

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION RESEARCH IN AFRICA

Principles and Comparative Practice

Working Papers

Paper No 8

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION FROM CONCEPT TO PRACTICE: A PRACTICAL FRAMEWORK

by

**EDMUND BARROW
MARSHALL MURPHREE**

Research funded by the Global Environmental Change Programme, Phase IV (Grant No. L320 25 3211) of the Economic and Social Research Council, United Kingdom. This research is a collaborative project between IDPM, University of Manchester, African Wildlife Foundation, (Nairobi), Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe and the Department of Geography, University of Cambridge.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to any of the collaborating organisations. These are interim research results circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments.

ISBN: ISBN 1 902518101

Published by: Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester,
Crawford House, Precinct Centre, Oxford Road, MANCHESTER M13 9GH
Tel: +44-161 275 2804/2800 Fax: +44-161 273 8829
Email: idpm@man.ac.uk Web: <http://www.man.ac.uk/idpm/>

Abstract

This paper provides an analytical framework for empirical studies of community conservation. It commences by exploring the meanings of the terms community, participation and conservation. It then proposes that tenure over land and resources is the main variable and that three analytically distinct forms of community conservation can be identified: protected area outreach, collaborative management and community-based natural resource management. Other important variables are reviewed: values and goals, public policy and devolution, benefits and incentives, institutions and the implementation process. The conclusion presents a conservation objective/livelihood objective matrix and affirms tenure as the most important variable in the analysis of community conservation initiatives.

Community Conservation from Concept to Practice

A Practical Framework

Edmund Barrow¹ and Marshall Murphree²

I. Introduction

Over the past two to three decades there has been a changing focus in rural development thinking from supply driven top down to participatory, demand driven bottom up approaches. Adams and Hulme (1998) describe these changes as they have affected conservation. An increasingly large theoretical and practical literature has developed, showing a plethora of different stances for working with communities, together with the means and mechanisms by which resource users can be better involved in, and benefit from conservation. These approaches have been given the umbrella term of “community conservation”.

Community conservation is a term of questionable definitional rigour or analytic utility. Community is a noun that has consistently defied precise definition. Conservation is a word frequently given meaning at odds with the cultural perspectives of “communities” that are expected to practise it. In spite of this ambiguity the term has gained a prominent place in the international lexicon of environmental policy and practice embracing a broad spectrum of approaches and programmes, often with their corresponding acronyms³. These approaches exhibit differences of intent, emphasis and substance. Equally there is a broad focus which places them under the rubric of community conservation. In its most generic and embracing sense the term represents a broad spectrum of new management arrangements and benefit sharing partnerships for the involvement in natural resource management by people who are not agents of the state, but who, by virtue of their collective location and activities are critically placed to enhance the present and future status of natural resources, and their own well being.

This generic definition provides a frame for what can be considered under the term community conservation, but tells little, if anything, about the content. One of the main objectives of this volume is, through a comparison of selected case studies, to analyse this content in terms of concept and practice. To bring structure and focus to this analysis, the authors have identified one dominant and a further five sets of variables which shape the profile of policies, programmes and projects that fall within the ambit of community conservation. Taken collectively, they form the analytic framework for this book. While the individual case studies emphasise certain of these variables at the expense of others, cumulatively they provide the material for a synthesis based on this framework.

It is important to create an appropriate, functional framework for community conservation, one primarily based on ownership, as well as the conceptual and definitional perspectives for this study and on a wider basis, in line with current trends in natural resource management. This attempts to relate conservation to rural livelihoods and poverty alleviation, and to the local, national and global conservation of biodiversity.

We recognize that community conservation is not a panacea for all environmental and conservation problems that nations and rural people may face. The notion and practice of community conservation needs to be strategically linked to the conservation of a nation’s biodiversity and its land use planing. The realisation that rural resource users must be responsibly involved in conservation, combined with national land use needs, is leading to a discussion on the need for a re-appraisal of protected area

¹ African Wildlife Foundation to October 1997, presently with IUCN - East African Regional Office, Nairobi, Kenya

² Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe

³ For example Integrated Conservation and Development (ICD), Community-Based Conservation (CBC), Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Community Wildlife Management (CWM), Collaborative (or Co-) Management (CM), and Protected Area Outreach Projects

categories (Dudley and Stolton 1998). While the need for the categories of protected areas is not in doubt, it is their form and shape which may change and evolve. Here community conservation is likely to complement, rather than be an alternative to existing protected areas.

The balance of this paper explores conceptual and definitional aspects of this study. Following a discussion of some of the key terms, including “community”, “conservation”, and “participation” together with a brief analysis of some of the evolving notions of community conservation, a template for the examination of case study data is described, from the basis of tenure, either *de jure* or *de facto*, of the land and the resources. Ownership of the land and resources is the basis for the three broad forms of community conservation, which are then discussed. This is followed by a briefer analysis of the five sets of key variables. These sets of variables relate to a) utilization based objectives including values and goals, policy and devolution, and benefits and incentives; and b) management objectives including institutions and local organizations, and process and implementation. While we take a focus on rural people’s and communities, it is clear that many of the principles and mechanisms discussed in this framework are also applicable to the private and commercial sectors.

2. Community

The definition of community is rarely addressed explicitly in approaches which seek community involvement in wildlife management. Community is one of the most vague and elusive concepts in social science and continues to defy precise definition (Sjoberg 1964). Communities can be functionally defined in several ways e.g. through representative structures, area, common interest, ethnicity, affinity, resource user groups or land use. Communities may be typified by their variation (between social groups, for instance gender), variegation (within social groups), and stratification (by wealth and power). Community can be a system of values and moral codes which provide members with a sense of identity (Cohen 1985). No community lives in isolation but is connected to others and to society in general. Communities are also dynamic and variable over time, and for different people at different times with varying roles. Elite’s exist in all communities and tend to be over-represented in leadership roles.

In its study of community approaches to wildlife management, IIED points out that the concept can be approached in spatial, socio-cultural and economic terms (IIED 1994). Spatially communities can be considered as “groupings of people who physically live in the same place”. Socio-culturally they can be considered as social groupings who derive a unity from common history and cultural heritage, frequently based on kinship. Economically they can be considered as “groupings of people who share interests and control over particular resources”. Combining these constructs one can derive a model of community as an entity socially bound by a common cultural identity, living within defined spatial boundaries and having a common economic interest in the resources of this area. An example of this model is found in what IIED calls “the archetypal notion of the African village composed of founding lineage’s who have stewardship and control over a bounded set of resources within a territory, lineage’s who have married into the community, and more recent settlers, all of whom inter-marry, who speak the same language and who practice the same way of life”. (IIED 1994:p.5). With variations, this basic model serves fairly well to describe small scale social aggregations where the homestead level is basis for much of rural Eastern and Southern Africa. Such “communities of place” are fairly typical where rural farmers are sedentary and primarily reliant on arable agriculture.

Problems arise, however, when we try to apply this ideal-type model everywhere, and in all cases across contemporary rural Eastern and Southern Africa. The model is static, giving little hint of the heterogeneity, changing membership, and composition of rural locales due to forced relocation, migration, rural/urban labour and resource flows, and changing agricultural practice. As a result “communities” are far more internally differentiated than the model implies. Their boundaries also

change as development shifts land from one jurisdiction to another, and governments impose new units of local governance on rural landscapes. Analytically the model poses problems in its spatial dimension. For example, the fisher community around Masali Island off Pemba is comprised of 1640 fisher folk from 29 coastal wards or “Shehias” around Pemba Island in the Indian Ocean (Cooke and Hamid 1998). The resource management community, defined in terms of residents, may not coincide with the accepted resource use community, defined socio-culturally. In particular, the model is not easily applied to semi-arid and arid areas where various forms of pastoralism prevails and where “communities of place” interact with each other over a much wider range in a system of reciprocity either seasonally or at times of environmental stress to mitigate risk and enhance resilience.

So the concept of "community" while attractive can be misleading. Where several parties require access to a common resource, proposed community "ownership" has utility as an unifying organisational principle. The price of belonging to a community is the acceptance of its customs, like patriarchy or deference to elders, unlike urban western society where individuality is emphasised (Metcalf 1996). The assumption that in rural society there are distinct autonomous social units, separate one from another, is false. Individual security of access to resources is based on membership of a community which involves obligations as well as rights. Allocation of land and resource rights by elite's, tradition, distant rulers etc., functions to control behaviour (Metcalf 1996). This helps cater for the variability of, and fluidity within a community.

A problem with using "community" as an organising principle for conservation concerns fitting it into the modern nation state structures of central and local government, based on the principle of individual adult representation. For example in Zimbabwe and other countries the local authority has three or more tiers, namely district, ward or division, and the village. While modern ward boundaries in Zimbabwe generally complement the traditional "headmanship" unit, the modern village boundaries contradict the "kraalhead" unit. These two sources of authority (democratic and customary) present conflicting sources of institutional legitimation (Metcalf 1996). Conflict between them can rupture community orientated conservation policies. These considerations make any attempt to provide a polyvalent definition of community futile, except at a level so generalised as to be analytically sterile. In this study we take another, actor oriented and functional approach to the topic.

Firstly we identify the level of governance and civic organisation which the concept addresses. This is the arena of social action requiring collaborative management of common pool natural resources by rural farmers, pastoralists or fisher folk below those of the large scale bureaucratic units which government have created at sub-national levels. Institutionally this is a manifest gap in the structure of environmental governance in Africa today, and an arena in which community conservation, however conceived, operates.

Secondly we see the nature of this action as being primarily inter-personal, guided by peer expectation and mutual reciprocities rather than by bureaucratic prescription. This characteristic has implications for institutional scale since any organisation based primarily on personal interaction requires that members have the opportunity for at least occasional face to face contact. Such units will thus be restrained in their size and we can refer to them as “small scale”, bearing in mind that this refers to social and not spatial scale.

Thirdly, we ask the question “What is required by rural resource users to effectively organise themselves for collective action for effective natural resource management?” The answer to this question is likely to throw up a variety of answers depending on context. While the detail is left for the analysis found in the

individual chapters, we suggest at this stage that any organisational vehicle for such collaboration is likely to require four characteristics: cohesion, legitimacy, delineation and resilience.

Cohesion: This refers to a sense of common identity and interest which serves to bring people together for collaborative action, and leads them to collectively differentiate themselves from others. At its core this characteristic arises from subjective perceptions, although it is fed by instrumental considerations. Its sources commonly arise from a shared history and culture, although it may be a product of political and economic factors which force people to share a finite resource base. Whatever its history, cohesion becomes the social glue which persuades people to act collectively to achieve mutual interest and represent it to others.

Demarcation: Cohesion sets social boundaries and determines membership. A parallel requirement is demarcation, which sets the boundaries of jurisdiction for the collective regime. This demarcation is commonly based on spatial criteria, a delineation of a fixed land area and the resources on it. It may, however be drawn on the basis of socially sanctioned access to given resource categories, as in the case of pastoralism or some fisheries. Whatever the criteria used, the definition of jurisdiction limits authority and responsibility for the collective grouping and is necessary for efficient organisational activity.

Legitimacy: Just as collective organisation requires demarcation, it also requires legitimacy for its processes and leadership which needs to relate to both power and authority. Legitimacy can be conferred by external authority but this on its own is not sufficient. More important is internal legitimacy arising from socio-cultural and socio-economic criteria. In many contexts these criteria are at odds with those which modern African states currently seek to impose on rural populations, and the persistence and adherence to them creates tension and conflict. An internal legitimacy endogenously derived but also sanctioned by the state is likely to produce a robust base for organisation.

Resilience and Risk: In the rapidly changing world of rural Africa the components of organisations are dynamic. The roots of social cohesion may change in their substance and combinations. Boundaries of jurisdiction and affiliation may shift. The sources of legitimacy may permute. Effective organisation must accommodate this change evolving over time. Resilience, that is the right and capacity to adapt in content and structure, permits it to do so and is a key tool to the management of risk in uncertain environments and livelihood systems. Not only does this characteristic provide durability to organisations, it also provides the scope for them to improve through processes of adaptive management.

The organisation characteristic described above, located in small scale, personalised arenas of social interaction, provide the profile for what we take to be “community” in the study. Our preference is in fact for the term “community conservation” since our emphasis is an interaction and process rather than form.

3. Participation

The language of democracy and participation is found everywhere. At a national level this may be with reference to civil society and good governance, while at a local project or activity level it appears as commitment to popular participation (White 1996). This is part of a fundamental shift in development thinking over the past twenty years which seeks to move from being capital-central to people-centred (Oakley 1991), and based on the need for a radical shift in emphasis from external professionals to local people (Chambers 1983). Now the need for participatory approaches is being embodied in conservation. “Properly mandated, empowered and informed, communities can contribute to decisions that affect them and play an indispensable part in creating a securely-based sustainable society” (IUCN 1991).

Participation varies from being passive at one extreme to self-mobilization at the other (Table 1). Participation helps strengthen the capacities of rural people to gain responsibility for their natural resources. But the meaning varies widely and is used to cover many activities, for instance the provision of labour, materials or cash; involvement in problem identification; project planning and implementation; community, institution, or individual participation; partnership, enablement or empowerment; or a combination. This reflects the many interests different people have in participation in terms of who participates, and the level of participation involved (White 1996).

A wide range of people and stakeholders may need to participate in natural resource management, and may have different perspectives and stakes. Key issues include **gender** differences in the way men and women use natural resources; **equity** for improving conditions of the poor, and their relations with the wealthy and powerful; **decision makers** at individual, household and group levels, and the rest of the population. In addition the use of **local knowledge** systems can be a valuable information source and tool for conservation.

Table 1: How people can participate in development programmes

Participation Typology	Some Components
Passive Participation	Being told what is going to happen or already happened. Top down, information shared belongs only to external professionals
Participation in information giving	Answer questions posed by extractive researchers - using surveys etc. People not able to influence
Participation by consultation	Consulted, and external agents listen to views. Usually externally defined problems and solutions. People not really involved in decision making. Participation as consultation
Participation by material incentives	Provision of resources, e.g. labour. Little incentive to participate after the incentives end, for ex. much on farm research, some community forestry
Functional Participation	Form groups to meet predetermined objectives. Usually done after major project decisions made, therefore initially dependent on outsiders but may become self dependent, and enabling. Participation as organization.
Interactive Participation	Joint analysis to joint actions. Possible use of new local institutions or strengthening existing ones. Enabling and empowering so people have stake in maintaining structures or practices
Self-Mobilisation	Already empowered, take decisions independent of external institutions. May or may not challenge existing inequitable distributions of wealth and power. Participation as empowering

(Sources: Pimbert and Pretty 1994, Oakley 1991)

Adopting participatory approaches, is a powerful tool in planning and implementation, but does not in itself guarantee equity. Sharing through participation does not necessarily mean sharing in power (White 1996). Participatory management styles give voice to local people but do they give voice to everyone? For instance vocal men may dominate discussions. Are there people who are negatively affected by something that benefits others? Can all different groups be consulted? The more varied a community is, the more difficult this is. Participation cannot be merely wished upon rural people. It must begin by recognizing the powerful, multi-dimensional, and in many instances, anti-participatory forces which dominate the lives of rural people (Oakley 1991).

This framework recognizes that different forms of participation are used to different degrees of scale and scope in different types of community conservation. Prescriptive forms of participation cannot be forced on systems, which, under policy and statutory terms, cannot cater for them. It is the notion of real and responsible participatory approaches which is more important, which meet the goals implied in the term so

as to suit the conditions for that participation. For instance a SCIP (Support for Community Initiated Projects) in Tanzania, a CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources) project in Zimbabwe, Conservancies in Namibia, and Collaborative Management in Uganda all require different approaches to participation which ultimately relate to the statutory conditions which control access to, and ownership and use of conservation resources. Subsequent chapters in this book will provide examples and explore the issue of participation in detail.

4. Conservation and Wildlife

Conservation refers to the management of human use of organisms or ecosystems to ensure such use is sustainable. Besides sustainable use, conservation can include protection, maintenance, rehabilitation, restoration and enhancement of populations and ecosystems (IUCN 1991). The term wildlife refers to non domesticated animals and plants which are used or valued by people. Unfortunately conservation as a term has generally been associated with preservationist approaches, while protection is only one form of conservation. Some of this is historic where, for example in Africa, conservation activities became increasingly concentrated on the alienation of land for game reserves (Adams 1996).

Both these terms evolved from an essentially Western definition, where ‘wild’ is defined in terms of the absence of human control, ‘conservation’ in terms of the “maintenance of quantified aggregates of biodiversity and the preservation of natural habitats”, and management objectives which relate to species and habitat protection, government control and abstract policy (Murphree 1996). This is at dissonance with African perceptions and practice of ‘conservation’ and ‘wild’ where customary property regimes determined what belonged to the household and what was a common pool resource. Natural resources and wildlife were a common pool resource, and conservation for rural people is an investment in the sustainable use of their natural resources. Conservation is a means to an end rather than an end-in-itself (Murphree 1996).

The “fortress conservation” or segregationist perspective is still espoused by many, but almost always by those who do not have day to day contact with wildlife. For them sustainable use of natural resources is of more direct concern, since, at a local level, natural resources play a vital role in rural people’s lives. In short, this is a more integrationist approach. With increasing land use and population pressures, these utilitarian arguments for conservation have been given increased emphasis in recent years as agencies recognize the need to link conservation and development (IUCN 1991; Adams 1996). The sustainable use of natural resources has to be balanced, and in balance with the needs rural people have for land. However this can lead to irrational conservationism, or “forced” degradation of natural resources (Parker, undated) through over use. The framework we present here helps put this argument in perspective with respect to the locus of the objective of land use.

5. Evolving Notions for Frameworks for Community Conservation

Community conservation has been used to denote a range of mechanisms and arrangements for community and local resource user involvement with, and benefiting from conservation resources. It includes protected area outreach, collaborative management, co-management, joint management, community based conservation and community based natural resource management. The elements of community conservation can be varied, but will include at least local resource users and the conservation resource, be under some form of conservation policy and legislative regime and may also include state conservation authorities, will have varying institutional arrangements, with an equally diverse array of potential levels of participation, but will ultimately be based on ownership.

A number of authors (Fisher 1995; Borrini-Feyerabend 1996; Metcalfe 1996) have placed community conservation as the major component of co-management, with the notion of collaboration being dominant. While these frameworks relate to the actual management of the resources, they do not implicitly relate to levels of participation or enablement involved, and recognise that rights to the resource and or the land, should be in some form of collaborative arrangement. In this sense all community conservation can be termed co-management of one form or other. The importance of ownership is implicitly, but not explicitly stated as the variable which forms the basis for functional conservation and land use.

Metcalfe bases his co-management continuum on the notion that a number of institutions, be they local, national or international, need to collaborate to make co-management successful (Pomeroy and Williams 1994; Metcalfe 1996). The focus of co-management is at the community level where communities are supposed to have primacy with respect to natural resource management, but will often collaborate with others to make that a reality so as to accrue optimal benefits from the resource. This is what much good rural development and community conservation is about, bringing together coalitions, centred around an issue or a set of resources, but with the focus, in this case, on the communities and resource users. The Zimbabwe CAMPFIRE programme is a good example of this (Metcalfe 1994).

IUCN has developed the notion a step further by relating collaboration between a community and a conservation authority to joint agreements about resource(s) use of an area that is under the jurisdiction of a state authority (Fisher 1995; Borrini-Feyerabend 1996). This approach evolved out of joint forest management, particularly in India (Sarkar, et al. 1995; Kothari, et al. 1996). Collaborative management has mainly been related to forest resources based on customary access rights which were abrogated when conservation areas were gazetted. This is evolving and, while access to plant resources may still be dominant, agreements concerning fishing, water and honey are becoming important (Van Ingen and Makoloweka 1998).

IIED address community conservation from the perspective of participation (see Table 1), which forms the basis for analysing community conservation activities (IIED 1994). These were summarised into four types of participation, namely top-down, passive participation, towards active participation and community lead (Table 6 p.60, IIED 1994). However the levels of participation can vary within, and between each of the different frameworks being used. This approach does not adequately explain resource and land ownership which is fundamental to any form of functional community conservation. The notion of participation has to be related to resource ownership and access, and is thus a tool, and not a panacea, all be it a vital one, for responsible conservation. For example a community may not participate in the management of their own resources despite the fact that they own them, they may simply use the resources as individuals; or there may be quite significant participation in problem and needs identification, and the means to mitigate such problems in protected area outreach where ownership of the resource is firmly with the state.

Murphree proposes that community based conservation is about contributing to rural livelihood and development objectives (Murphree 1996). Conservation objectives in such areas are of secondary importance. While this is both important, in terms of rural resource economics and livelihoods, and useful, in the context of integrating conservation into rural land use, the analysis is limited by its lack of address of community conservation within the context of other land owners, and in particular the state through its conservation estate.

6. Tenure of Land and Resources - The Dominant Variable

None of these analyses explicitly address ownership issues as the basis for community conservation. The focus is directed towards levels of involvement in conservation and of participation. The context of resource and land ownership has not been adequately analysed from the perspective of community conservation. Ultimately land and resource ownership determines use, who benefits, and who has rights and responsibilities for that land and its resources. Basing a framework for community conservation on ownership allows for exploration and analysis of the different types of participation, different forms of resource use and access arrangements, the different forms of benefit flows and the different objectives. In addition it provides a secure foundation for the analysis of the other five sets of important community conservation variables.

Tenure is a critical factor for conservation, since it determines the linkages between responsibility and authority over land and natural resources, and also determines the incentive structures for sustainable use (Murphree 1996). It can take a variety of forms ranging from rigid statutory defined individual title to *de facto* customary rights of access and use, to one where resource users are granted rights of access to, or authority over natural resources owned by another, usually higher body. Ultimately all lands and natural resources are controlled by the state, and the state, through various instruments, grants or upholds a range of tenurial and access rights to land and resources.

There are two main sets of contrasting tenure rules, statutory and customary, and these often co-exist. There are often problems of conflict between these two because in statutory law land tends to be treated as a single resource covering both the land and the resources on that land. In customary law it need not be a single resource and, for example, one person may own the land, while others may have access rights, or ownership of certain resources, e.g. water, trees, grazing. Contemporary public policy tends to promote privatisation of land because of its simplistic notions of ownership, equity and investment and a belief in the efficiency of private actors. Factors which underpin much of Western thinking and economics are often contradicted by more complex traditional tenurial arrangements (Baxter 1975). Customary law distinguishes in detail between resources and is a complex bundle of rights of access, of renewable or consumptive use, and of disposal. Such rights may be disaggregated by resource, for instance individual trees or groups of trees which may be subject to different rights; and by product and time, for instance when to grow and who can harvest or browse (Barrow 1996).

Land tenure refers to the possession and holding of the many rights associated with each parcel of land and its resources (Riddell 1987). These are referred to as a bundle of rights. However not all rights comprising the bundle may be held by the same person. Any system of land tenure is dependent upon the historical and cultural circumstances within which the given community has evolved and the legal and philosophical content of that community's conception of land (Okoth-Owiro 1988). Land can mean:

- Land and all things attached to it. For example this is reflected in the registered land act of Kenya and land becomes a commodity (Kenya 1985).
- Various material objects (e.g. trees, buildings) are legally severed from the concept of what land means. This is reflected in customary and communal land tenure. Here the context of communal tenure is complex but has two essential elements namely that of equal access to land, and the economic fact that land is not a commodity (Okoth-Owiro 1988).

Under traditional systems control of land was vested in various forms of traditional leadership, for example the Kingdoms of Ankole and Buganda in Uganda (Doornbos 1978; Kamugisha 1993). In terms of tenure, is it possible to reconcile the interests of the local population and the state, since customary law is largely unwritten and may be out of step with the wider development process (Wanjala 1990)? Development

policy has tended to ignore and not understand customary law. In the management of common pool resources, e.g. grazing and water access on communal lands, it is difficult and costly to exclude others. It is important to understand that such resources may be utilised by more than one person either simultaneously or sequentially. There is now an increasing body of empirical evidence of effective common property management of natural resources (Ostrom 1990; Bromley 1994).

Land tenure cannot be separated from land use. While tenure rules emphasise person versus person issues and the regulations of competing interests in the use of land, land use emphasises person versus environment issues and the regulation of land use so as to conform with acceptable methods of husbandry and conservation. Thus the holder of tenurial rights has to assume that the objectives of land use are realised, therefore land use decision making has to involve tenure (Okoth-Owiro 1988).

Frameworks for community conservation will differ depending on the ownership of a conservation important area, or the resource(s); the policy and legal frameworks of countries, and institutions; and the objectives of land users. Use is the real, at least *de facto*, if not *de jure*, determinant of ownership. If this is linked to responsible authority that use may be sustainable, but if the authority is vested in the distant state, and there are no perceived local benefits, then use may not be sustainable. However the state needs to retain control of its core conservation and bio-diversity estate, as well as ownership of last resort.

Ownership linked to rights to benefit, and to the notion of sustainable use recognizes that conservation may suffer if not seen as an "important", from either economic and/or cultural perspectives, component of land use. If it is not considered as important it will give way to more economically productive forms of land use (Norton-Griffiths 1996 and 1997; Emerton 1998). In other areas conservation may become increasingly significant, as benefits outweigh other forms of land use types. This may depend on a range of issues - subsistence based (use, meat, fuel, cultural), and increasingly market based benefits (eco-tourism, non and consumptive use, sale of primary and secondary products etc.).

Where disagreements over ownership occur, negotiations may take place resulting in changes of ownership. Ownership may also change through sale and purchase of, or through state expropriation of lands for other, often stated as more productive uses, for national or global importance. While ownership may change, it represents a given point in time as to who owns the land, and natural resources, and is a fundamental important reference point (Table 2). Establishing a framework to examine community conservation in practice, based on resource and land ownership allows for

- Clarity in understanding as to who owns what land and resources;
- Communities and conservation authorities to work towards more secure rights and responsibilities for that land and natural resources;
- Setting a legal framework for negotiating rights and responsibilities for different interest groups;
- Changes in ownership of land or resources;
- Redressing past inequities, land expropriation etc.;
- Greater participation, collaboration between conservation authorities and local people; and
- A firm *de facto* or *de jure* basis for "participation" in conservation.

Table 2: Links Between Different Tenurial Arrangements And Potential For Community Conservation

Tenure - State		Tenure - de facto people	Tenure de jure people
National Park, Game Reserve, Forest Reserve		Customary, trust, mailo (in Uganda)	Titled group or individual, company, freehold/lease
Conservation main objective either national or global, rarely local		Conservation seen as component of rural livelihoods, and rural economics - often negative	
Protected Area Outreach	Collaborative Management arrangement	Community based conservation	
Revenue and benefit sharing, conflict resolution, problem animal control	Agreement on resource use by type, amount, whom and over what time frame; conflict resolution, problem animal management	Conservation as part of land use - may be a major component - and so more likely to be used sustainably and lastingly; or may be minor, and, unless critical to people, will probably not last. Basis on cultural and economic benefits which accrue	
Wildlife part of "controlled", "pristine" landscapes. Control vested in State		Wildlife as part of "managed" landscape. If wildlife not significant economic component will probably tend to disappear, and be substitute by "more economic forms" of land use. If significant economic component to users pop pressures and inclusion/exclusion important so that wildlife can continue to be economically important	

However all over Africa there is confusion about ownership, and, more precisely, confusion about the interaction between customary *de facto* and statutory *de jure* ownership. This brief analysis cannot hope to resolve such arguments, rather we recognize that there are two forms of ownership, customary and statutory; that this is complicated due to differential ownership rights accruing to different resources, and even parts thereof; and that ownership can change. Housing this framework in ownership has practical utilitarian value, and can help form a basis for a pragmatic analysis of community conservation. The following section describes the three community conservation contexts in terms of ownership, followed by a briefer discussion of the sets of other key variables which are important for community conservation.

7. Community Conservation Arrangements based on Ownership

In this section we describe in more detail the three major forms of community conservation. Each is housed in a different tenurial/access regime with different foci. This allows for comparative analysis with, and between the different arrangements, and, into which, different community conservation activities can fit (Table 5; see also Hulme 1997; Adams and Infield 1998; Anstey and Murphree 1998; Barrow, et al. 1998; Jones 1998; Kangwana and Mako 1998). The three contexts of community conservation which have emerged in Africa are:

1. **Protected Area Outreach** seeks to enhance the biological integrity of parks by working to educate and benefit local communities and enhance the role of a Protected Area in local planning. Examples of protected area outreach include the work of Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA), Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), and Kruger National Park in South Africa (Barrow 1996; Venter and Breen 1996; Barrow, et al. 1998; Bergin 1998);
2. **Collaborative Management** seeks to create agreements between local communities or groups of resource users, and conservation authorities for negotiated access to natural resources which are usually under some form of statutory authority. Examples of collaborative management include what

is starting to happen with Forestry Departments in Tanzania and Uganda, and in UWA, as well as in a number of West African Forestry Departments (see for ex. Wiley and Haule 1995; Wily 1995; Fotso 1996; Ibo and Leonard 1996); and

3. **Community Based Natural Resource Management** schemes have the sustainable management of natural resources through returning control over, or responsible authority for these resources to the community as their chief objective - for example CAMPFIRE, ADMADE (Administrative Management Design) programme in Zambia, Conservancies, and Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (see for ex. Metcalfe 1994; Jones 1997; Murombedzi 1997).

Table 3 summarises the different types of community conservation in terms of land and resource ownership. This in turn determines the rights and responsibilities which can accrue to the different institutions involved to make such community conservation a success. Resources can refer to an area of land and all the resources therein, e.g. community forest, a national park; or it can refer to a bundle of resources - access to papyrus, fuelwood, water, certain wild animal; or it can relate to one resource, e.g. a tree species.

Table 3: Ownership As The Main Determinant Of Rights And Responsibilities

	Total State ownership of Area or/and resources	Collaborative Management Arrangements	Community or land user based ownership
Ownership of Resource or land vested in either state or land users (<i>de jure</i> or <i>de facto</i>)	State owned, e.g. National Parks, Forest and Game Reserves	State owned land, however state has created mechanisms for collaborative management of certain resources or lands	Local resource users and people, or groups thereof own land and resources <i>either de jure</i> or <i>de facto</i> . State may have some control of last resort
Some components	State determines type and level of use, by whom and under what circumstances	Agreement between state and user groups about managing and area or/and resource(s) which are state owned	Conservation as part of land use, rural economies
Type of community conservation	Protected area outreach	Collaborative Management	Community - Based Conservation

In Africa today a wide range of these different types of community conservation are functioning under different tenurial and institutional arrangements. The Pan African Symposium on the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, held in Zimbabwe in 1996 demonstrated this (CIRAD 1996). Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDP's) may include components of one or more of these types of community conservation depending on scale and scope. But ICDP's will also include components which are of a more direct livelihood link, for instance water development, resource substitution, improved agriculture and soil husbandry, improved efficiency of resource use etc. ICDP's are well discussed in the literature (Stocking and Perkin 1991; IIED. 1994; Barrett and Arcese 1995; Albert 1996).

7.1. Protected area (PA) outreach

Africa has a well developed protected area system, and includes national parks, game and forest reserves. Many of these protected areas were established prior to, or just post independence with little consultation with rural people (Adams and Hulme 1998). Protected area outreach is a more recent and pragmatic attempt to improve long term conservation goals, while redressing some past injustices. There

have been a number of protected area outreach type arrangements in the past, but it is over the last decade that they have become institutionalised within conservation authorities, in recognition of the importance of involving those land users who border protected areas. Tanzania National Parks' Community Conservation Service is a good example of this (Bergin 1996 and 1998).

The most important shortcoming in the past establishment of protected area systems may not have been geographical and ecological but human and institutional. Protected areas in Africa were usually established without the participation or consent of local people and many times involved their forced removal (West and Brechin 1991; Adams and McShane 1992). Few attempts were made to educate people about the importance of an area or indeed to learn about its importance from those who knew it best, i.e. those people living there. Parks were not established with linkages to local land use plans or as part of a system which provided opportunities for sustainable development.

Only recently has this attitude started to change. Adams and Mcshane (1992, p. 247) demonstrate that "Africans do care about wildlife. They live with it every day. They have been labelled as the problem; they are in fact the solution". However community conservation cannot be simplified to the provision of benefits but has to relate to wider issues of land use and tenure together with local and national economic needs and aspirations. This implies the need for alliances and real partnerships. Protected Area outreach represents an array of mechanisms to meet such alliances and seeks to:

- Identify mutual problems of protected areas and local people who live close to that protected area, and solve them in a manner that all benefit;
- Create opportunities and benefit flows, using the protected area as a basis, for local people to improve their livelihoods; and
- Resolve conflicts in a mutually agreeable manner.

Protected area outreach functions within a framework whereby the protected area is a nationally gazetted legal entity managed by some form of state conservation authority, for example national parks, forest reserves. While Protected Area outreach can also function in conjunction with collaborative management where policy and legislation allows, in this analysis protected area analysis forbids any use of conservation resources within the protected area, for example Tanzania National Parks, Kenya Wildlife Service.

Tanzania National Parks has the most institutionally strong protected area outreach programme (Bergin 1996 and 1998) with a functional Community Conservation Service well integrated within TANAPA, agreed to policies and procedures both at headquarters and in the individual National Parks, and agreed to mechanisms for benefit sharing. Protected area outreach is more developed in East Africa than elsewhere, partly in recognition of the importance of the East African system of protected areas, and in particular the savannah ones, play in terms of national tourism industries, and the significant benefits which in the past accrued to national governments and tour operators.

When protected areas were declared, Governments replaced traditional tenure with western ownership. This exclusive ownership led to no community or resource user involvement, or benefit flows except through "theft" of government assets. Protected area outreach attempts to introduce the idea of broadening the tenure arrangement, therefore assuming some level of tenure rights for local communities, converted into benefits, while government retains "legal" ownership. The law may give government ownership, but the *de facto* use can create confusion, and so negotiation may lead to compromise and ultimately improved management. The underlying principle for protected area outreach and collaborative management is essentially the same, however the balance of tenure rights is different.

Conservation objectives are the key management priority, assuming that the protected area is contributing to national conservation objectives. This also assumes that the protected area system of a

country has been strategically defined so as to include samples of valuable conservation resources. Therefore protected area outreach and benefits are linked to contributing to conservation as the primary objective, rural livelihoods are of secondary importance. This has to be seen in the context of, and interest for the neighbours who border such protected areas to see them as partners in so far as is possible, given the statutory conditions of the protected area authority. Dialogue, conflict resolution, and forms of benefit sharing arrangements, which do not include use of protected area natural resources, are the major components of outreach.

Benefits will contribute either directly, but more often indirectly to poverty alleviation through the provision of improved services, for example contributing to schools, health facilities, water etc., which may or may not be confined to those who live close to the protected area; or they may be part of national benefit sharing with a wider distribution. An important additional component of protected area outreach is the potential for reducing law enforcement and protected costs. The costs of protected area outreach may be off set by savings in law enforcement.

7.2. Collaborative management

Borrini-Feyerabend describes that “the term ‘collaborative management’ (also referred to as co-management, participatory management, joint management, shared-management, multi-stakeholder management or round table management) is used to describe situations in which some or all of the relevant stakeholders in a protected area are involved in a substantial way in management activities” (Borrini-Feyerabend 1996, p12). While the focus is on protected areas, collaborative management can apply to areas which do not have protected area status and can apply to virtually all types of natural resources (ibid).

For this framework we take a narrower ownership focused perspective, as being more appropriate. Collaborative management represents an arrangement whereby a community, or a group of resource users, and a conservation authority collaborate to jointly manage a resource, certain resources, or an area of conservation value. The collaborative arrangement may also be between a private sector interest and a community or a conservation authority. The resource(s) or conservation area is usually governed by national policy and legal instruments, and not legally owned by individuals or local resource users, for example national parks, game reserves, certain tree species. The important issue is that the collaborative partnership has negotiated rights and responsibilities, and seeks to:

- Identify important community resources that were, in one form or other, "illegal" to use. The resource (s) may be in a forest reserve, park or in some way nationally regulated;
- Create a negotiated framework through some form of formal agreement, with agreed rights and responsibilities by all involved stakeholders to use "sustainably" resources, various resources, or a conservation important area; and
- Establishes local responsibility for the management of such resources so as to achieve conservation as well as community objectives.

Collaborative management refers to arrangements where the resource or land is *de jure* owned by others, normally the state, and local resource users have negotiated and agreed rights of access. This usually refers to where, for example state owned forests and national parks can have collaborative management arrangements whereby agreed to uses, through documented agreements, management contracts or memoranda of understanding, have rights of access to and, use of resources in a protected area, and may have rights in joint protected area planning and management (Borrini-Feyerabend 1996). In some countries, for example where the use of certain trees species is nationally legislated, there is potential for collaborative arrangements on individual or community owned land concerning those species. While, by implication most collaborative arrangements relate to communities, this is not necessarily always the case. For example a forest department may enter into a collaborative agreement with a private sector tour operator, or a range of institutions may collaborate to assist in the conservation and

management of certain area, for example the Lake Naivasha Riparian Association in Kenya, where Lake Naivasha is a Ramsar site (Lake Naivasha Riparian Owners Association 1996). However for the purposes of this study we are more concerned with collaborative arrangement between rural people, resource users and various forms of state authority.

Collaborative management may be chosen for a number of reasons including

- The conservation resource being less critical; or
- Because governments capacity to manage the resources is lower; or
- Because government accepts that greater tenure rights exist for local communities and users, whether legally or morally; or
- A combination of these three factors.

What is important is the shift in the balance of tenure rights and ownership which enables or informs the management process, or negotiation and compromise leading to the collaborative management. Some of this shift is to redress the historic shift from customary to state control (Poffenberger 1990). Key differences with other forms of community conservation relate to relative access to benefits; the extent to which local practices and traditional rights are part of the process; and the extent to which a genuine local role in decision makes is encouraged and honoured (Fisher 1995).

While collaborative management arrangements cover certain types of resource use, it is likely that the conservation objectives are still the driving force. Management is focused by conserving, through sustainable use, components or all of an area. That use can be an important contribution to livelihoods, if so the collaborative management agreement will be stronger than when benefits are few or unimportant. However the resource and the land will still be part of a nations conservation heritage. Use will contribute directly to rural poverty alleviation, but will normally be confined to those who live relatively close to the protected area.

7.3. Community Based Conservation or Natural Resource Management

The basis for conservation, and natural resource management lies with the community or resource users. The "community" have ownership of their resources. In terms of the balance between rural people and government, government retains some rights, but normally one of last resort. Ownership may be based on western or traditional norms, and is vested in the individual or recognised groups. Conservation is by the people to manage responsibly in a way that is "sustainable" and benefits them. In some cases this can be related to eco-friendly development. Striving to achieve locally based sustainable natural resource management should also contribute to conservation objectives.

Community Based Conservation seeks to:

- Empower local people to sustainably manage their own resources;
- Create the enabling legal and policy instruments;
- Establish mechanisms for local ownership and responsibility for the process; and
- Ensure that benefits accrue responsibly and equitably.

The land either belongs *de jure* to users (titled) or *de facto* (customary, trust lands) to resource users, either as individuals or in groups. Resources, their management and use thereof, is usually a *de facto* local level responsibility, especially for flora, though some wild fauna may be nationally owned. However if use of, and responsibility for is not vested in some responsible manner in the resource users, then the value of wildlife tends to be discounted and disappear due to active removal, land use conversion, poaching etc. (Norton-Griffiths 1997; Rainy and Worden 1997; Emerton 1998).

Incentives to use, and have responsible authority for resources are key concepts. Benefits have to accrue, with community conservation being a major or minor component. Contributing to conservation objectives is usually, in reality, a secondary objective. Once rural livelihoods is the primary objective, wildlife may disappear from many landscapes and will only really survive where they are of real and substantive value (Norton-Griffiths 1997; Emerton 1998). Economic value may be more than just cash based, but could include cultural, aesthetic values, on which the land users are prepared to accept.

The example of Zimbabwe is illustrative. The Parks and Wildlife Act devolved appropriate authority to commercial land users in 1975, and to communal land users through the rural district councils in 1986, though this did not become practice until 1989. Zimbabwe acknowledges that its protected areas and wildlife resources are valuable and highly marketable assets, as well as a legitimate and sustainable form of land use; and recognizes that conservation of wild animals and habitats outside the Parks estate is only likely to be successful if wildlife can be used profitably and that the benefits accrue to those people with wildlife on their land. This statement of intent links conservation value, sustainable use and benefit accrual to resource users (Barrow 1997).

Unlike many other countries, Zimbabwe recognizes that land users should be the best custodians of their natural resources, provided they have the right to use wildlife and to benefit in a meaningful manner from their custodianship. The Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management allows and encourages the devolution of the management, and use of wildlife as a *privilege* to appropriate authorities of land users, which can include Forest Land, Other State land, Communal lands (CAMPFIRE), and on rural commercial lands, and urban alienated lands. Ownership of wildlife has not been transferred from the state to its citizenry, but the citizenry can gain appropriate authority to use its wildlife in a responsible manner (Barrow 1997). In terms of CAMPFIRE appropriate authority was granted to the lowest accountable level of government at the time, namely the rural district councils.

8. Other Key Variables in the Analysis of Community Conservation Initiatives

Community conservation initiatives in Eastern and Southern Africa appear in a wide variety of different forms. Some of the differences are those of contextualized detail; others are more fundamental in shaping the thrust and performance of the specific cases that this study analyses. In combination these fundamental differences constitute contrasting models of community conservation and it is tempting to analytically leap immediately into categorizations and typologies. This would, however, mask the fact that these difference although fundamental, usually manifest themselves in community conservation approaches as degrees of emphasis. Analytically we therefore take these differences as variables “susceptible of fluctuating in value or magnitude under different conditions”. (Webster’s Comprehensive Dictionary, International Edition, 1995). In our treatment of these variables below, each is regarded as a continuum, lying between the polar stances which produce the contrast. The dominant variable for this framework, ownership in its different forms, has been discussed. The other variables we will analyze are values and goals; policy and devolution; benefits and incentives; institutions and local organizations; and process and implementation. Table 4 summarizes some of these values for the three different approaches of community conservation. These are then discussed in more detail.

8.1. Values and Goals

Economic improvement is morally imperative and essential for environmental sustainability. Previously, economic growth and environmental protection were carried out in isolation, which often resulted in accelerated degradation. Thus "the deeper agenda, for most conservationists, is to make nature and natural products meaningful to rural communities. As far as local communities are concerned, the agenda is to regain control over natural resources, and through conservation practices, improve their economic well

being" (Western and Wright 1994). As a means to improve their economic well being, communities will only invest, where they can get better and quicker returns, within a short term.

Table 4: Location Of Different Components Of Community Conservation

Component	Protect Area outreach	Collaborative Management	Community Based Conservation
Whose agenda	Dominantly protected area; in terms of having neighbours as partners	Dominantly protected area, going to joint	Community, local level
Who owns process	Protected area	Legally the state, but towards joint management and use	Community
Who plans	For outreach activities can be joint	Joint	Community, often with assistance of others
Who controls	Protected Area	Joint	Community
Ownership of resources, area	Protected Area	Protected area	<i>De facto</i> community, or individual, but will legally depend how tenure is vested
Dominant objective	Enhanced conservation and integrity of protected area	Conservation, however increase access and use of resources	Rural livelihoods: needs met but conservation values integrated
Fate of conservation resource	Maintained, as part of States' Conservation heritage	Maintained, as part of States' conservation heritage; however may be overuse, or use may affect other species	Where insignificant to rural economics or culture will be lost. Resource likely to be maintained the more culturally and economically valuable the resource is.
Value of local rules and regulations	Slight related to how positive the relationship is, example of snares	Can be great depending on how local rules of access are joined with Park rules and who enforces	Local rules will govern access and use of resources, by whom and under what conditions
Influence of increased population	Reduced value of outreach, as benefits shared more thinly. Increased need to park integrity maintenance	Pressures on how many different stakeholders can have access to a relatively static resource. How community handles inclusion and exclusion	Conservation resource base not likely to increase, therefore benefits more thinly spread and so value per person may reduce. How community handles inclusion and exclusion key
Murphree (1966) analysis	Conservation for or with the people	Conservation with or by the people	Conservation by the people

The values and goals of specific community conservation initiatives reveal the definitions, often implicitly, which their proponents assign to the term wildlife conservation. Generally, wildlife conservation has to do with managing wildlife and human/wildlife interactions in ways which seek to ensure that humans can continue to derive values from wildlife in the indefinite future. The values that wildlife holds are, however, diverse - including philosophic existence valuation; aesthetic and recreational worth, and instrumental and economic benefit. The weight that people give to these different forms of value correlates closely with their cultural and socioeconomic location. For people in urban, industrial or post-industrial social contexts wildlife has little direct economic significance and emphasis is placed on the intrinsic or recreational worth of wildlife. For rural farmers and pastoralists where the presence of wildlife has important economic implications, wildlife valuations tend to be more instrumental even where their cultures dispose them to value wildlife for intrinsic reasons. Although there are important exceptions, the institutionalization of community conservation in African today

through policies, programmes and projects is largely a product of initiatives by international conservation agencies endorsed by state governments, shaped by conservation professionals and funded by international environmental grant sources. With its cultural and socioeconomic location, it is not surprising that this provenance tends to reflect an emphasis on the intrinsic and aesthetic values of wildlife, to define conservation in terms of abstract concepts such as biodiversity and ecosystem maintenance, and to emphasize such goals as species preservation and the maintenance of micro-habitats for aesthetic and recreational use.

The rural farmers who are the targets of such initiatives are unlikely to hold the same values and goals, or to articulate conservation as a discrete set of concerns. Indeed their vernacular languages rarely have the abstract noun “conservation” and translations usually involve the use of a phrase such as “taking care of natural resources”. This is not to suggest that they do not hold a conservation ethic. Their valuations are, however, likely to be more instrumental and economic in emphasis. Conservation is for them an investment (in direct or opportunity costs) for present and future value, the goal being the maintenance or enhancement of these livelihoods. They are unlikely to willingly collaborate in “community conservation” schemes if these costs do not score this goal.

Community conservation brings together two sets of social actors whose values, goals and definitions of conservation are likely to be very different. Until initiatives under this rubric recognize and reconcile these differences in approaches yielding material benefit to those who, in Bromley’s words, “seek to preserve biodiversity and those who must make a living amid this genetic resource” (Bromley 1994: 430) they are likely to be ineffective. The degree to which this recognition and reconciliation is present will thus be a significant variable in the analysis of the case studies which follow.

8.2. *Public policy and devolution*

Good wildlife conservation requires political will on the part of the government and the people who put it in power (Murphree 1993). In Africa this political constituency is broad and dominated by rural land users who are concerned with survival, and for whom the costs of wildlife are high and the benefits marginal at least. This has been the basis for much land conversion. Unless the costs and benefits are reversed and in favour of the land users, then conservation will continue to suffer (Norton-Griffiths 1996; Norton-Griffiths 1997; Emerton 1998). Politics and policy makers need to be informed by the potentials, now becoming explicit, for conservation as a significant, visible contributor to rural livelihoods.

A critical policy matter related to wildlife is ownership. How use rights to wildlife are assigned affects how communities act with respect to wildlife on their land, whether fauna or flora. In countries like Kenya where wildlife is owned by Government, communities have little, if any, use rights to wildlife, or in Niger where important trees requires state approval to dispose, even if on a farmers land (Leach and Mearns 1988). However in countries like Zimbabwe and Namibia the relevant government departments have created the legislative framework for devolving responsible authority to communities and land users (Metcalf 1994; Jones 1997; Jones and Murphree 1998). In East Africa there has been an ongoing process of policy and law revision, for example the 1996 UWA statute, which creates the statutory mechanisms for responsible community involvement in natural resource management (Uganda 1996).

One way to remove disincentives to community conservation is to grant communities multiple use rights to wildlife. If a Government decides to devolve wildlife use rights to communities, then it must also decide upon the structures and institutions to which these rights should be devolved, the transferability of these rights, and the checks and balances on these rights. For example, communities may be granted cropping rights for meat production, but not hunting rights, rights to certain resources, but not to others.

Within many countries in Africa there is an increasing political and policy shift to decentralization to a more local level. Reducing government budgets, and structural adjustment policies, coupled with decentralization means that government should no longer command and control. This has given added impetus for community conservation arrangements for the management of natural resources.

From a policy perspective, a serious shortcoming from many past and existing community conservation efforts has been that the initiative, in many cases, has been undertaken by donor funded projects. Although the management authority may have expressed support, and the policy strongly encourages initiatives that provide tangible benefits to communities, reservations may remain at all levels of the organization (Barrow, et al. 1998). The tradition of strict preservation, law enforcement approaches to Protected Area management remains strong, despite the speed with which new approaches have been adopted. TANAPA's Protected Area Outreach and Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programmes demonstrate that this can be done, and have official policy and legislative backing, with minimal external support (Bergin 1998; Jones and Murphree 1998). These programmes started without significant external support. Ownership of the process was national and seemingly more resilient.

The evolution of policies and procedures which create a more enabling climate for community conservation, has been a long and difficult process. Devolving increasing responsibility and authority to land users is not easy for government institutions. However, when local resource users gain responsible authority, they show that they are capable of managing natural resources in a responsible manner. The realization that responsible conservation must involve rural people, and the increased push to decentralization has helped facilitate more responsible community initiatives.

8.3. *Benefits and Incentives*

Rural people derive a wide range of benefits from their natural resources, some recognized, others not. The accrual of benefits relates to the rights of access to, and ownership of both the land and the resources, as well as the institutional arrangements put in place. These range of local and national level incentives are what will help conserve biodiversity, provided the incentives are real and tangible at those levels, and are not merely more nebulous global incentives.

Conservation value may not be simply one of local land use, but have national and global implications for the sustainable conservation of biodiversity. Benefits which may accrue from protected areas can be classified into 8 areas: recreation, tourism, watershed protection, ecological processes, biodiversity, education and research, non-consumptive benefits (e.g. historical and cultural), and future values (Dixon and Sherman 1990). These benefits, representing the total economic value, however, are not all obvious nor are they divided among people in a manner proportional to the "costs" to local people (Barrow, Bergin et al. 1995). The costs of wildlife conservation are better understood than the benefits. Recent attempts to formulate ways to quantify the benefits of wild lands conservation (e.g. Ledec and Goodland 1988; Dixon and Sherman 1990; Aylward 1992) 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.

For community conservation to be successful, there has to be a sense of responsibility and ownership, or proprietorship devolution at the community and resource user level. Without this, incentives for conservation become marginal and *ad hoc*. However there are often establishment incentives to resist this (Murphree 1998). These two incentive sets can be harmonized where complimentary and mutually supportive roles are given primacy through local level responsibility and benefits, supported by government facilitation.

Conservation benefits, both quantitative and qualitative, are key to this together with enabling policy support. Many would argue that tangible economic benefits alone are critical to sustainable and successful community conservation. One thing is certain: benefits, of whatever nature, have to outweigh the costs of conservation on rural lands for rural land users. The benefits need not be all economic, but local level economic benefits are crucial to the acceptance, or not, of conservation as a component, either major or minor, of land use.

National park benefit sharing, through protected area outreach is one array of benefits which can be classified into five broad types, namely (i) those where no additional expenses are required such as provision of advice; (ii) those where a re-direction and planning of normal park budget is required, such as road maintenance near the park; (iii) those that involve some re-planning of park development expenditure such as a ranger post for which the planning is mostly park dependent; (iv) those that are community development type projects, supported by special revenues set aside, such as a dispensary for which considerable planning is required from both park and people and (v) those projects which are of a commercial enterprise development nature, such as a camp site which requires much commitment and responsibility by both parks and people (Barrow, et al. 1995; Barrow 1996).

The process of negotiating what type of benefits to share, with whom, over what duration and for what purpose is long and of fundamental importance. 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, equitable, 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.

Though an economic analysis of the value of contributions made to communities through, for example, collaborative arrangements might reveal that they are insignificant in economic terms, they are locally important in many cases (Emerton 1998). Access to specific resources may have great social and cultural significance. Provision of access to bamboo shoots in Mount Elgon National Park to the local Bagisu people, for whom the bamboo plays a critical role in their rituals as well as their diet, is an example as “there is no substitute” for the ritual functions of bamboo (Scott 1994: p.112). The negotiation of access to water through Lake Mburu National Park for the livestock of certain communities living around the park has been of critical economic importance to these people, and the general understanding that the park forms the water resource of last resort during severe drought (Barrow, et al. 1998). Provision of access to valued plant resources in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park for use in both handicrafts and medicine has helped to support and strengthen traditional institutions as well as stimulating the development of new ones (Wild and Mutebi 1996).

For conservation to be sustainable and successful on rural lands, it has to 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.

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, for example a number of ranches in Kenya and Tanzania. 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 and conservancy in Laikipia, Kenya. Conservancies have evolved in Kenya, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia, where groups of land users manage their land for conservation purposes, for ex. tourism, sport hunting.

Unlike private or company lands group or village ranches/lands are largely subsistence based. Historically rural people living in such areas have not been involved, or significantly benefited from conservation related enterprises, or it was peripheral and *ad hoc*. Recently there has been a more concerted effort to create sustainable enterprise development projects with rural communities, for example communal conservancies in Namibia, CAMPFIRE arrangements in Zimbabwe, and Community Game Reserves in Kenya. 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.

8.4. *Institutions and local organizations*

The distinction between institutions and organizations has caused much confusion. Institutions are complexes of norms and behaviours that persist over time by serving collectively valued purposes (Uphoff 1986). Organizations structure these institutions in specific arenas through assigned roles, and may operate on a formal or informal basis. Most rural development thinking placed emphasis on organization capacity and efficiency, but it should be kept in mind that the effectiveness of organizational structures is largely dependent on their correspondence with the institutional requirements to which they are responsive

The institutions listed illustratively in Table 5 show mixed provenance, some endogenous and some exogenous to communities. Both types, in an increasingly economically and politically integrated world, are necessary for successful community conservation. The strengths of these institutions relate to the ownership the membership has, and the degree to which they are integrated into local society. For each type, evolution and adjustment is necessary and experience has shown that this is likely to be slow and uneven.

8.5. *Process and Implementation*

Project and programmes are the principal, though not exclusive, contexts which bring together local and international incentives for conservation. However implementation has focused on two cultures, one reductionist, bureaucratic and directive operating through the project cycle, the other incrementalist, personalized and consensual operating through adaptation and indeterminate time frames (Murphree 1998). This “blueprint or process” debate has been well described in the literature (see for ex. (Chambers 1983; Chambers, Pacey et al. 1989; Bond 1997).

Table 5: Examples Of Institutions Used For Community Conservation

Type of Institution	Origin of the Institution	Functions	Ownership
Park Management Advisory Committee	Uganda National Parks, Uganda	Benefit, Revenue sharing	Park initiated, not with community
Partnership Forum Framework	Kruger National Park, South Africa	Dialogue, conflict resolution, projects	? Joint
Villages	Government, Tanzania	Village level planning, implementation, bye-laws	Local - village + Government
Village Gestion	Government, NGOs, various forms in Central and West Africa	Natural Resource Management	Increasingly local ownership
Dina (Madagascar), Mchenya and Sungusungu (Tanzania)	Customary local	enforcement of locally agreed to rules and regulations	Local
Wildlife Forums	Kenya Wildlife Service	Wildlife Management outside Protected Areas	? Local
Associations	Local, and with Kenya Wildlife Service; Also Gov.	Associating for common cause, e.g. Wildlife benefits	Local
Conservancies	Local land users with conservation authority	Jointly manage larger land unit with stated conservation objective	Local land owners
Kraalheads	Local (Zimbabwe)	various - land use, natural resource management	Local

(Barrow 1996; Metcalfe 1996; Jones 1997; Barrow, et al. 1998)

Implementing community conservation in practise and creating mechanisms to do so has taken time, and much learning, changing essentially more preservationist “military” type state conservation institutions to one of facilitating, sharing power and empowering local community and resource users. It has been fraught with difficulties related to attitude, motivation, acceptance and the need for retraining. This changing of institutional mentality has taken time, but is essential to the long term success of community conservation. Donors and projects can help facilitate this change, through being more innovative and less tied to the rigidities of the project cycle which will allow for real institutional learning, and focuses more on experiential adaptation of roles and norms in new and changing circumstances within local social units (Jentoft 1997). The change from facilitation to “external” push can be very small, but potentially risky in terms of a conservation authorities’ ownership of the process and real capability to implement (see, for example Barrow, et al. 1998).

Within conservation authorities who now have functional community conservation programmes, a range of practical mechanism have evolved (Barrow 1996). In some cases there has been overlap, and memoranda of understanding have been used to harmonize activities, as, for example, has happened in Kenya between the Forestry Department and the Kenya Wildlife Service (Kenya Wildlife Service and the Forestry Department 1991). In general terms the steps being taken to try and create such partnerships and mechanisms include dialogue and conflict resolution, benefit flows, and enterprise development. Community type projects with simple conflict resolution activities have been easier to rationalise than, for instance initiation of enterprise related projects which might compete with the conservation authority for clients and revenue.

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 appropriate training;
- Evolution of benefit sharing mechanisms through trials resulting in benefit sharing policies;

- Evolution of community conservation 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 (Barrow 1996).

11. Conclusion

Community conservation has to address wider political, policy and land issues to achieve its conservation and livelihood objectives. Broader political and land use issues need to be understood and influenced, for instance land use and tenure is a critical, highly emotive and politicised issue in East Africa. Having a practical framework for community conservation, based on a tenure and ownership continuum can be a powerful analytical tool. It helps focus on conservation as one form of land use with a range of potential benefits depending on the tenurial regimes which apply.

There can be no one common framework for community conservation, but different sets of arrangements to suit different tenurial and institutional mechanisms. The three forms of community conservation, though based on tenure as the dominant variable, need to be cognisant of, and influenced by the other variables discussed. Different objectives influence the tenurial arrangements possible. Different tenure regimes determine the nature, scale of, and scope for community conservation, and the role conservation plays in the landscape, and to land users. Recognized ranges of stakeholders with tenure interests in the land and natural resources, including private sector and global interests, can influence the form of conservation management. The wide range of examples from practice allows for analysis against this framework and across the variables discussed. This framework :

- Is functional - it is based on land ownership, resource, or resources, or a combination;
- Recognizes that the state through its protected area system has rights, and obligations to strategically conserve nationally important biodiversity;
- Recognizes that the state can and should enter into a range of viable and affordable benefit sharing arrangements from its protected area system;
- Allows for, where policies and mechanisms exist or are being put in place, collaborative management arrangements for the more sustainable and equitable use of resources within conservation areas;
- Assumes that where land is held, either *de jure* or *de facto*, by rural resource users or communities, either individually or communally, that the people have prime rights to, and responsibility for conservation as part of economic livelihood based land use;
- Allows for flexibility in that arrangements can change with changes in tenure or resource status, and there can be changes within categories; and
- Allows for a wide range of participatory arrangements from essentially top down mechanisms, for example park authorities allow people to collect thatching grass once a year, to arrangements based on partnership, to ones where rural people are empowered to use their resources in a manner which they see fit.

Placing this framework on a conservation-livelihood matrix allows for a comparative analysis to show which major, conservation or livelihood, objectives are being pursued or achieved (Table 6, after Hulme 1998). This, in part, relates to a changing emphasis in conservation from one of “hands off” to sustainable use. Conservation objectives are still important, but are increasingly embedded in, related and contribute to livelihood objectives. This is also influenced by government decentralization processes, retrenchment, which necessitate increased resource user responsibility for, and rights to the natural resources and management thereof. Murphree has argued strongly for this shift in objectives. Table 6 shows the reality of this happening (Figures 1.2 to 1.6, Murphree 1996). It recognizes the

continued importance of a nation's conservation estate, though balances this with rural land use and livelihood needs.

Table 6 Conservation and Livelihood Objective Matrix

		Conservation Goal of an Intervention		
		Comprehensive Biodiversity Conservation	“Least-Worst” biodiversity Loss	Conservation as a residual Issue
Development Goal Of An Intervention	Sustainable Livelihoods for the Community	<i>Community Conservation in Theory and Rhetoric</i>		<i>Libertarian Developmentist</i>
		Rarely Achieved, ultimate objective of CBC or CBNRM	CBC, Conservancies CAMPFIRE	Conservation value lost, or perceived not to be of great value, environment will take care of itself
	Improved Livelihoods for the Community		<i>Community Conservation in good practice</i>	
		Protected Area Outreach where benefits of real use to people; CM agreements for use and access	Many CM agreements, also CBC	Some CBC where conservation role is not highly significant and so likely to be lost over time. Also some CM if not closely monitored
	Livelihoods as a residual issue	<i>Fortress Conservation in Theory</i>	<i>Fortress Conservation in Practice</i>	<i>Fortress Conservation in the Africa in crisis Narrative</i>
		Some Protected Area Outreach where benefits very minor. Pure Conservation	Protected Area Outreach, Some CM	Effects of population pressure. Poor land use and land use planning lead to resource degradation and poverty

Ultimately a nation wants to conserve its biodiversity for its present and future generations to sustainably enjoy. However this has to be tempered by a nation's overriding need to provide for its present population. Conservation needs to contribute to rural people's and a nation's economic base. The different frameworks for community conservation allow for this by recognizing, that, under certain conditions, national concerns and conservation objectives are more important, even though they may contribute to rural livelihoods, while in other areas conservation is part of rural land use and livelihoods. The framework will assist in the comparison of the many different types of initiatives which are underway, by basing this analysis on tenure. While tenure is the main underlying objective, a range of other management and utilization objectives have been briefly explored. This provides a practical comparative basis for community conservation which can then be linked to a conservation-livelihood continuum.

References

- Adams, J. S. and T. O. McShane (1992). The Myth of Wild Africa: Conservation without Illusion. New York, W.W. Norton.
- Adams, W. (1996). Conservation and Development. The Physical Geography of Africa. W. M. Adams, A. S. Goudies and A. R. Over. Oxford, England, Oxford University Press.
- Adams, W. and D. Hulme (1998). Conservation and Communities: Changing Narratives, Policies and Practices in African Conservation. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England: 30.
- Adams, W. and M. Infield (1998). Local People and Conservation in the Mgahinga National Park, Uganda. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.
- Albert, P. (1996). "Integrated Conservation and Development Projects. Examples from Africa." BioScience **46**(11): 845-855.
- Anstey, S. and M. Murphree (1998). Traditional Wildlife Management Systems: A Case Study in Central Mozambique. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.
- Aylward, B. (1992). Appropriating the Value of Wildlife and Wildlands. Economics for the Wilds - Wildlife, Wildlands, Diversity and Development. T. M. Swanson and E. B. Barbier. London, Earthscan.
- Barrett, C. B. and P. Arcese (1995). "Are Integrated Conservation-Development Projects (ICDPs) Sustainable? On the Conservation of Large Mammals in Sub-Saharan Africa." World Development **23**(7): 1073-1084.
- Barrow, E., P. Bergin, M. Infield and P. Lembuya (1995). Community Conservation Lessons from Benefit Sharing in East Africa. Integrating People and Wildlife for a Sustainable Future. J. A. Bissonette and P. R. Krausman. Bethesda, Wildlife Society: 21-26.
- Barrow, E. G. C. (1996). The Drylands of Africa: Local Participation in Tree Management. Nairobi, Initiatives Publishers.
- Barrow, E. G. C. (1996). "Partnerships and Empowerment - community conservation approaches and experience from East Africa." Rural Extension Bulletin, Reading University **10**: 5-13.
- Barrow, E. G. C. (1997). CAMPFIRE and conservancies in Zimbabwe - Now and Into the Future. Wildlife Resources Outside the Zimbabwe Parks Estate: A Management Policy Framework. Recommendations from the DNPWLM seminar on CAMPFIRE and Conservancies, Boulton-Atlantica, Zimbabwe, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management, Zimbabwe.
- Barrow, E. G. C., H. Gichohi, and M. Infield (1998). A Comparative Study of Community Conservation in East Africa. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.
- Baxter, P. T. W. (1975). Some Consequences of Sedentarization for Social Relationships. Pastoralism in Tropical Africa. T. Monod. Oxford, International African Institute and OUP: 206-228.
- Bergin, P. (1998). Reforming a Conservation Bureaucracy: TANAPA and Community Conservation. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.

- Bergin, P. J. (1996). Conservation and Development: The Institutionalization of Community Conservation in Tanzania National Parks. School of Development Studies. Norwich, East Anglia: 198.
- Bond, R. (1997). Operationalizing Process: The Experience of the First Decade of the Monerugala IRDP in Sri Lanka. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester. **IDPM Paper No. 50**: 108.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G. (1996). "Co-Management - a New Approach to Conserving Uganda's forests." Plant Talk **July 1996**: 22-25.
- Borrini-Feyerabend (1996). Collaborative Management of Protected Areas: Tailoring the Approach to the Context. Gland, Switzerland, IUCN. **Issues in Social Policy**: 67.
- Bromley, D. W. (1994). Economic Dimensions for Community-Based Conservation. Natural Connections. Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation. D. Western and M. Wright. Washington, Island Press: 428-447.
- Chambers, R. (1983). Rural Development: Putting the Last First. London, Longman.
- Chambers, R., A. Pacey, et al., Eds. (1989). Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research. London, Intermediate Technology Publications.
- CIRAD, I., IFRA (1996). Pan African Symposium on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation. Pan African Symposium on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Cooke, A. and A. S. Hamid (1998). Misali island Conservation Area, Pemba - An Analysis of Activities and Lessons Learnt. Paper present to Workshop on Experiences in Local and Community Integrated Coastal Zone Management Projects, Lessons to date. Zanzibar 4-6 March 1998: 18.
- Dixon, J. A. and P. B. Sherman (1990). Economics of Protected Areas - A New Look at Benefits and Costs. London, Earthscan.
- Doornbos, M. R. (1978). Not All the King's Men: Inequality as a Political Instrument in Ankole, Uganda. The Hague, Paris, New York, Mouton Publishers.
- Dudley, N. and s. Stolton (1998). Protected Areas for a New Millenium - The Implications of IUCN's Protected Area Categories for Forest Conservation. Gland, Switzerland, WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature and IUCN - The World Conservation Union: 15.
- Emerton, L. (1998). Why Wildlife Conservation has not Economically Benefited Communities in Africa. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England: 25.
- Fisher, R. J. (1995). Collaborative Management of Forests for Conservation and Development. Gland, IUCN, and WWF.
- Fotso, R. C. (1996). Two Models for Biodiveristy Conservation and Community Development Integrated Projects in Cameroon. Paper Presented to Pan African Symposium on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, June 1996: 16.
- Hulme, D. (1997). Community Conservation in Practice: A Case Study of Lake Mburo National Park, Uganda. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England: 50.
- Hulme, D. (1998). Conservation and Livelihood Matrix. Pers. Comm.

I.I.E.D. (1994). Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management. London, International Institute for Environment and Development.

Ibo, J. and E. Leonard (1996). "The Structure, subsistence and the Forest Theory and Practice of Participatory Forest Management in Cote D'Ivoire. Paper Presented to Pan African Symposium on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, June 1996." : 20.

IUCN (1991). Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living. Gland, Switzerland, IUCN - The World Conservation Union, UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme, and WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature.

Jentoft, S. (1997). "Beyond Rational Choice: Implications of a Broadened Institutional analysis for Fisheries Management." Common Property Resource Digest(42): 8-9.

Jones, B. (1998). Community Conservation in Namibia's Kunene Region. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.

Jones, B. and M. Murphree (1998). The Evolution of Policy on Community Conservation in Namibia and Zimbabwe. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.

Jones, B. T. B. (1997). Community Based Natural Resource Management in Botswana and Namibia - an Inventory and Preliminary Analysis of Progress. review for IIED study on "evaluating Eden": Factors Affecting Community Wildlife Management. Windhoek, Namibia, IIED.

Kamugisha., J. R. (1993). Management of Natural Resources and Environment in Uganda: Policy and Legislation Landmarks, 1890-1990. Nairobi, Regional Soil Conservation Unit of SIDA: 100.

Kangwana, K. and S. O. Mako (1998). The Impact of Community Conservation Initiatives around Tarangire National Park, Tanzania. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England.

Kenya, Republic of (1985). The Registered Land Act. Laws of Kenya CAP 300. Revised Edition. Nairobi, Government Printer.

Kothari, A., N. Singh, et al., Eds. (1996). People and Protected Areas - Towards Participatory Conservation in India. New Delhi, Sage.

Lake Naivasha Riparian Owners Association (1996). Lake Naivasha Management Plan, July 1996. Naivasha, Kenya, Lake Naivasha Riparian Owners Association: 27.

Leach, G. and R. Mearns (1988). Beyond the woodfuel Crisis. People Land and Trees in Africa. London, Earthscan.

Ledec, G. and R. Goodland (1988). Wildlands: Their Protection and Management in Economic Development. Washington DC, World Bank.

Metcalf, S. (1994). The Zimbabwe communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). Natural Connections. Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation. D. Western and R. M. Wright. Washington, Island Press: 161-192.

Metcalf, S. (1996). "Whose resources are at Stake? community based conservation and community self governance." Rural Extension Bulletin, Reading University **10**: 14-18.

Murombedzi, J. (1997). Community Wildlife Management in Southern Africa: Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Paper Prepared for IIED study on "Evaluating Eden": Factors affecting community Wildlife Management. Harare, IIED and Southern Africa Sustainable Use specialist Group: 44.

Murphree, M. (1996). "Ex Africa semper aliquid novi?" Considerations in Linking Environmental Scholarship, Policy and Practice. Pan African Symposium on the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Murphree, M. (1998). Synergizing Conservation Incentives: From Local-Global Conflict and Compatibility. Manchester, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, England: 10.

Murphree, M. W. (1993). Decentralizing the Proprietorship of Wildlife Resources in Zimbabwe's Communal Lands. Voices From Africa: Local Perspectives on conservation. D. Lewis and N. Carter, WWF: 133-145.

Murphree, M. W. (1996). Approaches to Community Participation. African Policy Wildlife Policy Consultation. Final Report of the consultation. Overseas Development Administration. London, Overseas Development Administration: 153-188.

Norton-Griffiths, M. (1996). "Property Rights and the Marginal Wildebeest: an Economic Analysis of Wildlife Conservation Options in Kenya." Biodiversity and Conservation 5: 1557-1577.

Norton-Griffiths, M. (1997). Why Kenya Conservation is Failing. Swara. 20: 6-8.

Oakley, P. (1991). Projects with People. Cambridge, England, Blackwells.

Okoth-Owiro (1988). Land tenure and Land Use Legislation Issues in Agroforestry Development. Soil Conservation in Kenya. Proceedings of the Third National Workshop 16-19 September 1988. D. B. Thomas, E. K. Biamah, A. M. Kilewe, L. Lundgren and B. Mochoge. Nairobi, Dept. Agric. Engineering, Univ. Nairobi and SIDA.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Parker, I. (undated). Conservation for Development: 2.

Pimbert, M. P. and J. N. Pretty (1994). Participation, People and the Management of National Parks and Protected Areas: Past Failures and Future Promise. London, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, IIED and WWF. **Mimeo.**

Poffenberger, M. (1990). Joint Management of Forest Land: Experiences from South Asia. New Delhi, India, Ford Foundation.

Pomeroy, R. S. and M. J. Williams (1994). Fisheries Co-Management. The Small Scale Fisheries. A Policy Brief. Manila, Philippines, International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM).

Rainy, M. E. and J. S. Worden (1997). Summary of Wildlife and Domestic Herbivore Populations Trends in Kenya's Rangeland Districts, 1977-1994, based on Data from the Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing. Nairobi, unpublished report: 25.

Riddell, J. C. (1987). Land Tenure and Agroforestry: A Regional Overview. Land, Trees and Tenure. Proc. Int. Workshop on Tenure Issues in Agroforestry. J. B. Raintree. Nairobi, ICRAF and Land Tenure Centre.

- Sarkar, S., S. Suri, et al., Eds. (1995). Joint Management of Protected Areas in India. Report of a Workshop. New Delhi, Indian Institute of Public Administration.
- Scott, P. (1994). Bamboo: Potential for Utilization by the Communities Surrounding Mount Elgon National Park. Kampala, IUCN.
- Stocking, M. and S. Perkin (1991). "Conservation with Development: An Application of the concept in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania." Trans. Inst.Br.Geogr. N.S. **17**: 337-349.
- Uganda, Government of (1996). Uganda Wildlife Statute. Entebbe, Government Printers.
- Uphoff, N. (1986). Local Institutional Development.
- Van Ingen, T. and S. Makoloweka (1998). Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme. Paper present to Workshop on Experiences in Local and Community Integrated Coastal Zone Management Projects, Lessons to date. Zanzibar, 4-6 March 1998: 20.
- Venter, A. K. and C. M. Breen (1996). "Partnership Forum Framework: A Conceptual Framework for the Development of Integrated Conservation and Development Programmes. Paper Presented to Pan African Symposium on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Community Participation, June 1996." : 17.
- Wanjala, S. (1990). Land Law and Disputes in Kenya. Nairobi, OUP.
- West, P. C. and S. R. Brechin (1991). Resident Peoples and National Parks. Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation. Tuscon, University of Tucson.
- Western, D. and R. M. Wright, Eds. (1994). Natural Connections in Community Based Conservation. Washington, Island Press.
- White, S. C. (1996). "Depoliticising Development: The Uses and Abuses of Participation." Development in Practice **6**(1): 6-15.
- Wild, R. G. and J. Mutebi (1996). Conservation through community use of plant resources. Establishing collaborative management at Bwindi Impenetrable and Mgahinga National Parks, Uganda. Paris, UNESCO.
- Wiley, L. and O. Haule (1995). Good News from Tanzania. Village Forest Reserves in the Making - the Story of Duru-Haitemba. Forest Trees and People Newsletter. **29**: 28-37.
- Wily, L. (1995). Collaborative Forest Management, Villagers and Government - The Case of Mgori Forest, Tanzania. Rome, Italy, Forestry Policy and Planning Division, FAO. **Forest, Trees and People Working Paper**: 44.