Submission of written recommendations to the AA consortium (AAC), to be considered at the July 2015 WMA meeting organized by the AAC

2015.06.30, Copenhagen/London

Submitted by

Jevgeniy Bluwstein (University of Copenhagen, Denmark), jevgeniy@ifro.ku.dk

Katherine Homewood (University College London, UK), k.homewood@ucl.ac.uk

Jens Friis Lund (University of Copenhagen, Denmark), jens@ifro.ku.dk

Aidan Keane (University of Edinburgh, UK), aidan.keane@ed.ac.uk

1. **WMA initiation, sensitization and implementation:** Despite ostensibly good governance guidelines (FAO/AWF/ILRI/URT/GEF/WB, 2009) the current role and practices by NGOs and District officers (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; Bluwstein et al., forthcoming; Loveless, 2014; Benjaminsen et al., 2013; Sulle et al., 2011; Sachedina, 2008) are not promoting open and transparent discussions (to join or not to join a WMA) and should make way for consultations with communities that are consistent with the spirit and the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). This will ensure more sustainable WMAs in terms of local people's support, attitudes and perceptions of ownership. No village should be persuaded into joining a WMA, sensitization should be based on transparent information, weighing potential costs and benefits for all, and including a realistic planning for future land use demands by local populations and how these demands will be addressed in light of WMA land use planning and associated rules over access to land and natural resources. Currently the Wildlife Conservation Act 2009 includes a provision specifying that communities should be informed how they will benefit from a WMA (URT, 2009 §31(5)). There is no provision ensuring that communities are informed about the potential costs of joining a WMA.

2. **WMA management plans** should be based on actual and comprehensive environmental assessments by independent consultants, who have no ties to the facilitating NGO, the District or central government. The positive role of local people in protecting the environment and in sustainable coexistence with wildlife should be taken into account and be part of management planning. WMA management plans should be negotiated in and final versions translated into local languages.
3. **WMA rules and regulations** (land use planning, zoning, access to resources temporarily and spatially) should be made through extensive deliberative processes at village level, whereby the NGO and DGO have to step back and not try to steer the process in a certain direction (Bluwstein et al., forthcoming). Facilitation by experts (DGO, NGO, other consultants) should only focus on technical assistance to assemblies to go through deliberative processes inclusively and effectively. Communities should be allowed to review their participation and to change WMA rules and regulations at least every 5 years in negotiations within and across villages, and additionally on an ad-hoc basis if it does not violate the contracts with investors. The CBO should act on whatever is negotiated and put forward by participating villages, independent of advice by other parties (e.g. DGO, WD, NGO).
4. **Contracts with investors** have to be made transparent to the village assemblies, and translated in local languages. WD and Hunting Block investors should as a matter of course accept contracts and arrangements that include land sharing with local herders during the dry season. Investors' observance of the terms of WMA contracts should be enforced by WD and the State.
5. WMAs should not be established without a **comprehensive assessment of financial viability** to sustain themselves through WMA-based tourism. This assessment should be based on realistic (not optimistic) assumptions, conducted by independent agents without ties to Tanzanian government, NGOs or conservation organizations. The example of 5 WMAs in the Selous-Niassa Corridor shows how WMAs struggle to obtain investments and how local people quickly lose confidence in their WMA, as well as having lost access to and use of key resources in the process (e.g.Kangalawe and Noe, 2012). By all accounts there is little chance that this will improve in the short and mid-term in the case of southern Tanzanian WMAs because there is little interest and incentives for tour operators to invest there, making these WMAs financially unsustainable.
6. **WMA revenues** at CBO level should be prioritized and the emphasis shifted from more anti-poaching expenditures towards more crop protection. Financial/in kind support and where applicable extension services should be provided to (predominantly shifting cultivation) farmers without access to modern cultivation technologies (e.g. ploughing, seeds) whose access to future farmland is restricted by WMA land use planning. Consolation payments to WMA families whose members are lost to or injured by wildlife should be honoured. Villagers should be assisted by CBO and DGO in submitting **requests to be compensated/consoled** for human losses and injuries, and damages to crops and assets. WD should accept compensation/consolation requests within 3 months of the event (currently it is 1 week to our knowledge, and sometimes not honoured even then). MNRT should specify the amount of money to be paid as a consolation following the Wildlife Conservation Act 2009 (URT, 2009 §71(1),(2)).
7. **WMAs should be based on villages who share similar burdens and have equally lucrative potential for investments**: the current practice of putting together villages without wildlife and tourism investments (and thus bearing fewer costs incurred by wildlife damage) with wildlife- and tourism-'rich'

villages (which incur more wildlife damage costs) under an equal benefit sharing mechanism creates conflicts and hostilities (Bluwstein et al., forthcoming; Green and Adams, 2014; Trench et al., 2009; Benjaminsen et al., 2013). The same applies between villages whose land is almost all committed to WMA being pooled with villages who retain large areas or profitable agricultural land not incorporated in the WMA. In all such cases the benefit sharing mechanism must be open to negotiation between the WMA villages. Further, the provision §66(2) under the Wildlife Regulations 2012 should be revised in favour of a higher share of AA's annual gross revenues to be directed to the WMA villages. Currently it is regulated that the AA forwards 50% of its revenues to the WMA villages. It is suggested to consider increasing this to 70%, and to reduce the share of revenues assigned for AA's administrative costs from 25% to 15%.

8. **Tenure and secured access to dry season grazing:** any village that joins the WMA should be free to continue using the WMA land for grazing in the dry season alongside the wildlife, if this is what the village assembly decides. There are cases where people are not confident that any assurances from the state on granted or continuous access to grazing will be honoured in the longer term. WMA facilitators and district officers should be bound by law to stick to promises made and not unilaterally change rules for WMA land use. WMAs that have already been implemented without allowance for dry season grazing should allow re-negotiation of such access.
9. Any WMA village should be allowed to **leave a WMA** if this is the decision of the village assembly. The village assembly should be simply allowed to cancel the Joint Land Use Agreement (URT, 2012 §30(2)) with other WMA villages (Bluwstein et al., forthcoming). The 2012 Wildlife Regulations should be interpreted in favour of such a wish, and §37 of the 2012 Regulations ('A WMA shall cease to exist where..') should be operationalized without bureaucratic hurdles. The Wildlife Division should assist a village in its decision to leave a WMA. Upon leaving, control of the land once included within the WMA should revert to the village government, as per the Village Land Act No. 5. Hence §34(6) of the Wildlife Regulations 2012 needs revision.
10. There should be a revision of current practices of **sharing revenues** of a WMA lodge equally amongst all participating villages. This practice is currently undermined by WMA member villages favouring investments in village land outside of WMA, which results in direct income to the hosting village Member villages should be allowed to negotiate the sharing of revenues between them as part of the negotiation of the WMA agreement between them.

References:

Benjaminsen, T. A., Goldman, M. J., Minwary, M. Y. & Maganga, F. P. 2013. Wildlife Management in Tanzania: State Control, Rent Seeking and Community Resistance. *Development and Change,* 44**,** 1087-1109.

Bluwstein, J., Moyo, F. & Kicheneri, R. forthcoming. Locating the community in community-based conservation: The case of Tanzanian Wildlife Management Areas. *Conservation & Society*.

Fao/Awf/Ilri/Urt/Gef/Wb 2009. Sustainaing communities, livestock and wildlife: a guide to particpatory land-se planning. Rome, Italy. Available at ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/011/i0821e/i0821e00.pdf.

Green, K. E. & Adams, W. M. 2014. Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *The Journal of Peasant Studies,* 42**,** 97-117.

Igoe, J. & Croucher, B. 2007. Conservation, Commerce, and Communities: The Story of Community-Based Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania's Northern Tourist Circuit. *Conservation & Society,* 5**,** 534-561.

Kangalawe, R. Y. M. & Noe, C. 2012. Biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation in Namtumbo District, Tanzania. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment,* 162**,** 90-100.

Loveless, S. 2014. *Establishing WMAs in Tanzania: The Role of Community-Level Participation in the Making of Randileni WMA.* MSc Thesis, University of Copenhagen.

Sachedina, H. 2008. *Wildlife is Our Oil: Conservation, Livelihoods and NGOs in the Tarangire Ecosystem, Tanzania.* PhD dissertation, University of Oxford.

Sulle, E., Lekaita, E. & Nelson, F. 2011. From Promise to Performance? Wildlife Management Areas in Northern Tanzania. *In:* Tnrf (ed.).

Trench, P. C., Kiruswam, S., Nelson, F. & Homewood, K. 2009. Still "People of Cattle"? Livelihoods, Diversification and Community Conservation in Longido District. *In:* Homewood, K., Kristjanson, P. & Trench, P. C. (Eds) (ed.) *Staying Maasai? Livelihoods, Conservation and Development in East African Rangelands.* New York: Springer.

Urt 2009. Wildlife Conservation Act No.5 of 2009. United Republic Tanzania.

Urt 2012. The Wildlife Conservation (Wildlife Management Areas) Regulations, 2012. Government Notice No.206. Published on 15/06/2012. Dar El Salaam: The United Republic of Tanzania. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism.