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Abstract
Tanzania has exceptional wildlife, environment and natural resources. The traditional way of conserving nature and wildlife has been through parks and reserves. In the 1980’s community based conservation emerged as a resource management paradigm. Its premise was that giving local people a stake in wildlife would increase their incentive to conserve it. This would make wildlife an important engine of local economic development. The core elements in community based conservation projects concern development, conservation and sustainable land use. Its ambition both to improve conditions for the local communities and conserve wildlife seems like a win-win situation, but has this really been working that well when applied in the field? This study aims to review the Community Based Wildlife Management in Tanzania, exemplified by a case study in the Wildlife Management Area in Burunge, located in a migration corridor between two national parks. There has been much controversy surrounding community-based management projects. While gains for the local communities have not always been clear, gains for wildlife seem more evident. Both species numbers and individuals have increased, but at the same time there has also been increasing conflicts between locals and wildlife. This is a sign that the WMAs are only halfway towards reaching their goal of improving conditions for both communities and wildlife. CBC still seems like the way forwards, maybe in a modified form which allows more government control, but where local people’s rights are still respected.
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1. Introduction

Biodiversity is rapidly declining worldwide. The rates at which species are going extinct have increased maybe as much as 1000 times the background rates that were typical over Earth’s history, due to human actions over the past centuries. Amphibians worldwide, birds in agricultural lands, mammals in Africa, Indo-Pacific and Caribbean corals, British butterflies, as well as a majority of harvested fish species have declining populations. Exceptions are mainly species which tend to thrive in landscapes that have been modified by human activity, or that have been protected in reserves or that have had their particular threats, such as overexploitation, eliminated. For species that are well studied, biodiversity loss has occurred through population extirpation and reduced distributions. Although the most rapid changes in ecosystems are now taking place in developing countries, industrial countries historically experienced comparable changes.¹

Tanzania has exceptional wildlife, environment and natural resources. Situated on the crossroads of many of the extensive biomes that cover Africa, it is also where the highest and lowest points on the continent are located, the top of Mt. Kilimanjaro and the bottom of Lake Tanganyika. Recognized for its large concentrations of large herbivores, it is also home of a vide variety of habitats, from coral reefs to mountainous forests, which all combine to make Tanzania a “mega diversity” country.²

The traditional way of conserving nature and wildlife has been through parks and reserves, which has been approached on the premise that the only way to save nature, and especially endangered species, is to forcefully exclude people from areas that are designated as wilderness. This is known as the fences-and-fines approach.³ In the 1980’s community based conservation emerged as a resource management paradigm. Its premise was that giving local people a stake in wildlife would increase their incentive to conserve it. This would therefore make wildlife an important engine of local economic development. Community-based conservation seeks to create a synthesis between conservation and development.⁴

The Wildlife Management Area in Burunge is located in Babati District, in a migration corridor between Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks. It is approximately 40.000 ha in size and is crucial in maintaining the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem, which is famous for its biodiversity. However, there has been much controversy surrounding community based management projects. I will look at the development of the project, focusing on the period after it was officially inaugurated in 2006.

¹ Millenium Assessment, pp. 12-13
² Wildlife Conservation Society, 2009-05-18
⁴ Igoe. 2004. Pp.28
1.2 Purpose
The objective of this study is to review the Community Based Wildlife Management in Tanzania, which has emerged as the new way for conservation to move into the future. The core elements in community based conservation projects concern development, conservation and sustainable land use. Its ambition both to improve conditions for the local communities and conserve wildlife seems like a win-win situation, but has this really been working that well when applied in the field?

The focus is to describe and analyze Wildlife Management Areas as a method to implement Community Based Conservation. Also, I wish to draw attention to the opinions of the local people involved in the project, and compare and contrast them to researchers view on CBC, both critical and positive.

1.3 Research questions
- How has the implementation of the Burunge WMA worked out, has it been successful in engaging the local community?
- What are the strategy’s strengths and what have been its weaknesses?
- What are the alternatives?

2. Methodology
In this paper I will use a deductive approach, and base my reasoning around thoughts on community-based conservation projects. The paper is mainly a literature-study, and I use the case study as an illustration.

Like other research methods, the case-study is a way of investigating an empirical topic by following a set of prespecified procedures. The most important function of the case-study as a method is to explain the presumed causal links in real-life situations. It might help describe, explore and illustrate phenomena that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategy and through this give the analysis an extra dimension. The case study can be used to generalize about theoretical propositions and not regarding populations and universes.\(^5\)

The case study in this report was conducted in Babati District in northern Tanzania during three weeks in February and March of 2009. This field trip was arranged by the Environment and Development Program at Södertörns University, and was part of a course on the connection between environment and development in the south.

The focus of my study has been the implementation of the Burunge Wildlife Management Area. While doing interview studies there are different techniques that can be used. I decided to use semi-structured interviews, as the method gives a framework to start from, but still opens up for a discussion with the interviewees.\(^6\) To find persons to interview I was helped by

\(^5\) Yin, R.K. 2009, pp3-23
a field assistant and a coordinator, to whom I explained what kind of people I would like to interview, and they either arranging meetings for me or giving me further suggestions on whom to contact. The interviews were conducted either in English or in Swahili with the help of a translator.

While arranging the interviews I was depending on other people to help me, because my insight into the local community was very limited. Also, most of the interviews were conducted in English with the help of a field assistant/translator, and neither he nor I had English as our first language. This might at times have lead to misunderstandings and misinterpretations. At the times when I was able to conduct the interviews directly in English I often had to rephrase my questions to get my point across, and I often discussed the answers I got with my field assistant to make sure we understood the answers in the same way. During my interviews I was also accompanied by a representative from the Wildlife Division of Babati District.

I have conducted semi-structured interviews with:
- Two representatives of the Wildlife Division at the Babati District Council
- A women’s group in Mwada village
- Two farmers with fields bordering the WMA
- Three speakers in the Burunge Project Office
- Two representatives for tourist lodges
- One representative for Mbugwe Secondary School

I also tried to get an interview with TANAPA – Tanzanian National Parks, but it proved very difficult.

I have compared my findings to those of a different student, who was there in 2005.

The secondary sources that I have used are mostly research articles on the subject, but also books and websites have been used.

3. Background and Theory

3.1 The Global Biodiversity Crisis

Human impacts are responsible for driving a large number of species to such low numbers that much of the global biodiversity is now threatened. The current speed at which we are losing species is predicted to be about 100-1000 times larger than what it would be without human interference. The processes that are responsible for species extinctions are habitat loss, invading species, overexploitation, habitat degradation and global climate change, where habitat loss (especially from agriculture) is considered to be the biggest problem for threatened species. Each year about 0.5-1.5% of wild habitat is lost. Approximately one quarter of the earth’s land surface has been transformed into agricultural land, and about 40-

Rahm. 2005
50% of tropical and subtropical forests and grasslands have been lost. The habitat that remains becomes highly fragmented in its distribution and as a result supports fewer species.8

The loss of biodiversity has been occurring at a faster pace in the last 50 years than ever before in historical times, and there are no signs of this trend slowing down, even though a lot of work has been put in to slow down or reverse these changes. At the same time, globally assessing the success of conservation impacts has not been an easy task. Biodiversity is hard to quantify, and the resources for monitoring and managing it are scarce. At any one time, high numbers of conservation efforts simultaneously take place worldwide, focusing at different aspects such as ecosystem restoration, single species management, political lobbying and environmental education. However, the total effect that conservation has cannot just be assessed as the summed up impacts of separate actions, but goes beyond that. Measures of conservation impact with finer temporal and ecological resolution are urgently needed to assess progress toward the United Nations 2010 Biodiversity Target of reducing the rate of biodiversity loss.9

3.2 National Parks and Fortress Conservation

The traditional management response to habitat loss has been to protect as much as possible of what remains, and to create a network with a variety of natural habitats that exists. During the twentieth century protected areas such as national parks and nature reserves grew both in number and area. Only around 7.9% of the world land area is protected, and it is problematic that much of the protected land is in marginal areas that no one else wanted.10

In much of Africa, the philosophical thoughts of the British Colonial era were the start of national parks. The Crown asserted ownership over game animals and set aside large tracts of land for their preservation. The great national parks of Africa grew out of these game reserves. The first one was Kruger National Park in South Africa, which was established in 1926 on a game reserve proclaimed in 1898. Kenya’s first park was established on the Nairobi commons in 1946, and Tanzania established Serengeti National Park in 1947 following a reserve founded in 1927.11

The traditional way of conserving wildlife through parks and reserves is known as the fences-and-fines approach, and is a clear reflection of western values. The ideas that fortress conservation draws from are that wilderness is an asocial landscape, a place free of human beings and their activities, and the second is the idea that humans and nature are separated, and that human beings are somehow above or outside nature. One of the central features of fortress conservation is that it relies on the forced exclusion of local people in order to remain viable. Over time, the justification for this type of exclusion has changed, and local people’s

8 Townsend. 2008. Chapter 1
9 Rodrigues, 2006
10 Townsend. 2008. Chapter 1
11 Sinclair et al. 2002
needs for a livelihood are more acknowledged.\textsuperscript{12} To not isolate wildlife populations in the different national parks from each other, corridors between reserves increase the size of populations and thereby decrease the chance of demographic malfunction (whereby a population goes extinct by accident because it is so small that its dynamics are determined critically by the fortunes of individuals rather than by the law of averages). By definition, these are strips of habitat that are too small for species to live in permanently. \textsuperscript{13} Movement corridors can be used by species undergoing seasonal migrations, a two way movement to and from breeding and non-breeding areas. Movement corridors might be ecosystem remnants that connect protected areas to each other in a human dominated landscape.\textsuperscript{14} As a general rule, species numbers present can be correlated to the size of protected areas in African savanna ecosystems. Nevertheless, it is not the size of the protected area, but the extent of the wider savanna ecosystem within which the protected area is located, that sets the limit for the species richness of the protected area. When the protected area is continuous with a wider rangeland ecosystem with conservation-compatible local land uses like pastoralism and farming, large mammals, other animals and plant species disperse through the wider area. If and when a conservation area becomes an isolated island surrounded by unusable habitat, species are lost. Maintaining conservation compatible local land uses across a broad area may better serve rangeland biodiversity than isolating protected areas from human impacts.\textsuperscript{15}

### 3.3 Community Based Conservation

In response to the recognized failure of top-down approaches to development, and ecological limits of fortress conservation, Community Based Conservation, CBC, has become the trademark of the “new conservation” approach, which is now unfolding across Africa. CBC shifts the focus of conservation from nature as protected exclusively by the state, to nature as managed through inclusive, participatory, community based approaches. To make this shift possible, CBC devolves natural resource management to local communities and is therefore often referred to as community based natural resource management. In the process, the community is often reified and presented as an “organic whole”. Communities, when viewed as small and homogenous units, are seen as better positioned to realize conservation goals, and as necessary allies in the expansion of conservation beyond national parks boundaries and into human-inhabited rural landscapes.\textsuperscript{16}

Turning local communities into business partners fits into neoliberal development models, where the expansion of free markets is seen as the most efficient way to achieve poverty alleviation. Tanzania has incorporated this into its National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty.\textsuperscript{17} In Tanzania the implementation of Community Based Conservation has been through Wildlife Management Areas, WMAs.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Igoe 2004
\item \textsuperscript{13} Sinclair et al. 2002
\item \textsuperscript{14} Meffe et al. 2002. pp. 198-200.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Homewood 2004
\item \textsuperscript{16} Igoe 2004
\item \textsuperscript{17} Igoe & Croucher 2007
\end{itemize}
4. Community Based Conservation in Tanzania

4.1 Wildlife in Tanzania

The wildlife resources in Tanzania are diverse and plentiful, and the country is considered to be the home of some of the wildest and most untouched African protected areas. The network of protected areas supports an abundant and diverse plant and animal life, such as a broad variety of endemic species of antelopes, primates, fish, birds, amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates and vascular plants. The country also contains some of the largest remaining populations of terrestrial large mammals, including the two million migratory wildebeest, and the zebras and gazelles of the greater Serengeti Ecosystems. The uniqueness of Tanzania’s species composition and the mosaic of different habitats makes the country one of the most important “mega diversity” nations on the African continent.

The Serengeti ecosystem and the Maasai Steppe cover the northwest and northeast of Tanzania with grasslands and open woodlands. The western part of the country is mostly covered by Miombo woodland, and the northern and southern highlands are dominated by forests. In the eastern arc mountains there still stand remains of old growth forests, which are considered to be biodiversity hotspots of global importance, as are the low lying coastal forests. All this is set in a natural landscape that includes Mount Kilimanjaro and Mount Meru, the Rift Valley, Lake Victoria and the largely pristine Indian Ocean coastline. In Tanzania there are also significant populations of species that are considered as endangered or threatened worldwide, such as Chimpanzee, Black rhinoceros, African elephant, Wild dog, Cheetah and Wattled Crane. The animal species which are classified as globally threatened include around 33 mammalian species, 30 bird species, 19 fish species and 46 invertebrate species.

Tanzania has dedicated close to 20% of its land surface to wildlife protection in areas where human settlement is forbidden, and almost 10% of the country’s surface area is set aside as protected areas where wildlife and humans are supposed to live together. This network of protected areas includes 14 National Parks, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, 31 Game Reserves and 38 Game Controlled Areas.

4.2 Wildlife Conflicts

Most of the population in Tanzania is directly surviving on subsistence agriculture and the use of natural resources. Since 80% of the population are practicing subsistence agriculture, there is intense competition for available land between livestock, wildlife and for crop cultivation. Shifting cultivation is one of the types of farming system practiced, and it is considered to

---

18 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 2003
19 LAMP 2007
20 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 2003
21 LAMP 2007
22 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 2003
23 LAMP 2007
contribute to environmental degradation. Conflicts with wild animals are common and local people risk having their crops raided and their livestock killed. Studies point to the fact that people, and in particular women and children, who are living close to protected areas have to devote much time to protect their crops against animal raids, and this interferes with the children’s education. The raiding of crops is also one of the reasons for hunger in parts of the population, which drives people to live off illegal natural resource use, such as wild meats. Many rural people are looking for access to larger or more fertile areas of land. Historically, pastoralists like the Maasai and Barabaig where relying on vast herding areas to sustain their cattle, but the intense competition for arable land has driven them into smaller and more marginalized areas year by year.  

4.3 Tanzania’s WMA legislation
There is a new law, the Wildlife Conservation Act, which was enforced in 2009. This law moves away from the community based system into a more government ruled legislation. It states that the Minister is the one who declares an area to be a WMA, and very little is mentioned about actual community participation. However, the Wildlife Management Areas were originally founded under the older act, and their regulations and Resource Zone Management Plans where established under the old acts. The two founding documents which the laws and policies of the wildlife sector were build upon were the Wildlife Conservation Act, WCA, of 1974, which was the main governing legislation, and the 1998 Wildlife Policy of Tanzania, WPT. There are also subsidiary regulations in the Wildlife Conservation Regulations or WMA Regulations, implemented in December of 2002. The WCA was the foundation for wildlife management in the country and was used to structure and divide rights and authority. It was mainly devoted to the legislation of creating and provisioning certain protected areas, such as Game Reserves and Game Controlled Areas, and well as the rules and regulations of wildlife use in mainland Tanzania. The Wildlife Conservation Act had a number of subsidiary regulations which functioned as additional laws, but unfortunately provided few opportunities for local community involvement.

4.4 Wildlife Policy
The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania was adopted in 1998, and aims to involve rural communities and other stakeholders to take joint responsibility for managing wildlife and other natural resources in a sustainable manner.

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism is responsible for formulating a Wildlife Policy, supervising its administration and co-ordinating the development of the wildlife sector in Tanzania. The vision of the wildlife sector for the next 20 years stands behind the

24 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 2003
25 Benjaminsen, T. pers com.
27 Catalyst, Kallonga et al 2003 p. 4
Development Vision 2025 for Tanzania on environmental sustainability and socio-economic transformation. The vision for the wildlife sector is to:

- promote conservation of biological diversity,
- administer, regulate and develop wildlife resources,
- involve all stakeholders in wildlife conservation and sustainable utilisation, as well as in fair and equitable sharing of benefits,
- promote sustainable utilisation of wildlife resources,
- raise the contribution of the wildlife sector in country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) from about 2% to 5%,
- contribute to poverty alleviation and improve the quality of life of the people of Tanzania,
- promote exchange of relevant information and expertise nationally, regionally and internationally.\(^{28}\)

To support the implementation of the Wildlife Policy, the government developed and approved the Wildlife Conservation Regulations (Wildlife Management Areas) in 2002.\(^{29}\) This new category of land is one where local people will be the ones responsible for managing, but will also be receiving benefits from their conservation efforts, through community based conservation programmes. The new policy then redefines the place for the community within the conservation arena in Tanzania, which is expressed in the following way by the Director of Wildlife:

“This point of departure towards accessing to the local communities the opportunity to manage wildlife on their land, in a category of protected areas to be known as Wildlife Management Areas, constitutes a major about turn from the protection approach in conservation to a situation where rural communities will participate in resource planning and management, thereby benefiting economically from the resources they have lived with since time immemorial.” (Wildlife Division, 1999:68)

Subsequently, the government completed and approved the Guidelines for Designation and Management of Wildlife Management Areas in December of 2002. To guarantee sustainable conservation of wildlife resources in WMAs, and also to safeguard the interests of traditional communities, the Wildlife Conservation Regulations of 2002 calls for the development of a General Management Plan, GMP, or a Resources Management Zone Plan, RMZP, before the establishment of a WMA. A RMZP, which operates for five years, is an interim measure before a GMP.\(^{30}\)

4.5 The WMA Regulations

In 2002, the WMA Regulations became a new subsidiary law under the WCA of 1974. This initiated the first WMAs on village lands and was a start for the utilization of the Wildlife Policy’s objectives. These policies are not legally enforceable and therefore cannot be enforced in courts of law if acted against. Only laws such as the WCA or the WMA

---

\(^{28}\) The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania

\(^{29}\) Babati District Council 2005

\(^{30}\) Babati District Council 2005
Regulations are providing the rights and responsibilities concerning the WMAs and wildlife management in general. The Wildlife Division has also established guidelines that can be used as a help throughout the process for stakeholders and facilitators to lean against, but they are also providing no legal rights.\(^{31}\)

The Regulations state that WMAs are areas set aside by the local communities to conserve and manage wildlife resources, and that the villagers are granted full responsibility. The goal is to empower the communities so that they can take advantage of the benefits that come with wildlife resources and that complies with the policy. The Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism is the one who designates WMAs, and the management of WMAs is by an Authorized Association, AA, who represents communities in one or several villages. The AA should be a Community Based Organization, CBO, made up by the local communities that wish to be assigned wildlife user rights by the Minister and the Director of Wildlife.\(^{32}\)

There is a process which all communities that wish to qualify for wildlife user rights must follow. Initially, a meeting must be held where the village decides to form a WMA; a CBO must be formed, which amongst other things needs a constitution, rules of membership, qualifications for office bearers and financial management procedures. To follow, the CBO has to present a Strategic Plan as well as a Land Use Plan, which both should be subjects to an Environmental Impact Assessment, EIA. Thirdly, the CBO must form a General Management Plan which should include the different zones of resource uses in the proposed WMA. After all these steps have been taken, the CBO can be presented to the Director of Wildlife, who then can decide to form the WMA. If the application is approved and the WMA is gazetted, the CBO becomes an Authorized Association, and is given limited user rights to the wildlife in the WMA. For villages situated in a Game Controlled Area, there is an additional step of having their land removed from reserved or conservation land and be included in community lands before the WMA can be official.\(^{33}\)

The policy was driven by the government, but the response was impressive. In many cases villages have taken their own initiatives, without waiting for the green light from Das Es Salaam. This shows that wildlife conservation and rural development do not have to be conflicting goals. Game is an important economic resource in many areas, and if correctly managed, its use is nature-friendly.\(^{34}\)

4.6 Local Gains from WMA’s

4.6.1 Non-consumptive tourism and trophy hunting

The tourism sector is a big part of Tanzania’s economy and since 2001 wildlife tourism has been a major part in the annual Gross Domestic Product growth of 4% in Tanzania. The country generated US $725 million from tourism in 2001, and has since had an annual

---

\(^{31}\) Catalyst et al. 2003
\(^{32}\) Catalyst et al. 2003
\(^{33}\) Catalyst et al. 2003
\(^{34}\) Baldus et al. 2001.
compound growth rate of 29%. This is due to the country’s many tourist attractions, such as game viewing, safari and beach holiday activities, mountain climbing, sightseeing, game hunting and photographic safaris. The mission of the industry is to develop sustainable quality tourism that is ecologically friendly to the conservation and restoration of the environment and culture of its people. For the WMAs tourism is the land use option that will probably provide the most income.

Tourist hunting in Tanzania is a recognized industry with a long history, and in recent years, the industry has been growing tremendously. It is now one of the main sources of income in large areas of the country, as well as a source of foreign currency into Tanzania. It has developed over a long time period, and has been influenced by authors like Hemingway (e.g. Green Hills of Africa). There are more than 130 hunting concessions in Tanzania, operating in areas covering over 200,000 km², which are being rented out to hunting outfitters holding a license to carry out tourist hunting. Over 60 animal species can be hunted with a tourist-hunting license.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, CITES, is an international agreement between governments. Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival and it accords varying degrees of protection to more than 33,000 species of animals and plants. The restrictions in CITES Appendix 1 place limits on the amounts of hunting trophies of leopards (500), elephants (50), and crocodiles (100) that each year can be exported from Tanzania and imported to other nations which have signed the CITES. In 2003 Tanzania pleaded the CITES secretariat for a higher leopard allowance and was permitted to raise the numbers from 300 to 500 leopards annually. The country is also going to ask for a higher allowance of elephant trophies, going from 50 to 100 annually. In 2004, there was an intense debate about including lion onto CITES Appendix 1, with the result that the lion can now be hunted. The tourist who wishes to hunt CITES Appendix 1 listed animals has to present a certificate from the CITES authorities in the nation to where he or she wishes to export the trophy, stating that they will permit it. After that a hunting permit can be granted to the client, and once the animal is shot, a CITES export permit and a CITES trophy tag are issued by the Wildlife Division. CITES provides the amount of trophy tags available which the Wildlife Division then distributes.

The Wildlife Division earns around 10 million US dollars per year on its concessions. The hunting industry in Tanzania is one of the most successful in Africa, and the country should be able to lead the industry forwards due to its large amount of accessible natural resources and its many opportunities for big game hunting. The Wildlife Division’s main source of income from the Tanzanian hunting industry is through applying trophy fees, based on the amount of hunted animals. Earlier attempts to improve income generation have concentrated

35 Igoe & Croucher, 2007
36 http://www.tanzania.go.tz/naturalresources.html 2009-05-09
37 Baldus & Caldwell, 2004
38 Baldus & Caldwell, 2004
on raising quotas and thereby creating a higher hunting pressure, which causes concern, because even if hunting generally is sustainable, there are key species such as lion which can be over-hunted and allowances in some areas can be unsustainable.\textsuperscript{39}

4.6.2 Resident hunting and beekeeping

In Tanzania, resident hunting is permitted but only in certain open areas. A permit is needed and can be granted for many of the traditional game meat species such as buffalo, hartebeest, impala, topi and game birds. Valuable and rare animals restricted only to tourist hunting are amongst others lion, elephant, leopard, hippo, sable, roan and sitatunga. The District Game Officers are responsible for issuing permits in their own districts. In order to apply one needs to have residence status and a proof that they legally own a gun. The fees for resident hunting are low and there is not much money being raised, so the areas where the hunting takes place get little economic return. Accordingly, these areas lack efficient management, the supervision is poor and it often happens that people misuse the system. Problems with over-shooting of permits are common, and there has been a drastic reduction in wildlife species in areas where resident hunting often takes place. There is little access to data on resident hunting, and the data that does exist does not necessarily give a good picture of the actual situation.\textsuperscript{40}

Beekeeping is an activity that is usually compatible with wildlife conservation and is usually allowed in WMAs. Beekeeping plays a large role in socio – economic development as well as in environmental conservation. Its honey, pollen and brood are a source of food; it provides raw materials for various industries, medicine and income for beekeepers. The contribution of the sector to the GDP is 1%. It is a source of employment, provides income to the people, a source of recreation, ecotourism and foreign exchange earner.\textsuperscript{41}

4.6.3 Joint venture

The term joint venture means “arrangement between an Authorized Association and other parties to undertake specified business matters related or incidental to the management and protection of wildlife in WMAs”\textsuperscript{42}

Joint venture usually means that the village makes a deal with a tourism company. The company then brings tourists to wilderness camps that are set up on village lands and pays a fee to the village bank account, grounded on the number of nights each tourist is accommodated. The fee is usually between one and five US dollar and villagers can discuss and approve the contract during a village assembly meeting. The money can then be used for projects concerned with community development.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{39} Baldus & Caldwell, 2004
\textsuperscript{40} Baldus & Caldwell, 2004
\textsuperscript{41} http://www.tanzania.go.tz/naturalresources.html 2009-05-09
\textsuperscript{42} Rahm 2005
\textsuperscript{43} LAMP 2007
4.7 Criticism against the WMA concept

While community based conservation has become the new conservation solution to the social and ecological problems concerning traditional top-down, protectionist conservation approaches, it has received some critique. Goldman (2003) claims that, despite the rhetoric of devolution and participation associated with new CBC models, conservation planning in Tanzania remains a top-down endeavor, with communities and their specialized socio-ecological knowledge delegated to the margins. The allocation of use rights by the Minister reflects a top-down distribution of privileges, rather than active participation by community members. Even in the cases where management rights are transferred, local communities are not recognized as competent decision makers. They are seen like subjects of the state, or tools of conservation that need to be “educated, informed and guided”, through technical assistance, standardized training and supervision to properly manage natural resources.44

Authors critical to the WMA concept mean that the definition of the WMA could be seen as contradictory and that it reflects a colonial conservation mentality. The policy defines a WMA as an area declared by the Minister to be so and the village government has to protect it for the aim of biological natural resource conservation. This short but powerful definition dispossesses the very community the WMA is established to represent. WMAs are defined by centralized state power for the sole purpose of conserving biodiversity. WMAs constitute an extension of the Protected Area (PA) system, rather than an alternative to it. CBCs most characteristic community development aspect is presented in the policy not as a collaborative goal of conservation but as a necessary means to achieve the end result of an enlarged conservation system. Rather than encouraging active participation, WMAs present new ways in which communities can be acted upon. Communities are not to be trusted with completely overtaking the management of a resource as valuable wildlife, and therefore, despite the discussion of a transfer of management of WMAs to local communities, the State will retain the overall ownership of wildlife.45

Other authors agree that the establishment of WMAs in general has not been a process driven by the local communities. Igoe and Croucher claim that a few transnational conservation organizations with access to resources, expertise, and technology have been the ones in charge of the transitions. Some of these international wildlife conservation organizations have been officially appointed to supervise the establishment of WMAs under Tanzanian law. Subsequently, the country has been divided between different organizations: the German organization Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit is supervising Selous and its surroundings, the World Wide Fund for Nature is managing the southwest part of the country, Frankfurt Zoological Society administers Serengeti and its environment, and the African Wildlife Foundation oversees the northeast. Furthermore, this division in Tanzania has occurred in the past 20 years in the context of the country’s transition to neoliberal development and governance models. These models are characterized by reregulation, where the state turns resources which used to be untradeable, including those that used to be not
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owned by anyone, state owned, or owned by the community, into commodities. This can be accomplished through direct privatization or by putting territories under state control, like in national parks, where the land is not privatized, but is still acquirable on the market through concessions and rent. Regarding WMAs, the local communities are given the chance to participate in business by having collective legal titles to the village lands. However, this arrangement often ends up with the rural people being disciplined into excluding themselves from their own resources. In practice, this often amounts to pushing local people to exclude themselves from their own land. Establishing a WMA is a process which involves a series of bureaucratic procedures that require rural communities to understand the potential value, or lack thereof, that a WMA would have for them. They need to reorganize themselves and their land in very specific and difficult ways, because detailed knowledge about the legal and legislative system in Tanzania is needed to establish and manage a WMA. And knowledge is not enough, since the laws and regulations in Tanzania are frequently contradictory and different government sectors often get into conflicts over how to implement rules and act upon transitions. Above all this, there is also the problem that many people in rural Tanzania are analphabets, and therefore depending on others to get access to information and interpretations of regulations and laws.

When a WMA is declared, the land is still formally owned by the village, but authority over the land is in basically re-regulated to the Wildlife Division and to the district and regional governments. For the villagers it means that the land has been earmarked for uses that greatly restrict their rights to access and use the land. Many times, this happens without regards for weather the locals have agreed to participate or not. Because of the large geographic and cultural distance between rural communities and the institutions where the policies are formed and sponsoring for the projects is agreed on, it is not difficult to present a persuading illusion of community participation where in reality there is none. If the community is required to participate, a few carefully selected representatives can be enough, and since many of the policy makers and donors do not have the connections, time and expertise to fully grip the complex issues of conservation involving local communities, they are relying on these over-simplified examples when reaching conclusions. This creates a gap between the rural communities and the donors, policy makers, and investors. The appearance of informed consent can be created through the complicated legislative and technical details of the WMA, and without the genuine informed consent of the major part of the rural people whose lives are the most affected.

5. Results and analysis

5.1 Case study-Burunge Wildlife Management Area

Burunge is an area in northern Tanzania, located in an important migration corridor between Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks. Lake Burunge Game Controlled Area was
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selected as one of the pilot WMAs in 2002. An Authorized Association comprised of the five villages of Vilima Vitatu, Minjingu, Mwada, Magara and Sangaiwe was formed, reflecting the policy and legal requirements. 49

The government of Tanzania gave official status to four WMAs, including Burunge, on March 31st 2006. The project now consists of nine villages, covers about 40,000 hectares of community land, and represents about 30,000 residents. 50 Most of these are Arusha farmers, although there are also significant numbers of Maasai and Barabaig pastoralists. The villages are located inside what the African Wildlife Foundation calls the Maasai Steppe Heartland, which Tarangire and Lake Manyara National Parks are also a part of. The AWF’s Conservation Heartland Programme, defines heartlands as “landscapes of extraordinary biodiversity value, which have the potential to conserve viable populations of African wildlife as well as key habitats and ecological systems well into the future”. 51

During every wet season, wildlife migrate from Tarangire NP, both eastwards to the nutrient-rich Simanjiro plains, and northwest to Lake Manyara National Park, across Maasai occupied lands in the Kwakuchinja corridor. The national parks have been drawn around dry season watering and grazing areas, and are not enclosed ecosystems. For more than six months of the year, most wildlife is found outside of the national parks, on community and village lands. (Fig 1) 52 There are no fences between Tarangire National Park, Lake Manyara National Park and the Burunge WMA. 53

While creating land-use maps can be helpful, strict zone-based planning contradicts the fluid nature of wildlife movements as well as those of pastoral herds, therefore risks to further disrupt both Maasai pastoral practices and wildlife movements. 54 There are plans to tarmac the Great North road, which goes through Africa from Cape Town to Cairo. The number of vehicles in the area is predicted to increase further if the Great North Road is asphalted. This would cause more accidents with wildlife. More road signs would be needed to reduce speed, and also gates and bye-laws. If someone gets into a crash with an animal they could be taken to court. 55

49 Babati District Council 2005
51 Igoe & Croucher, 2007
52 Goldman 2003 pp.14
53 Mr. Hewasi, pers. comm
54 Goldman 2003 pp 19
55 Mr. Teveli
Pastoralism is generally considered more compatible than agriculture with wildlife conservation. This is because the pastoralists and their animals migrate with the seasons, just like the wild animals do. There is no need for fields and fences to keep migrating animals out, like there is with agriculture. However, there seems to be a conflict between agriculturalists and pastoralists. One representative for the BWMA claims that the pastoralists (Maasai) still are not educated, that they have land in other places, and that pastoralism is the most harmful activity in the area. Two farmers with fields that border the BWMA, and are both growing simsim and sunflower, which are cash crops, state that they have never had any problems with wildlife. However, if they would grow maize they believe that their fields would get raided by wild animals, but also say that the reason they are not growing it is economical. There is no compensation if the crops are raided, which leads to a feeling of insecurity. They are not

---
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allowed to kill animals that are in their fields, only to try to scare them away, something that can be difficult since the animals are often used to people from national parks.\(^5^9\)

5.2 Values and objectives

In May and June of 2004 two workshops were arranged to analyze the data information sheet of the prospective Wildlife Management Area, and develop a draft RMZP for the endorsement of the Burunge Pilot WMA. There, stakeholders identified the following problems, in terms of priority:\(^6^0\)

- Lack of conservation awareness amongst leaders
- Inadequate working tools
- Tree felling and charcoal burning
- Inadequate funding
- Poor infrastructure
- Property damage by wildlife
- Unskilled labour
- Poaching
- Wildfires
- Haphazard livestock grazing and high number of livestock
- Boundary conflicts between Tarangire National Park and local communities
- Denial to issue licence on certain resources
- Agriculture inside BPWMA

Outstanding values were defined as resources that capture essence of why the protected areas exist, because they help maintaining the integrity of the protected areas system.

Five outstanding resource values of the BPWMA were identified:

- Revenue from tourism, photographic and hunting activities
- Wilderness character of the area
- Variety of wildlife, including birdlife
- Burunge and Manyara lakes
- Wildlife corridor for Manyara and Tarangire National Parks

Stakeholders in a technical workshop used the information data sheet and outstanding resources and values to define the following purposes of the BPWMA:

- To generate income from tourist, photographic and hunting activities
- To protect and preserve the wilderness character of the area
- To protect and preserve the variety of wildlife, including birdlife
- To protect and preserve the Burunge and Manyara lakes
- To safeguard the wildlife corridor for Manyara and Tarangire National Parks

\(^5^9\) Farmers in the BWMA
\(^6^0\) Babati District Council 2005
Based on the SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound objectives) the stakeholders in a technical workshop identified the following management objectives, which should be reached by the year 2010 for the BPWMA:

- To make sure that the actions of village leaders and people are reflective of increased conservation awareness
- To ensure that operations of the BPWMA are effective and efficient
- To increase the amount of trees and forest cover by 10%
- To increase and sustain economic contribution of the BPWMA to the village governments by 400%
- To reduce property damage by wildlife by 50%
- To establish and maintain ecologically sustainable wildlife populations
- To reduce the effects and incidents of wildfires by 30%
- To reduce the amount of conflicts between BPWMA and other uses in the area by 20%
- To reduce wildlife-livestock disease incidences by 5%  

5.3 Burunge WMA and the local community

The WMAs main source of income comes from the tourist camps, and it goes to building and maintaining offices, hospitals, schools and security. The project also gets some money from the government, and also selling crafts. More tourists in the area mean more money. Since the area is located on community lands, many activities that are restricted or forbidden in national parks can still take place in the WMA, such as horseback riding, walking safaris and night game drives. It also brings a cultural element to tourism, since it is carried out on community lands instead of national parks, where human settlement is not allowed.

The former horse race zone is now a tourist camp, the Maramboi Tented Lodge. It is situated close to the shore of Lake Manyara, and gives some of its profit to the Burunge WMA. It has about 2000 visitors a year, and has room for 44 people at the same time. They offer photographic and walking safaris, no hunting. They also contribute to the local community by providing jobs, in security and cleaning, to the locals. One representative of the Maraboi says that wildlife has increased in the area. This is because it has become safer for the animals, with more private security from the tourist camps and more game scouts to prevent poaching. They have also built a well for the animals to drink from, conveniently located within
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viewing sight from the hotels veranda. The village owns the land that the camp is situated on. The camp is privately owned and has seen the effect of globalization and the financial crisis.64

The rural communities in the BWMA have been sponsored by a number of institutions and organizations. The Land Management Program, LAMP, which was started in 1991 and is supported by the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency, SIDA, and has contributed with technology, knowledge and funding for such things as land use planning, seminars and training on wildlife management, village scouts and women groups. Another sponsor is the African Wildlife Foundation, which is an international NGO encouraging sustainable wildlife management, ecotourism and wildlife research, and also deals with community based wildlife management including alleviating agreements between villages and tourism companies. Tarangire National Park assists the Burunge WMA through its Department of Community Development Service which focuses on poverty reduction around the park. They work by encouraging community development, leading environmental projects such as promoting fuel-saving stoves to minimize deforestation, lending anti-poaching units to the villages and helping to equip village game scouts.65 There is some cooperation with Tanzanian National Parks, TANAPA, and Tarangire and Lake Manyara NPs. Game scouts count animals every 5 years, using helicopters with the help of TANAPA, since it is the marginal boundary to the national parks. There are currently 18 game scouts, 2 from every participating village.66

There have been several women groups started in the area to promote democracy and gender equality. The women got education from the WMA on how to form groups; and an expert came and taught them how to make baskets from Euphoria spp. The AFW built them a house in Mwada to motivate them. (Fig. 2) The positive effects are that the women are now getting an income; they have money for improvements and schools. The women themselves say that they are now more aware of conservation issues in the area, they are more coordinated, and they get leaves for their baskets from the BWMA area.67

The AWF, in an article on May 4th 2008, calls the Burunge project a success story, stating that it has made the people of the Burunge WMA aware of the importance of conservation, and villagers and buildings have been moved away from important migration routes to decrease the number of conflicts between people and wildlife, promoting and protecting the flow of wildlife through the region. The Burunge WMA receives over 50% of the income earned by two wilderness camps, and the money is divided between the nine BWMA villages, contributing to a large number of community development projects such as health services and schools. In the region there are over 40 village game scouts who have received official training. The Game scouts are responsible for organizing anti-poaching and wildlife monitoring patrols, supporting conservation education in the nine WMA villages, and they
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have had an effect of boosting positive attitudes toward wildlife conservation in the local community, which has also led to a reduction in poaching. The article claims that Burunge WMA members have come together in order to conserve and protect their resources before they were lost, and they have been given an ample compensation for their efforts.  

The Officials in Babati District agree that the project has been a success. One representative says that the area has benefitted from tourism, new schools, health projects, building of shallow wells, less bushfires and more tree and animal species. The Wildlife Officer in Babati District, Mr. Macokecha, says that the project has been successful, and that the local communities have benefitted. He says that there is community involvement, and the project is raising awareness in the local communities, and providing information and demarcation. Positive effects for the people have been that the villages have more money for development, people have been employed in the tourism and handicraft industries, people are proud of the project and benefit from tourism. Positive effects for wildlife from the project have been an increase in wildlife, and occurrence of wildlife in new places. There are now more impalas, elephants, zebras, wildebeest and lesser kudu. But rhinos disappeared from the area long before the WMA was initiated, and buffalos have not been increasing. Giraffes and cheetahs are the only species protected from tourist hunting, giraffes because they are the national symbol of Tanzania, and cheetahs because they are critically endangered. The community has more knowledge about wildlife, and there is less poaching.

Mr. Teveli is the speaker of the CBO. He considers the project successful. It has invested a lot of money for schools, women groups get to cut trees for baskets and mats, which they sell and get an income, and there are international sponsors. There are even two more villages that are interested in joining the Burunge WMA, Manyoka which may join because of its interesting ecology, and Sarame Village which has some forest.

One representative of the BWMA says that the project had a difficult start, because local people were not educated. But the project started with educating the office workers on conservation, and then the villagers. Now, the villagers in the area generally have a more positive attitude towards the project. There were also some problems with corruption in the beginning, but this has now been resolved.

In 2004, before the BWMA was officially inaugurated, the Babati District Wildlife Officer, Mr. Macokecha, was awarded the renowned Whitley Award from Great Britain. The price of £ 5,000 gas given as recognition for major contributions to community based wildlife conservation. Tanzania was one of the top eight countries in the world and the only other African country to receive the Whitley Award was Uganda. The purpose of the award is to
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empower communities which are involved in wildlife protection and have formed a community based organization to promote and generate income from wildlife tourism. Mr. Macokecha's comment on this was: “I think the Whitley Fund for Nature in Britain and other international conservation groups in Europe appreciated our performance in wildlife conservation. It is the villagers who have taken the pioneering role of protecting their wildlife resources.”  

5.4 Problems in the Burunge WMA

According to Mr. Said, the Assistant Wildlife Officer in Babati District, some negative aspects in the area include some some illegal grazing and poaching, mostly by Maasai. Even though the land is traditionally Maasai, they are now taken to court if they are discovered, and actions are taken to reduce the number of pastoralists in the area. However, the farmers that were already in the area before the project started are allowed to stay, but they are encountering more problems as there are more animals. There have been conflicts between wildlife and farmers, with elephants, zebras and bushpigs raiding fields, and lions killing livestock. At the moment there is no compensation for the farmers who get their fields destroyed or lose their livestock.

Even though the Burunge project may first appear as successful, it has also been met with criticism. A case study in the Burunge WMA made by Igoe and Croucher in 2007, showed a drastically different outcome, where the attempt to at the same time promote the conservation of nature, stimulate economic growth, and increase community prosperity failed to create a win-win situation for wildlife conservation and community development. Most of the villagers interviewed in their study claimed that the Burunge WMA had been planned and enforced without their knowledge and consent. They felt like they had been cut off from the natural resources which they needed to survive, and that this was a part of a bigger plan where several conservation actions enhanced their poverty instead of promoting community development. For the villagers, there seemed to be two main objectives: “the business of conservation and the business of business”. To them it seemed as if these objectives were given more consideration than the needs of the local communities and the acknowledged national priority of poverty alleviation.

Igoe and Croucher continue to describe the formation of the Burunge WMA, which in many cases seem to have been implemented without local agreements, and exemplifies by telling that some farmers had boundary beacons put up on their land without them knowing about it. Sixty-three families living inside the conservation area were evicted. A majority of these villagers did not know who stood behind these interventions, and also stated that they had never been to, or even been invited to, any workshop or seminar.
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The WMA Regulations do in fact emphasize the role of the village in independently resolving to create a WMA and in having the capacity and the legal authority to manage it. And yet, the villagers in Igoes & Crouchers survey indicated that they did not have the power to decide whether or not to cultivate or to have their land contracted out to tourist companies. Local people, as well as village officials, stated that the Burunge WMA had been brought upon them without them knowing about it or agreeing to it. Moreover, Igoes & Crouchers study showed that the money generated from wildlife activities seldom end up back in the communities, and if it does, it will probably only reach a small number of village elites.\textsuperscript{80}

To illustrate, the Burunge WMA will generate about US $230,000 per year for 45,000 people, which is around US $5.20 annually per person. This money comes in the form of indirect gains, contrary to the direct costs rural people have had to pay as a consequence of the BWMA. Furthermore, the people that get the highest cost associated with the project are the ones that will probably get the least of the benefits. Many of the respondents in Igoes & Crouchers survey did welcome development projects, but also stressed: “you can’t eat a dispensary or a school”. The District Game Officers, who is also the secretary of the District Natural Resources Committee, response to this was that “the AWF and the government have put a lot of money and work into this WMA; we will not stand by and allow it to fail”.\textsuperscript{81}

6. Discussion

In 2005, another student from Södertörn University College conducted a case study about the Burunge WMA, and the conclusion that she came to was that, in order to be able to move forward, all pilot WMA’s should be given Authorized Association. Even though this would be a long and difficult process, she perceived that the villagers had a positive attitude towards the project. One respondent also pointed out to her that the process and implementation of Community Based Conservation was of very high importance to the politicians. They were having a hard time finding partners who were willing to invest in the area so that the villagers could start getting some benefits, so the project was not doing what it was supposed to be doing.\textsuperscript{82} Now, with the opening of tourist camps and hunting lodges, it seems to have changed, but the question is how much the local community is benefiting from the income from these camps, and if it can make up for the lost benefits of not being able to use the area the way they used to.

Burunge was given Authorized Association in March 2006, but it seems questionable how much has actually improved for the local communities. Most people that I spoke to seemed to have a positive attitude towards the project. However, this strongly contrasts to the scientific reports which have judged the project unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{83} The contradicting results that this study reached compared to Igoes & Crouchers can probably be explained by the fact that the locals
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did not know who I was or why I was there, so maybe they did not feel that they could speak freely. Also, during my interviews with the locals, I was accompanied by a representative of the District Wildlife Office, something that most likely kept people from speaking freely about any perceived problems. In retrospect, I should also have tried to get an interview with an NGO that was critical of how the WMAs are implemented. A lot of money has been invested into the project and therefore they want to show off positive results.

Igoe and Croucher question how much of the income that actually benefits the local community. During my interviews several of the respondents mentioned that it would be beneficial to the project to have an accountant who would have full overview over the project’s finances. As it was working now, no one had a full oversight, something that would of course make it easier for someone with unjust intentions. Even though one respondent said that the problems with corruption had been solved, Igoes & Crouchers case study showed that a local elite profited the most from the project.

The assumed synergies between neoliberal capitalism, wildlife conservation, and poverty alleviation, where conflicts are easily solved and no one has to make any sacrifices, has seemed like an answer for conservation work in the third world. Everyone involved; rich and poor, animals and people, charity and private enterprise, Africans and westerners, consumers and producers, should end up benefitting from these operations. From this outlook, everyone is a stakeholder and there are no losers. By the contrary, Igoes and Crouchers case study shows a reality in which there absolutely are losers. 84

The new Wildlife Conservation Act from 2009 has also taken into account the problems with community based conservation, and moved away from it. It is yet to be seen how this will practically affect the WMA’s that have been established under the old act and policy. This is also an example of how research moves faster than society. 85

The idea of bushmeat hunting has failed in the BWMA. The villagers could initially hunt for species such as impala, wildebeest, Thompson’s gazelle, eland and reedbuck, but because of misuse of the system, resident hunting is has not been allowed since 2008. This has since lead to an increase in these “bush-meat” species. 86 This means that the villagers are not entirely in control of the user rights. The establishment of a local meat market has thus not been accomplished. However, one positive effect for the project is that it is located in an area in close proximity of the much visited Northern Circuit, and could therefore allow several tourist camps. Especially the hunting camps bring in much money, since tourists pay large sums for trophies.

Most of the people I spoke to saw illegal grazing in the BWMA as the biggest problem. This is contradictory to most scientific studies, which claim that pastoralism is a better suited

84 Igoe & Croucher, 2007, pp 19
85 Benjaminsen. Pers com
86 Representative of BWMA
activity to coexist with wildlife. It seems to me that blaming the pastoralists was the easy way out, since most of them were Maasai and not very well integrated into the community. One of the representatives from the District Wildlife Office claimed that most Maasai did not want to be integrated, and therefore would not want education or send their children to school.

As for the participating villagers in the BWMA, they wish for future improvements in the form of more officers and better security in the form of game scouts. Also, some form of transportation for the officers and game scouts, since the area is so large. Improvements of the infrastructure are necessary, especially in the rainy season when it is very difficult to get around the area. They feel like the WMA would benefit from having a head manager, and an appointed accountant that would be responsible for all the financial issues. The speaker of the BWMA feels like they need more experts in ecology, more training of local people, and more education in general, especially in ecology and accounting. There should be some organized planting of trees. He agrees that there is poor infrastructure inside the area, there are no permanent roads and the officials have no access to cars. Also, the game scouts have no weapons.

In the future, Mr. Macokecha thinks that the BWMA should cooperate more with TANAPA regarding anti-poaching activities and animals that are raiding crops. Now the cooperation depends on the personal chemistry of the people involved. In the future, there are plans to significantly raise the fee (up to 5 times more, from 5 us$ to 40 us$ per night) that the tourist camps are paying to the WMA, but they are still waiting for answers from the tour operators. The representative of Maramboi tented Camp says that he would like more cooperation with the game scouts, and also to plant more trees. Regarding the financial issues, he states that he generally prefers contributing money directly to a project, such as building a well or a school, than giving it to an organization such as the BWMA, because then you know that the money really ends up where they were supposed to.

6.2 Conclusions
While the gains for the local communities have not always been clear, the gains for wildlife seem to have been more evident. Both species numbers and individuals have increased, but at the same time there has also been increasing conflicts between locals and wildlife. This, to me, is a sign that the WMAs are only halfway towards reaching their goal of improving conditions for both communities and wildlife. However, I cannot see any other viable alternative, since fortress conservation also has had its difficulties, and it will be hard to establish more areas in Tanzania where you can justify the complete exclusion of people. To me CBC stills seems like the way forwards, maybe in a modified form which allows more government control, but where local people’s rights are still respected.
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