3-5 June 1999, Chilo Safari Lodge, Mahenye

CBNRM and its contribution to Economic Development in Southern Africa

Proceedings of the Exchange Visit Workshop for Directors

Edited by Steven Johnson and Carmel Mbizvo
CBHRM AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

PROCEEDINGS OF EXCHANGE VISIT WORKSHOP FOR DIRECTORS

Edited by Steve Johnson and Carmel Lue Mbizvo

CHILO SAFARI LODGE
MAHENYE

1-4 JUNE, 1999
SPONSORED BY:

SADC Natural Resources Programme (USAID) and The Social Science Perspective in Natural Resource Management (SSPNRM) Project Phase II (GTZ)

ORGANISED BY:

Regional Institutional Development Programme, IUCN ROSA and Africa Resources Trust (ART)

FACILITATED BY:

MetaCom (Pvt) Ltd, Harare, Zimbabwe

ABBREVIATIONS:

CBNRM ..................Community Based Natural Resources Management
ADMADE ..................Administrative Management Design
LIFE ......................Living in a Finite Environment
CAMPFIRE .................Communal Area Management, Programme for Indigenous Resources
PCC ......................Project Co-ordinating Committee
SADC .....................Southern Africa Development Conference
NRM ......................Natural Resources Management
DNPWLM ..................Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management
ZESA ......................Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority
NRZ ......................National Railways of Zimbabwe
ZTA ......................Zimbabwe Tourism Authority
GMB ......................Grain Marketing Board
GTZ ......................German Technical Co-operation Agency
AA ......................Appropriate Authority
WWF ......................World Wildlife Fund
CASS ......................Centre for Applied Social Sciences
RDC ......................Rural District Council
CA ......................Communal Areas
CITES ....................Convention for International Trade in Endangered Science
BSAP ......................Biodiversity Support Action Programme
ODA ......................Overseas Development Agency
USAID .....................United States Agency for International Development
DEAP ......................District Environmental Action Plan
LSCF ......................Large Scale Commercial Farmers
NR ......................Natural Resources
NGO ......................Non-Government Organisation
ART ......................Africa Resources Trust
IUCN-ROSA ..............The World Conservation Union – Regional Office for Southern Africa
IKS ......................Indigenous Knowledge Systems

Namibia Investment Foundation
P.O. Box 243
Windhoek, Namibia
Tel(264) 24 6345
Fax(264) 24 6344

CBNRM and its Contribution to Economic Development in Southern Africa
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1.0 SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

- Introduction
- Background
- Workshop Goals and Objectives
- Workshop Methodology

## 2.0 PAPER PRESENTATIONS SUMMARIES

- "Welcome" Address – Wilas Makombe .......................................................... 9
- "CBNRM and Community Development: Experiences from Mahenye" – Community Representatives .................................................. 10
- "Creating an Enabling Environment for CBNRM" – Clive Stockil ............................................................... 10
- "Overview of CBNRM in the Region" – Yemi Katerere 12
- "Devolution and Community Empowerment: Operationalising CAMPFIRE" – Steve Kasere ............................................................. 13
- "Economic and Policy Elements in EBNRM" – Ivan Bond ................................................................. 13
- "The Role of the Private Sector in CBNRM" – Isidore Gwashure .............................................................. 14
- "Summary of Presentations" ........................................................................... 14

## 3.0 CREATING AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT TO FACILITATE CBNRM: ISSUES ........................................ 15

## 4.0 THE WAY FORWARD:

- Principles, Guidelines and Recommendations .............................................. 17
- Follow-up Actions .......................................................................................... 25
- Workshop Evaluation ...................................................................................... 26

## APPENDICES

- Appendix I: Exchange Visit Programme ....................................................... 27
- Appendix II: List of Participants and Expectations .......................................... 29
- Appendix III: Participants Contact Details .................................................... 31
- Appendix IV: Papers Presented ...................................................................... 33
SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Southern Africa is widely recognised as a region with abundant natural resources. The majority of people in this region depend directly or indirectly on these natural resources for their survival. Despite the fact that the region is rich in natural resources, rural economic development remains modest compared to expected real potential for improving standards of living. As a result the region faces some of the greatest conservation and development challenges of recent times and there is increasing pressure to find solutions.

Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) has emerged as a great contributor to development initiatives. Indeed experiences from ADMADE, LIFE, CAMPFIRE and other regional programmes demonstrate that CBNRM can have significant impacts on development and economic growth.

But this has not been without difficulty. In most SADC member states ideologies and philosophies adopted during previous political regimes continue to influence economic policies. Inequitable access to land and use of natural resources is forcing many communities to adopt unsustainable practices and agriculture continues to be encouraged as the major strategy for food security, despite the semi-arid nature of the region.

During the past three years of implementing the SADC Natural Resources Management Programme (NRMP), the participating members have realised that a key strategy in moving towards the sustainable use of natural resources in the region is the creation of an enabling policy environment in which CBNRM would be recognised as a complimentary approach to other development strategies. To ensure that such an enabling environment was created, the NRMP realised that it needed to work with a wider scope of sectors which influence the nature of socio-economic incentive structures and institutional frameworks in society. Sectors such as Finance, Economic Affairs, Trade and Industry, and Agriculture were identified as key agencies.

Early in 1999 therefore it was decided that directors from a broad cross-section of government departments should be invited to participate in an exchange visit to the Mahenye community in the Southeast lowveld of Zimbabwe. It was intended that through dialogue with directors from the Ministries and Departments of Environmental Affairs, Conservation, National Parks & Wildlife and Natural Resources Management a greater understanding could be developed about the forces and processes which influence the adoption and implementation of CBNRM in the region.

1.2 The SADC NRM Programme

The SADC Natural Resources Management Programme (NRMP) was initiated in 1989 with support from USAID to provide assistance in coordinating their bilaterally funded CBNRM projects in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana and later Namibia. Its regional focus and direction is provided by the SADC Wildlife Sector based in Malawi, although the programme also works closely with the other natural resources orientated SADC Sectors of Inland Fisheries and Forestry, which are also based in Malawi.

The current phase of the SADC NRMP initiative was developed and initiated in 1995 and funded by USAID’s Regional Centre for Southern Africa (USAID...
RCSA). It is implemented through a Consortium comprising of IUCN-The World Conservation Union’s Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN-ROSA), the Africa Resources Trust (ART), as well as WWF-The World Wide Fund for Nature’s Zimbabwe Office, with IUCN-ROSA being the lead agency.

The initial Objectives of the programme were:

- To co-ordinate an improved understanding and technical knowledge of CBNRM issues in the region, and communicate this information throughout the region.
- To strengthen the capacity of the SADC TCU in Malawi to fulfil its management and administrative mandate within the NRMP, through the introduction of effective operational procedures for communications, planning, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

More recently the NRMP has modified the first objective to read:

To facilitate a deeper understanding of national and regional CBNRM issues amongst key decision makers of specified SADC member states, and the identification and assessment of best practices, whilst at the same time carrying out a focussed, and intensive programme of communication activities.

It was intended that these objective would be achieved through carrying out the six Outputs:

- Effective project management and technical administration capacity established;
- Liaison, communication and information exchange between NRMP implementing countries improved;
- Regional Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM communications systems developed and functional;
- A systematic data collection, analysis and feedback (M&E) system to improve NRM project management and impact assessment developed;
- Skills enhancement and capacity development for regional NRMP staff, relevant community, and technical members to facilitate development of CBNRM systems within the region achieved;
- Support provided to the PCC in the identification of research needs, and management and administration procedures developed for the small grants programme.

1.3 Social Science Perspectives in Natural Resources Management Programme

In April 1993, IUCN -The World Conservation’s Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN-ROSA) in conjunction with the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) at the University of Zimbabwe embarked on a programme on Social Science Perspectives in Natural Resource Management. This project was made possible by a grant by the German Ministry for Economic cooperation and Development (BMZ) of 1.35 million Deutsch Marks obtained through the German Agency for Technical Cupertino (GTZ). The first phase of the project came to an end in 1995. The second Phase of the project was initiated in 1998 and is funded by BMZ through GTZ.

The project aims at addressing the problem of a lack of experience with community forms of natural resource management and the absence of an appropriate legal and political framework to support such community based forms of resource management. The lack of experience with community forms of natural resource management and the absence of an appropriate legal and political framework were seen as the hindrance to sustainable natural resource management in southern Africa.

To address the above, the project’s purpose is to increase the capacity of change agents to deal with social concerns in natural resource management.

The project has the following main components:

- six weeks regional training courses in SSPNRM
- roundtable meetings for policy makers and decision makers

The results of the project are:

- To ascertain the regional training needs;
- To develop and adjust appropriately the training curriculum;
To train middle-level managers in the field of natural resource management;
To sensitize important decision makers at the political level with regard to sustainable management of natural resources;
To efficiently control the programme on SSPNRM; and
Through a network, analyse and disseminate practical examples and experiences with the management of natural resources.

1.4 Exchange Visit Goals and Objectives

This Exchange Visit was organised in recognition of the critical need to facilitate a deeper understanding of CBNRM among key decision makers in the region. This was one of the priority activities identified by the SADC NRMP’s Project Co-ordinating Committee (PCC) which guides the SADC NRM Project on behalf of stakeholders. It was also one of the issues identified by SADC Wildlife Ministers at a meeting held in October 1996 in Lilongwe, Malawi.

The Exchange Visit was designed to enable Directors of various government Departments from member states, to examine the Mahenye community’s CAMPFIRE project in the Southeast lowveld in Zimbabwe, as a working model of CBNRM principles. The model highlights the ability for CBNRM to leverage community resources, in partnership with the Private Sector to create economic growth in marginal rural areas, whilst also encouraging the responsible management of natural resources.

The objective of the Exchange Visit was to create a deeper understanding of socio-economic linkages between CBNRM and development among the participating Directors, and enable them to enhance natural resources related policy formulation in the region. The Exchange Visit Workshop also provided a forum for the exchange of regional experiences, within the sphere of natural resources management, as well as cross-sectorally amongst different government sectors.

Specifically, the workshop objective was to contribute to the development of an enabling environment that will facilitate CBNRM being accepted as a key element in economic development strategies in SADC Member State governments. This would be achieved during the workshop by:

(a) creating a common understanding of processes, issues, principles and constraints that affect CBNRM in southern Africa; and
(b) developing a set of guidelines and recommendations regarding the development of natural resource related policies in the region.

1.5 Workshop Methodology

The Exchange Visit Workshop used an approach that facilitated dialogue and critical reflection based upon an examination of the Mahenye Model, in conjunction with an analysis of the various CBNRM experiences in SADC member states. The workshop approach included the following aspects:

Facilitation Principles:
- Participation by all present
- Visualisation of the entire process
- Securing of results during the process

Roles:
- Participants – responsible for content quality i.e. provide inputs in terms of knowledge, arguments and creative ideas
- Facilitators – responsible for the quality of the process, i.e. encourage participation by all, assist with reflection of group process and give feedback and create a relaxed atmosphere conducive to creative thinking and learning

Methodical Objectives:
- Creating a common understanding of issues within a limited time period
- Develop creative ideas and pragmatic solutions to existing problems
- Develop recommendations that can be implemented jointly and effectively.
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2.0 PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

The Exchange Visit Workshop was targeted at Directors from various sectors and departments within governments in the SADC region whose responsibilities included the overseeing of the implementation of government policies which may affect the management of natural resources in the region. This definition includes sectors such as Agriculture, Tourism, Finance, Rural Development as well as those directly linked to NRM such as Conservation, Parks and Wildlife, and Environmental Affairs. A core of “Resource Persons” was identified by the organisers to provide national, regional and sectoral perspectives to guide the deliberations of the workshop, and to provide added depth to the discussions.

This section of the proceedings summarises the main points made in the presentations by the resource persons that were relevant to the issue under discussion. The summaries represent the understanding and perceptions of the facilitator regarding the issues raised during the presentations, and may not entirely reflect the author’s perspectives. The full texts of the presentations made by the resource persons in their original form are contained in Appendix IV to this report and should, therefore, be read in conjunction with these summaries below.

2.1 WELCOME ADDRESS

Willas Makombe (Director, Zimbabwe Department of National Parks & Wildlife) welcomed the participants to the workshop in both his capacities as a Zimbabwean delegate and as a representative of the three host stakeholder groups, being the Director of Zimbabwe’s Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPWLM).

In his welcome remarks, Mr Makombe underscored the important principle of underpinning conservation with utilisation and the derivation of economic benefits from conservation as exemplified by the CAMPFIRE Programme in Zimbabwe. He noted that innovative ways of enhancing economic benefits from sustainable management of resources by local communities should be explored, including processes such as Joint Ventures Partnerships (JVP) between communities and the private sector, such as the one found in Maheny.

Mr Makombe ended his address by challenging delegates to take the responsibility for ensuring the sustainable management and utilisation of regional natural resources, whilst also in meeting the challengers of a global market economy.
2.2 “CBNRM AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: EXPERIENCES FROM MAHENYE” REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MAHENYE WILDLIFE COMMITTEE

During the afternoon of the first day, the participants travelled to Maheny village to meet with its local CAMPFIRE Sub-committee for Wildlife. They were welcomed and entertained by the local community of Maheny with dances and discussions.

Mr. Charles Inggs of the Chipinge Rural District Council and Mr Cephias Chauke representing the local community made a joint presentation on the history and challenges of the CAMPFIRE Programme in Maheny. They indicated that Maheny is one of seventeen wards in the Chipinge District of Zimbabwe, covering 210 sq km, with a relatively low population of only 3,646 people according to the 1992 census. The ward lies on the North-East border of Gonarezhou National Park with its eastern boundary being Mozambique border, and is wedged between the Save River on the West and the Rupembe River on the East.

While the Maheny community endeavour to do cropping and livestock production, these activities are limited by the harsh environmental conditions of the area which is characterised by low and erratic rainfall. However being situated adjacent to the Gonarezhou National Park large mammals move across the river into the communal land at will. Through the campfire Programme the Maheny ward is committed to managing these natural resources in a sustainable manner. A detailed background paper on Maheny is contained in Appendix IV to this report.

The presentation and the ensuing discussion brought to the fore the complexity of the issues that development agencies and the target communities themselves have to contend with as they attempt to bring development to the people. Some of the key issues mentioned included tenure issues (especially ownership of land); capacity building for local communities to empower them to participate effectively in decision making processes; competition between wild-animals and people; and the inadequacy of incentives for communities to conserve natural resources; and the conflict between modern and traditional authority with regards to ownership and utilisation of natural resources. The visit to the community was a great eye-opener to the participants.

2.3 “CREATING AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR CBNRM: THE CRITICAL STEPS FOR DEVELOPING CBNRM JOINT VENTURE PROJECTS BETWEEN PRIVATE SECTOR AND COMMUNITIES” – CLIVE STOCKIL

Clive Stockil was introduced to the group as a farmer from the lowveld who had a long association with the Maheny Community having been born there and speaking the local Shangaan language. During his presentation he recounted the long “process” that the Maheny Community had been through to date and drew lessons that had been learnt in the process.

Mr Stockil observed that when dealing with community development issues, one had to be practical in order to be effective. He explained how the Maheny CBNRM Project had come out of a conflict situation, where the Maheny community had been removed from their home area south of the Save River, in order to create the Gonarezhou National Parks, and resettled north of the river. This move had created a great deal of tension and conflict between the community and the Zimbabwean government, who had arranged the removal. This move marked the beginning of a protracted period where the community indicated their displeasure by challenging the Department of National Parks and carrying out of poaching forays into the Park, claiming can that it was their traditional right to hunt in that area. Mr Stockil noted that it was unfortunate that policies were often made from the “Ivory Towers” of Government, with very little consideration of the realities facing local communities.

He noted that the 3 principles for successful interaction with the communities were:

(a) patience
(b) determination and
(c) a willingness to sit down and communicate meaningfully with communities.
Referring to the importance of economic incentives, Mr Stockil drew a parallel between cattle and wildlife by saying that cattle have not become extinct because people were able to place an appropriate value on them and therefore looked after them. This can also happen to wildlife if the state enabled land-holders to place realistic values on wildlife and other natural resources. He noted that the devolution of authority, legal hunting and the appropriate distribution of financial benefits received were starting to have the desired impact on wildlife management in the area. However, still lamented the lack of participation by local communities in the management of the adjacent park area which was creating a great deal of tension.

In the commenting on the key success factors for CBNRM, Mr Stockil observed that given an appropriate location, a significant resource base and good marketing strategies, any community would be able to enhance their livelihood is through the sustainable use of local natural resources. However, he warned that there is no blueprint that will fit every situation, advising that it is very important to do a proper analysis of the situation before embarking on an CBNRM initiative. It is also important that each situation is critically evaluated to identify what needs to be done. People should be allowed to make mistakes and learn from those mistakes. Laws and procedures in themselves do not guarantee compliance and so it is important that people understand how control measures will benefit them personally and stimulate them to collaborate in resource management processes.

With regards to community/private sector joint ventures and partnerships, be advised that developers should always look for win-win situations in order to be sustainable. In this case, it is important that the private sector wins, the community wins and last but by no means least, the environment should also win. It is also necessary that the government should also see it is also winning in its attempts to provide for the needs of the nation.

As an illustration of the complexity of natural resources management and utilisation, Mr Stockil provided an example in which he was involved, being the Save Valley Conservancy. This Conservancy which had been formed in the South East Lowveld by concerned commercial ranchers, who had agreed to consolidate the individual properties into one large Wildlife area. This process allowed wildlife to exist in a more natural extended ecosystem thereby enabling them to increased more rapidly. It also provided a more realistic wilderness scenario to tourists. Such collaboration was seen to be an important progression in the field of Wildlife Management in Southern Africa. He noted that the three most important pre-requisites for success in such projects were:

(a) Ecological sustainability in order to maintain a productive base
(b) Economical sustainability where marketing is very critical and
(c) Socio-economic sustainability ensuring acceptance of project

The most popular utilisation options in this conservancy project were rated as:

(a) consumptive trophy hunting
(b) regulated meat hunting (cropping)
(c) live game sales and
(d) photographic safaris

In conclusion, Mr Stockil emphasised to the government officers present that they should assist in the removal of bureaucracy between good ideas and reality and the importance of creating win-win situations. He summarised the critical success factors, based on his experience, to be:

- the need must be felt in real terms by both parties
- the problem must be recognised, acknowledged and understood by all parties
- persistent and unrelenting dialogue
- proper contracting (ethical, fair and just).

Mr Stockil’s closing joke to the participants was also quite significant: “Do not devolve expenditure, devolve authority”.
2.4 “OVERVIEW OF CBNRM IN THE REGION” – YEMI KATERERE

Dr Katerere’s keynote address was based on three main issues for consideration for CBNRM. The first issue related to the models of CBNRM, the second related to power relations in policy formulation in NRM and the third on the conceptual framework for CBNRM. The detailed charts on the keynote address are contained in Appendix IV to this report.

On the first issue of models for CBNRM, Dr Katerere noted that, consciously or subconsciously, all development agencies have their own understanding and perception of CBNRM. Inevitably, some of the models create conditions for success and others create conditions for failure. On the one end of the scale are “Imposed” models of CBNRM characterised by fierce competition among stakeholders, lack of common vision, no involvement by communities in policy processes, individualism, no sharing of information, no benefits sharing, conflict between government and local communities, no innovation and a host of other negative factors (see Diagram 1, Appendix IV). For all practical purposes, these kinds of CBNRM models are impositions of NGOs, government or donors on local communities.

At the ideal end, the opposite extreme, are what could be called “Organic” models of CBNRM where community ownership is maximised. These models are characterised by more collaboration and less competition, a common vision, communities inputting into policy processes, knowledge generation, sharing of experience, benefits generation and sharing, rural transformation and other positive benefits. Along the continuum though, there are various shades of “Assisted” CBNRM models. Dr Katerere challenged the participants to reflect very carefully on what kind of CBNRM they are engaged in their own situations in their home countries.

The second issue of Dr Katerere’s keynote address was the issue of power relations in policy formulation in NRM. There are two very important variables when considering this issue namely ‘Power’ (where one stakeholder can have High Power or Low Power) and ‘Involvement’ (where one stakeholder can have High Involvement or Low Involvement) (refer to Diagram 2, Appendix IV). Usually the communities that are the focus of many CBNRM initiatives find themselves in the unfortunate situation where they have low power yet they are highly involved, and were therefore at a disadvantage. Dr Katerere challenged the participants to assist the communities to gain more power so that they can be both highly involved and have high levels of power, in order to meaningfully participate in CBNRM.

Lastly, Dr Katerere presented a conceptual framework for CBNRM for the consideration of participants (see Diagram 3, Appendix IV). The presentation illustrated the complexity of CBNRM and the interplay between the factors that influence this development approach. The message again was that agents of development in CBNRM should be aware of this complexity and, depending on how they handle this complexity, there are both negative and positive outcomes that could emerge from these processes.

Dr Katerere noted, however, that the framework gives some hope as there are some clear guiding principles which, when adhered to, and with utilisation of identified tools, can enhance the success of CBNRM.
2.5 “DEVOLUTION AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT: OPERATIONALISING CAMPFIRE” — STEPHEN KASERE

The CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe is regarded in some quarters as one of the flagships for CBNRM in the region. Despite its noted successes, there is still a lot to be done to enhance the successes of the programme and make it sustainable. One such issue still to be addressed is the issue of devolution of authority.

In his presentation, Mr Kasere, noted that “effective devolution of authority” was the key to the success of CAMPFIRE. He, however, observed that devolution cannot be looked at in isolation since the issue of policy formulation impacts greatly on the level of devolution which may be appropriate in specific situations. Kasere noted that the policy definition of “natural resources” should also include natural resources other than wildlife. The issue of incentives and benefits was also seemed to be an important issue in promoting the sustainable management and utilisation of natural resources within marginal rule communities. Mr Kasere appealed to participants to explore ways of making CBNRM more attractive, sustainable and effective as a development alternative. Mr Kasere’s detailed and wide-ranging paper is also contained in Appendix IV for further reference.

2.6 “ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES” — IVAN BOND

Dr Bond’s input was designed to highlight the significance of economic considerations in ensuring the success of CBNRM. He argued that the rationale for CBNRM systems had three elements:

- The declining capacity of central government to manage natural resources;
- The breakdown of traditional management systems due to colonial and post colonial natural resource legislation based on enforcement, expanding human populations and market economies; and
- A global appreciation that the devolution of natural resources management (unit of benefit = unit management = unit responsibility) is necessary and that it is an appropriate approach for sustainable natural resources management.

He queried the models upon which CBNRM are being based, indicating that changes would only come about if the net benefit of new approaches exceeded the benefits from existing or old approaches. To support this he argued that common property theory predicts that institutional change requires strong and well defined property rights for producers, while institutional economics requires strong economic incentives, especially within common property regimes (See Diagram 4). He clearly demonstrated, through analysis of existing CBNRM initiatives that the two aspects of ‘control of natural resources’ and ‘economic incentives’ are intricately linked and that both are critical to the success of CBNRM. However, policies regarding both these issues in many southern African countries is not very clear and straightforward. (see paper in Appendix IV to this report).
Dr Bond also made the important point that although wildlife has generated substantial revenues for communities participating in CBNRM initiatives, there are limitations to the extent that this can continue to be so. There is an urgent need to diversify and consider other alternative natural resources as sources of revenue. This is even more critical when we consider the fact that many communities in the Region do not have significant wildlife resources although they do have other forms of natural resources. Dr Bond’s challenge to participants was to create policies and incentives structures which would allow communities to have significant levels of control over their natural resources including the appropriate rights of access and utilisation.

2.7 “THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN CBNRM: CREATING ECONOMIC GROWTH IN RURAL AREAS” — I Gwashure

In his presentation Dr Gwashure (CEO of Zimbabwe Sun's Safari Lodges of Africa Company) attempted to provide the participants with an overview of the mechanisms involved in partnerships between communities and the private sector. Safari Lodges of Africa is the company that owns and manages the two lodges (Chilo and Mahenya) in the Mahenye area in a partnership process with the local community of Mahenye.

Dr Gwashure introduced his talk by painting a gloomy picture of a global decline in natural resources whilst there is a increasing demand for resources. Despite the gloom, he noted that there was hope for reversing the situation if all important stakeholders cooperage. He specifically focused on the contribution that the private sector could make towards conservation through investment development activities that contribute to conservation and sustainability, through the engine of economic growth.

He, however, noted that in order for everyone to play their part effectively, there was need to remove the many obstacles and constraints that investors and entrepreneurs face in attempting to generate economic activity. He particularly highlighted the issues of ‘government bureaucracy’, a lack of commitment, a culture of mistrust, together with political and economic paternalism as key negative elements preventing growth from happening.

Dr Gwashure also noted that successful co-operation in joint ventures between communities and the private sector depended mainly on: a concept of mutual benefit; cost effectiveness; sustainability; and mutual trust.

2.8 SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

The presentations as a whole, together with the actions of the participants with the Mahenye community representatives highlighted the importance of economic processes in moving the CBNRM agenda from an imposed model to one of an organic model. In this regard, the key aspects of collaboration rather than competition, together with the issue of benefit generation and the equitable sharing of these benefits, emerged as major factors. It was seen that meaningful partnerships had to be developed between the stakeholders, especially between communities and the private sector. The group noted that this could not happen if the government did not likewise collaborate in creating an enabling environment.

The participants were then requested to break up into working groups and based upon the information presented, to develop a model framework of an enabling policy environment that would facilitate CBNRM being accepted as a complimentary development process in the SADC member states.
3.0 CREATING AN ENABLENGL ENVIRONMENT TO FACILITATE CBNRM: ISSUES

GROUP WORK PROCESSES

The participants, working in groups addressed a number of issues identified as being fundamental to the creation of an enabling environment for CBNRM to emerge as a complimentary process of development. Specifically, the groups were asked to explore the following question:

“What important issues do we need to address in the region in order to create an enabling environment that will facilitate CBNRM being accepted as a key element in sustainable economic development?”

SUMMARISED RESPONSES STRUCTURED IN CATEGORIES OF ISSUES

The various working groups, in reporting back to the plenary session, concluded that the following aspects were important in creating an enabling environment for CBNRM, and for communities to use natural resources as a means of entering the mainstream economic processes in their countries:

1. Capacity Building
   • strengthen the capacity of communities
   • human resources development need emphasis
   • capacity building skill development
   • capacity building skills to strengthen CBNRM
   • provide appropriate skills to manage natural resources
   • educate communities on sustainable use of natural resources
   • improved capacity and skills at community level to manage resources

2. Institutional/Legal Framework
   • need to define the institution “community”
   • inappropriate institutional arrangements
   • formulate appropriate legislation
   • enabling legislation
   • develop legal frameworks which allow producers to manage resources and benefits
   • effective legislation to support economic growth
   • decision-making process and who does what?
   • more decision making authority to be delegated to district level
   • reduction of bureaucracy
   • need for good policy on use of natural resources
   • legislation needs to be changed
   • responsibilities between stakeholders

3. Partnerships (Joint Ventures)
   • partnership between communities and private sector
   • partnerships between private sector and communities

4. Access to and Prioritisation of Financial Resources
   • commitment of government/communities to make it work (ownership)
   • capacity of communities to raise funds
   • additional revenue for councils' social and administrative functions

5. Equity
   • equitable sharing of resources
   • transparency in dealing with local communities
   • ways of equitably distributing benefits from natural resources
   • sharing of economic benefits should be clear and fair
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6. **Incentives**
   - the incentive structures that distort economic processes of CBNRM to be redressed
   - reduce levels of taxation on revenue accruing to communities
   - inadequate incentive structure
   - maximise economic incentives for resource management by producers
   - economic incentives to promote CBNRM
   - government to provide infrastructure for private incentives

7. **Needs Analysis**
   - needs of a specific community must be pre-determined
   - strategic planning e.g. medium and long term is very important
   - there must be a natural resource to stimulate growth

8. **Information**
   - awareness campaign among all stakeholders
   - available information on markets
   - exchange visits among communities
   - decision makers need access to better information on CBNRM
   - research
   - monitoring and evaluation
   - networking

9. **Research**
   - explore ways of equitably distributing benefits from natural resources to communities
   - joint efforts on research in the SADC countries on CBNRM issues
   - innovative ways of using the resources
   - proper valuation of resources
   - relevant research and data generation
   - explore ways to ensure councils pass revenue to communities
   - innovative and pro-active solutions to access issues
   - value of the natural resource(s) to the local communities

10. **Tenure**
    - provide a conducive tenurial regime
    - tenure be defined
    - innovative and proactive solutions to access issues
    - fundamental aspects relating to access, tenure, control needs to be addressed honestly and openly
PRINCIPLES, GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having identified the important issues necessary to create an enabling environment for CBNRM to be seen as a key element in sustainable economic development in Southern Africa, the group then re-examined their findings and produced a set of guidelines and recommendations to be considered by the SADC governance process as well as by individual member states.

1 Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward? Proposals for Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Principles and Guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Inadequate availability of management skills at local level
- Lack of active involvement by local people
- Lack of skilled personnel at local level
- Lack of clearly defined responsibilities of local institutions
- High level of illiteracy
- Lack of material resources
- Dependant syndrome

- Management skills at local level are critical for CBNRM success
- Commitment leads to sense of local “ownership”
- Decision-making enhanced by skills at local level
- Clearly defined responsibilities facilitate proper planning and decision making = reducing confusion
- Quality of life is directly related to education standards
- Access to resources is empowerment
- Dependency syndrome stifles local initiatives

- NGOs, Government and Private Sector need to work with communities in developing skills and expertise through:
  - training courses
  - apprenticeships
  - monitoring schemes
  - scholarships
  - Involve communities more significantly in decision-making processes
  - Ensure roles and responsibilities are outlined.

In carrying out this exercise the groups provided a description of the current situation relating to each particular issue and then identified pertinent principles that influence the area of concern as well as developing guidelines to address the particular issue. Each group also identified which important steps needed to be taken in moving the process forward and formulated these into a set of recommendations.

These principles, guidelines and recommendations are presented here in tabular form for ease of reference.

Proceedings of the Exchange Visit Workshop for Directors
## 2 Institutional Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward?</th>
<th>Proposals for Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Principles and Guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fragmented and contradictory sectoral policies</td>
<td>• Environmental protection needs to be balanced with development Timely decision-making and implementation enhances development</td>
<td>• Harmonise relevant legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fragmented and uncoordinated acts</td>
<td>• Local governance involvement in CBNRM is important for success</td>
<td>• Accelerate legislated decentralisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centralised authority for decision making</td>
<td>• Clearly defined roles enhance co-ordination of CBNRM initiatives Clear definition limits enhance proper planning and implementation Establish and integrate sectoral policies</td>
<td>• Decentralise decision making to conservation committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local authorities have responsibility but not the authority</td>
<td>• Too many role players in the system Community is an undefined entity Clear decision making and implementation aids co-ordination</td>
<td>• Delegate authority to local levels of governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many role players in the system Community is an undefined entity Clear decision making and implementation aids co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Streamline procedures and guidelines for faster and informed decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear definition of criteria for membership of specified “Communities”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Principles and Guidelines:</td>
<td>Proposals for Recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - In many CBNRM programmes production communities are receiving benefits but not necessarily operating as partners | - Risk, responsibility and benefits shared between stakeholders  
- Recognise and manage power differences  
- All partners in Joint Ventures should have access to critical decision making information relating to the operation of their Joint Venture  
- Clear national policies and incentives for the private sector to develop partnerships with affected communities and stakeholders | - Establish partnerships that allow for true shareholding by communities  
- Ensure transparency in management processes  
- Accommodate community equity i.e. land and natural resources in enterprise shareholding  
- Provide mentorship opportunities for community members to become involved in management processes |
### 4 Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principles and Guidelines:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposals for Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-equitable distribution of benefits and control of natural resources</td>
<td>• Equitable distribution of and control of resources between stakeholders</td>
<td>• Clear national policies and guidelines on the control and management of natural resources (including land) and their benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equity between private sector and communities</td>
<td>• Inclusiveness to participate in opportunities and policy processes</td>
<td>• This can only be achieved through extensive national and regional consultation and consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equity between protected areas and adjacent communities</td>
<td>• Legal framework for national fiscus revenue sharing</td>
<td>• Establishment of legal instruments to facilitate equitable sharing of revenue and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equity between renewable and non-renewable natural resources</td>
<td>• Greater equity in access to land and natural resources is required for sustainable natural resource use.</td>
<td>• National policies which address inequalities must be developed and implemented in a transparent and accountable manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inequitable share of national revenue at local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inequitable control of land and natural resource use is relating to unsustainable natural resource use in many areas/regions and countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward? Proposals for Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principles and Guidelines:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many SADC CBNRM Programmes have been able to transfer some economic incentives to communities</td>
<td>- Benefits from the sustainable use of natural resources should not replace economic development by central government</td>
<td>- CBNRM programmes need to be extended to all natural resources – timber, water (land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many CBNRM Programmes wildlife specific</td>
<td>- Communities must be allowed to maximise benefits from all natural resources under their management</td>
<td>- National governments need to formulate appropriate macro-economic policies which promote economic development and reduce pressure on use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many CBNRM programmes constrained by resource scarcity</td>
<td>- Control over natural resources should be devolved to the lowest level possible</td>
<td>- Government should facilitate communities obtaining the maximum (optimum) value possible from the use (non-user) of natural resources through devolving rights, tenure and control over natural resources to the lowest levels of institutions possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many CBRM programmes are constrained by under-valuation of resources</td>
<td>- People should easily be able to see the link between the use of their resources and the benefits they receive</td>
<td>- Market value of natural resources needs to be publicised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the situation now?</td>
<td>Important conditions for success?</td>
<td>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward? Proposals for Recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Principles and Guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inadequate land-use planning</td>
<td>Should be:</td>
<td>* CBNRM Projects should be more demand driven – need adequate data on hand to guide donors in the placement of their funds, and to ensure that local needs addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Over-emphasis on wild animals – not cross sectoral</td>
<td>- Inclusive and involve all relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alternatives, options, opportunities not adequately explored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical relationship between people and natural resources’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- traditional moved to commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- project driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top down/facilitator driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communities unclear on fundamental intentions of CBNRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- lack of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- lack of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drive to fragment user areas into smaller, non-viable areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- jealousy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- inequities of endowment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- inequities of endowment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- creating tensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- causing divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- fostering exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of needs has not really focused on people’s needs – ecologically driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Donor response focused in areas with wildlife or rich natural resources – areas of real need ignored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Important Conditions for Success</th>
<th>Principles and Guidelines</th>
<th>Way Forward: Principles, Guidelines and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor targeting of research data</td>
<td>Should be:</td>
<td>Information/data needs to be consolidated and made more accessible to national planning processes, and especially key decision makers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Director's critical in policy formulation</td>
<td>- accurate</td>
<td>- Greater awareness about the potential of CBM to contribute to economic development needs to be created among a cross-section of key policy makers and media through systematic and targeted campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information overload</td>
<td>- relevant</td>
<td>- Better use of new research technology needs to be made, including developing the capacity of companies, NGOs and key decision makers where they may currently access information and share experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision makers lack time to read research</td>
<td>- format should promote accessibility (legal)</td>
<td>- Identify appropriate accounting features and processes that will balance the promotion of information-integrated decision making, and pay for intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor use of research findings as advocacy tool</td>
<td>- reader friendly</td>
<td>- Ensure information developed is appropriate to needs of different stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination efforts receive little or no response</td>
<td>- literature</td>
<td>- Ensure information developed is appropriate to needs of different stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information not up to date</td>
<td>- concise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak production skills in respect to research</td>
<td>- targeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor understanding</td>
<td>- affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low utilization</td>
<td>- timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Way Forward: Principles, Guidelines and Recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward? Proposals for Recommendations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Applied research generally deficient in region (sociological and ecological)</td>
<td>- Where possible adaptive / applied approaches used</td>
<td>- Research Institutes need to be engaged more in CBNRM processes (as partners) to carry out research and generate data that will enhance the understanding of CBNRM processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research gap</td>
<td>- Needs to be demand driven BUT - top down always bad!</td>
<td>- Should diversify research beyond wildlife and provide insights into new opportunities and markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- analysing current</td>
<td>- Should be replicable</td>
<td>- Need to exploit the potential of research to inform more appropriate policy development which includes CBNRM elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no futuristic/ predictive information</td>
<td>- Should be based on best available knowledge/ information</td>
<td>- Appropriate research needs to be carried out that provides adequate baseline information/data for monitoring and evaluation, planning, policy development, management techniques and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research inaccessible</td>
<td>- Information</td>
<td>- Need more research/data understanding of cross-boundary CBNRM processes (community/community, within countries; and between countries) and development of appropriate approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- physically</td>
<td>- Should always be relevant and applicable</td>
<td>- Communities to be actively involved in the management of resources resulting in sustainable utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intellectually</td>
<td>- Data produced needs to be made accessible</td>
<td>- Protection for intellectual property rights on IKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supply driven - not demand driven</td>
<td>- Recognise IKS and regional skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the situation now?</th>
<th>Important conditions for success?</th>
<th>Way forward? What important steps do we need to take in order to move the process forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principles and Guidelines:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposals for Recommendations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Differing de jure and de facto land authorities</td>
<td>• Synthesise responsibilities for land allocation between councils and chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insecure and no ownership, no reason to invest</td>
<td>• Develop relevant legal framework e.g. title deeds, lead agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No commitment to management and conservation due to non-ownership of land</td>
<td>• Develop legal instruments that give ownership to resources limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict between the state and the communities “no control”</td>
<td>• Create appropriate organisation/bodies/institutions to facilitate the joint management of natural resources where conflict arises relating to ownership of tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

Through the process of their debate the participants highlighted the fact that the findings needed to be made known to a wider circle of decision makers throughout the region. They also identified the need for a set of concrete actions to be developed to ensure that the exchange visit did not result in being merely another ‘talk shop’ with no resulting impact at the end of the day.

It was agreed that the following steps would be carried out to ensure that results were obtained:

1. Report produced and disseminated to participants.
2. Information dissemination and consultations with other relevant parties (in-country) by participants. This could be through seminars, workshops etc.

3. A further exchange visit to be arranged based upon a ‘non-wildlife’ case study, and preferably a good example of a “negative experience” that would highlight what could go wrong.

4. Explore issues further/deeper to get to grips with the diversity and complexity of issues, and especially to use additional or alternative approaches such as “scenario-planning”.

5. Next exchange should:
   - include other countries in SADC that were not represented at the workshop
   - include other government Directorates if possible.
   - the group of Directors involved in the Maheny workshop should be the focal group to drive the process forward.

---

The Way Forward: Principles, Guidelines and Recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I really liked about this workshop was...</th>
<th>What we did well and should continue is...</th>
<th>What I did not like so much about this workshop...</th>
<th>What we could do better is the following...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* exposure/</td>
<td>* the process we achieved our objectives and had fun</td>
<td>* discussions with the representatives from the community could have been longer</td>
<td>* the focus was still on wildlife, need to diversify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* networking with colleagues</td>
<td>* practical exposure/ experience to CBNRM application</td>
<td>* advance information about workshop and better logistical arrangements</td>
<td>* application of CBNRM to other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* excellent resource persons and facilitation</td>
<td>* interaction with colleagues</td>
<td>* strategic planning for co-ordination</td>
<td>* feedback mechanism not clearly defined/ explained “so what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* the facilitation</td>
<td>* the first exchange of CBNRM information between different sectors in the region... should be replicated</td>
<td>* delay at airport and inadequate communication about house-keeping</td>
<td>* lack of representation from other SADC countries... ensure wider participation in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* objectivity</td>
<td>* the presentations and discussions</td>
<td>* travel logistic could be improved i.e. delays at Harare airport =&gt; late for community</td>
<td>* more regional representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* good presentations</td>
<td>* openness of discussions</td>
<td>* send information on logistics in time</td>
<td>* we need more case studies next time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* village participation</td>
<td>* extremely good and creative facilitation</td>
<td>* the departure from Harare to the Mahenye</td>
<td>* the workshop was too short to fully achieve its objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* interface with the Mahenye community</td>
<td>* wide country and senior representation</td>
<td>* lack of information before arrival and at arrival</td>
<td>* again, we talked on behalf of other people...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* learning</td>
<td>* discussion of relevant issues and interactions</td>
<td>* carry on</td>
<td>* could utilise the resource management by farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* practical experience from the Mahenye Community</td>
<td>* keep up the organisational facilitating skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDICES:
#### Appendix 1: Exchange Visit Programme

**EXCHANGE VISIT SEMINAR FOR DIRECTORS**
SCHISMALILODGE, MAHENYE - 1 TO 4 JUNE 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th><strong>Programme</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Delegates check out of Cresta Lodge and travel to Mahenye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Introductions - Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Welcome - William Makondele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Seminar Programme and Objectives - Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Seminar Expectations - Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Tour of Community Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>&quot;CHRM and Community Development Experiences from Mahenye&quot; - Community Representative (Mr. Mawango)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>&quot;Creating an enabling environment for CHRM: The role of the local government&quot; - CHRM joint venture project between the private sector and Community/Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Game Drive to Gwetaehun National Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2nd June |
| 08:00 | Morning welcome |
| 08:30 | Key Note Presentation: &quot;Overview of CHRM in the region&quot; - B. Kachenje |
| 09:30 | Presentation: &quot;Devolution and Community Implementing Organizations: Challenges&quot; - S. Kaunda |
| 10:30 | Presentation: &quot;Economic and Policy Element in CHRM - Integration&quot; |
| 11:00 | TEA |
| 11:15 | Presentation: &quot;The role of the private sector in CHRM: Creating economic growth across&quot; - Dr. Gwathumw |
| 12:00 | Facilitated Discussion |
| 13:00 | LUNCH |
| 15:00 | Discussion with Mahenye Campsite Co-ordinators |
| 17:00 | Game Drive to Gwetaehun National Park |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday 3 June</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Morning welcome and consolidation of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:15</td>
<td>Facilitated Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Working Group Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Report Back Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Development of recommendations and policy guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Consolidation of thinking and closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Farewell Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday 4 June</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>Early Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>Depart for Harare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II: List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Management Department</td>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>National Parks and Wildlife Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Regional Office</td>
<td>IUCN Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPO</td>
<td>NAPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC NIPF</td>
<td>SADC NIPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Department</td>
<td>Forestry Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs and Health</td>
<td>Environmental Affairs and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipinge Rural District Council</td>
<td>Chipinge Rural District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Local Housing</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>National Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
- NAPO: Natural Resources Protection Office
- SADC NIPF: Southern African Development Community National Parks Fund
- GTZ: German Technical Cooperation
- MET: Ministry of Environment and Tourism
- Ministry of Local Housing: Ministry of Local Government and Housing
- National Department of Agriculture: Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>My Organisation is</th>
<th>My Country is</th>
<th>My Expectations from this Exchange Visit are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashibedikasa</td>
<td>National Environmental Secretariat</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Deeper understanding of issues around CBNRM and how it can contribute to poverty alleviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsho Francisco Mtembe</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Application of CBNRM principles to management of other natural resources (i.e., other than wildlife).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Bond</td>
<td>WWF-SARPO (Southern African Regional Programme Office)</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>To have better understanding on CAMPFIRE Programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikwetepe</td>
<td>Department of Resource Management</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Improved understanding of how central governments in SADC perceive CBNRM both now and in the future. Dynamic exchange of ideas by all participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandilewe Mbizo</td>
<td>IUCN - ROSA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Exchange of information and experience in the management of natural resources. Participants will feel that the Exchange Visit was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: Participants' Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Secretary</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1509, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Lands, Housing, Physical Planning and Surveys</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1509, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1523, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1512, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Tourism</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1509, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>P.O.Box 1509, Juba, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +211 11123456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Department</td>
<td>7th Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPAIGN</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipinge Rural District Council</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF-SARPO</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN-RC (A)</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN-RC (A)</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC NBAMF</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwean Tourism Group</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MozCom</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Harare Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 263-714 224242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 263-714 224246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WELCOME ADDRESS

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE DIRECTOR, MR W.M. MAKOMBE TO SADC DIRECTORS: EXCHANGE VISIT SEMINAR, MAHENYE, JUNE 1-4 1999

The Directors of Departments from SADC Members States, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure and honour to welcome you to Zimbabwe and particularly to Mahenye. For Zimbabwe, this is one of the pioneer areas with regards to the implementation of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Initiatives.

The use of Exchange Visits to exemplify a particular process or model is not new, but it has proven to be an extremely effective tool in facilitating rigorous debate within a setting that enables examples to be drawn from it. It is our job here over the next few days, therefore to use this tool to challenge our understanding of the CBNRM and the role it has in facilitating economic growth in marginal rural areas in particular and at a national level in general.

Sub-Saharan Africa has for a long time been characterised by a high concentration of global poverty in terms of absolute numbers. Poverty according to the 1990 World Development Report is described as the inability to attain a minimum standard of living measured in terms of basic consumption needs or income required to satisfy them. One of the major reasons for this, is a result of the high population distribution in ecologically fragile lands. This population consists mostly of rural communities whose day to day activities revolve around access to natural resources, and the critical dependence of natural resources.

We sit here today amongst the Mahenye Community, adjacent to the Gonarezhou National Park, in this luxurious lodge, as living proof that our efforts have eventually started to bear fruit. We are at last seeing previous inequities being addressed and new opportunities being created. We are witnessing the transformation of natural resources management in our region. This partnership here in the south east lowveld of Zimbabwe, between the Mahenye Community, the Zimbabwe Sun Group and my Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management is merely one example of the many similar CBNRM initiatives that are emerging throughout our region.

CBNRM initiatives in Southern Africa including Zimbabwe were a result of the stark realisation that communities are better placed to manage and utilise their own resources, while deriving economic benefits.

The CBNRM/CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe is now operational in 30 of the 57 Rural District Councils with 33 of these having Appropriate Authority to manage their wildlife resources. Some of the basic CAMPFIRE principles are based on economics and these include:

- Decentralised management of natural resources through economic empowerment of local communities,
- Creation of economic incentives to make wildlife a competitive form of land use,
- Economic benefits derived from the management of the natural resources utilised by the producer communities leading to the sustainable utilisation of the resource.

Proceedings of the Exchange Visit Workshop for Directors
How then has CBNRM/CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe contributed to economic development?

The local communities are experiencing tangible economic benefits of natural resource management from the dividends from CAMPFIRE revenue. Part of the revenue which is derived from both consumptive and non-consumptive tourism is going into community projects such as schools, clinics, grinding mills, dam rehabilitation projects, boreholes etc including household dividends. Thus, the proceeds are also contributing to poverty alleviation and food security by giving the communities the ability to procure those commodities which they cannot produce.

Communities in Zimbabwe are realising significant economic benefits from the management of their wildlife resources and these economic benefits are substantially high enough to offset the costs of living with wildlife. The largest amounts of money are derived from sport hunting (consumptive) while non-consumptive which includes photographic safaris, ecotourism etc is increasing in its significance. The challenge now is for continuity of the economic benefits which can be achieved by through diversification of the natural resource base instead of focusing on wildlife only which is highly mobile and might result in lower revenue for certain years thus resulting in costs of living with wildlife being higher-un sustainable. Through diversification, the CAMPFIRE programme has widened its revenue base to now include forestry products, scenic sites, cultural tourism etc which has been characterised by the development of micro-enterprises.

In Zimbabwe besides the communities under CAMPFIRE being provided with the opportunity to manage and benefit from their wildlife resources, some are now enhancing their revenue generation through Joint Ventures. Maheny is a clear example of an operational community/private sector initiative. It has been demonstrated repeatedly in our region that partnership between communities and the private sector include inestimable synergy - bringing together the 'big business' expertise of the private sector and the resources and human potential of the communities. Government's role has been seen to be that of the honest broker – protecting the interests of the communities and ensuring that they are at the end of the day true shareholders, and not merely the recipients of moderate hand-outs.

The recent ivory auction to Japan is also going to realise a substantial amount of revenue for those Rural District Councils whose ivory was sold through this auction. The various amounts realised will be distributed to the recipient Rural District Councils. This will not only strengthen our elephant management programmes but will provide the much needed revenue to rural development projects. The Department is also providing technical advice with regards to the disposal of wildlife products in order to maximise the benefits to the communities. There is no reason why the elephant in the Parks and Wildlife Estate should cost more and be undervalued when it enters the Communal areas. We in Zimbabwe are serious with empowering the rural communities as they deserve the maximum benefit from the wildlife resource they manage and protect.

It is important to acknowledge with pride that we have progressed as a region to strengthen and enhance our natural resources management especially at the community level. There have been some legislative changes in Namibia which have enabled communities to establish conservancies which they manage for their benefit. In Malawi great strides have been made in introducing technical policies encouraging co-management in some of their key National Parks, whilst in Zambia there has been a recent revision of the Wildlife Act incorporating wildlife management at the Community level. The examples are endless but we continue to monitor and review our strategies and legal instruments so that the resource base of this region will continue to benefit and sustain our citizens.

We would like to thank the SADC Wildlife Sector for encouraging us to be forward thinking and challenging us to create our own destiny, rather than always being responsive to the vagaries of global dictates. The leadership provided by this Unit with regard to the management of our environment will be critical in the coming years. Many of our people have traditionally relied upon the use of natural resources in providing for the livelihoods. However, we are increasingly being influenced by modern progress and global trends, though we cannot be merely reliant upon modern processes – once again, as ancient wisdom is what to explain – the ox drawn plough may break the ground of our maize, but grass builds the might of the ox.

Ladies and Gentlemen it is important that Southern Africa becomes a global economic player, but, we also need to understand the implications of this progress and accept responsibility for the impacts of this advancement. This Exchange Visit
should facilitate a better understanding of which choices to make. As well as how we can improve and enhance the livelihoods of about 150 million people in this region. The results of this meeting might have far reaching consequences, guiding and directing policy formulation well into the new millennium. May your deliberations therefore be tempered by the wisdom of the ages, whilst also being inspired by the infinity of the universe.

At this juncture I would like to welcome and acknowledge the presence of Dr Katerere, the Regional Director of IUCN ROSA and Lead Representative of the NRMP Consortium managing the SADC NRM Project, Dr C Machena, Director of the Africa Resources Trust organisers of the event, Dr Gwashure CEO of Safari Sun – the owner-operators of the Chilo and Mahenye Lodge Complex, Dr Oswald, Project Advisor of GTZ. Mr Kasere the Director of the CAMPFIRE Association, and Dr Ivan Bond from the World Wide Fund for Nature.

In conclusion I would like again to remind ourselves that as a group and as leaders in resource management, conservation and utilisation this meeting can make significant changes to our region with possible global implications. Please take time to relax and enjoy our hospitality in Africa’s Paradise, Zimbabwe.

With these remarks, it is now my singular honour and privilege to declare this meeting officially open.

I thank you.
CHIRINGE RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL - MAHENYE WARD PROJECT

A. General Introduction to Chipinge District

Chipinge District is situated in the Southern part of Manicaland Province. To the East it is bounded by Mozambique, to the West bounded by Save River (Buhera, Bikita, Chiredzi Districts) to the North bounded by Chimanimani District.

The District has all the five ecological regions and each region covers the following hectares of land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>158375</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>240920</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>516295</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1992 population census revealed that the District had 336,616 people. The District had the highest population when compared with the rest of the District in Manicaland Province.

Chipinge Rural District Council is the local authority in Chipinge District. The Council came into being as a result of coming together of former Chipinge Rural Council and former Gazaland District Council in 1993.

The Council area comprises of large scale commercial farms, small scale commercial farms, resettlement lands and communal lands. There are also state lands like Chipangayi Safari area, Mt. Selinda forest.

The Council area is divided into Wards as follows:

- 17 Communal land wards
- 3 Resettlement land wards
- 1 Small scale farms ward
- 9 Large scale commercial farms wards
- 5 Urban land wards
- 35 Wards total

In Chipinge District, the state of Natural Resources Conservation varies greatly between the large scale commercial farming areas and the communal land farming areas. Natural Resources Conservation in the large scale commercial farming areas is
generally good due to low domestic animal and human population numbers. Most large scale commercial farms apply expert knowledge in the conservation of natural resources. On the other hand, the commercial lands have low rainfall, high domestic animals and human population numbers, little or no vegetation cover and lack of conservation awareness amongst the peasant farmers giving rise to an alarming poor state of conservation of natural resources. Over utilisation of natural resources has forced the communal people to resort to stream bank and steep slopes cultivation resulting in the siltation of rivers.

B. Mahenye Ward General Information

Location

Mahenye ward is one of the 17 communal land wards. The ward lies on the North East boarder of Gonarezhou National Park, its Eastern boundary being the Mozambique border.

Mahenye ward is a narrow wedge of land about 210 km (20 816 hectares) between the Save River on the West and the Rupembe River which forms the border with Mozambique, on the East. The ward lies in the Southern – most corner of Ndowevo communal land and is in Natural Region V.

Land Use and Population

Land in Mahenye Ward is allocated as follows:

- Village sites: 505 hectares
- Arable land: 2 500 hectares
- Reserved wildlife land: 9 438 hectares
- Mixed - cattle/wildlife/crops: 8 373 hectares
- TOTAL: 20 816 hectares

The land use plan envisages three villages for the 787 households. Each household may get an allocation of 6 – 8 ha of land for sorghum and maize. At the present time some 2 500 ha of land has been opened up for crops. The Mahenye community passed a resolution that 9 438 ha of land would be for wildlife only, so one would be allowed to settle or graze domestic animals in the reserved land. Some 8 373 ha of land reserved for domestic animals and human expansion is still predominately bush land being used by wild animals. While the Mahenye community endeavour to do cropping and livestock production, these activities are limited by the harsh environmental conditions of the area characterised by low and erratic rainfall.

Topography Geology and Soils

Most of the terrain in Mahenye Ward is fairly rugged. The ground drops from Save – Runde junction. The soils in Mahenye Ward consist of alluviums overlying either to the North and North-West or sandstones in the extreme South and South-East. In the low laying areas the soils are blackish grey and these are formed by decomposition of basalts.

Climate and Hydrology

Temperatures in Mahenye Ward are generally quite high. During fine weather conditions there may be a daily variation of 15°C or more. In the rainy season the average daily variation is approximately 10°C with temperatures falling sharply with the onset of the rains. Mahenye Ward is part of the Save – Runde River system which drains eastwards via the Save River to the Indian Ocean. In the Mahenye Ward low areas, where alluviums are sufficiently deep (at least 30 metres), there exist possibility of getting very high yielding boreholes.
Vegetation and Wildlife

The vegetation in Mahenye Ward is similar to that found in Gonarezhou National Park and the ground is predominately covered by mopani trees. Very little land has been opened for cultivation living large areas of woodlands which form habitat for wildlife. Big mammals move between Gonarezhou National Park and Mahenye Ward periodically.

Agriculture

The Mahenye Ward carries relatively low number of livestock. There is a tendency to concentrate all livestock close to the settlement areas, primarily as a protection against stock raiding predators. The overall stocking rate for Mahenye Ward is 35 HA/LSU, assuming that local adult beasts are equivalent to 350 kg.

There is no significant cash crops in Mahenye Ward. The average yield of maize is 1-3 bags/ha, up to this point, no grain marketing board. Wild fruits are gathered when in season and a drought relief programme has been implemented in the ward by the Department of Social Welfare.

Protected Areas and Biodiversity Issues

Mahenye ward is adjacent to Gonarezhou National which is a protected area. Through the CAMPFIRE Programme, Mahenye ward is committed to own protected area for wildlife habitat. A good number of species in Gonarezhou National Park can reside in Mahenye if the habitat is kept intact. The Save Rive together with Save – Runde confluence is habitat for a good variety of fish species which are of interest to both Mahenye ward and Gonarezhou National Park. Mahenye ward is unique habitat for birds and nearly 400 species have been recorded.

Socio-Economic Characteristics and Infrastructure

The ward has relatively low population of 3646 as per 1992 census as compared with the rest of Chipinge District communal land wards. The population density being 12-19 people per km². The household number was also recorded as 787. There are 12 kraal heads (traditional leaders) under Chief Mahenye. All the 12 traditional leaders are located in three administrative villages.

One traditional leader with approximately 90 households resides in the Northern part of Mahenye ward, the rest of them reside in the Southern part.

Access to the Mahenye ward is via the Jack Quinton Bridge (lower Save Bridge) on the Chiredzi/Tanganda Halt road. Two buses service Mahenye ward daily although at times there is no bus service.

Mahenye ward has only one primary school, one clinic, on business centre and a police station. A recent development is the construction of two safari lodges by Zimbabwe Sun Limited which is a joint venture with Mahenye community. Mahenye Safari lodges located on a small river bank, all the two overlooking Gonarezhou National Park. The two lodges have a total capacity of 40 beds. There is also a District Administrator’s rest camp by the Save River rebuilt by Zimbabwe Sun Limited in lieu of the attractive Chillo Gorge (where it was formerly located) taken over by Zimbabwe Sun Limited.

Since the advent of CAMPFIRE, the Mahenye community has been earning income from consumptive wildlife utilisation, however, this source does not present an immediate opportunity for steady income as it is not always possible to find sufficient trophy elephant to fulfil the quota. The new development of non-consumptive opportunities are enhanced by the Mahenye’s proximity to Gonarezhou National Park and Mahenye Island which has riverine forest of great aesthetic and botanical interest. The Island is habitat for several bird species endemic to lowland evergreen forest. Development of the lodges has brought to Mahenye electricity and telephone which no one ever thought of in the remote part of the District. Through funds generated
from the Safari Lodge, the community has extended the power line from Chilo Gorge to Maheny Business Centre to electrify the clinic and the community run grinding mill.

Maheny ward also received a donation from GTZ for the installation of a pump and pipe line to the Maheny Wilderness area (land reserved for wildlife). The wilderness area now has a water point and it is now easy to establish two or three further water points down the slope. This project was carried out in support of the Maheny community proposal to translocate impalas and other species into the wildlife area. GTZ also provided funds for the proposed Maheny ward irrigation scheme feasibility study. More than half the households in Maheny ward are engaged in reed mats making. This is an important household economic activity. The reed mats are transported by bus to markets to the big centres of Zimbabwe.

Cultural Heritage

The CAMPFIRE Programme in Maheny was born out of conflict between National Park authorities and the Maheny community over ownership of wild animals. Historically, the Maheny people belong to the Shangaan clan of Northern Transvaal in South Africa. The Maheny Shangaan people originally settled on the lower reaches of the East and West banks of the Save River as far South and the Runde – Save confluence and across the boarder in Mozambique enforced by the Chief in order to ensure sustainable yields. Breeding seasons were respected, the areas of hunting were rotated and there was an annual fish drive.

Sometime in 1891, wild animals were proclaimed the property of the Crown and the Shangaan people were denied legal access to wildlife and they became poachers; the wildlife was no longer the property of the community and therefore regulated hunting came to an end. The traditional cultural basis of their society was lost. These Shangaan people found themselves in an area of wildlife. In 1966 the west bank of the Save River was incorporated into Gonarezhou National Park and the Shangaan people were evicted and their villages destroyed. A group of the Shangaan people crossed the Save River to the East and settled on Ngwachumunzu Island now also known as Maheny Island. A rebel community had been created which continued to hunt for survival.

The conflict between the Maheny people and the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management over wildlife slowly came to an end a few years after Independence through the efforts of a white farmer who grew up with the people before establishment of Gonarezhou National Park. The white farmer, Clive Stockil applied the same philosophy of traditional ownership of wildlife and persuaded the Government to allow the Maheny community a hunting quota and the proceeds going to the community.

While this philosophy (CAMPFIRE) was being slowly accepted by the community, the elephants continued to destroy the little crops the community tried to grow annually; this problem is still there. While the people are receiving benefits from Safari hunting and from Zimbabwe Sun lodges, they still have question marks in their minds as to the management of wildlife at grassroots level since they cannot control elephants from destroying their crops.

In an effort to further reconcile the situation, the Maheny people proposed an irrigation scheme which is an intensive agricultural unit and will be electrically fenced to drive away elephants. The irrigation scheme when fully developed is expected to generate food for the Maheny community in the first instance and the surplus food will be sold. The Maheny people set aside the wildlife area with a view of restocking the traditional value of using bow and arrow hunting and occasionally enjoying wildlife meat within the concept of sustainable utilisation.

Legislation and Environmental Policy

Wildlife management and utilisation is the responsibility of Government. This management is extended to adjacent communities who also include communal lands. Wildlife covers all forms of aquatic and terrestrial indigenous animals and plans ranging from large mammals to minor organisms. Large mammals become available in communal lands as spill over from
the protected area. The Mahenye people have committed themselves to manage all forms of wildlife on their land and draw benefits from the process. The Mahenye people have drafted by-laws for the conservation and protection of wildlife in line with the protected area, e.g. Gonarezhou National Park.

CHIPINGE RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL/ZIMBABWE SUN LIMITED JOINT VENTURE PHOTOGRAPHIC SAFARI OPERATIONS

Contribution by Council, Zimbabwe Sun and Mehenye Community

Zimbabwe Sun Contribution

Capital Development:

- Lodges at Gaiseni Island (8 lodges and a boma)
- Lodges at Chilo (14 lodges and a boma)
- Air strip
- ZESA power that has been extended to Mahenye Clinic, police post
- Telephone that has been extended to Mahenye Clinic and school
- Piped water that goes to the police post, chief’s home and cattle drinking trough.
- Assume sole risk of profit or loss during usage of the Unit.
- Employment which has resulted in a good number of people engaged by Zimbabwe Sun
- Marketing of its operations in Mahenye to attract local, regional and international interests
- Generation of revenue from photographic operations. The lease is for a ten year period subject to extension

Percentage Payment of Revenue

8% of gross trading revenue is photographic fees in respect of Mahenye Community for the first three years.
10% of gross trading revenue is photographic fees in respect of Mahenye Community for the other three years.
12% of gross trading revenue is photographic fees in respect of Mahenye Community for the remaining four years of the ten year period.

At the end of the ten year re-negotiation for photographic fees due to Mahenye Community would be based on higher percentages.

- Contribution by Council/Community
- Land with all its natural resources and its beauty
- Goodwill of the Mahenye Community
- The right of access into Gonarezhou National Park
- Assurance of peaceful enjoyment by Zimbabwe Sun Limited
- Assist ZimSun to participate in game viewing and photographic Safaris into the National Park Estate which adjoins the Unit
- Assurance that the wilderness shall be as wild as possible
**Contribution by Chipinge Rural District Council**

**MAHENYE CAMPFIRE PROJECT - 1998 CAMPFIRE REVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Safaris (Tshawezi Safaris)</td>
<td>393 792-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic fees (Zimsun)</td>
<td>543 312-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of stones (Malilangwe Trust)</td>
<td>3 151-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation to school repairs</td>
<td>7 089-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment interest</td>
<td>14 278-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount generated</strong></td>
<td>963 623-69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATION OF INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE Association levy</td>
<td>25 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE Association Annual Subscriptions 1,500-00 @ 26,500-00</td>
<td>937 123-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Council 20% administration x 937 123-69</td>
<td>187 424-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to community</td>
<td>749 698-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT SHADE OF INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitors allowances 5 x $1000 x 12 months</td>
<td>60 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
<td>10 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward rep T and S allowances</td>
<td>6 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments at meetings</td>
<td>3 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>600-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammunition</td>
<td>3 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82 600-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPITAL WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School development</td>
<td>67 089-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Office</td>
<td>60 000-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipote G/Mill doors</td>
<td>2 100-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>129 189-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Community</td>
<td>537 909-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINOR EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle tyre</td>
<td>1 080-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle tubes</td>
<td>360-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch cells</td>
<td>300-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot (1)</td>
<td>400-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea-spoons</td>
<td>100-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>300-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2 540-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to community</td>
<td>535 369-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HOUSEHOLD DIVIDENDS**

Total amount available for cash payouts: $535,369.26
Total number of households: 849
Individual cash payouts: $535,369.26 / 849
Chief Mahenye: $630 + 849 x 0.5880569

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>213,924.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>82,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL WORKS</td>
<td>129,189.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>2,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD DIVIDENDS</td>
<td>535,369.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CASH GENERATED</td>
<td>963,623.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed dividend distribution Day 16 April 1999 at Mahenye Business Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Household Share</th>
<th>Total Payouts</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Council Administration</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>56,600.00</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14,200.00</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>70,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>87,120.00</td>
<td>10,850.00</td>
<td>30,600.00</td>
<td>51,430.00</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>80,176.00</td>
<td>27,962.00</td>
<td>26,850.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>158,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>81,229.00</td>
<td>27,380.00</td>
<td>35,367.00</td>
<td>19,760.00</td>
<td>163,736.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>78,953.00</td>
<td>28,930.00</td>
<td>29,920.00</td>
<td>6,740.00</td>
<td>144,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>183.00</td>
<td>140,544.00</td>
<td>36,700.00</td>
<td>49,761.00</td>
<td>51,974.00</td>
<td>278,979.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>442.00</td>
<td>340,449.00</td>
<td>58,268.00</td>
<td>129,536.00</td>
<td>60,299.00</td>
<td>618,594.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>630.00</td>
<td>535,369.00</td>
<td>82,350.00</td>
<td>187,424.00</td>
<td>129,189.00</td>
<td>963,623.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Household Share</th>
<th>Total Payouts</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Council Administration</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>653.00</td>
<td>1,398,687.00</td>
<td>272,582.00</td>
<td>514,312.00</td>
<td>682,472.00</td>
<td>2,576,177.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mahenye Ward Contribution

COMPLETED PROJECTS

• Mahenye wildlife watering project by GTZ at a cost of $300 000.00
• Mahenye proposed irrigation scheme feasibility studies at a cost of $27 000.00. Funding was provided by GTZ.
• Mahenye clinic whose construction materials were donated by Canadian International Development Agency.
• Mahenye /ZimSun lodges construction at a cost of ± $10 000 000.00: comprising twenty-two units, thus eight at Mahenye Island and fourteen at Chilo Gorge. Meant to generate revenue from the committee in this format:
  • 8% of gross trading revenue accrues to community for four years
  • 10% of gross trading revenue accrues to community for the next three years
  • 12% of gross trading revenue accrues to community for the next three years
• Cattle drinking trough financed by community and Zimsun at about $10 000.00.
• Mahenye School
  • 2 x 2 class-room blocks
  • Two teachers houses
• Mahenye electric grinding mills
  • Lower grinding mill at about $49 000.00
  • Chipote grinding mill at $129 000.00
• Mahenye traditional home at a cost of $12 000.00 wholly financed by community
• Electricity at business centre and clinic at a cost of $207 687.99

Planned Projects

• Fire management project
• Impala translocation
• Community butchery
• Mahenye irrigation scheme
• Solar electric fence
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Overview of CBNRM in the Region: Keynote Presentation
By Dr Yemi Katerere, IUCN-ROSA Director

Diagram 1: Contested Model of CBNRM
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- Collaboration and no competition
- Common vision
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- Knowledge generation
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CBNRM Failure
Characterised by:
- Competition
- Lack of common vision
- No involvement in policy process
- Individualism
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- Conflict between government and local communities
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Diagram 2: Power Relations in Policy Formulation in Natural Resources Management
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Diagram 3: Conceptual Framework of CBNRM

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CBNRM

Interaction to generate goods and services

- Gender
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- Empowerment
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Ecological Management
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CBNRM Policy and Practice

Principles
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“DEVOLUTION & COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT: OPERATIONALISING CAMPFIRE”
BY STEPHEN KASERE, DIRECTOR, CAMPFIRE ASSOCIATION

INTRODUCTION

The theme “Devolution and Community Empowerment: Operationalising CAMPFIRE” is timely because currently in Zimbabwe the whole debate of community based natural resource management centres mainly on the success story of the CAMPFIRE programme and how devolution and resource tenure can be best improved to enhance community empowerment. The objective of this paper therefore is to analyse the devolutionary process in Zimbabwe, paying attention to the achievements and shortcomings of the CAMPFIRE programme and then assess prospects for further devolution of authority in a more realistic and applicable manner that will not undermine the cardinal objectives of the programme which are (a) conservation and (b) rural development. But first we need to define the term devolution which has caused so much confusion among practitioners.

What is Devolution?

There appears to be a lot of confusion on the use of the term devolution. There are on one hand people who view the term devolution as interchangeable with the term decentralisation. On the other hand there are those who see devolution only as a process for achieving private tenure and total independence from central government. Unfortunately, both views are not correct. Devolution should be understood as one of many forms of decentralisation just like a banana being one kind of a fruit.

Devolution is a form decentralisation, but note that not all forms of decentralisation are devolution. Decentralisation is a broader term which refers to a cluster of distinct and (or) interlinked administrative and political process of transferring power and responsibilities from the central authority to lower tiers, structures or units of government.

The most common forms of decentralisation are (a) decongestion or de-concentration (b) delegation (c) privatisation and (d) devolution.

Decentralisation

- Decongestion (Ministry Officials e.g. Provincial and District Administrators)
- Delegation (Parastatals)
- Privatisation (Government companies) (Private ownership)
- Devolution (Local Authorities: District, Ward and Village)

- Deconcentration or decongestion - This form of decentralisation refers to the transfer of administrative authority or responsibilities to lower or periphery levels within the Central Government or ministry. In our Zimbabwean context, this may refer to personnel like Provincial Administrators, District Administrators, Department of National Parks Wardens, Agritex Provincial or District Officers who are civil servants posted to rural/urban centres but working for and reporting to their line ministries.

- Delegation - This refers to the transfer of managerial responsibilities for specifically defined functions from the public sector to organisations outside the regular government ministries. These often take the form of public corporations (parastatals) which are semi-autonomous bodies which are controlled mainly through the Act of Parliament. Examples in Zimbabwe are ZESA, NRZ, ZTA, GMB and hundreds others which deliver services in their own legal right and not in the name of government.

- Privatisation – This is normally an advanced level of delegation which implies government efforts to privatise or disinvest itself from certain functions. These are normally joint venture companies where government has shares or those companies which were sold by government wholly to private sector. So those calling for devolution as a way of securing private tenure should be reminded to be careful before they cause more confusion.
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Devolution – Unlike deconcentration which transfers administrative powers only, devolution transfers political powers and authority to local people. This type of decentralisation means that some decision making authority and control over resources is assigned to regional and local units. In other words, local people are allowed to form local government units which are semi-autonomous and independent except through remote means to Central Government. Examples are RDCs, Wardcos and Videcos.

- Devolution allows for the following important ingredients for rural empowerment for communities:
- Effective community participation in democratic processes affecting their livelihood.
- Participate in crucial planning processes
- Allows ethnic groups greater cultural autonomy

**CAMPFIRE: Devolution and Community Empowerment**

CAMPFIRE, an acronym for Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources, is Zimbabwe's efforts to translate principles of community empowerment on natural resource management into practice. The programme seeks to assist poor communities living in semi-arid communal areas of Zimbabwe to use their natural resources, most especially wildlife in a sustainable manner, so as to achieve both conservation and development. To this end, CAMPFIRE is about empowerment of the rural poor. The programme seeks to establish and strengthen institutions at the lowest levels of governance (hence devolution) so that communities are sufficiently empowered to “own” and husband their natural resources in the most sustainable manner.

**Historical Background of CAMPFIRE**

The CAMPFIRE programme began as a uniquely Zimbabwean initiative, responding purely to a unique set of historical conditions. The initial concepts of the programme was conceived as early as 1982 by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPFWM) out of concern to arrest the rapid decimation of wildlife species within and outside National Parks.

The two major legislative instruments which were key to the establishment of CAMPFIRE were (a) The 1975 Parks and Wildlife Act (amended in 1982) which now forms the basis for present wildlife management policy through the granting of Appropriate Authority (AA) to landowners; and (b) the Rural District Councils Act which creates and defines various structures and powers of local government units in communal areas ranging from Rural District Councils to Wards and Villages.

The period 1982 – 1987 saw intensive consultations between the DNPWM and non-governmental organisations in an effort to refine the CAMPFIRE concept. In 1998, an agreement on the implementation of CAMPFIRE was mooted between DNPWM, Zimtrust, WWF and CASS who established a loose coalition to form the CAMPFIRE Collaborative Group. This group worked closely to encourage RDCs to apply for AA.

Two Districts, Nyaminyami and Guruve were granted AA in 1988. A steering committee comprising of 12 RDCs was formed in 1989 to explore ways of forming an Association that would co-ordinate CAMPFIRE activities and lobby effectively for the sustainable utilisation of natural resources. A year later, a draft constitution establishing the CAMPFIRE Association was agreed upon and in 1991 the Association established its secretariat. Since then, the CAMPFIRE Programme has expanded rapidly in terms of both size and focus. To date CAMPFIRE Association boasts of a membership of 36 RDCs whose activities range from sport hunting, non-consumptive ecotourism, and the exploitation of other natural resources such as forestry, minerals, aquatic resources, river sand and others.

**Implementation of CAMPFIRE**

The key institution for the implementation of the CAMPFIRE Programme at grassroots level is the RDC whose power to control occupation and the use of communal areas is well enshrined in the Communal Lands Act of 1982. It however needs
stress that while the RDC is key, their role is mainly facilitative and custodial since CAMPFIRE principles requires full participation and decision-making by producer communities.

At the national level, the CAMPFIRE Association is the head and accountable agency of CAMPFIRE activities. Its primary responsibility is to lobby for a supportive policy framework, which allows maximum benefits to accrue to rural communities through wise use of natural resources. Another key responsibility is the co-ordination of services from a number of specialist government and non-governmental agencies working with RDCs and communities to achieve the objectives of CAMPFIRE. (See table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>AGENCY/DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead CBO</td>
<td>CAMPFIRE Association</td>
<td>Programme co-ordination, policy communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management</td>
<td>Policies for wildlife management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government and National Housing</td>
<td>Policies for local governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Trust</td>
<td>Training, capacity-building, institutional building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>ACTION (Magazine (a sub-unit of Zimtrust)</td>
<td>Environmental education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZ-Department</td>
<td>Centre of Applied Social Sciences</td>
<td>Applied field, sociological research, some policy studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
<td>Biological monitoring, training in quota-setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Africa Resources Trust</td>
<td>International advocacy, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Policy co-ordination, land-use planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parastatal</td>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Woodland management, participatory approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Southern Alliance for Indigenous Resources</td>
<td>FRA, woodland management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAMPFIRE Achievements

CAMPFIRE has contributed significantly to Rural Development since its inception. A lot of financial resources were churned out which were used either for development of infrastructural projects or distributed as cash dividends to communities themselves. Popular projects among communities in CAMPFIRE include:

- Installation of boreholes with engines for clear water;
- Pre-school, school and health clinic developments;
- Fencing of arable land to protect it from crop pests;
- Small dam/pan construction to supply water for people and wildlife;
- Road development;
- Maintenance funds for electric fences;
- Payment to community members for removal of snares and construction of warehouse, shops and teachers' accommodation.

A combination of three factors namely (a) the increase in participating RDCs and communities in CAMPFIRE, (b) higher trophy quotas and (c) improved marketing, account for the impressive increase in revenue generated by CAMPFIRE over the past 9 years. Gross income accruing to RDCs from wildlife, other natural resources and non-consumptive tourism grew from Z$743 699 in 1989 to Z$13 489 612 in 1994 and to Z$22 851 982 in 1997.

A further examination of statistics reveals that over 90% of revenue generated comes from sport hunting and with the elephant as a single species contributing over 60%. So in effect, statistics show that while good revenue is accruing from sport hunting, more still needs to be done in terms of exploiting non-consumptive tourism opportunities which explains why CA is working so hard to develop new tourism projects especially in districts without much endowment of game.

It also has to be pointed out that while to many outsiders, the significance of the programme is connected to the income accruing to communities, to communities themselves money and the projects they choose to embark on are just some of many benefits. To them CAMPFIRE is viewed as a package whose contents are of little significance if isolated. To them CAMPFIRE has made inroads in promoting grassroots democracy which as enabled them to have a sense of ownership of the natural resources.
which they used to be alienated from. Through devolution of decision-making powers, to sub-district structures such as Vicos and Wardcos, communities now participate in key programme activities such as project planning, evaluation and financial accounting.

Local management has also been witnessed in the field of quota setting where local communities with the advice of Department of National Parks, World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF), and to a certain extent, the Department of Natural Resources, are involved in natural resources inventory in their respective areas. This can be done through ground transacts, routine counting at water points and relating wildlife movements to wildlife populations.

All these benefits have manifested themselves in a change of attitude in communities with regards to natural resource management where communities now guard all the resources jealously, thus reducing significantly acts of poaching and wanton destruction of environmental resources which had almost become the fact of life in Zimbabwe’s communal areas before the introduction of CAMPFIRE.

Another key achievement by CAMPFIRE is in the area of advocacy internationally. CAMPFIRE Association has worked closely with government and other Service Providers to fight for community rights and a change of policy with regards to CITES and other international conventions. The recent downlisting of the African elephant to allow Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana to experiment in controlled trade of ivory to Japan speaks volumes of CAMPFIRE achievements in the area.

Also in the international scene, CAMPFIRE has worked tirelessly to repel efforts by animal welfare organisations based in Europe and America who were and still are carrying out a campaign to squash CAMPFIRE because of its commitment to sport hunting. A very pro-active strategy has been applied by CAMPFIRE to flood the international communities with information on the benefits of sustainable use of natural resources in general and hunting in particular.

The results have been positive. Most universities, including Harvard in the US have now entered an agreement with CAMPFIRE Association to make the study of CAMPFIRE compulsory reading for students studying Environmental Management at Post-Graduate levels. Another indicator of CAMPFIRE's effectiveness has been the programme's ability to galvanise international funding such as ODA, Dutch, USAID and others which have all been put to good use in assisting CAMPFIRE achieve milestones in community development. All these constitute Zimbabwe's achievements which may all be hard to quantify in dollars and cents alone.

Problems

While CAMPFIRE has undoubtedly done so much for communities, some key issues have emerged in the implementation of CAMPFIRE, which require concerted efforts by Zimbabweans. One that easily comes to mind is the problem with regards to policy.

Policy related to laws affecting holistic utilisation of resources are a constraint to the broadening of CAMPFIRE. While there is Appropriate Authority for wildlife the same has not happened for other potential money spinning resources like minerals. The limitation of Appropriate Authority to wildlife has been one of the major criticisms of CAMPFIRE. Thus the current thrust on the Biodiversity Support Action Programme (BSAP) and the District Environmental Action Plan (DEAP) are aimed at leading with natural resources management in a holistic manner. These approaches will improve CAMPFIRE because more rural communities will be involved in CAMPFIRE even if they do not have mega-fauna such as elephants, lions and buffalo.

The issue of who benefits has also been controversial. The unit of benefaction could be the village or ward, but the most important issue is that local power equations are important bundles of incentives. Some analysts feel that cash equations are important bundles of incentives. Some feel that cash dividends are viable while others opt for projects. What is significant is that communities make informed choices and that RDCs should act as facilitators. Sometimes the RDC sees itself as the owner of Appropriate Authority and would like the entire district to benefit.

However, those wards and villages that meet the costs of living with wild resources would like the principle of exclusion to prevail, otherwise there would be the problem of “open access” or “free riding”. Exclusion would ensure that the communities can identify themselves as custodians of natural resources. In the Zambezi valley local people are against new settlers who are
perceived as intruders. CAMPFIRE is based on the principle that the smaller the unit of proprietorship the greater the satisfaction that stakeholders derive. In Matobo, communities are working out strategies of how they can stop direct harvesting of mopane worms by people from urban areas so that they can maximise their gains.

**Devolution - A Serious Matter**

Another problem rocking CAMPFIRE at the moment is with regards to devolution. For a considerable time now, CAMPFIRE Association has been battling with the whole issue of further devolution of power to lower echelons of the rural District Council. This has been necessitated at times by bottlenecks experienced at RDC level where some (and not all) of the local authorities have been holding on for too long on money intended for distribution to producer communities.

However, it is a pity that the whole issue of devolution has been piddled left, right and centre by academics most of whom do not provide the exact parameters through which further devolution should be taken. Even some of our own membership in the CAMPFIRE Service Providers Group are beginning to mislead the international community by promising highly chimerical revolutionary structures with the hope of impressing donors for the sake of lining their pockets. One has to wonder about the interests or even sanity of a CAMPFIRE activist who advocates immediate devolution of Appropriate Authority to wards and villages as a condition of granting further funding to CAMPFIRE Association even where we all know that such wards are almost non-existent as independent bodies of the RDCs which the advocates intend to avoid.

Some of the Safari Operators too have joined up with the campaign for devolution in a way that appears to suggest the disempowerment of Rural District Councils in overseeing Community based conservation activities. Experience shows that while Safari Operators have been the vectors for the generation of the bulk of CAMPFIRE revenues, these people are purely businessmen whose driving force has been nothing more than business. Some of them have also been less co-operative in their deals with RDCs and may see further devolution to ill-prepared communities as an opportunity to by-pass technically staffed Rural District Councils from demanding more beneficiary type of contracts. So the attraction of dealing directly with communities may be higher.

And as if the complications are not enough, there has emerged a group of critics who view devolution as a means to achieve private tenure of land, an issue which we feel is driven more by Eurocentric values than local conditions. To begin with, CAMPFIRE’s mandate is to deal with communities managing communal resources as opposed to those who have private tenure whose interest may be better served by the Wildlife Producers Association and other private land ownership oriented organisations.

While security of tenure of resources may be a solution, a number of issues have to be taken into account. As an indigenous organisation, CAMPFIRE Association does not subscribe to the principle of total privatisation of land. The gap between the poor and rich is so wide with 80% of the country’s population living in abject poverty. CAMPFIRE Association therefore sees the availability of communal land as security for millions of people who are without any means of eking livelihood through formal employment and total privatisation may reduce all these people into armies of squatters in the long-term. It is our opinion that the state should strike a balance between land available for private ownership and that which should be left as a communal resource.
Practical Solutions

The CAMPFIRE Association is presently examining opportunities to revise CAMPFIRE principles to help improve the level of community participation in the programme. The Association is also considering developing a new legal instrument between the RDC and Wards or Local Boards as a way of transferring meaningful rights of ownership of both natural and financial resources.

It is however important to note that the AA status will remain with RDC to allow the RDC rights to co-ordinate, facilitate and account for all conservation requirements expected by Central Government. Transfer of AA to Wards and Villages is considered improper because of the following:

CA is aware of lack of both formidable and professional administrative structures below the RDC level. This results from historical concentration of resources at the RDC which has been the primary co-ordinating unit for development of communal land as per the Communal Land Act. The current-building by government recognises the need to strengthen the RDC for this purpose. Even CAMPFIRE has poured heavy financial resources through the USAID NRMP which are intended to boost the capacity of Rural District Councils to act more proficiently in facilitating rural development. So any attempt to prematurely transfer the AA to underdeveloped Wards and Vidcos is likely to meet some resistance from Central Government, the RDC itself and political organs in the District.

There is a fallacy that Wards and Vidcos can operate independently of the RDC if given the AA status. This perception fails to recognise the fact that the very Councillors that make the DRC are elected from Wards and Villages. There is no clear separation of power between the RDC and the units below it. So an immediate transfer to AA from RDC to Wards is likely to change nothing of significance if the very councillors running RDCs today are requested to manage the AA at a lower level.

Notwithstanding absence of technical know-how to draw up legal contracts with safari operators at the Ward and Village levels, protagonists of a speedy transfer of AA to lower echelons of RDCs appear to be driven more by idealism than reality. The hard reality is that Wards and Vidcos are political entities with no clear geographical boundaries. There is also a dangerous fallacy that Wards and Villages have independent hunting safari areas upon which future AA status can be based. Zimbabwean Wards are oriented towards agricultural production and less on wildlife management, a concept which was adopted recently and which may cause undue frustration on the part of administrators if used as the basis for granting a legal instrument such as the AA.

The call for immediate transfer of AA to Wards is based on an assumption that Wards would be more empowered to handle their AA, quotas and other operations more independently of the RDC. Very little thought is given on the reality that the DNPWLM is at the present moment struggling to meet demand to grant AA to RDCs countrywide. One has to imagine the Department's capacity to give AA to more than 300 Wards or a thousand or more villages. Is this the way to go? Should we be talking of the AA or another legal document for the lower echelons which can easily be negotiated between the RDC and its Wards? The matter is further complicated when considering that each Ward may have its own quota of game and would be able to engage their own safari operators.

One has to imagine the problem of control and administration that may arise from such an arrangement. If splitting a sustainable quota of 5 elephants between 8 or so Wards may not sound as bad enough as a problem, one wonders how to describe a problem of having more than 8 safari operators all engaged by separate Wards to hunt 5 elephants in a single hunting area.

To conclude the otherwise long story, the CAMPFIRE Association is quite proud of the notable achievements the programme brought about to the communities of Zimbabwe. By devolving authority to rural communities through government structures, unprecedented financial targets have been achieved by communities over the past ten years which were used for development of infrastructure in the rural areas. Further to that, communities experienced a very high degree of involvement on decisions pertaining to the use of resources thus giving them a sense of ownership of the programme. But like every other programme managed by the human hand, CAMPFIRE is not without its own challenges. One such challenge is to further reinforce the sense of ownership by communities who lack absolute tenure of resources in the legal sense of the word.

Proceedings of the Exchange Visit Workshop for Directors
The answer may lie in the development of our extra-contract between the RDC and the Ward to allow more decision-making by communities. Or more interestingly, the answer may be found in the ongoing debate for land reform, Environmental Management Bill, the Traditional Leadership Bill or even here at the Exchange Visit for Directors in Mahenye. But one thing for sure, we know the solution does not lie in a revolution that removes facilitation by RDCs, which have done a lot themselves to achieve the results that have made CAMPFIRE receive the world-wide acclaim it enjoys today.
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"ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES" BY IVAN BOND, WWF - SARPO, HARARE, ZIMBABWE

1.0 Introduction

This paper summarises a presentation made to the regional directors Exchange Visit held in Mahenye Ward, Chipinge District. The paper begins by defining two key words, institutions and organisations. It then considers the rationale for community based natural resource management in the southern African context. It argues that community based natural resource management (CBNRM) fundamentally seeks to change the rules by which resources are managed and so presents a simple model for institutional change. The model is based on two key elements; the economic incentives for change and the strength of local control. The paper briefly examines how CBNRM facilitators can increase both the financial incentives and the degree of control at the unit of management (taken as the producer community).

The paper concludes with a brief case study of the incentives for change in CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources).

2.0 Definitions

The words, institutions and organisations are commonly used interchangeably. This paper uses makes a very clear distinction as per the definition established by North (1991). Organisations are groups of people with certain responsibility, most commonly in CBNRM - community based organisations, for example Mahenye Ward CAMPFIRE Committee. Institutions are the rules by which resources are managed. These rules can be determined nationally through legislation, can be locally derived by-laws which are based on national legislation or traditional norms.

The paper also refers to four commonly recognised property types: private property, common property, state property and open access (or non-property) (Table 1). Significantly, common property is defined as a property regime in which the owners have the power to exclude outsiders.

Table 1: Recognised Property Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime/Type</th>
<th>Private property</th>
<th>Common property</th>
<th>State property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner rights</td>
<td>socially acceptable use; control</td>
<td>exclusion of non-owners</td>
<td>determine rules, maintain social objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner duties</td>
<td>avoidance of socially unacceptable uses</td>
<td>maintenance; constrain rates of use</td>
<td>Open access (non-property)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Rationale for CBNRM

The rationale for CBNRM systems is derived from three related factors:

- the declining capacity of central government to manage resources,
- the breakdown of traditional management systems due to colonial and post colonial natural resource legislation based on enforcement, expanding human populations and market economies, and
- a global appreciation that devolved natural resource management (unit of benefit = unit management = unit of responsibility) necessary and appropriate approach for sustainable natural resource management.
4.0 Conceptual Model of Institutional Change

The model begins with the assumption that current institutions for the management of natural resources are not leading to the sustainable use of those resources. The exact nature of the tenure regime may vary between open access, weak state and / or common property. The model assumes that institutional change is necessary and desirable. However it is also important that CBNRM facilitators appreciate that their interventions can:

- have both positive and negative impacts on institutional change, and that
- institutional change is a gradual and incremental process and therefore takes time.

The necessary but not sufficient economic condition is that the for the resource managers the net economic benefits of new institutions exceed the net benefits that they derived from the old institutions. Unless this condition is fulfilled it is most unlikely that institutional change will occur. The process of institutional change is not costless. All organisations will incur the following costs when embarking on a process of institutional change:

Transaction costs: These are the costs incurred by organisations agreeing on the new institutions. CBNRM programmes are usually characterised by a wide range and large number of stakeholders, including the resource producers, all of whom bear these transaction costs. Supporting these costs, or reducing their impact on the stakeholders is an obvious role for donor fiscal support.

Monitoring and enforcement costs: These are the costs which are incurred by organisations which have to enforce the new institutions. For example at a ward level these might be the costs associated with resource monitors or game scouts who have a law enforcement role.

Opportunity costs: Importantly in any situation which involves institutional change there are opportunity costs of the alternative options forgone. These may not be obvious and may be confined to certain groups within the producer community. However, when assessing the probability of institutional change it is important to consider how the opportunity costs might be alleviated. For example, within a CBNRM programme which seeks to change the rules of how wildlife is managed, one opportunity cost might be the loss of income to hunters.

The proposed model of institutional change within CBNRM programmes seeks to relate two key variables, the level of economic incentives and the strength of control exercised by resource producers / managers over the resource. The model is based on observations and research from within CAMPFIRE and commercial sector wildlife production. Common property theory predicts that institutional change requires strong and well defined property rights for producers while institutional economics requires strong economic incentives especially within common property regimes. These ideal conditions are represented by point “D” on the graph and at this point institutional change for natural resource management will occur (Figure 1). However experience has shown that usually there are weak and variable property rights as well as variable levels of economic incentives. The model predicts that institutional change will take place at various combinations of economic benefit and control along the line between “A” and “B”. Thus at “A” there are high economic incentives but weak control and at “B” weak economic incentives but a high level of control. Therefore the area above the line “A to B” also represents all those combinations of incentive and control which will result in institutional control. Those combinations which fall under the line represent the combinations of control and incentive which will not result in institutional change.

The challenge for CBNRM facilitators is therefore to strengthen producers control over their natural resource base either through de jure or de facto means and to increase the economic incentives for change. Some interventions might do both. Although most SADC countries are now characterised by some level of producer community control over wildlife, institutional change will be enhanced by:

- Strengthening producer communities control over wildlife and the economic benefits which are derived from wildlife;

- Strong and integrated natural resource legislation which provides producer communities with control over all renewable natural resources including land.
The strengthening of current wildlife legislation implies that producer communities should receive the market value of resources, control the economic benefits, have the skills and techniques to manage the wildlife and be able to enter into resource management decisions (set hunting quotas) and form business relationships with the private sector (leases).

Similarly the challenge to facilitators is also to increase the economic benefits derived from resource management. These incentives can be increased by simply bringing a much wider range of resources under the full control of the chosen management unit. For example, rural communities seldom derive any financial benefit from commercial logging. Other measures could include the commercialisation of grazing through a system of tradable grazing permits and the commercialisation of land but under the control of the community. Specifically, within the current focus on wildlife based CBNRM programmes, economic incentives can be maximised by:

- Ensuring wildlife producers receive the market value of their resources, which implies reducing the levels of bureaucracy between the producers and the commercial sector users of wildlife (e.g.: ADMADE and CAMPFIRE)
- Open and competitive allocation of user rights
- Strategic partnerships with private sector where appropriate
- Strategic partnerships with protected area managers where appropriate (win-win scenario)
- Free trade in animal products (CITES)

5.0 Assumptions with Respect to Institutional Change

The proposed model of institutional change is dependent on a number of key assumptions. These are that:

The state is willing to devolve real control to rural farmers and communities:

- Human population densities are below a threshold level (with respect to agro-ecological potential) which exclude CBNRM as an approach to natural resource management;
- The macro-economic environment for institutional change is either neutral or preferably positive;
- The process of institutional change is not challenged by any extreme climatic changes, and
- There is demand for the products derived from CBNRM systems.

6.0 Economic Incentives and Control of Resources Within CAMPFIRE: A Case Study

In most Rural District Councils, wildlife habitat and a quota are leased to a private sector safari operator. The exact form of the contractual relationship between the operator and the RDC varies between districts. However, the most common approach is that operators pay lease and trophy fees. Over 90% of wildlife revenue accruing to RDCs under CAMPFIRE is from sport hunting leases. Other sources of revenue are: tourism leases, hides and ivory. The gross annual revenue earned by RDCs has increased from US$0.35 million in 1989 to US$1.8 million in 1997 (Figure 2). There are three reasons for the increases:

- An increase in the number of RDCs participating in the programme. However it should be noted that over 50% of the gross revenue is earned by four districts, Nyaminyami, Binga, Guruve and Tsholotsho.
- A small increase in the quotas over time.
- The use of open, competitive and accountable methods of marketing wildlife leases to private sector partners by RDCs.

The use and the allocation of wildlife revenue earned by RDCs is guided by the CAMPFIRE Guidelines (1991) issued by DNPWLM. These recommended that at least 50% of the gross wildlife revenue be allocated to producer communities, up to 35% be allocated to wildlife management activities by the RDC and that up to 15% was to be retained by the RDC for the purposes of administration. Over time the allocation of wildlife revenue has been characterised by a high level of inter and intra-district variability in its use, the proportion allocated to different categories and the actual methods of disbursement. Aggregate statistics show that the proportion of revenue allocated to wildlife producers has varied between 35% in 1990 and 58% in 1995 (Figure 3). The number of benefiting producer wards has increased along with the number of RDCs participating in CAMPFIRE. In 1989, 16 wards in two districts benefited, while in 1996 over 100 wards benefited.
The incentives for institutional change for the management of natural resources can be considered at various levels. At the household level the benefits are characteristically skewed and in most wards financially marginal. In 1996 the median benefit per household by ward was US$4.50 (Figure 4). This means that in 1996, in 50% of the wards, the benefit per household was US$4.50 or less. However this conceals the range of the benefits which was from US$0.20 to US$529.20 per household for the same period. If it is assumed that all the revenue earned by RDCs was devolved to wildlife producer wards then the median benefit per household by ward rises to US$10.18 while the maximum benefit would have been US$733.24. In terms of the proposed model of institutional change, the data appears to indicate that for a high proportion of the wards benefiting from CAMPFIRE, the financial incentive for institutional change is marginal. Comparative analyses with agricultural income show that in most wards the revenue from wildlife constitutes less than 10% of gross agricultural income.

The level of control over natural resources by producers, the second variable in the proposed model, can be analysed by considering the legislative framework for natural resource management (Table 2). This summary shows that at the sub-district level there is little real control at the level of the ward / village / household over natural resources. Much of the legislation governing the use of natural resources places control with either the state or the RDC. The high level of variability in the use and allocation of wildlife revenue indicates that wildlife producer wards are primarily passive recipients of wildlife revenue allocated by RDCs.

With respect to the proposed model for institutional change and considering CAMPFIRE generally, most wards seem to be operating in the area below the necessary combinations of economic incentive and control necessary to achieve institutional change. This implies that as a matter of urgency the programme needs to consider lobbying government for the rationalisation of legislation governing natural resource management (including wildlife) so that both the sub-district incentives and control are strengthened. Without these changes it is unlikely that sustainable institutional change will be achieved in the majority of wards currently receiving revenue from wildlife.
Table 2: Major legislation governing natural resources in Zimbabwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Resources Covered</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural District Councils Act</td>
<td>Land and all resources through the Communal Land Model Land use and Conservation By-Laws</td>
<td>Empowers the RDC to assume a dominant role in land use planning, for either parts of or an entire district, agricultural practices etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Act</td>
<td>All non-mineral natural resources in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>The NR Act provides for the improvement and sustainable use of natural resources at a national level. In the LSCF emphasis on self-regulation. In the Communal lands emphasis on criminalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests Act</td>
<td>Timber resources</td>
<td>Provides for the management of wood resources throughout Zimbabwe. Focuses on private and state land commercial timber. Restricts use of forest products to use only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Land Forest Act</td>
<td>Commercial timber and forest product in the communal lands</td>
<td>RDC’s can grant licenses for commercial timber exploitation. Revenue accrues to RDC. Movement of timber between communal lands restricted. Prohibits and criminalises the use of forest products from protected forests within the communal lands. No trees to be cut within 100m of river banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Wildlife Act (1975)</td>
<td>Plants, trees and wildlife</td>
<td>Allows the devolution of Appropriate Authority to LSCF owners and District Councils, but discriminates between district councils, communal land residents and the LSCF landholder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines and Minerals Act</td>
<td>All minerals</td>
<td>Supersedes all other natural resource legislation and gives absolute rights to land. For example the recent cases of black granite and guano has shown that the Government is unwilling to devolve proprietorship and control of minerals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Act (41/1976)</td>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>Divides water into public and private water. The Act vests control of all communal land water resources in the state. Divides water into public and private water. The Act vests control of all communal land water resources in the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN CBNRM: CREATING ECONOMIC GROWTH IN RURAL AREAS" PRESENTATION BY DR I. GWASHURE, ZIMBABWE SUN HOTEL GROUP

A. The Global Perspective
- About 30% of the world's natural resources were lost between 1970 and 1995.
- Fresh water eco-systems declined by 50%
- Marine eco-systems deteriorated by 30%
- Natural forest cover declined by 40%.

B. Causes for the Degradation
- Global human consumption pressure which is growing at 5% per annum.
- Marine fish consumption has grown by more than 60% since 1960 NB Most world fish resources are either fully exploited or in decline.
- Wood and paper consumption has grown by more than 66% world-wide since 1960. NB It is estimated that the world uses more than half the available fresh water supply.
- Carbon dioxide emissions have grown by more than 60%. NB Currently carbon dioxide emissions far in excess of the biosphere's capacity to reabsorb.

Private Sector Contribution
- employment creation
- from employee to employer
- culture of enterprise
- catalyst for infrastructure development
- growth of the economy
- generation of more government revenue

C. Solutions and alternatives:
- The role of the Private Sector
- Turn threats into opportunities
- Invest to create portfolios of viable commercial activities to contain damage to natural resources.
- Commercial activities to be driven by the profit motive.
- Profit margins realised to be large enough to pay for sustainability.
- Promote education through symbiosis

D. Obstacles and Constraints
- Government Bureaucracy
- Inadequate legislative commitment
- Anti private sector sentiment
- The culture of mis-trust
- Political and economic paternalism
- The easier humanitarian approach versus the harder sustainable development approach
- Parochial nationalistic
- Devolution (Local Authorities: District, Ward & Village)
- Privatisation (Government companies) (Private ownership)
- Delegation (Parastatals)
- Decongestion (Ministry Officials e.g. Provincial & District Administrators)
Figure 1: The proposed model of institutional change for the CBNRM Programmes

A = Strong financial incentives and weak control
B = Weak financial incentives and strong control
C = Strong financial incentives and control (optimum)
D = Weak financial incentives and weak control (least desirable)

Figure 2: Allocation of gross wildlife revenue (US$) earned by RDCs with Appropriate Authority (1989 to 1997)
Figure 3: Distribution of Benefit (US$) per household by ward (1989 to 1996)

Figure 4: Gross livelihood income (US$) earned by RDCs with appropriate authority (1989 to 1997)
CBNRM and its contribution to Economic Development in Southern Africa

The IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa was established in Zimbabwe in 1987 to serve the Southern African region and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) in the development of modern skills in conservation and natural resource management. IUCN - ROSA coordinates such regional services to over 70 members in 11 countries through its regional support programmes, regional networks, and its country offices in Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa and Zambia.

IUCN - ROSA seeks to support and complement our membership and their own priorities. The underlying objective in all IUCN ROSA's activities and programmes is capacity building and catalysing action. Developing, coordinating and supporting programmatic partnerships is the preferred operational mechanism supporting this objective. Additional services include the provision of objective and scientifically based advisory services and technical assistance, training inputs and programmes, and fora for national and inter-regional dialogue, networking, debate and conflict resolution.

At the regional level, IUCN - ROSA spearheads The World Conservation Union's efforts to integrate the Union's secretariat, membership and commissions in common purpose within the framework of the Union's mission.
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