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ii. Abstract

Tanzania is dependent on revenues from tourism, a sector that can only thrive if conservation efforts to protect its prized ecosystems and species rich biodiversity are taken on. Efforts have resulted in securing a variety of protected areas from game reserves, to game controlled areas, national parks and more recently, the participatory conservation scheme called Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). Yet, because, Tanzania lacks the financial resources and manpower to fully protect their wilderness areas and esteemed wildlife, the WMA scheme includes mobilization of communities in assisting with conservation by giving up a parcel of land for protection. In exchange communities receive education on how to manage land sustainably, receive revenues from tourism and aid in community development goals.

The participatory WMA model, oft referred to as a win-win solution, is explored in this study, shedding light on the process of including communities in creating Randileni Wildlife Management Area in the Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem. Assessment of participation is done using Arnstein’s Ladder of Community Participation. In addition to the results of assessing participation, the limitations of using Arnstein’s Ladder for the WMA context are addressed in this study. The results from assessing participation point to a lack of inclusion of communities, resulting in resistance to and lack of knowledge of the day-to-day functionality of Randileni WMAs. Findings suggest that effectively meeting conservation and sustainable development goals in Tanzanian WMAs requires addressing barriers to participation, with the inclusion of accountability measures, addressing heterogeneity of local communities, increased education and training at all levels for improvement in using the WMA model and including local knowledge into management plans.

iii. List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Authorized Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>African Wildlife Foundation</td>
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<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community-Based Natural Resource Management</td>
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Part I

Photo taken by author, April 2014, Mswakini Chini
1.0 Introduction

Today ‘conservation as usual’ in the developing context often includes a call for participation based in part from international donors pressure (Homewood, 2004) and issued by the state, taking shape in numerous community based natural resource management models. These models seek to devolve power to local communities and their procedures call for what appear as ample space for participation. Tanzanian Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) are one type of community based natural resource management model and the chosen setting for my master thesis study. Framed and designed as community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) projects, WMAs are established when rural communities decide to jointly set aside parts of village land that is to be protected under WMA regulations. In return communities receive revenues for social development and conservation, generated from WMA-based tourism. An important part of becoming an operational WMA is to form a community-based organization (CBO) by electing village representatives (CBO members). The CBO applies for user rights to wildlife at the Wildlife Division and after having received the user rights the CBO is upgraded to an Authorized Association (AA). The AA manages all WMA affairs and is “community-based”, since that the AA members are directly elected in the participating villages. It is the study of community participation in WMA-related activities, and in creating Randileni Wildlife Management Area (RWMA) in particular that will be presented in this thesis.

Community participation is a concept that Sherry Arnstein conceptualized in 1969 with her famous ‘ladder of participation’ used in assessing participation as an indicator of who holds power in a given situation (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein’s ladder incorporated value-laden and politicized terms, placing citizen control as the ideal goal of participation—in other words, the goal of participation (CAG, 2014). Her ladder set the stage for others to experiment with and modify participatory concepts and assessment straying from Arnstein’s American urban setting to development contexts. In the developing context, Robert Chambers, a pioneer in mainstreaming community participation during the ‘90s, focuses on inclusion of communities in development via participation (Williams, 1999; Chambers, 2007). It was this wave of mainstreaming participatory techniques that led to governments and donors incorporating participatory models into development policies, particularly in the Global South (Williams, 1999).

With the widespread use of participatory policies, also came critique and deconstruction of these models that had, at the outset sounded so promising, yet in reality seemed not to deliver what they promised (Mansuri and Rao, 2004). Cornwall (2008) and Cooke and Kothari (2001) felt participation was coopted by governments and NGOs. On the one hand, their analysis initially discussed the notions of ‘internal critique’ of participation, focusing on improving the methods for using participatory techniques. On the other hand, the authors wrote
about, what Williams deems a “more fundamental critique” (1999), examining what Cook and Kothari call the “tyranny of participation”, by focusing on how participation is tyrannical in the sense of “illegitimate and/or unjust uses of power” (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Yet, some such as Whitehead and Gray-Molina (1999), and Moore and Putzel (1999), examine the overall affect of participation and suggest looking more broadly and on a longer timespan for assessing how participation impacts political involvement of a community and its members over time (Williams, 2004). Clearly, from its inception, participation has undergone an evolution in both theory and practice and despite much remaining skepticism of participation in general, it is interesting to examine Wildlife Management Areas as a contemporary outgrowth of participatory practices.

Today, after more than 10 years of Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania there is a growing body of critical literature, yet Tanzanian government and international donors still cling to the participatory rhetoric that WMAs are a means to conserve Tanzania’s landscapes and biodiversity while providing communities with revenue-making and development opportunities despite the fact that there is growing evidence to the contrary (Benjaminsen et al., 2013; Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012). And, despite claims that WMAs assist with obtaining, maintaining and/or reclaiming land rights, done by operationalizing by-the-book prescriptions and procedures for making WMAs, the process, in the eyes of many, continues to fall short of genuine inclusion and delivery of benefits to communities (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; Benjaminsen et al., 2013). Much like Igoe and Croucher’s account of making Burunge WMA eight years ago (2007), the saga of excluding communities in the process of making WMAs continues to be demonstrated in this case study, explored here by probing into the process of the making of Randileni WMA in the Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem.

1.1 Aim of the Study

I was given the opportunity, under supervision from Jens Friis Lund, to research wildlife management areas related to a project called Poverty and Ecosystem Impacts of Tanzania’s Wildlife Management Areas (PIMA) that looks at impacts of WMAs on communities including people, wildlife and the environment. The part of PIMA concerning issues of governance is where the topic of this thesis is situated within the WMA context. The fieldwork portion of this study, conducted from February to May 2014, took place in three of the six villages—

1 PIMA project — Poverty and Ecosystem Impacts of Tanzania’s Wildlife Management Areas (PIMA), NE/L00139X/1, funded with support from the Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) programme. The ESPA programme is funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC).
Mswakini Chini, Mswakini Juu and Naitolia—in the near fully operational Randileni WMA. During this period I surveyed 63 respondents and conducted 32 semi-structured interviews with 61 respondents including men and women in a variety of leadership positions, age groups and socio-economic statuses in order to explore the degree of community participation in making Randileni WMA (see Appendix 10.1 for list of respondents). Through this study I aim to contribute to the body of research concerning participatory practices in establishing and managing WMAs and the next section discusses the overall objective and research questions used to explore this topic.

1.2 Objective and Research Questions

**Objective:** To assess the degree of community participation in the creation of RWMA.

**Q1:** How do official WMA regulations call for participation in Randileni WMA and whom do they involve?

 Todos: This is done through content analysis of Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) WMA regulations and guidelines, AWF WMA handbook and FAO guide to participatory land use planning.

**Q2:** What does actual community participation look like in making Randileni WMA, how does it compare to prescriptions?

 Todos: Answering this question is based on semi-structured interviews with a variety of members from the three villages in Randileni WMA and outsiders, including higher levels of government, experts and facilitators and then comparing official to actual participation.

**Q3:** What are the limitations of using the ‘ladder’ for assessment and how can other frameworks address these limitations?

 Todos: This question is answered in the analysis and discussion by examining limitations of the ladder in regards to assessing community participation in RWMA and by including a discussion of frameworks that might pick up what the ladder cannot.

Addressing the overarching objective by answering the questions is done through observations, semi-structured interviews and focus groups with a variety of members from inside three villages in Randileni WMA and with outsiders from higher levels of government, experts, facilitators and members from CSOs. A short household survey will also be utilized for assessing and characterizing participation in making RWMA.
1.3 Outline of this Thesis

This study will be presented in the following way: First, background and literature of the history of conservation in Tanzania up until today will be presented. Next the study site will be presented for Randileni WMA. In the third section of this thesis, methods will be presented, and in the fourth section the theoretical basis for participation and the analytical framework for assessing participation will be discussed. After this, an analysis of data based on the theory and analytical framework will be presented. In the penultimate part of this paper there will be a discussion of the analysis where barriers to participation and limitations of the analytical framework will be presented and the last part will consist of concluding remarks.

2.0 Background and Literature Review

There is no doubt that much of the world looks upon Tanzania’s wilderness areas and the bustling wildlife inside its borders with envious eyes. The wide open Savannas of the north and Miombo woodlands of the south have, since colonial times, been desired by the *mzungu*; white man (Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012).

By 2012 forty percent of Tanzania’s land was under protection (Mkumbukwa, 2008; Formo, 2010; Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012) now including 38 WMAs across Tanzania, which are either fully operational or in various stages of becoming fully operational (AAC, 2014). Current, management practices of WMAs utilize a conservation model deemed participatory by the state and donors, with the goal of filtering revenues to the village-level in order to positively impact livelihoods and alleviate poverty (Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012; Formo, 2010; Humphries, 2013; Minwary, 2009). Although WMAs are the most current extension of conservation policies, official conservation of Tanzania’s landscapes and securing areas for wildlife began during Tanzanian colonization.

2.1 Conservation Roots: Historical Aspects of Natural Resource Management, Protection and Land Use

*Put simply, the colonial era wildlife conservation and utilisation in Tanzania were externally driven – with the main aim of satisfying the tastes and yearnings of a powerful European elite (Mkumbukwa, 2008)*

In Tanzania prior to colonialism leaders and citizens had their own forms of wildlife and natural resource management (URT, 2013; Nelson et al., 2007). With their own land use plans intact, locals led by pre-colonial chiefs mandated how natural resources were managed, and for instance, ensured protection of sacred areas and natural resources, including wildlife management (URT, 2013). Furthermore, pre-colonial settlements utilizing common-sense land use plans were already forming around important natural resources such as, fishing areas, sources of water, etc. or for practical reasons such as defending settlement areas and trade (Leader-Williams et al., 1996).
Official conservation efforts of Tanzanian wildlife began in 1891 during German colonialism and continued during English colonialism between 1921-1960 (URT, 2013; Nelson et al., 2007). German colonists enacted a series of ordinances to regulate hunting and use of flora and fauna and based upon upholding international wildlife and conservation agreements (ibid). Agreements were a response to large numbers of up to 95%, of wildlife dying from rinderpest and decreasing elephant populations due to ivory trade (Nelson et al., 2007; Solomon Bekure et al., 1991). These ordinances were said to ‘ignore traditional natural resource use and community involvement’ yet secured use for colonists (Leader-Williams et al., 1996) akin to way European elites or nobles reserved access in their respective lands, to wildlife for themselves, excluding the remainder of the population (Mkumbukwa, 2008; Homewood, 2004). Enforcement of ordinances led to creating protected areas, namely national parks, game reserves, the Ngorogoro Crater Area, partial game reserves, forest reserves and game controlled areas (Mkumbukwa, 2008; Nelson et al., 2007). Presently, post-colonial Tanzania has kept the conservation model put in place by colonists. When the British replaced the German colonists, they more strictly enforced protected areas through their Game Preservation Ordinance of 1921, keeping wildlife in and people out using national parks and game reserves a the primarily means of excluding citizens from living and conducting activities inside these areas (ibid). In explaining what this is like from the excluded community’s perspective, Mkumbukwa says of this period that, “As local communities are excluded from the natural resources in their immediate locales, a feeling of alienation ensues. On top of this, the community does not benefit directly from these resources” (2008). In 1933 came the International Convention for Wildlife Conservation and in response Britain made the Game Ordinance in 1940 and the Flora and Fauna Conservation Ordinance in 1954 (Mkumbukwa, 2008). These ordinances and international calls for conservation displaced people especially from the 1930s to Tanzanian independence (Nelson et al., 2007; Mkumbukwa, 2008) through what is a means now referred to as fortress conservation whereby protected areas were fenced and people living inside these areas displaced (Formo, 2010; Homewood, 2004; Minwary, 2009; Nelson et al., 2007; Brockington, 2002; Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012). Interestingly, also during this period, controlling sleeping sickness from Tse Tse fly worked to conveniently move people into concentrated areas. Due to this, as areas became less occupied, they could more easily be converted to protected areas (Nelson et al., 2007).

In post-Colonial Tanzania the State continued using the protected area conservation arrangements colonists had put in place with pressure to do so from European conservation organizations and by tourism, particularly for hunting, which was just yet in its infancy at independence in 1961 (ibid). State-led conservation allowed for a continuation of the fortress conservation legacy, apparently still ignoring local community (Nelson et al., 2007; Mkumbukwa, 2008). In 1974 Tanzania legislated the original Wildlife Conservation Act centralizing
control over wildlife and despite calls for including local concerns, did not meet these prescriptions (Mkumbukwa, 2008). In the 1980s the tourism industry expanded to include private companies (Nelson et al., 2007) and the state increased the number and vastness of protected areas (Mkumbukwa, 2008). Additionally, with the Conservation Act under its belt, Tanzania began to put environmental concerns at the fore by creating the National Environmental Management Council in 1983 (ibid). In the late 1980s/early 1990s, the impetus to implement CBNRM stemmed from underlying reasons for including the community in conservation (Homewood, 2004) such as the fact that Tanzania lacked the manpower to effectively protect wildlife and wildlife areas, particularly as large numbers of ‘important’ species were in decline (Mkumbukwa, 2008). In addition, reduced revenues from tourism companies due to economic circumstances of the time were increasingly problematic as was growing unease of locals with fortress conservation (Nelson et al., 2007; Mkumbukwa, 2008). In 1982 the Environmental Legislation Management began to include local communities as a means of easing conflicts between locals and authorities (Mkumbukwa, 2008). By the mid 1990s, the first wave of participation, acknowledging that the community had valuable knowledge to contribute in reaching conservation goals and contributing to development and poverty alleviation, brought with it CBNRM. In addition Tanzania adopted the National Environmental Policy in 1997 and the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania in 1998 (ibid). This seems to have allowed Tanzania to continue conservation efforts despite shortcomings in their own resources and eventually WMAs evolved from the call for CBNRM in the Wildlife Policy (Leader-Williams et al., 1996).

Recognition and inclusion of community was, not least, based in part by donor pressure and as a means to meet MKUKUTA\(^2\) goals to alleviate poverty and promote development (URT, 2013). Participatory practices also led Tanzania away from fortress conservation strategies commonplace during colonialism and toward community management of conservation areas to include locals in the decision-making process and to ensure that they would have both access to and benefits from protected areas through the Wildlife Management Area (WMA) scheme (Minwary, 2009; Formo, 2010; Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012; Humphries, 2013). This shift is also attributed to what USAID calls “the crisis facing wildlife at the time” and “provoked a change in government thinking about wildlife policy and management at the time” (2013, p. 2). In 1998 Tanzania enacted

\(^2\) MKUKUTA are the long-term national economic reforms, including the macro-economic policy framework; the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, also known as Mkakati wa Kupunguza Umasikini na Kukuza Uchumi Tanzania, (NSGARP/MKUKUTA) URT 2013. Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority Management Framework In: TOURISM, M. O. N. R. A. (ed.).
the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania demonstrating the country’s interest in and willingness to cooperate with the community and simultaneously meeting conservation efforts and development goals.

2.2 Conservation Today: Wildlife Management Areas, Conservation, Participation and Development

Some coined marrying of communities and conservation policies vis-à-vis WMAs a win-win solution with the local perspective supposedly brought back into consideration under the Wildlife Management Area scheme (Minwary, 2009; Formo, 2010; Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012; Humphries, 2013). In 2007 the MNRT made revisions to the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania by stating that it wanted to move away from a “protection focus to wise use principles for sustainable natural resources management” (2007, p. 8). Though some critics argue that the revisions of the Wildlife Policy in combination with the Wildlife Conservation Act of 2009 and creation of WMAs actually serve to recentralize control of land and resources related to wildlife (Benjaminsen et al., 2013). Also, Game Controlled Areas (GCAs) present during colonial times, experienced a policy shift in 2009 so human activities are no longer permitted in these areas without permission from the Director of Wildlife (URT, 2009), imposing a problem for pastoralist communities already residing here. An AA member says that permission to graze in GCAs comes in the form of user rights and the process for obtaining them is expensive, long and technical, made easier when communities team up with other communities to participate in the WMA scheme (#25). Importantly, donor contributions and facilitators assist with obtaining user rights through the WMA process making this option even more appealing for GCA communities. Because of the issues with user rights in GCAs, communities such as Sinya in Enduimet WMA, and now Lokisale in RWMA with who have had pre-existing direct investor contracts for hunting on their GCAs land experienced pressure to join WMAs when the government began appropriating revenues from these contracts (#25; Homewood et al., 2009). Yet, despite obvious indirect pressure on communities participate in the WMA by garnishing revenues from villager contracts, the WMA the model is still premised under CBNRM. WMAs will now be further discussed in the present-day conservation context to understand how assessing the degree of participation in creating RWMA is the point of departure for this study.

Wildlife Management areas were created under the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania of 2007, Wildlife Conservation Act of 2009 and WMA regulations of 2012. The primary objectives of these acts are to: protect important and rare wildlife and wildlife habitats enabling Tanzania to contribute to international conservation goals and benefit from these natural resources, utilize wildlife in reaching sustainable development goals now and in the future, and encourage protection and improvement of eco-systems and the conservation network (URT, 2013).
On the land that is set aside for protection in WMAs, communities agree to allow certain types of activities such as hunting and photo safaris to take place. In exchange for the land they have given up, they receive user rights to wildlife translating into revenues from these WMA tourism activities. On the remainder of the land that is left for communities, community members should be able to conduct their livelihood activities such as agriculture, pastoralism, and collecting building materials, firewood, medicinal plants and establishing settlements here. Other benefits that communities are supposed to receive from their WMA, besides revenues from tourism, are user rights to wildlife, increased control over land use through titles gained by making village land use plans, improved security by village game scouts who are protecting against wildlife damage and poaching, inclusion of the community in decision-making over land use and village revenues. In theory, benefits accumulate to a sense of ownership of the WMA enterprise, and education on and realization of sustainable use of natural resources (WWF, 2014; URT, 2012; AWF, 2011; FAO, 2009). Recent literature, primarily from donors and government reports that WMAs are delivering some of the promised benefits, but acknowledge many challenges and much room for improvement (USAID, 2013; URT, 2007; Nelson et al., 2007; TNRF, 2011). In fact, up to now one would be hard pressed to find an example of a completely well functioning WMA where villagers are content, revenue is high enough to offset costs and governance is not a problem (USAID, 2013). Instead, in examples like Enduimet and Burunge WMAs, villages may have received revenues from the WMA but experience many challenges (WWF, 2014; Sulle et al., 2011) including lack of understanding of how WMAs function, lack of genuine community involvement, costs outweighing benefits received, unfair distribution of benefits, concerns of elite capture in the benefit-sharing scheme, few actual employment opportunities per village, increased crop raids and livestock attacks from wildlife, lack of response or compensation for wildlife-related deaths, distrust of village game scouts (VGS), inability to improve problems with the WMA and lack of mobility (personal observations and interviews, 2014; Benjaminsen et al., 2013) contributing to underlying resentment, rejection of and resistance to WMAs. In terms of management in existing WMAs there have also been reports of lack of transparency, corruption, elite capture and rent-seeking (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; Benjaminsen et al., 2013; Humphries, 2013). During interviews, leaders often boasted benefits despite villager complaints or suggested villagers take (self-proclaimed) futile actions to improve the situation such as writing letters to the District Council (observations and interviews, March 2014). Igoe and Croucher report little community participation when creating and implementing Burunge WMA (Igoe and Croucher, 2007). In addition, Burunge WMA experiences conflict related to land use plans that do not match villager’s needs, problems with investor contracts and inclusion of Minjingo village despite the fact that they did not want to be a part of the WMA (Sulle et al., 2011). Minjingo even claims the attendance lists and minutes stating they wanted to join were forged (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; Sulle et al., 2011).
With the implementation of Wildlife Conservation Act 2009, the management of the protected areas has shifted, back, it could be argued, toward a more state-controlled approach and at the same time, lost some of the donor funding that had readily promoted participatory practices, yet remains under the facade of participatory and community based natural resource management (Benjaminsen and Bryceson, 2012).

3.0 Study Scope

Figure 1: Location of study site, adapted from googlemaps.com

3.1 Study Site

This research takes place in the Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem in Northern Tanzania. This site was chosen for several reasons. Firstly, because a case study of Randileni WMA can contribute to the PIMA project which is evaluating impacts of Wildlife Management Areas. Another reason for choosing this site is because RWMA is situated in a conservation-dense area, nestled between Tarangire National Park, Burunge WMA, Manyara Ranch, Lake Manyara National Park, Lake Burunge, Lokisale Game Controlled Area and Tarangire Conservation Area comprised of the Naitolia Concession area, Makuyuni Elephant Dispersal Area, Lokisale Conservation Area, and the Lokisale Livestock and Wildlife Zone, and near several forested areas making it an ecologically but also a politically interesting site (see Figure 2) (King, 2009). A third reason for choosing RWMA is the proximity of half of its villages to the main road, making it accessible with limited transportation and time but also relatively navigable during the rainy season, which was encountered.
3.2.1 Geography, Ecology, Climate

The official location of RWMA is situated in Monduli-Arusha area. Lokisale Randileni WMA is made up of six villages—Mswakini Chini, Mswakini Juu, Naitolia, Lemote, Nafco and Lokisale—occupying 31,200 hectares of land (#25, May 2014; AWF, 2012). Between the time of initiating RWMA and this study, Lokisale split into three villages forming Lokisale Lemote and Nafco. Also, a village called Makuyuni was originally a part of RWMA but later dropped out (#25, 17, 8).
The Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem is a mixture of semi-arid short grass savannahs, riverine forests, and savannah woodlands in the Arusha region of northern Tanzania and experiences two rainy seasons from October to December and March to May (AWF, 2012; Davis, 2011; Msoffe et al., 2010). The primary land cover in the area is *Acacia-terminalia* woodland (AWF, 2012). According to conservationist literature, the Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem is of ecological significance on a number of accounts, notably as a dispersal area for elephants and buffalo and a corridor for zebra and wildebeest (King, 2009; Msoffe et al., 2010). Additionally, the landscapes in this area are renowned for their rich biodiversity, consisting of nationally and internationally ecologically significant, rare, endangered or threatened flora, fauna and avifauna (ibid).

Tourism has become popular in this area within the last 20 years as a result of conservation and revenues from tourism (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; Nelson et al., 2007; Nelson, 2012). As discussed previously, colonization encouraged conservation practices and was also a period of boundary-making. During colonial times, experimentation began with how best to ‘settle’ people into villages and borders were drawn based on existing land use but with the idea of future villagization in mind (Leader-Williams et al., 1996). Boundary-making, also seen as a move toward increased legibility was to be furthered after independence in 1961 and by the
villagization, or ujamaa, regime put in place in between 1969-1974 by the State (Leader-Williams et al., 1996; Scott, 1998). Aside from the multitude of protected areas described in this area, WMAs pushed by government and international donors, continue to assist in demarcating the land and have the potential to change mobility patterns of nomadic tribes (Igoe and Croucher, 2007).

3.2.2 The People

Photo taken by author, March 2014

Cultural significance of the Maasai, the dominant tribe in Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem, is a central feature of this area in additional to the ecologically important aspects discussed above. For the study villages, the population for Mswakini Chini is roughly 2,000 people, for Mswakini Juu around 1,500 people and for Naitolia about 4,000 people. The Maasai settled here in the 18th century, with the Wahehe and Barbaig inhabiting the area before the (AWF, 2012; Leader-Williams et al., 1996). As a tribe, the Maasai are something of a melting pot, evolving from several cultures which Homewood notes as “Superficially distinct ethnic groups are in large part a product of the colonial era, which tended to create separate identities and attempted to fix separate areas for their use” (2008). The Maasai are primarily dependent on pastoralism but have experienced difficulty in maintaining the purely pastoralist lifestyle, thus incorporating agriculture as a livelihood diversification strategy (Homewood et al., 2012). Livelihoods dependent on pastoralism require a delicate dance to and fro available resources, very much requiring access to move about landscapes as needed. Loss of access to land, can, in part, be attributed to conservation activities, continuing to cause reduced access to rangelands today (Homewood et al., 2012; Homewood, 2008). Dwellings in the study villages consist primary of mud-dung huts, particularly in villages where pastoralism is still important (observation and discussions from the field,
April/May 2014), but because Maasai move throughout the year in order to find resources and meet nutritional
demands of their herds, building temporary dwellings away from villages is common (ibid). Something to note
here is that Maasai continually moving can contribute to a loss of voice (Homewood, 2008) and reduced ability
to participate in community decisions, often done during village assemblies (#12).

3.2.3 Socio-Economics of the area
Maasai, aside from their cultural significance play an important role in the socio-economic stability of the Tarangire-Manyara Ecosystem (AWF, 2011). Primary economic activities in the area are agropastoralism, wage labor, remittances, trade and some current tourism, with hopes of increasing the capacity for tourism (Homewood et al., 2012; AWF, 2012; King, 2009) making it economically significant. The livestock owned by people in the area are sheep, goats, cattle, donkeys and chickens (personal observations; Msoffe et al., 2010). Predominant crops here are maize, beans, and sunflowers (personal observations ; AWF, 2012). In terms of the WMA itself, the land given for conservation and tourism is divided into the following zones: photo-safari, grazing and photographic and the private use zone (AWF, 2012). The natural resources in this area such as sources of water, wood for charcoal, firewood and building materials, bee hives, rangelands and land for cultivation are important contributors to sustaining livelihoods of the people who live in the villages comprising the RWMA (King, 2009). Many of the same resources are also imperative to the survival of wildlife and are considered, by AWF, threatened by human activities, namely herding and cultivation but also hunting and poaching (2012).

Land rights in Tanzania are under state ownership and village land is given to villagers to use through customary land rights, as stated in the Village Land Act No.5 of 1999 (URT, 1999). Depending on the size of a parcel of land, either the village government or minister can transfer land to other users besides villagers (URT, 1999). Obtaining user rights to wildlife and titles for securing rights to a parcel of land are generally a long, expensive and technical processes for which the WMAs offers an ‘easier’ way of acquiring these legal documents (AWF, 2011; URT, 1999).

3.2.4 Infrastructure and Government
Randileni WMA is off the main tarmac highway A104, making access to villages relatively easy. There are rough roads for access inside the villages, and with an appropriate vehicle, are easily navigable, except perhaps at rainy times. Insufficient access to water for both humans and livestock was mentioned several times in the study villages. Each study village had primary schools. Villages and their sub villages were working to build dispensaries if they did not already have them. Based on observation, electricity seemed to be absent except
from occasional sources from solar panels. Market access in these areas is generally considered insufficient (Homewood, 2012) but participants of this study did mention selling goods at markets in the vicinity and also as far away as Nairobi, Kenya. In general, based on conversations with residents of the area, they generally characterize it as having a lack of necessary infrastructure, especially pertaining to water. There exist two established security apparatuses in the area from Manyara Ranch and Tarangire National park with the RWMA village game scout force in the making. A few VGS have begun operating in RWMA as of April 1st, 2014 (personal observations from stakeholder meeting, Monduli District, 2014, #22). There are currently several investors in the RWMA area, but one goal of the WMA is to bring in more investors.

In terms of government structure, the figure below (left) nicely illustrates the general structure from the District level down to the village. The figure on the left refers to levels of government involved with WMA governance.

**Figure 4: Governance structure from District to Village, left (Brockington, 2008) and Institutional Governance Structure Prescribed in Policy for WMAs in Tanzania, right (Humphries, 2013)**

Upon observation and knowledge gained from the field, the government structures involved particularly with the WMA will be outlined. There is a village council, comprised of the Village Chairman elected by the village assembly, and the Village Executive Officer appointed by the Minster of Tanzania. Additionally, there are the
sub-village chairmen (sub-VC), Village Development Committee and Balozis, elected by the village assembly and acting as village, sub-village and ten-homestead representatives, respectively. The graphic above right shows all levels of government and managing bodies involved with the WMA. Villagers that participate in a WMA scheme elect at least 3 village representatives to the CBO/AA, the managing body for the WMA. Between the village and district is ward level government where Ward Councilors are situated. Higher levels of government are the District level including the District Commissioner, District Game Officer, District Executive Officer and District Administrative Secretaries. At the ministry level, WMAs deal primarily with the Wildlife Division under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The Wildlife Director handles matters between ward, district and village level governments, and the Minister of the MNRT (see Figure 4).

4.0 Theoretical and Analytical Frameworks for Participation

4.1 Participation and its critiques

Participatory approaches began with thinkers such as Gandhi and Friere in the 1960s and 1970s with underlying premises such as communities’ needing to increase their sense of self-determination in determining their own development and being self-reliant and self-sustaining (Mansuri and Rao, 2004). Sherry Arnstein fits into this first wave of participation theory and began characterizing it with her ‘ladder of participation’ (1969). As the 1980s approached and the poverty and environmental goals were not showing signs of improvement under the ‘big development’ wave, development agencies started to look to community driven development, participation and local management to improve upon development practices (Mansuri & Rao, 2004). This formed the second wave of participation and early on in this second wave came influential contributors such as Robert Chambers. Both Arnstein in the first wave and Chambers in the second wave seemed to agree that more community participation is better and a means toward end-goals such as equality and influence in decision-making and receiving benefits. A closer look at look participatory theory according to Arnstein and Chambers will be done in the next two sub-sections and in the third sub-section, the school of theorists who were critical to community participation interventions will be discussed. These sections will help gain an understanding of what participation and how it contributes to calls for participation in such models as the WMA.

4.1.1 Arnstein

Policies such as WMAs have become commonplace in development practices and are a result of a trend toward an inclusion of participatory practices in community decision-making as a means for more equitable and inclusive policy-making and development practices. Beginning in the late ‘60s scholars such as Sherry Arnstein
examined community participation and citizen power in decision-making. Arnstein viewed citizen participation essentially as citizen power and posits,

"nobodies" in several arenas are trying to become "somebodies" with enough power to make the target institutions responsive to their views, aspirations, and needs" (1969, pg. 3).

From this perspective, the nobodies are looking for the power to be heard, to be somebodies, to share power and obtain, maintain or improve agency, which can be done through participation (Arnstein, 1969). For Arnstein, the goal of participation is for citizens to achieve a higher degree of citizen power through increased and more genuine participation as a means to influence decision-making and control the fate over their resources and development.

Arnstein’s ‘ladder of citizen participation’, which Cornwall suggests is “from the perspective of those on the receiving end [of participatory models]” (2008, p. 270), includes eight rungs, for assessing the degree of participation. She admits her ladder is a jumping off point for assessment because in reality, participation is much more complex than eight clear-cut typologies and expects blending and elaboration of her model (Arnstein, 1969). ‘The ladder’ will be discussed in more detail later when describing how it will be used as the analytical framework for this study. Her work, used in an urban American context, influenced similar but different models for a variety of contexts, with models from Pretty, White, Choguill, Burns, Wilcox, Wilson and Wilde to name a few (CAG, 2014; Bruns, 2003). Arnstein no doubt gave rise to future wave-makers in participation such as Robert Chambers whose role in participation will be discussed below.

4.1.2 Chambers

Another monumental shift toward increased inclusion of community participation in decision-making and development took place from the mid-80s onwards as Chambers introduced his seminal work Rural Development: Putting the Last First and in the 1990s developed into the widely known book Whose Reality Counts: Putting First Last (Cook and Kothari, 2001). Participation in development practices was pioneered by Chambers with the view that development, was ‘being done’ by powerful, professional outsiders who ‘got it wrong’ in development and poverty alleviation and calls for a change in practice (Chambers, 1997; Simon, 2006). Chambers’ states,

It is not ‘them’, those who are peripheral, poor, weak and vulnerable, who are responsible for these problems of knowing, acting and error. For it is not they who have been wrong, but us [development professionals] (Chambers, 1997, p. 32).
Chambers addresses a need for powerful elites to step aside and make room for marginalized groups and encourages practitioners toward reflexivity in their policies and actions (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). The impetus for giving marginalized groups a central role in leading development is that they are most able to describe their experiences and thus better able to inform policy-makers and development workers of their needs and wants (Simon, 2006). Chambers accompanied this participatory approach to development with his use of methods such as Participatory Rural Appraisal offering a low cost, inclusive, alternative method for collecting data about a particular context (Simon, 2006). His participatory model was highly influential in development work and it was in the ‘90s when an emphasis on participatory approaches began to gain momentum. When examining the evolution of conservation policies in Tanzania during the late ‘80s and early ‘90s time, the Environmental Legislative Management began including communities and a shift in conservation toward CBNRM and later the WMA model, it was a time when participation in policies took hold (Mkumbukwa, 2008).

From the perspective of those like Arnstein and Chambers, ‘participation is the panacea’ toward a more equal and just world and an important premise of the proclaimed win-win approach to development and poverty reduction. The WMA model is a blending of both Arnstein and Chambers’ call for more community inclusion in decision-making by interweaving concepts as democracy, consensus and deliberation into their practices to meet program goals. Where Arnstein emphasizes increased citizen participation and eventual control within a defined model, structure or institution, Chambers suggests citizens play an active role in shaping those practices and institutions. Yet, after putting participatory policies into practice, many felt that it was not the panacea practitioners had originally hoped for and this will be discussed next.

4.1.3 The critical wave

After the widespread use of participatory approaches took hold, Mansuri and Rao suggested that “with this, it appears that a movement which had its early origins in antiestablishment and revolutionary goals that were anti-colonial and anti-modernization has been fully absorbed into mainstream forms of development” (2004, p. 8). During this period was a backlash from many critics concerning participatory practices in the field of development whom, with the mainstreaming of participation, began questioning how well the policies were delivering what they promised. Many had witnessed the failure of participatory policies or considered ‘participatory’ policies a misnomer altogether (Cook and Kothari, 2001). Critics viewed the results of this approach as unimpressive and more reminiscent of a win-lose, than a win-win outcome—the winners being the ones on top, and the losers being those underneath.
Cook and Kothari’s book *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, a compilation of critiques on participation, tactfully uses *tyranny* to describe how participation is “the illegitimate and/or unjust exercise of power” (2001, p. 4). These authors discuss the ‘internal critique’ of participation, by examining the methodological practices of participation, and suggest looking at “theoretical, political and conceptual limitations to participation” (ibid, p. 5). However, Cook and Kothari consider internal critique as technocratic limitations and methodologies. Whereas their bigger discussion should focus on the ‘external critique’ of participation, looking at the ways that power and influence, and top-down approaches to participation, perpetuate inequalities in development settings (Cook and Kothari, 2001). Hickey and Mohan come full circle back to Arnstein by calling for a return to the citizen and ‘citizenship’, “securing rights for marginalized and subordinate groups” and as a way to achieve social change rather than simply carrying out “discrete technocratic interventions” (2005). Also as Arnstein called for, these authors suggest ‘engaging in power and politics’ as a means for examining participation (2005, p. 274). Mansuri and Rao said that community based projects dominated by elites can be can be a Trojan horse for carrying-out underlying agendas of development agencies and are done publicly, adding a political element (2003). Rather than addressing ‘structural inequalities’ through deliberation or “negotiations and contestation”, using the ‘right’ techniques and methods for development has taken place, allowing for depolitization of community involvement and cooption of participation (Hickey & Mohan, 2005, p. 11). In addition to looking at the process, model and techniques used, critics of participation also examine context suggesting participation is context-dependent and by recognizing this, participatory practices can be improved to meet and extend program goals.

In Andrea Cornwall’s article ‘Unpacking Participation’ she deconstructs what participation actually means to different actors and what practices are associated with according to both theory and practice, and also Cornwall examines what typologies like Arnstein’s and participatory practices like Chambers’ seek to do (2008). She also suggests that those who envision participatory methodologies, approaches, and polices, cannot predict the interactions and resulting outcomes from inclusion of participatory practices since they are context-dependent (Cornwall, 2008). Critics of participation call for a better examination of context and ‘unpacking’ what such things as participation, empowerment and community mean in a particular setting. In addition, according to critics, practitioneres implementing participatory practices should strive to “support, build capacity, nurture voice and enable people to empower themselves” (Cornwall, 2008, p. 275). In general, critics of participation also focus more on the role and influence of those who design participatory processes and practices on the one hand and on the other hand, the role of the powerful and influential in the carrying out actual participatory process. By not taking into account such things when including participation in a process,
Cornwall and Mansuri and Rao suggest that participation can deepen exclusion, leading to exclusion of local knowledge in planning, making empowerment rather symbolic than authentic (2008, 2004). Also, Mansuri and Rao suggest that participatory approaches put more costs on beneficiaries—financial, time, and responsibility-wise (2004), quite possibly detracting from livelihoods rather than adding to them. Addressing exclusion and cooption of participation by elites, can be partially remedied by monitoring and evaluating participatory programs (Berkes, 2007; Nielsen and Lund, 2012).

Mansuri and Rao conceptualize genuine participation as citizenship: ‘Participation within citizenship situates in a broader range of socio-political practices, or expressions of agency through which people extend their status and rights as members of particular political communities, thereby increasing their control over socio-economic resources.’ (2004, p. 22), speaking to both Arnstein’s approach to participation and to that of this study. The bottom line from the critics of participatory practices is that participation that has been transformative challenges existing power-relations thereby changing underlying processes of (uneven) development. Therefore, once the degree of participation has been assessed, policies must seek to address structural and underlying inequalities within a particular context to improve the effects of participatory practices on their target populations. In this light, this study assesses community level participation as called for in regulations for creating WMAs as a step toward understanding effectiveness of participatory practices in this model and as a means for meeting conservation and development goals. In the next part of this section, a brief look at what makes participatory practices effective will be presented and then outlining the analytical framework for assessing participation in Randileni WMA will be done.

4.2 Theoretical Basis for Participation

In seeking to understand, concretely what makes participation successful or not, many have tried to described the functions that participation should serve and have come up with indicators as to whether or not functions are being met. For example, four dimensions of participation—Influence, inclusivity, communication and capacity—can be used to assess effective participation, but these are rather abstract still and would require more specific criteria for measuring participation. The table below, compiled from Wilson and Wilde, Priscoli and Homenuckm and Cogan, lists more specific criteria and functions under each of the broad dimensions of participation that one could use to measure how ideal, or successful participation in a process is (CAG, 2014).
Table 1: Dimensions, functions and criteria for effective participation, adapted from Wilson and Wilde, 2003; Priscoli and Homenuckm 1986; Cogan 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence—community involvement in decision-making</th>
<th>Inclusivity—participation by all groups and addressing inequalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The community is recognized and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process.</td>
<td>1. The diversity of local communities and interests is reflected at all levels of the regeneration process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is meaningful community representation on all decision making bodies from initiation.</td>
<td>2. Equal opportunities policies are in place and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All community members have the opportunity to participate.</td>
<td>3. Unpaid workers/volunteer activists are valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communities have access to and control over resources.</td>
<td>4. Identify public concerns and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation of regeneration partnerships incorporates a community agenda.</td>
<td>5. Be an integral part of decision-making structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meet legal requirements</td>
<td>6. Reduce isolation of the planner(s) from the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Command political support</td>
<td>7. Identify concerned or affected publics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Be an integral part of the decision making structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Build credibility for those involved in community participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increase public support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication—effective with clear procedures for maximizing participation</th>
<th>Capacity—resources provided for community to participate and support to all involved to develop understanding, knowledge, skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A two-way information strategy is developed and implemented.</td>
<td>1. Communities are resourced to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program and project procedures are clear and accessible.</td>
<td>2. Understanding, knowledge and skills are developed to support partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify public concerns and values</td>
<td>3. Produce better decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create greatest number of unsurprised apathetics</td>
<td>4. Isolate and identify extremes and find middle ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Articulate goals and objectives</td>
<td>5. Receive adequate funds, time and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Delineate clear roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>6. Generate a spirit of cooperation and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Provide opportunities to disseminate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Identify additional dimensions of inquiry and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Assist in identifying alternative solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, knowing the indicators for successful participation still does not give one a systematic way for assessing participation, which is why an analytical framework such as Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation is used here for assessing the RWMA process. In parallel to an assessment, and as theorist of participation called for, considering such things as socio-political, historical and economic processes at play in a setting contribute to understanding why participation functions as it does in a particular context and can be useful for planning and improving participatory processes.
4.3 Analytical Framework for Assessing Participation

This study will apply Arnstein’s ladder of participation for assessing the degree of community participation in creating Randileni WMA. Arnstein’s ladder was selected as the basis for assessing RWMA because it is a politicized approach to assessing participation ‘emphasizing citizen empowerment’ (Bruns, 2003, p. 5), which also fits with the political3 ecology4 approach used in this study for analyzing participation in creating RWMA.

An analysis of participation in creating RWMA is believed to be important on the one hand as participation is now more often called for in development policies and its use should be monitored for success or needed improvements in meeting development goals. On the other hand assessment is needed because participatory processes tend to de-politicize community participation through procedures which can be technocratic in nature (Bram Büscher, 2012). Assessments are needed to understand where participation is genuine when and if procedures are followed, or, if following the protocol is the ‘Trojan Horse’ of participation, perhaps stifling deliberation and rendering participation disingenuous. On this basis, there is an underlying assumption that through genuine and politicized participation, ‘emancipatory politics [can be] reclaimed around notions of equality and freedom’ (Swyngedouw, 2011). Thus, the basis for analyzing participation using Arnstein’s ladder is to gain understanding of how the process of creating RWMA allows for communities to participate and then to understand the nature of participation—politicized/depoliticized, genuine/disingenuous, and successful/unsuccessful.

---

3 Political “The political refers to a broadly shared public space, a rational idea of living together, and signals the absence of a foundational or essential point (in the social, the cultural or in political philosophy) on which to base a polity or a society.” (Swyngedouw 2011, p. 373). In essence thinking of the political in terms of a plurality, living together and basing a society off not just one view but including all views.

4 Political Ecology is a “broadly defined environmental politics (i.e., land-change science, resilience theory, environmental history, cultural ecology, environmental sociology, ecological anthropology, political science, etc.) by variously combining some aspect of the following three features in its analysis (discussed in detail below): 1. A commitment to incorporating understandings of the biophysical processes that underlie environmental change and the availability of natural resources 2. An emphasis on understanding environmental politics as geographically and historically situated (i.e., the ‘case study’ approach) 3. Strong commitments to social justice. GOLDMAN, M. J., NADASDY, P. & TURNER, M. D. 2011. Knowing Nature Conversations at the Intersection of Political Ecology and Science Studies, University of Chicago Press.
Arnstein’s ladder of participation has three realms and eight rungs beginning on the bottom rung with no power and progressively increasing to the top of the ladder for citizen control. The first of the three realms is **no power** with **manipulation** on the bottom and **therapy** on the rung above. In the second realm are **degrees of tokenism** with **informing**, **consultation** then **placation**. In the uppermost realm are **degrees of participation** with **partnership**, **delegated power** and **citizen control** (1969). The basic criteria for each rung and those used for characterization of participation in RWMA are outlined in the graphic below.

**Figure 5: Arnstein’s ladder and criteria for each rung, adapted from Arnstein and George Julian’s graphic.**

Arnstein lists three primary limitations to her ladder which are that the groups involved in participation are “not homogenous blocs” (1969, p. 217), the ladder does not assess roadblocks to participation, and in reality there are more than eight rungs for assessing participation and a blending between rungs should be considered when using her ladder (1969). In other words, Arnstein acknowledges participatory processes are complex and nuanced and that her ladder cannot capture all aspects. In this way, she also leaves it up to the assessor to
interpret participation and include additional details as needed. Also worth addressing is that the nature of some steps in making RWMA lend themselves more easily to certain ladder rungs and this should be considered when reading the following assessment. For example, step 2 more easily lends itself to the **placation** rung simply because this step includes making the CBO, where Arnstein discusses the inclusion of a ‘board’ comprised of community members. Additionally, the ladder is most useful in steps that call for community participation and has limitations when steps do not include the community—in the broad sense of the word—issues that will further addressed in the analysis and discussion. The methods for this study and employing Arnstein’s ladder will be discussed next followed by Part II of this thesis which includes the analysis, discussion and conclusion.

### 5.0 Methods

#### 5.1 Study Design

**5.1.1 Ontological and Epistemological approach to this study**
The study undertaken here is exploratory in nature as an exact research question was not developed prior to or upon entering the field (Berg, 1989), but rather developed as knowledge of the study area and socio-cultural context came to light. Grounded theory was used particularly during the first month of fieldwork, allowing themes to surface and then choosing the research questions, direction of the study and ultimately underlying theory and the analytical framework from there (ibid). A case study was conducted for study area and topic allowing me to place the local perspective at the forefront and gain an understanding of the ‘community’ and look into how and why participation took place when making RWMA (ibid). The downside to conducting a case study is that the study is not generalizable (ibid) to all WMAs but can give insight into how the process of creating them is done in RWMA and locate specific areas of interest to extend to other WMAs. A positivist approach was used in this study for collecting and presenting household surveys data simply by measuring whether or not respondents knew about and were involved in making RWMA and presenting responses as a reflection of facts without interpretation (Krauss, 2005). The underlying assumption with this approach is that answers reflect a greater truth (Krauss, 2005) and that reality stays the same (Berg, 1989). On the other hand, a constructivist approach was taken for collecting interview data and in observations because this approach considers reality to be dynamic, allowing for consideration of socio-cultural, historic and economic factors resulting in the inclusion of a range of perceptions on participation, attached meaning and interactions when making RWMA, to be reflected (ibid). As called for amongst scholars of various disciplines, situating my approach and personal biases to this study is important for understanding the overall approach to this study.
(Bailey, 2007; Angelsen et al., 2012; Chambers, 1983; Cooke and Kothari, 2001). To this end the case study and constructivist approaches utilized in this study, allow me to acknowledge my role in interpreting the data and to express my underlying assumptions, knowledge and understanding of the setting (ibid). One of the lenses I chose to view this study through is that of political ecology where human-environmental interactions are explored, including political and social aspects pertaining to the environment and natural resource management (Goldman et al., 2011). Through this approach, an underlying normative assumption is that there should be an emphasis on, and commitment to, equality and justice in environmental interventions (Goldman et al., 2011) and in that sense my approach is openly biased.

Aside from speaking to the approach underpinning this study, there was a necessity to take use iterative methods for two primary reasons, one because of a lack of knowledge and previous understanding of the study site prior to fieldwork, and two, because of logistical constraints and financial resources. This allowed flexibility in conducting the study, which I was thankful for in the end particularly because of unanticipated events (e.g., the rainy season, buses letting us off in the wrong villages and malaria), allowing methods to be reworked and refined as needed.

5.2 Field Work Overview

Fieldwork was conducted between February 15th and May 1st 2014. The first month of fieldwork was conducted in Enduimet WMA and in Arusha, having interviews with NGOs, lawyers and other CSOs. Fieldwork conducted in Enduimet was centered on the issue of changes in mobility from enclosures yet two conspicuous themes began to emerge during this first month of data collection. High human costs experienced from villagers living in and adjacent to conservation areas and the issue of prior consent and participation in creating, implementing and managing WMAs. The latter gets at root causes relating to human costs, community resistance, inadequate success, and general opposition to the WMAs. Throughout this first month of interviews, two new WMAs, Lake Natron WMA in the Longido District and Randileni WMA (RWMA) in Monduli District were mentioned but there was sparsely any literature, particularly concerning Randileni to learn about these emerging WMAs. At one point we were invited to a stakeholder meeting concerning Randileni WMA and other subsequent events pointing me toward choosing RWMA as the subject of this study.

The usual channels of gaining access to the field were followed, firstly having both a resident visa and research permit at hand and by collaborating with local institutions such as Tanzanian Natural Resource Forum (TNRF) and Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI). After acquiring all necessary credentials, permission to enter the field was requested from the District Executive Director of Monduli District. Having learned from
Enduimet the proper way of approaching the request for access to villages, the protocol begins by making a clear explanation of the research project to the right people in the district, and in this instance, permission was granted relatively easily. Subsequent to the District Executive Officer granting permission for field access, contacts were made for village government and a meeting set for the first village Mswakini Chini with the Village Councilman (VC) and Village Executive Officer (VEO) to introduce the research project and seek permission to talk with villagers. This protocol was followed for Mswakini Juu and Naitolia as well. After meeting with village leaders, data collection could officially begin.

5.3 Primary Data Collection

During fieldwork triangulation was done by collecting data in a variety of ways: key informant and semi-structured interviews, focus groups, a digital household survey, observations and content analysis. Data collection was done by myself and with my Tanzanian Maasai field assistant and interpreter, Supuk “Jeremiah” Millia who speaks Kiswahili and Maa. Additionally, working with a field assistant adds yet another layer of observations and interpretations to consider. Berg says “By combining several lines of sight, researchers obtain a better, more substantive picture of reality; a richer, more complete array of symbols and theoretical concepts; and a means of verifying many of these elements” (1989, p. 5). Where survey data gives straightforward answers, observation gives information about context and interviews can yield nuanced data in addition to confirming observations and survey data and vice versa. Triangulation was important for a qualitative study such as this, which can largely be left open for interpretation but by validating data with different collection methods, it helps to give weight to analysis and makes it a more reliable study (Berg, 1989). In some instances, triangulation for convergence was used, primarily in validating survey results with interviews, for agreement between interview data and between sources used for content analysis (Ahlborg and Nightingale, 2012). At the same token, triangulation for divergence was utilized when looking at the differences between prescribed and actual participation and when assessing data for different actor groups such as leaders versus ordinary villagers (ibid). Also, using all data collection methods together as a means of triangulation for complementarity (ibid) or for what Yauch and Steudel refer to as “a way to more fully explain the results of analyses” (2003) was done here and contributes to a more contextualized understanding of the case. Data collection was done across a range of age groups, wealth statuses, social statutes, and in different geographical areas in each village yielding a variety of perspectives in seeking to gain a deeper understanding of the process of creating the Randileni WMA.
5.3.1 Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups Discussions

For this case study 32 interviews were conducted with 61 informants who participated in either a one-on-semi-structured interview or a focus group discussion. I conducted interviews and Jeremiah translated from either Kiswahili or Maa. Interviews were recorded by taking notes by hand, or with a voice recorder and transcribing at a later point. During some interviews the laptop was used directly in the field for recording responses immediately into a word document. Participants from villages were chosen through transect walks allowing for a semi-random element to selection yet included purposive sampling in each of the sub-villages of the three study villages to ensure that participants from a range of backgrounds were interviewed. There were a few times where convenience sampling took place if, for example, a participant expressed explicit interest in being interviewed. Also, focus groups were sometimes arranged purposefully but often arose out of convenience because one person did not want to be interviewed alone or we approached a group. Sometimes, it seemed as though more information was given in focus groups but at the same token, participants could influence one another, so exactly how focus groups alter or enhance responses is difficult to know. Leaders were generally the starting point for interviews so we could be introduced to a village and get their perspective on making RWMA and most leaders were willing to be interviewed. The majority of the semi-structured interviews were done with village members, many of which, by happenstance, hold one or more leadership positions including village government, involvement with the ward council, a variety of village committees, AA members, VGS, traditional leadership positions and church leaders. However, efforts were made to talk with non-leader village members and to balance the number of men and women and individuals from a variety of age, education, wealth and social status categories. A handful of the interviews were conducted with higher-level government members including Captain Minja from the Wildlife Division of MNRT, members from AWF, WWF, Honeyguide, Pingo’s forum and independent lawyers.

Semi-structured interviews and focus groups discussions generally lasted from thirty minutes up to two hours. Interviews always began with an introduction of Jeremiah, the study and myself. The general structure for each interview was to first inquire as to whether the respondent knew about Randileni WMA at all. If respondents knew of RWMA, there was a line of questioning surrounding the process and participants’ involvement with the process (see Appendix 10.3 for interview guides). For those that did not know about RWMA, and subsequent to the line of questioning for those who did, general perceptions on village governance, tourism, conservation, human costs and human-wildlife conflict were discussed. The purpose of asking questions beyond the scope of RWMA was twofold: one, to understand issues around conservation and governance and two, to assist with triangulation in understanding if/how villagers’ experiences with the WMA or other issues
are similar or different to one another thus helping confirm knowledge and events of issues through multiple accounts to improve validity. At the end of interviews, participants had as much time as they needed to ask me questions or express any other concerns and received a phone-card voucher for their time, which they were not told about until afterwards so as not to influence responses.

General interview guides were utilized but the leader and non-leader guides differed slightly, primarily based on roles in the WMA process but also based on experience from Enduimet. To increase reliability, the general structure of the interview guides was followed, however, because these interviews were semi-structured (Bailey, 2007), this allowed for a change in the sequence of questions and for veering off topic to delve deeper into particularly important, interesting or relevant topics. Because I gave myself the freedom to stray from interview guides, my own perception of what was important, interesting or relevant for this study influenced the responses given during interviews. This also allowed participants to bring issues they viewed as important into data collection. As the interviews continued, patterns of issues and events began to emerge, shaping the types of questions pursued outside of the interview guide and reflecting the iterative approach. Through the allotted freedom to sway from guides and by repetition, I shaped the type of data received in the interviews, gradually refining the guides until they were better fit for the study case. Guides were also refined based on role a villager held (eg, leader/non-leader) and I gradually learned which to questions were okay to ask and to whom. The benefit of this is that over time I could better target topics for data collection, but the downside is that the first interviews probably do not resemble the last very accurately. This is a major disadvantage in terms of reliability but one that seems unavoidable having not known the context or precise research question beforehand. Should another researcher pursue the same research objective, they would likely receive much of the same information, but because of the iterative approach, this is not guaranteed.

Also, it was difficult to choose exact research questions before beginning the study lending itself out of practical reasons, toward a grounded theory approach by letting themes emerge. As an example, it took one month of fieldwork in Enduimet before I felt like I had a solid topic to chase in Randileni. Also, once the study moved to Randileni, had the questions been sharper from the get-go, sampling might have been more systematic and random, yielding, if nothing else, a higher degree of reliability and also validity (Angelsen et al., 2012). While looking at the process of including the community in creating RWMA was the general aim of this study from the beginning, the study rather looked at if and to what degree participation took place, instead of the intended why and how so, though the latter been addressed in the discussion and to some degree can be answered by having been in the field at all and reading literature to understand the context. Nonetheless, this study definitely took on a different shape by its culmination than was anticipated at the outset. In speaking to
construct validity (Angelsen et al., 2011), once the framework for analysis was chosen, the data, interpretation of the data and characterizations do seem reasonable when assessing RWMA participation with Arnstein’s ladder. Still, it can be reasoned that another researcher may interpret the data differently based on their contextual knowledge and/or approach.

5.3.2 Household Surveys
Household surveys were introduced after beginning data collection via semi-structured interviews. The surveys were incorporated in the study for practical reasons (Angelsen et al., 2011) due to the spatially large villages in RWMA, unlike those in Enduimet, which could more easily be covered by foot. Surveys were also introduced due to my case of malaria and the necessity to keep collecting data during this period because of overall time constraints. It proved a useful supplementary option for capturing more perspectives than would have been possible from only semi-structured interviews, yet did not allow for follow-up questions, detailed responses on interesting or curious answers, or a deeper understanding of context as discussed previously (ibid). The benefit of doing the survey is that a rather large cohort (ibid), n=63 respondents, and a bigger area of the villages was surveyed in a short period of time. We did not have a set sample size but the goal was to survey roughly the same amount per sub-village and village on a whole. Basic background information was collected during each survey and stored in a database—age, education, gender and leadership position held, if any. The survey was done digitally on a tablet with responses being uploaded to an online server. For the sampling strategy, the survey sample was chosen through transect walking routes carried out by Jeremiah. Jeremiah was usually alone when doing surveys because they were standardized—no straying from interview guides—and responses were recorded in English for my use later on. We agreed upon routes by looking at village maps, based upon our knowledge of villages from looking at documents such as the resource zone management plan (RZMP) and by talking with village leaders and from interview participants. The target population was regular villagers who were selected during the transect walks and were chosen using purposeful sampling including a variety of age groups of both men and women (ibid). Survey respondents were also chosen based on convenience sampling (ibid) —those who happened to be home at that day between 9:00 and 17:00. More family members in study villages were likely to be home in the afternoon because mornings were spent on farms and iteratively, we adjusted our time schedule to survey in the afternoon so that we had a slightly more random chance and mixture of potential respondents. Those at home in the morning were most likely to be elders, men or women
with young children to tend to. Also, at this time of year many *morani*\(^5\) who herd were still out of the village, though some were beginning to bring herds in from dry season grazing areas as rainy season began. Generally those younger than 18 were not selected primarily because they are younger than voting age and, we assumed, by default were likely not to have attended village assembly meetings or been involved in decision-making in the villages. In general we interviewed people in the *boma*\(^6\) not wanting to detract time from those working in the *shamba*\(^7\). If there were multiple family members living at one homestead\(^8\) we chose one man and one woman, or alternatively, if we interviewed two people at one location, each had to live in a different homestead, which we confirmed before beginning the survey. Additionally, GPS coordinates were collected alongside surveys to understand the spatial relevance of interviews and make sure we were working according to transect routes and covering a wide area. The questions can be viewed in Appendix 10.4 and survey questions closely followed a similar structure as the semi-structured interview guides by asking questions pertaining to knowledge of WMAs, RWMA, village governance, tourism and wildlife, especially HWC. To make the survey more reliable and representative, a better sampling procedure could have taken place. For example choosing the sample randomly from the village register, as the PIMA study does, might have yielded a more representative sample but at the same time could require more resources to execute this strategy and collect data. Since the survey was developed out of necessity, there was little time to develop complex sampling

\[5\] *Morani* in Maasai culture are warriors—boys old enough to have been circumcised but young enough not to be married or have their own homestead. Additionally, in generally, people younger than 30, men and women alike, are not considered adults.

\[6\] A *boma* (Kiswahili), also called *enkang* (Maa) is a mud-dung dwelling used for living.

\[7\] *Shamba* is Kiswahili for farm.

\[8\] Homestead or household “refers to the Maasai entity of an *olmarei* within the homestead, that is, one household head with his or her dependents, which may include, in the case of male-headed households, more than one wife and her children and grandchildren, parents and dependent siblings, as well as non-related individuals who reside with the family and depend on them for food in return for assistance with household chores (most commonly herding). Customarily each wife builds a small home for herself, her children, and the occasional presence of her husband.”


methods. If the study were to be done again utilizing a household survey, efforts to choose a random sample would be taken to ensure a representative sample.

5.3.3 Observations
Observing was a useful means for collecting data in situations where talking did not occur or when translating was not possible. A great deal of observations and my thoughts surrounding them were noted in my field log and later transcribed, reflected upon and incorporated when interpreting or for providing context in such things as this thesis. Additionally, observations were done in meetings again, where language, since I only speak a few words of Kiswahili and Maa, was a limitation. Observation was employed at times of simply watching and trying to understand a culture that I had no previous exposure to and included looking at the setting where things were taking place, the type of clothing people were wearing, what homesteads looked like, smells, who spoke, who did not speak, who was present and who was not giving clues about the culture and socio-economic status. As an example, if a woman in a homestead was approached while men were present, women had to ask permission to be interviewed or men would insist on being present, likely changing the responses women gave. Through observation I could also take in reactions to me, as an outsider and researcher, and incorporate such things into understanding the context and my role in the setting. Also, through observation customs and taboos were brought to light, like the implications of accepting (or not) chai, a chair, or anything else offered, and also learning what things could be said to whom and how. Observation, in retrospect, adds quite some depth to the study, approach, interview sessions and general understanding of the context and for which spending first a month in Enduimet to take in similar scenes, helped immensely when beginning work in Randileni.

5.3.4 Secondary Data Collection and General Analysis
For analyzing household surveys, the data was extrapolated to spreadsheets and basic descriptive statistics were calculated. This involved compiling the number of answers of each type for a question, calculating percentages and rendering graphs based on answers to questions to present data.

In analyzing interview data prior to deciding to focus solely on the degree of participation in making RWMA, data was initially coded and logged in spreadsheets for prominent themes adhering to a grounded theory method. From interviews the following predominant themes emerged: participation, information, expertise, politics and gender and age. After contemplating the results of initial coding and through discussions with my supervisor, the a decision was made to focus on participation in making Randileni WMA.
In order to compare prescribed and actual participation, content analysis was done to extract data on official calls for participation by using Arnstein’s ladder to assess official United Republic of Tanzania documents in addition to FAO and AWF guides for making WMAs. Non-governmental documents were utilized as a means for cross-referencing Ministry documents for similar content on participation and regulations. Additionally, NGOs facilitate in making WMAs so it seemed appropriate to include their references guides as well, even though they are largely based Ministry documents. For content analysis, first the process to creating WMAs was identified by reviewing the literature and making sure all steps were understood and in agreement. Next, tables were created for each step and actors and their roles were identified (see Appendix 0) and the role was characterized according Arnstein’s ladder. As an example, once a WMA has been accepted and a land use plan must be made, in the **MNRT WMA regulations** 2012, under part IV, section 30-1, the regulation states that

*The Village Council shall prepare a Land Use Plan in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Land Use Planning Act (2012, p. 21)*

The **MNRT procedural guidelines**, part 3 states:

*Procedures for the designation of WMAs state: Before an area is designated as a Wildlife Management Area, the following procedures have to be followed: A Land Use Plan approved by the Village Assembly (2003, p. 12)*

The **AWF handbook**, module 3 states:

*Who is involved in making village land-use plan? Land-use planning should involve everyone in the community. Villagers make the main decisions, but they will be guided along the way by district administrations, facilitating agencies, and other specialists (lawyers, scientists, professional planners, etc. (AWF, 2011, p. 12)).*

In the **FAO Guide to Participatory Land Use Planning** Module 4 for the same step as above states:

*In consultation with the community, the AA will create a land-use plan (FAO, 2004, module 4).*

From the text, identifying actors with a role in this step is done by making a list of those named as responsible for contributing—everyone, the community, the AA, the village council, village assembly, district administrators, facilitating agencies and other specialists. Then, the roles would be further scrutinized and interpreted to try to understand what responsibilities or opportunities to participate come with identified roles. Once actors and roles have been identified, then these can be applied to Arnstein’s ladder. The community, in this study considered the village assembly, can be placed under **consultation**—from the texts, citizens approve plans, make the main decisions but are guided by experts and governments, the community is consulted, but the AA
creates the land-use plan. There is no real assurance community input is incorporated into the plan but citizens can ‘participate in participation’. These extractions from the text paired with contextual knowledge allow such characterizations to be made. Citizens do not appear to have real bargaining power in making these plans though they can give input and approve them. Sometimes if the exact terminology for characterizing a step was not included with ‘the ladder’ either tacit meaning of the words which name the rung were used or working backwards by figuring out which rung a process was not on, helped to classify participation.

Admittedly, it is difficult to assess the steps according to regulations ex post fieldwork in an unbiased way because knowledge of what happens on the ground is difficult to overlook entirely. Had the research objective been clear prior to fieldwork, it might have been beneficial, as in less bias, to do the content analysis ex ante fieldwork. Additionally, this would also have made data collection more tailored to the framework and criteria. On the other hand, perhaps this would have made it so that answers were molded to fit the framework instead of using a broader range of perspectives from which to understand and interpret the WMA process. At any rate, each step in the process and related components were analyzed in the same fashion as the example above.

Supplemental documents include a collection of NGO/CSO/GO reports, legal documents, academic journals, books, newspapers, website content, and any other written or media content either found by the author or acquired from NGOs, government and were used, generally for context, understanding and validation or invalidating information in the analysis.

A similar method was used for analyzing the interview responses as for content analysis also using Arnstein’s Ladder of participation. For each step, participants’ responses to interview questions were analyzed and as with content analysis, the process was followed and actors and roles were teased out of interview responses for each step. Analyzing all the interviews is slightly more complex because there are so many responses and a broad range of answers to interpret and categorize but using spreadsheets and taking notes helped to organized the data. For analysis, I first read through interviews and tried to get a general feel of villagers’ responses and understand what they were expressing about a step for an initial categorization —did they know about it, approve disagree, etc. Below is an example of how interview data was analyzed using the same example of creating village land use plans (VLUP) as with the example for content analysis. Then interpretation was done in a logical way—for example, if respondents knew nothing about creating VLUPs, then that would indicate that they were not included in the process despite official regulations calling for their participation leading to one categorization. If villagers were involved in a process, then their perception of how they were involved was scrutinized, along with contextual knowledge and interpreted, leading to another type of categorization. By identifying trends in responses, I would use quotes to illustrate and support them while
trying to present the range of perspectives when they were present, by grouping responses as best I could. For example in regards to VLUPs, several villagers had similar sentiments toward land use planning as the villager quoted here expresses:

To me, as Maasai, it feels like we are just left to hang, we have no place. We don’t have any rights with the new land use plan. People who have rights are educated and leaders and they don’t have to struggle. Others have to struggle. The only people who seem they have rights are leaders and educated people. Because to them wildlife are more important than people (uneducated) and livestock. We can find our land is sold and areas have been taken without being informed (#13).

Passages such as these were interpreted to match other responses which revealed similar sentiments: the man was not involved in making the VLUP and does not agree with the way or basis upon which it was made which was implied by him saying villagers do not have rights under the VLUP, that land was sold without being informed and that the educated and leaders sell land and have rights. To me this indicates that leaders and educated were the involved and influential when making land use plans, or selling land without informing villagers, and villagers felt excluded. Further, the man is upset by the premise upon which the VLUPs were based—highly valued wildlife. This interpretation was then plugged into Arnstein’s ladder and characterized as informing based on ladder criteria—one-way communication, little opportunity to influence design, intimidation by prestige of officials. This interpretation however, also includes my tacit knowledge of the context and overall approach to the research, both contributing to the fact that interpretation in unbiased way has probably been impossible. To the best of my ability, I have used this process of analysis to accurately represent villagers’ views and opinions in interpretation and analysis.

5.4 Ethical Considerations

There were several ethical considerations considered during this study. Confidentiality and anonymity were important factors. Firstly, prior to conducting an interview or survey, my field assistant, Jeremiah, and I explained the purpose of our research and how it would be used, then, subsequent to introductions, we asked for verbal consent. Those with extensive field experience in this setting instructed us beforehand, that verbal consent would be sufficient. We allowed time for our respondents to ask questions both before and after the interview and to give any feedback as they saw fit. We made sure to give ample time for answering questions, taking into consideration pertinent feedback. The most frequent post-interview question from participants, summarized below, was along the lines of:
So many researchers have come to this village and interviewed us about problems, and nothing changes. We gave you our time, what will we get? How will you use our information? How will this change anything?

In general my response was that I am a student researcher without many resources but that I intended to contribute to the body of research that reports on the good and bad of WMAs in an effort to make policies more people-friendly. I tried to make no promises about what this study could do but did say that I would try to get copies of the research to those who asked for it (another common question—“how can we get a copy of your report”). Many people asked how WMAs work and I tried to give the most by-the-book responses to avoid creating problems for villagers. Other frequent comments were along the lines of “you researchers have nothing better to do with your time” OR “please tell people about the problems and concerns we’ve shared with you”. As much as I can I would like to give a voice to villager concerns but recognize the limitations of my research and this was something I tried to convey to the people who generously gave me their time. These questions were also a difficult thing to reconcile with because I really want(ed) to help but often felt helpless. It was particularly difficult when people had expressed trying many outlets to be heard but to no avail. In this way, wanting to ‘fight’ for justice with and on behalf of villagers shaped interviews and data collection.

In order to ensure anonymity in my research I did not take names of participants but recorded only their ages and village name, later coding this information with a respondent and interview number so that surveys and interviews cannot be traced back to any particular individual or homestead. Throughout the study I collected GPS coordinates for each respondent, and have stored this information separately from responses given by participants, further protecting their identity.

5.5 Limitations

As a researcher there is always a concern about accuracy and strategic responses from participants in data collection (Angelsen et al., 2011). Respondents can choose a strategic response over being open and honest for a variety of reasons such as fear their identity being revealed or feeling their answer is ‘not good enough’, etc. In order to encourage open and honest responses from participants, we made sure to emphasize anonymity, gave them ample time and remained fully engaged during interviews. Time limitations were often an issue because participants have many daily activities to attend to.

Nearly all of our respondents spoke only Maa, and my field assistant, Jeremiah, utilized Kiswahili when possible. Since I do not speak either language but a few words, it was imperative to find a field assistant who would translate both my questions and participant responses as closely as possible. Though, I do believe my field assistant translated quite accurately, some of his personal convictions, biases and taboos did causes some
obvious ‘filtering’ at times and this was taken into consideration when apparent or when subsequent discussions between us could clarify that ‘filtering’ took place. Furthermore, and quite interestingly, we had many discussions about how educated and ‘elite’ Maasai are sometimes considered as turning their backs on traditional Maasai. This was something my field assistant had a personal awareness about and took into consideration when he was in villages and addressing participants. Finally, though I believe we communicated quite well, miscommunication and instances of ‘lost in translation’ did occur though we tried our best to mitigate this.

Along these lines, I bring my personal biases and perspectives into the field. Not least, I am a female, mzungu outsider, which has the potential to affect the dynamic between participant and researcher in both perceivable and unperceivable ways. Additionally, I am from and have been educated by both American and European traditions and though I can have awareness about it, it cannot be ‘unwoven’ from my personal fabric. In that respect, this has undoubtedly influenced how I have constructed this study, questions for participants, my reactions and responses during interviews, and any conscious or unconscious underlying agendas of mine. Also, through utilizing a political ecology approach where the people are at the center to this analysis, it is still me as an ‘educated outsider’ leading the study, asking questions and analyzing data, therefore, in that regard reproducing relationships formed between respondents and the researcher.

Because of both time and money but also due to the spatially large villages in Randileni WMA, I moved with the PIMA research team when possible, could only get to three of the six villages in Randileni WMA and could not get to every area of the villages I did go to, but tried to account for these factors as best as I could. Luckily, I also received a grant late in my fieldwork and was able to hire a car and driver to cover more ground and improve data collection.

This study took place during the rainy season and though it did not present major problems, it was a deciding factor in choosing villages closer to the main road in order to avoid having to spend again, time and money, fishing the research vehicle out of the mud. On extremely muddy days, this prevented access to parts of villages by car or foot and contributed to less data collection and re-thinking of methods used.

5.6 Methodological Reflections: Too Soon to Tell

Worth briefly touching on is the idea that some feel pro-poor and participatory policies and their effects should be assessed over a longer time scale (Williams, 2004). If participation does not appear to reach benchmarks set forth during initiation of interventions, changes might instead be revealed with an impact assessment over a longer time period. Williams discusses how Whitehead and Gray-Molina view short-term assessments as a
better indicator of how ‘technocratic’ process in these policies are functioning (2004). On the other hand, Whitehead and Gray-Molina further this by saying that when looking for causal links of the impacts of participatory policy, “that developing the political capacity of the poor is a long-term enterprise” that can be “lengthy and indirect”, requiring a long-term commitment to monitoring and assessing policies and processes implemented (1999). Some researchers claim that the nature of donors’ and facilitators’ involvement with CBNRM is to fund short-term projects rather than committing in the long-term (Nelson et al., 2007; Moore and Putzel, 1999), which could have implications for implementation, monitoring and assessment of interventions. Though, the reality is that long-term assessments and comparisons of case studies present their own challenges in terms of resources and logistics. In regards to monitoring and WMAs, WMAs have been around for less than two decades; by-default critics of these interventions have only been able to conduct relatively short-term analyses of impacts. Perhaps it would be more apt to frame analyses up to now, as short-term or as baseline studies, which would incorporate a consideration of the fact that longer-term effects of interventions on communities may evolve and or manifest themselves differently over time—for better or for worse. Nonetheless, if long-term assessments and monitoring are included in project design, it would allow for a more accurate assessment of long-term effects of CBNRM (Ribot, 2004) but also encourage practitioner accountability and better planning, by keeping project designers invested in their projects (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).
PART II

The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it –Henry David Thoreau (1849)

6.0 Analysis

6.1 The Process of becoming a WMA

Figure 6: 6 steps to becoming a WMA

Given the legal and technical nature of creating WMAs, not to mention high cost, following these procedures requires a certain level of know-how, previous exposure to the process and cash-flow in order to successfully create a WMA (FAO, 2009; AWF, 2011) Because of the ‘nature of the beast’, so to speak, villages interested in joining a WMA require assistance throughout the process. There are certain criteria that must be met in order for a village to join a WMA. First, Villages must group together to create a WMA and be outside of core protected areas, on village land and have natural resources that are important for supporting WMA activities—namely tourism from hunting and photo safaris. The villages interested in joining the WMA have to create have to create a Joint Village Land Use Agreement. When these criteria are met, a village can start the WMA process (URT, 2013).

Once a community has expressed interest in forming a WMA, Step 1 is when the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism calls upon facilitating agencies, generally NGOs such as World Wildlife Fund (WWF) or African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) to assist along the way beginning with sensitization. Additionally, the Wildlife Division conducts an assessment of natural resources. After the community has been introduced to idea, Step 2

6 AWF facilitated in the making of Randileni WMA so this organization will be referred to in these steps.
is when it decides to accept or reject a WMA and if it accepts, the villages establish a representative body known initially as a community based organization (CBO). The CBO now represents the community for any decision made regarding the WMA and is accountable to the villages by means of elections of CBO representatives. In order for the CBO to become an official authorized association (AA) that holds user rights to wildlife, several documents are needed and they must be created in Step 3. Documents required to apply for official AA status are a WMA constitution, village land use plan (VLUP), resource zone management plan (RZMP), and a WMA information sheet. The constitution includes by-laws outlining access to natural resources and restrictions such as needing a permit to cut wood from live trees or collect medicinal plants. The VLUP describes how the village land will now be used under the WMA, for example where grazing is allowed or restricted. The RZMP includes all villages of the WMA and zoned areas for different uses such as consumptive tourism, photo tourism and grazing. Regulations require all documents to include community input as well as expert advice and assistance with compiling documents. Once all documents are in order, the CBO is able to apply for official WMA status and step 4 is when the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism decides if the CBO and WMA are granted official status. Step 5 is when the AA finds investors for the WMA. Step 6 is when the WMA begins officially operating as a WMA and continual monitoring and managing of natural resources must be done in addition to distribution of revenues (URT, 2012).

6.2 Getting on Arnstein’s Ladder
This portion of the thesis deals with assessing participation for the process of creating a WMA. For each step in the process for creating WMAs, first official regulations will be assessed answering research question one. Then actual participation when creating the WMA will be assessed and a comparison of the official to actual participation will be done, answering research question two. Arnstein’s ladder of participation will be used for characterizing participation in each of the steps for the process of creating the WMA. An important point to reiterate is that Randileni WMA was still at step five out of six at the time of this field work, thus not yet fully operational and thus reflected in the analysis.

Additionally, at the time of this writing (July 2014), two key informants in Randileni have shared information explaining that RWMA is experiencing resistance from villagers in three of the six RWMA villages which also happen to be the study villages for this project. The conflict has been going since late June 2014 and police force has been used in an attempt to stop villager resistance. It appears the conflict has arisen due to villagers’ discontentment with new demarcations and grazing restrictions in particular. Two rounds of negotiations, first high level and village level government, have been attempted but villagers are refusing negotiations. Four offices remain closed due to the conflict—the three village offices and Mswakini Chini Ward office. Traditional
leaders from Mswakini are reportedly in police custody. During the analysis it will be seen that, despite calls for community-level participation, the RWMA process is not genuinely inclusive when villagers have the opportunity to participate at all, leaving villagers feeling excluded from the process and creating underlying tension manifested in such ways as the current resistance to Randileni WMA.

6.2.1 Pre-Sensitization

Criteria for joining a WMA: Villages must group together to create a WMA and be outside of core protected areas, on village land and have natural resources that are important for supporting WMA activities—namely tourism from hunting and photo safaris. In order for step 1 to take place, a village must have previously expressed interest in joining a WMA to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. If these criteria are met, then a village can proceed to step 1 (URT, 2012).

Prior to the WMA, one of the Randileni communities, Lokisale village that has now split into Nafco, Lemote and Lokisale, several accounts from interviews claim the village had its own consumptive tourism contracts (#1, 8, 17, 25,) and were making revenues. Lokisale had the largest portion of land for the WMA and used to be part of a Game Controlled Area (GCA). These activities can be thought of as what Choguill refers to as ‘self-management’ whereby villages manage their own activities without the intervention of higher authorities (1996). Once the GCA policy changed with the revision of the Wildlife Conservation Act 2009, people were no longer supposed to graze or collect needed materials for everyday sustenance inside these areas without permission from the Wildlife Division, and gaining permission is supposedly easier with a village land use plan10 (#25). With revisions to the Wildlife Conservation Act, the government started pushing implementation of WMAs in GCAs so that those living inside could secure land rights and stay within their village land. During this time the government started garnishing village revenues from independent tourism contracts, much like Sinya in Enduimet (interviews with Sinya village government leaders, March 2014; Benjaminsen et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2007; Homewood et al., 2009). To reclaim revenues from tourism and hunting, Lokisale was pressured to accept the WMA but under the caveat that they must join with other villages to do so. Thus, Lokisale was compelled to encourage other villages to join the WMA to keep revenues flowing in and get user rights to wildlife in the village (#1, 8).

10 Official rhetoric is to keep human encroachment at bay, thus WMAs serve a double purpose allowing in-GCA communities to obtain user rights—normally too expensive for a community to do on their own. But also, establishing WMAs in GCAs avoids the costly eviction conundrum the government would otherwise face for in-GCA communities (#25)
The other impetus to create the RWMA began with the Minister calling a meeting in Dodoma to educate ward councilors on WMAs and councilors subsequently took the WMA idea to lower levels of government, and finally the community\textsuperscript{11} during step 1 (see figure below). Leaders were given a ‘WMA education’ through a series of seminars, field trips and meetings (#1, 8, 10, 11, 17, 26) and village and ward level governments were told, “If you stop accepting WMA, actually your land will already be in danger because land has already been taken and they are trying to give titles” (#17). Threat of land being taken was one method of persuading leaders to bring the WMA idea to their communities. Minutes demonstrating village assembly support for the WMA must accompany the request (#28); yet, no villager mentioned participating in WMA meetings prior to sensitization.

\textbf{Figure 7: How the idea to start a WMA makes its to the RWMA communities}

\textsuperscript{11} Community here is used to described members/citizens and groups of citizens of one village and is also used to describe the groups of actors who make up several villages in Randileni WMA. Its use here can be characterized in terms of geographical similarities and does not attempt to dispel group dynamics through generalizations, thereby homogenizing groups of heterogeneous nature FORSYTH, T. 2003. \textit{Critical Political Ecology: The Politics of Environmental Science}, Routledge, GOLDMAN, M. 2003. Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: Community-Based Conservation in Tanzania. \textit{Development and Change}, 34, 833-862.. Villagers characterize a community as themselves and those who live in their village, including village government. They have sometimes included elements of culture, particularly that of being Maasai, in their definitions (#13, 15, 15, 18).
Once a request is made to bring a WMA to an area, resources in potential WMA villages are assessed by outside experts such as land and resource officers from the district and from organizations such as TAWIRI and AWF (#28, #26), a process that excludes villagers. When asked how they do assessments, an NGO facilitator responds:

*The Wildlife Director together with the district team, they look at ecological values, potential investment of the area, economic view and also social….uhhh, in terms of the social not so much, they were just like birds, looking at the number of wildlife, presence of wildlife…That was number one, presence of wildlife and also potential investment in the area. They were bias; they were just looking for those two.* (#26)

Once support for WMAs has been established and a request has been made to bring the WMA to an area, communities officially move to step 1.

### 6.2.2 Step 1: Sensitization—Prescriptions from official regulations

Step 1 is when the sensitization team brings the WMA idea to potential WMA communities. For RWMA communities this was done in 2011 (AWF, 2012). This step in creating the WMA calls for the most members from the community to participate and therefore requires ample space for analysis. During the analysis of step 1 the call for participation in official regulations will be discussed first. Then actual participation will be discussed using WMA meeting attendance rates, the degree of awareness and whether villagers’ needs and concerns are addressed. After issues pertaining to attendance are discussed, sensitization during the meetings will be addressed by looking at the means by which the sensitization team engineers village-level support for the WMA. Finally, in the analysis of Step 1, a brief discussion of breaching official WMA procedures by combing step 1 and 2 into the sensitization process and the implications of combining these steps will be presented.

The sensitization process generally begins by speaking with and educating village government about the pros and cons of WMAs and the process for creating WMAs. Based on the analytical framework used here, the first step according to official regulations primarily resembles consultation, informing and placation. According to Arnstein, this rung of the ladder is one step above no power and lies in a domain called tokenism.

Step 1 includes all relevant parties concerning the WMA—village leaders, experts and community members—taking part in the sensitization meeting makes this step appear to be an inclusive exercise by all relevant parties, including the community, as having a seat at the ‘table’ so it can be characterized as placation according to Arnstein. The sensitization team is comprised of influential members collaborating on step 1 from all levels of government—Ministry down to the village-level—and facilitators and is responsible for educating and
informing the community about the WMA. All parties involved in the sensitization team are upwardly accountable to the MNRT—activities must be done according to Ministry regulations and decisions are ultimately approved by the Wildlife Director. The village government holds two roles—one as part of the sensitization team and another as an advocate for the village assembly.

For Step 1, the MNRT guidelines for implementing WMAs suggests that sensitization in the community be done using audio-visuals, drama, songs, posters, fliers, etc., resembling one way communication toward community members and can be characterized as informing based on how the information is to be disseminated (URT, 2003). Also, adding to the informing categorization here, is that Step 1 requires knowledge of the WMA-related technical and legal language which can make it difficult for citizens who are not familiar with such things to participate. Villagers do not have a chance to influence how the WMA process is made or implemented and their role is to be present in assembly meetings, receive information, accept information, ask questions, express concerns and contribute land for the WMA (#25, AWF, 2011) which can also be characterized as informing. One AA member says,

Of course there is some paradox that I can say really, they [villagers] contribute to the process but [the villagers] don't have the ability to change the process because the process of the WMA has been set by the ministry and needs to be implemented as it is. (#25)

Elements of consultation are prescribed in the official procedures for WMA meetings because community inclusion is a requirement for the process. According to regulations, any village member can give their input freely and ask questions, including local concerns—this can be viewed as two-way communication and also a way of collecting information about the community through feedback in village assembly meetings. Here, participants ‘participate in participation and leaders can say they’ve done their part’ (Arnstein, 1969, p. 219) but there is no assurance that community input influences the process or the outcome in making the WMA, e.g. through accountability mechanisms.

Sensitization—Meeting attendance and participation
In reality, less than 10% of the total village population attended meetings for each of three study villages (see table 2 below) where the sensitization team begins the process of trying to inform and convince the village assembly to accept the WMA. Actual villager participation in these meetings is low and in some cases actual participation does not even meet the prescribed levels—50% of active community members. In Naitolia, one village leader said he could remember no general village assembly meeting for the WMA and that he would
know if there was a meeting and adds that there was only a meeting to discuss the VLUP (#19). One AA member defines community participation as

*Participation is [about] coming to the meetings, contributing [land] and accepting the logical matters from the expert and the district department of natural resources, that is participation* (Interview #25).

This quote is an example of *therapy* and illustrates ‘curing pathology’, or rather, educating villagers so that they will accept the ‘logical’ rationale for creating WMAs. This illustrates how community participation is based on passively participating in step 1 rather than actively deliberating the idea of the WMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Mswakini Chini</th>
<th>Mswakini Juu</th>
<th>Naitolia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village population</strong> (entire population, roughly half would be adult population)</td>
<td>~2,000</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>~4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of WMA meeting attendees from meeting minutes</strong></td>
<td>97, 91</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>115, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 meetings—first accepting WMA, electing CBO, second, RZMP; roughly 5% total population for both meetings</td>
<td>2 meetings, minutes only available on one, acceptance 8% total population</td>
<td>2 meetings first accepting WMA, electing CBO, second, RZMP; acceptance 3% and 2% total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Attendance numbers from WMA meeting minutes provided by village government.*

Often during interviews, leaders exaggerated attendance numbers sometimes by up to double, triple or more (interview #1, 9), despite providing copies of attendance lists documenting meeting attendees. This exaggeration can be classified as *manipulation* because it is something said as a ‘public relations’ strategy. A village government leader of Mswakini Chini says that it is villagers who hold the power in deciding to have the WMA but her response contradicts the low WMA meeting attendance rates depicted in attendance lists she provided me with. A village government leader of Mswakini Juu attributed low attendance rates to the pastoral lifestyle. If this is the case then when implementing the WMA scheme, this should be taken into account to
improve village assembly participation. Other village government members admitted that “very few WMA meetings involve villagers” (#9) and “participation is very low” (#16). Leaders in more than one instance revealed that more sensitization meetings are necessary to educate villagers on WMAs (#8, stakeholder meeting). In the broader picture, a low attendance rate paired with leaders confessing there has been little inclusion of villagers but needing more inclusion of the community in meetings, demonstrates that the call for inclusion of the community was not met in reality.

In interviews some villager accounts attested to the fact that low attendance rates are consistent with Arnstein’s manipulation that appears as a low degree of transparency. When asked why villagers do not attend WMA meetings, one response was that “leaders don’t like us to know the details of the WMA” and are not made aware of meetings (#2). Villagers interviewed feel leaders have ulterior motives when engaging the with WMA scheme. Also, villagers report having not been informed of the WMA meetings and instead many only heard about the WMA through others in the village, if at all, and many were not keenly aware of how the WMA works, despite villagers attesting to attending regular village assembly meetings (#2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23).

Survey results seem consistent with interview data indicating that roughly half know and half do not know of RWMA. Of those that knew about RWMA two-thirds attended meetings.

**Responses from RWMA Survey**
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*Figure 8: RWMA survey response about general knowledge of WMA (left) and meetings (right).*

For villagers who know about RWMA, those from interviews and focus groups reported receiving their information about the WMA and WMA meetings through village council members such as sub-VCs and balozi,
posters and letters sent home from school with children, phone calls, messengers and word of mouth from other villagers (#11, 12, 13, 14)—indicating primarily formal and some informal channels. The graph below is based on survey responses and shows that the majority of information about the WMA comes primarily from fellow villagers, NGOs, then village government respectively, indicating that the majority of information about RWMA is received through informal or non-governmental channels rather than through the sensitization team or government. When informing villagers about the WMA is done primarily through informal means, this reduces the likelihood of being properly informed about WMA meetings, e.g. making arrangements to attend the meeting and how WMAs actually function. As it speaks to the call for participation in the WMA process, receiving information about the opportunity to participate is a precondition of including the community in decision-making since villagers cannot participate in something they are not made aware of, even if the sensitization process, as will be seen, may not always promote genuine participation. This step is lacking in the RWMA process and can be a major hindrance to participation.

**How did you receive information about RWMA?**

![Survey responses about how information on RWMA was received.](image)

*Figure 9: Survey responses about how information on RWMA was received.*

Aside from WMA meeting attendance and awareness of meetings and WMA functionality, inability to voice opinions, give input and express concerns is a barrier to genuine community participation in the sensitization meetings and will be discussed through the following examples. Based on observations, socio-cultural dimensions to participation in meetings also contributes to difficulties in expressing concerns and opposition, an example of which is the social hierarchy where disagreements with those in influential positions is frowned upon, in addition to such factors as which tribe, age group or gender one belongs to.

On more than one account villagers felt they did not have a chance to adequately express concerns in WMA meetings, oppositions or suggestions for change (#10) feeling they were not heard placing this example in the
realm of *tokenism* under *consultation*—no assurance input is taken into account, but did participate in meetings. One example is that villagers from a focus group articulated that they wanted tangible benefits like dispensaries and boreholes for improved access to water but either villagers were not asked about their needs or their needs were not discussed in WMA meetings despite being expressed (#2). A village government leader of Mswakini Juu, among others, said that questions were brought from the community including those concerning firewood collection; grazing and medicinal plants where villagers were given ‘correct’ answers involving education, expert opinion or technical knowledge (#1, 11, 25). These types of ‘correct’ response can be categorized as *informing* because the village assembly is given the chance to give input and express concerns but answers to questions are “superficial, discouraging or irrelevant” (Arnstein, 1969). It can also be considered *therapy*—an emphasis on ‘curing’ and adjusting values and attitudes to larger society whereby certain responses are given by the sensitization team to the villagers to persuade villagers to accept the WMA. If villagers attend meetings but needs are *not* expressed or considered, they are ‘participating without participating’, in the realm of *degrees of participation* and belonging to *consultation*. In both cases villager input is not legitimized by power-holders, but rather demonstrates that power-holders have adhered to formal procedures, thus legitimating their activities. Villagers from one focus group feel that the:

*WMA is in place, but we don’t show cooperation because we know leaders are on that side. The right thing to do is involve us in every step. Otherwise [if there was participation] the WMA would hear complaints (#2).*

Survey results indicate that 71% of villagers surveyed, who are aware of RWMA, have concerns and nearly the same percentage have not expressed these concerns, confirming interview accounts.

**Figure 10: Survey responses for concerns related to RWMA.**
Concerning opposing voices an NGO facilitator said they can confuse many people and to remedy this they:

...had to educate those few people who started those troubles in the area. Using different approaches using political leaders on the ground, make sure they're well informed also the members of parliament. If not, then these things are very hard to push forward and also for example the MP who was in the front line to ask for the minister, made a call to Wildlife Director to make a follow up. Committed people. (#26)

This sort of activity by leaders and facilitators can be viewed as manipulation where power-holders engineer community support. Clearly, villagers did not feel they had adequate opportunities to express needs because leaders are intent on engineering support through expert opinions or discouraging responses in addition to not asking for or considering villager input.

In regards to gender, women do not have an equal opportunity to voice opinions and concerns in meetings, despite gender mainstreaming being called for in WMA regulations (URT, 2003). Women report that men will say things such as:

‘Just be seated. What do women know? They have nothing to say in front of men’. Normally men have a good opportunity to express themselves...we’re not empty headed, it’s always men that oppress us. (#10)

In addition to gender, age is a factor in who participates. The legal voting age is 18 but most villagers are not considered adults until they are at least 30 years old (discussions with Jeremiah and villagers). Upon observation at meetings women and young people, unless elites and even then, rarely speak (personal observations) meaning that there is an unspoken social hierarchical component where these groups are discouraged from speaking. One villager described that if women, young people or those who are not considered worthy of contributing in village meetings speak, leaders give them looks indicating that they are breaking this unspoken law and there can be repercussions afterward. There is also an issue of tribalism in the study villages with the divide between Waarusha and Maasai¹². Villagers reported that most leaders are Waarusha farmers and do not invite pure Maasai pastoralists to meetings (#13). A genuinely participatory process would take extra measures to address gender, age and tribalism so these groups would have a chance

¹² Waarusha were traditionally cultivators while Maasai were traditionally pure pastoralists. After tribal mixing and out of necessity in the last several decades, both tribes have begun diversifying livelihood strategies and moved toward agropastoralism MCCABE, J. T. 2003. Sustainability and livelihood diversification among the Maasai of northern Tanzania. Human Organization, 62, 100-111.
to be included in proceedings but these efforts have not been made apparent from conversations with villagers in interviews and focus groups.

**Sensitization—Engineering community-level support**

Issues concerning **land rights** are discussed during sensitization in a way that will create an atmosphere for saying ‘yes’ and convince villagers to accept the WMA by using certain techniques and language to achieve this (#25,26). During sensitization meetings, these efforts are most often characterized as **informing**, **therapy** and **manipulation**.

Frequently, **manipulation** is used to gain villager support with threats used to scare villagers into feeling as though they must accept the WMA. As an example, an AA member of Mswakini Juu was quoted in an interview as saying that the Minister claimed ‘the Tarangire border would extend its borders and they would remain with no land at all’ (#8). Perhaps to some degree this is a fate villagers would face, particularly those living in the Lokisale GCA who were trying to escape the change of regulations stipulating that people can no longer live in these areas without user rights, or must seek permission to graze and collect fresh wood (Benjaminsen et al., 2011). Likewise, this is one reason an AA member urges communities to accept the WMA despite admissions of its flaws because if nothing else, it allows villages self-determination in securing land rights and access to natural resources for the present and future (#25). An AA member from Mswakini Juu who was interviewed felt that, in terms of securing land, by joining the WMA:

*It was the best option because when we accepted the WMA we accepted a contract, and if they violate they agreement we can opt to leave WMA (#8).*

Perceived threats of land being taken by Tarangire or by other means, such as GCAs, gives many villagers a sense that the WMA is the only way to secure and protect land rights and support is engineered in this way.

Another method of **manipulation** reported was that in the Dodoma meeting a Member of Parliament was telling ward councilors, VCs and sub-VCs to act quickly to tap into the money being made from conservation (#11, 19). **Manipulation** was also used by influencing traditional leaders to accept the WMA (engineering support, public relations), telling them that by accepting the WMA this would allow kids to go to school—if Enduimet is any example, then Randileni will be sorely disappointed because in EWMA few children have received continual support with school fees (observations Enduimet stakeholder meeting and interviews in Enduimet, March, 2014).
There are also many strategies falling under the **informing** rung used by the sensitization team to ensure that the process goes quickly, that ‘correct’ answers are given to questions, often based on expert advice or conservation narratives. Correct answers demonstrate the ‘superficial information’ characteristic of informing. This example is illustrated through the following quote given by an NGO facilitator and also includes an element of **manipulation** seen by using fear of losing of land, as discussed above:

*So we are trying to mention to them, if you keep your land tight and let don’t others to come and graze you can use the area throughout the year without maybe going somewhere else because if you're moving to another area, 5 years, 10 years to come, the land will not accommodate them anymore. You will find people have fenced the area and their will be no more pastures for the animals to graze (#26).*

Another method of engineering support is the way in which the sensitization team has streamlined and tailored procedures over the years (sometimes skipping or condensing procedures) and now recognizes the importance of gaining local political support to accomplish agendas (#26). The quote below from an NGO facilitator again illustrates **manipulation** as a way of ‘engineering support’ by getting the community behind an idea first so it looks as if the community came with the idea:

*Sometimes they [the community] are telling us that we [NGOs] want to move people from their area and there are some people who are human rights advocates and we’re not supposed to move people. But if the proposal comes directly from the community, then it’s easy.*

Facilitators and government can now see that political will and villager support is achieved by having the village council tell villagers about the WMA rather than having higher-level government or outsiders present the WMA (#16). Additionally, wording is important to gain WMA support:

*For the WMA..you don’t want to say the word corridor because if you say corridor then they [think] these people want to establish another national park in the area. We had a hard time to convince people of Randileni WMA. Sometimes they thought we wanted to turn the area into a national park. (#26)*

The corridor issue is particularly touchy for villagers because they had long rejected corridor proposals. Many describe the corridor conflict as ‘one day it was a conflict the next day the conflict just ended’ but that through the WMA the corridor had been established despite villages rejecting it (#11, 13, 14, 16). This is **manipulation** where Arnstein describes people being duped into accepting an idea, only to realize afterward what they accepted (pg.218, 1969). Additionally, because RWMA is surrounded by numerous protected areas, such as Manyara, Tarangire and not far from Ngorogoro, this causes confusion as well (#13). Makuyuni village was
promised a piece of the Manyara ranch but later lost rights. In Ngorogoro Crater Area villagers saw a lot of suffering there and did not want allow the same thing happen with the WMA so many refused it on these grounds (#25). Because these areas are laden with land rights conflicts, it is not surprising that facilitators dance around such words as ‘corridor’ as if walking through a minefield to successfully manipulate the target population.

Community support is also engineered by the way costs and benefits are presented, and this aspect largely falls under manipulation as well. A full cost-benefit analysis is neither carried-out beforehand nor is full information entirely conveyed to the village assembly (#25, #26). An NGO facilitator on the sustainability and economic analyses of WMAs says:

*The issue of sustainability was not there. When they started the concept of WMAs they didn't think about the sustainability of WMAs they were only thinking of revenues. But of how WMAs can run by themselves, not so much. In the RZMP, the [calculations] were not realistic. (#26)*

This means the village assembly and village leaders do not receive information to make a fully informed decisions on the economic aspects of creating and managing WMAs. Under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ICESCR, indigenous groups have the right to ‘economic self-determination’ when making decisions about land use and livelihoods (Ward, 2011), meaning that without full disclosure of economic factors and impacts, this inhibits fully informed decision-making. Income from tourism is practically a guess at this point and leaders believe they will receive more per head for each tourist despite having to share the revenue between six villages. Operating without donor help, especially with the high costs, level of promised security via VGS, and setting aside funds for consolation/compensation funds are not realistic goals. Continuous reliance on donor support undermines autonomy of community management of WMAs (#17).

Although the benefits are uncertain, the costs can be expected based on other WMAs with similar bio-physical traits and social context. Villagers will inevitably experience externalized financial costs from the WMA, mostly in the form of wildlife attacking livestock, crop raids (USAID, 2013), potentially loss of human lives, bailing family out of jail for violating WMA restrictions (#7) and pursuing other forms of employment (observations). As an example one woman describes her experiences of crop raids from increased wildlife numbers, even before wildlife numbers are expected to increase again due to protection under the WMA. For this woman costs of crops raids result in an 8,000,000tsh-10,000,000tsh financial loss per year plus the need to re-supply food for the year usually done by selling livestock to purchase food:
Today, villagers try to harvest crops and keep the food in the house to protect it but then the food rots. Every year we lose 10-20 sacks from WL. I cultivate 8 acres. After an elephant comes it looks like a tractor came through. I get five sacks of beans per acre. A 120kg bag, depending on season, sells between 200,000-250,000TSH. (#7)

Costs and benefits are not just economic in nature but also include trade-offs and changes in access to natural resources. A villager government leader of Mswakini Chini says that the district and village leaders told the village assembly about costs of the WMAs such as giving up a portion of land and increased wildlife numbers leading to more frequent livestock attacks and crop raids (#1). In addition benefits were discussed to the village assembly such as gaining income, conserving land and creating employment for community members (#11). One AA member said that full costs are not revealed to villagers because if they were, villagers would reject the WMA (#8). Yet in reality, only a handful of employment opportunities like VGS or working at investor sites are possible per village under a WMA (perhaps 50 maximum VGS per WMA)—in Enduimet, about 40 (field observations; WWF, 2014). Additionally, leaders are in a position where they may not need to present full costs as long as the most relevant concerns of community are addressed:

The villagers themselves never talked about the challenges, they were fighting to make sure their livestock will be safe. If they find this answer of livestock being safe, then you find, yes, they accept. For women, they wanted to be sure the issue of firewood and construction materials will not be prohibited or limited. They asked, will they continue to allow us to collect firewood for free and construction materials for free? If the answer is yes, then they don't have a problem [with WMA] (#1).

One last issue that needs to be addressed is the fact that steps 1 and 2 are condensed into step 1 but the sensitization team is supposed to bring the information to the community, answer questions and give advice, then step back and give the village time to decide if they want to proceed with establishing the WMA or not (URT, 2003; AWF, 2011). Step 2 involves accepting the WMA and electing a CBO. One leader said the sensitization team used the following agenda at the first meeting:

Opening, discussing the WMA, appointing VGS and formulating a group of people who will go through and identify the areas to be marked for areas of WMAs (#16).

In the first meeting for all three case study villages, villagers were presented with the idea of the WMA, perhaps given time to ask questions and seek advice in that meeting and then voted on whether to accept the WMA or not. By cutting short a community’s time to deliberate and reach consensus over whether or not to
have the WMA this begins to look like a violation of the free prior informed consent and the right to self-
determination as called for in International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International

Additionally, in the WMA regulations of 2012, “safeguarding interests of traditional communities” (URT, 2012 p. 20) is included, yet when traditional communities are not allotted as much time as they need to make decisions, feel pressured into making decisions, do not have real choice in decisions and are not given the full picture concerning implications for land rights and livelihoods, this is a clear violation of indigenous rights as well (Ward, 2011). A longer discussion regarding violations of human, indigenous and land rights is outside the scope of this thesis, but it is important to acknowledge that there are international conventions which pertain to WMA proceedings for which it can be argued are not heeded, in addition to non-adherence to the official regulations on creating WMAs.

From analysis of step 1, there was a lack of information given to the community about RWMA, low community attendance in WMA meetings, many members of the community felt an inability to express concerns, use of certain language and emphasizing benefits by facilitators and finally, communities were pushed into making a choice on WMAs by condensing steps 1 and 2 into step 1 only. Based on the above analysis, it can already be seen that many of the villagers interviewed do not feel included in the sensitization process and many are either not aware of RWMA or not keenly aware of how the WMA functions. Although Step 2 has been mentioned in this section, it will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

6.2.2 Step 2: Accepting or rejecting the WMA, Creating the CBO

In Step 2, there are two main processes occurring—accepting or rejecting the WMA and selecting a CBO, often along with the VGS. Based on the information received during sensitization, facilitators ask the village assembly to vote on whether or not they want to join the WMA by approving or rejecting the proposal. If rejected, discussions between facilitators, outside experts, NGOs and different levels of government often continue to determine if community opposition can be changed or not. If accepted the WMA process moves forward and the Village Assembly selects the CBO members and VGS are appointed. The analysis of step two will delve into the community’s experience of accepting RWMA and appointing the CBO in an effort to illustrate that by and large, there was not a consensus in accepting the WMA, due to low attendance and because the choices were not genuine.

Participation in Step 2, according to WMA regulations, can generally be characterized in the realm of degrees of citizen power in the partnership rung because there is two-way communication, decision-making becomes
shared between the community and power-holders and citizens appear to have bargaining power over
decisions and outcomes. The decision to accept or reject the WMA lies with the village assembly and it is asked
to vote either by paper or by show of hands whether they accept the WMA and want to proceed with having it
in their village or reject the WMA.

In practice, step 2 can be characterized as informing because even though there is 2-way communication and
the sensitization team is seeking legalization of WMA status from each of the concerned villages, villagers (and
some leaders) feel that the actual decision to accept the WMA is usually made prior to even asking villagers do
decide, by people in leadership positions at the district and village level, together with the facilitating NGO.
Citizens are essentially a ‘rubber stamp’ here. The following examples will demonstrate how villagers
experience the process of accepting or rejecting the WMA.

An AA member from Mswakini Juu said, of sensitization meetings and opposing the WMA:

Two [meetings] was enough but if there was still opposition, they would have needed more. We would never
force people to agree, if people disliked [the WMA], then we could keep sensitizing until people accept
(Interview #8).

From the perspectives of villagers interviewed, they feel that even when questioning the WMA or when
expressing opposition, the leaders reinforced the potential benefits of WMAs and after the initial meeting
about the WMA kept the door closed to villager input (#2). Categorized as therapy, an NGO facilitator makes a
judgment call on whether or not a village is ready to be a part of the WMA and stated, “If a community has
major questions or opposition to the WMA, they are considered not ready to join” (#26). Communities who
question the WMA or appear not to be heading toward a consensus or conforming to or accepting rationale for
creating the WMA are given homework by the facilitator, adding to the list of technical benchmarks that must
be met in order to create the WMA. The question of whether a village should join or reject was never really on
the table if leaders were intent on joining RWMA. Rather, villages were made WMA-ready. Some villagers felt
they had no chance to express opposition and one villager, a village government leader from Mswakini Juu,
said:

We have fears and concerns about the WMA because we are enclosed on almost every path [which would
eventually lead them to having to] “quit the land altogether”. They villager continued that the WMA is...Not a
policy for us, it favors wildlife and increases wildlife numbers. Right now wildlife are valued more than people.
Big problem nowadays, if people are attacked by wildlife, then no one cares, if wildlife are killed they take us to court (#13).

**Therapy** is further seen in step 2 as villager concerns are not heeded and leaders try to convince villagers to accept the WMA. A village government leader and WMA leader from Mswakini Chini said that those who oppose the WMA are so few in number that they have a difficult time being heard. As in step 1, **manipulation** is seen with threats of land being taken away to force them to accept the WMA. One villager reported, “the VC said no one can reject the WMA” or leaders were pleading with villagers to accept the WMA but often upon the premise of fear of land being taken away (#9, 14, 16, 17). Another villager said that bringing the WMA to the area is a political trick because conservation areas surround the area already and this has implications for the world and for governments to put money in their pockets (#4). A village government leader from Naitolia said a Member of Parliament told him the WMA must be established since the corridor was rejected and this will be a way to stop investors or government from taking land (#16).

The following are examples can that be categorized under **therapy** of how villagers’ and even leaders’ opinions were not legitimized because they felt forced to accept the WMA. A villager from Naitolia said:

*For those who didn’t accept? For those who rejected, they are reject-less, they were forced to agree because the WMA is operating (#22).*

He added that attendance in meetings was low because villagers had heard about what happened in Burunge with grazing and feared it would happen in Naitolia and believes the Naitolia village leaders forged the list from the annual general assembly meeting for WMA acceptance—**manipulation**. After this there were more WMA meetings with the village development committee but not with villagers (#22). When a village government leader of Naitolia stood with villagers and rejected the WMA, the village council and other committees left him out of the process of making the WMA from that point on, establishing it without Village Chairman support (#17, 21, 22). One woman said “no one listens when we say we don’t need [the WMA]” (#15). Survey results show of n=20 people surveyed, the majority do not agree with the decision to have the WMA in their village, similar to the number in interviews who expressed disagreement with joining.
During some of the interviews, general opposition to the WMA was expressed and a sense that concerns have not had adequate space to be expressed (#13, 15, 16). One villager said the community had asked to have the CBO sit together with a lawyer when making agreements and to give villagers ample time, plus a period of assessing WMA impacts before deciding on the WMA. Had the village government acknowledged and granted this request, this would have represented **partnership** but these requests were not met by leaders placing them instead under **therapy**. Lack of adequate time for decision-making is part of the problem with condensing steps 1 and 2. Now villagers express that “we do not have a clear idea if we agreed to the WMA or not, the leaders had already put in the beacons” (#16). The following examples show **manipulation** and **therapy** as concerns were not heeded or villagers felt forced to conform to decisions already made. A village government leader of Mswakini Juu said upon leaders telling the ward counselor they did not accept or reject the WMA:

*It was just a matter of pushing people. Actually, I’m a leader and even I wonder…. Why don’t the government leaders give us 6 or 5 meetings to become clear and sign the contract rather than being pushed (#16).*

A village leader of Naitolia said, of accepting the WMA:

*Because we don’t easily say yes or no because we don’t know what this [WMA] is, so we need to first understand what this is. We don’t do either until we get enough information, and we’re surprised enough to see that the WMA is going on without agreement…. [The] whole meeting [yesterday] thinks it’s the ward counselor and we’re not sure if the VC is actually part of it but we don’t need to undermine him, we need to go slow and find out who initiated the WMA in the area. (#19)*

Though interestingly in Naitolia, some villagers interviewed, including one village government leader, say that the WMA was made behind closed doors through small village committees (#20, 17, 21, 22). In one interview a villager said:

---

**Figure 11: Survey response on agreeing to join WMA or not**

Overall, do you agree with the decision of your village joining RWMA? n=20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Environmental committee, water committee, school committee, so within these committees they are some people within, especially the environmental committee who have been given the authority to make the WMA. Another group is the village development committee it’s among those people who are making the WMA. The VC is in a great conflict with the 25 development committee members...there is outside influence starting from the ward and others on top that I don’t care to mention.

Really I hate speaking about these things because you can find your house on fire. It’s true that we need to be careful talking of big people because they disturb our families even if we’re struggling. I’m busy with my children and family and have many children in school so why disturb this. (#21)

Later, the man states a Member of Parliament is an influence in making the WMA in Naitolia. The influence of members of parliament is connected to the initial leaders conference in Dodoma and an example of higher-level government influencing the process of establish and implementing WMAs. Concerns include loss of access to resources, costs to villagers, fair compensation for damages from human-wildlife conflict and for use of land that is otherwise suitable for agropastoral activities (#13).

Additionally, villagers interviewed and leaders just the same, indicate knowing the law for needing over 50% of the adult village population to pass decisions voted for in village assemblies and while more than half of the villagers who attended may have accepted the WMA, it does not represent at least half of the village population itself (table 2).

And finally, as a last quote illustrating how one villager feels about accepting the WMA:

*I wish the wma would work the way it’s supposed to on paper because it would really benefit. Our school got support from TANAPA but not from WMA. WMAs are a very good thing but the way it comes is very bad, we wish we could get a chance to have it explained. We were forced to accept something we’re not satisfied with. WE are wondering if we are forced to sign something we don’t want. What if in the coming days the

_________________________

13 According to article X in the WCR, voting on issues in village assembly is granted to active members and if there is ‘any election in which participation of members is less than fifty percent of total members entitled to vote shall be void’. Article V defines an active member as a member of village that is a registered village resident.
government tells us to get out because it’s a protected area and we cannot refuse to move because we signed. Our leaders are eating the money. (#21)

It is evident by now that accepting RWMA was not the wish of many villagers interviewed and surveyed, but despite ‘accepting’ RWMA the next step according to official WMA regulations is to elect a CBO. Voting for the WMA and electing the CBO should occur in an “open, free and fair” election called for in the AWF WMA handbook (2011, p. 19) and for which the MNRT also calls for vis-à-vis good governance practices. The regulations for voting to accept the WMA can be placed under partnership because decision-making is put in villagers’ hands as power is redistributed and demonstrating citizens achieving bargaining power and influence over the outcome of a plan. In WMA and CBO elections for each of the three study villages, villagers report voting for candidates by a show of hands or writing their name on a paper then enter their vote into a ballot box as good governance principles call for.

In practice though, electing the CBO/AA can be characterized as placation where, despite citizens having a ‘seat at the table’ and creating partnerships with power-holders, village council has previously selected candidates for CBOs—‘people being planned for’. This is what Arnstein considers choosing ‘hand-picked worthy candidates’ to be on the board, instead of the village assembly choosing candidates rather than having a set number of pre-selected choices to vote for.

Another consideration in placing CBO members under placation is that many of the selected candidates already hold one or more leadership positions or a member of their family holds a leadership position adding weight to ‘hand-picked’ and ‘worthy’ candidates categorization. Seven interview participants held AA or VGS positions in RWMA in addition to holding another leadership position or stated a member of their family as holding a leadership position (#1, 9, 16, 24).

In general good governance practice is about transparency in decision-making, but if decisions were made without villager inclusion, such as pre-selecting candidates, good governance elements can be said to be missing since villagers were not made aware of how, when or why candidates were selected (URT, 2003). Also, under free prior informed consent principles, decisions should be made free from coercion or intimidation and include an ‘independent process of decision-making’ (IWGIA, 2012; Ward, 2011). Although, in some cases, AA members applied for the position while in other cases they were selected, particularly when not enough applications were received before the first WMA meetings, as in Mswakini Juu where only two applications were received, the others were hand selected by village council (#11). Some villagers discussed in interviews that AA members receive allowances for their WMA activities (#1, stakeholder meeting observation) and have
their own interests with the WMA so they keep it secret from villagers (#10)—manipulation. Despite not having a genuine choice in accepting the WMA or choosing a CBO, once a village has accomplished these things according the procedure, they can move to step 3 in the process.

In summing up this section, discrepancies can be seen between prescription and practice in carrying-out WMA procedure with the prescriptions being ranked higher on the ladder than practice because it was not really possible for villagers to reject the WMA even if they did not want it. Also, threats of land being taken away are used as a way to pressure villagers into accepting the WMA. Finally, it can be seen that electing the CBO is not a genuine form of participation because villagers must vote on pre-selected candidates, after having been convinced or pressured to join the WMA. Importantly here is that beginning with step 2, steps in the WMA process appear to make their way up the ‘ladder’ according to official prescriptions, yet in practice, gradually move toward lower rungs. This occurs because the ‘ladder’, as used in this analysis, examines a process rather than, for example, individual roles, rights, access, power, etc. The process can appear to be more inclusive of communities, but in actuality as it progresses, requires less input from and devolves less power to the community itself. Therefore, as the WMA process progresses, the community is included less often as more decision-making responsibilities are left with the AA and a point that needs to be kept in mind for the remainder of the analysis. This limitation of Arnstein’s ladder will be further addressed in the discussion by suggesting alternative frameworks to pick up what ‘the ladder’ cannot.

6.2.3 Step 3: CBO makes a constitution, strategic plan, VLUP, RZMP and eventually GMP, applies for certification WMA and AA status. VGS trained and services implemented.

Once a decision to include a village in a WMA is made, the participating villages proceed to step 3. The RMWA process began in 2011 and proceeded to step 3 by 2012, which is rather quickly in the history of making WMAs. During step 3, the newly elected CBO sets to work on filling in MNRT templates for the constitution, data sheet and monitoring of natural resources and by following MNRT guidelines for making a joint land use agreement, land use plan, resource zone management plan, general management plan and a request for hunting license if desired (URT, 2013). For step 3 first the roles of who is involved at certain points will be discussed, then making the VLUP, RZPM and the constitution will be discussed. Worth noting is that by electing a representative body the community surrenders powers to the CBO, which will from that point on, make decisions for the community. Electing the CBO seemingly turns the ‘community’ as a stakeholder into the CBO as the stakeholder and moves from direct democracy in steps 1 and 2 to a representative democracy from this step forward. As an AA member put it, ‘the community is the CBO’ (#25).
Only after the documents have been prepared, is the CBO ready to apply for Authorized Association (AA) status to become an official representative body and official WMA scheme with user rights to wildlife. The documents created are made because they stipulate how the WMA will be managed. The constitution includes such things as by-laws for restrictions pertaining to the villages included in RWMA. The VLUP determines how villages will utilize their land and natural resources under the WMA scheme. The RZMP is a WMA-wide plan that designates how the WMA is zoned and for which purposes, e.g., photo tourism, settlements, grazing, etc. After documents are created and still in step 3, the application for approval of the WMA is submitted. These actions require the following documents be submitted to the Wildlife Director from the interested communities and then participating WMA villages can move to step 4 (URT, 2012):

- Minutes from a village assembly (VA) meetings demonstrating the community has approved creation of the WMA
- A constitution created by the CBO
- A properly completed WMA information sheet in the proper format
- A certified copy of the incorporation of the CBO
- A Village Land Use Plan approved by appropriate authorities
- A description of the proposed WMA area for the villages including boundaries, size, name and map
- A Resource Zone Management Plan used until the General Management Plan is available

During step 3, all ‘partners’ have a role called for in the WMA regulations, in assisting the CBO with creating the necessary documents to apply to become an official WMA. In the official WMA regulations, the role of the CBO (now representing the community) can be characterized as delegated power and partnership because it holds powers to make decisions and negotiate investor contracts. The CBO is accountable to the village council and village assembly and is supposed to involve both constituents in their management plan, particularly because

14 MNRT also requires that an area designated for the establishment of Wildlife Management Area shall meet the following criteria: (a) it has significant resources that can be accessed; (b) its natural resources area is of significant economic value; (c) it is ecologically viable or forms part of an ecologically viable ecosystem; (d) it belongs to one or more villages in accordance with the relevant provisions of the law governing village land, and other legislation. If more than one village is on the specified WMA land, they have to create a Joint Village Land Use Agreement (URT, 2013).
The role of the village assembly can be characterized as partnership insofar as it gives input in the planning and decision-making done by the CBO thus influencing the outcome of decisions regarding documents made during this step. But, the village assembly can also be characterized as consultation because there is a two-way exchange and community concerns are brought into the picture, yet the village assembly has given their power to the CBO to make decisions for them. Facilitators hold power in the sense that they provide expert knowledge and technical assistance to the WMA activities but their role is also classified in both the partnership and placation rungs. Facilitators are not just advising but sharing planning and decision-making with the CBO and at times village assembly by helping with restructuring of management and decision-making, yet facilitators still ‘plan for people’ vis-à-vis expert knowledge. The district government works alongside the facilitators in this step and has a similar role as facilitators, except they also approve by-laws. The Wildlife Director approves the process and promotes collaboration between parties, adherence to procedural guidelines and approves RZMP/GMP. In the following section, an assessment of how these participatory roles is manifested in practice when making the required documents for becoming a WMA will be discussed.

For making and preparing VLUPs and RZMPs committees are formed with the CBO, experts, leaders and community members. Additionally, a group of community members are chosen to join on the committees by nominating candidates and voting for them in the village assembly. It is not expressly clear when and how committee members were chosen because this information was not seen in meeting minutes nor was this discussed during interviews. One initial discrepancy in step 3 is that all stakeholder opinions are to be represented in the making of official documents like the constitution, RZPM and VLUP. This is because the community is defined as a stakeholder in the RZMP but have given decision-making power to the CBO under the premise that the CBO is representative, yet some villagers do not feel that is the case (interview numbers #1, #11) and therefore do not feel represented as a stakeholder.

Stakeholders is a more specific way of describing the public as related to WMAs and are delineated as RWMA CBO/AA members and employees, the business community, conservation/development partners, training and research institutions, mass media, community/public and CBOs, tourists, pastoral community members, MNRT, adjacent conservation authorities (AWF, 2011).
Also, the process of making VLUPs and RZMPs calls for villager opinions, but as discussed in previous sections, opinions are often not heeded or villagers are often not given a genuine opportunity to express themselves and one reason why participation in step 3 can be characterized as consultation. There were only a maximum of two WMA-related assembly meetings so that village input prior to making VLUPs and RZMPs could only have been done in the first meeting (steps 1 and 2) as the second meetings involve viewing the plans, which have now been made my the VLUP committee and CBO, giving input and approving them (interviews and also minutes). With the CBO as a representative body, there is an underlying assumption that the CBO is a representative of the community’s agenda in making plans, yet, in one focus group, villagers expressed that leaders are not speaking on behalf of them (#13). This reflects sentiments that the CBO is not representative, and can be characterized under placation where representatives are not representative.

However, even though villagers’ needs were included in land use plans, how they were included is not always representative of their needs. Placation takes place here as well because land use planning committees, the CBO and villagers have been involved; yet, expert opinions take precedence in land use plans so that ‘people are being planned for’. Land use plans, according to those interviewed, still do not reflect in entirety community grazing needs and have reduced grazing access or increased its distance, which can be costly for villagers, i.e., time, resources, etc. (#1, reports of current protests). Additionally, villagers now must request permission for access to cut fresh wood, for harvesting medicinal plants and accessing sacred areas. Given current villager protests regarding grazing rights in RWMA, villagers giving input for land use plans seems to have amounted to little in the way of actualizing these needs. In this sense expert knowledge plays a role in making the land use plans and RZMPs. Here therapy takes place with expert opinions taking precedence for informing villagers on how to manage land. Common narratives include planting trees for rainfall and conservation, which one villager says are for tourists and increasing the country’s income (#10)—pointing to both the narratives and underlying agenda of the narratives. On the one hand, an AA members says that the role of experts is simply to help translate villagers’ wishes onto paper and into correct formats (#25), yet a village government leader of Mswakini Chini says:

[Y]ou might have a car, you might buy a car, but you don't know how to drive it so you might need someone to teach you to drive they car. This is what happens, the experts teach you how to use the land properly. Because people they normally, formerly had their own way of traditionally using land but a person can just keep increasing their number of cows regardless of the space he has, and regardless of that they know how to use their own land in the previous time but what we can do, the experts they come and teach us how to control the
number of livestock so that they expect to be able to accommodate them all and this is how villagers came to accept the land use plan. This is why villagers had to accept the opinion of experts. (#1)

This excerpt illustrates that the community should accept the expert knowledge because experts know best how to plan land use, despite the fact that the community had always relied on local knowledge for land use planning. By relying on expert advice, for land use planning, this cancels out the need and more importantly, call for local knowledge in WMA guidelines via villager input (URT, 2003). Additionally, as an NGO facilitator states,

_The community had problems with the land use plans and had to be ‘convinced’, as in educated and given ‘correct’ answers, to accept them, using new plans instead of traditional land management techniques (#1)._  

When it comes to WMA boundaries and restrictions, one villager says he and others have noticed that beacons have been moved, further encroaching on village land since the WMA began (#21) In April 2014 VGS began patrolling in villages and violence already ensues, with two accounts confirming an incident of a man inside WMA area whose motorbike, or piki piki, was taken and the man beaten (#21, 22). When planning the village land, one villager said they had requested fences to protect themselves from wildlife but this request was not considered, leaving villagers feeling vulnerable in terms of security and having to take on costs of wildlife attacks (#14). The fact that these VLUPs do not match villagers needs is evident in some cases where villages are not using the VLUPs like in Mswakini Chini but eventually VGS will enforce them (#1).

Concerning the RWMA VLUP, one participant of a focus group said that it was made three years ago (2011) and villagers were not informed. He adds:

_To me, as Maasai, it feels like we are just left to hang, we have no place. We don’t have any rights with the new land use plan. People who have rights are educated and leaders and they don’t have to struggle. Others have to struggle. The only people who seem they have rights are leaders and educated people. Because to them wildlife are more important than people (uneducated) and livestock. We can find our land is sold and areas have been taken without being informed (#13)._  

A village government leader/AA member attributes the mismatch of land use plans to villager needs to the fact that the AA went to a seminar on boundary-making and proceeded to make them before villager inclusion in the process (#9). The same village government leader/AA member further states that the land use planning committee made an environmental assessment committee and then land-use plan, then brought the idea to the village (#9)—_informing_. Also, at the time of this writing, Randileni WMA was not yet fully operational so
some, though not all restrictions had been put in place though perhaps villagers were simply not yet made aware of them (#21). A villager of Naitolia said there was a meeting with people from Monduli (the district) and village government notifying villagers about new grazing restrictions two days before we were in the village (#23) so the process of raising awareness on new land use plans is beginning. As discussed above, residents of the three study villages are protesting due to discontent about the new grazing restrictions since they do not reflect needs or wants, pointing to lack of villager participation when making these Plans.

As briefly mentioned in the beginning of this section, the constitution is supposed to involve input from villagers when making it, including making by-laws, and the village assembly is to approve the constitution before being finalized. This point is reiterated as an AA member from Mswakini Juu said that the constitution contained everything from villagers, expressing wants and needs but also as having been approved by them (#8)—partnership. Yet a government leader/AA member from Mswakini Juu admits that some issues have not been done involving villagers in a good way, giving the example of villagers not knowing about new WMA boundary demarcations before they were established (#9)—placation and informing.

In summing up step 3, again, a discrepancy can be seen with higher calls for participation in official regulations and lower participation in practice. Although the village assembly is called on for input and approval of plans, villagers rely on the elected CBO to express and carryout their wishes when making plans and few genuine opportunities for inclusion of the community as a whole exist. In Naitolia, a village government leader states that the AA is the only entity in charge of running the WMA and does not include village level government (#17)—off the ladder. There appears to be no real mechanism to call the CBO into accountability for expressing villagers’ wishes, which is reflected most obviously through resistance to new VLUPs. The only mechanism for CBO/AA accountability is to re-elect those members after five years’ when new AA members are selected, but this does not solve any issues with lack of accountability in the meantime. Finally, as in step 2, step 3 appears to be higher on the ladder in terms of prescribed community participation, yet in reality, this devolved participation and powers that follow is extended to increasingly smaller groups as the steps move forward. All the while, expectations for the community to adhere to plans and procedures become stronger as do consequences for non-adherence. This trend continues in step 4.

6.2.4 Step 4: MNRT approves/rejects application and Minister issues a Declaration of Order to make WMA official and grant User Rights to the AA. Demarcations put in place.

After receiving necessary documents described in step 3 the wildlife director sends the application to the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism and the minister will approve or reject the application. If the
application is rejected an explanation of why is given, and a community can contest this decision. The ability to contest the decision can be characterized as partnership since the community has bargaining power. If accepted, it becomes the CBO’s, now officially called an AA, responsibility to submit a General Management Plan to the Wildlife Director within five years (URT, 2013). If the application is accepted the Minister issues a Declaration of Order to make the WMA official and grant User Rights to the AA (ibid) then demarcations ensue. Arnstein would place the Minister’s decision to devolve management, dominate power over some decisions and assure ‘program accountability’ under delegated power. While meaningful powers to manage natural resources and wildlife are devolved to the AA (community representative), power is concentrated in fewer hands as the process of WMA implementation continues. Since power devolution stops at the level of the AA, community input is reduced after the AA status is granted to the CBO, while expectations and responsibility of adhering to the conditions upon which user rights are granted are now fully in place for community members. However, the ways in which this partial devolution plays out in the operationalization of RWMA can only be readily assessed in the future. At this early stage there are already critical voices from community members and recent villager protests are a show of dissatisfaction of RWMA and the grounds upon which user rights have been granted. In an interview with an AA member in April 2014, he expressed his skepticism:

There is point of the WMA gazetting and getting user rights. I tried to ask them you say that we’re given user rights of wildlife, which user right have you given us, why is the issue of hunting in your office, why is the collection of money in your office. Which kind of user rights? Laughs. User rights of night patrols, user right of protecting without benefits? It is bad (#25).

A key event in life of every WMA is placing the beacons to demarcate the different WMA zones as decided upon in the GMP/RZMP (step 3). Since boundary making and demarcating is inherently a conflict-laden affair in the context of natural resource management in Africa, the event is a litmus test for the claim of participatory management and decision-making. In the case of Randileni, villagers were informed about the new demarcations and restrictions from leaders in village assemblies as recently as April 2014 and later. Yet villagers who did not attend meetings, often still do not know how the WMA works or who their AA representatives are (#2). Also, more than two years passed between getting user rights and forming an AA, before being notified about the demarcation of already defined boundaries and the launch of rule enforcement, attributable to low degree of participation in WMA meetings and in making of plans and also explains why some villagers have been surprised upon finding beacons or encountering VGS if they cross the demarcations.
The fact that the CBO/AA is a representative body on behalf of the village assembly and has pushed the WMA forward despite disingenuous participation makes it easy to understand why villagers report feeling as though the AA does not support the villager’s wishes and carries-out a top-down agenda. But, now that the WMA and AA have achieved official status, the community’s role is to abide by WMA restrictions and regulations and contribute to protecting wildlife and landscapes while taking on a large portion of the associated costs.

6.2.5 Step 5: Ventures/Conservation-Based Venture/Investors

In step 5 the WMA is official, managing bodies are in place and now contracts with investors can be made to begin generating in revenues. The AA negotiates investor contracts as the community representative (#11, MNRT). Contracts must be approved by the bid and tender committee made up of members from the Ministry, District and AA. Ultimately these bodies help finalize and approve contracts. The wildlife division must still give final approval on contracts and provides legal advice.

Regulations call for the village assembly to participate in approving the selection of the investor and the signing ceremony for starting new investor contracts, characterized partnership since they have genuine bargaining power in accepting or rejecting the contracts and as consultation since they are ‘participating in participation’ at the signing ceremony.

Participation is difficult to assess for this step in practice since the business venture was just beginning at the time of fieldwork and there is only speculation as to how investor contracts and community ownership of the business venture will work under WMA management

6.2.6 Step 6: Monitoring, Managing, Benefits Sharing

Once investor contracts are in place the WMA is about to become fully operational creating an action plan, using the template from the WMA regulations (URT, 2013). Efforts by involved parties go towards making sure the WMA is working according to this plan. AA members create the action plan and hire VGS for the WMA security apparatus. Prescriptions call for VGS to conduct monitoring of natural resources and strive to secure the WMA to ensure that valuable natural resources are thriving, that people are following RZMP and VLUPs, protects villagers against attacks from wildlife with hopes of reducing poaching. After initially assessing this step, it has be withdrawn from the analysis simply because it would on the one hand be based on conjecture and on the other hand, the experience of knowledge other WMAs. Finally, a longer timespan would be required to assess this step and would make for an interesting follow-up study.
7.0 Discussion

By assessing participation based on Arnstein’s ladder, we see that the prescribed role for participation for the communities is more substantial than the actual participatory process that occurred. The results of the RWMA analysis are illustrated in the graphic below. Steps 5 and 6 have not been placed on the ‘practice’ side of the graphic because such steps had not yet been implemented or attempted at the time of my analysis.

Adapted primarily from Arnstein (1969)

Figure 12: RWMA participation ladder placement

Also, from the analysis we see that the process of creating RWMA never reaches the point of citizen control officially or in practice, primarily because the government remains involved in administering management schemes and citizen control is not built into the design of the WMA model. Citizens can never have control in this model because the village assembly is only called upon to fully participate in steps 1 and 2. Furthermore, even when decisions are devolved to the AA, they still need ultimate approval by the MNRT so decisions never lie entirely in the hands of either the village assembly or the AA. However, in what opportunities to participate
do exist for the community, there exist a handful of notable barriers inhibiting citizens from partaking in such opportunities and this will be discussed next.

7.1 Barriers to Participation

Based on the findings, it was shown that in the case of RWMA establishment less participation does yield a reduction in the degree of decision-making power and the ability to influence decision-making. Several barriers are in the way to an increased degree of community participation in processes pertaining to WMA establishment and management: 1) lack of measures to ensure strong accountability of the AA to the villages, 2) not including the community and its heterogeneous nature in designing and implementing policies, 3) not having a training program for using the WMA model and 4) an emphasis on expert knowledge. Each of these barriers will be briefly discussed.

1) Although the villagers elect representatives into the AA, the AA is not adequately accountable to the villagers, has been pre-selected by village government and at the same time is upwardly accountable to the Wildlife Division, which must approve all important decisions. The AA resembles what Ribot (2004) refers to as single-purpose institution in the context of decentralization in natural resource management which usually decrease downward accountability to the communities. This has been shown in the analysis by using Arnstein’s ladder, whereby during and after Step 1 the villagers are no longer being given the possibility of genuinely participating in the process of the establishment of RWMA because the candidates for AA members have been preselected by government and then the AA steps in on behalf of the community with no incentive toward accountability. Accountability mechanisms are one means of improving the degree of participation and inclusion of communities (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).

2) Genuine community participation in the process of RWMA establishment requires appreciation of the heterogeneity of communities (Agrawal, 1995; Cornwall, 2008) in order to account for the different needs and livelihood strategies. The analysis has shown that aspects like, for example, dry season grazing or harvesting periods, sizeable geographic areas and such things as social status were not adequately considered when designing the WMA model and led to a lesser degree of community participation. Lack of attention to needs and livelihood strategies can undermine effectively meeting conservation and development goals and ignoring these factors does not contribute to breaking the mold of top-down centralized/recentralized wildlife management and development (Benjaminsen and Svarstad, 2010; Benjaminsen et al., 2013; Humphries, 2013).

3) It can be argued that because community based natural resource management schemes such as RWMA were new to these communities, facilitators and government had difficulties in meeting procedural guidelines
set forth due to a lack of training in how to implement such participatory policies. Leaders discussed learning about WMAs and having training in such things as RZMPs but not in actually implementing the steps. The NGO facilitator mentioned many ways of streamlining the process of creating WMAs, at times resulting in communities being stripped of the opportunity to fully participate and consider options, as with combining steps 1 and 2. Finally, a large number of villagers interviewed revealed they are not keenly aware of how RWMA works pointing to a lack of education on the functionality and implications of WMAs. As Ribot suggests, and which can be applied to WMAs, for more community inclusiveness, adhering to procedures and democratic processes is important when bringing CBNRM to an area for long-term success (Ribot, 2004). In addition, community education on policies and projects to be implemented (ibid), as well as adequate resources are needed. By properly implementing the WMA model, actual procedures would better match prescribed procedures and, it is argued here, would result in decision-making that is more representative and inclusive of villagers’ wishes.

4) Expert knowledge can be used to gain support from elites (Nightingale, 2005) as is the case in Randileni, particularly from various levels of government while excluding use of traditional knowledge, genuine community participation and silencing concerns, thus overriding villager input, and replacing local knowledge. By excluding local knowledge, there has been a reduction of opportunities for villagers to participate when making land use plans, the WMA constitution and by-laws, contributing to the recent conflict between the community, the AA and involved governmental constituencies. As Agrawal (1995) suggests, by incorporating local knowledge in the development practices, this would more appropriately reflect villagers’ needs in these plans and more readily achieve development goals.

If these barriers to participation are addressed, there is an increased chance that the development goals, which work toward a reduction in poverty and meet conservation goals would produce better outcomes in meeting both of these goals.

7.2 Limitations to Arnstein’s ladder

Although Arnstein’s ladder was effective for assessing the degree of community participation in steps 1 and 2, it became clear that using her framework to assess steps 3-6 would increasingly exclude analysis of villager participation, because the villagers delegate meaningful powers for decisions-making to the AA. As the process progresses, steps appear to fall higher on the ladder indicating increased amount of popular participation, yet the opposite is true. As the process progresses, with each new step on the ladder, fewer community participants are able to influence and make decisions. It could be argued that this happens because Arnstein’s
ladder is better at assessing processes that employ a direct democracy approach where “all citizens are legislators” (Christman, 2002). Direct democracy is in accordance with Arnstein’s theory that including a greater number of citizens will result in an increased degree of citizen input, influence and control (1969).

However, during steps 3-6, the representative democracy model takes precedence over community participation. After citizens elect their representative body—the CBO—to make decisions on behalf of them, accompanying roles, rights, powers and responsibilities are given to the CBO. However, Arnstein’s ladder does not allow one to assess which rights and powers are given to whom and the implications of this. Therefore, to better understand why the gap between prescribed and actual participation widens as the process progresses, it is useful to identify who holds what powers and what those powers stipulate. This would help better explain why community participation is assessed as being lower on Arnstein’s ladder even as the degree of AA’s participation appears higher. Schlager and Ostrom can be used to assess what rights and powers are held by participating actors under WMA governance (Schlager and Ostrom, 1992; Bluwstein, n.d.). Agrawal and Ribot’s accountability framework can be used to map the relations of accountability (Agrawal and Ribot, 1999; Bluwstein, n.d.). Using these frameworks to assess prescribed and actual participation in creating Randileni, particularly for steps 3-6, would allow for an understanding of the effects of the WMA policies on all actors, including the villagers whose role is difficult to capture when using Arnstein’s ladder to assess participation later steps of establishing WMAs.

8.0 Concluding Remarks

This study has demonstrated the ways in which prescribed community participation in making Randileni WMA does not match actual participation during the process of implementation. Yet, communities are held to rules and restrictions or met with consequences once the WMA is fully operational, what Igoe and Croucher refer to as “disciplining people to exclude themselves from their own land” like the situation in Randileni’s neighbor WMA Burunge (2007). By looking at the example of Burunge where creating that WMA “was not a community-driven process” (2007, p. 537), creating WMAs by excluding the community can lead to conflict and resistance as is the case presently in Burunge (Bluwstein, n.d.). The effects of excluding the community in creating Randileni are yet to be known but upon early stages of implementation, acts of resistance and rejection of RWMA are obvious reflections of exclusionary practices by disregarding villagers’ needs in planning and implementation. It may be too soon to tell what the long-term effects on WMAs in general and Randileni in particular will be, as their implementation and use has been relatively short-term, but with studies such as the one presented in this thesis, future explorations of natural resource management and the role of community-based participation in WMAs would help to reveal causal links that may exist between the way WMAs were
created and the way they are being operationalized. As it stands now, decentralization in WMAs has stopped short of genuine inclusion of communities and needs rethinking if the government is actually devoted to CBNRM. Commitment to community management could be done by seriously addressing barriers to inclusion or redesigning the WMA model altogether to achieve the types of community participation the policy calls for and perhaps through this, getting closer to Arnstein or Chambers’ ideal type of participation.
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10.0 Appendices

10.1 List of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey: n=63 (42 females, 21 males)</th>
<th>Msawini Chini</th>
<th>Mswakini Juu</th>
<th>Naitolia</th>
<th>Dar es Saalam/Arusha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32 Interviews/focus groups 61 people interviewed (18 females, 44 males)</th>
<th>Msawini Chini</th>
<th>Mswakini Juu</th>
<th>Naitolia</th>
<th>Dar es Saalam/Arusha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of interview Respondents</th>
<th>Focus group/Interview (FGI) or Survey (S)</th>
<th>Interview #</th>
<th>village</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Village government leader (VL), traditional/religious leader (TL), CSO (C), NGO (N), VGS, AA member, government (G), Academia (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>shop owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shop owner, former teacher, former VL and AA member from Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>VL, VGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>village council member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>environmental development committee for wma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Chini</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mswakini Juu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Naitolia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Criteria to characterize each Step in the process of WMA establishment

Step 1) Sensitization—This is when the sensitization team brings the potential idea to WMA communities. The process generally begins by speaking with and educating village government first, then the village assembly, about the pros and cons of WMAs and the process for creating WMAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
<th>Role on the ground</th>
<th>Outside of WMA process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villagers/Village Assembly</td>
<td>Request WMA, attend sensitization village assembly meeting—consultation, receive information, ask questions/seek advice—consultation.</td>
<td>Attend meeting, receive information, ask questions, raise concerns, receive ‘correct’ answers, vote to accept/reject WMA, create CBO and sometimes elect VGS</td>
<td>Are generally not included in outside WMA processes unless selected for committees prior to accepting WMA and creating CBO and RZMP committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to decide whether or not to accept or reject WMA (AWF).—**partnership (veto power)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Division</th>
<th>Sensitization team—once community expresses interest in WMA (prior to step 1), information is disseminated to target groups (school children, elders, women, youth, poachers, local leaders, politicians and other influential people) utilizing audio-visuals, drama, songs, posters, fliers, etc.— <strong>informing</strong></th>
<th>WD receives request from interested village and asks sensitization team to assist with entire WMA process.</th>
<th>Initiates requests from minister to create WMAs. If village is interested, team from the wildlife division comes meets with district, then goes to villages to survey if areas are suitable for a WMA. If suitable, process continues to sensitization. WD meets minister’s request to form WMAs to meet official goals on paper and to help ‘clean-up’ change in GCA guidelines, generate revenues, meet conservation, poverty and development goals. Educate all levels of government via seminars outside of villages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Government</td>
<td>Sensitization team—assists/carries-out WD sensitization plan— <strong>informing</strong></td>
<td>Present in village assembly WMA meetings and assists with sensitization</td>
<td>Meets requests of minister to form WMA to meet official and unofficial objectives and their own agenda. Have attended seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Government</td>
<td>Sensitization team—assists/carries-out WD sensitization plan—</td>
<td>Assist, encourage, influence, pressure village level government</td>
<td>Have attended seminars called for my Minister educating about WMAs and urging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing to accept WMA.</td>
<td>Councilors to get communities to make WMAs quickly according to WD agendas. Influence/pressure local government to accept and form WMAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Village Government**   | **Sensitization team & village assembly advocate**  
Assists/carries-out WD sensitization plan—informing  
Acts as village representatives on behalf of village assembly—placation/dissimulation  
Under pressure from higher levels of government to form WMAs. Have own agendas in forming WMAs. Have previously met with sensitization team outside of village assemblies for field trips and seminars about WMAs. Accounts of VC forging attendance lists. |
| **Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies** | **Sensitization team—in this case study, AWF**  
Assists/carries-out WD sensitization plan—informing  
Facilitate with establishment activities. Contributes financial resources during creation of WMA. Capacity building.  
Once selected by government to facilitate, proceeds in organizing seminars and meetings for leader education and arranging details prior to idea being brought to community. Necessity to meet own objectives and government objectives to continue receiving government endorsement and donor funds. |
| AWF starts by asking if villagers want WMA. By facilitating, AWF meets org.’s conservation goals, acts as donor to villages, pushes to get WMA made quickly to meet org. goals and government goals. Sometimes active participant in meetings, otherwise passive but present to ensure |
Step 2) Based on the information received during sensitization, facilitators ask the village assembly to vote on whether or not they want to join the WMA by approving or rejecting the proposal. If rejected, discussions between facilitators, outside resources and different levels of government often continue to determine if community opposition can be changed or not. If accepted WMA process moves forward. The Village Assembly selects the CBO and VGS appointed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
<th>Role on the ground</th>
<th>Outside of WMA process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villagers/Village Assembly</strong></td>
<td>Vote to accept/reject WMA and proceed if accept. VA elects and creates CBO, sometimes elect VGS. Free and fair elections called for in good governance section of WMA reference manual. VA approves selection of VGS.</td>
<td>This step was done is <strong>step 1</strong> for all three study villages. VA votes on pre-selected candidates from VC. Sometimes CBO made even if village opposes WMA. MSC accepted WMA, selected CBO.</td>
<td>Some accounts of village government forging village attendance lists. Pre-selected candidates for CBO. Pre-selected land for WMA before WMA accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife Division</strong></td>
<td>WD receives notification from village(s) that they wish to form WMA. Must approve suggested WMA area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 According to article X in the WCR, voting on issues in village assembly is granted to active members and if there is ‘any election in which participation of members is less than fifty percent of total members entitled to vote shall be void’. Article V defines an active member as a member of village that is a registered village resident.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>District Government</strong></th>
<th>Facilitate with establishment activities and with GO/NGO/private sector. Link CBO with WD on issues.</th>
<th>Based on villager accounts, pressure into joining WMA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Government</strong></td>
<td>Based on villager accounts, pressure into joining WMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village Government</strong></td>
<td>Acts as village representatives on behalf of village assembly. Village council should recommend to VA a portion of land for WMA. Initiates selection of VGS. VC has already pre-selected candidates to vote for CBO. Refer to interviews to fill this column. No mention of land chosen at this step but perhaps not captured in interviews.</td>
<td>Based on villager accounts, pressure into joining WMA due to pressure from ward level councilors. By this point there have been a number of field-trips, seminars and meetings with district, ward, MNRT and facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBO</strong></td>
<td>VA votes for CBO members from pool of candidates. Accountable to VC. Candidates named and nominated in VA and voted on by VA. Candidates pre-selected based upon VC choices/applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate with establishment activities. Contributes time, financial, expert resources during creation of WMA. Capacity building. Facilitate, answer questions, help adhere to procedural guidelines and conflict management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TANAPA/NCAA</strong></td>
<td>Support and facilitate establishment of Wildlife Management Areas in areas adjacent to national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks and Ngorogoro Conservation Area;
(b) cooperate with the Director in facilitating development activities

Step 3) CBO makes a constitution, strategic plan, LUP, RZMP and eventually GMP, applies for certification WMA and AA status. VGS trained and services implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
<th>Role on the ground</th>
<th>Outside of WMA process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villagers/Village Assembly</td>
<td>Coordinate natural resource activities. Formulate NR by-laws. Contribute to LUP and RZMP by expressing needs and approving plans. Select villagers for participatory LUP team,</td>
<td>Plans made my representative committees led by experts. Plans approved in village assemblies but attendance is low.</td>
<td>Communities largely unaware of restrictions being put in place, often find out at VAs later down the road and usually when restrictions go into place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Division</td>
<td>Facilitates process of establishment. Oversee and support levels of government in creating WMA and ensure procedures and guidelines are followed. Promote cooperation and mobilize resources and support between GO &amp; NGO organizations, private sector, experts, etc. Approve RZMP/GMP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Government</td>
<td>Facilitates the application for WMA. Make legible those living in WMA areas via Land Use Registry. Prepare data sheet for application. Recommend land for WMA. Link CBO with WD on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village Government</strong></td>
<td>Participates in LUP, RZMP and facilitates VAs for approving plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBO</strong></td>
<td>Accountable to VC. Agree with VC on management of WMA. Part of Village LUP committee, Attends seminars to learn about LUP, RZMP, and other aspects of managing WMA. Participate in committees for WMA, present information to VA, prepare documents, including meeting minutes, constitution with by-laws, data sheet and apply for AA status and WMA. Appoint VGS. Supportive role in making by-laws. Make GMP within 5 years after application/acceptance of WMA. Made constitution with input from all stakeholders and every opinion represented and final approvals made. Expert advice heeded without full community participation. Attendance at meetings and seminars seen as a financial, and influence-building opportunities. Villagers discuss approved demarcations being moved after approval and encroaching further on village land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate with establishment activities in collaboration with WD, TANAPA, NCAA and District. Part of Village LUP committee and participatory LUP team, Facilitators and experts contribute time, financial, Facilitate, answer questions, and help adhere to procedural guidelines and conflict management. Provides expert and technical resources and advice. Meet own agendas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
technical, expert resources and advice during creation of WMA, particularly with LUP/RZMPs plans. Facilitate with preparation of by-laws. Capacity building.

**Investors**  
Potential investors express needs. To promote and support Authorized Association in developing responsible practices on resource utilization.

**TANAPA/NCAA**  
Support and facilitate establishment of Wildlife Management Areas in areas adjacent to national Parks and Ngorogoro Conservation Area; (b) cooperate with the Director in facilitating development activities

**Step 4)** After receiving these documents the WD sends the application to the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism and the minister will approve or reject the application. If the application is rejected an explanation of why is given, if accepted, it becomes the communities’ responsibility to submit a general management plan to the WD within five years. If the application is accepted the Minister issues a declaration of Order to make the WMA official and grant User Rights to the AA (ibid). Demarcations ensue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
<th>Role on the ground</th>
<th>Outside of WMA process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villagers/Village Assembly</td>
<td>Heed by-laws and regulations of WMA constitution.</td>
<td>Plans made by representative committees led by experts. Plans</td>
<td>Communities largely unaware of restrictions being put in place, often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Division</td>
<td>Facilitates process of establishment. Accept/reject WMA application. Declaration of Order of WMA under section 32 of Wildlife Conservation Act, issue Certificate of Authorization and user rights to AA. Director designates WMA for use by communities and areas of special provisions (i.e., corridors).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Government</td>
<td>Facilitates the application for WMA. Link CBO with WD on issues. Publicize establishment of WMA in district and in ‘widely distributed newspaper’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO/AA</td>
<td>Accountable to VC. Manage wildlife in accordance with WMA regulations/RZMP/GMP. Cooperate with TANAPA &amp; NCAA. Part of Village LUP committee, Attends seminars to learn about LUP, RZMP, and other aspects of managing WMA. Participate in committees for WMA, present information to VA. Make GMP within 5 years after application/acceptance of WMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert advice heeded without full community participation. Attendance at meetings and seminars seen as a financial, and influence-building opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villagers discuss approved demarcations being moved after approval and encroaching further on village land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruit VGS according to regulations.

| Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies | Facilitate with establishment activities. Part of Village LUP committee and participatory LUP team, Facilitators and experts contribute time, financial, technical, expert resources and advice during creation of WMA, particularly with LUP/RZMPs plans. Facilitate with preparation of by-laws. Capacity building. | Facilitate, answer questions, and help adhere to procedural guidelines and conflict management. Provides expert and technical resources and advice. Meet own agendas. |
| Investors | Potential investors express needs. To promote and support Authorized Association In developing responsible practices on resource utilization. | |
| TANAPA/NCAA | Support and facilitate establishment of Wildlife Management Areas in areas adjacent to national Parks and Ngorogoro Conservation Area; (b) cooperate with the Director in facilitating development activities | |

**Step 5) Joint Ventures/Conservation-Based Venture/Investors—Investors and WMA make contracts. Now again with help from facilitators and village government, investors are found and contracts are drawn up. The AA plays a big role in this process and acts as a representative for the villages**

| Actor | Role on paper |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villagers/Village Assembly</td>
<td>Primary beneficiary of WMAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Division</td>
<td>WD lawyer helps with legal aspects and drawing up contracts. WD approves contracts. Participate in process of negotiation and signing with investors. Scrutinize hunting and tourist companies. Form joint venture management committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Government</td>
<td>Witness for signing ceremony for investors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA &amp; board of trustees</td>
<td>Accountable to VC. Present for signing ceremony for investors. Open a bank account. Follow good governance guidelines when making investor contracts including transparency. Negotiate and enter into investment contracts. Implement mechanism for equitable benefits sharing between AA and village according to government guidelines. Share investment opportunities with VA before signing agreements. Oversee investment and development activities. Manage finances according to procedures. Collect and remit fees to relevant authorities according to law. Recruit and provide training to staff. Budget and implementation plan. Any other tasks for better WMA performance. Sets concession and block fees. May for tender and evaluation committee when needed. Scrutinize hunting and tourist companies. Submit copies of investor agreements to Director and district; seek advice of WD and have contracts approved by WD. Form joint venture management committee. Share quarterly, semi-annual and annual financial reports through offices with VA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors</td>
<td>Present for signing ceremony for investors. Subject to environmental impact assessment. Enter into investment agreements on resource use. Participate in investment and development, with AA. Market and promote natural resources of WMA. Collaborate with law enforcement in protecting natural resources. Pay AA and authorities duly and promptly. Form joint venture management committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 6) Monitoring, Managing, Benefits Sharing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role on paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Monitor and evaluate performance of WMA based on social, economic, ecological guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Government Monitor enforcement of WL law in/out of WMAs. Monitor investments. Issue hunting license to AA. Create district natural resources advisory board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Government Chooses mechanism for benefit sharing. Monitors activities of AA and reports to VC and district council. Promotes secure and favorable business environment in WMA. Ensures AA implements sectorial policies within WMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/CBO &amp; board of trustees Accountable to VC. Review GMP/RZMP. Recruit VGS as needed. 3 members from AA on district natural resources advisory board. Protect biodiversity resources. Promote control of problem animals and keep trophies in safe custody. Maintain proper records and report quarterly and annually to VA. Issue permits for use of NR according to WMA regulations. Consult with other institutions for information and technological exchange. Facilitate with training VGS in institutions. Resource monitoring. Propose quota and implement WD approved quota.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies Representatives on district natural resources advisory board—conflict resolution, technical and legal advice, scrutinize quotas, advise district council committee on WMA, oversee and advise cross-sectorial issues. Any thing else for better performance of WMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsiders—NGOs, CSOs, facilitating agencies Facilitators collaborate with director and district councils in supporting WMAs, and with law enforcement agencies in protecting natural resources and get approval from Minister first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors Promote and support AA in developing responsible resource utilization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representatives on district natural resources advisory board. Support resource monitoring and inventory, anti-poaching activities and support problem animal control.

10.3 Interview Guides

Randileni Interview Guide April 2014—Leaders

- Age?
- Leader?
- Education?
- Village?
- Leaders
- What is your role in establishing the WMA?
- Did all the information presented to you make sense?
- Did you have enough time to ask questions and receive responses?
- Was community consulted in deciding on meetings, structure, agenda, etc.?
- Who is the community?
- What are the reasons for having the WMA?
- Where did the idea come from?
- Who are the stakeholders in the WMA?
- What was the sensitization and mobilization process?
- What does it mean to sensitize?
- What kind of information did villagers get?
- How many meetings? How often?
- How many attended?
- How encourage villagers to attend?
- Encourage to participate in meetings?
- Did you use all usual channels to get information to people about meetings and WMA activities?
- Was community consulted prior to outside parties coming in and determine their role?
- What happened in the meetings?
- What benefits and challenges and costs were presented to the villagers?
- How were they notified of meetings?
- Was the time of year important in scheduling the meetings?
• How as voting done?
• What is participation?
• What is consensus?
• If you were part of seminars in establishing WMA, what were your impressions of the field trips?
• Does the WMA so far meet the goals of establishment?
• In your opinion how was participation of the community?
• Can you compare it to previous ways of decision-making?
• How does the WMA plan to deal with problems that arise?
• Do you see the WMA as creating more awareness about related issues in the village?
• Do you imagine villagers will have more control over land and revenues after the WMA?
• How are contracts made?
• Were there previous contracts?
• Where do you find investors?
• Who negotiates the contracts?
• Is the WMA a business?
• How the WMA work with the traditional system?
• What influence do outsiders have?
• Others?
• Can you influence the decision-making process or change anything about the WMA structure?
• Will the WMA be self-sustaining?
• How about VGS?
• Accountability? Responsibility?
• Emphasis on what happens after the WMA is made in terms of accountability, decision-making, management and participation?
• Is there a way to monitor success, costs, benefits to community?
• Grievance and recourse mechanisms?
• Safeguards to ensure community involvement?
• Are villagers aware of land rights?

Randileni Interview Guide April 2014—Villagers
• Did you attend WMA meetings?
• Do you remember what the atmosphere was like?
• Who spoke? Which type of cars they were driving, etc.
• How do you know about meetings?
• Are you given information?
• Who is involved in making the WMA?
• Was there villager participation at the meeting?
• Did villagers express what wanted/needed?
• Who was at the meetings? Involved in making the WMA?
• What do you know about RWMA?
• Concerns?
• WMA process compared to other decisions made in community?
• Does the WMA involve villagers?
• Who owns the WMA?
• Are the benefits?
• Costs?
• Do you attend village assembly meetings?
• AA members? Female members?
• How do you feel about village leadership?
• Do they follow leaders wishes?
• View of the environment now? Before/after?
• Do you have rights to the land and wildlife? What are they?
• Do you have a traditional system here? What is it?
• HWC?
• VGS?
• Conservation?
• Who is the community?

10.4 Survey Questionnaire

RWMA--Survey Questions 2014

1.3 Gender of the respondent
1.4 How old is the respondent
1.5 Birth year/Agemet of the respondent
1.6 Level of education
1.7 Does anyone in your homestead (including yourself) have a leadership position currently?
2.0 Do you know anything about the WMA Randile? (Have you ever heard of it? Can also start by asking about the word WMAs first and then ask 'what about Randile WMA?
2.1 How did you receive information about WMA?
2.2 Have you attended any MEETINGS, VILLAGE ASSEMBLIES OR SEMINARS where the establishment of WMA Randile was discussed?
2.3 Who has influence in deciding if the WMA in this village?
2.4 Do you have any worries about the establishment of the WMA?
2.5 Did you have any opportunities to express worries?
2.6 Do you think that the community feels that they own the WMA?
2.7 Do you think the community will own the WMA in the future?
2.8 Overall, do you agree with the decision of your village to join the WMA?
2.9 Does the village have assembly meetings?
2.10 Do you attend village assemblies?
2.11 If you have to vote in an assembly meeting do you usually vote? for example, to select candidates for a position or to make decisions in the village
2.12 Do you actively participate in the meetings in ways other than voting? For example, expressing concerns, asking questions, asking for information, etc
2.13 Are you satisfied with village leadership?
2.14 Do you think that village leaders generally do what villagers want? (generally=most of the time)
2.15 Do you receive any information about village assemblies and village news?
2.16 Do you think that you receive enough information?
3.0 Is tourism happening in this village?
3.1 Did somebody tell you about tourism and investors before they came to your village?
3.2 Are there benefits from tourism and investors in the area? Benefits can be sponsorship for students, jobs, funds for village projects, money, ETC.
3.3 Are there negative impacts from tourism and investors in the area? Examples include loss of grazing area, less access to resources like water, firewood, building materials, no payments from tourism/investors
3.4 Is there conservation, hunting or areas where you are not allowed go to in your VILLAGE or SURROUNDING AREAS? (includes areas outside their own village)
3.5 Is there more or less wildlife TODAY than there was 10 years ago or NO change?
3.6 Do you think it is important to conserve wildlife in the village?
3.7 Have you experienced damage to your SHAMBA from wildlife?
3.8 How often have you experienced damage to your SHAMBA from wildlife in the last 12 months (365 days/1 year)?
3.9 Does damage to your SHAMBA from wildlife happen more or less often TODAY than 10 years ago or NO change?
3.10 Have you experienced damage or loss to LIVESTOCK from wildlife?
3.11 How often have you experienced damage to your LIVESTOCK from wildlife in the last 12 months (365 days/1 year)?
3.12 Does damage to your LIVESTOCK from wildlife happen more or less often TODAY than 10 years ago or NO change?
3.13 Have you, YOURSELF, or your FAMILY MEMBERS experienced attacks and/or injuries from wildlife? (humans injuries)
3.14 Does damage to YOURSELF or FAMILY MEMBERS from wildlife happen more or less often TODAY than 10 years ago or NO change?
3.15 Overall, do benefits from wildlife outweigh (weigh more) than losses from wildlife? *[use the example of the balance scale to explain weighing benefits to losses, which side is heavier?]
3.16 Is it important to conserve the environment?
12.0 Write here your notes about this interview: (e.g., if there were others around that might have influenced answers, or any thing else that might have influenced survey answers or worth noting)