Wildlife for Communities in Tanzania:
Taking stock of governance of wildlife by communities

A Roundtable Meeting
2-3 November 2011
Giraffe Hotel, Dar es Salaam

Jumuiko la Maliasili Tanzania
Tanzania Natural Resource Forum

Acronyms

AA	Authorized Associations
AAC	Authorized Associations Consortium
AMADE	Administrative Management Design
AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
BMU	Beach Management Units
CBNRM	Community Based National Resource Management
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CWM	Community Wildlife Management
D by D	Decentralization by Devolution
DENRM	Decentralized National Resources Management
DPs	Development Partners
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources
GMA	Game Management Areas (Zambia)
JAST	Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania
LIFE	Living in a Finite Environment programme
MAFC	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Cooperatives
MKUKUTA I and II	National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy I and II (Kiswahili)
MNRT FBD	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism – Forestry and Beekeeping Division
MNRT WD	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism – Wildlife Division
MoW	Ministry of Water
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
NLUPC	National Land Use Planning Commission
PMO-RALG	Prime Minister's Office – Regional and Local Government
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REPOA	Research on Poverty Alleviation
RTTZ	Responsible Tourism Tanzania
SFTZ	Savannahs Forever Tanzania
STEP	Sustainable Tourism Eco-certification Programme
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach
TNRF	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum
UCRT	Ujamaa Community Resource Trust
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VGS	Village game scouts
VNRCs	Village natural resources committees
VPO DoE	Vice President's Office – Division of Environment
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WMAs	Wildlife Management Areas
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Table of Contents

Introduction

There is increasing consensus that, despite substantial opportunities and investment to date, progress on community wildlife management (CWM) in Tanzania has fallen below the expectations of many stakeholders. Promised socio-economic benefits, democratic governance and conservation outcomes are not being sufficiently realized. However, there are emerging successes in Tanzania, and experiences in the Region from which all stakeholders can learn.

At a roundtable meeting on "Wildlife for Communities in Tanzania: Taking stock of governance of wildlife by communities" (2-3 November 2011, Giraffe Hotel, Dar es Salaam) TNRF brought together stakeholders and technical experts from communities, research bodies, the private sector, civil society, government and development partners (see Annex II). The roundtable aimed to create a space for informal, open and lively discussion about CWM: what we know, what we still need to learn, where we are, where we want to go, and what we can do to get there. The roundtable also sought to identify a concrete way forward for collaborative actions. It is envisioned as a first step in a longer, multi-stakeholder process to improve CWM in Tanzania.[i]

Roundtable **objectives** were to:
1. Facilitate sharing of information and experiences on CWM to date among stakeholders in Tanzania
2. Initiate a process for further knowledge sharing and collaborative learning and action on CWM in Tanzania
3. Contribute to improved wildlife resources governance and outcomes for communities and wildlife conservation, including by ensuring governance in line with community rights and interests

Roundtable **outputs** include:
1. Collation of recent CWM/ CBNRM research in Tanzania and region
2. Dissemination of experiences (successes, challenges) on CWM in Tanzania and the region among meeting participants, and other stakeholders in Tanzania
3. Identification of relevant challenges and opportunities to improve CWM
4. Agreed way forward for collaborative CWM initiatives among participating stakeholders

Full presentations and more information from the Roundtable are available here: http://www.tnrf.org/cwm

Summary of key points

ο WMAs have achieved some important successes, with substantial support from participating communities, NGOs, donors, investors and others. However, implementation remains slow and there are many remaining barriers / challenges to effective and equitable implementation overall. Key among these are weak governance, lack of empowerment with full and effective participation of communities in WMAs, low benefits generation, inequitable benefit (/cost) sharing, and lack of integration between wildlife and other livelihood strategies (e.g. livestock, crop farming).

ο WMAs should and can be viable businesses – including through balanced partnerships with private sector investors – but there are also multiple (conservation, cultural, social) values of CWM that should also be recognized.

ο WMAs are a key mechanism for CWM in Tanzania, but CWM is broader than just wildlife management, and so it should be approached holistically. This means integrating complementary livelihood strategies into WMA management frameworks and recognising that alternative models to WMAs exist and may sometimes be more appropriate.

o   There is substantial research on CWM/WMAs, but there are gaps and quality concerns, and a lack of a central space where information can be collated, accessed and shared.

o   Historical and current regional CBNRM experiences can provide lessons for Tanzania – both positive and negative. Tanzanian CWM stakeholders should continue to engage with regional partners for shared learning and action.

o   Key areas for action for improving CWM governance include:
    o   Action research/ applied research
    o   Reviewing and enhancing the national CWM policy and legal framework.
    o   Improving CWM's economic viability, including through a focus on developing stronger incentives and economic opportunities for communities and their partners
    o   Promoting good governance, better management practices and more accountable and institutions.
    o   Understanding/ supporting a diversity of approaches to CWM: WMAs may be best in some contexts / geographies, but may fail to meet their conservation and development objectives in others.
    o   Supporting training, education, and capacity building.
    o   Promoting networking, information sharing, learning and advocacy.

o   Participants agreed that the roundtable was a useful starting point, but that far more discussion and action is required among a broader group of stakeholders. Formation of a CWM Working Group was proposed.

Session I: Learning from Successes and Challenges with CWM in Tanzania

Tanzanian law, policy and regulations support community wildlife management, primarily through the mechanism of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), with the multiple and inter-linked aims of conserving biodiversity and enhancing livelihood security, poverty alleviation, and the quality of life of rural people. WMAs have received substantial support from different stakeholders, including the participation of village governments and local government authorities, donor support, technical and implementation support from international NGOs, private investment, and research. But it is clear that WMAs are not a panacea towards achieving CWM in Tanzania – they are not appropriate or viable in all cases. CWM must be seen to be broader than WMAs.

PROGRESS AND EXPERIENCES TO DATE

There have been **substantial successes** in the development **of WMAs,** including formalization of 14 pilot projects into fully fledged WMAs governed by Authorized Associations (AAs). The Authorized Association Consortium (AAC) has also recently been formally established with the objective of providing services to AA members in Tanzania to improve their social and economic welfare. Nonetheless **implementation has been slow** (although it is gaining some momentum) and establishing equitable and effective **WMAs in practice poses many challenges**:

o   **Long, cumbersome, and expensive process** required for establishing a WMA.

o   **Benefits generated are often low**, while (opportunity, transaction, implementation, enforcement) **costs are often high**, including as a result of increased human-wildlife conflict. These costs are often borne by AAs.

o   **Insufficient/ inequitable benefit sharing** and revenue distribution between central government, district government, and village level, as well as within and across communities. For example, there are often inter-**village conflicts** regarding the relative benefits delivered to each village, given that some villages may contribute more land/ wildlife-related resources than others.

o   **Weak governance at all levels.** This includes political will/ governance at the highest level, and issues of better governance/ representation at the village level, as well as elite capture.

o **Insufficient awareness and under-developed capacity at all levels**, e.g., capacity constraints at the AA level in running WMAs as a business operation with appropriate management systems and procedures, as well as capacity for carrying out fair negotiations in contracting with prospective investors

o **WMAs are often not yet self-sustaining businesses**, and reliance on donor support and international NGOs continues to be high. Pathways that greatly reduce such dependencies need to be established and implemented.

o Land and natural resource conflicts, and **continued insecurity of tenure and natural resource access rights** for communities.

o **Pressures from the changing economic landscape** in Tanzania, including land pressure from biofuels, mining, commercial agricultural expansion, smallholder agricultural expansion etc.

o New challenges and opportunities presented by **climate change**, including responding to adaptation needs, such as impacts on the resource base, and mitigation opportunities such as REDD+.

o **Lack of full and effective community participation**, particularly at the policy level, and too little empowerment and authority given to local community to manage wildlife and collect/ redistribute revenues.

o **Lack of practical guidance and tools**, although the AAC presents an opportunity to help address this. Additionally, US AID is working on a toolkit for existing and new AAs to support WMA development, including a checklist for planning and best practices to date.

o **Lack of efficiency/ flexibility in regulating wildlife-based enterprise** – e.g. in hunting licensing and operations.

o **Slow and bureaucratic business regulation processes** for tendering and awarding concessions to lodges and permits to tour operators.

o **Insufficient monitoring** of each WMA's development process and a **lack of auditing** provisions.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

o There is **a lot of research and information on CWM/ WMAs** in Tanzania, but **no central space where this information can be collated and accessed** or where stakeholders can exchange experiences and network. There are also **significant gaps** in the existing body of research, including little baseline data. Additionally, there are concerns about, inter alia, a bias towards a focus on the problems, lack of grounding in stakeholders' key information needs, lack of research-policy-practice linkages, and lack of full representation in research (e.g., lack of investors' perspective).

o **Several new resources are forthcoming**, such as new research (and data) from Savannahs Forever Tanzania. USAID and the WMA support programme are also preparing a status report on the 16 WMAs. This should help develop understanding of what is (and isn't) working, and where.

o **WMAs need to function as successful businesses** while also recognizing that **economic viability is only one aspect** of WMAs and that a solely private-sector orientated business approach may undermine other (conservation, cultural, social, livelihood) values and benefits.

o **WMAs also need to be integrated with people's broader livelihoods** - e.g. mobile livestock keeping, crop farming, artisanal fishing and hunter-gathering in areas where these apply. Within and outside of WMAs, there is also a **need to understand CWM in a more holistic manner** – e.g., understanding and respecting the role of customary institutions, supporting effective and equitable alternatives to WMAs where appropriate, incorporating broader livelihood and environment values and needs, and taking up additional opportunities (e.g., wildlife ranching).

o The wildlife sector will likely be among the first in being incorporated into **Devolved Natural Resource Management** – a forthcoming Sector Wide Approach in Tanzania. The specific implications for WMAs are not yet clear, but CWM in general needs to be understood in the broader DeNRM context, where CWM and community-based forestry management approaches are likely to become increasingly integrated.

o WMAs are grounded in community based natural resource management (CBNRM) theory (user rights lead to benefits which create the requisite conservation incentives). However, the performance of WMAs to date raises the question about whether or not, or to what extent, the approach adopted by WMAs has thus far sufficiently embodied a full 'rights-based approach'. There is a need to take a step back and re-examine practices to date and reflect on fundamental **questions about how and for whom CWM is working now**... Is this 'development'? Does CWM help realize this vision, in reality? Is this the 'right' theory of development, and is it a theory and vision that is driven by the communities who are supposed to benefit? What other visions exist?

Session II: Comparative Experiences in CWM from Southern Africa

o Historical and current regional CBNRM experiences will provide lessons for Tanzania– both positive and negative.

o Throughout the region, expansion of CBNRM was justified based on, among other things, general degradation of natural resources, especially wildlife; limited capacity in central authorities to reverse this degradation – despite owning the resources; and the need to democratise natural resource management as part of a wider political and governance reform process.

o In practice, regionally there has been a general adoption of CBNRM principles, initially as an experiment and eventually supported by major policy reforms. **Impacts of these efforts have been mixed across the region**. Where the principles have been adequately implemented, legislated for, and supported by mechanisms for communities developed through partnerships, the positive impacts have been dramatic. However, where the principles of CBNRM were only partially or weakly implemented, the impact has been much less dramatic and benefits have been limited. Some important examples of relative success stories can be drawn from Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe.

o The mixed performance of Game Management Areas (GMAs) in **Zambia provides informative comparison with WMAs** (similarities and differences). In GMAs, communities are co-managers/co-signatories to hunting concession agreements, with a 50/50 benefit sharing mechanism on licence fees and a 20/80 sharing on concession fees. Overall, GMAs have transferred millions of dollars to communities, and are supporting thousands of community projects. However, GMAs are often governed by weak institutions and are subject to elite capture. Further, the people participating in GMAs are still generally very poor, and as such GMAs are also under threat from competing land uses and resource degradation. In comparison to WMAs, GMAs are characterized by: a deliberate and clear pro-poor community empowerment agenda at policy and political level; local NGOs taking the lead in capacity building in conjunction with international organisations; local level decision making – quota setting, wildlife monitoring, pricing; direct community negotiation with private sector partners; high level of enterprise development, with joint ventures and community lodges; and 100% community retention of revenues generated in an area, which creates important incentives.

o A key challenge for benefit sharing is the **question of what percentage of benefits should be retained at the community level and what proportion should be transferred to other levels of government** and/or redistributed for greater public benefit. There is a move towards more redistribution away from communities in several countries, but this goes against the basic theory and logic of CBNRM.

Session III: Alternative CWM approaches and community voices

o   While the WMA approach is Tanzania's only official CWM mechanism, **CWM is broader than the WMA modality**.

o   There are **operational alternatives** to WMAs that should be considered in efforts to improve CWM governance. For example, in 2002, communities in Northern Tanzania made contracts directly with tour operators, in line with traditional decision making institutions and village governments. The contracts allow livestock grazing and other key livelihood strategies and stipulate that the village retains land ownership. Communities' were provided training by supporting NGOs on financial management and enhanced accountability so that revenues would be transparently and equitably managed. All revenues go directly to village accounts, and village governments pay a percentage to the district. Tour operators benefit because community lands offer access to large wildlife populations, opportunities for cultural tourism, less expensive camping areas (as compared to national parks), and opportunities for walking safaris.

o   There are **many communities with relatively large wildlife populations on their lands that are not part of WMAs, and that have questions and reservations about joining WMAs.** In one community's experience (from Simanjiro) they have heard a lot of stories, both positive and negative, about other villages that are part of WMAs. They are concerned that they have very little clear, direct information about the law and their rights. They might be interested in joining a WMA, but the community would want to ensure that their customary tenure over and use of their lands would continue - including for livestock grazing, that they would receive substantial benefits (exceeding real costs), that they would be fairly represented (as a village) through the AA, and that their rights would otherwise be protected. However, what these communities currently hear about WMAs from other villages' experience has not yet given them confidence that a WMA would meet these criteria.

Session IV: Linking basic economics with local economies and entrepreneurialism

o   **Natural resources management is closely linked to the nature and strength of land and natural resources tenure**. The stronger one's property rights, the stronger the management, the more wealth generation, etc.

o   Kenya has seen rapid change from large land parcels under group or communal ownership to small parcels under private ownership. Research has demonstrated that for every one percent decrease in the size of landholding there is a two percent LOSS of density in wildlife. Therefore **the underlying dynamics of land economy have a major impact on the viability of wildlife**: this is as true for Tanzania as it is for Kenya. To date WMAs have been spatially planned, but in the future they will need to increasingly focus on incentives, and competing land economies. This means that local collaboration and innovation for maximising the value of wildlife to local communities must be strongly encouraged and supported: less regulation and more incentives are required.

o   Evolution in land rights has also opened opportunities for conservation. Individual landowners have gotten together to create conservancies, partnering with tour operators. Tour operators pay the landholders individually to grow and keep wildlife (and forgo agriculture or livestock keeping). Payments are based on annual contracts and not per-trip fees.

o   In Tanzania, **eco-tourism can be a (environmentally, socially, economically) sustainable business model** that brings new income (e.g. employment) and other benefits to communities. But engagement with investors needs to be a partnership, based on empowered participation, and there needs to be a balance between business, conservation, community livelihoods benefits. Wildlife tourism **also has potential costs** (e.g., human-wildlife conflict) and is **not a 'silver bullet'** – there will be trade-offs and choices to be made, which are likely to change over time.

o   WMAs should be approached as one part of people's broader lives, including coupling them with other livelihood strategies and other economic development opportunities. These approaches should recognize customary institutions but that also look for new, appropriate opportunities in a changing environment.

o   Economic development within CWM (including WMAs) should also be based on **understanding of the real costs and benefits**, taking a holistic view of people's livelihoods.

Session V: Identifying thematic areas for action on CWM

Participants identified seven thematic areas for targeted action on improving CWM in Tanzania.

1. **Action research /applied research for better informed decision-making, including:**

   o   Better accessing and utilizing existing research (e.g., creating shared space for information exchange).

   o   Addressing research gaps including: reconstructing baselines; grounding research in the needs of stakeholders (community, government, NGOs, private sector); and developing a better understanding of full costs and benefits, equitable allocation mechanisms, and differences between CWM strategies (e.g., how/ under what circumstances different outcomes are achieved for different stakeholders).

   o   Science for wildlife management, including community-led science. Linked to this, the importance of traditional knowledge should be documented and illustrated, and it should be integrated with 'contemporary' science.

   o   Involving stakeholders in research, e.g., participatory action research.

   o   Supporting a holistic approach to CWM through participatory research.

   o   Undertaking strategic environmental assessment of CWM models, including to understand how to accommodate a range of environmental and cultural options.

   o   Determining what needs to be measured (what are the key questions and research needs of different stakeholders?).

   o   Establishing a mechanism to coordinate research measures.

   o   Developing standard outcomes measures for monitoring performance across CBNRM models.

2. **CWM policy and legal framework, including:**

   o   Revisiting the process for establishing WMAs in order to further streamline, simplify, rationalize and harmonize it, minimizing costs and making it more technically accessible for communities, etc…

   o   Ensure fair and equitable benefit sharing among CWM/ WMA members, especially for those who have contributed land, reflecting real costs/ contributions.

   o   Strengthen land tenure and property rights for good investment / land management.

   o   Develop CWM strategies and frameworks, and link these to the DeNRM framework.

   o   Develop comprehensive guidance and related toolkits for WMA implementation and management for all stakeholders at all levels.

3. **Economic viability, including:**

   o   Approaching WMAs as investments, rather than as charities.

   o   Ensuring land uses respond to prevailing market forces and that CWM is a competitive land use option.

o Facilitating establishment of accountable private sector partnerships and sustainable conservation businesses.

o Ensuring that WMA investments and benefit sharing/ revenue distribution mechanisms sufficiently reflect costs.

o Developing and distributing comprehensive technical guidance and toolkits for, among others, CWM/WMA economic and business planning, benefit sharing arrangements, etc. Guidance should be accompanied by appropriate training and capacity strengthening.

o Establish independent reviews and watchdog mechanisms for WMAs finances.

4. **Good governance, management and institutions, including:**

o Local level institutional development.

o Fair, equitable benefit sharing.

o Full and effective (empowered) participation.

o Recognizing institutional complexity (including customary institutions).

o Addressing inter-institutional conflicts.

o Monitoring, assessment, evaluation including environmental/ biophysical issues and livelihood, rights issues.

o Supporting communities in governance assessment of their WMAs.

o Establishing independent auditing and certification.

o Develop comprehensive, practical guidance on improving CWM/ WMA governance, supported by targeted training.

5. **Understanding/ supporting multiple approaches to CWM, including:**

o Taking a holistic approach to CWM, including permitting alternative approaches to be pursued.

o Recognizing multiple types of conservation knowledge and values.

o Integrating traditional conservation and natural resources practices in new models.

Proposed guiding principles for approaches to CWM/ WMA that support equity and sustainability include:

o Informed and equitable participation by all stakeholders including communities in planning and decision making

o Local communities (or land users) must benefit from the revenues gained and costs need to be understood

o Local land users/ communities need to decide how to use the revenues earned

o Communities must be able to withdraw or cancel the arrangements (under appropriate terms…)

o Appropriate and empowering education and training with CWM stakeholders, including communities

o Livestock can co-exist with wildlife - this must be respected in pastoralist lands

o Conflict resolution mechanisms must be locally based

o The CWM arrangement must be linked to the village government (village council)

6. **Training, education, capacity building, including:**

o Developing CWM guidance and toolkits for multiple levels and users, and anchoring this training in schools/ colleges.

o Providing legal support to communities, including for negotiating contracts.

o Developing tools to better assess opportunity costs incurred by communities and facilitate benefit sharing.

o Create M&E/ assessment tools for WMA performance.

o Support stakeholders' capacity strengthening on, inter alia, good governance, resource management, and business management. This should include AA capacity.

o Undertake training needs assessment to inform a curriculum and training plan. Impacts/uptake should be monitored. This could be led by the AAC, with specific functions to be delegated to supporting stakeholders.

7. **Networking and information sharing, including:**

o Develop CWM forum/ networks at multiple levels, including link to SADC initiative, for information sharing, etc.

o Facilitate cross-community lessons learning/ exchange.

o Develop information sharing/ communications strategy, including anchoring mechanisms in local and national learning institutions.

Session VI: Agreeing on the way forward

Participants agreed that the discussions at the roundtable provided a useful starting point, but that far more discussion was required among a broader group of stakeholders, and that a process was needed for developing and facilitating collaborative action on supporting improvements in CWM governance. It was proposed that stakeholders form a **CWM Working Group** be created for further dialogue and action on improving community wildlife governance.

At the close of the meeting, participants agreed that a small group of volunteers should prepare a draft concept for a CWM Working Group to which all stakeholders can then be invited. It was agreed that the small drafting team will be coordinated by Baruani Mshale (Independent Consultant, engaged under TNRF for purposes of this group) and include Simon Anstey (WWF-CEA), Boniface Wambura (AAC Executive Secretary), Susan James (Savannahs Forever), and John Balarin (Technical Advisor to the Wildlife Division - Wetlands Unit).

It was further agreed that TNRF will serve as interim Secretariat for the proposed CWM Working Group, with formal election of a Secretariat to come when/if the group is more formalized.

Annex I: Full Meeting Report

OPENING

The roundtable was chaired by Mr. Bakari Mbano (Wildlife Conservation Society [WCS], former Director of Wildlife in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism [MNRT]). In his opening speech, he spoke about the objectives of CWM as contributing to biodiversity conservation and socio-economic transformation, including enhancing livelihood security, poverty alleviation, and an improved quality of life for rural people. These objectives align with the Tanzania Vision 2025 and the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania 1998 (rev 2007). He emphasized the considerable potential for CWM to benefit rural communities. In this regard the Wildlife Management Area (WMA) Regulations (2005) permit the use of wildlife, forestry, fisheries and mineral resources by WMA/ Authorized Associations (AAs) on behalf of and with communities.

Mr. Mbano outlined successes to date, which include the development and implementation of supportive policies, legislation and regulations; the formalisation of 14 pilot WMA CBOs into AAs; the development of photographic and tourist hunting investments - demonstrating that WMAs have tourism potential; and the fact that infrastructure and tourism facilities in WMAs have been improved. However, he also identified a number of challenges for CWM, including: the exorbitant cost of establishing WMAs - including the process for CBOs becoming an AA; insufficient capacity of WMA institutions - including among village game scouts (VGS), AA Councils and AA Administrations; and weak governance.

Mr. Mbano welcomed the roundtable as a timely forum for taking stock of CWM /WMA progress in Tanzania, particularly as some long standing pilots are beginning to become success stories, and as the challenges that need to be addressed are becoming clearer. He reminded participants that the roundtable's objectives are in part to suggest a way forward for:
ο   Reviewing and revising processes for establishing WMAs, to make them more affordable and technically feasible for community members to access and meaningfully engage in;
ο   Increasing sensitization, education and training of CWM stakeholders; and
ο   Improving governance at all levels, including within AAs.

SESSION I: LEARNING FROM SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES WITH CWM IN TANZANIA

The CWM landscape in Tanzania – A political economy analysis
Presenter: George Jambiya (WWF)

CWM in Tanzania has to be understood in its broader historical, political economy and policy context. In sum, while there are increasingly significant contributions from wildlife tourism and hunting to GDP and employment, these gains are threatened unless poverty and environment issues are addressed. Key problems include mismanagement, under-pricing, loss of revenues, and poor benefit sharing with the rural communities participating in the initiative.

The **vision for the wildlife sector** is, according to the Wildlife Policy (1998), to:
ο Promote conservation of biological diversity;
ο Administer, regulate and develop wildlife resources;
ο Involve all stakeholders in wildlife conservation and sustainable utilisation, as well as in fair and equitable sharing of benefits;
ο Promote sustainable utilisation of wildlife resources;
ο Raise the contribution of the wildlife sector in country's gross domestic product from about 2% to 5%;
ο Contribute to poverty alleviation and improve the quality of life of the people of tanzania; and
ο Promote exchange of relevant information and expertise nationally, regionally and internationally.

The Wildlife Policy does have strong **links to poverty and development related policies and strategies** in Tanzania… in theory if not always in practice. Paramount among these is MKUKUTA (I and II) which includes aspirations of wealth creation, poverty reduction, social well being and good governance. The MKUKUTA component on good governance is the weakest, but has important implications for the wildlife sector. There are also important linkages to the Rural Development Strategy, and other policy and strategies.

The **track record with regard to delivery** to date is mixed, with challenges including:
ο Remaining problems with land and natural resource tenure (explored further below);
ο The need for entrepreneurial success and a good business environment in which to achieve the transformation of WMAs into practical and viable business models;
ο Addressing the high transaction costs of WMA development and management;
ο Engendering the political will / goodwill for these transformations to take place; and
ο Incorporating realistic consideration of the challenges and opportunities posed by climate change.

The resolution of pending **land and natural resource tenure issues** requires judicious, fair and considerable political goodwill on all sides. Issues include: land tenure; wildlife corridors; pastoral lands; human – animal conflict; and other competitive land uses such as agriculture and minerals.

WMAs must become **practical and viable business** models capitalizing on a variety of successful entrepreneurial ventures. They need to be grounded in a sound business environment, and focused on delivering a 'package' of opportunities based on the available resource endowment. And as with any business, challenges related to governance have emerged and will need to be addressed to ensure a continued sound business environment. These include elite capture, bureaucracy, transparency, dishonesty, conflicts, crime, etc.

Regarding WMA policy and practice, there are high transaction costs in terms of time and resources. It is not clear if WMAs are having the benefits they are meant to in many cases, in part because we have no clear yardsticks for success. It is also not clear if/ how those mandated to deliver benefits can be held to account. We

also lack a clear sense of whether we are using WMAs effectively, such that the full range and extent of benefits are being realized.

Finally, we have to add the challenges and benefits of climate change to the WMA picture. WMAs (and conservation more broadly) must be proactive in understanding and responding to the challenges and the opportunities… not being reactive. REDD, for example, potentially provides new funding opportunities, but also stands to compound the existing challenges highlighted above.

So are we at a place of hope or despair going forward? The business as usual scenario for CWM is neither acceptable nor tenable. Wildlife resources must contribute to a positive change in rural people's quality of life and create opportunities (livelihoods) in the present and the future. The broader political economy of the country is changing and the sector must adjust. But there is hope on the horizon, *should the shortcomings of WMAs be addressed sooner rather than later and their advantages be multiplied*, as we shall hear from coming presentations and experiences.

Points of discussion:

Grounding WMAs in their broader contexts
The wildlife sector needs to change to be more viable and sustainable in the context of new and growing pressures for "development" - from biofuels, oil and gas exploration, commercial crop agriculture, etc… Additionally, the broader governance context of WMAs needs to be considered. Governance dynamics at community level are important, but the effort and work can't only be done at the community level. In many cases in the region, community members have made great contributions to wildlife areas, but the community members have not benefited, and/or wildlife conservation efforts have not been successful, due in large part to a lack of political will, commitment, and effective management/ coordination at other levels of government. More generally, WMAs may ultimately require a level of democratic governance, at multiple levels, that will take time to fully develop.

Perceptions and attitudes about CWM at all levels also matter, as reflected in experience across the region. In Tanzania, there is often a perception that WMAs are a form of charity to communities. This perception needs to be changed to support economically viable, sustainable and respectful engagement with participating communities, as is the case in Namibia.

While climate change does present adaptation challenges to WMAs, in Namibia community wildlife areas are both good businesses and good strategies for enhancing resilience and helping communities adapt to climate change because, among other reasons, people need fewer head of cattle (i.e., less land/water) to maintain or improve their livelihoods (though this does imply a change to culture that may not be acceptable to Tanzanian communities).

WMAs as businesses… and more
WMAs need to be viable businesses based on tenure security. At the same time, while the "business" of wildlife management is important, there are many other values to community wildlife management that should be considered – including wider biodiversity conservation, and enhancing the security of ecosystems that are important to people's livelihood security.

Further, the reality is that some WMAs will not be viable businesses. They may be too remote to compete with nearby national parks or other WMAs. Wildlife may be present for too few months. In all cases, making WMAs viable businesses at least takes time and upfront investments. But there are challenging questions regarding the best course of action where WMAs are not (or, are not yet) viable businesses, e.g., should they be subsidized in some way to preserve their other (conservation, cultural, livelihood) values?

WMAs are also not a panacea, as stressed by Marshall Murphree. They are not the solution for all social and environmental issues in rural areas, and they will not work everywhere. We need to ask ourselves difficult questions about where/ when they will and won't work, and who they will work for. Wildlife farming is a new institution and new investment opportunity that should be considered in Tanzania, along side WMAs, etc.

Community engagement in WMAs
Any decisions about how WMAs should be run – to become viable businesses, to underpin wildlife and other conservation, livelihood values etc. – should be grounded in the reality and vision of the communities involved. This requires understanding the experiences and perspectives of participating communities. This community engagement, however, needs to be based on genuine empowerment and participation. There are often politicians, projects, and other interests that come to the community to make promises (including promises of development schemes that are not in line with conservation values) or seek "participation"… but in reality they do not (sufficiently) support an empowered role for community members.

Recent research on CWM in Tanzania – Successes, benefits, and challenges
Presenters: Professor Jafari Kidegesho and Laura Tarimo

A review of recent studies on CWM in Tanzania, undertaken by the presenters for purposes of the roundtable, focused on the following key thematic areas:

o   Governance issues, including questions about who makes the strategic decisions, what decision making systems are in place, and how they function;

o   Levels of participation among the actors in making and implementing WMA policies;

o   Benefit sharing, including questions of what the benefits are, how much is generated, and how they are distributed;

o   Attitudes and perceptions towards WMAs of various stakeholders; and

o   The link between policy and regulations vs. the realities of implementation on the ground.

Highlights of Recent Studies
Stolla, Francis (March 2005) Wildlife Management Areas: A Legal Analysis. TNRF Occasional Paper No. 5 o   An examination of the WMA Regulations (2002) as the legal mechanism for implementing community-based wildlife management. Hindrances noted are **long and bureaucratic procedures** for their establishment, and **limited authority given to local communities** to manage wildlife.
Baldus, R. et al., (2004) CBC: Where are we now, where are we going: 15 years of CBC. WCS Newsletter. o   A critique of **slowness of the process** of implementation of WMAs
Baldus, R. and Cauldwell, Community Wildlife Management Program, GTZ; Kagera Kigoma Game Reserves Project (2004) *Tourist Hunting and its role in Development of WMAs in Tanzania* o   Highlights the need for communities within WMAs to have the rights to issue hunting quotas to private companies as a move to **empower** them in wildlife management.
Baha & Chachage (2007) Wildlife Conservation for Tourist Investments or Villagers' Livelihoods – A Fact Finding Mission Report on Vilima Vitatu Village Land Dispute Babati District o   An assessment of **land disputes**: pastoralism vs tourism/conservation and **lack of participatory process** in Vilima Vitatu village in Burunge WMA
WWF (2007) Assessment and evaluation of the Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania MNRT (URT), Institute of Resource Assessment, USAID, o   A review of the progress of 16 pilot WMAs, including an assessment of **process, policy and implementation issues** and **recommendations** for way forward.
Igoe, J. & Croucher, B. (2007) Conservation, Commerce and Communities: The Story of Community-Based Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania's Northern Tourist Circuit. *Conservation and Society* 5(4)534 -561 o   Highlights the conflict between conservation and business objectives versus human livelihoods using WMA cases in Northern Tanzania
Nelson, F. (2007) Emergent or illusory? Community wildlife management in Tanzania. IIED, London UK. o   Assesses the **role of institutions** in implementing community-based wildlife management
Sulle, E. (2008) Wildlife-based Revenue Transparency Performance in Longido and Simanjiro Districts Hakikazi Catalyst o   Highlights the conflict between central collection of revenues and community **empowerment in wildlife management.** Points to the confusion arising during transition from company – village contracts to company – (CBO) WMA contracts.
Minwary, (2009) Politics of participatory Wildlife Management in Enduimet WMA. MSc Thesis o   An assessment of the extent of **inclusiveness / participation** of local communities during the establishment of WMAs
Wilfred (2010) "Towards Sustainable Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania" Conservation letter in Tropical Conservation Science o   Provides an assessment of obstacles, and offers recommendations for improvements towards more

Highlights of Recent Studies
effective management of wildlife resources by communities within the WMA context.
USAID, Health & Development International Consultants, Africare, FZS, WWF (2010) **Socio-economic baseline studies** in selected WMAs under the WWF cash-for-work program: Enduimet, Burunge, Ikona, Ipole, MBOMIPA ο Population size, growth and characteristics, economic activities, source of income in the WMA, expenditure of income from the WMA, people's knowledge. awareness and attitudes of CBNRM and WMAs
Round Table Africa (2011) How can WMAs be turned into viable sources of income for communities, business and government while also achieving conservation objectives – based on four case studies: Enduimet, Burunge, Ikona, Ngarambe-Tapika. ο An assessment of earnings/ **economic benefits, processes, and governance/policy issues in WMAs, and the conservation role** of business investors, communities, government, and conservation-oriented NGOs

Overall, key findings of this recent research raise major concerns about the state of CWM policy and implementation in Tanzania, including the following:

- **CBNRM/WMA implementation processes have led to unexpected and disappointing outcomes.**
There is often little genuine community participation and evidence that communities have sometimes been forced to accept WMAs. More generally WMAs are typically being implemented though a top-down approach. In many cases it is not clear who has authority and responsibility for WMA management, and there are major concerns regarding transparency in revenue collection and generation. There is little devolution of power in practice. Inconsistencies and conflicts between the law and regulations are partly responsible for these problems, as well as the centralized nature of Tanzania's (lucrative) tourist hunting industry. Further, local (district and village) authorities still have inadequate capacity to support WMAs.

- **Local communities are often the "losers" in WMA processes and outcomes, and overall WMA acceptability to communities is low.**
There are often high conservation-induced costs - crop damage, livestock depredation, opportunity costs of land and related resources. Benefits are often very limited, or absent all together. Thus, WMA benefits frequently are significantly outweighed by the costs imposed by conservation measures. This creates little incentive for people to continue engaging in the WMA. Where WMAs do bring benefits, they are often granted as communal/public goods, rather than being directly captured by households. Community members have often expressed dissatisfaction with such benefits; 'W*e can eat neither classrooms nor dispensaries'*. Further, genuine, empowered community participation is very limited.

- **There are emerging conflicts between member villages in WMAs.**
Some villages have contributed more land for WMAs than others. Some villages were already reaping benefits from investors before the WMA was formally established. In such cases the formalized WMA has meant sharing these benefits with other villages (including those without significant resources).

- **There is an unsupportive environment for business in CWM.**
Business investors are frustrated with the lack of clarity and consistency in policy, changing regulations and fees, lack of security of the investments, and other issues. The burden of marketing WMAs – including the concept and the individual sites - in an important but often overlooked issue that falls on the investors.

While these are all important points, there is also a clear **bias towards focusing on the challenges of WMAs in this body of research**. This belies the need for more balance in assessing the performance of WMAs to date. For example, other recent research (e.g., from Laura Tarimo) demonstrates that **many villages welcome WMAs** and

are benefiting from them. This is particularly true where the village had few development opportunities in place in advance of the WMA (i.e. it faced fewer trade-offs). There are still widespread frustrations with the process, but there are also **community benefits being realized in some cases**. There is also an **under-representation of the investor perspective in the research**. Investors are growingly frustrated with the lack of clarity (in governance structures, fees, etc), which makes for an insecure investment environment.

Other major **remaining gaps** in the body of research on CWM/ WMAs in Tanzania include the following:
ο A strong focus on views and perceptions of local communities, but insufficient representation of the perspectives of government, conservation NGOs, and other stakeholders.
ο Too little understanding of the ways different policies and legislation affect (promote/undermine) the objectives and goals of WMAs.
ο Lack of clear impact measurements with regard to both socio-economic and conservation outcomes, due in part to lack of baseline data and studies.
ο Examination of viable alternatives (different options, approaches, principles) for improvement wildlife management and CWM. **Is the only other option a return to 'fences and fines'?**

Points of discussion:

Gaps in research

The lack of baseline data is a major concern, but there was some baseline data collected at the start of the 16 pilot projects, and there have been more recent efforts to establish a comprehensive picture of the situation and to reconstruct the baseline. There will also be more continuous monitoring going forward. As part of this kind of research, WMAs need to be subject to environmental and social impact assessments, to help anticipate results, and to better understand what the results are / have been in on-going initiatives. USAID and the WMA support programme are preparing a status report on the 14 WMAs. This should help develop understanding of what is (and isn't) working, and where. It will be made available to stakeholders more widely.

There is a lack of research and practical guidance on the business side of WMAs—how can they be made sustainable businesses? Further, while academic research is useful, there needs to be more direct engagement and communication of the experience of successful entrepreneurs. We need to understand why, where and when businesses work, and don't. When we talk about investment in WMAs as businesses, we also need to recognize that WMAs aren't just about business. They are also about *partnerships with communities.* This may take a particular kind of investor, and a particular kind of business. The "market as usual" may not be appropriate in all cases.

There is also too little research on how wildlife management (through WMAs or otherwise) can be aligned/ integrated with other livelihood strategies, such as livestock keeping.

Finally, while there is a growing body of research on WMAs, there is relatively little on CWM more broadly in Tanzania.

Quality of research methods and content

While recent research raises many important concerns, participants generally felt that there is also an overall research bias towards problems and negative issues. We need to better understand the objectives and agenda of research projects before we can fully interpret the results. Perhaps research might be equally well framed in terms of understanding when, where and why successes happen. We also need to understand the difference between 'data' (what the research tells us at the most basic level) and how that information is framed and used for management purposes and politically.

In this regard, there are too few linkages between research and policy: research is often weakly grounded in policy, research questions are often not sufficiently directed towards pragmatic policy-making, and policy makers have too little access to / interest in research results. Weak policy-practice linkages are partly related to perceived research biases, as policy makers often do not trust research.

Research needs to be more inclusive. There is too little reflection of the views of, among others, government bodies. Government stakeholders are unlikely to effectively respond to and incorporate research that does not take account of their perspectives. Other participants raised the concern that the research does not sufficiently respond to communities' real experiences especially communities who aren't in AAs / WMAS!

Researchers need to engage CWM stakeholders, including government, communities, businesses and conservation NGOs in assessing needs for research and in sharing findings. Research should be driven by "real" questions and needs about CWM on the ground. Some of the basic concepts the research is dealing with need to be better understood and further unpacked. Among these is the concept of sustainability: What is sustainability? Environmental, social, cultural? Further, research needs to help us understand CWM in dynamic ways - the factors leading to sustainability will change over time and at different scales.

Some of what the research tells us…

CWM and WMAs are political. While it is important to understand the business side of WMAs (as discussed earlier in the morning) the research clearly highlights the need for more focus on broader governance issues and the politics of WMAs. Policies are of course important, but it is in large part the politics and governance that create the policies and that frame their implementation.

The research raises some questions about why the original 16 selected pilot projects were selected. In 1998, there was a policy in place, but no regulations or guidance on its implementation with regard to CWM. There were a number of studies done (primarily with DFID support) and these suggested the 15 selected sites as viable starting points. An additional site – Twatwatwa – was selected because there was a hypothesis that introducing a WMA could help resolve the on-going land conflicts in the area. Two of these sites (Twatwatwa and Ngorongoro) have failed to move forward, but the other 14 pilot sites were ultimately formed into the formalized WMAs once the regulations were in place. Interest in WMAs is also growing; there are 34 additional areas in which communities are interested in forming a WMA, and WWF (as programme coordinator) receives frequent new requests. In Kilosa, for example, communities are undertaking wildlife conservation activities on their own already, and are interested in formalizing a WMA to enhance the benefits they get from these efforts.

How information is shared

There is a large body of research that hasn't been discussed here. However, it is difficult to know where this research is, or how to access it. There is a clear need for better spaces/ mechanisms for sharing information and research among CWM/ WMA stakeholders. Similarly, CWM in Tanzania should be supported by a forum where stakeholders can exchange experiences, information, and resources – building a **community of practice**.

Improving Effectiveness & Sustainability of Development Projects in Rural Tanzania

Presenter: Susan James (Executive Director – Operations, Savannahs Forever Tanzania (SFTZ))

(Also representing Craig Packer, Distinguished McKnight University Professor, University of Minnesota)

SFTZ and its partners (including Partners for Development, Frankfurt Zoological Society, Friedkin Conservation Fund, African Wildlife Foundation, Canadian Food Grains Bank, and Global Service Corps) have been undertaking extensive research to understand the complex dynamics between a wide range of livelihood and development variables in rural villages in Tanzania. The research was conducted as part of USAID/ PEPFAR, supporting HIV/AIDS awareness-raising and prevention training. Surveyed villages included many outside of WMAs, and also many within WMAs (Makao, Burunge, and Enduimet). This has allowed for comparisons between villages inside and outside of WMAs.

The research is based on a system ecology approach to understanding rural villages. Results are based on identifying interactions among a wide range of key variables to enable better anticipation of unforeseen consequences. This information provides better understanding and context for strategic interventions.

Surveys were conducted in 56 villages (2009-2011), including interviews with 70 randomly selected households in each village, institutional analysis, and focus groups with men and women's leaders. Key variables determining 'village ecology' include:
- Environmental drivers: rainfall, season, water access, landscape, and proximity to markets; and
- Cultural influences: ethnicity, religion.

Research results demonstrate highly complex, multiple linkages between these drivers and community conditions. Among the many linkages is a clear pattern of correlation between higher water access and crop agriculture based livelihoods and lower water access and pastoralist livelihoods.

The research is revealing that WMAs are located in villages that (as compared to non-WMA villages) more frequently face a number of challenges to sustainable rural development. According to the findings, villages in WMAs are more often characterized by, among other things:
- further distance from towns and markets
- higher costs from wildlife conflict (crop damage, wildlife loss)
- fewer latrines
- greater dependence on firewood
- primarily located in dry areas
- most people have pastoralist livelihoods
- lower formal education
- higher poverty levels (measured by wide range of variables)
- lower food security

In summary, the research has shown that different aspects of village life are strongly linked. Holistic data, which highlight these complex linkages, provides better context for designing more effective project interventions. Specific villages can be targeted for awareness, prevention and monitoring systems, etc. The baseline data can also be used to measure outcomes of new projects.

Note: Several participants later raised questions about the implications of the SFTZ research. It was clarified that the research is not implying causal linkages (e.g., the research is not saying that there is lower formal education in WMA communities *because* they are primarily pastoralist communities, or that there are overall higher livelihood challenges because the villages are in WMAs). Rather the research is pointing to broader *correlations* that, taken together, suggest that WMAs are being carried out in rural areas that face a wide range of pre-existing and complex development challenges.

Prospects of the Authorized Associations Consortium (AAC)
Presented by Mr. Boniface Wambura on behalf of the AAC leadership

The AAC is an umbrella body for all Authorised Associations (AAs) that manage Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) in Tanzania. It is a CSO intended to provide a platform to the AAs to articulate their views, concerns with different stakeholders. AAC was registered as a CSO on 22nd January 2010 and its leaders have been democratically elected.

14 Registered AAs agreed to form AAC include:		
AA	**WMA**	**District**
NALIKA	Tunduru	Tunduru
MAGINGO	Liwale	Liwale
MUNGATA	Ngarambe/Tapika	Rufiji
WAMI-MBIKI SOCIETY	Wami-Mbiki	Morogoro, Bagamoyo & Mvomero
MBOMIPA	Pawaga-Idodi	Iringa
JUHIWAI	Ipole	Sikonge
UWIMA	Uyumbu	Urambo
JUHIBU	Burunge	Babati
JUHIWAIKO	Ikona	Serengeti
ENDUIMET	Enduimet	Longido
MBARANG'ANDU	Mbarang'andu	Namtumbo
JUKUMU	Ukutu	Morogoro
INDEMA	Makame	Kiteto
JUHIWAPOMA	Makao	Meatu

The objective of the AAC is to provide services to AAs members in Tanzania to improve their social and economic welfare. Key activities that they support to meet these objectives include the following:
ο Conservation and sustainable utilization of NRs in the respective WMAs;
ο Fundraising and laying down procedures for use of financial resources in order to improve social services (i.e. schools; infrastructure and hospitals) around members' WMAs;
ο Providing advisory services to AA members, particularly during planning of development projects, marketing research, and control of illegal off take of natural resources;
ο Liaison with government, non-governmental organizations, and/or private sector in all matters that affect the consortium positively or negatively;
ο Dealing with issues related to licenses, permits and fees for natural resource-based investments/ businesses;
ο Ensuring good public relationships with governments, NGOs and other institutions that work together with member AAs;
ο Creating an enabling environment for tourism and hunting business in WMAs;
ο Law enforcement and ensuring the rule of law in all WMAs; and
ο Dealing with all other issues for the benefits of its members, in compliance with existing policies and legislation.

Expected benefits include:
ο To have sustainable NRM in WMAs;
ο To secure funds for NRM activities;
ο Provision of social services;
ο Good development plans;
ο Secured markets for different tourism products in the WMAs;
ο Representation of AA members in decision-making bodies;

ο	Good public relation with all stakeholders working with AAs; and
ο	Having a favourable environment for investment in WMAs.

While the AAC is just getting started, it has had several important achievements to date, working with the support of USAID and WWF. Key achievements include formalizing the CSO, electing leadership, developing a website, and developing a preliminary two-year work plan. On-going work includes fundraising to meet operational costs and support improved social services for AA members; supporting sustainable utilization of natural resources in WMAs; and strengthening the capacity of AA members in natural resource management.

While new, the AAC is already facing challenges in meeting its diverse objectives, and it anticipates other challenges going forward. These include:
ο	Inability of AAs to exercise their user rights due to pre-existing contracts between government and investors;
ο	Lack of sustainable income sources within AAC and AAs;
ο	Lack of social services in AAs;
ο	Lack of good governance and transparency in AAs and other levels;
ο	Lack of skills/ capacity within AAs;
ο	Lack of patrol and office equipment within AAs;
ο	Delayed responses and funds from government;
ο	Poor infrastructure in WMAs;
ο	Bushfire and illegal logging;
ο	Increased poaching;
ο	Lack of awareness about WMA regulations and respective WMA constitutions;
ο	Human-wildlife conflicts;
ο	Contracts which do not sufficiently benefit local communities;
ο	Poor record keeping;
ο	Increased conflicts within AAs;
ο	Increased encroachment in WMAs from both crop farmers and livestock keepers;
ο	Climate change; and
ο	Lack of training to Village Game Scouts.

The AAC's plans for addressing these challenges and increasing the benefits and effectiveness from WMAs going forward include: enhancing stakeholders' participation in supporting WMA plans through AAC; marketing WMA resources; making the voices of AA representatives heard; engaging government to address benefit sharing issues; mobilizing resources to support the operations of the AAC; and providing more support to AAs to improve governance issues.

Points of discussion

AACs role in supporting integrated/ landscape approach to WMAs

While encroachment was recognized as a legitimate concern, participants also stressed that the integration of livestock in WMAs is very important from the perspective of secure livelihoods and cultural respect. WMAs need to fit into the livelihoods of those people on whose land they are situated. Rather than framing livestock "encroachment" as a conflict for WMAs, there should be more focus on how to ensure that local people are able to continue to keep sufficient livestock while maintaining WMAs. This will require, among other things, improving and facilitating community based land use planning, including helping community members devise ways of best integrating their livestock within the WMA management plan. Often land use planning associated with WMAs looks only at the "core" area. A more landscape-orientated approach is needed to help ensure that

there can be proper integration of wildlife and other livelihood strategies and land uses (crop farming, livestock keeping, etc.)

The AAC could be part of bringing a landscape approach to WMAs. While discussion and action around WMAs often focuses on conserving specific areas, we also need to consider the broader ecosystem and landscape in which WMAs are situated. Approaches to WMAs should avoid a narrow protected areas approach or 'islands' of conservation.

Capacity strengthening and resources development

There is a significant capacity gap among many AA leaders that AAC activities can help address. It was specifically suggested that the AAC and partners develop detailed guidelines and tools for communities to use in WMA management and governance.

Under the terms of the 2009 law, AAs are allowed to manage concessions. However, there are major capacity gaps in ensuring that communities can effectively exercise this right. WWF is hosting a workshop on enhancing concession management (8-10 Nov 2011) to present different templates for supporting communities.

AAC also needs to ensure that people stay well informed at the village level – not just within the AAs. The AAC will assist with this as part of their existing two-year plan, though it remains a major challenge. USAID is working on a toolkit for existing and new AAs to support WMA development, including a checklist for planning and best practices to date.

NGOs Support to WMAs in Tanzania: Experiences and Challenges

Presenter: Hussein Sosovele

(Programme Coordinator, CBNRM Policy Programme, WWF-Tanzania Country Office)

The Government of Tanzania adopted CBNRM as key policy and is supporting WMAs as a viable land use in rural areas. The Wildlife Policy of 1998 (rev 2007) empowers rural communities to be in charge of their environment and natural resources (ENR) found in their areas. Policies supporting the integration of *nature*, *wealth* and *power* to achieve sustainable development are being implemented. Some notable positive changes are occurring in some areas, whilst several challenges are also noted. The WMA process is challenging, but has a bright future and will have positive results *if the right policies and interventions are adopted consistently and in time.*

It is important to take a step back and ask some challenging questions about the basic theories and premises upon which Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) policy is based. Conservation theories suggest that if people benefit from ENR conservation, they will support such efforts. It is assumed that poverty tempts people to poach and to clear land and forests just for survival reasons. It follows from this that if conservation results in benefits for people, people will engage in conservation. Thus, "conservation = benefits" became an ideal policy option and shaped conservation programmes in many countries. Key questions about this theory include: Whose benefits? And what are those benefits (employment? for who? in what? which skills are required? what is the income?)? Proponents of this "benefits for conservation" theory have not adequately addressed these issues.

Colonial governments introduced changes in the management of ENR that excluded local people, and created protected areas through force, largely to serve external needs. These changes led to injustice, hostility between communities and conservation organizations, increased management costs, and inability to protect resources. Postcolonial governments continued with the same approaches, with minor changes in recent times. Some new policies that considered local people's needs and fostered participation were made. Those policy changes supported various forms of CBNRM, i.e., processes that promote strong community engagement and benefit sharing. WMAs are part of that broader concept of CBNRM.

The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania of 1998 (rev. 2007) defined the need for devolving responsibilities to local people and extending benefits to enhance conservation and improve livelihoods. By 2002 the first WMA Regulations (rev. 2005) were issued to support the establishment of WMAs. WMAs are established on village land after villagers have agreed to do so. WMAs are therefore "conservation business ventures" owned and managed by local people.

NGOs play an important role in WMA implementation in Tanzania. The NGOs most involved include: African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Frankfurt Zoological Society, and AFRICARE. The government of Tanzania (GoT) works with these and other NGOs in facilitating the development of policies and laws, and in establishing WMAs. NGOs also provide technical support to the process covering all aspects of the WMA development, including capacity building programmes, data collection, research and information sharing.

In practice NGOs do a substantial portion of the work of supporting WMA development. These NGOs enjoy great support from GoT and local communities in WMAs establishment and management. Working with local communities and government requires cultivation of mutual trust and strong commitment: many of them have had a long history of working with communities to support conservation programmes.

While they have realized a number of important successes, these NGOs also face a number of challenges in supporting WMAs. All of the NGOs involved in WMAs in Tanzania are donor supported and foreign registered. Often the NGOs' relationship with local communities leads to "donor dependence syndrome" – i.e. the NGOs

are perceived by communities as donors, rather than service providers or technical support organizations. Further, there is very little networking and coordination among NGOs, though the recent establishment of a WMA Support Unit under MRNT WD, with responsibilities including coordination of the NGOs supporting WMAs, is expected to help address this weakness. Most of the NGOs are also confined to specific geographical areas, and thus there can be mismatches between where NGOs are working, and where most WMA support is needed. Further, WMAs are not the only focus for many of those NGOs, and to some not the main issue of focus. As such, in some cases expectations are growing while resources to support WMAs are insufficient. The NGOs are also sometimes caught in inter-institutional conflicts, particularly conflicts between local communities and local governments over resource management. Finally, the role of NGOs raises sustainability concerns. How can WMAs be sustained when their operations currently depend on donors?

Key lessons learned to date from NGOs' experience in WMA engagement include:
- Initiating community conservation programmes takes time and resources – long term investment is critical;
- Implementing programmes that empower local communities, create wealth and conserve resources generates significant positive change;
- Strong WMA programmes have the potential to change attitudes towards resource management; and
- The need to build strong and sustainable WMAs calls for multi-stakeholder involvement - not just foreign NGOs and donors.

Points of discussion:

Communities have not been sufficiently engaged in the process of establishing and managing WMAs, and there is a perception that communities are sometimes "forced" to enter or stay in WMAs. The strong role of NGOs in WMA implementation brings these concerns to the forefront – how are communities' concerns addressed, and how are their rights to engage – or not – in WMAs respected by NGOs? Are communities able to disengage if they choose to, and to use the land for other purposes, e.g., increased livestock grazing or agricultural expansion? NGO experience suggests that the problem is often not that communities are unequivocally interested in disengaging from the WMA, but rather that the WMA is failing to deliver benefits superior or equivalent to those that communities could get from an alternative land use or wildlife investment. In such cases, have NGOs have often been able to successfully address the underlying concern, and to adjust the WMA to enhance the benefits.

Enhancing capacity and realizing the greatest benefits from WMAs

WMAs often compete with national parks for tourism. The values and benefits of WMA vs. National Parks need to be better understood. For example, mapping where wildlife is at different times of the year (in the park vs. in the WMA) can help target WMA marketing. This may be something that NGOs could help support. NGOs could also help emphasize with the government that WMAs are working and are important.

There needs to be more emphasis placed on developing models for WMAs that benefit everyone, and that are grounded in genuine community based control. This may require engaging with government, NGOs and other stakeholders on the issues of real cost accounting and real benefit sharing. District level Natural Resource Advisory Boards may be an underutilized resource for supporting WMAs. However, there have been many challenges in practice in working with the Boards. In some cases, Boards' pre-existing relationships with particular investors, for example, have made it difficult for them to support the best interest of communities. One option may be to provide more training / sensitization on Board members' roles and responsibilities in supporting WMAs. CBOs should also be trained and empowered to take on broader roles, and to complement the roles of the government and NGOs.

Wildlife protection in Enduimet WMA - A Joint Effort
Presenter: Damian Bell (Honeyguide Foundation)

The experiences of the Honeyguide Foundation and its partners over the two last years in supporting Enduimet WMA provides important lessons in the needs, challenges and costs of protecting a WMA. Enduimet is situated between the growing urban populations in Arusha and Namanga (along the Kenya border) and provides a corridor for movements of wildlife between several national parks. The Village Game Scouts thus face a number of threats from illegal human activities (including charcoal, ivory, bush meat, cannabis/bhang trafficking, human trafficking and related problems of corruption), as well as multiple threats from wildlife (crop raiding, human-wildlife conflict, livestock predation).

In Enduimet, resources dedicated to addressing these challenges and protecting the WMA include: 45 VGS (55 needed), 3 vehicles, 16 guns, ranger posts and gates, aerial patrols by microlight, night vision equipment, tracker dogs, uniforms, radios, etc. This range of equipment is required in part because poachers change tactics in response to whatever techniques the VGSs are using; if VGSs patrol at night, poachers operate in the day, and visa-versa. Being able to have 24hr patrolling is also part of why a large number of scouts are required. Protection strategies include informer rewards, VGS incentives, and raising community awareness and buy-in.

Costs are one of the main challenges for effectively implementing and maintaining these protection measures. Operational running costs total US$87-US$112,000pa (=45 game scouts @ US$50,000- US$60,000pa; 3 vehicles @ US$30,000- US$40,000pa; Informers rewards @ US$5,000-US$8,000pa; prosecution follow up @ US$2,000-US$4,000pa). Required initial capital investments are also substantial (US$140,000).

However, costs are not the only challenge. WMA governance structures are highly complex. There are often many, parallel decision makers and it is not clear who has ultimate authority and responsibility. Other challenges include: low understanding of the law among VGSs, poor follow up on prosecutions, inadequate and inconsistent funding, and lack of conservation action plans. CBOs also often do not fully understand the nature of restrictions on the use of conservation funding, e.g., why the project can buy two cars at a high cost but can't distribute smaller amounts of money to directly fund things that the community would like assistance in purchasing.

In conclusion, WMA's have not been given the structure and full picture to understand and react to the challenges to protect their resources. There are many challenges, and big remaining questions regarding who we are conserving for and whether we've been successful. At the same time, despite all these challenges, some progress is clearly being made. We can't yet do specific animal counts, but we can see positive changes happening. Tourists are coming, and are reporting more animals over time. Animals are coming back, and communities are beginning to benefit.

Points of discussion:
- In addition to patrolling, VGSs are doing some counting and tracking of game numbers, but to date data management has been challenging.
- The WMA has taken substantial time to establish and become operational. It is still not a sustainable business model, and in the long term it may be a struggle to make it financially self-sustainable. However, financial sustainability is possible as wildlife numbers increase (in a way that is balanced and harmonious with livestock keeping) and if the WMA is able to continue to attract high end, but not too exclusive, tourism. The WMA also needs to remain linked to its conservation values.

Private sector engagement in WMAs – Hunting sector reflections
Presenter: Michel Mantheakis (Michel Mantheakis Safaris)
A long time investor and business manager engaged in the hunting sector

When the idea of WMAs was introduced in the 80s, it sent shock waves through the government. There was concern that if you take power away from the Wildlife Department regarding which companies should be allowed to engage in hunting, you will promote corruption. At the same time, everyone agreed that it is necessary for people to benefit from conservation, and WMAs were meant to contribute to local sustainable development. Yet the reality of WMAs is not meeting these basic expectations. In Kilombero, for example, most of the local environment has been destroyed despite the conservation efforts there. There are fundamental problems in the system that need to be addressed.

Lack of flexibility and rational pricing in hunting licensing: WMAs are meant to be revenue-generating ventures. Yet the wholesale hunting licensing process does not allow investors the flexibility to arrange packages in revenue maximizing ways. Investors cannot, for example, provide smaller, cheaper packages when that would meet demand. During the recession, hunting companies lost significant market share because they were able to provide only large, expensive packages for which there was little demand. With more flexible (/market driven) licensing arrangements, hunting revenues could be much higher with the same number of animals.

Inadequate and unfair revenue sharing: Too great a percentage of total revenues go to the District rather than Village government. Once revenues have been distributed to the district, they often go into 'supplementary' budgets rather than being redistributed to the villages as they should be. This results in complaints and pressures against WMAs from local people because they are not getting what they need from the enterprise. There is also an insufficient portion of total revenues being reinvested in conservation. Efforts to more appropriately distribute funds are often marred by politics at multiple levels.

Poor governance and corruption: WMAs also suffer from poor governance at multiple levels. For example, AAs often comprise only two individuals from each village, and not necessarily from village government. These representatives often do not have the capacity or full mandate to effectively represent the village. Personal interests often take precedence over communal interests, and dealings of the WMA body are vulnerable to corruption. Lack of village government representation on the AAs can lead to internal conflicts and politics at the village level, as the village governments often do not trust the dealings of the AA and sometimes seek to undermine it because they do not believe it is working in their interest. There is frequently little disciplinary action taken when rules are violated, which only serves to undermine the overall sense of members' commitment. Further, too much money is often used for 'logistics' (sitting allowances, transport allowances, per diems, etc). Pricing and negotiation processes are often not clear or reliable, and clan or allegiance divisions in the village extended into decision making and voting.

Points of discussion:
- Pricing for hunting licenses needs to be reformulated, including giving companies options other than wholesale licenses where smaller, cheaper packages could result in greater revenue for hunting the same number of animals.
- It would be helpful to establish independent monitoring and auditing processes for WMAs.
- Hunting certification/ verification can be useful to introduce checks and balances and to ensure a degree of independent verification is in place.

CWM in context of broader DENRM in Tanzania
Presenter: Kahana Lukumbuzya (Independent Consultant)

In the interest of increased efficiency and effectiveness, there is a movement towards greater Decentralized National Resources Management (DeNRM) in Tanzania. This is being supported and promoted by several stakeholders, including major development partners. However, there are various approaches and perspectives on what decentralization means and how it should be carried out. It is important to understand the broader DeNRM context in which CWM is situated. Towards that end, it is helpful to first take a step back and look at the terminology and key concepts (though the definitions and their distinctions are not consistent across sources):
- CBNRM – Community Based Natural Resource Management, Collaborative NRM
- DeNRM/DNRM – Decentralized NRM
- DENRM – Decentralized Environment and Natural Resources Management

CBNRM and DeNRM have the same goal: **"sustainable natural resource management at the lowest appropriate governance level".** CBNRM is a broad term, while DeNRM is about devolved responsibility and ownership of NR on village or adjacent land (i.e., forests, bees, honey, fish, wildlife, wetlands, etc.) through local government structures under Decentralization by Devolution ("D by D") processes.

Participation in planning is a key component of decentralization approaches. In part it is grounded in the Tanzanian National Vision 2025, which promotes, among other things: situating the private sector as the engine of growth of the economy; government withdrawal from production; central government supporting policy formulation that results in an enabling environment for private sector and civil society; decentralization, including through empowering citizens, households and local governments; and effectively involving citizens, e.g. in development plans.

The broader overall reform agenda in which DeNRM is situated includes: citizens' participation in planning their own development; citizens' user rights over resources for their own benefit; principles of good governance in empowering citizens to own and manage natural resources; and ensure use of natural resources adheres to principles of sustainable environmental management.

Land reforms are also a key part of realizing this vision. The basis for land reforms includes the Land Policy (1995), Land Act and Village Land Act (1999). Village lands (as opposed to reserved land and general land) are to be administered by the village council on behalf of the village assembly, and managed / used by village residents for their own benefit and well-being. This includes sustainable use of natural resources, inline with relevant legislation, including the Land Use Planning Act (2007).

While specific processes vary by context and sector, some common steps for DeNRM include: involving citizens through public meetings; establishing committees, e.g., village natural resources committees (VNRCs), Authorized Associations (AAs), beach management unites (BMUs); demarcating areas and agreeing on boundaries; assessing the resources, e.g., through participatory rural appraisal (PRA); preparing Management Plans; passing by-laws; and securing user rights.

Across the natural resource sectors, progress in implementing CBNRM mechanisms has been mixed, with CBFM (community based forest management) being the most widespread to date.

Progress in implementing CBNRM as of 2011

Projects	No. Of Villages	Area in Ha
WMA	145	3,000,000
CBFM	1,457	2,345,000
JFM	863	1,777,000
BMU	666	

Decentralization by Devolution ('D by D') in Tanzania is primarily supported by the Local Government Act (1982), which supports political devolution and decentralization of functions and finances. Under this system LGAs are responsible for social development, public service provision, maintenance of law and local development through participatory processes. Leaders are elected by citizens at district and village levels, and are meant to ensure that services are provided in an efficient and effective manner. Roles and responsibilities of the central government under "D by D" include: formation of policy, legislation, and guidelines; law enforcement; allocating user rights and market access; devising national 'minimum standards'; technical advice and capacity building; monitoring; and financing.

Under the current "sector approach" (separate projects / programmes under each sector), there is a wide range of donor-supported projects, though these are largely uncoordinated. In part to address these coordination concerns, Development Partners and other stakeholders are promoting **Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAST)** and the **Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp)**.

JAST is being promoted ostensibly with the objectives of:
• Strengthening national ownership and government leadership of the development process,
• Aligning development partner support to Government priorities, systems, structures and procedures,
• Harmonising government and development partner processes,
• Managing resources for achieving development results,
• Ensuring mutual accountability of the government and development partners, and
• Strengthening accountability of the government to the citizens of Tanzania.

SWAp aims to bring together governments, development partners and other stakeholders within any sector through a set of operating principles rather than a specific package of activities. It supports government leadership in broadening policy dialogues and in developing a single sector policy, a common and realistic expenditure program, common monitoring arrangements, and coordinated procedures for funding and procurement.

The **DeNRM – SWAp** being promoted by development partners in Tanzania may include the forestry, wildlife, fisheries, lands, energy and minerals sectors, and possibly climate change. Under the SWAP, sectors would prepare a common development plan drawn from the sector strategic plans. There would be a Steering Committee, to include Prime Minister's Office – Regional and Local Government (PMO-RALG), MNRT Forestry and Beekeeping Division (FBD) and Wildlife Division (WD), Fisheries Division, Vice President's Office – Division of Environment (VPO-DoE), Treasury, National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Cooperatives (MAFC), Ministry of Water (MoW), DPs, CSOs and the private sector. The permanent secretaries of MRNT, PMORALG, and VPO would chair the proposed committee. The budget for DeNRM would be drawn from country's Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), with reporting to follow regular GoT procedures. The budget would be comprised of contributions from GoT and development partners, and a

'basket fund' with a 'ringed fence' for natural resources would be created. The SWAp would include joint programme reviews, audits by the Control and Auditor General (CAG) and National Auditing Office (NAO). Procurement procedures would follow the Procurement Act (2004).

The expected results of a DeNRM - SWAp would include:
- Investments available for developing natural resources;
- Resources targeted according to objectively determined needs;
- Transparency in planning and expenditures; and
- Improved efficiency from extension staff by using systems that they are familiar with.

There are a number of key stakeholders that must be on board for a DeNRM SWAp to work effectively. However, the positions and perspectives of these stakeholders vary widely, and there is a long way to go to bringing the different stakeholders in line with one another in their vision and approach to DeNRM.

Stakeholder	Expectations
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	o MNRT lacks common understanding about the meaning of DeNRM, across and within each Division o FBD envisions that all 17 million Ha of general lands forests will come under PFM o WD envisions that most Game Controlled Areas will come under WMAs o FBD collected TSH 35 Billion in 2009/2010, with greater retention (i.e. not remitting the collected revenue to the Ministry of Finance) they would be able to support PFM o MNRT envisions greater retention from Ministry of Finance and greater benefit sharing with LGAs
Prime Minister's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government	o Envisions NRM to be integrated into 'D by D' o Envisions that stakeholders will be realistic about the timeframe for achieving DeNRM o Envisions that the Local Government Development Grant (LGDG) for each district will be utilized for disbursing of funds and that it will remain unconditional o Envisions that capacity building of NRM staff in the districts will be conducted by MNRT
Development Partners Group - Environment	o Need to build stronger consensus amongst DPs and with stakeholders o Envisions a comprehensive and holistic sector dialogue o Envisions greater poverty reduction impacts from investments in NRM, outsourcing of implementation to Non-State Actors o Envisions support to DeNRM to be disbursed through avenues other than the LGDG modality o Envisions a fund of approx. USD40 million for next four years

There are many important open questions and challenging issues to realizing a joint vision on DeNRM in Tanzania, including the following:

- Which natural resource sub-sectors should be included?
- How can a balance between impact and coverage be established – e.g., should the programme start by being limited to a geographical area (to help ensure impact), or should it be launched nationally?
- What scope of activities / investment should be supported – e.g., should districts be supported in developing natural resource based enterprises to improve revenue collection, managing critical ecosystems (e.g., catchment forests) that do not generate revenue, law enforcement, etc.?

- Who are the different partners at each level (village, district, regional, national) and what activities are most appropriate at each level?
- What is the appropriate share of support to go towards investment, planning capacity development, etc?
- How can climate change and DeNRM support be harmonized? Would a unified and comprehensive sector dialogue under NRM be the best means of coordinating climate change activities with natural resources management in villages?
- What are the benefits and weaknesses of a phased approach (either geographically or sub-sectorally)? If it is to be a phased approach, how should starting districts/sectors be selected?
- What should the opportunities be for the participation of non-state actors (NGOs, CBOs, private sector) in accessing SWAp resources, e.g. for purposes of supporting local service provision, monitoring, advocacy, etc.?
- How should incentives be developed to strengthen natural resource revenue collection and reinvestment into the sector?
- How can collection of revenues from sustainable natural resource use (versus unsustainable use) be promoted?
- For allocation, how should minimum conditions and access criteria be set, and what is the appropriate allocation formula for grant qualification and disbursement?

Next steps in the development of DeNRM in Tanzania include:
- Developing a common understanding and vision among key stakeholders: June – Sept 2011(delayed)
- Developing an action plan and next steps: Dec 2011
- Formulation of the full DeNRM programme: 2012

Regarding development partners' positions on DeNRM, at this stage, Finland, Denmark, and Belgium are committed to supporting DeNRM. Norway, USAID and possibly DfID have aligned their support so that it complements DeNRM.

In further discussion on DeNRM it was noted that wildlife was one of the first sectors to start engaging in the DeNRM. The point was also raised that DeNRM is in some senses a parallel initiative to the on-going decentralized development planning mandated under the local government reform programme. It is not clear if/how these separate initiatives will align. In all cases, the specific implications of the national DeNRM programmes for the wildlife sector are not yet clear.

Day 1 Summary and Reflections
Rapporteur: Alais Morindat (IIED/TNRF/ KDSC)

Alais Morindat, TNRF Chairperson, provided a summary of each of the day's presentations, and raised several challenging observations and questions for the participants to consider going into the second day. He posited that the basic theories of development that CWM is often based upon need to be re-examined. Is this 'development'? Does CWM help realize this vision, in reality? Is this the 'right' theory of development, and is it a theory and vision that is driven by the communities who are supposed to benefit? What other visions exist?

The current mechanisms unpinning WMAs are also not as effective and efficient as they need to be – they are not realizing sufficient or sustainable benefits for the people who are bearing the costs. There is increasing conflict, too few resources and high costs, weak governance, too little political will, poor stakeholder collaboration, and poor generation and sharing of benefits. Some of these problems may arise because we lack the tools we need to realize the vision of WMAs we aspire to. We may also, however, need to go back to the drawing board and revisit the basic concepts.

SESSION II: COMPARATIVE EXPERIENCES IN CWM FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA

Comparative Experiences in Community Wildlife Management from Southern Africa - Some perspectives from the Regional CBNRM Capacity Building Programme for Southern Africa

Presenter: Mwape Sichilongo, Coordinator – Regional CBNRM Programme for southern Africa

The presentation started with an overview of the Regional CBNRM Programme:

- **Goal:** Improved rural livelihoods at the household level attained through sustainable management of natural resources by communities in southern Africa
- **Purpose**: CBNRM principles, policies and practice adopted as a mainstream strategy in southern Africa for sustainable natural resource management in a manner that promotes equitable access to, use and management of natural resources
- **Problem Description:** Limited understanding and support of CBNRM amongst policy makers, civil society, the private sector and communities, is retarding the ability of rural people to realize maximum value from their natural resources, and thus improve their livelihoods and management of their natural resources sustainably

The Programme outputs are:
1. Institutional strengthening, e.g. through support to forums.
2. Consolidating best practices and capacity building in core CBNRM processes, including:
   o Practical tools and applications for capacity building for CBNRM support providers (e.g., members of the Forums), 'training of trainers' in various thematic areas (including local level governance), synthesis, lessons learned, sharing, etc.; and
   o Cross cutting issues thematic areas including gender, HIV/ AIDS and climate change mainstreaming.
3. Performance monitoring, evaluation and dissemination, to address what is actually happening in CBNRM and whether or not it is having any impact.
4. Policy development and implementation, including assessing how the enabling environment can be enhanced.
5. Conclude support to select existing partner training institutions, e.g., training and production of educational materials, training of trainers, etc.

CBNRM in the region has been justified based on, among other things, general degradation of natural resources, especially wildlife; limited capacity in central authorities to reverse this degradation – despite owning the resources; and democratisation of natural resource management as part of the wider political process.

The key principles and foundations of CBNRM are:
- Devolution of responsibility and authority;
- Improve community participation in decision making;
- Benefit sharing and distribution;
- Maintaining the natural resource base, including by building on the comparative advantage of wildlife over agriculture in certain areas;
- Improved natural resource governance;
- Capacity for NRM and enterprise; and
- Enabling environment for political and economic community empowerment.

The CBNRM Forum has been involved in, among other things:
- Development of training manuals;
- Capacity building and support to conservancies through the National Association for CBNRM Support Organisations;
- Reorientation and promotion of the direct payment system in Zimbabwe;
- Supported the development of the national CBNRM policy in Botswana and follow up reviews and discussions;
- Policy lessons learned across the region;
- CBNRM enabling environment and development of indicators for measuring performance; and
- Supporting policy engagement and strengthening of forums across the region; exchange visits and training.

In practice, regionally there has been a general adoption of CBNRM principles, initially as an experiment. There have been various major projects across the region, e.g., CAMPFIRE[1] (Zimbabwe), ADMADE[2] (Zambia), LIFE[3] (Namibia), and 'Tchuma Chato'[4] (Mozambique). Policy and legislation reviews and revisions throughout the region increasingly recognised communities as managers, granted legal rights, recognized wildlife as a viable land use, establishing benefit sharing mechanisms, and /or supporting an enterprise approach to natural resources. These policy reforms have also often been coupled with institutional reforms, including creation of community structures, strengthening of central agencies for this role, and the mobilisation of new players.

The impacts of these efforts have been mixed across the region. Where the principles have been adequately implemented, legislated for, and supported by mechanisms for communities developed through partnerships, the positive impacts have been dramatic. Tangible benefits have been delivered (e.g., jobs, meat, development); community attitudes have changed; wildlife have returned; habitats have been protected; ownership has been enhanced; and communities have been politically and economically empowered (rights, decision making, joint ventures). However, where the principles of CBNRM were only partially or weakly implemented, the impact has been much less dramatic. In such cases there have been limited benefits, particularly at household level, power has remained centralised, wildlife depletion has continued, communities have remained marginalised.

Some important examples of relative success stories can be drawn from Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe. The CBNRM programmes in these countries, including for wildlife, have been characterized by clear policy and legislation for community empowerment, granting of rights, capacity building, and local level decision-making. They have resulted in recovered or maintained wildlife populations, secured wildlife habitats, resilient community structures, and direct payments to communities. However, even here progress has not always been consistent. In Botswana, the CBNRM programme used to accord 100% of revenue to communities, but now, based on a national level CBNRM policy that somewhat recentralizes power, their share has been reduced to 35%. Community concessions and land reforms have been implemented in Mozambique to support communities (e.g., communities are granted 20% of all resource user fees), but these reforms have not been fully implemented. In Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique there has been only partial implementation of CBNRM, and the interventions have not been well supported.

Taking a closer look at Game Management Areas (GMAs) in Zambia demonstrates the complexity and promise of CBNRM in practice. GMAs serve as important buffer zones to national parks. They incorporate integrated land use areas, customary land, and state resources. Communities are co-managers/co-signatories to hunting concession agreements, with a 50/50 benefit sharing mechanism on licence fees and a 20/80 sharing on concession fees. The governing Community Resource Boards are democratic, with traditional with chiefs as patrons. GMAs employ village scouts for law enforcement. Overall, GMAs have transferred millions of dollars to

---

[1] Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
[2] Administrative Management Design
[3] Living in a Finite Environment programme
[4] Our Wealth (translation)

communities, and are supporting thousands of community projects. They provide effective incentives for conservation and support sustainable rural development. And there is still great potential for their expansion in still wild, remote, undisturbed areas.

However, GMAs still face many challenges. The Community Resources Boards are very weak as institutions, and subject to elite capture and governance challenges. They lack management capacity and have too limited support. In practice, no resource rights have been realistically given and devolution has been only partial. Few benefits are felt at the household level. Land use conflicts persist, including between wildlife and agriculture encroachment. Some areas have seen reduced income generating capacity, reduced wildlife populations and threatened habitats in general. Further, the people participating in GMAs are still generally very poor, and as such GMAs are also under threat from competition and degradation.

There are many similarities between experience with GMAs and Tanzania's experience with WMAs. These include:
• Similar history, justification and circumstances;
• Created in response to wildlife depletion in the 1980s;
• Offer opportunities for communities to benefit;
• Based on partnerships with central authorities and the private sector;
• Provided for in policy and legislation;
• High potential for conservation of wildlife;
• Already generating income for communities and conservation; and
• Communities setting aside land for conservation.

There are also important differences between GMAs and WMAs, and from which Tanzania may draw useful lessons. Some key differences include that GMAs are characterized by:
• Deliberate and clear pro-poor community empowerment agenda at policy and political level;
• Local NGOs taking the lead in capacity building in conjunction with international organisations;
• Local level decision making for, inter alia, quota setting, wildlife monitoring, pricing;
• Direct community negotiation with private sector partners;
• High level of enterprise development, with joint ventures for lodges and hunting as well as more recently developed up-market community lodges;
• Craft sales are surpassing hunting as the main source of revenue; and
• There is 100% community retention of revenues generated in an area, which creates important incentives.

Overall, the extent to which regional experiments with CBNRM have translated into benefits in reality has depended on many factors. In summary, some key lessons from the regional CBNRM forum include that: different countries are at different levels of implementing CBNRM; principles of CBNRM have never been fully institutionalised across the region; devolution of rights and responsibilities have been only partial, and rights are not always clear; CBNRM is often based on mere involvement, rather than actual community empowerment; initiatives are too donor dependent and too wildlife focused; there is limited capacity at all levels; and results are mixed.

Regional experience to date also leaves open many important questions for community wildlife management:
• Is the environment adequately supporting income generation by communities? In many cases benefits are insufficient and income is not covering wildlife management costs.
• Are fees accruing to communities directly? Or is fiscal devolution too limited?
• Is there adequate capacity for resource management and running of institutions? Does the distribution of benefits support this capacity?
• Do communities know how much money is captured from their area?
• What is the money spent on and who decides?

- Is the money generated from an area adequately reinvested in the area?
- Is there potential or actual land use conflict?
- Is wildlife the land use option of choice?
- What is the main motivation for setting up the wildlife management areas?
- Is the regulatory framework adequate?
- Is there adequate support to improve the performance of the areas?
- Is there adequate monitoring and evaluation of the actual performance, and is this information informing programming and policy debate?

The presenter provided some final reflections on improving CWM in Tanzania, based on regional experiences. There are enough experiences and lessons in the region to learn from - both negative and positive. There are different current and historical models that should be considered. CBNRM processes are political by nature, and yet we are not adequately engaging in / with the political process. Communities need support and capacity to be adequately involved; they need to have the capacity and opportunity to ask questions and demand answers. We also need to take a step back and ask ourselves questions about the conservation agenda or development agenda we are pursuing. Whose agenda is this? For whom is it being pursued? Finally, we need to consider what has caused the positive and negative impacts we've seen so far: Are they due to coincidence? Political change? Growing awareness? Someone somewhere must make sure we can consistently realize the vision of CBNRM in ways that go beyond the pronouncements or policies!

Points of discussion:

Performance monitoring

Approaches to CBNRM performance monitoring vary across the region. Under the CBNRM Forum monitoring is built around the model developed for Namibia. This has involved consulting stakeholders and agreeing on principles that need to be monitored. The aim is to have as comprehensive a set of principles as possible at the multi-stakeholder platform level (regional level). National forums will then find contextually appropriate means to collect the information needed for monitoring, using their existing institutions. Programmes have typically used private consultants to collect information and 'fill in the gaps'.

At the local level, a system is being developed for communities to do community level governance and monitoring. They are looking at a range parameters including animal sitings, meetings held (and who attended), projects implemented, poaching, revenues in and out, etc. These community level monitoring systems are meant to assist communities in their decision making, to show local level trends over time, and to help community members hold others accountable for governance and benefit sharing.

At this stage monitoring is probably most advanced in Namibia. They produce an annual state of CBNRM report, which has detailed information on each conservancy, showing how many people are involved, how much money they have generated, what the revenue sources have been, how many community members are employed, a detailed map of the area including use zoning, which partners are involved, etc. This document is used to see where the national and local programmes are going and to highlight challenges and success. The report development is supported by COPASA and USAID.

Land tenure and wildlife ownership

There are similarities and differences in land tenure and wildlife ownership between Tanzania and other countries in the region. These contribute to how and where CBRNM benefits communities and wildlife conservation. Across most of the region, there are three main categories of land: state, private, and community / customary land, with most CBNRM initiatives situated in the latter. In most (all?) countries in the region where communities have communal tenure, they still lack ownership of wildlife (or minerals below the surface). There is often an assumption that if communities own these resources they will have greater incentives to conserve. However, for wildlife, this assumption is being challenged in several places – e.g. in Botswana. Communities will contribute to, and can benefit from wildlife management even where they do not own all land or its resources… as long as certain conditions are met and rights are realized. Experience is suggesting that the key factor is not ownership of the wildlife, but clear access and use rights, supported in good governance and a strong enabling environment. In Namibia, for example, the quota system allows people to chose what they want to do with animals (conserve or hunt) and communities choose to do some combination of these two. They would not do this, however, in the absence of a supportive enabling environment for exercising these rights.

Benefit sharing

Benefit sharing is both critically important and a key challenge for CBNMR across the region. A key part of the basic concept seems to be unsolved… Is money generated in a particular community meant to stay there, and benefit them (for reasons of rights, development promotion, and conservation incentives)? Or is part of the intent to redistribute revenue such that CBNRM also results in financial gains for the district or the whole country? There seems to be a consistent move towards the latter concept of benefit sharing, yet this challenges the basic theory of CBNRM.

While it is clear that nationalizing CBNRM benefits is a major disincentive, there is not a consistent way of dealing with these issues across the region. It is generally agreed that people's costs should always be met (at the very least) and that benefits must be net positive in order for a conservation incentive to exist. But there are also costs at different levels of government, and there are some arguments that wildlife should produce broader national benefits (for "the public"). The challenge is in the details and in finding the right benefit sharing arrangements in practice… what exactly should the percentage of revenues retained by the community be (and what should benefit sharing look like within communities as well)?

Discussions around fair and equitable benefit sharing also highlight the problem that opportunity costs and externalities are not well captured, especially those borne by communities. This arises in part because costs are too often defined only in monetary terms. Likewise, the non-monetary values of, e.g., ecosystem services at the local level (and the contribution of CBNRM to these) are often poorly captured.

CBRNM Forum vs. COPASA

The CBNRM Forum, described in this presentation, is a regional programme funded by Norway and focused on training and knowledge management. COPASA focuses on other areas of CBNRM in the region, but is coordinated with the Forum. The Forum budget does allow for study tours and other means of cross-country information sharing.

SESSION III: ALTERNATIVE CWM APPROACHES AND COMMUNITY VOICES

Experiences from community-private sector CWM partnerships at local level in northern Tanzania
Presenter: Edward Loure (UCRT)

UCRT and partners are working with pastoralist communities, primarily the Maasai, including those within Loliondo Division, Ngorongoro District. Many of these community members are conservationists, and their land is appropriate for the livestock keeping that constitutes the main part of their livelihoods. Livestock are maintained primarily on lands long held by these communities. Since 1998, UCRT has supported these communities through training and capacity strengthening for the control, management and benefit of their natural resources.

In 2002, some communities in Northern Tanzania made their own contracts with tour operators, in line with their traditional decision making institutions. These contracts are aimed at generating income for villages from tourism, based on empowered engagement. Benefits from the tour operators' perspective include that the community lands offered large wildlife populations, opportunities for cultural tourism, and opportunities for walking safaris in areas adjacent to Serengeti National Park. Camping accommodations in village lands are often significantly less expensive that camping within the park, which can attract different tourists. Benefits to the communities from these contracts include income generation. The contracts are simple and straightforward (most not exceeding three pages). They allow for the continuation of livestock grazing and other key livelihood activities important to the community. Thus, tourism is made compatible with people's broader livelihoods. The contracts also stipulate that land ownership is retained by the village (no land will be "taken"). Most tour companies do not establish permanent lodges, but rather pitch temporary 'high end' camps as needed.

These arrangements have often been very effective from both the community and tour operators' perspectives. This success was due in part to the fact that there were strong incentives for both tour operators and communities, and that the contracts ensured that communities retained full control and ownership. The communities' were supported in these roles in part through training support from UCRT and others on financial management etc. All revenues accrued at the village level went into village accounts; tour operators issued cheques directly to village accounts. According to village plans, made through the village council and village general assemblies, community members can request money from the account for approved uses. Village governments also pay a fair share of revenues to district government, in exchange for some technical guidance. There is no formal marketing of these tourism opportunities outwith the participating tour operators marketing their tours to clients.

Revenues under this scheme have varied widely, with some village receiving TSH 80 million per year, but with the range in most years being TSH 8 - 10 million. Villages that have received less revenue than others have in some cases changed practices (e.g., improved camp areas) to help attract greater revenues.

Key differences between this community model and the current WMA model include:
- Control /governance is at the village level, rather than an WMA comprised of multiple villages, which better links CWM governance to village governance institutions and effective representation.
- Livestock grazing is allowed in numbers established by the community.
- There is not a strict system of penalties as there is in WMAs, addressing the concern that community members can be fined for rules they do not understand / are not aware of or for activities that they do not understand to be illegal.
- Revenue allocation is straightforward and fair, directly benefiting the contributing community.

Despite this success, it is not clear whether the programme can continue because there is significant external pressure against it. The original idea was for a model in which participating, adjacent villages could prepare land use plans that collectively create wildlife corridors across bordering villages. However, there is extensive external pressure not to do this, as this 'grassroots' conservation planning is not controlled by higher authorities and directly conflicts with already established game controlled areas. The communities in these areas are also facing a number of other pressures and challenges, including possible expansion of protected areas (national parks) that may lead to further evictions/ displacement, and increasing land privatization and fragmentation.

Nonetheless these and other experiences in northern Tanzanian demonstrate that if communities are empowered and given time they can become good wildlife managers and conservationists, using money from tourism to effectively enhance community wellbeing. But more discussion and support is needed for developing such opportunities. Currently, people are reacting to rapidly changing landscapes rather than being able to lead or participate in empowered ways.

Experiences from community representatives within and outside of WMAs

FROM WITHIN WMAs

Presenter: David Mgalla AAC Vice-Chair, Mbarang'andu WMA, Namtumbo-Ruvuma

Awareness-raising on the importance of CWM on improving rural livelihood needs to dwell on the tangible benefits from WMAs such as in contributing to social services such as education funds. However, awareness-raising is usually delayed until adulthood thus missing the opportunity of promoting positive conservation attitudes and practices from an early age. Therefore, awareness-raising for CWM should be incorporated as part of the school curriculum in primary schools. Doing so would help ensure youth understand and carry on environment and wildlife management by making it a more central part of people's lives.

Engaging in WMAs has meant a cultural shift at the local level that has taken time to develop and that has had many challenges. However, there are important, visible successes. For example, there was a well-known poacher in a certain village that even once the WMA was established continued poaching activities. However, poaching could not cover his son's secondary school fees. He was able to secure funds for his son's schooling from the WMA / conservation fund, and after this stopped poaching and decided to contribute to the community's wildlife conservation efforts.

Communities in WMAs should be allowed to collect, retain and manage 100% of revenues at the village level, with an appropriate percentage distributed to the District Council. However, as it stands communities are not receiving a fair share of benefits and are not able to control funds.

FROM OUTSIDE WMAs:

Presenter: Kaayai Murero (Simanjiro)

There are large wildlife populations in Simanjiro – more than in national parks at some times of year – and communities are bearing the cost of their conservation (including through current wildlife conflict and historical displacement from the park when it was established) without getting benefits. Simanjiro does not yet have a WMA, but community members are hearing a lot of reports – positive and negative – about other communities' experiences and about what might happen in Simanjiro. There have been reports that a WMA is being formed in the area and that communities may benefit, but also that communities may be forced into the WMA and may lose some of their lands for other uses as a result. There have been reports of villages getting anywhere from TSH 3 to 10 million per year from the WMAs, but also reports that communities are getting no benefits and are incurring big costs, e.g. from human-wildlife conflict. They have also heard that villagers are often penalized for rules that are unclear. There are also concerns about corruption – that WMAs will be formed based on corrupt deals that do not benefit communities. There are fears that pastoralists' livelihoods will not be recognized and that livestock grazing will be banned, and that the WMA will attract people from other areas (Dodoma) that will come for the benefits and will take land for agriculture, etc.

There is a need to revisit the Wildlife Policy and Wildlife Act of 2009. There is no recognition of customary institutions / traditional cultural practices and ways of life in the way that WMAs are established. Nonetheless, the community may be interested in forming a WMA if they could be assured that they could keep their livestock and grazing areas, and that they will receive substantial benefits.

Points of discussion:

The role of 'alternatives' to WMAs for CWM

Participants discussed whether the CWM model developed in northern Tanzania (or similar models) are in line with national law and regulations, whether the outcomes and benefits can be tested, and whether the model is replicable. It was stressed that the efforts and experiences of communities should be supported and shared, regardless of whether there is consensus about their sustainability, because they provide an opportunity for experimentation, leaning and empowered action on CWM.

Integrating WMAs with other land uses

It was also stressed that livestock grazing *is* allowed in WMAs, though typically there are controls on the number of animals and different times and locations they can graze. These restrictions are written into community by-laws. However, there are often problems that arise as people bring animals in from outside the community to take advantage of the local resources. A key component of sustainable grazing in WMAs (and outside of them) is community-led land use planning and secure tenure such that communities can keep 'outsiders' from in-migrating for livestock grazing, crop planting, or other land uses.

Community participation and information sharing and access

In general, there are too few opportunities and forums for community participation and community voice in CWM / WMAs at all levels. This includes too little participation and community voice in developing of policy and law, as well as more spaces (such as this roundtable) for effective exchange of ideas and experiences.

It is also clear that more information sharing is needed with communities across Tanzania. Communities are receiving mixed/ misinformation about WMAs; they need accurate, timely and full information to participate on empowered terms. Likewise policy makers and others stakeholders need to better understand communities' perspectives and experiences. Learning exchanges are one helpful approach. This should include not just informing communities about wildlife but also learning from communities: wildlife and livestock have been sustainably co-existing for a very long time, based in part on customary management. CWM in Tanzania should build upon these existing, effective mechanisms.

SESSION IV: LINKING BASIC ECONOMICS WITH LOCAL ECONOMIES AND ENTREPRENEURIALISM

The New Economics of Conservation in Kenya
Presenter: Dr. Mike Norton Griffiths (Senior Research Fellow, ICRAF, Nairobi, www.mng5.com)

Natural resources management has 'everything' do to with the nature and strength of land and natural resources. When looking at the productivity of farms, there are major differences based on the strength of tenure of the land. All other things being equal, the stronger your property rights, the stronger the management, the more wealth generation, etc. The same is true across the region, and particularly with regard to wildlife. In Kenya, where the government perpetuates what is essentially a command and control system, the wildlife loss has been 80%.

The role of land tenure is also central to understanding public vs. private conservation. Public conservation is what the state does on behalf of the broader public. In this model the state retains complete control. However, the state often makes the mistake of trying to conserve by command and control outside of government protected areas. Rather, on lands outside of government-controlled areas, incentives are more effective. In Kenya, the only places where wildlife is remaining as a viable enterprise is where people have strong use rights. Wildlife populations have been decreasing while cultivation, off-take, population, and livestock numbers have been increasing across Kenya's rangelands over the last 35 years. This includes continual expansion of cultivated areas into Kenya's arid and semi-arid rangelands. Overall livestock dynamics suggests a switch from extensive to more intensive methods of production, with greater involvement in the cash economy. Wildlife dynamics demonstrate an overall decline (-3.2%pa from mid 1970's to 2000's). A recent analysis suggests that the trend has continued unchecked, and is now as strong inside the Protected Areas as outside.

Part of the problem is that the economic returns to wildlife are too low throughout the region to encourage wildlife conservation over cultivation or livestock keeping. So why are the returns to wildlife so low? It is a combination of:
ο **Policy Failures** – Insufficient utilization is allowed and control is still too centralized (maintaining too much of a 'command and control' system).
ο **Institutional Failures** – The Kenya Wildlife Service acts as an enforcement agency, rather than an enabling agency. Conservation NGOs are also insufficiently involved in addressing market failures.
ο **Market Failures** – Wildlife rents are poorly distributed. Benefits are not going to the producers of wildlife. They go instead to the service side, e.g., tour operators. Land owners are getting so little benefit that they are not conserving the resources.

In addition to these three 'failures' the evolution of property rights in Kenya has also been a major contributing factor. Along with this fundamental change in the pastoral production system we see a rapid transformation of property rights from large parcels of land under group or communal ownership to small parcels of land under private ownership. In the Mara Area, the same area that was recently comprised of 45 large Group Ranches has now been subdivided into 60,000 small private plots. The same process of sub-division is happening in the Kitengela region. This sub-dividing of property rights has important implications for wildlife: for every % decrease in size of landholding there is a 0.4% LOSS of diversity and 2% LOSS of density in wildlife. The main drivers of this sub-division of landholdings are:

Defensive drivers:
ο To improve security of tenure from corrupt group ranch committees, political and economic elites, and conservation NGOs
ο To prevent the further dilution of group or communally owned resources

Opportunistic Drivers

o   Capturing revenue streams from agricultural, livestock and wildlife production directly at the household level rather than through local institutions such as group ranch committees.

o   Capturing rising land values, e.g.,

  •   Sub-divided land immediately acquires value to the owner and is now worth investing in.

  •   Growth of urban markets creates a burgeoning demand for greater quantity and higher quality of production. Sub-division requires production to be intensified: owners respond by investing in methods of higher intensity production, land values rise with such investment.

  •   In peri-urban areas, the near exponential growth in the demand for land for domestic and commercial use triggers precipitous rise in land values, and land becomes completely delinked from its agro-ecological potential.

While this all sounds bad, this **evolution in land rights has also opened up new opportunities for conservation**. Individual landowners who have private titles have gotten together to create a conservancy comprised of many small plots, and tour operators have likewise gotten together to partner with them. Tour operators pay the landholders individually to grow and keep wildlife (and forgo agriculture or livestock keeping). This helps increase rents from wildlife, and helps offset the opportunity costs of forgoing alternative land uses that are less supportive to wildlife conservation. The payments are based on annual contracts and not per-trip fees, and thus the landowners get paid regardless of whether the tourists come. The risk is thus primarily on the tour operator.

This is entirely a private sector initiative. However, new government regulations being put in place to manage these initiatives establish a bureaucracy and rules that increase transaction costs and undermine the flexibility in the system.

In further discussion the point was raised that the terms of the private landholder – private tour operator agreements include local people moving their houses, livestock, etc., out of the conservancy areas. This has important implications for people's culture and livelihoods that warrant further exploration. More generally, while there are lessons that Tanzania can draw from Kenya's experience with privatization, the historical experience and current trends regarding privatization in Tanzania are unique and thus the implications for CWM may not be directly transferable.

WMAs: Poor Land Use Economics but Good Entrepreneurship Incubators?
Presenters: Damian Bell (Honeyguide Foundation) and Rehema Tukai (REPOA)

Eco-tourism is a 'natural' partner for communities. It can be a (environmentally, socially, economically) sustainable business model that brings new income (employment) and other benefits to communities. But their engagement with investors needs to be a partnership, based on empowered participation.

Under the right conditions, tourism CAN provide funds to make conservation a viable business venture for communities to engage in. For example:
• Loliondo (eastern Serengeti) in 2007 exceeded US$400,000
• Simanjiro, (east Tarangire) earned US$20,000 in 2007
• Sayari camp (northern Serengeti) employed 40% local people in 2005, and 90% local people (approx 40 staff) in 2007
• Grumeti reserves purchased vegetable and salads locally approx US$30,000 per month

However, several factors have to be in place to make such partnerships 'work'. They need to be able to capture relatively high-end tourists, but not so high end as to make them too vulnerable to market fluctuations. Moreover, they have to be given a supportive environment, including:
• Tourism development support, including marketing of the tourism opportunities and the concept of WMAs themselves;
• Innovation during planning (which investors are often not given opportunity to participate in). For example, encouraging low end tourism product in areas/zones of low value and focusing on high end tourism in high value areas, with the caveat that local community members are employed; and
• Utilizing external evaluating services for responsible tourism, such as Responsible Tourism Tanzania (RTTZ), and Sustainable Tourism Eco-certification Programme (STEP) etc.

Further, without the right balance between interests and values in the partnership, negative impacts are possible. Without an intelligent business approach, cultures and ecosystems can suffer, e.g. through increased in-migration, unmet expectations, poor wealth distribution, damage to ecosystems, etc. Ideally WMAs will be grounded in a 'perfect partnership' between community development, ecosystem conservation, and tourism business. In the absence of the business element, there will be a lack of economic incentive for communities. Without sufficient consideration of conservation, wildlife populations and habitats can be degraded. If the community is not on-board, there will be no buy-in to conserve the ecosystem… but in balance these three components can lead to a partnership beneficial for all three.

At the same time, tourism is not a silver bullet, even where it is working well. Tourism enterprise has to be developed in balance with other income generating options (e.g., agriculture, livestock keeping, etc). We also need to recognise that CBNRM/ WMA's are part of people's way of life. They are not just "projects" that communities take up. They are grounded in history and tradition, even if many may actually be quite recent. We need to convince government and other stakeholders to understand and respect this aspect of CWM and the communities that contribute to them.

Finally… while 'old is gold', it is also true that circumstances are changing… and traditional economic activities may need to be changed or improved in some cases. New and innovative SME's are expensive to introduce and manage and need a minimum of 5 years incubation. However, they can be important opportunities in the longer term.

The bottom line… while there are many challenges, and there are limits to what WMAs can provide, they can also deliver multiple benefits:
ο NR management services

- o social services (schools, etc)
- o employment (tourism)
- o security
- o governance capacity building more broadly
- o business opportunity and finance

In further discussion, participants raised the point that we need to develop more realistic assessments of real costs (including opportunity costs) and benefits, recognizing that there are many hidden opportunity costs, but also that there are many values and benefits from the natural environment that often go unrecognized. One third of household income is from the sale of natural resources. Pastoralism, when you look at the whole supply chain, is often worth as much as wildlife. We also do not calculate the additional, broader benefits of improved governance, land use planning, and other activities that are supported by WMAs.

SESSION V: IDENTIFYING THEMATIC AREAS FOR ACTION ON CWM

In a facilitated plenary exercise, meeting participants identified and grouped key issue areas or themes that they viewed as priorities for discussion and action on improving CWM in Tanzania. Seven broad thematic areas were formulated. Breakout groups then discussed each of the seven thematic areas. Groups focused on identifying priority actions for addressing each theme. Time permitting, groups also discussed stakeholders to engage, lead and participate; broad timelines; possible milestones; and resource needs. Crosscutting issues were also identified as key considerations for all thematic areas, including: climate change, population growth, gender and local government.

1. **Action research /applied research for better informed decision making, including…**
    o   Better accessing and utilizing existing research e.g., creating shared space for information exchange
    o   Addressing research gaps, including reconstructing baselines; grounding research in the needs of stakeholders (community, government, NGOs, private sector); and developing better understanding of full costs and benefits, mechanisms for their fair sharing, and differences between CWM strategies (e.g., how/ under what circumstances different outcomes are achieved for different stakeholders).
    o   Science to support wildlife management.
    o   Traditional knowledge, including documenting and illustrating its importance, and integrating TK with 'contemporary' science.
    o   Involving stakeholders in research, e.g., participatory action research.
    o   Supporting a holistic approach to CWM through participatory research.
    o   Undertaking strategic environmental assessments of various CWM models.
    o   Determining what needs to be measured – e.g., what are the key questions and research needs of different stakeholders?
    o   Establishing mechanism to coordinate research measures.
    o   Developing standard outcomes measures of some kind across CBNRM models.

2. **Reviewing and enhancing the CWM/WMA policy and legal framework, including…**
    o   Revisiting processes for establishing WMA to streamline, simplify, rationalize, and harmonize them; minimize costs; make them more technically accessible for communities; etc.
    o   Ensure legal/ policy framework for fair and equitable benefit sharing among CWM/ WMA members, especially for those who have contributed land. Benefit sharing arrangements should reflect real costs and contributions.
    o   Strengthen land tenure and property rights for equity and good investment and land management.
    o   Identify and address policy gaps and bottlenecks to implementation of CWM/WMA policies.
    o   Develop CWM strategies and frameworks, and link these to DeNRM framework.
    o   Develop comprehensive guidance and toolkits for WMA implementation and management for all stakeholders at all levels. These should focus on helping to ensure CWM is well governed and carried out in line with community rights, and to ensure economic benefits are fair and reflect investments and full costs. Guidance should be regularly updated, and should be accompanied by targeted training and other necessary capacity building measures. Clear funding mechanisms for guidance development and updating will be required.

3. **Understanding and enhancing economic viability, including….**
    o   Approaching WMAs as investments, rather than charities.
    o   Ensuring land uses reflect market forces.
    o   Establishing accountable private sector partnerships and sustainable conservation businesses.
    o   Ensuring that WMA investments and benefit sharing/ revenue distribution mechanisms are in line with rights and responsibilities, are fair, and reflect full costs and contributions.

o   Promote and facilitate the generation of multiple benefits from CWM/ WMAs, e.g., income generation but also secure tenure, ecosystem services, cultural protections, etc.
o   Develop and distribute comprehensive technical guidance and toolkits for establishing and maintaining economically viable CWM/ WMAs, recognizing multiple CWM contexts and approaches and including considerations of multiple benefits and full (opportunity) costs. Guidance should be regularly updated, and should be accompanied by targeted training and other necessary capacity building measures. Clear funding mechanisms for guidance development and updating will be required.
o   Establish independent reviews/ watchdog mechanisms for WMAs finances.
o   Developing periodic (/annual) reporting on CWM/WMAs for learning/management/ transparency, including for accountability in receipt and transfer of revenues.

4. Good governance, management and institutions, including…
o   Assessing CWM/WMA governance structures and providing targeted support for governance improvements, including for accountability, transparency, full and effective participation, fair and equitable benefit sharing, etc…
o   Developing comprehensive, practical guidance and tools on improving CWM/ WMA governance across sectors/ levels. Guidance should be regularly updated, and should be accompanied by targeted training and other necessary capacity building measures. Clear funding mechanisms for guidance development and updating will be required.
o   Recognizing institutional complexity (including customary institutions) and multiple operational structures for CWM.
o   Addressing inter-institutional conflicts
o   Monitoring, assessment, evaluation including environmental/ biophysical issues and livelihood, rights issues.
o   Supporting communities in governance assessment of CWM/ their WMAs based on community developed criteria.
o   Establishing independent auditing and certification.

5. Understanding/ supporting multiple approaches to CWM, including…
o   Taking a holistic approach to CWM
o   Recognizing and respecting multiple types of conservation knowledge and values, including customary institutions and traditional knowledge as well as innovations. Seek opportunities to effectively integrate traditional conservation/ NR practices in new models
o   Assessing what models of CWM exist, what works, what does not, for whom, under what circumstances
o   Supporting more and more meaningful stakeholder engagement/ participation in all forms of CWM

Proposed guiding principles for approaches to CWM/ WMA that support equity and sustainability included:
o   Informed and equitable participation by all stakeholders including communities in planning and decision making
o   Local communities (or land users) must benefit from the revenues gained and costs need to be understood
o   Local land users/ communities need to decide how to use the revenues earned
o   There must be means of accurately measuring financial benefits from wildlife and habitats
o   Communities must be able to withdraw or cancel the arrangements (under fair/ appropriate terms…)
o   Appropriate and empowering education and training with CWM stakeholders, including communities, on e.g., NRM, business and enterprise management, legal issues, contracting, etc.
o   Livestock can co-exist with wildlife - this must be respected in pastoralist lands
o   Conflict resolution mechanisms must be locally based

o The CWM arrangement must be linked to the village government (village council). (A related proposal to amend WMA governance structures to be village government based was identified as a topic requiring substantial further discussion.)

6. **Training, education, capacity building, including…**
   o Developing CWM toolkits for multiple levels and users, and anchoring these in schools/ colleges.
   o Providing independent legal support to communities, including for negotiating and contracting.
   o Developing tools to better assess full costs (including opportunity costs) incurred by communities, and full benefits generated, to facilitate benefit sharing.
   o Create M&E/ assessment tools for WMA performance.
   o Support stakeholders' capacity strengthening on, inter alia, good governance, resource management, and business management. This should include AA capacity.
   o Undertake a training stocktaking to understand what has already been done, and a needs assessment to inform a curriculum and training plan to address gaps. Impacts/uptake of new training should be monitored to better target training going forward and to track needs. Training programmes can be developed around multiple thematic areas. Training programme can be led by the AAC, with specific functions to be delegated to supporting stakeholders. For example, private investors or organizations like Honeyguide Foundation can provide support / technical guidance for business development training, etc.

7. **Networking and information sharing, including…**
   o Develop CWM forum/ networks at multiple levels, including link to SADC initiative, for information sharing, etc.
   o Facilitate cross-community lessons learning exchanges.
   o Develop information sharing and communications strategy, including anchoring learning in schools and other appropriate institutions.
   o Linking networking and information sharing initiatives to research initiatives and training programmes.

SESSION VI: AGREEING ON THE WAY FORWARD

Participants agreed that the discussions at the roundtable provided a useful starting point, but that far more discussion is required among a broader group of stakeholders, and that a process is needed for developing and facilitating collaborative action on supporting improvements in CWM governance. It was proposed that stakeholders form a **CWM Working Group** for further dialogue and action on improving community wildlife governance.

At the close of the meeting, participants agreed that a small group of volunteers should prepare a draft concept for a CWM Working Group to which all stakeholders can then be invited. It was agreed that the small drafting team will be coordinated by Baruani Mshale (Independent Consultant, engaged under TNRF for purposes of this group) and include Simon Anstey (WWF), Boniface Wambura (AAC Executive Secretary), Susan James (Savannas Forever), and John Balarin (Wildlife Division - Wetlands Unit).

It was further agreed that TNRF will serve as interim Secretariat for the proposed CWM Working Group, with formal election of a Secretariat to occur when/if the group is more formalized.

Annex II: Meeting Participants

NO	Name	Organization
1	Simon Anstey	WWF-Coastal East Africa
2	John D Balarin	DANIDA
3	Damian Bell	Honeyguide Foundation
4	Matt Brown	The Nature Conservancy
5	Jessica Campese	Freelance consultant (supporting TNRF)
6	Krissie Clark	PAMs Foundation
7	Jessie Davie	TNRF
8	Mike Norton Griffiths	ICRAF
9	Mary Hobbs	USAID
10	George Jambiya	WWF –Coastal East Africa
11	Susan James	Savannahs Forever Tanzania
12	Asukile Kajuni	Africare
13	Alfred Kalaghe	Africare
14	Gilbert Kajuna	USAID
15	Sula Kibira	African Wildlife Foundation
16	Jafari Kideghesho	Sokoine University of Agriculture
17	Isaya Kilaye	UCRT-Kiteto
18	Stephanie Lang	Development Partners Group – Environment (DPGE)
19	Mikala Lauridsen	USAID
20	Alais Lendii	Frankfurt Zoology Society
21	Edward Loure	UCRT
22	Kahana Lukumbuzya	Consultant
23	Amiri Mataka	AAC
24	Seraphino B Mawanja	District Game Officer - Monduli
25	Michel Mantheakis	Michel Mantheakis Safaris (MMS)
26	Michael Matiti	AAC
27	Bakari Mbano	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS - Ruaha)
28	David S. Mgalla	AAC
29	Captain Minja	MNRT Wildlife Division - Wetlands Unit
30	Alais Morindat	TNRF/IIED/KDSC
31	Kaayai Murero	UCRT-Simanjiro
32	Baruani Mshale	University of Michigan /TNRF
33	Someni Mteleka	MJUMITA (Community Forestry Network of Tanzania)
34	Gwandani Mwakatobe	Consultant
35	Geofrey Mwanjele	TNRF
36	Christine Noe	University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM)
37	Keith Roberts	Friedkin Conservation Foundation
38	Agathe Sector	USAID
39	Mwape Sichilongo	WWF Regional RCBNRM Programme, Zambia
40	Carol Sorenson	TNRF

41	Hussein Sosovele	WWF
42	Laura Tarimo	Round Table Africa
43	Patricia Tarimo	TNRF
44	Rehema Tukai	REPOA
45	Boniface Wambura	AAC (Executive Secretary)
46	Andrew Williams	Consultant
47	Corey Wright	Mc Gill University

Annex III: Meeting Agenda

NB: Schedule was adjusted in the course of meeting to accommodate discussion. Times below are approximate only.

Time	Topic	Presenter / Facilitator
DAY 1 - Wednesday, 2 November 2011		
Opening Presentations		
8:30 – 9:00	Arrival and registration	All
9:00 – 10:00	Welcome and participants' self-introductions Introduction to roundtable objectives Participants' agreement to objectives and adoption of agenda	Facilitator – Baruani Mshale
10:00 – 10:30	Introductory reflections on CWM in Tanzania	Chair - Bakari Mbano
10:30 – 11:45	Tea/ coffee break	
Learning from successes and challenges with CWM in Tanzania		
10:45 – 10:50	Introduction to the session	Facilitator – Baruani Mshale
10:50 – 11:30	The CWM landscape in Tanzania – A political economy analysis	George Jambiya (WWF)
11.30 – 12:15	A summary of recent research on CWM in Tanzania – Successes, benefits, and challenges	Jafari Kideghesho (SUA) and Laura Tarimo (Roundtable Africa)
12:00 – 12:30	Improving Effectiveness & Sustainability of Development Projects in Rural Tanzania	Susan James (Savannahs Forever)
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
13:30 – 14:00	Experiences and perspectives of WMA AA representatives	Presented by Mr. Boniface Wambura on behalf of the AAC leadership
14:00 – 14:30	Experiences of NGOs supporting WMA Programme in Tanzania	Hussein Sosovele (WWF)
14:30 – 15:00	Experiences and costs in protecting wildlife in a WMA (Enduimet WMA)	Damian Bell (Honeyguide Foundation)
15:00 – 15:30	Private sector on engagement in CWM/ WMAs – Reflections from the hunting sector	Michel Mantheakis (Michel Mantheakis Safaris)
15:00 – 16:00	CWM in context of broader NRM decentralization in Tanzania	Kahana Lukumbuzya (Independent)
16:00 – 16:30	Tea/ coffee	
16:30 – 17:00	Rapporteur summing up on key lessons/ themes Closing of Day 1 meeting	Alais Morindat

Evening	Cocktail hour and showing of videos on community wildlife management in Tanzania and southern Africa	All

	DAY 2 - Thursday, 3 November 2011	
9:00 – 9:15	Opening and review of revised Day 2 agenda	Facilitator – Baruani Mshale

	Learning from successes and challenges with CWM in the Region	
9:15 – 10:00	CWM - Comparative Experiences from Southern Africa	Mwape Sichilongo (SADC/WWF CBNRM Forum)
10:00– 10:15	Q/A and reflections from plenary	

	Alternative CWM approaches and community voices	
10:15 – 10:45	An opportunity lost? The demise of community-private sector CWM partnerships at local level in northern Tanzania	Edward Loure (UCRT)
10:45 – 11:45	Community voices: What changes would result in CWM working better in Tanzania?	Kaayai Murero (Simanjiro) And David Mgalla (Mborang'andu WMA)(Namtumbo-Mtwara)
11:45– 12:20	Q/A and reflections from plenary	

	CWM – linking basic economics with local economies and entrepreneurialism	
12:20 – 12:50	Back to basics: the economics of wildlife, opportunity cost, land-use and development trajectories	Mike Norton Griffiths (Independent)
12:50 – 13:20	WMAs: poor land use economics but good entrepreneurship incubators?	Damian Bell (Honeyguide Foundation) and Rehema Tukai (REPOA)
13:20 – 13:30	Q/A and reflections from plenary	
13:30 – 14:30	Lunch	

	Identifying key action themes for CWM in Tanzania	
14:30 – 15:30	Plenary discussion: Identifying key thematic areas for CWM improvement in Tanzania ο Identification ο Grouping ο Prioritization	Facilitator – Baruani Mshale

	Starting to find our way forward…	
15:30 – 16:30	Group work on further development of actions/ needs to support themes	All
16:30 – 17:00	Presentation of group work outputs with feedback from full plenary	Group rapporteurs

Bringing it all together…		
17:00 – 17:30	Plenary discussion and agreement on institutional arrangements for the way forward	Facilitator – Baruani Mshale
17:30 – 17:45	Concluding remarks and thoughts Meeting closes	Chair - Bakari Mbano

---

[i] This roundtable also built upon a June 24, 2011, TNRF hosted learning event on community based wildlife management in Tanzania.