

WILDLIFE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¹

By Ernest Mwape, CONASA² Policy Component Manager

Paper presented at the Media Enviro Forum as part of the World Environmental Day commemoration under the theme "Water: 2 Billion are Dying for It", held 3-4th June 2003, at Protea Hotel, Chisamba. This was part of the post-World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg, RSA in 2002.

² CONASA stands for Community Based Natural Resources Management and Sustainable Agriculture

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Although Zambia is addressing aspects of natural resource conservation and management for sustainable development as emphasised by the various UN conventions on environment and development, including WSSD, it is only the implementation of the wildlife sector policies and legislation that is far ahead in most respects compared to the other natural resource sectors.
- Even though the domestication and subsequent implementation of these international convention resolutions has been elusive and difficult for Zambia, it is important to for the various development practitioners to continue including the spirit, principles and approaches of sustainable NRM in high-profile national development documents like 2025 National Visions, Transitional National Development Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs), and National Action Plans.
- Local community involvement and partnerships for sustainable development, and in particular for natural resource management, is crucial and should be priority in poverty reduction strategies in rural areas where people live with natural resources.
- After going without safari hunting for the last two seasons, 2003 provides Zambia with an opportunity to consolidate the gains made after restructuring and reforming the wildlife sector (through restructuring of NPWS and subsequent transformation into ZAWA, privatisation of state-owned operations, liberalisation of safari business, etc). The new strategy should immediately demonstrate the benefits to communities of conserving wildlife; and show a higher level of commitment and spirit to the new partnerships based on mutual respect of all stakeholders.
- If in fact Government and other stakeholders are serious about sustainable development then they should commit themselves to raise awareness of an average Zambian on the implications of the resolutions that come out of these international conventions on Environment and Development.
- The international community should also do more to conserve and sustainably manage the natural resources that are important to the global environment. Apart from monitoring trade in endangered species, they should advocate for equitable sharing of benefits that arise from use of genetic resources that communities have protected, conserved, preserved and managed for a long time now.

INTRODUCTION

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held in Johannesburg, South Africa in 2002 was a follow-up the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. The main outputs of the Earth Summit were: Rio Declaration on Environment and Development; Agenda 21; Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Forestry Principles and United Nation Framework on Climatic Change (UNFCCC).

The main outputs of the Johannesburg Summit or WSSD were the Johannesburg Declaration and the Plan of Implementation. There have been a lot of other initiatives that share the same objectives as these world conferences on environment and development. Some of the objectives of these initiatives vis - a-vis natural resource management call upon international cooperation and collaboration in areas like:

- Conservation of the natural resources given the important ecological/biological functions they play
- Regulation and control of human activities that have adverse impact on the environment
- Sustainable utilisation of the elements of nature given that they play important socio-economic development functions
- Because “public goods” can be commonly accessed there is need for rules and guidelines, if confrontations/conflicts between and within the different stakeholder groups are to be avoided/minimised. Most civil wars in Africa are as a result of disputed control, ownership, access and utilisation of natural resources. At the centre of the prolonged civil wars in Congo DR, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone and Angola is control, or lack of it, of benefits arising from exploitation of natural resources like minerals and oil.
- In the same vein, equitable sharing of benefits arising from exploitation of natural resources should be proportional to the cost borne by each stakeholder group when performing the assigned/negotiated roles and responsibilities
- Increasing recognition of the local communities’ stake and role implies need to realign the alliances or partnerships if conservation and sustainable management of natural resources like wildlife is to be successful. Government and private sector have had formal business arrangements/partnerships in the wildlife sector for a considerably long period of time; without involvement of the local communities that live with the natural resources. Governments have realised that if wildlife is to be conserved and sustainably managed/utilised, local communities that usually bear the highest cost of conserving wildlife have to be formally recognised as (equal) partners that should also share in the benefits derived from wildlife utilisation. Communities also come with their traditional knowledge, innovations, values and practices that have proved useful in conservation of wildlife.

NGOs and private sector organisations have also initiated equally important arrangements, with varying degrees of success, that aim at achieving some of the objectives mentioned above. Safari Club International (SCI), an annual conference for marketing safari hunting the world-over is attended by safari operators, Government-mandated tourism marketing agencies, conservation NGOs, etc could be used to

promote these noble goals and objectives. Some of these NGO initiatives try to set voluntary standards and provide mechanisms for peer review so that the different conservation and sustainable wildlife practices are followed. Whatever rules, guidelines or standards are agreed upon are self-imposed by members themselves, and are not dictated by Governments. CITES is an IUCN/WWF initiative that has become so effective in protecting endangered species through control of trade in endangered species and their specimens. The International Council of Game and Wildlife Management is trying to have such ideas put into practice.

Specifically from the WSSD in Johannesburg, the Partnership Forum on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management from the WEHAB³ Initiative of the UN, the following objectives relate to wildlife management and sustainable development in its broader context:

- Reversing biodiversity loss by 2010
- Involvement of local, indigenous communities
- Mutually supportive global trade policies
- Development models to incorporate ecosystem management and poverty reduction alleviation
- Setting time-bound targets, implying collection and sharing of data for M & E
- Benefit sharing from ecosystem
- Good governance at all levels – local, national, regional and global

It was assumed that each member country will set specific targets using the broad objectives and recommendations that were made. Member countries are also expected to develop indicators (intermediate and outcome) to monitor progress being made.

WILDLIFE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

In our discussion, wildlife will be limited to be wild animals (fauna), although the approach and analysis could easily be extended to cover plants (flora) and other natural resources. Sustainable development implies that elements of the environment should not be exploited to extinction or drastically altered/degraded to impair the natural environment or jeopardise the ecosystem balance when countries are pursuing their development goals. Elements of nature that are utilised in development activities are air (oxygen, carbon dioxide, etc), water, plants, soil, wild animals, and marine and mineral resources. This environmental degradation or ecosystem imbalance mainly comes about as a result of excessive use of these elements of nature through various human activities - industrial activity, hunting, cultivation, grazing and frequent application of chemicals in economic activities. In wildlife circles, countries should not unnecessarily hunt down their wildlife just because the price being paid by safari hunting clients is right. Sustainable development through wildlife use means that when there isn't enough wildlife a country should first conserve the wildlife by and letting it to reproduce in descent/sustainable numbers (i.e. reach "carrying capacity") before engaging in safari hunting.

As part of sustainable development, a country like Zambia will need a sustainable wildlife population for tourism to thrive, since we know that tourism in Zambia is

³ WEHAB is an abbreviated form for **W**ater and Sanitation; **E**nergy; **H**ealth and Environment, **A**griculture, and **B**iodiversity.

wildlife-based. There are three principles that can be applied in analysing the functions or contribution of wildlife in sustainable development, viz; social, economic and environmental functions. Local people attach Social-cultural value to wildlife. Certain indigenous practices, customs, beliefs, and medication require specimens from certain wildlife species. Even the traditional rulers' attire may require certain parts of a certain animal species as symbols of authority, wealth, etc. Without some of these social symbols there might be social disorder, and such social stability, cohesion and order can not be assigned some monetary value but is very important for any meaningful (economic) development to take place in society.

The Economic function of wildlife is in terms of humans securing food security, trophies as storage/investment of monetary value although they are displayed, medicines (vaccines from snakes' venom), etc. Commercial conservation and production of wildlife on private ranches is more profitable compared to communal areas because it is easy to control and contain management costs. Communal areas are open to all, and therefore it is difficult to apportion benefits according to costs borne or contribution made in conserving/producing wildlife. "Free riders" and rent-seeking behaviour become disincentives to the conservation effort among all, but especially local community stakeholders. There is need for strong regulatory oversight to define the beneficiaries, and enforcing their negotiated role and responsibilities, failure to which Government should withdraw the benefits associated with sustainable management of wildlife.

The economic incentives in a stable policy environment that encourages investment in wildlife production are needed. Such incentives should aim at limiting and eliminating threats to wildlife production. Accountable local community institutions that target the very poor people who contribute to wildlife threats/conflicts:

- By-laws/constitutions that mandate/empower local community leaders on ways and procedures for using safari revenues
- Open transparent procedures for remitting revenue shares to local communities or their bank accounts. Such benefits can even be received at household level. This helps increase appreciation of the link between wildlife and improved livelihoods, and therefore that wildlife production is an alternative land-use form that is profitable.
- External regulatory controls to prevent financial mismanagement by community leaders, and situations where the local elites capture all the benefits of sustainable wildlife management for themselves, excluding the majority of the local community members. Regulatory oversight should also ensure that private sector operators comply rules and regulations for conducting their business and fulfil their pledges to community partners.
- Replace the time-consuming bureaucratic procedures that delay remitting safari revenues by empowering communities through community leaders to transact on their behalf – such that public auctions of hunting concessions at local community level be used instead of long-drawn out processes of Government.

It is important to address household livelihood needs that contribute to wildlife conflicts/threats, especially food insecurity that lead to poaching. Government should ensure that communities see the linkage between increased safari revenues and improved benefits within a relatively short time. And that such revenue is properly invested areas that improve a sustainable livelihood in general: social services,

infrastructure, credit facility for agricultural inputs, and if possible cash income dividends to households for their other uses as well.

The Environmental function of wildlife: certain species of animals perform acts that maintain ecosystem balances. Some of these functions are so complex that they have yet to be understood properly. Obvious functions are those performed by the elephants digging “water holes” from which almost all the other animals in their range benefit from. Without the elephants most animals would die after less-than-normal-rainfall season and during drought years. Therefore it is not only the 2 billion human beings that need (clean drinking) water as the theme says, but also the wildlife and forests. Yet other animal species have to produce a lot of their young because very few will survive as go to fulfil the natural basic food-chain function for other animal species. Other wildlife functions are to be seen in the propagation of plant species that are important for sustaining human life. The seeds of these tree species need to go through the digestive system of mega fauna (elephants, rhino, etc) if they are to germinate and repopulate. Suffice to say that the complex food chain and ecological functions of wildlife species has not yet been completely understood, and therefore countries need to protect their environments as a social responsibility to all humanity.

Therefore in the quest to develop, countries should strike a balance between utilising wildlife resources and ensuring that there is enough left for the future generations. Poor countries like Zambia should be helped by the international community to conserve its endangered species and manage the wildlife habitat through paying for conservation efforts. Otherwise poor local communities will be asking why they should protect the elephant that is so destructive in their view (crop damage, human loss, etc) when they can easily kill it and eat it. Poor countries like Zambia should be helped with resources to compensate people who fall victim to the human-wildlife conflicts. In free-open range the cost of protecting wildlife is relatively large because of the free-rider behaviour – no one wants to bear the cost of protection, yet they all want to benefit from the same resource. If communities finish harvesting wildlife in areas they stay (GMAs), they will start going into protected areas (National Parks) that act as reservoirs for wildlife reproduction for the GMAs.

The WSSD in Johannesburg (2002) emphasised partnerships, implementation and accountability given that there has been slow progress made since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 in implementing the outcomes/resolutions. Contextualising for wildlife sector, the following can be said about these areas of emphasis.

Partnerships: Before the current approach of involving local communities in the management of wildlife, Governments thought they were best placed to conserve wildlife using a model commonly referred to as “Guards and Fences” that led to declarations of national parks, from which all people were removed to pave way for wildlife only. Even when wildlife found itself among communities, the benefits derived from its legal use was not shared with the resident communities. This proved costly over the years, especially in countries where local resident communities have become poorer and food insecure. When these community people become food insecure and poor, they do not have time and resources to go through the legal channels to secure access/harvest rights to wildlife like their well-off compatriots in urban areas. Therefore they resort to illegal harvesting of wildlife, or poaching.

Conflicts and confrontations immediately arise both with Government and private safari operators.

The local communities could not help conserve and protect a resource that they do not consider valuable. To reverse this trend, the local communities are increasingly being called upon to undertake certain roles and responsibilities in the sustainable management of wildlife for a share in benefits derived from utilising such wildlife – consumptive and non-consumptive uses. There are other reasons why community involvement is seen as a sustainable way of managing wildlife, some which are that:

- 1). Government is becoming smaller and doesn't have as much money to put into management of wild life as before. Therefore Government can not employ as many wildlife scouts as it would like, even for protected areas. Where communities reside with wildlife, local solutions are more cost-effective, and therefore will rely on local communities to police/regulate wildlife management, at least in areas where people live with wildlife. Since Government business is conservation, and not profit making, it has started to lease out or privatise all safari operations to the private sector.
- 2). The ecosystem functioning is so complex that to only rely on "hard science ecology" may not yield the best results. Therefore there is increasing application of indigenous knowledge and practices that have proved as effective conservation methods all along. In Zambia, "Abena Nsofu" could not hunt the elephant, just as "Abena Nkalamo" or "Abena kalulu" could hunt the lion or hare respectively. Such clan names served to conserve and sustainably manage the wildlife.
- 3). Increased awareness of wildlife (monetary) value by local communities has made them contest the status quo vis-à-vis access, ownership and utilisation of wildlife resources, especially given that private sector operators and Government are seen as "absentee landlords", but who actually get a disproportionately large share of the wildlife revenues. Communities feel that they should be given a fair share given that they are the ones who have to bear the brunt of wildlife-human conflict. Some times this has led to increased confrontations between the stakeholders.

Implementation: there has been slow progress made in implementation of agreed upon aspects that would lead to sustainable management of wildlife and therefore contribute to sustainable development. Although a good number of countries have recognised the principle of partnering with local communities through updating their respective policies and legislation, it is still difficult for local communities to get a fair share of the benefits from wildlife because of vested interests that make it difficult to fully implement the policies and laws. We still have individuals who go against the dictates of sustainable management through, for example, issuing excessive quotas; abuse of special licences; delay in remittance of community share by Government; protracted fights over hunting concessions; imperfect flow of information among stakeholders; and unfulfilled pledges made to communities by private safari operators. Communities should be involved in all aspects of wildlife conservation and sustainable management. They should not passively earn benefits from wildlife, otherwise they will not see the link between conservation of wildlife and improvement in their livelihoods. Government in its regulatory oversight should encourage and ensure that communities have appreciable technical capacity to undertake their negotiated/assigned roles and responsibilities in sustainable management of wildlife. By doing so communities will complement Government information for monitoring and evaluating of legal instruments; best practices are employed in management wildlife and its habitat; and ensuring that there is no

exploitation of disparity in knowledge, understanding and experience when agreements between stakeholders are being developed.

Accountability: all stakeholders should be accountable for their actions at local level, just as countries should be accountable to the international community for their actions. In Zambia the extinction of the Rhino in the 1980's is so instructive in this respect that no one stakeholder has been asked to account for its actions so far. What little we know is that Government regulatory and policing oversight was so weak, that private individuals with resources would hire local community people to hunt the rhino on their behalf. At the time there was no incentive for local communities to protect and conserve wildlife because they did not receive any benefits from wildlife utilisation. Now that there is a framework/basis on which benefits are apportioned, each of the stakeholder group will be asked to account for its negative actions. Chief NaBwalya of the Bisa people urged government to involve local communities in management of wildlife resources when 5 black rhinos donated by the South Africa National Parks, courtesy of Frankfurt Zoological Society, were introduced into the North Luangwa National Park of Zambia. Five white rhinos were earlier by South Africa National Parks donated to Zambia, and are in Mosi-O-Tunya National Park, Livingstone. It is hoped that Zambia will account for these donations.

Zambia finds itself in the same awkward position of failing to properly account for its elephant ivory stockpiles. At local community level, local elites should be audited to ensure that there is no mismanagement of community finances and abuse of authority in wildlife-related transactions.

DOMESTICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS and/or AGREEMENTS

The Zambian Government has the responsibility to ensure that whatever it agrees to in principle at international fora is translated into domestic policies and legislation, and follow through with implementation by itself or the various non-state actor partners. There are quite a lot of conventions, protocols, agreements, etc to which Zambia is party to. Some of these have been followed-up with development and implementation of equivalent domestic policies and legislation. However, there are others that have yet to even be ratified, although in principle Zambia is in agreement with their stated objectives. Sometimes the delays are difficult to understand. Examples of policies and legislation that has been inspired by international conventions, agreements and mere principles are:

- National Environmental Action Plan (1994)
- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (1999), following the CBD
- Revised Wildlife Policy and Act (1998) that have captured the spirit of incorporating local communities' participation in management of wildlife resources through what is referred to as CBNRM principles⁴. This also required

⁴ Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) principles are based on the hypothesis that sustainable wildlife management requires demonstration of benefits to local communities, within a shortest possible time, that wildlife is a profitable land-use option; the beneficiary group should be manageable, but small for the benefits to be meaningful; the CBO leaders should be constitutionally and democratically elected; decision-making will be participatory, and not representative; Government role should provide regulatory oversight, but increase proprietorship rights to wildlife to the

the restructuring and transformation of National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) from law enforcement and safari business operator to a regulatory agency (ZAWA)

- Tourism Policy
- National Policy on Wetlands and Conservation (2001 draft)

The above cited policy documents were developed after the Earth Summit in 1992. The current PRSP (2002-2004) and TNDP (2002-2005) have not as strongly addressed the spirit of partnerships as the above-mentioned documents in so far as environmental management through community involvement is concerned. The challenge of implementing the WSSD and earlier resolutions lies in how well the principles that lead to sustainable development are integrated in the mainstream development documents, programs, strategies and action plans such as PRSPs. Given the attention, but arguably not-so-much political commitment, that the PRSP has generated it would have been very important that community partnership elements in sustainable natural resources management and poverty reduction were captured and addressed.

The development of a *sui generis system* that aims at protecting and conserving the country's genetic resources should also incorporate international trade aspects, and recognise the intellectual property rights of the local communities whose assets (traditional knowledge, practices and innovations) are already openly accessed in the public domain.

IMPLEMENTATION

As was alluded to above, whilst incorporation of principles factors (social, economic and environmental) in sustainable wildlife management has been made in the country's policies and legislation, implementation of the international conventional resolutions and these principles has been rather elusive and difficult. In Zambia's wildlife sector, examples abound where good governance principles suffered because of vested interests – especially from within Government and the private sector. Otherwise, how else can we explain the recent controversial award of Liuwa National Park to a private sector operator to run? Outcry is an indication of little consultation that was done by Government. Issuance of unjustified excessive Special Licence quotas in the past? How else can you explain the ban on safari hunting during the 2001 and 2002 seasons?

These incidences have only eroded the confidence other stakeholders had in new initiatives of partnerships, especially the local poor communities that are the weakest and poorest partner in the arrangements. Delays in remitting community share of wildlife revenue, withdrawal of private sector pledges in the absence of signed Concession and Co-Management Agreements, making it even difficult to hold powerful stakeholders accountable for their actions – serve for the few times affected stakeholders resorted to court action. These are areas that the WSSD tried to emphasise when implementing the Action Plans.

communities; communities should actively earn their share of benefits through undertaking certain agreed upon roles and responsibilities; communities to spread their portfolio i.e. they should invest in other livelihood activities apart from wildlife – especially those that address threats to wildlife; etc.

There has also been little progress made in addressing the human-wildlife conflicts, especially if there is loss of human life and destruction of aspects of human livelihood. In Zambia, such conflicts are mostly related to elephants invading granaries, eating crops and causing human deaths along the way. Since ZAWA the regulatory agency does not have an adequate compensation mechanism and resources in place, it has been difficult to convince poor people of how valuable the elephant is to the Zambian economy and the environment. The elephant is seen more as a dangerous pest, and not an economic asset. Apart from Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) program at ZAWA, there is nothing else that directly addresses the concerns of the poor people, who increasingly see such programs as valuing wildlife more than human life.

CITES is a powerful organisation regulating trade in endangered species has also failed to reconcile the transboundary nature of the benefits derived from a species like an elephant. Elephants cross borders between Zambia, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana (the 4-Corners area) with relative ease. Whilst rural communities can be adequately compensated in the other three countries because they are allowed to derive benefits from using elephants by CITES, Zambia does not because the elephant population is listed under Appendix I; meaning that elephants are an endangered species in Zambia and can not be commercially utilised in safari tourism. Given the local communities' sentiments have in Zambia, CITES can look for some resources to compensate households that are victims of human-wildlife conflicts. An elephant is a global resource that the international community should help pay for its conservation and protection. Poor people need very little incentive to tolerate, conserve/protect the elephant.

Because of misunderstandings over access, ownership and utilisation of wildlife between communities on the one hand, and Government and private sector on the other, there are conflicts and confrontations that would be reduced and eliminated if there is frequent consultation and sharing of information and knowledge. And because local communities do not have the same amount of information as the other stakeholders, they tend to have different perceptions of the value of wildlife. For a long time, communities used to see wildlife as food only (a source of protein), but now increasingly they recognise the economic value of wildlife because of increased flow of information – especially with the NGO capacity building interventions.

Failure by Government to prosecute and punish those involved in illegal harvesting of wildlife and trading in their specimens has added to frustrations that the rest of the stakeholders feel. Some ivory from elephants that were culled and/or retrieved from anti-poaching exercises has disappeared from Zambian Government custody. It has been alleged that Zambian ivory has been in far-flung countries sustaining the illegal trade. Even when there are descent leads/information to follow through with investigations, there seem to be very little political will to do so. Given that elephants are an endangered species in Zambia, and its population is under Appendix I of CITES list, it is very frustrating on the part of other stakeholders who are investing a lot of time and resources conserving the elephant in the hope that in the near future they will benefit from its commercial utilisation in tourism. Despite the celebrated benefits of globalisation (technology and improved information flow), it does not

benefit the poor people who bear the brunt of conserving the wildlife if there is nothing to show for their efforts/sacrifice.

On a more positive note, I should acknowledge the efforts that ZAWA is making in implementing CBNRM aspects of the current wildlife policy and legislation, and also the current initiative to formulate a specific CBNRM wildlife policy for GMAs and Open Areas. Successful conservation and sustainable management of wildlife will be determined by how inclusive of the local communities the wildlife management strategies and action plans are. Such inclusiveness should be based on the negotiated roles/responsibilities and the proportionate corresponding benefits going to the local resident communities from utilisation of wildlife. Failure to recognise the local community factor will lead to unsustainable harvesting of wildlife (poaching) and subsequent imbalances in the ecosystem. Once the vital role played by wildlife in development goes missing, the respective countries and international community at large will have failed in their pursuit of sustainable development agenda.

The CBNRM approach has paid dividends in neighbouring countries that have been implementing it earnestly to sustainably manage wildlife during the last two decades now. This has been with limited community proprietorship rights over the wildlife. Now there is even increasing pressure to give more proprietorship rights over the wildlife resources to local communities, just like the private sector proprietors have in some countries. That will have huge implications on determination of how the wildlife will be managed and utilised, and the land-use options/choices community will make that will result in maximum benefits. Note that, at least in Southern African region the private sector operators have increasingly converted their livestock ranges into wildlife range because of the huge profit margins to be realised from keeping wildlife compared to livestock.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In Zambia, although the wildlife sector is still addressing the sustainable development aspects of conservation and management (that were emphasised at WSSD: implementation, partnership and accountability), it is ahead of the other natural resources sectors. Zambia's wildlife policy and legislation has in principle addressed the questions of partnership; redressing the imbalance in benefit sharing. Communities now appreciate the need to cooperate and collaborate in negotiated roles/responsibilities in sustainable management of wildlife because there have been demonstrated benefits to the communities. To consolidate these gains, ZAWA would like this to culminate in formulation of a CBNRM wildlife policy and follow-up with legislation to increase transparency and accountability through the Co-Management and Concession Agreements. NGOs in the sector are equally enthusiastic about these developments, and are building community capacity to negotiate for fair, equitable share of benefits commensurate with their new roles and they will pick up.

High profile visible development initiatives such as the Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs) should incorporate more aspects of CBNRM aspects for sustainable wildlife management objectives. This implies more involvement and empowerment of local communities in NRM in areas where the majority of the poor are to be found earning a livelihood from natural resources. CBNRM provides a less-costly alternative for

addressing rural poverty and improving rural livelihoods through job creation, supplying requisites to safari operators, and sharing in consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife licence fees. As the Zambian Government has said in its WSSD report, national development initiatives will do well to recognise the fact that biodiversity loss can only be reduced and mitigated if “local people benefit from conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, in particular in countries of origin of genetic resources, in accordance to article 15 of the Convention on Biological Diversity”⁵.

After two years without safari hunting, Zambia is set to resume safari hunting this year. The build-up to this year’s safari season has not been without problems, but all the same 2003 will provide an opportunity for all involved to move forward in realising the goal of a sustainably managed wildlife resource in Zambia. Especially important is the need to demonstrate the benefits of conserving wildlife to local communities who could have just opted to be less cooperative and be a threat to wildlife through illegal harvesting (poaching). In relation to this year’s World Environmental Day theme, wildlife revenue that goes to the local communities can easily be used to sink bore holes, construct dams to harvest water, dig water holes for wildlife as well as fulfil some of the community responsibilities in managing the wildlife habitat.

If in fact resolutions from the world conferences on environment and development (Earth Summit and WSSD) are important, then Government should commit itself to raise awareness among its citizenry regarding their content and implications for not following through with implementation. Without awareness raising exercises, Zambia is unlikely to properly domesticate resolutions and recommendations of most of these international conventions because compliance and implementation will not be through government officials, but through the non-state actors.

Apart from monitoring trade in endangered species and their specimens through CITES, the international community should put in a place an effective international trade regime that promotes fair trade, but also safeguards equitable sharing of benefits (biotechnology research results, etc) from legally acquired genetic resources. This should recognise intellectual property rights of local indigenous communities as holders of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices that benefit humanity. Results of advanced scientific or biotechnology research should be made available to these communities through appropriate, satisfactory arrangements.

⁵ Zambia’s Report for the World Summit on Sustainable Development Held in Johannesburg, South Africa. Ministry of Finance and National Planning, September 2002 - P.75

RECOMMENDED READING

Nature, Wealth and Power: Emerging Best Practice for Revitalising Rural Africa, Jon Anderson, August 2002

“Revisiting Principles of CBNRM in Southern Africa” paper presented by Dr. James Murombedzi at the conference CBNRM in Southern Africa: Sharing Best Practices for the Future, Windhoek Namibia, 3-7th March 2003

“Safari Hunting and Conservation on Communal Land”, paper presented by Dr. Dale Lewis at the , London, UK, November 2002

Speaker’s Notes on “Sustainable Management of Wildlife and Poverty Reduction”, presentation made by Mr. Ernest Mwape at the CONASA-facilitated Natural Resources Forum, Pamodzi Hotel – Lusaka 2002

Wildlife and Poverty Study, DFID December 2002

Zambia’s Report for the World Summit on Sustainable Development Held in Johannesburg, South Africa, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, September 2002