Evaluating Eden Series
Working Paper No.11

COMMUNITY WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

A REGIONAL REVIEW

IUCN – THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA
SOUTHERN AFRICA SUSTAINABLE USE SPECIALIST GROUP

November 1997

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This report is the result of a collaborative effort between the Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SASUSG), the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN ROSA) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). The report has drawn on a wide range of personnel and expertise from within the southern African region and has been through several reviews.

Initial contact between IIED and SASUSG was made in September 1996 and again in October 1996 at the World Conservation Congress in Montreal. At this meeting it was agreed by IIED, SASUSG and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences that SASUSG would be an appropriate collaborating partner on this project. In December 1996 SASUSG sent to IIED comments on the structure of the southern Africa report and a budgeted proposal for the completion of phase one of the report towards which SASUSG would make a 43% financial contribution.

The initial schedule proposed to split the study into three consultancy reports which would be synthesised into a draft report by the end of March 1997 for discussion at the annual SASUSG members meeting in April. The synthesis was not ready at this time and so each consultant presented his country report at the April meeting. It was further decided at the meeting that a fourth country report (Mozambique) would be prepared separately by two SASUSG members with considerable experience in Mozambique. The final country reports (which are attached as annexes) were undertaken by the following SASUSG members:

Botswana and Namibia	- Mr. Brian Jones
Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe	- Dr. James Murombedzi
Mozambique	- Mr. Simon Anstey and Mr Eben Chonguica
South Africa	- Institute of Natural Resources (Mr. Myles Mander)

It had been hoped to include Angola, Lesotho and Swaziland in the study but this was not possible with the limited budget and regional priorities.

After further delays in the production of a draft synthesis report, a decision was taken to hold a workshop to develop the structure and content of the final report. This workshop was combined with a meeting of the Manchester Group[1] on 17th July 1997 and was attended by

1. The Manchester Group includes researchers from CASS, East Africa and Manchester University who are collaborating on a complementary study of community based initiatives in southern and east Africa.

Prof. Marshall Murphree	-	University of Zimbabwe
Prof. David Hulme	-	University of Manchester
Prof. Bill Adams	-	Cambridge University
Mr. Edmund Barrow	-	African Wildlife Foundation
Dr. David Grossman	-	David Grossman and Associates (Consultants)
Mr. Hector Magome	-	National Parks Board of South Africa
Dr. Kadzo Kangwana	-	Kenya
Dr. James Murombedzi	-	University of Zimbabwe
Mr. Simon Anstey	-	IUCN Mozambique
Dr. Christo Fabricius	-	IIED
Mr. Michael Murphree	-	SASUSG

In a subsequent meeting with IIED, a preliminary structure for the report was agreed which has been further modified following an examination of the report content. The synthesis of this report was done by the Rowan Martin (Chairman) and Michael Murphree (Executive Officer) of the Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group.

Following the introductory section, this report summarises the important issues emerging from the country reports, presents the key issues within a synthesis framework and, finally, draws conclusions which link commonalities and identify future needs. Text from the country reports has been extracted in whole or summarised to complete the synthesis. The four consultants reports form the annexes to this report together with an overall bibliography.

In reviewing the execution of this project several points arise:

- The study has suffered delays due to administrative, logistical and other factors. In the initial phases of the study a rigid structure was abandoned to allow for a diversity of situations. Later this was to present its own set of challenges in the synthesis of these reports.

- The time frame used in southern Africa was too ambitious. To document and disseminate findings requires more time to be allocated to the consultative process. The value in this report is the extent to which the various components have undergone a review process.

- One of the concerns expressed in Phase I and a factor to bear in mind for Phase II of the *Evaluating Eden* project is who is the client? Ultimately, it is hoped that rural communities will be the beneficiaries of such studies even if this should come about indirectly through the influence on external donor agencies, policy makers, state bureaucracies and other participants influencing the development of CWM in the region. The studies show that external factors have greatly influenced the development and direction of CWM in southern Africa ☝ which is probably characteristic of studies of this nature.

1.2 Survey Methods

The southern Africa study was initially conducted as an open-ended research exercise. The initial guidelines provided by IIED were found to be too proscriptive to accommodate the

wide range of situations existing in southern Africa. The consultants were provided with broad terms of reference which would enable them to respond to the essential differences in approaches to CWM in each country. The country reports show the diversity of approaches taken by each consultant. They also show the diversity of issues and priorities in each country.

A regional meeting of the Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group held at the end of April 1997 provided inputs to the synthesis. The meeting (attended by IIED) resulted in a wide consultative process with SASUSG members and provided the opportunity for concerns and opinions to be made at an early stage. Three primary concerns expressed at the meeting were that:

- the study limited itself to terrestrial wildlife which would result in an incomplete picture of community based initiatives in the region;
- greater emphasis should be placed on examining the key issues influencing CWM in southern Africa so enabling the study to become more process orientated; and
- there was a need to capture community initiatives that are not based on formal projects.

The synthesis workshop held in July focussed attention on the key issues identified in the reports and managed to group these issues into a framework of overarching themes. The information from the country reports was used to 'fill the cells' of the framework and complete the synthesis.

The reports presented here are not exhaustive and neither is the list of issues. The intention is to provide a broad status assessment of CWM in southern Africa with detailed analysis reserved for the case studies in Phase II of *Evaluating Eden*.

1.3 The Southern African Resource Base

Southern Africa is extremely varied in its range of ecosystems and the distribution of its human populations. The west of the region is arid to semi-arid (less than 300mm average annual rainfall) with very low human population densities and the eastern seaboard is warm and moist (over 800mm annual rainfall) with a corresponding higher human population density. The central areas of the region vary from dry scrub to savannah grassland and savannah woodland interspersed with a variety of wetlands and, at higher altitudes, montane forest. The region possesses a rich biological diversity. The number of plant species in Lesotho, Swaziland and South Africa is twice that of Brazil and four times that of the United States (ART, 1997). Colonial settlement patterns and modern agricultural activity have resulted in a situation where many wildlife populations are actually displaced from their preferred habitats and for the most parts are confined to the dryer or more inhospitable parts of the region. The greatest threat to

Southern Africa Resource Base –
300 terrestrial mammal species
900 bird species
301 reptile species
95 amphibian species

biological diversity in southern African terrestrial ecosystems is the conversion of wild lands to other forms of land use.

An extensive system of National Parks and protected areas has been established in southern Africa primarily by colonial regimes to "protect" southern African wildlife and habitats. For the most part the integrity of the parks and protected areas in the region has been maintained although in many cases management and conservation is better in surrounding private or communal lands.

STATE PROTECTED AREAS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

COUNTRY	COUNTRY SIZE sq km	PROPORTION AS PROTECTED AREA %	SIZE OF PROTECTED AREA sq km
Botswana	581,730	39.0	226,875
Malawi	118,480	8.9	10,545
Mozambique	799,380	8.7	69,790
Namibia	824,290	13.5	111,414
South Africa	1,221,040	5.9	72,000
Zambia	752,610	29.8	224,078
Zimbabwe	390,580	12.9	50,385
TOTALS	**4,688,110**		**765,087**

Source: IUCN Protected Areas of the World, 1992

The potential earnings from wildlife under various forms of management as a land use in a typical southern Africa savanna (average annual rainfall 400-800mm) which is well stocked with wildlife (including elephant, buffalo and the large cats) is given opposite. Mass tourism may not be sustainable in the long term and is vulnerable to external factors. The most practical and profitable uses in southern Africa lie in exclusive ecotourism and sport hunting. The remaining uses are unlikely to be competitive.

FINANCIAL POTENTIAL OF WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	GROSS RETURN US$/ha	NET RETURN US$/ha
Mass Tourism	100	50
Eco-tourism	50	25
Safari Hunting	7.5	5
Sale of Live Animals	5	2
Cropping for meat and hides	2.5	1
Subsistence hunting	1	1.5
Cattle	2	1

Source: Martin (1993)

There is an important distinction to be made between the southern African situation for wildlife as a land use and that in most other regions of the world. Firstly, wildlife management is generally the highest valued form of land use for non-arable land – particularly when two or more options given in the table above can be combined. Secondly, successful wildlife management is based on value-added forms of management such as safari

hunting and photographic tourism which provide far higher returns from the resource than its use for commodities such as meat and hide. Management of wildlife for its products is generally the lowest-valued use and unlikely to provide sufficient incentives for CWM.

1.4 The Enabling Environment

This report was commissioned in a period of continued expansion in community based approaches to wildlife management. As southern Africa moves further into a post-colonial, post-apartheid era with corresponding stability and peace, interest in the sustainable use of natural resources has been heightened. All of the southern African countries studied in this report are implementing a variety of community-based programmes and all have reviewed or are in the process of reviewing national policies and legislation affecting communal rights of access to wildlife and other resources. In all of the countries studied, government departments, universities, NGOs and individuals are increasing their regional linkages and a variety of regional institutions now exist.

Economic structural adjustment is often viewed as having negative impacts on the rural poor. However, the concomitant pressures on State bureaucracies to decentralise and devolve authority have arguably assisted rural communities in gaining access rights to resources. It is this issue of access rights and land tenure that remains key to CWM.

In much of southern Africa, the next decade will determine how land will be used in the next millennium. During the 1890s land tenure and resource access rights were determined by new colonial regimes a century later communities disenfranchised in the 1890s are again securing land and resource rights in much of southern Africa. One of the critical issues at this stage is the role that the state and donors play in facilitating this process. Driven by donor demands, there is a danger that state authorities will attempt to prepare prescriptive or 'blueprint' programmes that do not allow adaptive, process-orientated CWM development. In southern Africa the CWM process varies considerably in the different countries sampled but an overall trend to view communities as integral to the management of wildlife resources is clear.

2. REVIEW OF COUNTRY REPORTS

2.1 Botswana

In Botswana there are a number of different policy documents and laws which, together, provide opportunities for government to allow communities to gain rights over wildlife and tourism. The Botswana approach combines rights to obtain quotas and hunting licenses from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) with rights to obtain leases over land for commercial purposes from Land Boards. These policy directives ensure that communities' interests are promoted.

The Policy on Wildlife Conservation of 1986 calls for the greater involvement of local people in wildlife management and utilisation and for rural people to gain greater benefits from wildlife use. It does not, however, spell out how this might be achieved. The Wildlife, Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992 provides for the declaration of Wildlife Management Areas and Controlled Hunting Areas and provides for permission for wildlife use on communal land to be given by Tribal Land Boards. The Tribal Land Act of 1968 enables Tribal Land Boards to give out leases for commercial purposes. Policy directives, such as the SAVINGRAM on community tourism and hunting development, provide for leases over hunting and tourism to be given to communities who form a representative legal entity.

Rights are dependent upon designation of an area as a community hunting area (CHA) otherwise the lease is negotiated between the Land Board and the private sector directly. District level government agencies play a significant role in the process of a community negotiating its joint venture. According to the Joint Venture Guidelines, communities have to wait for endorsement of the joint venture approach by the District Development Committee. The District Council is assigned a role in negotiating with the private sector on behalf of the community e.g. informing operators of a community's objectives.

The Joint Venture Guidelines make it clear that: "Wildlife remains the property of the State, and although wildlife management is to be decentralised, wildlife utilisation and any form of off-take will be subject to the DWNP's decisions regarding the quota for each area. Close liaison with the DWNP is therefore important".

The present framework for providing rural communities with rights over wildlife and tourism depends to a large extent on the goodwill of government at a number of different levels. The President can, for example, remove the wildlife management area (WMA) status which protects wildlife as a land use. The Minister of Commerce and Industry can make regulations which affect the WMA on issues such as grazing and keeping of livestock. Consultation on these issues is expected to take place at the district level. Controlled Hunting Area status can also be removed or changed by government according to whether the current policy approach is to favour communities or the private sector.

2.2 Malawi

Malawi is a small country (118 482 sq km) with a population of 9.6 million giving a population density of 81 persons per sq km of which 78% are rural. There is little wildlife in communal lands resulting in the main CWM emphasis being on relationships between protected areas and their neighbouring communities.

Until recently, Malawi has not integrated the interests of local communities into its conservation policy. Malawi (like South Africa) is now faced with hard edge boundaries for its protected areas and there are serious conflicts between the protected areas and adjacent communities. In order to resolve this Malawi is exploring resource sharing and co-management possibilities between protected areas and neighbouring communities. Protected area managers are negotiating various co-management options with their neighbours with the intention of devolving decision making to local level management systems that include the rural communities. It is expected that by doing this the protected areas will be able to fulfil their aims of conserving biological diversity while addressing the needs of resource hungry neighbouring communities.

The policy and legal environment for these programmes is provided by the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992. The Act provides for consumptive and non-consumptive use of protected area resources if these are in the best interests of conservation of the protected area. It also allows the establishment of a conservation fund to collect public revenues generated through use of wildlife and allows disbursements from the fund to selected beneficiaries (including neighbouring communities). Some work has been done by UNDP (5th Country Programme 1993) to develop community institutions in selected LIAs (Local Impact Areas) for wildlife management but a noticeable feature of all of the projects below is a lack of emphasis on institution building.

Projects are currently being developed and implemented in the following areas

1. Kasungu National Park [European Union]
2. Nyika National Park and Vwaza Marsh Wildlife Reserve [KfW and GTZ]
3. Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve [JICA]
4. Nankumba Peninsula [World Bank]
5. Lower Shire Parks and Reserves (Lengwe, Majete and Mwabvi) [World Bank]
   Source: ULG (1997)

All of these projects are basically similar in that their stated aims are to improve the standard of living of adjacent communities through sustainable use of the Protected Area resources. An extension programme is incorporated into each project.

The planning and implementation of these projects has started but it would be premature to assess their success at this stage

2.3 Mozambique

In Mozambique the situation is one of a single land owner (the state) with conflicting policies and lack of an institutional framework.

Mozambique is one of the larger countries in southern Africa covering some 800,000 sq km with a population estimated at 17.5 million of which 70% live in the rural areas. Mozambique is emerging from both the destructive effects of two decades of war, which started shortly after the transition from colonial rule by Portugal, and the effects of centrally planned economic and political strategies. Peace was achieved in the internal conflict in 1992, multiparty elections were held in 1994 and the economic policies are now moving rapidly towards free market approaches.

The costs of the political and economic conflicts of the past decades have been high. Large segments of the population were internally (3 million) or externally (1.7 million) displaced as refugees, much of the basic infrastructure of the country was damaged or destroyed and the per capita annual income is the lowest in the world (US$80 in 1995). The vast majority of Mozambicans live below the poverty line and literacy rates are estimated at 35%. Approximately 70% of the national budget is sourced from donors or multilateral funding facilities.

However, there are many positive aspects including the remarkably rapid and durable transition to peace, the economic growth rate of 6.7%, the dynamism in the rebuilding of the country and the relative openness in debate on economic and political issues at various levels. A successful community wildlife project (Tchuma Tchato) in the Tete Province has set precedents which could be rapidly expanded to the remainder of the country.

The present period of transition is dominated by two main issues ✍ decentralisation and land tenure. These are critical factors in community natural resource management and, while not unique issues to Mozambique, the response to these imperatives is unusual. Institutional change does not seem to be originating from within the central system or from donor and other external pressures but rather from forces at the provincial, district, rural community and even individual level. This has created a very different dynamic to that in much of Southern Africa where decentralisation (particularly in natural resource management) was actively taken up within the central structures by individuals and institutions convinced of the need for it for conservation or development reasons. While Mozambique has its share of bureaucrat anarchists at the central level, the main forces reacting to the retention of decision-making at the centre are the local communities and local administration structures. Local community self reliance (resulting from 20 years of conflict and failed central economic policies) and a relatively high political sophistication (FRELIMO has only a narrow majority over RENAMO and national elections are in 1998) is supplemented by the increasing independence demanded (and taken) by Provinces, Districts and local government officers. These local forces are driving a counter-action against the retention of real power at the centre

2.4 Namibia

Namibia, like Zambia and Zimbabwe, has established an umbrella CWM programme implemented by a partnership of government, NGOs, the private sector and communities. The programme uses community resource management units known as conservancies and was initiated by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. This programme is supported in part by a USAID funded programme known as Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) which includes local organisations in the establishment of CWM projects (Rihoy,1995).

Namibia's policy and legislative environment goes further than any other in southern Africa in giving secure rights over wildlife and tourism directly to local communities. The rights are given by law to community institutions, thus avoiding regional government structures and the need for such structures to further devolve authority. Communities have to define themselves, enabling the development of cohesive social management units with incentives for individuals to cooperate together, rather than be defined by artificial administrative units which potentially force people together who would not normally co-operate. The rights given to communities are relatively strong and are exclusive. In the case of game which may be hunted, communities gain conditional ownership of wildlife with the State continuing to set quotas for all consumptive activities. In the case of tourism, concessionary rights automatically go to a conservancy on registration by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET).

The conservancy policy and legislation is flexible enough to make provision for the variety of socio-cultural and ecological conditions which exist in Namibia. The legislation does not prescribe the size of a conservancy nor does it prescribe how a conservancy committee should be appointed. It leaves communities to decide for themselves who should represent them on the conservancy committee. Communities are therefore able to shape their conservancy according to the social and ecological conditions of their own areas and choose their committees in a manner consistent with their own cultural norms. Because communities are dynamic, and change over time, the flexibility of the legislation enables communities to change and adapt the way in which they choose their committee.

Although the policy and legislation give strong and exclusive resource rights over wildlife and tourism, they clearly do not give secure and exclusive land tenure. If communities are not able to control access to their land, even with state backing, it will be difficult for them to control access to their resources. The current system of 'open access' to communal land in Namibia provides a threat to the opportunities for sustainable resource management provided by the conservancy approach. Without exclusive group land rights, other people can move into a conservancy area and settle on the land, using resources being conserved by the existing residents. The current version of the White Paper on Land Reform addresses this issue by providing for communal area residents to gain exclusive group tenure and by specifically enabling conservancies to apply for ownership of their land.

2.5 South Africa

In the past twenty years there has been a massive swing towards wildlife as a land use in many of the semi-arid parts of South Africa particularly in north of the country where commercial farms which once supported cattle have changed to wildlife management. This awareness that wildlife is a viable land use option is bound to influence community choices in the future even if, in the past, they have rarely chosen to pursue the option of wildlife management as a land use and have, in fact, rejected co-operation with pre-independence state conservation agencies.

The recent history of apartheid in South Africa is resulting in changes which are probably more pronounced than in any other country within the region. Several key policy areas are having a significant influence on community based wildlife management in South Africa. These include national constitutional reform, land reform processes and changes to conservation agencies policies.

The constitutional reform process that South Africa has undergone in the last few years has led to a policy environment that has indirectly promoted community-based wildlife management. The entrenched constitutional rights of access to land, democratic and transparent decision-making, and development have provided communities with opportunities to engage in the acquisition of land and the power to decide how land should be utilised.

The land reform process, by entrenching the right to land or benefits, has created a policy environment which promotes community based wildlife management. In many cases, protected areas were established in areas previous occupied by indigenous people. In terms of recent legislation, communities may now have a legal right to the land or to benefits stemming from the use of the land.

The changing national policies have led to a realignment of policies within the conservation agencies. In the past some agencies were progressive in terms of community involvement, while others were reluctant to consider a role for communities in wildlife management. The result of this has been to push conservation agencies towards co-management arrangements or benefit sharing from existing protected areas. It would be wrong to give the impression that this will be plain sailing in the coming years: there is a predictable reluctance amongst many conservation officials to accept the new era and the capacity in many provincial bureaucracies to deal with the new challenges. This is not assisted by a history of conservation involvement of the urban elite and preservationist wildlife NGOs.

Nevertheless, the post apartheid period is now at a stage where conservation and rural communities are finding each other largely as a result of the activities of development NGOs who are stimulating dialogue with state conservation agencies and raising the political profile of natural resource management.

2.6 Zambia

The evolution of CWM policy in Zambia has been partially in response to a massive decline in elephant and rhino populations due to illegal hunting in the late 1970s / early 1980s, which motivated the granting of benefits as an enticement for conservation by rural communities. An important workshop held in 1993 in the Luangwa Valley (The Lupande Development Workshop) resulted in a Presidential Directive that led to the creation of the Administrative Management Design (ADMADE) Programme for Game Management Areas (GMAs) and the Luangwa Integrated Development Project (LIRDP). In the same year Zambia provided policy support for CWM through its *Policy for Wildlife in Zambia,* which established an administrative and financial framework for the further development of the ADMADE programme. The implementation of ADMADE relies on two institutional instruments: Wildlife Management Authorities (WMAs), which are a local level administrative institution, and the Wildlife Conservation Revolving Fund (WCRF) which is a centralised funding mechanism (Rihoy 1995). A feature of the ADMADE programme (now being challenged) is the central role of traditional authority (chiefs) in decision making and revenue distribution.

The key factors giving rise to CWM in Zambia have been:

- A need by state agencies to involve communities in curbing unsustainable resource use and protecting for state protected areas;
- A demand by rural populations in Zambia for access to resources; and
- A critical shortage of capital available for rural development.

The bulk of ADMADE income is derived from safari hunting (about 90%). The ban on elephant hunting in Zambia limits the realisation of the full potential of the resource. There is some confusion about the extent to which income from non-consumptive activities may be directed to communities participating in the ADMADE programme (ULG 1997).

The CWM initiatives in Zambia have tended to be more centralised than other countries in the region in respect of their policy on the devolution of management authority, tenure and access rights. The distribution of benefits is only partial and the use of benefits is tightly controlled: the State retains 40 % of all monies earned from wildlife in GMAs and adjacent protected areas for management costs and a further 25% for administrative costs. This has resulted in increasing pressure from rural communities who wish to have greater control over their resources and financial management.

2.7 Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe, the origin of CWM lies in the Parks and Wild Life Act of 1975 which accorded tenurial rights over wildlife to landholders on alienated land (private land). With the advent of independence in Zimbabwe in 1980 and following a policy decision by the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management, the Act was amended to enable the Minister responsible for wildlife to grant similar rights to district councils. In 1989 the first two CAMPFIRE districts (Nyaminyami and Guruve) were granted Appropriate

Authority to manage their wildlife resources. At the time of writing, 24 districts have been granted such authority.

CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe was the first programme to recognise that conservation of natural resources requires the sustainable use and management of those resources by producer communities. The development of CWM within CAMPFIRE is primarily the result of a non-prescriptive process that has allowed for a broad interpretation of the legislation and from progressive ideas from within the government wildlife agency that recognised the inadequacies of state management and control. Another strength of CAMPFIRE has been its implementation. For this the programme has been able to draw on a pool of highly skilled local expertise from a range of government departments and NGOs. The development of CWM in Zimbabwe has relied on

- A model for successful wildlife conservation and management provided by commercial farmers on private land;
- Progressive concepts subsequently influencing policy and legislation;
- A broad interpretation of the legislation;
- A realisation by state authorities of their own inadequacies and of the appropriate levels of for effective management;
- Highly skilled personnel within government and NGOs;
- A sense of proprietorship by producer communities that when pooled results in a group of resource managers with considerable political weight.

A weakness in CAMPFIRE is that the decentralisation process has stopped at the level of the District Council which effectively prevents communities from achieving full tenure rights over their resources. Despite efforts in 1994-95 to persuade the Ministry of Environment and Tourism that further legal provisions for devolution to ward and village levels were needed, there has been little policy or legal progress in CAMPFIRE since its inception.

The success of Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE has inspired CWM initiatives in other parts of the region. It is important to note that this success was initially achieved with the minimal amount of legislation, no formal policy document and little donor funding. The relative performance of CAMPFIRE districts in efficiency and effectiveness of wildlife management today appears to be inversely proportional to the amount of donor inputs received.

3. SYNTHESIS

3.1 Issues Influencing Community Wildlife Management In The Region

During the review workshop held to examine the separate country reports, 18 key issues were identified (**Table 1**). These 18 issues were then further consolidated into 8 topics (**Table 2**) which provided the basis for this synthesis report.

Table 1. A List Of Key Issues Influencing CWM in Southern Africa

No.	ISSUE	COMPONENTS
1	Tenure	Rights of access Degrees of rights
2	Cost /Benefit	
3	Participation	
4	Framework	Policy Legislation Institutional Mechanisms
5	External Inputs	Funding Technical Support Training
6	Nature of Resource Base	Demand /resource ratio
7	Degree of Communal Cohesion	
8	Local Governance	
9	Competing Land Uses	
10	Markets and Economic Incentives	
11	Incentives	
12	Adaptive Management	Monitoring and feedback
13	Conservation / Biodiversity Impacts	
14	Planning and Planning Process	
15	Vertical and Horizontal Integration	Integration with other structures or regimes
16	Community Wildlife Conservation and Protected Areas	
17	Learning and Diffusion	
18	Objectives	

Table 2: A Consolidated Grouping of The Key Issues In CWM in Southern Africa

Group	TOPIC	ISSUES
1	**LOCAL CAPACITY**	3 - Participation 6 - Nature of Resource Base (Demand / Resource Ratios) 7 - Degree of Communal Cohesion 8 - Local Governance
2	**ECONOMIC FACTORS**	6 - Nature of Resource Base (Demand / Resource Ratios) 10 - Markets and Economic Incentives
3	**MANAGEMENT**	8 - Local Governance 12 - Adaptive Management (Monitoring / Feedback) 14 - Planning and Planning Process 15 - Vertical and Horizontal Integration 17 - Learning and Diffusion
4	**POLITICS AND POLICY**	1 - Tenure (Rights of access, Degrees of rights) 4 - Framework (Policy, Legislation, Institutions)
5	**RESOURCE BASE**	6 - Nature of Resource Base (Demand / Resource Ratios) 9 - Competing land uses 13 - Conservation / biodiversity impacts 12 - Adaptive Management (Monitoring / Feedback)
6	**OUTSIDERS**	5 - External Inputs (Funding, Technical support, Training) 4 - Planning and planning process
7	**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**	2 - Cost Benefit 3 - Participation 11 - Incentives
8	**STAND-ALONE ISSUES**	16 - Community conservation and protected areas 18 - Objectives

3.2 Analysis of Topics

3.2.1 Local Capacity *(Group 1)*

Local capacity, defined as the ability of a producer community to manage and derive benefit in a sustainable manner, is central to the success of any CWM programme. The development of local capacity is dependent on the following

Participation: In CWM participation occurs at several different levels. In the first instance there is participation within the community itself which is the level of input (activity, time or even money) that community members are willing to commit to their programme. To a large extent, this commitment is dependent on the degree of community cohesion (see below) and the perceived benefits of the programme. In the initial stages potential benefits may not be apparent and this may explain why few, if any, CWM projects in the region have been initiated by communities without outside stimulation and assistance.

Secondly, there is participation by persons or private sector outfits from outside the community. In much of the region CWM relies on joint venture or lease arrangements with the private sector and the level of commitment and participation of these partners can be

critical to its success. In Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe considerable emphasis has been placed on developing private sector/community joint ventures. Experience has shown that it is the level of personal commitment and participation (as opposed to level of financial commitment) on the part of the private operator that most enhances local capacity.

Thirdly, the role of NGOs has been essential to the development of CWM in the region. There is, however, a delicate balance between the NGO as a catalyst for CWM and the NGO as the implementer of CWM. As a catalyst the NGO confines itself to limited strategic technical or funding interventions with little role in respect of management decisions: as an implementer the NGO manages funding and technical inputs with significant influence on management decisions and community management institutions.

Finally, there is the state as a participant (see section 3.2.7). The attitude of state bureaucracies to devolution constitutes a critical factor. The level of state resources committed to CWM initiatives may also significantly influence the development of local capacity.

Nature of Resource Base: The nature of the resource base and the abundance of resources in relation to human populations is a factor in developing local capacity. In those areas of Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe where wildlife is abundant, communities which have a long tradition of *de facto* management of wildlife resources are considerably more advanced than other communities where resources are scarce and population demand/resource ratios are high.

Communal Cohesion: In any society or community the level of cohesion is directly relevant to decision-making and hence the capacity of any group to manage. In southern Africa this cohesion was historically related to cultural homogeneity. However, while homogeneity may reinforce communal cohesion, it is not the only factor involved and, in certain resettled communities in Zimbabwe and Mozambique, heterogeneous communities exhibit high degrees of cohesion where incentives for collective action override sectional interests.

Local Governance: The issue of good governance is central to CWM in the region and forms much of the debate around institution building and capacity building. One of the difficulties with governance is its variability. Where traditional systems are used it may be the difference between a good or a bad chief ☝ the highly autocratic chieftaincy system used by the ADMADE programme in Zambia does little to enhance local capacity. A national structure such as a district council or, in Mozambique a *Chefe de Posto*, may be equally deficient in building capacity and highly dependent on individuals in office. The absence of meaningful local governance in Mozambique impacts negatively on local capacities. In contrast, certain enlightened district councils in Zimbabwe have been responsible for major development of local capacity as a result of their willingness to devolve responsibilities to the communities within their purview. In order to counteract this inherent variability, many CWM initiatives in the region have attempted to rely on democratically elected institutions ☝ however these may also function poorly when the communities have a preference for traditional systems.

3.2.2 Economic Factors *(Group 2)*

Economics has played a central role in the development of CWM in southern Africa. Regionally there is broad acceptance that wildlife is best conserved when it is given a focussed value and benefits are accrued by those who bear the cost of its production. In Zimbabwe, the legal granting of rights firstly to private and then to communal landholders to manage and benefit from wildlife has resulted in successful conservation of wildlife outside protected areas. This principle is fairly universally accepted in the region even if there are differences in its application in the different countries. The following issues are viewed as important in analysing the economic factors of CWM in the region.

Nature of Resource Base: The nature of the resource base, its abundance and the demand-to-resource ratio affects the use of the resource and the financial return to the community. The relationship of the resource base to other variables determines the level of importance placed by a community on wildlife management as an economic activity. In most of Malawi, South Africa and much of Zimbabwe human population densities and a loss of wildlife habitat have resulted in communities turning to alternative land uses where CWM is no longer an option.

Where communities have an abundance of wildlife or access to wildlife (eg communities that border protected areas) a wide range of use options is available. The potential incomes from wildlife as a land use are given on page 4 and most successful CWM initiatives in southern Africa have come about where there is sufficient wildlife to provide the base for safari hunting operations. In the most favourable situations (e.g. the Nyaminyami community on the shore of Lake Kariba in Zimbabwe) the potential exists for both photographic and hunting tourism operations. Safari hunting is generally the preferred use where resources are less abundant or where the area is remote. The Kanayurira community in Zimbabwe recently entered the market for sale of live animals with a translocation of roan antelope to a

commercial farm. In areas where wildlife populations are low and human densities are high, use tends to be confined to low levels of subsistence hunting but it is has to be accepted that this form of wildlife use is of low income earning potential and is unlikely ever to form a sustainable CWM initiative. In certain situations communities may possess wildlife resources of great value even if at low densities - as in north west Namibia. A general rule which has been found to apply is that once human densities exceed about 20 persons per square kilometre very little wildlife survives and there is no potential for wildlife as an economic form of land use (Parker and Graham, 1989).

Markets and Economic Incentives: An important component of any successful CWM initiative is the marketing of the product. Good marketing will realise a higher per capita return at the community level and provide the necessary economic incentive. This incentive can be very powerful where income derived from wildlife supplements or exceeds the marginal subsistence income derived from crops and livestock. The markets for CWM products are

MARKETS FOR WILDLIFE					
	Meat, Hides, Products	Sale of Live Animals	Sport Hunting	Eco-Tourism	Mass Tourism
LOCAL	Subsistence requirements	None	None	None	None
NATIONAL	Biltong, venison, skins, ivory, horn	Strong demand from private sector for restocking	Strong demand from national sport hunters	Significant interest in wilderness trails, wild safaris	Citizens unlikely to seek mass wildlife tourism
REGIONAL	Markets limited by veterinary constraints	Strong demand from private sector	Strong demand from regional sport hunters	Growing market - largely from South Africa	May develop in some State Protected Areas
INTER-NATIONAL	Large potential market for ivory, rhino horn, elephant hide, ostrich products, crocodile skin etc but constrained by CITES treaty.	Huge market for birds, reptiles, fish and amphibians in international pet trade. Growing market for large mammals in Asia and Arab States.	Strong demand from USA and Europe. Robust market, less vulnerable to political factors than non-hunting tourism.	Rapidly growing market but vulnerable to political factors	Already affecting State Protected Areas, unlikely to affect CWM. Also vulnerable to political factors .

A principle adopted in much of southern Africa is that wildlife should be allowed to attain its highest market value. The principle holds that where tenurial rights are secure, high financial returns from wildlife result in enhanced conservation and sustainable use. The problem faced by most CWM initiatives in the region are the economic disincentives that are attached by government or local authorities through misguided conservation motives or through the variety of percentages and levies retained by governments and local authorities from wildlife revenues. These retentions are effectively a preferential tax on wildlife where there is no similar form of taxation on domestic livestock. Additional biases acting to prevent wildlife from realising its full potential as a land use arise through international treaties such as CITES.

3.2.3 Management *(Group 3)*

The management component of CWM is where socio-economic considerations are combined with the reality of the nature of the resource base. The planning process needs to consider long term objectives with an adaptive management component that allows for the fine tuning of the initiative.

Local Governance: A key factor in management is the extent to which local governing institutions represent the needs and wishes of producer communities in the planning and management process. There are a variety of governance regimes in the region, some more representative than others. Where a local authority is representative of community perspectives, meaningful participation and community cohesion is achieved. However this is never a static state and there is a continuous dynamic within the community and between

levels of authority. Even if conflicts occur from time to time, this dynamic can be healthy and result in strengthened institutions and increased local capacity.

Adaptive Management: Adaptive management is effectively a trial and error process which allows for progress in managing extremely complex systems fraught with uncertainties and surprises. Its value is not limited to the management of biological systems: when the full range of factors impinging on resource management (including socio-economic and political factors) are consciously included in the experiment, adaptive management provides the learning basis for revisions of policy and technical management. Experience in the region has shown that the process of adaptive management with its negative feedback loop is essential for the sustainability of CWM. The dynamic nature of rural communities and the resource base requires an approach that allows for fine tuning as the programme develops. The principle of adaptive management was incorporated early into the CAMPFIRE programme and has allowed the programme to adapt to changing circumstances. A major component of the USAID funded Natural Resource Management Programme in the southern African region involves the use of adaptive management in its monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

Planning and Planning Process: A great danger in CWM is the development of blueprint programmes that stifle local initiative, incur considerable costs in money and time and ultimately fail. These programmes are generally donor driven and are developed to meet a set of objectives not necessarily shared by the recipients of the plan. There are several examples of this in the region but perhaps the most extreme examples are found in Mozambique where some programmes (such as the coordinated donor Investment Programme for Forestry and Wildlife) have been in the planning stage for more than five years. For planning to be effective in CWM it needs to be recognised as a process where the principal planning is done by the community at the producer level and all other institutions including government and donors are subordinate in this planning process. This is often operationally difficult when programmes are conceived at a national or donor level and when the controls over tenurial rights are held at national levels. Ironically, in contrast to the centralised planning taking place in the capital (Maputo), Mozambique also has one of the best examples in the region of a programme that was initiated at a community level and is now influencing policy and planning at a provincial and national level (the Tchuma Tchato programme in Tete Province).

Vertical and Horizontal Integration: Closely allied to the planning process is the relationship which CWM structures enjoy with other community based initiatives and with district institutions and NGOs. Integrating with other structures enhances local capacities and allows for conflict resolution. In its early stages, CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe suffered some setbacks because the programme was insufficiently integrated with mainstream government departments operating in communal lands. In southern African situations, often the required integration will not happen until a programme has official political blessing from a high level.

Learning and Diffusion: Under adaptive management, a logical result of monitoring and feedback is a learning and diffusion process. In southern Africa several institutions have been established to assist in this diffusion and exchanges between CWM programmes have

proved very useful to the learning experience at community level (e.g. Tchuma Tchato in Mozambique and Masoka in Zimbabwe).

3.2.4 Politics and Policy (Group 4)

The political context in which CWM occurs varies considerably from country to country in the region. Policy in itself does not need to be comprehensive or prescriptive. However, it does need to establish an enabling environment by determining the rights of access to resources and the degree to which those rights may be applied. In Zimbabwe a simple policy that supported sustainable utilisation as a means for conserving wildlife and an instrument of legislation that enabled the state management agency to devolve its authority resulted in the CAMPFIRE programme. It may be argued that CAMPFIRE was a catalyst for many other similar initiatives that followed in the region.

Differences in policy and politics are well contrasted in the Namibian and Mozambican case studies. In Namibia there is a well-structured programme where the enabling policies and legislation are in place ☝ a situation where the framework has been established and awaits the development of community based initiatives within that framework. In Mozambique community based initiatives are running ahead of the policy and legal framework (in this regard the early community initiatives in Mozambique could be viewed as illegal), so that the policy makers and legislators are using the *de facto* community initiatives as the basis for the enabling policy. In Zimbabwe, Namibia and, to a lesser extent Zambia, policy became a legal instrument that enabled the devolution of tenure rights to sub-national levels. Once again the issue of tenure is key for CWM.

Tenure: In all cases in the southern African region, CWM initiatives are occurring in a period where the issues of land tenure, the rights of rural communities and community involvement are high on the political agenda. In South Africa and Mozambique this comes after a period of political instability where the issues reflected in CWM become components of a larger human rights debate. In Zimbabwe the debate is more one of economic empowerment, often with a struggle for the control of resources by stakeholders such as the state, private land owners and rural communities.

Tenure can be regarded as the extent to which an individual or community has rights of access to a resource and the degree of those rights. The right of access and the degree varies greatly between different countries in the region with much of the variability being shaped by

colonial history. In most cases private land use regimes have enjoyed secure tenure and rights of access to resources: only recently have similar rights been accorded to communal land use systems often with restrictions and conditions attached to them. An example of this is where a rural community has tenurial rights of access to wildlife that allow it to sell trophy animals to a private hunting operator but they are not allowed to hunt themselves. The regional experience is that tenure enhances sustainability when ☝

- rights of access are clearly defined and accepted;
- the ability to enforce those rights exists; and
- the unit of management and accountability is small and functionally efficient.

Policy, Legislation and Institutional Framework: To achieve the above requires a policy and institutional framework in most cases. The institutional and legislative contexts of wildlife programmes in southern Africa cover a wide range, the extremes of which would be typified by Mozambique and Namibia. A comprehensive policy such as Namibias is desirable but, as other countries have shown, is not essential. What is essential in all cases is an enabling approach for the devolution of authority and an institutional framework that allows for multi-sectoral participation in the development of CWM programmes. The role played by NGOs in the development of CAMPFIRE is a case where a highly collaborative institutional framework facilitated the development of the programme.

3.2.5 Resource Base (Group 5)

Nature of the resource base: The relationship between human population densities and the abundance of resources determines the potential and viability of CWM. Highly populated communal lands that border protected areas in Malawi will not realise the same return that the wilderness areas of the Zambezi valley can offer to communities in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique. Generally, wildlife management projects cease to be feasible when human densities exceed 20/km^2.

The range of large wild mammal species present in the project area is also economically important when the main community income is derived from sport hunting. The presence of elephant, buffalo and lion make the difference between financial returns which are less than US$1/ha without these species to as much as US$5/ha which can be realised when they are part of the hunting quota.

Many CWM projects will never function as major drawcards for high quality ecotourism because of the nature and degree of modification of the landscape. For such areas, international safari hunting offers the highest possible return from land. Exceptions are where there are low human population densities in ecosystems which possess outstanding scenic features such as the Okavango swamps in Botswana and the desert landscapes of north-western Namibia.

Competing Land Uses: The greatest threat to biological diversity in southern African and CWM programmes is the conversion of wild lands to other uses primarily agriculture and livestock. Despite the fact that returns from wildlife as a land use may be potentially higher than those from cattle and subsistence cropping on poor soils, strong traditions of land use, lack of familiarity or awareness of wildlife values, and numerous disincentives posed by governments will result in the preference for the lower yielding land use.

Often abnormal influxes of immigrants into historically sparsely populated areas will result in the conversion to agricultural land use. In two districts in Zimbabwe (Lower Guruve and Northern Gokwe) the CWM option was foreclosed in some communities by immigration and the conversion of wild land. In Botswana the traditional dominance of the cattle industry has also foreclosed CWM options for some communities both through veterinary measures which have eliminated wildlife and through the degradation of wild habitats caused by overstocking of cattle.

In Mozambique the rehabilitation of state protected areas has the potential to foreclose CWM options. Almost every protected wildlife area in the country has resident human populations following the civil war and the potential exists to create a new generation of national parks with effective management by local peoples if bureaucracies can shed themselves of traditional conservation baggage. In this context, it seems futile to create new protected areas ✍ yet current initiatives to develop transborder megaparks extending into neighbouring South Africa and Zimbabwe are being pursued at the moment with very little consideration of the tenurial rights of local communities. Such protected areas will have the short term effect of further marginalising rural peoples through appropriating their resources and, in the longer term, the lack of support from these communities is likely to cause the failure of the projects.

Conservation and Biodiversity Impacts: Some detractors of CWM programmes in southern Africa argue that by assigning monetary value to wild resources and using them consumptively they will be quickly mined to extinction. Nowhere in the region is there any evidence that this assumption is true. In most cases the opposite applies: where private landholders have been accorded sweeping rights over their wildlife it has resulted in conservation successes. When similar rights have been granted to rural communities they have shown themselves to be conservative in their approach to use. In the Sebungwe region of Zimbabwe regular aerial surveys of elephant populations have shown an upward trend in numbers in the past 8 years following a period of marked decline prior to the inception of CAMPFIRE.

One large mammal species - the black rhino - has suffered a catastrophic decline in the region (Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe) but this has come about because no legal financial value was attached to the species, the special protection afforded to the species through legislation effectively removed the incentives for local communities to conserve it and the largest numbers occurred in unsettled state protected areas where state agencies were incapable of protecting it (indeed, they may have assisted in its decline).

For this reason a motivation by state authorities to devolve rights to communities is based on the realisation that conservation and the protection of biological diversity is better achieved through a CWM process rather than through enforcement of restrictive national legislation. It is recognised that CWM will have possibly negative impacts in some areas. However, the long term impact can be expected to be on balance positive in comparison to the short term alternative that leads to the conversion of wild areas to agricultural activities and a loss of wildlife and biological diversity.

Adaptive Management: The use of adaptive management in monitoring and correcting management practices has worked well in the CAMPFIRE programme. Several CWM initiatives in the region now have resource monitoring programmes being implemented by communities. In some cases where this wildlife monitoring has been in place for several years the communities are actively managing hunting quotas with an emphasis on attaining a high degree of trophy quality even where this results in offtakes which are well below the maximum sustainable yield. The concept of adaptive management is not new to many communities in southern Africa as traditional management regimes have through necessity involved adaptation to environmental changes especially for those living in arid regions such as the Himba people in north west Namibia. Adaptive management in CWM is not only a

response to environmental changes: the development of CWM has shown how adaptive management has been applied to changing social, political and economic situations.

The success of CWM in southern Africa has largely been due to an avoidance of a prescriptive science that would result in rigid blueprint programmes and the employing of an adaptive process which has permitted these initiatives to respond to rapidly changing social, political, economic and even environmental conditions in the region over the last decade.

3.2.6 External Influences (Outsiders - Group 6)

This topic is intended to include external factors that influence CWM such as funding, technical support and training. While external issues tend not to be core to the long-term success and sustainability of CWM, they have a considerable influence on its development and, when positive, act as a catalyst.

Funding and Technical Support: Most CWM programmes benefit when stimulated by limited strategic funding. For most rural communities, entering into new forms of land use entails risk and few peoples who live on survival threshold are prepared to take risks which place their survival in jeopardy. An important aspect of funding is to cushion to the risks which the community may be expected to absorb. In all cases funding applied strategically to provide technical services, specialised technical interventions and expertise is important especially in the initial stages. However, it is important that such funding should not attempt to meet the recurrent expenditure of the project other than in the early stages of development. Funding provided for training and information dissemination has been successful e.g. the regional publication ACTION Magazine is developing new materials for CWM programmes and is distributing materials in several languages to schools throughout the region. In several cases funding has been provided to communities to enable them to share experiences by visiting other programmes and this has often resulted in increased community confidence in their own CWM.

Funding may have negative impacts that lead to avoidable donor dependencies. A broad analysis of project funding in CWM reveals a phenomenon whereby a high level of donor funding and technical support appears to be inversely related to success of the project. Successful CWM initiatives such as those at Chikwarakwara, Masoka and Mahenye in Zimbabwe have received very little in terms of external funding and it may well be argued that **no CWM project in southern Africa has ever failed due to a lack of funding**. In contrast, there are districts in Zimbabwe where CAMPFIRE projects have been the recipient of more funding than was necessary which resulted in development of infrastructure and institutions with high overhead costs. Instead of the CWM project resulting in high individual dividends, most of the potential earnings for the community are swallowed up in overhead costs. There is growing evidence supported by this study that shows how some of the larger regional programmes (such as the USAID - NRMP) may achieve results at a policy and national institutional level but tend not to be as successful at district and sub-district level. The larger programmes with their rigid structures, annual work plans, semi-annual reports and log frames are not adaptable to community institutions and time scales.

Planning and Planning Process: Further to the funding of CWM is the planning and planning process used in developing projects and programmes. Accepting that CWM does

not happen spontaneously but is generally the result of planning that occurs at a national level which, in turn, may be influenced by planning at the international level, the success of a CWM initiative is often determined by a fine balance between planning and process. Placing too great an emphasis on prior planning is not as likely to result in a successful CWM venture as is the early initiation of community projects under an adaptive management approach. It is essential that rural peoples develop their management skills through hands-on experience in real project implementation where mistakes are not seen as failures of the project but rather as milestones in a learning process.

Two of the oldest CAMPFIRE communities (Mahenye and Chikwarakwara) in Zimbabwe developed a very strong CWM programme in the absence of any external planning or funding. A successful community based initiative requires a flexible process-orientated system and this has to be adversely set against the desire of most donor agencies, government departments and local administrations to have blueprint plans with a clearly stated set of objectives, indicators and outputs in a defined time frame. Time is an important consideration in this as the planning and planning process becomes determined by a calendar established in Washington, London or Oslo which is determined by the budgetary cycles of each donor government. For the rural community, time operates on an agricultural, environmental and societal calendar that bears no resemblance to the donor calendar. To address, this programmes often attempt to incorporate the community into the donor time frame by drawing the community into the planning process and if necessary creating a new institution at the community level. It is interesting to note that even after 10 years of well documented and researched CWM in southern Africa, the major donors and government departments continue to gravitate towards establishing inappropriate and prescriptive type programmes.

For CWM external factors are not confined to the donor community but also include the planning and administrative activities of central or local government. The greatest concern in this regard is the extent to which the state sees itself as the planner and implementer of CWM. Further difficulties occur when state authorities view themselves as rightful beneficiaries of revenues derived from community based programmes (as in Mozambique and Zambia). The struggle between state and local authorities and rural communities will continue as long as tenure is assigned to a level other than the community. Only in Namibia, where tenure has been assigned to the community level, is there a high probability that is conflict will be avoided.

3.2.7 Cross Cutting Issues *(Group 7)*

Three interrelated cross cutting issues have been identified in this analysis of CWM:

Cost / Benefit: The costs and benefits of CWM may be economic, social or ecological. In economic terms this relates primarily to the level of return for the level of investment in competition with other forms of land use. Given the bias against wildlife management as a land use through pricing structures and market distortions created by subsidised agriculture, CWM often fails on a purely economic cost/benefit analysis.

The social cost/benefit of CWM is analysed as the effort and inputs required by a community that will significantly enhance its status. This may include enhanced standards of living based on improved education, health, crop production and disposable income. It may include

important cultural, spiritual and aesthetic benefits. It may also include the political status and influence of a community within a district or province: a community that can secure political status can attract additional state or NGO investment. These motivating factors are often considered more thoroughly at a community level than the purely economic cost/benefit issue.

The ecological cost/benefit ratio is ultimately a factor which will decide the sustainability of all CWM ventures. Use which is unsustainable can only be justified on a temporary basis. In certain situations for sound socio-economic reasons it may be beneficial for a community to use resources at levels that are known to be unsustainable. This should be a finite situation which is justified on the grounds that the short term ecological cost will pay in long term gains.

Participation: Essentially participation is the process whereby all valid stakeholders are able to pursue their interests with a minimum of mutually subtractive influences. The level of participation is determined by a combination of cost/ benefit motivations such as financial reward or political power combined with incentives that may be tenurial or institutional.

STAKEHOLDERS
State and state management authorities.
Non governmental organisations, donors, and academic institutions
Private commercial land owners
Private commercial resource users (hunting and non-hunting)
Rural communities (in *de facto* or *de jure* communal tenure)

Management of wildlife is an interaction of various stakeholders. The stakeholder most influential to wildlife management in southern Africa remains the state. The state largely determines the level of activity of other stakeholders such as safari/tourism operators, rural communities and private landholders. This control of activity level is not an indicator of the effectiveness of state control over direct management or use of any resource and, in many instances, the state has shown itself to be a poor manager of land and resources in southern Africa. The interaction between stakeholders is in a constant state of flux with both positive and negative effects on resource management. This has corresponding implications for the manner in which the interest groups interact and the perceptions each has of the others.

Incentives: The incentives for CWM will vary at different levels - at the national level the incentive may be the attraction of donor funding for a government department or a need to meet national conservation objectives. Local incentives may include securing tenurial rights and political status. Equally there are disincentives to CWM such as market distortions that favour other forms of land use.

The provision of incentives which will contribute to sustainable use of wild resources is seen as a key focus by the SUSG of the IUCN. It is almost exclusively the State who has the power to provide such incentives and some of the more effective government actions should include

- the recognition of wildlife management, not merely as an acceptable form of land use, but rather as a preferred form of land use;

- co-ordination amongst government agencies responsible for resources to ensure that conflicting agendas are not prejudicing the development of wildlife as a land use;

- the removal of market distortions which favour lower valued land uses (e.g. subsidies to the cattle industry);

- the streamlining of bureaucracy in permit issuance and project approval which acts as a disincentive to the development of the wildlife industry;

- collaboration and co-operation with NGOs and the private sector in community development based on natural resources;

- the promotion of wildlife populations outside the SPAs through the translocation of breeding nuclei of selected species from SPAs to new initiatives at economical rates;

- the expenditure of government funds on research which will benefit the wildlife industry; and

- the defence of wildlife producer communities rights in international treaties such as CITES.

3.2.8 Stand Alone Issues *(Group 8)*

Two stand-alone issues have been identified in the analysis. These are

Community Conservation and Protected Areas: It is an inescapable fact that the vast majority of CWM projects border on state protected areas. The explanation is not difficult to find: the immediate environs around SPAs tend to contain significant wildlife populations and these provide the starting point for community management. If human densities are high, the CWM project tends to rely almost entirely on animals emigrating from the parks which, although less satisfactory than project areas which have their own resident wildlife populations, nevertheless assists in the management of overabundant animals within the SPA.

Amongst the increasingly enlightened approaches which are developing in wild resource management, the next quantum leap that needs to occur in southern Africa is the devolution of control of national protected areas to lower levels such as provinces and districts. As yet we are unaware of any example where an attempt has been made to devolve the management of a national park o its surrounding communities so allowing them to derive the majority of benefits from it. The arguments in favour of a such a bold experiment become increasingly stronger as the failures of state wildlife agencies in the region (and throughout Africa) become more and more general. An opportunity may exist for Mozambique to become the pioneer in this process since all of its state protected areas contain resident communities to a lesser or greater extent.

Relationships of neighbouring communities with SPAs are of particular importance in South Africa where several communities have land claims in National Parks. This situation is likely to lead to a new form of investment and commitment by park authorities to CWM. In such circumstances communities will need to be incorporated as shareholders rather that seen as just beneficiaries.

Objectives: On simple inspection, the objectives of most CWM projects would appear self-evident. The overarching goal of CWM must be to improve the quality of life of the community involved. However, there are often mixed motives or objectives belonging to those who are promoting CWM. Many see CWM simply as a mechanism to ensure the integrity of State Protected Areas. While this may be an outcome, it seems an imperfect objective. Where the management of wildlife genuinely offers a community the highest-valued or optimum form of land use, then it would appear an acceptable motivation to assist the community to realise that form of land use. During the synthesis workshop the various objectives and time frames imposed by projects and donors were also recognised to have a significant impact on CWM

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Impacts and Achievements of Community Wildlife Management

Jones, in his report on Botswana and Namibia, makes the following observations relevant to examining the impacts and achievements of CWM in southern Africa

There are in any case dangers in trying to categorise individual projects in a particular way at any given time. Community-based projects are dynamic and levels of participation and institutional relationships change over time. In the reality of field-based activities, projects do not always start with the level of full community participation desired by theory, but increased participation often develops as the project progresses, provided that outside agencies apply an adaptive management approach which is constantly aiming at promoting the fullest participation possible. Much the same is true in terms of community dynamics. It is part of the nature of many community-based projects that factions and groupings within communities gain temporary dominance of decision-making and benefit distribution at one particular time. The test of the success of the project lies more in the extent to which accountability and change is possible rather than which grouping is dominant at any given time. Many of the community-based projects in southern Africa now considered successful, might have been abandoned long ago, if strict criteria based on theory alone concerning the level of participation, institutional relationships or community dynamics, had been applied.

Following this approach, it is necessary to conclude that CWM in southern Africa has had significant impacts on the development of natural resource management regimes at national levels and added significantly to the sustainable use debate at the international level. CAMPFIRE has done much to heighten awareness and increase interest in CWM both regionally and globally. This has led to increased investment (USAID has provided in excess of US$100 million for community-based natural resource management in the region) with corresponding donor interest in support of CWM as a means of achieving rural development and conservation objectives.

Zambia and Zimbabwe have had a longer experience with CWM than the other countries in the region. The WWF regional office in Zimbabwe in particular has developed an extensive database on the CAMPFIRE programme which indicates statistically some of the achievements.

(1) By 1993 the total area under CWM in Zimbabwe through participating CAMPFIRE wards had reached 32,530 km^2 which is about 20% of the total communal land area in Zimbabwe. The total area of the districts which have appropriate authority to manage wildlife is 71,493 km^2 - about half of all communal land in Zimbabwe.

ZIMBABWE
Area Under Communal Wildlife Management

YEAR	AREA (in hectares)
1980	0 ha
1989	770 017 ha
1993	3 253 003 ha

(2) Appropriate Authority status to manage wildlife was granted to the first two districts in Zimbabwe in 1988. By 1993 twelve districts had joined CAMPFIRE. The number of actively participating people in the programme had risen to slightly less than one-half million by 1993 which is about 5% of the total human population.

ZIMBABWE
Number of people involved in CAMPFIRE

YEAR	NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING DISTRICTS	NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING PEOPLE
1989	2	61 432
1993	12	438 788

(3) The income earned by rural communities from CAMPFIRE has also increased dramatically since the start of the programme. Now at slightly less than Z$20 million, this represents an individual annual income of about Z$40 per person or some Z$240 per household.

ZIMBABWE - Income derived under CAMPFIRE

YEAR	EARNINGS Z$	EXCHANGE RATE	EARNINGS US$
1989	743 699	US$1 = Z$2	$148 793
1993	9 606 767	US$1 = Z$7	$1 372 823
1996	17 175 775	US$1 = Z$10	$1 717 577

The focus of CWM activities on rural development and community 'empowerment' is an important consideration when trying to evaluate the success of these projects from a conservation perspective. Ultimately, conservationists will judge them by the extent to which wild habitats and biological diversity have been maintained or improved. But before these results are reached, rural people need to be empowered to manage their resources and need to be able to reap the benefits of sustainable management. Particularly in the early stages, CWM projects must therefore be judged on the extent to which empowerment and the development of successful common property resource management institutions are achieved.

In support of the position taken by Jones that the real strength of CWM lies in the process rather than the product, the Mozambique report in analysing the Tchuma Tchato project demonstrates how a successful CWM process can develop into a much broader economic and resource management programme. This sentiment was expressed by a by a community member at a workshop in 1996 :

We are now citizens who own or at least have control over our land and the benefits that come from using it. Government is becoming a partner in our development and officials in our area are starting to feel that they should work for our benefit. The company that hunts in our area is also becoming our partner. And all this means that in the eyes of our neighbours in Zimbabwe and Zambia we are no longer refugees, poor cousins whose land is no-mans land where anyone can do as they want. We are also now people in our own right.

Such statements encapsulate the impacts of CWM in southern Africa which have been considerable and go well beyond purely conservation issues into the realm of human rights, democracy and constitutional reform.

4.2 Strengths and Weaknesses in Existing Knowledge

The development of CWM has only occurred in the last ten years in southern Africa. During this period significant achievements have been made in the implementation of programmes in the region. Even where considerable research has been done, new approaches and new situations will require continued monitoring, evaluation and understanding. Nowhere can the existing knowledge be considered complete. The table below assesses the strengths and weaknesses in existing knowledge.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN EXISTING KNOWLEDGE

SUBJECT	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments
Tenure	❄				Well researched, principles established, monitoring systems in place
Cost/Benefit	❄				
Policy	❄				Well studied - great variability in the region
Legislation	❄				Derived from policy, required components well identified, considerable variability in the region
Institutions		❄❄			A good understanding of institutions but situational differences need considerable work
Resource Base		❄			Well researched and understood but still a need for biological diversity inventory
Resource Management		❄			Well researched, but deeper understanding of management at the ecosystem level required. Skills need to be developed at community level.
Land Use		❄			Well studied but a dynamic issue responding to a large number of environmental, socio-economic and political variables
Community Development		❄			Well understood and developing fast in CWM. Still suffers from reliance on classic approaches
Political Economy				❄❄	Poorly understood and accounted for in CWM. Highly important in the stakeholder analysis - will receive greater attention in South Africa.
Training		❄			Several good initiatives in the region - Namibia and Zimbabwe well developed
Funding		❄❄			Lessons are being learned by both donors and recipients but same mistakes are often repeated
Technical Support		❄			Management and level of technical support good. Application of strategic inputs is still developing
Adaptive Management		❄			Well understood - often difficult to apply. Ongoing requirement in all systems
Planning			❄		Variable in region - appropriate planning mechanisms need development
Markets			❄❄		Well studied but dynamic and poorly understood especially at community level
Participation		❄			Elements are understood but application needs development.
International Influences			❄❄		Influence of international community and the effects of treaties such as CITES and CBD need greater attention

❄❄ - Indicates a Research Priority

4.3 Region Specific Perspectives

USE - is the derivation of benefit from a wild natural resource in one or more of the following respects

- economic or financial
- social or cultural
- political
- ecological

SUSTAINABLE USE - is use that allows for the continued derivation of benefit.

As such, there are no valid distinctions between

- consumptive and non-consumptive use
- commercial and subsistence use
- conservation and sustainable use

In any geographical region there will be differing perspectives on issues such as resource use. Fundamental concepts of sustainable use have been developed in southern Africa (SASUSG 1997) which underpin the regional approach to CWM. The diversity of perspectives and approaches has allowed for a rich variety of CWM initiatives to develop and there are several key perspectives that separate the region from others

- CWM in southern Africa has occurred in an environment of intellectual development that has run contrary to the position taken by the majority of western conservationists. Despite the fact that the concept of adaptive management was developed in the Northern Hemisphere (Hollings 1971) it seems that it has taken root in southern Africa to a far greater extent than in its country of origin. Adaptive management challenges the predictive and prescriptive science followed by most western technical specialists. This approach has considerable implications for international treaties like CITES and the CBD where north/south differences stem from fundamentally different approaches in the application of science to resource management.

- In southern Africa management and conservation are focussed at the ecosystem level rather than at the species level, with the emphasis being placed on monitoring overall biological diversity rather than species population levels. The classical approach to sustainable use in the Northern Hemisphere assumes stable environments and concentrates on species and carrying capacity. This introduces a completely different set of management objectives to those in southern Africa and partly explains the differing perceptions of conservation epitomised by the recent debate on the trade in African elephant products at CITES.

- In southern Africa little distinction is made between consumptive and non-consumptive forms of use: more important are the relative impacts of the various forms of use at the ecosystem level. This is not simply an issue of semantics but a significant philosophical difference to approaches in western countries and frequently places southern Africa in an adversarial position.

- A common and often repetitive theme in this study is the importance of tenure in natural resource management and sustainable use. Successful CWM requires governments to decentralise and devolve land and resource tenure rights to the lowest accountable and functionally efficient units of society. Here, too, is an area of potential conflict with western worldviews. For those that are familiar with the situation where the State manages and controls all wild resources (as in the USA), it is frequently difficult to assimilate the concept of alternative tenure systems.

Like tenure, the role of economics is central to CWM in southern Africa. The primary principle is simply to create and environment whereby rural communities are in a position to benefit economically from the use of their wildlife resources. In order to achieve this it is necessary to remove economic disincentives and distortions (such as cattle subsidies) to enable CWM to be a competitive land use.

4.4 Provisional Policy Lessons

It is beyond the scope and authority of this study to suggest amendments to any specific regional policy on CWM. However, this study has drawn on and expressed key principles that need to be applied by policy makers in determining or developing new policy or legislation. These principles have been applied broadly in the region and may act as a reference for policy makers and implementers

- Effective management of natural resources is best achieved by giving the resource a focussed value. To determine whether the benefit of managing a resource exceeds the cost, the resource must have a measurable value to the community.

- Differential inputs must result in differential benefits: those communities living with the resource and thus bearing a higher cost should receive higher benefits than those who do not bear the cost.

- There must be a positive correlation between the quality of management and the magnitude of derived benefits: an incentive for good management must reward greater investment in the resource with greater benefits.

- The unit of proprietorship (i.e. who decides ?) should be the same as the unit of production, management and benefit: the group which manages the resource should also form the local management institution.

- The unit of proprietorship should be as small as practicable: smaller social groups are better at managing themselves and the resource than large anonymous institutions.

Based on these principles, a sound policy for CWM will have three interrelated components:

(1) Political and Institutional - a simple policy statement that allows the state to devolve authority to the community level (currently this exists only in Namibia). This allows for the development of institutions at the community level that will assume functions currently performed by state agencies. It also should allow for the development and participation of NGOs and the private sector in CWM.

(2) Resource Tenure - a simple policy statement that accords unconditional access to and management rights over wildlife and land to rural communities. This should be done without restriction in order to prevent subsequent market distortions. For state authorities this is very difficult, the assumption being that over-use and extinction will result if rights are given unconditionally. The error in this assumption lies in the delusion that the state has adequate management or control capacity. In all cases should a rural community

wish to exploit their wildlife to extinction there is little that the state can or will do to prevent this.

(3) Economic - The policy should act to remove economic distortions that favour other forms of land use such as cattle. This component should provide for the total economic empowerment of rural communities allowing them freedom to use wildlife as an economic asset. The policy should also encourage the participation of private sector investment in CWM.

In summary, policy may be viewed as the first step in a process of legislative reform. The use of policy alone is generally not sufficient to accord secure rights to communities and CWM in the region has suffered through programmes which have cobbled together differing pieces of legislation, parts of policy statements and sundry documents for the purpose of implementation. Often policy is not even documented but determined by a group within a government department, ministry or ruling political party. This type of policy obviously is unstable and highly subject to change. Only in Namibia has there been a concerted effort to rationalise written policy with legislative reform and CWM - with the result that the Namibian legal and policy framework is now the most advanced in the region. Its drawbacks are that, unlike Mozambique policy, it has not evolved in response to community demands and still retains a significant degree of government technical controls. In Zimbabwe a simple policy and legal instrument that enabled the development of CAMPFIRE has changed little in 10 years but pressures from rural communities for the further devolution of power from district to community levels may result in change. In South Africa policy development has been consultative and has become linked to national reconstruction, political reform and the resolution of land disputes.

4.5 The Future of Community Wildlife Management in Southern Africa

Certain observations made by Jones in relation to Botswana and Namibia are largely relevant to all the countries in the region

An important feature of both national programmes is the diversification away from wildlife and wildlife-related tourism as income-generating activities, and the focus on sustainable resource management. Although wildlife and tourism still form the basis of many of the CBNRM activities, the government, communities and other implementers have realised the interrelatedness of natural resource use and placed considerable emphasis on diversification, focussing also on veld products and forest products. This diversification is important for spreading risk in terms of income generation and is also crucial to the ability of communities to make trade offs in deciding how to use their land.

Another important feature of CBNRM activities in Botswana and Namibia is the strength of the focus on rural development. A considerable amount of time is spent on carrying out socio-economic surveys, Participatory Rural Appraisals, developing community enterprises, facilitating community decision-making and institution building - all activities which would normally be associated with a rural development project rather than a wildlife conservation programme. Many of the CBNRM activities being carried out in Botswana and Namibia do not have traditional conservation objectives such as biodiversity conservation or maintenance of ecosystems, as part of their goal or objectives. Indeed, the nature of the CBNRM activities in both countries begs the question whether they are in fact conservation

or development programmes. It might be argued that if the primary focus is rural development, then this will lead to unsustainable use of resources as local people pursue maximum profit and benefits. Conservationists might ask why conservation authorities in the two countries are involved in a programme which places so much emphasis on rural development at the possible expense of conservation.

To a large extent, however, the dichotomy between conservation and development in the case of CBNRM is a false one. Firstly, rural communities have always used natural resources, including wildlife, to contribute to secure livelihoods and have had a number of mechanisms to regulate use of resources. Most rural African communities do not separate use from conservation.

Secondly, many of the activities in CBNRM programmes which appear to be concerned with rural development issues, are in fact focussed on building local level community management institutions which can, on behalf of local people, manage natural resources sustainably. At the heart of most CBNRM activities in Botswana and Namibia is an attempt to help communities to develop institutions which can manage common property resources successfully. Wildlife, forest products, veld foods and tourism are good examples of common property resources. In order to manage common property resources, a number of conditions need to be met which include:

- ***clearly defined boundaries for the area to be managed***
- ***appropriate rules for exploiting the resource and for conserving it***
- ***the people affected by the rules must be able to participate in changing them***
- ***effective resource monitoring procedures must be in place and monitors of rules must be resource users or accountable to them***
- ***conflict resolution mechanisms must be in place***
- ***the right of resource users to devise their own institutions should be recognised by external authorities***
- ***resource users must have the right of exclusion of outsiders from using the resource***

(adapted from IIED 1994)

With the possible exception of Namibia, all the countries studied are in need of policy and legislative reform. This process is occurring but is likely to be slow and will lag behind the development of CWM. Therefore future expectations are that CWM initiatives will continue to develop in the region but the will be handicapped by:

- Inappropriate institutional structures and mechanisms that will reinforce bureaucratic inefficiencies.

- Market distortions due to levies and subsidies which favour other forms of land use over wildlife.

- Partial access and management rights which will treat communities as beneficiaries rather than as producers.

In certain cases this will result in a loss of incentive and participation will decline. Following this the resource base will be eroded as land is used for alternative uses such as farming or cattle. Several current CWM projects will then cease to exist. Should policy and legislation be revised in the manner described in the previous section then it is likely that existing initiatives will continue to develop and that new projects will emerge.

REFERENCES

ART (1997). *Biological Diversity in Southern Africa*. ART Facts Sheet No.1. Published by Africa Resources Trust. P.O. Box A860, AVONDALE, Harare, Zimbabwe. 2pp.

Holling C.S. (1971). *Adaptive Environmental Management and Assessment.* John Wiley and Sons, New York.

IIED (1994). *Whose Eden ? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management.* Publ. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Martin R.B. (1993). *Should Wildlife Pay Its Way?.* Keith Roby Memorial Address, Murdoch University, Western Australia, 8th December, 1993.

Parker I.S.C. and A. Graham (1989). *Elephant Decline: Downward Trends in African Elephant Distribution and Numbers.* (Part II). International Journal of Environmental Studies 35: p13-26.

Rihoy L. (1995). *The Commons Without The Tragedy ? Strategies for Community Based Natural Resource Management in Southern Africa*. Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Annual Conference held in Kasane, Botswana, April 3-6 1995. Ed. L. Rihoy. Publ. SADC Wildlife Technical Coordination Unit/USAID Regional NRMP. pp221 + 4 appendices.

SASUSG (1997). S*ustainable Use Issues and Principles.* 2nd Edition. Printed and published by ACTION Magazine (P.O. Box 4696, Harare, Zimbabwe) for the Southern Africa Sustainable Use Specialist Group of the IUCN Species Survival Commission. 20pp.

ULG (1997). C*ommunity Based Natural Resource Management: A Strategy for the USAID Nature Programme, Malawi.* Draft Final Report by ULG Consultants Ltd. University of Arizona. 35pp.