.
Mixed/By Area	Rights differ by area: exclusive access rights are guaranteed in some areas, while shared access is recognized in others.

B.4. Right to Use Pastoral Resources

Do pastoralists have rights to use pastoral corridors, grasslands, grazing areas, forest, freshwater, and/or wildlife resources, and for what purpose(s) (subsistence, commercial, or cultural)?

Full Credit is assigned first if any type of use for any resource/purpose is recognized. Then, a matrix is populated to track whether rights are “Fully Allowed”, “Restricted/Conditionally”, or “Not Allowed” per resource/purpose combination. Each of the five resources (Pastoral Corridors, Freshwater, Rangelands/Pasture Lands, Wildlife, Forest) is assessed separately against each of the three purposes (Cultural/Religious, Subsistence, Commercial):

Score	Criteria					
Full Credit	The law recognizes the right to use.					
	Purpose	Pastoral Corridors	Freshwater	Rangelands/Pasture Lands	Wildlife	Forest
	Cultural/Religious					
	Subsistence					
	Commercial					
No Credit	The law does not recognize the right to use any resource for any purpose.					
Not Applicable	The resource in question is not present or not legally distinguishable within the tenure regime or country assessed.					

B.5. Overlapping, Shared, and Seasonal Use

Does the law address the overlapping, shared, and seasonal use of resources?

Score	Criteria
Yes	The law addresses overlapping, shared, and/or seasonal use of resources.
No	The law does not address overlapping, shared, or seasonal use of resources.
Not Applicable	Cannot verify as the law defers to unknown customary arrangements (e.g., as is the case for Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation).

Implementation Indicators

B.6. Extent of Recognized Rights

What is the extent of lands to which pastoralists have recognized rights? If the area of recognized rights differs by season, or if pastoralists have different levels or types of rights to different areas, please explain.

- Narrative answer

B.7. Dedicated Infrastructure/Support.

Is there any infrastructure supporting pastoralists (institution, national policy, budget targets, or planning document)?

Full Credit	Dedicated state support to pastoral mobility exists (government portfolio, program, or equivalent).
No Credit	No dedicated state support exists.

B.8. Formalization Requirements

Are there any requirements to formalize pastoralist communities for their rights to be acknowledged (i.e., registration, fees, etc.)?

- Narrative answer

B.9. Documented Customary Access Agreements

Are there documented customary access agreements between pastoralist groups and other land users?

- Narrative answer

B.10. Procedural or Social Barriers to Use

Are there procedural or social barriers to use (e.g., seasonal/timebound constraints, fees, permits, approval requirements)?

- Recorded as Yes/No, with narrative detail

B.11. Documented Customary Use Agreements

Are there documented customary use agreements between pastoralist groups and other land users?

- Narrative answer

Gender B. Women's Access and Use Rights—Legal Indicators

GB.1. General Property Rights

Does the constitution, civil code, land law, or other overarching environmental or agrarian law contain a general provision affirming all women's right to movable (including livestock) and immovable (land) property, or prohibiting property-related practices that would adversely affect women's access to or ownership of property?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	The constitution or other overarching law contains a general provision affirming women's rights to both movable and immovable property, or prohibiting practices that would adversely affect their access to or ownership of property.
Partial Credit	Only women's right to movable or immovable property (not both) is protected.
No Credit	Women's rights to property are not guaranteed
Discriminatory	Laws prohibiting or otherwise adversely affecting women's property rights exist.

GB.2. Women's Land Access Rights

Are pastoralist women's rights to access community lands, territories, or resources explicitly recognized?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Pastoralist women's rights to access community lands, territories, or resources are explicitly recognized.
No Credit	There is no explicit recognition of pastoralist women's rights to community lands, territories, or resources.
Discriminatory	The law explicitly restricts or limits pastoralist women's rights to community lands, territories, or resources.

GB.3. Livestock Ownership

Can women within pastoralist communities legally own or co-own livestock?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Equal ownership rights are guaranteed by law.
Partial Credit	Co-ownership only (e.g., via a male relative).
No Credit	Ownership is prohibited for women by law.

GB.4. Livestock Inheritance

Do national/PRTR laws guarantee women's inheritance of livestock in cases of intestate inheritance?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Equal inheritance rights for livestock are guaranteed by law for all women, including widows, daughters, and women in consensual unions.

Partial Credit	Livestock inheritance rights for women are restricted to only a category of women (e.g., widows only).
Case-by-Case	Inheritance rights for livestock depend on which legal regime applies (civil, customary, or Islamic law) to the individual/community; daughters and widows retain some individual inheritance rights but without full control over the animals, while discriminatory customary/Islamic rules (favoring male heirs, such as a son's share being double a daughter's) typically govern by default in the absence of a will.
Discriminatory	Inheritance rights are guaranteed only to men.

Gender B. Women's Access and Use Rights—Implementation Indicators

GB.5. Disproportionate Impact of Restrictions

How do restrictions (e.g., sedentarization, infrastructure) disproportionately affect women?

- Narrative answer

GB.6. Inclusive Community Regulations

Are there community regulations that explicitly include or exclude women?

- Narrative answer

GB.7. Non-Legal Barriers to Ownership

Are there other (i.e., non-legal) barriers to women's ownership or management of livestock?

- Narrative answer

C. Management and Governance

Legal Indicators

C.1. Right to Manage or Participate in Management

Do pastoralists have the right to manage or participate in the management of grazing lands and seasonal corridors?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	The community has the right to manage lands and/or resources in the areas to which they have rights.
Partial Credit	Co-management or right to participate in a management board with other actors.
No Credit	Communities do not have legally recognized management rights.

C.2. Communal Governance

Does the law recognize pastoralists' communal governance? If so, what is the community-level governance body?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	The law recognizes pastoralists' communal governance Name the community-level governance body, if available, or mark N/A if not specified.
Partial Credit	The law recognizes pastoralists' communal governance, but only through a government-imposed entity composed of community members.
No Credit	The law does not recognize pastoralists' communal governance.

Implementation Indicators

C.3. Shared Governance Institutions. Are there shared governance institutions/arrangements/spaces for intercommunity coordination, adjudication, and rule-setting?

- Narrative answer

Gender C. Women's Governance Rights—Legal Indicators

GC.1. Voting

Do women have the right to vote or take equivalent binding action in community general assemblies or equivalent community-level decision-making bodies, and is a quorum of women required to be present in order for the decision-making body to take other legally binding action?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Women have the right to vote or take equivalent action in a community general assembly or equivalent decision-making body, and a quorum of women is required to be present for the body to vote or take other legally binding action.
Partial Credit	Women are specified as having the right to vote or take equivalent action, but there is no quorum requirement for women voters/decision-makers.
No Credit	Women are not specified as having the right to vote or take equivalent action in the general assembly/equivalent body. Individual or household voting rights may be generally discussed without specifying women.
Case-by-Case	Women have the right to vote or take equivalent action in a community general assembly or equivalent decision-making body, and whether a quorum of women is required depends on several applicable legal regimes.
Discriminatory	Community-level executive body membership is explicitly limited to men.
Not Applicable	Community-wide governance processes are not addressed under the law.

GC.2. Leadership

Do community-level executive bodies require a minimum quota of women to be members, and is a quorum of women executive members required to be present for the executive body to take binding actions?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Community-level executive bodies require both a minimum quota of women to hold seats and a quorum of women executive members to be present for the body to exercise its decision-making authority.
Partial Credit	A minimum quota of women must be included in community-level executive bodies, but there is no women's quorum requirement.
No Credit	There is no quota or quorum requirement related to women's participation within community-level executive bodies.
Discriminatory	Community-level executive body membership is explicitly limited to men.
Not Addressed	Community-level leadership is not addressed under the law.

Gender C. Women's Governance Rights—Implementation Indicators

GC.3. Non-Legal Barriers to Decision-Making

Are there other (non-legal) barriers to women's participation in community-level decision-making processes?

- Narrative answer

GC.4. Parity in Governance

Is parity required within community-level governance processes? Recorded as a narrative finding.

- Narrative answer

D. Consultation and FPIC

Legal Indicators

D.1. Consultation and FPIC

Do pastoralists have the right to participate in the planning of corridors and land use policy, or other policy that may impact or extinguish their rights?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	FPIC rights are recognized, including all FPIC requirements.
Partial Credit	Only some FPIC requirements are recognized (e.g., rights to prior consultation and/or participation are recognized, but there is no requirement for consent).
No Credit	The law does not guarantee any FPIC rights, nor any recognition of any participation or consultation rights.

D.2. Government Override

Does the law allow the government to make decisions against/overturn FPIC?

Score	Criteria
No (Cannot Override)	The law does not allow the government to make decisions without advancing a recognized FPIC or consultation right.
Yes (Can Override)	The law allows the government to make decisions overturning a recognized FPIC or consultation right.

Implementation Indicators

D.3. FPIC Policy or Procedures

Is there an FPIC policy or procedures in place?

- Narrative answer

E. Due Process, Compensation, and Dispute Resolution

Legal Indicators

E.1. Due Process and Compensation

Does national law recognize the rights of pastoralist and Mobile Peoples' communities to judicially or administratively challenge governmental decisions, proposals, and actions that would extinguish or infringe upon their rights? Does national law recognize that communities are entitled to compensation from the government for infringing upon or extinguishing their tenure rights?

Due process and compensation are assessed as two distinct sub-indicators, each scored separately, and each is further distinguished according to whether the right is guaranteed generally in national law or guaranteed specifically for pastoralists:

Score	Criteria
DUE PROCESS	
Recognized	The right to due process is recognized in national law.
Restricted	The right to due process is only partially or conditionally recognized.
No Credit	The law does not recognize the right in question.
COMPENSATION	
Recognized	The right to compensation is recognized in national law.
Restricted	The right to compensation is only partially or conditionally recognized.
No Credit	The law does not recognize the right in question.

E.2. Dispute Resolution

Are community-based dispute resolution bodies recognized in national law? Is this implemented through the representative institutions of these groups, or by a body appointed or created by the government?

Score	Criteria
Full Credit	Yes, through the representative community institution.
Partial Credit	Yes, through a body appointed or created by the government, with community representation.
No Credit	No dispute resolution bodies are recognized, or they do not require any community representation.

Implementation Indicators

E.3. Barriers to Accessing Due Process

Are there any obstacles or barriers to accessing the right to due process, including social and political barriers?

- Narrative answer

E.4. Fairness of Compensation Calculation

In the event of compensation, what is the due process to ensure this compensation is fair and informed? Where monetary compensation is given, how is the amount calculated and shared? Where alternative lands are given, how does the law ensure they are equally valuable and convenient for pastoralists as those being taken away?

- Narrative answer

E.5. Third-Party Enforceability

Are decisions of communal dispute resolution bodies enforceable by the community or third parties?

- Narrative answer