



# CONASA

*Community-Based Natural Resource Management  
and Sustainable Agriculture*

## REPORT ON THE ZAWA -CRB WORKSHOP (Garden House Motel, Lusaka)

By ERNEST MWAPE  
CONASA POLICY COMPONENT MANAGER

*June 2002*



Tel: 260-1-250456  
Fax: 260-1-253354

CONASA  
P.O. Box 36238  
Lusaka  
Zambia

Office: Pandit Neru &  
United Nations  
junction, Longacres,  
Lusaka

Email: [rhino@zamnet.zm](mailto:rhino@zamnet.zm)

Web: [http://www.geocities.com/conasa\\_zm](http://www.geocities.com/conasa_zm)



The Programme that was adopted without any adjustments, additions or subtractions was as follows:

## PRESENTATIONS

### **1. CBNRM POLICY FRAMEWORK** by Dr. Lewis Saiwana

Zambia's CBNRM policy started with the ADMADE program. ADMADE itself was conceptualised at a workshop at Nyamaluma in 1983 as a pilot project in the Lupande GMA. Later the project was extended to cover other areas of the country.

In 1988 ADMADE was adopted as the official National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) policy. The objectives of ADMADE program were, and still are, to raise and improve the welfare of communities living in GMAs, while at the same time promoting wildlife conservation.

There are 36 GMAs in the country, covering the equivalent of 31 percent of Zambia's surface area. Under ADMADE the revenue that was realised was deposited in a revolving fund called the Wildlife Conservation Revolving Fund (WCRF). This revenue was shared among the primary stakeholders in the following proportions: 35 % for the communities; 40 % was meant for wildlife management while 25 % was retained to meet WCRF administrative costs.

ADMADE institutional framework involved the community structures on the one hand, NPWS, Nyamaluma College and the private sector. ADMADE programme attended to development projects as well anti-poaching activities, and improvement of wildlife habitat to increase the number of wildlife.

In the current dispensation, ZAWA's mission is to conserve NRs, solicit participation of communities, encourage tourism and increase the economic value of wildlife. ZAWA works with the CRB secretariats and their patrons. It is envisaged that the CRBs will set up funds into which all monies raised will be deposited for various activities that will be undertaken such as community development projects, wildlife protection and law enforcement. The communities will enter into Co-Management Agreements with ZAWA; and will also be party to the concession agreements between private sector operators and ZAWA.

In 1997, the NPWS asked the communities whether they were ready to manage wildlife in the GMAs on their own. Communities refused because they did not have the capacity to do so. It was also argued that NPWS was relegating its responsibilities to the community. Co-management was the preferred option. ZAWA are the

---

<sup>1</sup> Report prepared by Ernest Mwape based on his assessment and analysis/impression of the proceedings of the workshop.

custodians of national parks and some protected areas. The GMAs act as buffer areas for the national parks. It is a requirement that GMA management plans should be prepared to enhance biodiversity conservation, viability, law enforcement, revenue collection and utilisation, research, etc.

During the plenary session questions were raised regarding the role of the Minister in the sector; who actually issues special licences. Gaps and contradictions in laws and policies governing other natural resources with those related to wildlife were not dealt with in depth. For example, are GMAs going to create other structures to govern land, water, forestry, etc as their specific pieces of legislation require?

Even CRBS that have already been created, they have yet to effectively be involved in management of wildlife. That role is still evolving; and ZAWA is yet to gain confidence to allow for that.

## **2. ROLES OF NGOs** by Mr. Nalumino Nyambe of WWF

Scarce resources require control and regulation of their utilisation. Such resources may not necessarily fall under private sector ownership, but may be in the realm of common property resource.

The Government develops rules to govern common property resources e.g. cultural practices and access rights to certain resources and put in place, institutional arrangements. CRBs may not have the capacity to manage wildlife resources, and therefore their partners - the private sector, NGOs and Government/ZAWA – should help address such inadequacies. The CRBs are expected to:

- Manage the natural resources in their respective areas
- Form village-based agents
- Facilitate business arrangements with private sector operators
- Establish funds and manage grants
- Distribute the natural benefits equitably

Some of the roles that ZAWA is supposed to play are:

- Set animal quotas in conjunction with communities
- Facilitate and provide technical assistance in the development of the management plans by the CRBs
- Facilitate the establishment of CRBs in GMAs
- Develop guidelines and regulations in formation and registration of CRBs.

The NGO roles arise out of inadequacies on either party of primary stakeholders i.e. ZAWA and CRBs. And therefore NGOs will

- Support the establishment of a functioning, effective network
- Link the CRBs to development organisations and agencies to leverage some funds for development projects
- Provide financial and technical assistance e.g. wildlife surveys, logistical support
- Development of CBO capacity – skills, institutional set up, sensitisation and awareness raising, facilitating CBO advocacy, etc

In the plenary, the traditional chiefs contributed as follows:

Chief NaBwalya: He reminded the gathering about the age-old traditional role the communities have played of looking after wildlife. He indicated that he has a company that lost out in the 2002 award of hunting concessions by Zambia National Tender Board (ZNTB) and ZAWA. He was bitter about that, and was seeking explanation from ZAWA. He complained bitterly about corruption for “this

unfortunate development”. He went on to explicitly indicate that if his complaint was not addressed, he was not going to allow anybody to hunt in his area. He cited frequent changes of Ministers at the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR) as contributing to the never-ending problems in the wild life sector.

Chief Chundaponda: Communities have been observing the negative attitude and behaviour of tour operators with concern for a long time. The operators go into an area without the knowledge of the chiefs, and they leave an area without any tangible benefits for the custodians of the land and other natural resources. Currently there is wanton killing of wildlife because of the absence of ZAWA wildlife police officers. The presence of Village Scouts is not preventative enough. The chief also alluded to trickery and exploitation on the part of the operators and Government. This has led to too many arguments and less commitment on the part of the community to wildlife conservation efforts.

Chief Nalubamba: The colonial and subsequent Zambian Governments had no regard for traditional authority, knowledge and judicial systems. This knowledge and traditional practices, as a resource, were all along treated with contempt. In the same breath, the chief also warned his fellow traditional rulers not to act as “sole owners” of the natural resources. He advised them to just have a descent share from the benefits that accrue from these resources, or any other wealth generated by the communities. The rest of these benefits should go toward community development. He also suggested that schools in the GMAs should revise their curricula to include wildlife and natural resource conservation/management education.

During the plenary session that followed:

- ZAWA indicated that it is difficult to make progress on the 2002 safari hunting season because court injunctions continued to be obtained by interested parties. At the time of the workshop, one more injunction was obtained after the High Court had ruled that ZAWA (and ZNTB) go ahead with the allocation of hunting blocks without the Minister administratively allocating them – the issue that delayed the process in the first instance.
- It was head that if donor money, meant for community and wildlife development is channelled through ZAWA, very little will get to the community because ZAWA has too many problems now.
- Information sharing: ZAWA has not been very good at disseminating new developments in the sector to the local community. The local communities often times rely on what comes through the newspapers and radio, and this can be untimely and inaccurate. For example the ban of the 2001 safari hunting season was never communicated to the communities. This raises suspicion of ZAWA intentions on the part of other stakeholders. Under the current arrangement, information flow should be improved if CRBs are to be effective, efficient partners in the management of wildlife.

### **3. BENEFIT SHARING**

In 1988, the Zambian Government accepted participation of local communities in the management of wildlife. As earlier indicated, there were three programmes that involved local communities in the management of wildlife; namely ADMADE, LIRD, and WWF Wetlands project.

The principles guiding the development of wildlife sector:

- Adding value to wildlife by institutions

- Equitable sharing of tangible benefits to the lowest unit of management: who receives these benefits? For how long? In what form?
- Sustainability: community manages its own natural resources to generate benefits

During the plenary session, the problems facing the sector were reiterated in slightly different ways. It was heard that ZAWA staff had not been paid for four months, some GMAs had no village scouts to fill the void left by the ZAWA wildlife police officers. There have not been any tangible benefits for the community because there has not been any safari hunting the last three years. On the last issue all stakeholders expressed strong desire to have safari hunting resumed.

The community would like to help ZAWA staff get over these problems, and hope that there will be safari hunting in 2002. During the workshop the participants in fact prepared a letter for the Republican President over the worrying state of the wildlife sector.

The participants also felt that if CRBs and their communities are the primary stakeholders, then these court injunctions should not derail the generation of benefits for them by quickly dealing with them. Right now CRBs are working voluntarily, protecting wildlife. If it takes long to resolve the impasse, these court injunctions will affect the long-term prospects of developing the wildlife sector.

ZAWA also revealed that it is planning to hold a workshop for Members of Parliament (MPs) to sensitise them on the role of ZAWA for them to be more supportive of it.

#### **4. WILDLIFE MONITORING AND QUOTA SETTING (Mr. W. Chansa, ZAWA)**

Factors considered in monitoring wildlife

- Encounter rates
- Extent and frequency of crop damage
- Signs and sounds
- Sightings by safari operators

Animal recruitment rate is computed to aid in quota setting.

The participants were informed that they should study animal behaviour too. For example, lions live in a pride with one dominant male. If a quota recommends killing the dominant lion in a pride, then most likely the new males that take over will kill all male cubs when they take over the pride. Therefore there will be few lions in subsequent years to allow for more lions to be placed on quotas. It is also very important that professional hunters record coordinates where they make their kills using GPS equipment.

Quota setting should also take account of the wildlife-human conflicts, animals for baiting purposes, etc.

#### **Determining Off-Takes**

Determine the growth rates. The off-take growth rate is slightly lower than the animal population growth rates. Monitoring the animal population is very important, but it is also most expensive aspect of wildlife management. One take account of the land-use activities, the rate at which the human population increases, types of crops grown, legal and illegal use of wildlife, etc.

Some animal species suffer heavy casualties because they are natural prey for other animals. That is natural mortality. Therefore for a head of ... buffalo..., one should set aside a figure for natural mortality, and this should not be part of the hunting quota.

Cost implications: an aerial count costs US\$ 300 per hour of aircraft time. There are also human resource implications and their capacity. Different animal species require different human coverage. For example, you need a minimum of 1 person per 20 square kilometres in Rhino range.

## **CHALLENGES**

- Quota setting is strongly influenced by socio-economic factors that may conflict with biological aims
- Quota setting is an expensive exercise because data collection is that expensive. Assembly of relevant ecological/biological data on whose basis a quota is set is not only costly, but it is time consuming
- Pressure to base hunting blocks along the chiefdom boundaries. Wildlife distribution is not uniform and does not respect boundaries
- Pressure to de-link GMAs from Government operations. Freelance consultants with little knowledge and appreciation of ecological and biological systems influence and make wrong recommendations to the communities. National parks act as breeding ground for animals and GMAs act as buffer areas for national parks. There is need to appreciate implications of unclear “ownership” of animals being hunted in any given area. The law vests ownership of all natural resources in the Republican President, on behalf of the people of Zambia (Government).
- High rates of human encroachment of wildlife estate have impacted negatively on animal population and therefore quotas
- Inadequate M & E imply setting quotas with less than an ideal set of information
- Inadequate buffering of national parks has contributed to the faster rate of falling animal population. Poachers have easy access to national parks wildlife that produce for the GMAs and other hunting areas.
- Poor management of parks has a big effect on what you harvest in the surrounding GMA areas too

The conclusion of this powerful presentation was that CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe is successful because it is heavily supported with donor funds. Therefore it remains to be seen whether the successes registered in wildlife management so far can be sustained without donor funds. The presenter advised the participants to be patient and allow for enough time for wildlife to increase in numbers before recommending big quotas.

During the plenary the issues related to Special Licences were raised and discussed. Who issues them? It was heard that even when it is off-season people are given special licences, like the case that Chief NaBwalya raised regarding a Special Licence that had 88 animals on it, including an elephant that is still on Appendix I of CITES, to be hunted in his area in March 2002. He refused to allow the hunt to take place. That licence, nevertheless was redeemed somewhere in Eastern province. The Chief urged his fellows and community members to be vigilant on the ground.

During plenary the presenter further informed the meeting that communities have always participated in quota setting. During the NPWS days, biologists were placed at community level to collect information from community members, before the quota was worked out and recommendations passed onto NPWS HQ.

Although the question of benefit sharing was discussed, there was a glaring omission in the discussions of HOW the benefits were going to be remitted in future given that there have been problems associated with remittance of money by NPWS (and now ZAWA). On its part ZAWA still indicated that it will have a “pot” of funds from which allocations to CRBs will be made. ZAWA still owes a lot of money to community members using this system before the 2001 safari ban. The meeting agreed that money should be split at source for it to quickly get to the beneficiaries. ZAWA should merely ensure/verify that clients have the money in their bank accounts so that cheques don’t bounce. (The question of proportions that go to CRBs, ZAWA, Patrons and Government was deferred to the next day).

When Chief Mwanachingwala took the message to the President and briefed him on what was happening in the sector, the Republican President suggested that a meeting be called with the Deputy Minister and ZAWA DG in attendance (Minister was on the C/belt attending a World Bank-sponsored diversification meeting). The Chief responded that the Deputy Minister was new and not very conversant with the issues at hand. The Chief requested the President to adequately fund ZAWA to which the President requested that a letter be sent to him with all the intimate details of the issues they would like him to attend to.

There was a reminder by the participants that NGOs and communities present should ensure that whatever recommendations were being made and agreed upon are put into practice – i.e. through statutory instruments, policies and legislation.

On the question of apportioning benefits between “producer and conservation” communities, ZAWA will determine at a later stage. What was important now is what proportion of the main revenue goes to the communities through CRBs. ZAWA did not even encourage discussion of the other revenue streams such as photography, park entry, professional hunter, etc fees.

When it came to elaborating on the factors that will determine stakeholders’ share in the revenue so generated, it appeared that ZAWA carries a big law enforcement burden in the GMAs. Yet right now communities have employed village scouts using the EU grant for a short period. ZAWA is literally not present in the GMAs because it has even bigger responsibilities in the national parks..

During the heated debate about costs and benefits, it came to light that 2002 is the last official year for ZAWA to receive grants from Government. That could have also been influencing their arguments for a much bigger share in the revenues.

Some community members also wanted to translate the “customary and traditional rights” so recognised by the 1998 Wildlife Act into monetary terms. This was not well appreciated by the participants, going by the evident failure to further elaborate on what that will mean.

**5. Partnerships With Local Communities: A New Challenge for Community Resource Boards (CRBs) in Game Management Areas (GMAs),** By Jeremy Pope of the Tour Operators Association of Zambia

The presenter urged all stakeholders to forge effective, equitable, and cooperative relationship for all involved in management and sustainable utilisation of wildlife in GMAs and Open Areas. The Tour Operators Association of Zambia (TOAZ) represent interests of non-consumptive safari operators, and is a member of Tourism Council of Zambia (TCZ).

It was heard that the relationship between tour/safari operators and Government is over forty years old in Zambia. Local communities have only benefited from employment that is generated in their areas. A little business has also been generated for them to increase the revenue base. The current thrust of allowing communities to have some shares in revenue generated from wildlife is a welcome idea. The presenter bemoaned the fact that the relationship between wildlife users on the one hand and the local communities as managers on the other hand remain poorly developed. It will require a lot of trust, cooperation and effective communication by all stakeholders in the industry, whether through the Natural Resource Management Consultative Forum spearheaded by the MTENR, to which CONASA is an active contributor.

The speaker was delighted with the fact that most CRBs are registered with ZAWA, and were also showing strong interest in establishing regional and national level CRB Associations. CONASA and its partners is actively spearheading and facilitating such efforts. Communities are actively seeking clarification regarding their roles and responsibilities. An equally important institutional arrangement where stakeholders will interact with Government policy makers is the PRSP process (under the Ministry of Finance and National Planning - MoFNP) that is linked with the Provincial Development Coordinating Committees (PDCC) and the District Development Coordinating Committees (DDCCs). MoFNP will be working through the Provincial Planning Units (PPUs) and District Planning Units. It is therefore highly desirable that CRBs are properly and effectively linked into these local-level development institutional set ups.

Wildlife conservation and resource protection will require wildlife police officers' presence on the ground with the right motivation, equipment, logistical support and direction to achieve this task. Use of properly developed plans to manage land-use, NR management and animal husbandry will be emphasised. Currently there are too few ill-equipped, lowly motivated wildlife police officers and/or village scouts that are asked to do the dangerous work of law enforcement. The presenter was equally concerned about the high level of emphasis being placed on "early burning", without regard to other factors such as performance of the rain season, and the dry season carrying capacity for different game species. The local communities are better placed to manage bush fires since they are very knowledgeable about their geographical areas, and its water points, the presence/absence of poachers, activities of operators and seasonal movements of game. They are better-placed to harness synergies of traditional and classical knowledge of wildlife conservation.

After elaborating on the roles of communities, ZAWA and operators/outfitters, it was heard that access roads to communities are extremely poor. Operators work under very difficult conditions compared to the urban-based businesses – safari business spans over a four-month period, wear and tear on equipment is high because of the rough environment. It becomes difficult at times to be more financially supportive of ZAWA and local communities than is probably stipulated in the Concession Agreements. He asked the meeting to adopt a simpler revenue sharing mechanism, and for ZAWA to easily and quickly remit community shares for development purposes to improve community livelihoods.

He recommended that:

- Full support be given to community groups like CRB Associations to improve communication with ZAWA, and their representatives participate in the Natural Resource Management Consultative Forums.
- That wildlife management responsibilities be transferred to select GMAs for a four-year trial. ZAWA staff in these should be redeployed elsewhere.

- Operators should notify the CRBs of every payment they have made to ZAWA for concessions, animals and lease. Documentation to that effect should be provided.
- Pre- and post- safari season meetings be held so that CRBs meet operators and ZAWA to discuss relevant issues
- Stakeholders should consider sub-dividing the larger GMAs such as Lunga-Luswashi and Zambezi West (each of which is equivalent to half Kafue National Park).

Although the Wildlife Act vests the ownership of wildlife in the Republican President, the presenter appealed for more clarity on who actually “owns” and “manages” animals. He argued that stakeholders should undergo a complete change in mindset regarding the wildlife resource. There is need for stakeholders to be more transparent and supportive of partnerships for mutual benefit now than ever before given the rise in acceptance of democratic values and human-rights based approaches to tackling social-economic development issues.

#### 7. **Entrepreneurial opportunities in Game Management Areas** By Mr. T. Mushingi

The paper set out the theoretical aspects of entrepreneurship – it being for individuals who are risk takers, opportunity seekers, etc. The mechanism for selecting business opportunities was elaborated on, and the factors (market size, return on investment, source of inputs, qualified HR availability, infrastructure, etc) that should be taken into account when evaluating a business opportunity (and not merely a business possibility).

The presenter made an attempt to indicate what sort of opportunities currently exist in the various GMAs – from low-value activities such as thatch glass, crafts/curios, honey, fishing, etc to high-value ventures such as game ranching, saw milling and lodges. The sort of support entrepreneurs in GMAs would require was discussed and the institutions that can avail such support such as SEDB or MCTI.

The presenter ended by encouraging local communities to seize opportunities to widen their revenue base. The Government is now in the business of removing “barriers to entry” into any line of business in the GMAs, and for that matter in all economic sectors of the country.

#### 8. **The Roles of ZAWA, CRBs Hunters and Operators** By Dr. L. Saiwana

The presentation brought to light the standard roles and responsibilities that are contained in the Wildlife Act of 1998. During the plenary the following issues were brought out:

- Operators should be more helpful of community needs by providing employment, development of locally-based professional hunters, contributing to community development projects, and generating business opportunities
- Operator is not allowed to sub-lease to another, unless with express permission from the ZAWA DG.
- The safari outfitter buys the licence for the client, and therefore should not be inconvenienced by going through so many places.
- The meat that comes out of the animal is also paid for, and therefore can be used as bait. It is highly prohibited to kill animals that are not on the licence, whether for bait or not.
- Villages are supposed to monitor activities of the professional hunters. They are required to file reports to the safari operators and ZAWA, and now the CRBs.

## 9. **PROFESSIONAL HUNTERS** by

Although in 1996 the Minister of Tourism then instructed operators to form an Association there has been no attempt to do so for whatever reason. Professional hunters are not happy with the relationship they have with leaseholders or safari operators. The professional hunters bear a lot of costs through provision of vehicles, spares, camping gear, etc.

The presenter argued that although ADMADE was/is a good concept, it did not work well for communities in practice. There is need for hunters and CRBs to forge strong alliances so that the operators don't pocket most of the revenue realised from the wildlife business. It was suggested that the hunters should remain in their areas of operation after the safari season so that they can carry out other activities in readiness for the next season.

It was argued that operators are unnecessary middlemen in this business because in fact the professional hunter ends up spending a lot of time with the client. Safari operators tend to easily move out of the areas compared to professional hunters. Communities were urged to aim at owning safari companies too.

During the plenary, it came to light that safari operators are a business with more investments compared to professional hunters. The other difference is that professional hunters seek employment from safari operators, and don't bring enough business with them for the communities. And in any case tenders in Zambia require companies to respond, and not individuals such as professional hunters.

On the question of unfulfilled pledges, it was suggested that pledges that are currently made by operators should be converted into monetary terms so that it is easier to compare the pledges made by different operators. Such pledges should also be in form of signed contracts/documents. The presenter encouraged local communities to closely work with professional hunters by joining the ranks of professional hunters. It was recognised there are artificial barriers for local community members to enter this profession.

Some licences used to be issued for wild game when construction is being undertaken in the areas of operation. Currently only bird licences are issued for workers' ration. Issuing of animal licences for this purpose was stopped because this facility or provision was highly abused by safari operators.

It was heard that in fact professional hunters are well-remunerated by the safari operators. They command work rates ranging between US\$ 200 and US\$ 300 an hour. It was also heard that professionals easily convert into safari operators once they have made enough savings and become employers too.

## 10. **COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM SAFARI HUNTING ACTIVITIES** (By Keith Ashwood, a safari operator)

The safari operator makes all logistical arrangements for the client – buying the licence, picking up the clients from airports, etc and taking them to the site. There are a lot of tangible benefits for the community in all forms and manner.

The long and short of safari business is that: the more animals there are in the hunting area, the more money is likely to be made through killing them. It was admitted that animal quotas are sometimes badly managed. Safari operators compete with other

countries with similar wildlife species as Zambia. And therefore it is important to manage the quota properly, and make prudent decisions as to how you distribute the quota between local clients and (classical) safari clients. How the quota is allocated determines how much money safari operators make. The presenter indicated that for a typical 7-day hunt an operator will make about US\$ 1,500. When a licence has a “cat” on it, the hunt is supposed to take 14 days. If there are two cats, then 21 days is given. It was also mentioned that a quota with 4 lions, 5 leopards and 10 buffaloes can generate about 7 classical hunts that can easily translate into at least US\$ 7,000 in income.

When setting a quota, it should also be noted that there is “natural attrition” i.e. cats eat some of the game that are usually form part of the allocations. A pride of lions eat an equivalent of a buffalo per week. Therefore natural attrition for a buffalo quota is a serious factor to consider. Also a dominant lion in a pride is ecologically more valuable, and should be valued differently because if it dies prematurely the protection function for the pride is removed and there are likely to heavy casualties among the young that remain once another male takes over.

During plenary issues that came up were:

- Operators should announce their presence, and communicate clearly what their obligations/commitments are
- Most CRBs are not conversant with the Concession Agreements. Operators should be asked to make long-term commitments to strengthen the partnerships with local communities.
- It was suggested that local communities be given quotas, and not put monetary value on such a quotas. This generated a lot debate, and criticism that such an action will merely lead to wiping out animals quickly, and no tangible benefits will be realised in future. There are just too many people that will need to be subsidised in such a fashion.
- There appears to be a problem of how to differentiate between local, and resident hunters.
- CRBs should be looking for other value-adding activities that they can undertake as businesses. They should no longer be looking forward to alms or charity from other stakeholders
- There was strong concern regarding the damage that bush fires do to wildlife estates – destruction of breeding sites for birds, water sources, winter grazing, small wildlife are wiped out unknowingly by bush fires. The traditional leadership through the CRBs should come strong on this issue.

#### 11. **DRAFT CONCESSION AGREEMENT** By T. Mushingi

A draft copy of the new Concession Agreement was circulated to which three parties will be signatories – Communities, ZAWA and Operators. It was suggested that 50 percent of the carcass should be given to the communities free of charge.

The concession agreement will be for a duration of four years, renewable for another four years.

It was indicated that there is a strong possibility of splitting the larger hunting blocks. In 1995 there were more hunting blocks than now. However it should be noted if there are more units, subdividing benefits accordingly may water down the impact of such benefits. It was also suggested that open areas with sufficient game should be considered as hunting blocks and therefore be allocated to operators – such as the Kafue flats which right now are considered as special hunting areas by ZAWA.

There concern was raised regarding the interchangeable use of words “CRBs” and “Community” in the draft agreement to imply the same thing. ZAWA indicated that community is the preferred word because some areas may not have CRBs as such. It was however pointed out that the Wildlife Act of 1998 recognises CRBs as the institutions that ZAWA will work with; and therefore opening up the possibility of ZAWA working with any CBO will bring unnecessary problems. Already ZAWA had dealt with one community where two CBOs were claiming legitimate representation of the same community members, viz; Nyawa Community Trust and Nyawa CRB. Since there was not sufficient interest to further discuss this issue, ZAWA insisted on having the word “community”, instead of CRB. May be the Co-Management Agreement will specify that it is CRBs that ZAWA will deal with in the GMAs.

Other issues not related to what was on the agenda kept coming up - such as the Special Licence that was issued in February 2002 that included an elephant. Again emotions soured up because the 88 animals that were on the licence were eventually killed, though not in the initially targeted area. The resurfacing of this issue was indication of the level of desperation on the part of the communities to stop abuse of Government facilities by politicians.

The Concession Agreements will facilitate for development of local communities. The local community members should be considered for development into locally-based professional hunters. There were a lot comments that were made, but it required a smaller working –group to consolidate these issues for ZAWA to revise the draft agreement. That was done during the workshop.

The meeting urged ZAWA to quickly prepare draft guidelines and procedures for most of documentation required for stakeholders to operate e.g. CRB registration.

The ZAWA responded to concern raised on the US\$ 50,000 performance bond for primary hunting blocks saying that performance bond of US\$ 30,000 per year (for two years?) in under-stocked areas is a requirement. Therefore it is in order that such an amount be asked for an area that has sufficient game. Such an amount will also deter “poachers” i.e. people who want to go into an area, over-harvest and quickly move out before they can commit an tangible investment, and worse still before the local communities can even get any benefits.

On the question of revenue sharing ratios, although proposals were made there was not any data to support any of the suggestions being made. During the presentation on roles and responsibilities of CRBs and ZAWA a lot of factors that could help determine the ratios were discussed, but there were no numbers and data to help qualify these suggestions. The proportion for the Chiefs as patrons was a delicate issue. However the meeting was helped by some of the Chiefs who were of the view that benefits are for the community members, and not patrons. As such they settled for 5 percent of the revenues realised. In fact one of the Chiefs from Eastern province only gets 1 percent of any revenue that comes to the community.

The proposed ratios that will be submitted to the ZAWA Board for approval were

CRBs	45 %
Patrons	5 %
ZAWA	40 %
GRZ/ZRA	10 %

Note that, previously the Government used to receive 50 % of the wildlife revenue, while the NPWS and communities shared the remainder. Now with the above

suggestion, the communities will in effect receive a lot more money than they used to receive before.

The ZAWA approved ratios will then be submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources for consideration. Even though the question of the mechanism for remitting the shares was briefly discussed, it was not conclusive and it was not captured in the day's deliberations as recorded by ZAWA. The meeting agreed that revenue will be split at source: meaning that whenever a client is paying for a licence, he/she should deposit such fees/money according to the proportions that will eventually be adopted. Such a mechanism, though cumbersome will ensure that local communities get their share quickly enough and in the right amounts. ZAWA was proposing a system of having a "pot" of money i.e. pooling revenue from all GMAs and then later apportioning such revenue to the various CRBs. It was quickly pointed out that such a system will lead to unnecessary arguments as to which CRBs/GMAs should be allocated a higher share based on their animal productivity compared to others.

There was another aspect of apportionment that was deferred by the meeting: that of proportions between what are referred to as "producer" and "conservation" communities.

## END OF WORKSHOP – CONCLUSION

In concluding the workshop, the meeting was reminded about what the suggested ratios imply in practice. Apportionment of responsibilities for aerial surveys, ground-truthing monitoring, law enforcement, training of human resources, infrastructure, external auditors, etc were to be apportioned accordingly. The communities were cautioned not to go for a higher proportion when in fact they don't have the capacity to come through on responsibilities that go along with a large proportion of the wildlife revenue. CRB represented put an argument regarding definition of capacity, and the allegation of lack or absence of capacity at community level to undertake responsibilities that go along with a bigger portion of the wildlife revenue. The different aspects of capacity were highlighted. The meeting agreed that if anything they can build their capacity through training just like ZAWA can.

Being the last day of the workshop, concerns were raised about way forward on the 2002 safari hunting. The DG was optimistic and that he was going to call the CRB leaders soon for a meeting to discuss the 3 short-listed safari operators per GMA or hunting block.

Although it was an important issue that even the ZAWA DG raised, there was little time left to consider the CRB Association. The DG was excited about the prospect of having to merely call upon a few representatives instead of all representatives from each CRB.

ZAWA also indicated that it will be hosting a Wildlife Consultative Forum, supposedly to feed output into the National Natural resource forum spearheaded by MTENR.

