



COMMUNITY CONSERVATION APPROACHES AND EXPERIENCES FROM EAST AFRICA

Edmund Barrow



African Wildlife Foundation Discussion Papers
Series

Community Conservation Discussion Paper No. 4

CC-DP-4

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION APPROACHES AND EXPERIENCES FROM EAST AFRICA¹

PARTNERSHIPS AND DIALOGUE

One of the basic tenets of community conservation is the notion of partnership, which in East Africa has not yet resulted in empowering local resource users, by devolving responsible authority to them, as has been the case in, for example Zimbabwe. In promoting concepts of partnership, issues of rights and privileges need to be examined. True partnerships relates to negotiated rights. All partners are recipients of benefits and each holds responsibility for the management of resources that create the benefits. Receipt of rights by a community presumes that they accept and are able to cope with the implicit responsibilities. In Africa, governments often assume ultimate responsibility for land and natural resources - wildlife included, as the assets are national as well as local. This does not, however, reduce the importance of a community being able to assume both its rights and its responsibilities. Government intervention is the safety net which protects the majority from the unscrupulous minority. The promise of access to benefits may be the stimulus needed for communities to create structures for making decisions over resource use created or provided by conservation.

Establishing processes of negotiation with people and communities is difficult especially with mixed communities who have for the most part been resident for short periods of time. For example around Lake Mburo and Lake Manyara National Parks in East Africa, this is difficult due to different local agendas, land use systems, cultures and languages. Strong suspicion of park authorities, the result of, usually a turbulent history of relations, is a compounding factor. Therefore a process of partnership and enablement may be more realistic than full proprietorship or empowerment. An important process is to develop community structures that will be able to negotiate with conservation authorities over resource use and park management, and be responsibly involved in conservation related activities.

Within the various authorities who now have functional community conservation programmes in East Africa, Table 1 shows, in general terms the steps being taken to try and create such partnerships and mechanisms for dialogue, conflict resolution, benefit flows, and enterprise development. Many of the initial steps have been tentative as conservation authorities, more used to protectionist type policies, start to engage in partnerships with rural people and communities. Community type projects, simple conflict resolution activities have been easier to rationalize than, for instance initiation of enterprise related projects which might compete with the conservation authority for clients and revenue, though such enterprises may help achieve a nation's overall conservation objectives.

Participatory park planning around Lake Manyara National Park, Tanzania illustrates this process. It was recognized that most serious threats to Lake Manyara National Park originated from out-of-park sources, for instance due to population and land pressures,

¹ Reprinted from Rural Extension Bulletin Number 10 - Theme Issue on Community Conservation. This issue was jointly edited by Edmund Barrow of AWF, and John Best of the University of Reading; published by the University of Reading Agricultural Extension and Rural Development Department, England

irrigated farming and reduced river flow to the park. The Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) Planning Unit and Community Conservation Service met to look for the best strategy for community input into the park management plan being developed. It was

Table 1: Evolving Process of Community Conservation Dialogue in East Africa

Mechanism	Some Components of Community Conservation Dialogue	Results
Local approval to initiate activities	• Discussion with authorities on aims objectives • Gathering of available baseline district data and to ensure no duplication	• Approval to initiate activities at local level • Summary of existing available data and literature
Village Profiles	• Introductions to village leaders, stakeholders • General discussions related to conservation, problems, opportunities • Establishment of village profile on which future dialogue and activities may be based, development of plans in partnership	• Acceptance at village level. • Village profile • Initial problem and opportunity analysis
Knowledge, Attitudes and Practises survey	• A simple easy to administer and analyze survey to obtain quantifiable assessment relating to conservation issues • Other PRA type tools can be used. Forms basis for further discussion, visit and revisit, plans	• Survey analysis and results for use by local resource users • PRA results
Visit and Revisit	• Importance of continuous dialogue to create trust, discuss problems and opportunities to come up with agreed solutions, ideas for actions • Use of PRA to ensure stakeholders and interested parties involved • Local workshops on issues and problems which are listed, prioritized and then proposed solutions sought in a continuing process • Importance of follow-up, monitoring on agreed to actions • Input into conservation authority planning for the village, conservation area for realistic community plans	• Trust built, mutually agreed to solutions planned and basis for implementation • PRA plans • incorporation in conservation action planning.
Actions undertaken	• Benefit sharing - community and enterprise development projects mutually identified, planned, agreed to and implemented • People most likely to act on problem they themselves recognize • conflict resolution through negotiation	• Projects implemented • Rules and regulations related to conservation locally agreed to

important that this was done as part of a participatory approach involving an interdisciplinary team, as well as input and participation of a number of stakeholders. TANAPA had three objectives in seeking the participation of local communities in park planning: (i) to get good information, much of which only local people have; (ii) to enhance the likelihood of local cooperation, for instance through mutual benefits from tourism; and (iii) the educational goal of exposing people to the many types of issues and concerns the park management faces.

TANAPA agreed upon a two-fold approach using surveys and workshops. A survey was carried out, and followed up by a series of Community Leaders' Workshops which served as a means of "ground truthing" the information collected in the survey and gained participation not only of local people but of local leaders and government officials, as well as providing a dynamic consultative setting where attitudes could be not only expressed but solutions

proposed. Participants generated lists of problems and issues, discussed them at length, prioritized them by voting, and proposed solutions for their top problems. Priority problems included problem animal control, unethical park staff behaviour, Park expansion, shortage of water and inaccessibility of ranger posts for villagers. Some proposed solutions included ranger re-training, Park Authority involvement in land use planning, and water catchment protection.

A similar type, though locally adapted, process was used around Lake Mburo National Park in Uganda to develop a community conservation programme there and evolve a National Park Plan based on the active participation of all the stakeholders. This has resulted in an increasingly positive attitude to the park. Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) has used a combination of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practises' surveys, baseline data gathering, to form the basis for PRAs in for example Kajiado, Laikipia, Samburu and parts of the coast. The PRAs form the basis for generating community action plans which provide the rationale for the practical planning and implementation of agreed to activities.

INSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY CONSERVATION

While broadly comparable approaches are being used at the field level, the three countries have evolved somewhat different institutional approaches and mechanisms for community conservation. Table 2 attempts to establish a comparative framework for the institutions who currently have community conservation programmes in the East African region. However all have found that creating real and lasting partnerships is not easy, especially in a context of doubt and conflict between conservation area managers and local people. Nor is the implicit change of conservation area authority attitudes towards local community issues easy. It is difficult to change an anti-poaching and protectionist model to one of conciliation, consultation and enablement. But this must be done. Partnership and consultation, concern over sustainability leading to a voice in decision making, an increased responsibility and benefit sharing are seen as key to long term sustainability of conservation areas.

Each country is moving towards this in different ways, and at different speeds. TANAPA has used both headquarters and park based strategic planning for community conservation as a major tool to obtain a broader understanding and acceptance of the importance of community conservation within the institution, and creating norms and policy guidelines for the implementation of various community conservation activities. In both Kenya and Uganda workshops have been used as basis for formulating guidelines, sharing experiences concerning benefit and revenue sharing, and community conservation training. The product from these has resulted in guidelines and policies concerning revenue sharing in Uganda and the Wildlife for Development Fund in Kenya, and Support for Community Initiated Projects in Tanzania.

Without a strong institutional capacity to, and commitment for community conservation, it is unlikely that conservation authorities will accept the long term implications explicit in forging partnerships with rural people for sustainable, economically viable conservation.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Conservation Authorities working with Community Conservation in East Africa

Institution-Country	Policy-Mandate	Early CC Work (prior to 1990)	Lessons learnt	Emerging structure for CC 1991 to present	Issues, Constraints with CC	Evolving Policy for CC
TANAPA-Tanzania	All National Parks, which have the highest conservation status.	Pilot work next to Serengeti, CC evolving around soft edge park. Board approval to explore how to set up CC within TANAPA. 1989 workshop identified need for CC and to institutionalize it.	Land use and hunting as major issues outside scope of TANAPA, therefore importance of collaboration with others. CC tools and practises being developed, and tested. Need for professional cadre of extension staff apparent. SCIP as TANAPA approved benefit sharing process. Mweka graduates being assigned to CC.	Coordination of local activities with TANAPA. Community Conservation Wardens from within staff establishment. Importance of links with Mweka college. CC work with both soft and hard edge parks. TANAPA HQ and Park based strategic planning for CC. SCIP and CC as part of TANAPA budgetary process, also special account for SCIP	Retraining helps promote acceptability in TANAPA. Recognition of importance of CC to rest of organization as integral part of activities. Time it takes for successful CC. Importance of strategic planning at HQ and field levels	C4 as coordinating committee for CC. SCIP guidelines approved by board. Community Conservation Wardens at field level with CC authority at park level, Coordinator at HQ unit. CC as part of human resource development. CC has budget lines for activities and SCIP account. Donor policies.
Wildlife Division - Tanzania	Mandate for wildlife in Tanzania outside Parks and special areas. Currently allows hunting.	Responsible for hunting operations, little benefit to local people. Pilot initiatives for ex. Selous Conservation Programme since 1987, with community component relating to hunting benefits; no central policy mechanism	Selous has been main Wildlife Division Community Programme, but not adapted widely. Evolution of idea of Wildlife Management Areas. Some private sector initiatives, for instance Cullman award scheme, showing importance of CC.	Wildlife Division remains as government division - strong need identified and demonstrated, for more community involvement. 25% of certain types of fees go to District Councils. Community Based conservation unit being formed and trained	Constraints of budget and resources. Little human resource capacity for CC, hampered by lack of incentive. No WMAs establishes yet	1992-1994 evolution of number of draft policies on hunting, lives species and community conservation leading to wildlife sector review in 1994-95. However implementation slow.
KWS - Kenya	Mandate for all wildlife in Kenya both in Parks and outside.	World Bank funded revenue sharing scheme around Amboseli in 1970's. Ban on hunting. Wildlife Extension Project around Amboseli-Kajiado in early 1980s. KWS-AWF Tsavo CC project started in 1988 to test institutionally viable CC methods, including trial revenue sharing, grazing incursion resolution, building on earlier project based experience.	CC evolved mainly in pastoral areas. Fencing as main option for hard edge park areas. Revenue Sharing based on conservation criteria initiated. Cropping and wildlife farming increasing in importance but hampered by lack of regulations	Establishment of Community Wildlife Service. Many staff recruited from outside KWS. CC receives large donor support for capacity building and field activities. Community Wildlife Officers deployed. Evolution of Wildlife for Development Fund - RS guidelines with a focus on enterprise development. Training for CC re-orientation. Studies on utilization, land use, pricing and legal issues to formulate basis for policy revision	Revenue sharing raising expectations. CWS seen as parallel to mainline KWS. Relatively large donor funding driving capacity building. Land use and tenure issues critical. Studies on utilization, pricing, land use completed	KWS CC and WDF-RS policy approved by board. KWS reporting lines becoming more functional and relating to CWS. Problem animal management and fencing policies being developed. Studies undertaken will result in policy revision, also possible re-introduction of hunting
UNP - Uganda	Mandate for all National Parks	Little CC work before 1990, due to political instability	SCIP process being used as basis for Revenue sharing in 1993 and trial work with Gorilla revenues from Bwindi. Mainly protected area outreach. Lessons from Lake Mburo show importance of CC	Revenue sharing agreed to for all parks - park based with a % going to national fund. Parks starting to have Wildlife Extension Wardens for CC activities. UNP HQ CC capacity increasing. Establishment of Park Management Advisory Committees (PMAC)	Political instability a major constraint. Rehabilitation of conservation estate and infrastructure necessary. Importance of PMAC as means for improving dialogue, enabling community responsibility.	Revenue Sharing policy and role of PMAC agreed to by Board. Post of UNP HQ CC coordinator agreed to, but not yet filled. Evolving Uganda Wildlife Authority with national mandate for all wildlife.

Some of the common areas in the ways the three East African countries have evolved community conservation strategies and policies include the

- need for Community Conservation, and training for CC;
- evolution of benefit sharing mechanisms through trials resulting in benefit sharing policies;
- evolution of CC process and field level activities;
- fact that land tenure and land use issues not adequately addressed;
- importance of regional collaboration, especially in areas of shared ecosystems;
- importance of operating within local and national political environments; and the
- importance of private sector involvement.

BENEFIT SHARING

Opportunities for responsibility and benefit sharing partnerships need to be fully and equitably explored. Most community conservation projects acknowledge the need to link benefits to conservation. But this is may be difficult to achieve in practise, as it should not just rely solely on fickle tourist revenues.

Once a conservation area authority moves from simply managing and enforcing the integrity of a conservation area, to one of partnership and benefit sharing, that authority moves into the limelight of local and national political agendas together with power and authority issues implicit. This shift to increased emphasis on partnership should not preclude the importance of conservation and protected areas themselves. In the rush to be politically correct, rights and prerogatives of conservation and parks, and the wider public as stakeholders in national assets may be overlooked. Satisfying community and conservation authority goals and objectives is a major crux for community conservation.

Benefits which accrue from conservation areas can be classified into 8 broad areas: recreation, tourism, watershed protection, ecological processes, biodiversity, education and research, non-consumptive benefits (e.g. historical and cultural) and future values. These benefits, however, are not all obvious nor are they divided among people in a manner proportional to the "costs" to local people living near or in a conservation area. The costs of wildlife conservation are better understood than the benefits. Some recent attempts to formulate ways to quantify benefits of conservation may be beneficial to national planners but are unlikely to be convincing to local people. The problem of wildlife costs and benefits is not one of productivity but of equitable distribution. Benefit sharing is one local level attempt to redress the inequities of wildlife conservation that directly affect rural resource users.

The process of negotiating what type of benefits to share, with whom, over what duration and for what purpose is long and fundamental community conservation. Negotiations have to be carried out in different ways with different stakeholders, is time consuming and demands patience as well as negotiating and facilitating skills since it depends on establishing trust and links. The temptation will always be present to adopt an expedient approach in which immediate wildlife conservation needs or political pressures form the primary criteria for working with communities. The possibility for success is increased if the activity addresses community needs, and represents an approach around which a community has formed a consensus; benefits community members in an open, easily understood and straightforward manner; is one in which the maximum number of members of a community or group benefit and see themselves as benefiting; and, stands the greatest chance for long-term sustainability. However in terms of process and responsibility how much can or should be handed over to local people? If responsibility is solely with conservation authorities there may be too little real participation, and if too much, conservation goals and objectives may be compromised. An agreed framework needs to be established to satisfy all the varying stakeholders, and has to have policy support, be practically oriented. Policy guidelines have been instituted for the sharing of benefits in East Africa, namely the Wildlife Development Fund - Revenue Sharing (WDF-RS) in KWS and Support for Community Initiated Projects in TANAPA (SCIP), and Revenue Sharing in Uganda.

Already many rural people feel that they receive, either directly or indirectly benefits from conservation. Table 3 indicates a variety of benefits, even without formalized benefit sharing. However many of the benefits are incidental, opportunistic and *ad hoc*, and do not represent a true partnership, important though they are.

Table 3: Some perceived benefits for local people from wildlife and living next to a Protected Area

Benefit	Tanzania: Lake Manyara n=1597	Tanzania: Arusha n=983	Kenya: Tsavo n=968
Revenue from camping	12%	0.6%	21%
Curios and photographs	47%	14%	18%
Foreign exchange	8%	41%	66%
Bring water	13%	10%	27%
Build classrooms	15%	4%	20%
Provide transport	27%	41%	23%
Do business with, employment	28%	5%	
Game meat and wildlife products		6%	7%

Benefit sharing in East Africa can broadly be classified into five types (see table 4, 5). Outside protected areas benefits from hunting and other non-consumptive tourist related activities are becoming increasingly important especially when the benefits accrue in a realistic and responsible manner to rural resource users in such areas (Table 5).

Table 4: Some practical examples of different types of benefit sharing in East Africa

Type	Some Examples	Planning requirements
No direct additional expenses required	Advise, support, training for example of village guards, PRA. Technical advice relating to, eg. agroforestry, school buildings problem animal management and control, conservation education	Minimal - timing and work planning
Redirection, planning of normal recurrent expenditure	Road maintenance near parks. Use of lorries for transport of goods, people. Bringing people into conservation area to view conservation activities	Little - depends on what is available and what people want to do
Planning of Development expenditure	Siting a, for instance ranger post or interpretation centre, so that communities can benefit more easily	Community participation in park facilitated process
Community Development Projects; support from special benefit sharing funds	1. Infrastructure Village offices, school buildings, health facilities, roads, live and electric fencing 2. Service Cattle dips, wells and water points, equipment purchase 3. Recurrent School bursaries, salary support for community game scouts.	Considerable in terms of commitment, contributions and responsibility from both conservation authority and communities, with community directing process
Enterprise Development	See Table 5	

Table 4 shows the range of type of activities that have, and are being undertaken within the region. It is important to retain a balance so that benefits are not seen as hand-outs, nor should they be recurrent. The importance of the philosophy behind, for instance SCIP should not be underestimated in creating community responsibility and ownership for benefits accruing.

KWS initiated its Revenue Sharing (now called Wildlife for Development Fund) in 1991 with a national focus. Initially it was based on 25% Adult non resident gate for revenue sharing, a figure which has since being revised to what is more realistic and institutionally affordable. Criteria developed and used to allocate revenue sharing to different conservation areas were based on lessons from the trial revenue sharing around Amboseli National Park. This led to the evolution of the Wildlife Development Fund (WDF), which set out policy and criteria for application to, and implementation of WDF. WDF is no longer seen as purely National Park related but a national KWS contribution to WDF for areas where land users bear conservation costs. There is a balance between community and enterprise type projects with an increasing emphasis on income generating projects. There has been considerable donor support and Government counterpart funding.

TANAPA's Support for Community Initiated Projects (SCIP) was initiated in 1992, with board approval in 1993, as part of TANAPA HQ, and Park strategic planning. No fixed percentage of what types of revenue were stated, however this is now evolving to a percentage of total recurrent expenditure deemed sustainable. SCIP works with communities bordering or close to National Parks, and stresses supporting **community initiated** projects. The approval mechanisms are at the Park level. There is increasing

liaison with enterprise type tourist related projects that neighbour parks. TANAPA has policy guidelines for donor contributions to fund SCIP, and donor funding is much lower, than for example KWS

UNP's benefit sharing programme was started in 1995 with a national parks outreach focus. The initial benefit sharing focused on Revenue sharing, which was politically initiated. Revenue sharing guidelines were approved by the UNP Board in 1994, and was based on 12% from entrance fees, ranger-guide fees, accommodation, camping, Gorilla tracking and concession franchise fees. UNP uses democratically elected Parish Management Advisory Committees (PMAC) as an institution for improving relations between park and people, and making decision about the use of revenue sharing funds.

Both in Kenya and Uganda some of the pressures to initiate benefit sharing were political and are not necessarily sustainable. TANAPA tries to ensure that its benefit sharing programme is institutionally viable. It has had less political interference. In all cases what is important is that the benefit sharing is seen to be transparent and accountable, with well defined principles and practises that are understood, agreed and accepted.

6. COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND CONSERVATION

For conservation to be sustainable and successful it has to pay, pay not just to conservation authorities, national governments etc., but pay to those resource users who are most affected by conservation activities, and bear the costs of lost production, lost access and damage. For conservation to pay, it has to be seen in, not only financial and economic terms, but also in terms of more qualitative cultural values. This means that conservation must increasingly become part of local peoples economic base, where the financial and economic returns from conservation, together with economic returns from other compatible forms of land use, for example livestock ranching, must exceed returns from alternative forms of land use, for instance wheat farming. Where conservation is important nationally and internationally, it must also be important locally on a household economic base. If conservation does not pay at this level, then the long term sustainable basis for conservation is at risk. If conservation areas are to pay for themselves as well as provide tangible benefits to neighbouring communities and to national economies, then they should operate on an increasingly commercial basis.

Though this rationale is widely accepted, developing commercial enterprises at the community/rural resource user level has been fraught with difficulties of control devolution, power, local institutional capacity and management. CAMPFIRE is one example of this that has been successful in Zimbabwe but driven primarily by the lucrative hunting industry. Currently economic benefits from conservation are derived at a number of levels in East Africa (Table 5).

Table 5: Land Use and Conservation Enterprises

Type of Land Use	Some Examples	Potentials and Constraints
Private, Company Lands	Ranch hunting (Tanzania), Cropping (Kenya); Tourist lodges, bandas and campsites; walking, horse and camel trips; Private Wildlife Sanctuaries and Reserves; Game farming and ranching	Tenure: Private or Company title Potentials: Commercial focus, benefits and dividends to individual, company. Conservation value more easily integrated into land management Constraints: Does not really affect the majority of poor rural resource users, who still pay conservation costs
Group, Village Lands	Hunting (Tanzania), Cropping (Kenya); Tourist lodges, bandas and campsites; Walking, horse and camel trips; Community Wildlife Reserves and Sanctuaries, for example Kimana and Mwaluganje in Kenya; Cultural homesteads and curio sales, for instance in Maasai land	Tenure: Group or Village title Potentials: Potential to involve significant numbers of poor rural people to support sustainable conservation as a component of a viable land use system Constraints: People normally have a subsistence focus. Establishment of enterprise projects requires much commitment and is time consuming. Potential for exploitation high
Lands held under customary tenure	Hunting (Tanzania); Tourist lodges, bandas and campsites; Walking, horse and camel trips; Cultural homesteads and curio sales - Samburu, Maasai	Tenure: Title vested in Local Authority Potentials: Many such lands are important areas to conservation, eg. in Kenya, and where conservation can play a significant economic role to rural people Constraints: Security of tenure not vested in rural people. Potential for exploitation high. Difficult to create legal groupings when tenure not assured

Some opportunities and constraints concerning conservation and enterprise development include:

- National and international tourist companies, where benefits accrue to commercial interests at either national and/or international levels. Such companies may have concessions, lodges etc. either inside or external to conservation areas. They may accrue significant benefits to local resource users. Unless the benefits are equitably negotiated, and dividends accrue in a mutually agreed transparent fashion, then this is not a true partnership;
- The hunting industry in Tanzania is operated by national and international hunting companies, and carries out its operations in Wildlife Division controlled areas. Few benefits accrue back to the rural communities. The Wildlife Division shares 25% of certain types of revenue with District Councils, but this opportunity rarely benefits rural people. The Cullman Reward scheme, and the Selous Conservation Project are efforts to foster an improved conservation ethic through sharing hunting benefits.
- Conservation related enterprises that are based on private or company lands in areas of important conservation value may be owned and managed by the land owner, or as part

of a negotiated lease agreement with a national or international company. A number of ranches in Kenya, for instance around Laikipia, and some in Tanzania have such enterprises. Returns from tourism create a bundle of economic choices for the land owner. In some cases conservation has become the main economic choice, for example Lewa Downs Ranch in Laikipia which has significantly reduced its livestock enterprises in favour of wildlife related business. Such conservation related economic activities are helping land users become more responsible with respect to conservation as the power to generate tangible benefits increasingly rests with them.

- Group or village ranches are found in many of the rangeland areas of, in particular Kenya and Tanzania. Unlike private or company lands they are not commercial in focus, but subsistence based. Many of these areas lie in important conservation areas. For instance, the Group Ranches in the Amboseli ecosystem, and village ranches in Tanzania.

Historically rural people living in such areas have not been involved, or significantly benefitted from conservation related enterprise, or if they have it has been peripheral, and has been characterized by a history of exploitation. There are notable exceptions. Recently there has been a more concerted effort to create sustainable enterprise development projects with such rural communities in group and village ranches. However major lessons learnt include the time it takes to plan, and implement such projects in a manner that is most likely to be sustainable, and the diversity of activities required, for instance use of awareness programmes, problem and opportunity definition, project planning, business training. Examples include the formation of Mwaluganje Community Game Reserve and Kimana Game Sanctuary in Kenya, the concession agreements and local level involvement of Dorobo Safaris with villages in the Simanjiro plains to the east of Tarangire National Park in Tanzania.

- Communities occupying lands without secure title, for instance the trust lands of Kenya, are in a much more difficult position since the land tenure, though it may be customarily recognized, is vested with local authorities, not local communities. This makes successful community based enterprises difficult, and where there are conservation related enterprise projects, the benefits are more likely to accrue to the local authority through leases, and not local people.

While conservation should pay and be economically viable at a local level, translating this into reality in a way that rural people benefit in a negotiated and partnership manner is more difficult and time consuming. Creating a viable business attitude in an essentially subsistence economy is not easy. Business-based hand-outs will not work. The enterprise has to be properly planned and implemented. This implies significant efforts into training for such conservation based business, for instance planning, legal issues, management and accounting.

8. FUTURE TRENDS AND DIRECTIONS

The ultimate benefits of community conservation should include maintenance of protected and conservation area integrity and objectives, resolution of conflict and responsibility creation resulting in sustainable conservation for improved food security and household economics of rural resource users in a manner that is nationally and internationally viable and sustainable. Community conservation has to address wider political, policy and land issues to achieve its conservation objectives. Broader political and land use issues have to be understood and influenced, for instance land use and tenure is a critical, highly emotive and politicised issue in East Africa.

Changing attitudes, and improving rural economies takes time. Results are not easily and quickly visible or quantifiable. Partnership, related to mutual responsibilities, is crucial to long term success of community conservation. Relationships between conservation authorities and communities depends increasingly on their direct or indirect involvement in conservation management decisions. Local people's "voice" in a partnership is important on its own. To re-enforce this community conservation needs to be tied to some form of benefit sharing, or enterprise development. Provision of benefits and resources is one mechanism for encouraging the establishment of community structures that will persist in their positive relationship with the conservation authority. For conservation authorities to be fully involved in community conservation, they have to see benefits related to conservation.

Benefit sharing and enterprise development cannot be seen as completed projects or interventions at the community level. That would be an abrogation of responsibility well discussed in the rural development literature, and not in keeping with the partnership philosophy that sustainable conservation depends and will depend on. The actual activity may represent a culmination of months or years of painstaking negotiating. It cannot stop at implementation, but has to continue during and after implementation to ensure that the activity is managed on a sustainable, and in the case of enterprise projects, profitable and self supporting basis for continuity; that it does not compromise conservation objectives; and that agreed to responsibilities are adhered to. In many respects these wildlife experiences with benefit sharing is consistent with that of rural development. Hence there is need for appropriate skills in modern African wildlife and conservation departments, in terms of appropriate policy instruments, suitable training and equipped staff and above all the interest and commitment to make community conservation work, else the future of sustainable conservation in Africa may be bleak.

LITERATURE USED

- Adams, J.S. and T.O. Mcshane 1992. The Myth of Wild Africa - Conservation Without Illusion, W.W. Norton, New York.
- Aylward, B. 1992. Appropriating the Value of Wildlife and Wildlands in T.M. Swanson and E.B. Barbier (eds) 1992 Economics for the Wilds - Wildlife, Wildlands, Diversity and Development. Earthscan, London.
- Barrow, E. Bergin, P. Infield M. and Lembuya P 1993. Community Conservation Lessons from Benefit Sharing in East Africa. Paper presented to International Wildlife Congress "Integrating People and Wildlife for a Sustainable Future. Costa Rica
- Dixon, J.A. and P.B. Sherman 1990. Economics of Protected Areas - A New Look at Benefits and Costs, Earthscan, London.
- Ledec, G. and R. Goodland 1988. Wildlands: Their Protection and Management in Economic Development World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Ryan, J.C. 1992. Conserving Biological Diversity in Brown L.R. et al. State of the World 1992, Earthscan, London.
- Snelson, D. (1994) Neighbours as Partners of Protected Areas. The African Wildlife Foundation's Community Conservation Programme. In McNeely J.A. ed. Partnerships for Conservation. IUCN, Gland. p. 223-231
- Wells, M., K. Brandon and L. Hannah 1992. Parks and People: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities. World Bank, Washington.
- West, P.C. and S.R. Brechin 1991. Resident Peoples and National Parks. Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation. University of Arizona, Tuscon.
- Western, D. and Wright M. (eds) 1994. *Natural Connections - Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*. Island Press, Washington 581 p.
- Edmund Barrow is the African Wildlife Foundation's Community Conservation Coordinator, based in Nariobi, Kenya