

Nkiruka Chiemelu, International Relations and History (2004), Luce Fellow,
Summer 2003: "At Whose Expense?: Policy Formation in Wildlife
Conservation and Human Conflict in Kenya"

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the **Watson Institute for International Studies Luce Fellowship Program** for the opportunity for their funding and support and giving me the opportunity to proceed with my research. Secondly, I would like to thank **Winfred Nelson** for his constant support and guidance through the entire duration of my project.

Also invaluable to my research, the **African Centre for Technology Studies** in Nairobi, Kenya and the **International Centre for Research in Agroforestry** where I conducted most of my work and without the help of the staff, I would not have been able to successfully complete my work.

The **Kenya Wildlife Service** for their staff which was unflinching in providing me with information on Kenyan wildlife conservation policy as well as taking the time out to address the issue of human-wildlife conflict as well as take me around the national park.

Benson Ole-Kituyi and the **Friends of Nairobi National Park** as well as the Wildlife Trust for their aid in my research on the Kitengela dispersal region.

Daniel Morinke and the **Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project** for his assistance with my on-site research.

The **Friends of Tsavo** organization for providing me with assistance as well as their help in the parks.

Deborah Nightingale for her patience and assistance in providing me with useful contacts and helping me in steering my research on the right path.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the **East African Wildlife Service**, the **United Nations Environment Programme**, the **Ecotourism Society of Kenya**, the Kenya Community Tourism Network and the **Inter Region Economic Network-Kenya**, all of which were all essential elements that facilitated my research.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wildlife is a controversial yet beneficial renewable natural resource for Kenya, which supports ecotourism, subsistence hunting, and cash cropping and marketing. Yet the sustainability and management of this resource is in danger due to poor government policies towards domestic investment in wildlife conservation as well as ineffective policies to alleviate community-wildlife conflict. The issue of human-wildlife conflict emerges as the main theme in this paper when analyzing policies to promote foreign private investment as parks that cannot effectively manage interaction between the local community and the wildlife often tend to fail in their objectives of providing a “sanctuary” for the animals. Often this results in poor international publicity as well as the reduction of foreign private investment. This paper seeks to investigate the attitudes, whether of acceptance or aversion towards various wildlife groups and how the management of game reserves in Kenya, run by private individuals and/or institutions, have placed a positive or negative impact on human-wildlife conflict as well, thus adding to the success of the reserve and encouraging more private investment.

Kenya is currently witnessing a paradigm shift with regard to the decision making process in its wildlife resources management due to the transition of government. The country is no longer under the long-standing one-party system dominated by the Kenyan African National Union (Kanu) political party, which was rife with corruption and policy mismanagement. Under the new National Rainbow Coalition (Narc) government, demand for citizen participation in the decision making process has increased to a point where it has been mandated by official policy. Thus, the attitudes and behaviour towards wildlife among local communities become key considerations in conservation policy formulation.

This change in attitudes towards wildlife is also as a result of the change in the higher levels of decision-making within the government. During the days of the Kanu government, the dominating conservation ideology exemplified by Dr. Richard Leakey, former director of the Kenyan Wildlife Society (KWS) from 1989-1994, employed a more preservationist approach to wildlife management that appealed more to foreign investors, specifically those in the West. After the transition in government, “Leakeyism” began to be seen as a “European” view on wildlife management and private groups as well as the new government sought more “Kenyan” methods for conservation that would include community participation as a larger factor in the programs.

However, the new government faces two main challenges in their attempts to restructure wildlife organization as well as encourage private funding from foreign donors. The first involves the Leakeyist ideology. In terms of foreign private investment, the Leakey view on conservation was more effective in

stimulating donor funding from abroad because of the staunch position he took on poaching. Yet, the Leakey view of conservation had the tendency to marginalize community involvement in policies concerning wildlife management and often these communities shared the same dispersal area with the game reserves.

The second major obstacle in the way for the new government is the rampant corruption that characterized the Moi administration and still plagues the new Narc government. Since the early 1990s, foreign direct investment as a whole has decreased from 57 million \$US in 1990 to 13 in 1996¹ and the through the kleptocratic officials of the national administration, the amount of donor funding that wildlife conservation receives had reduced dramatically as well. A history of policy mismanagement has inhibited KWS from receiving adequate funding to carry out its long-term projects. For example, in 1998 the surprise departure of KWS director, Dr. David Western resulted in the loss of millions of dollars pledged by various countries and wildlife conservation bodies for long-term projects. In the years of 1992 and 1997, when political unrest was at its most tumultuous, FDI to Kenya plummeted as a result. . Ever since, even despite the creation of a multi-party system and the peaceful transition of political power, foreign investment in Kenya has lagged due to the incapability and ineffectiveness of the government in its anti-corruption programs.

The human-wildlife interface surrounding conservation sites in Kenya is characterized by conflictive relationship between humans and their wildlife neighbours. Boundaries of conservation areas are often blurred and vague thereby creating conflicts in the land use patterns between the wildlife habitats and their surrounding areas, which are normally used for human settlement, pasture land, farmland, commercial and/ or other social functions. Occasionally often during migratory periods, wildlife invades and occupies the human inhabited land bordering conservation sites thereby preying upon, transferring disease to, and competing for grazing and water with domestic stock and threatening human life through physical injury or death and damage to crops and other private property.

The main focus of this paper is to investigate the policies that promote foreign investment looking directly at wildlife management programs and conservation sites that have been successful in wildlife sustainability through community service projects that allow for biodiversity within the conservatory areas. Using four case studies of KWS-run national parks, this paper will examine which policies are effective in promoting foreign investment in the field of biodiversity and wildlife management. The four national parks: **Nairobi, Tsavo East, Amboseli** and **Aberdare** were selected according to a variety of criteria including: dependence on foreign private investment,

¹ United Nations Development Program. Statistics and Data. FDI Inflows. 2002. www.undp.org.

active community-run programs, policies to alleviate community-wildlife conflict, success ratings (in terms of wildlife sustainability and community well-being) and fencing. While the first three serve as examples of successful programs, the Aberdare forest range is an ongoing case study of a national park where there have been no effect policies or programs as of yet to effectively check wildlife-community conflict.

Each park has taken its own approach to mediating human-wildlife conflict as well as stimulating foreign and domestic and private and public investment. Yet the four are all similar in that their objectives towards biodiversity and wildlife management:

- Reduction of poverty among the community populations
- Security of biodiversity in the desired ecosystem
- Sustainability of conservation amongst the community landowners
- Generation of income from wildlife through ecotourism through the increase of direct benefits for the community

Community involvement is a large component of these parks as well as foreign intellectual and financial aid. Many of the programs currently active in the park are dependent on private donations of members, such as the **Friends of Nairobi National Park (FoNNaP)** and **Friends of Tsavo (FoT)**. These programs and others that highlight community building through the implementation of wildlife, create policies that work to change the actions of community towards wildlife from that of conflict to cooperation. These policies include:

- Awareness creation
- Facilitation of areas to be set aside for tourism
- Land holding rental
- Provision of water
- Payment for wildlife use of privately held lands

KWS is currently dealing with direct and rather publicized cases of human-wildlife conflict, the two most notably being the Maasai-lion conflict in Nairobi National Park and the fencing controversy in the Aberdare. In both cases, the government has failed to work with the community in order to deliberate a peaceful solution to the problem. Using the policy guidelines set by other programs in Nairobi, Amboseli and Tsavo, it might be possible to adopt similar policies in these two situations of human-wildlife conflict.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	ii
Table of Contents	v
Abbreviations and Acronyms	vi

I. Introduction	1
II. Background	
II.1 Human-Wildlife Conflict	2
II.2 Foreign private investment	3
II.3 Ecotourism	4
III. Case Studies	
III.1 Nairobi National Park	5
III.2 Amboseli National Park	8
III.3 Tsavo National Park	11
IV. Current Issues	
IV.1 Nairobi National Park	14
IV.2 Aberdare National Park	15
IV.3 Policy Recommendations	16
V. Observations and Conclusions	
20	
VI. Appendix	
23	

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACWTP	Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FPI	Foreign private investment
FoNNAP	Friends of Nairobi National Park
FoT	Friends of Tsavo
KANU	Kenyan African National Union
KCTN	Kenya Community Tourism Network
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
NARC	National Rainbow Coalition
NNP	Nairobi National Park
WF	Wildlife Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program

I. INTRODUCTION

Wildlife has always been the main attraction to Kenya as the country is synonymous with vast grasslands dotted with a variety of wildlife such as zebra, wildebeest, giraffe and lions. In the Western imagination, Kenya is an animal sanctuary as lions bask in the sun on large rocks while herds of wildebeest drink from a nearby watering hole, all with the ever-present Masai warrior standing in the background, spear traditionally in hand. In reality, wildlife and wildlife conservation is a hotly debated issue not only for its implementation but also in the traditional role of the community as competitors and victims of the wildlife. Amidst the game reserves, safaris, poaching and illegal ivory and game meat bans, lies a long-standing and fundamental problem of human-wildlife conflict and community exploitation.

Originally the purpose of this study was to examine government conservation policies and how they are directed to encourage foreign private investment in the field of wildlife conservation and sustainability. Yet, as the subject of wildlife conservation is an active and controversial one, it is impossible to predict what route it will take once arriving on the field.

The human-wildlife conflict aspect of conservation is unavoidable when analyzing the success of conservation policies and government policies on dealing with such are sparse to nonexistent. Especially as conservation is mostly a private sector issue, government conservation policies have remained stagnant since the mid-1990s of the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). Wildlife conservation is no longer an issue of protecting the wildlife from human encroachment but rather creating an environment in which the wildlife can coexist along with the human populations living nearby.

In order to have successful wildlife biodiversity and sustainability, conservation societies and organizations must first address the issue of human-wildlife conflict as well as community exploitation in ecotourism.

Many private institutions both foreign and domestic have recognized this fact and are undertaking programs with the objective of providing benefits to communities through wildlife. The idea is to show that wildlife can be an asset to communities rather than a burden and danger.

The purpose of this study is to examine a select group of these programs in three of Kenya's national parks (Nairobi, Amboseli and Tsavo) to see how they manage human-wildlife conflict and use their policies to create a model for other parks and regions that are currently dealing with issues of community-wildlife conflict, namely in the Kitengela region of Nairobi and the Aberdare forest. As it is not feasible to completely separate humans from wildlife successfully in all parks, this study should hopefully provide insight into policies and practices that are successful in bridging the human-wildlife gap as well as promoting biodiversity. It is the hope that this will provide a cohesive and pervasive prototype of wildlife biodiversity management can

effectively work not only in Kenya but in other sub-Saharan nations that deal with similar issues of conservation and eco-tourism.

II. BACKGROUND

II.1 Human-Wildlife Conflict

Although some Kenyan researchers and conservationists have maintained that people bordering wildlife conservation sites hold negative attitudes towards wildlife, their observations lack empirical evidence and are largely a vestige of misguided colonial conservation policy in Kenya which depicted people bordering wildlife areas as the greatest threat to the wildlife resource, totally ignoring the fact that such people had lived with and conserved wildlife for hundreds of years. Yet, as the world and the country grows smaller with increased development and growing population as well as the change in government which has taken a more community-centered approach to conservation, human-wildlife conflict has become an issue of many shade of gray.

Opposition to accommodating wildlife on private land has often been wrongly interpreted to mean people have negative attitudes towards wildlife in Kenya. Yet it is the socio-economic activities including land use practices of people bordering wildlife conservation sites that determine whether or not co-existence is a workable conservation strategy, and argues that wildlife conservation approaches in Kenya must, as a matter of necessity, adapt to changing circumstances in areas surrounding the country's parks and reserves. The consensus amongst most communities is that both people and wildlife are better off if wildlife has its own area in which to live, away from human settlement and activity.

Complaints of crop damage in the wildlife dispersal area surrounding Maasai Mara are a reflection of the changes in socio-economic activities of the landowners who were previously associated with strict pastoralism. Cultural transformation in Maasai land is largely affecting their traditional community values, perceptions about land use and patterns of land ownership. Communal land is rapidly being sub-divided and turned to private ownership, fenced and turned to from land or sold of to outsiders who in turn convert it to crop land.

It is clear that consensus among residents of both areas is that wildlife be kept within conservation sites to reduce conflicts with humans. Kenya Wildlife Service policies have often been criticized for being divorced from reality. Indeed, wildlife conservation in Kenya has been plagued by inappropriate policies for quite some time now. This study illustrates how people bordering wildlife conservation sites have often found themselves on the frontier of the organization's policy conflicts and contradictions. Strong support for adequate and prompt compensation is evidence that those neighboring conservation sites expect relief from costs associated with living with wildlife. However, the Kenya Wildlife Service, without consulting the affected communities, scrapped the compensation scheme for all forms of property damage caused by wildlife about ten years ago. The apathy with which the

organization treats property loss and damage suffered by local residents is demonstrated by the fact that it no longer records cases of damage or loss of private property caused by wild animals. The corollary of such apathy is that most local residents no longer bother to report such cases. Essentially therefore, the situation translates to mean that individual landowners bordering wildlife conservation sites maintain, at a personal cost, a resource, which is managed primarily as a national asset.

Well over 70 per cent of Kenya's Wildlife is found outside protected areas. KWS, which is charged with the conservation of wildlife throughout the country, believes that conservation of wildlife outside protected areas cannot be achieved without addressing the needs and rights of communities coexisting with wildlife. Hence, a sustainable strategy of wildlife conservation in places where wildlife coexist with human beings is a major objective of KWS.

One of the main achievements of KWS on the community wildlife program has been the creation of awareness and the mobilization of communities to such an extent that, at present, people in dispersal areas are proposing wildlife conservation and utilization projects.

KWS provides training for selected community leaders and representatives in human-wildlife conflict areas. Under the working partnership that has been established, communities identify those individuals they consider to be reliable, and KWS trains them as community conservation scouts. This has not only relieved pressure on the skeleton KWS field staff but more importantly, it has brought about community participation in conservation.

In the past, communities were used to receiving and sharing KWS funds put at their disposal. KWS is now moving away from this and encouraging communities to come up with their own income-generating projects. The past one year or so has seen an encouraging increase in the number of such projects as opposed to social projects - a positive change from an earlier attitude of dependency on KWS.

A number of community-run game sanctuaries have been proposed and with KWS's technical assistance, these projects, now at advanced implementation stages, will form the first ever community run game parks in Kenya. They include the Golini Mwaluganje Community Game Sanctuary at the foot of Shimba Hills in Kwale District. Another community project is the Shimoni Nkwiro-Kibuvuni Fishermen Project. This is an artisan fishing project that will involve local communities in the preservation of the lagoon off Shimoni and Wasini Islands, as well as at the Mpunguti Marine Reserve south of Mombasa. Also the Iingwesi Tourist Bandas, a community project to be constructed on an escarpment in Laikipia District in Central Kenya that will link the Iingwesi community to the revenue from the tourist circuit of northern Kenya.

FOREIGN PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Under the Wildlife Development Fund Program introduced by KWS in 1990, community and enterprise development projects totaling K. shs. 54 million (US\$ 981,800) have been approved and disbursements totaling K shs. 36,954,980 (US\$ 671,909) made.²

KWS is not the only country investing in ecotourism. The USAID in partnership with the World Bank are providing a propelled multilateral funding to KWS for ecotourism in a number of projects. The majority of private organizations that run parks and programs at the KWS reserves are sponsored by foreign donors, usually NGOs. The Masaai Mara, the largest and most famous game reserve in Kenya, is completely privatized.

Dr. Chris Gakahu, a Kenyan ecotourism expert, says tapping the potential to the benefit of Kenyans and most other people in Africa is not going to be easy. He observes that while residents of the Nepalese villages on the slopes of Mt. Everest pocket as much as 60 percent of the trekkers' dollars because they own the cottages, cook the food, and guide trekkers, in Kenya, the communities living within the boundaries of the game parks do not even share in as much as 20 percent of the revenue from safaris³. However, KWS scientists and others in the travel industry agree that the country's US\$350 million tourism industry could gain greatly from increased investment and aggressive marketing of a people-oriented and eco-friendly package dubbed ecotourism.

Conflict is also exacerbated by the Maasai's dissatisfaction about the current level of wildlife-derived benefits being extended to the local communities. Currently, Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) distributes approximately US\$10,000 among the seven group ranches adjoining Amboseli National Park. The forum heard that the amount was not only meager; it was erratically given, in spite of the fact that Amboseli generates more tourists' dollars for KWS than any other park in the country. Moreover, lodges in Amboseli employ more than 1,500 people of which Amboseli residents constitute fewer than 100 people,⁴ put in the most undignified, poorly paid positions. Amboseli residents feel cheated and are increasingly becoming resentful of tourism and conservation programs alike.

² Kenya Wildlife Service. www.kws.org. 2003.

³ Chris Gakahu. Lewa Wildlife Conservancy. 2002.

⁴ Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project. www.acwtp.org. 2000.

ECOTOURISM

Ecotourism, which is a relatively new concept, is expected to help save wildlife and the environment, while bringing in the much needed cash to local communities. Yet, preserving nature and at the same time generating income from it has always been a tricky balancing act, with nature always losing to human greed.

In recent years, KWS has been actively involved in the sensitization of communities coexisting with wildlife to get involved in its management so as to sustain their natural resources. While the conservation of Kenyan biodiversity is the core mandate of KWS, the organization long realized that without active community participation, resulting in their reaping of direct benefits from wildlife-based tourism, there could be no guarantee as to the survival of wildlife and nature for posterity.

For ecotourism to succeed, emphasis has to be on the rights of communities coexisting with wildlife. Communities living in an area that supports 90% of Kenya's wildlife receive less than Ksh1 billion (\$ 13.2 million) of the estimated Ksh 400 billion (\$ 5.4 billion) earned by wildlife based tourism annually.⁵ Despite this, the communities have literally no say in conservation policy. The recent outrage by the Maasai community in Kitengela whose cattle had been killed by lions is a pointer to the urgent need to review the wildlife policy that seems to favor animals to human beings.

A major problem facing ecotourism in Africa in general, and Kenya in particular, relates to the land rights of people in areas with tourism potential. In Kenya, demand for huge and immediate returns from tourism for people living around protected areas is a sensitive issue that both KWS and Kenyan authorities are grappling with. Sustainable tourism in both protected and community areas demand the re-examination of the extent to which people are allowed access to and use of land for tourism purposes.

According to the recent estimates by 9 major Wildlife forums in Kenya that include Samburu, Nakuru, Laikipia, Kenya Marine Forum, Machakos Wildlife forum, Taita-Taveta, Narok, Kajiado and Kwale wildlife forums, 70 - 90% of the wildlife roam on private peoples land.⁶ The government of Kenya has failed to recognize the fact that these locals are legitimate partners in the wildlife industry. The voice of these communities have remained locked out as the government often chooses to listen to NGOs that benefit from funding that focuses in the status quo.

Despite the good intentions of those who want to protect animals and plants for their intrinsic value, unless a species has economic value there is little motive for people to conserve it. Elephants and Lions may appear valuable to some, but certainly not to the subsistence farmers of Africa, whose crops are trampled, livestock mauled and human life lost. However if the communities that live next to elephant population's

⁵ James Shikwati. *Human - Wildlife Conflict: Which Way?* Defenders of Property Rights. 2003.

⁶ **Kenya Wildlife Service Review**, Kenya Wildlife Service. 2000.

can benefit economically from the elephants, they will value them. This also gives people incentives to work together to stop poachers.

Conservationists driven with good intentions and fundraisers raise millions of dollars in the name of protecting wildlife and have an incentive to keep things as they are. These groups have pursued preservation policies as opposed to conservation. Conservation is the sustainable use, manipulation and management by man of renewable natural resources for both cultural and economic purposes such as hunting, fishing, logging, and grazing of livestock and soil utilization for agriculture. While preservation on the other hand focuses on complete protection of resources with minimal management interventions allowing natural regulations to determine the evolution of the ecosystems such as national parks.

Human centered conservation, based on incentives to protect both animals and vegetation, is critical to the success of any conservation endeavor. This will happen only if the rural poor who live closest to the wild animals are involved and enfranchised in the process of conservation, through the extension of protection of property rights to land and wildlife.

III. CASE STUDIES

III. 1

NAIROBI NATIONAL PARK

Friends of Nairobi National Park – Kitengela Wildlife Conservation Lease Program

BACKGROUND

As the oldest national park in Kenya, Nairobi National Park (NNP) is unique in that it is a wildlife game reserve bordering a major city which is only minutes away in the background of the richly diverse wildlife. It is a relatively small park compared to others in Kenya, roughly only 117 sq. kilometers. Although some animals remain within the boundaries of the park, there is a seasonal migration year-round by some 20,000 herbivorous animals, mostly wildebeest and zebra, into the dispersal region of the Kitengela area⁷. As a result of this the pressures on land owners to protect their land from wildlife as well as destruction of livestock and cattle by animals that hunt in the region, threatens the balance of the wildlife in the ecosystem as well as animal migration which is necessary for wildlife biodiversity sustainability.

The land to the south of the Park has traditionally been utilized by the Maasai people and their livestock. Today, most the land is privately owned, but over 70% of the landowners are still pastoralists⁸, depending largely on their herds of cattle, sheep and goats to sustain their livelihoods. The Masaai pastoralists who live close to the park have long shared their land with the wildlife there yet now increasingly many are selling pieces of their land to new groups moving into the region, mainly those of the Kikuyu ethnic group.

As a result of the growth of the human population, the pressures on the land are increasing, exacerbating tension between the community and the wildlife. Traditionally the Masaai community living in this area have never benefited from the wildlife there. During the drought in 2000, 85% of Masaai lost some livestock due to predators and wildlife related diseases as the wildlife from the Park migrated far south in search for grazing lands⁹. As evident in the current controversy in Nairobi National, conflict between the Masaai and government over wildlife has been a constant problem in the dispersal region.

Working closely with Kenya Wildlife Service, Friends of Nairobi National Park (FoNNaP) is a non-profit organization formed in August of 1995 as a support group with a broad-based membership whose primary aim is to safeguard the future of

⁷ Nairobi National Park. Friends of Nairobi National Park. 2000.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

Nairobi National Park. Against the backdrop of human-wildlife conflict and fencing debates, FoNNaP works to alleviate conflict between the communities of the Kitengela dispersal region through the Kitengela Wildlife Conservation Lease Program.

KITENGELA WILDLIFE CONSERVATION LEASE PROGRAM

Since the inception of the Kitengela Wildlife Conservation Lease Program in April of 2000, the program has taken active steps to address the plight of the Masaai families living in the Kitengela dispersal region.

The idea behind the Kitengela Lease Program is to provide monetary compensation for use of the privately owned land in the Kitengela region. The Wildlife Foundation (WF), which runs the program, pays land owners for use of their land by the wildlife that migrates to the area year-round. The families are paid K. Shs. 300 (roughly US \$4) per acre unfenced land per year to leave the land open for wildlife to graze under certain stipulations which are agreed upon in the contract signed by the family and the Foundation. In return for the compensation, the families must agree to keep the land unfenced, not actively develop the land through farming or construction and to protect the wildlife and plants from poaching and destruction. Also families are not permitted to sell their land while under the program.

Many of the 115 families currently participating in the lease program own up to and more than 100 acres of unfenced fallow land and so are receiving up to K. Shs. 30,000 every year. The payments come in three equal installments given directing to the individual families during an open community ceremony. The checks are handed directly to the landowners rather than a chief or community council, which often results in little trickling down of money and corruption. The payments are also set to coincide with school opening days so that parents are encouraged to use to money for school fees for their children. The majority of the 115 families in the program use the funds for this purpose.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

In its third year of implementation, the program continues to have success with the community in changing attitudes towards wildlife growing from its two initial participating families to 115 in 2003 and many more on the waitlist. The program is steadily expanding and more land will be included as funds permit. Aside from its collaborative partners, the Wildlife Trust in the U.S. and the Kenya Wildlife Trust in the U.K., the lease program is currently generating interest from other donors who view the success of the program as an effective method to alleviate human-wildlife conflict through community-building practices.

By providing direct benefits for use of their land by wildlife, the community learns to view wildlife in a more positive light. The area of the dispersal region is often unreliable with rain and in periods of drought or low rainfall, the families under the

program can depend on the supplementary income they receive from the lease program. The program also discourages land sales by the participating families. Education of Masaai children has also increased as a result of the program as families are now able to send their children to school using the payment they receive from the program.

There are still many families that are outside the program and are eager to join. The lease program for now is limited by its funds in its scope and range but eventually it is intended to include all the key parts of the migration route and dispersal area, specifically that of the zebra dispersal area and wildebeest calving area.

III.2

AMBOSELI NATIONAL PARK

AMBOSELI COMMUNITY-WILDLIFE TOURISM PROJECT

BACKGROUND

The name “Amboseli” actually comes from the Maasai word “embosel” which means “a dry open area”. The Maasai people first came here about three hundred years ago, replacing other more primitive people. In those days the Maasai were nomadic pastoralists, relying entirely on their cattle sheep and goats for all their requirements. They moved between the best areas for grazing and there was plenty of land for everyone. They did not hunt the wildlife but learned to live with it quite peaceably with only the occasional fracas taking place, either in defense of their livestock, or to provide sport for the Maasai warriors. But since the population has grown and cattle numbers have increased, pressures on the land have widened and there is less and less room for wildlife.

Up to the turn of the last century, the numbers of wildlife had remained more or less constant, but over the past 50 years there has been a marked decline, not only in the variety of species in the ecosystem but, also and more significantly, in the numbers of those species that do remain. Elephants are the only herbivore that has increased over the same period, but this increase has been mainly within Amboseli National Park and its immediate vicinity.

A widespread unbalancing has consequently occurred, leading to the dying out of some of the more palatable plants and the proliferation of others that only the now absent wild herbivores eat. It is this growing absence of a variety of wild herbivores that is the main cause of the degeneration of the herbage that has in turn, led to a drastic reduction in the quality of livestock. This is the main cause of the poverty and near starvation of the rural population.

The Maasai are learning that cattle and goats actually need elephants and rhinos to keep their pastures healthy. There is now a real threat of more decimation to the remaining wild herds through the bush meat trade, which, if allowed to continue unchecked, will reduce the numbers of wildlife to a point where even the remaining species will be unable to regenerate. The encroachment of subsistence farming is also threatening to render some of the most important wildlife habitats useless. Based on our knowledge gained over many years and our close association both with the communities and with the wildlife of the area, we are convinced that the isolated

islands of conservation, notably the Amboseli National Park and the three existing community wildlife sanctuaries will not be sufficient to save the ecosystem.

Prolonged droughts in 1999 and 2000 were the worst in 25 years¹⁰ and led to widespread competition for water throughout East Africa. Many rivers, swamps, and dams dried up, and the few water sources that survived the droughts immediately became hot spots for human-wildlife conflict. This natural catastrophe caused starvation among wildlife, livestock, and even people in some parts of Kenya.

This situation has led to a severe deterioration of the vegetation which has suffered from overgrazing and from the absence of wild herbivores that used to graze and browse the whole mosaic of plants. As a result, the quality of the Maasai livestock has deteriorated and become more susceptible to drought and disease. The people themselves have become poverty-stricken due to their dependence on their livestock and regularly have to seek aid for food during drought periods.

About half of the children receive primary education and some of the luckier ones go on to secondary school. Education brings new horizons and new aspirations, and many of the more educated individuals are now looking for ways to supplement their meager income. Some believe the future lies in irrigating parts of their land to grow cash crops such as tomatoes and vegetables, moving away from the traditional practice of pastoralism and communal land ownership.

In many of the arid areas of Africa, wildlife has been shown to be the most sustainable and economically viable resource available, yet it is still the most under-utilized. Unlike domestic stock or subsistence crops, wildlife is drought resistant and disease resistant. It thrives without human input, for it is self-sustaining and self-regenerating. Allow it an area of land and provide proper tourist facilities and people will come from the ends of the earth to spend a few days in the African bush watching and photographing it, and they will be prepared to pay dearly for the privilege of doing so.

¹⁰ James Shikwati. *Human - Wildlife Conflict: Which Way?* Defenders of Property Rights. 2003.

The Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project

The Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project (ACWTP) is a community-based organization run by local people from Loitokitok, Kenya committed to saving the Amboseli ecosystem by encouraging the Maasai landowners to use the wildlife they have on their land as a resource. The objectives of the ACWTP are:

- to reduce the poverty of the rural Maasai population,
- secure the biodiversity of the Amboseli ecosystem,
- engender sustainable conservation amongst the Maasai community landowners,
- reduce the reliance on livestock by generating income from wildlife,
- and increase direct benefits for the community from wildlife tourism.

The ACWTP facilitates the setting aside of such areas for wildlife tourism. Already it has helped a number of landowners to mark out viable areas and has introduced them to reputable tour companies who are renting the areas, paying bed-night fees, and employing the local people.

ACWTP is run by a few local people who have the knowledge and expertise to advise the landowners on suitable areas for tourism and can undertake negotiations on their behalf with reputable tour operators who will develop them for tourism. Three areas amounting to roughly 200 sq. kilometers have so far been set aside by the landowners assisted and facilitated by the ACWTP. Rent is being paid together with a bed-night fee for every visitor, and local people have taken up employment in the developments.

The organization produced a 25-minute film in the Maasai language showing clearly the benefits that can accrue from allowing wildlife tourism on their land. This film is taken around to village centers and shown to the community during meetings. The local community is then invited to share in the discussions about the new concept for reducing their poverty through wildlife conservation and tourism on their land.

ACWTP will facilitate community meetings to discuss the setting aside of areas for wildlife tourism. When the community is ready to declare such areas, ACWTP will advise them on the best areas for tourism. When everybody is happy with the decision, we will mark out the boundaries and erect notice boards so that everyone knows where the areas are.

Employment is the one means of gaining income directly to those members of the community who have no access to other income from rentals and visitor fees. Similarly, the project's objective is to support and enable the communities to manage wildlife tourism alongside pastoral activities. A small college will be set up in Loitokitok, the main centre for the area, for the practical training of skills in hotel and guiding work so that as many local people as possible will be qualified to apply for work in the tourist developments. There will also be representative training in more specialised techniques, including negotiation skills, estate management, book-keeping and borehole maintenance in order that the landowners may understand that they have responsibility to manage their areas in accordance with good accountability and transparency.

Representatives from the organization travel to schools within the Loitokitok region and talk to the children, explaining why wildlife is important to them. The video shows visitors paying to enter national parks to see and photograph the animals inside. It explains why wildlife is a good thing and can be used as a resource.

For the first time, the herdsmen can see actual benefits coming from the wildlife that graze their lands. These benefits come in the form of supplementary income for their family and revenue for the community. All illegal killing of wildlife within these three areas has stopped and if any snares set by the bush meat traders are found they are destroyed immediately. But many more areas must be set aside before the ecosystem can safely be regarded as secure.

The sponsors of the ACWTP are The Mayer Foundation of Liechtenstein, The Kenya Wildlife Trust, Drusillas Zoo Park in East Sussex, United Kingdom, The Irish African/Asian Conservation and Wildlife Trust and British Airways.

III.3

Tsavo National Park Friends of Tsavo

Tsavo National Park, gazetted in 1948, is one of the largest and most diverse national parks in Kenya. Covering a total area of approximately 21, 000 square kilometers (roughly the size of New Jersey), the park is bisected into two sections: Tsavo East and West.

TSAVO EAST - Area 11,747 sq. kms. The Eastern section of this park is strategically located because of its proximity to Mombasa. The geophysical features within this section of the park date back centuries and have led to the formation of the Yatta Plateau, one of the longest in the world. With lowlands interspersed with rocky outcrops and hills, Tsavo East's vegetation structure has been greatly transformed from woodlands into bush and grasslands. The Athi River is also found in Tsavo East before emptying into the Indian Ocean. Seasonally, the Voi River fills the Aruba Dam where huge concentrations of wildlife can be found. Prominent features include The Mudanda rock, a water-catchment area and Lugard Falls.¹¹

TSAVO WEST - Area 9,065 sq. kms. In contrast to the East, Tsavo West is more rugged in its features. This has been attributed to previous volcanic activity forming numerous volcanic hills (Chyulu), steep escarpments (Ngulia) and deep valley beds. The higher altitude on this side of the park contributes to a more picturesque landscape characterized by dense, luscious vegetation. Major attractions in Tsavo West National Park include Mzima Springs, The Chyulu Hills formed 600 years ago and the 8 sq. km Shetani molten lava spread.¹²

The biological diversity and geographical land variation of Tsavo reflects wealth and abundance of its flora and fauna yet its fragility is no less pronounced in the delicate maintenance of an equilibrium on its animal population dynamics and the sustenance of the habitat in relation to the limited land resources compounded by the increasing demand for land settlement and farming by a fast growing human population living on the periphery of the park.

It is in Tsavo, a land that once teemed with abundant wildlife, that the once harmonious relationship between man and wilderness is being threatened. Land encroachment by an increasing population has resulted in a loss of habitat and species extinction on the park's edges. Off-road driving has also contributed negatively to the vegetation affecting the ecosystem. Hostility between local community and wildlife, fire and inadequate resources remain a major threat to Tsavo's future. It is with this intent that F.O.T has emerged to work in conjunction with the Kenya wildlife services to ensure the future of Tsavo National Parks and its wildlife and integrate the local community through incentives into conservation undertakings.

¹¹ Tsavo West National Park. Kenya Wildlife Service. www.kws.org. 2003.

¹² Tsavo West National Park. Kenya Wildlife Service. www.kws.org. 2003.

FRIENDS OF TSAVO

“Without the acceptance of the people who share the land with wildlife, all conservation efforts will be fruitless.” This is the primary objective of the Friends of Tsavo (FoT) seeks to create an educational awareness by organizing educational field trips to Tsavo East and West National Parks with its members and school children from urban centers and those in the vicinity of the national park in an effort to introduce them to the realm of wildlife conservation with the end result of active participation.

One of F.O.T's future projects involves the effective management of fire within the park. Fire continues to pose as a major threat to Tsavo's ecosystem and is greatly responsible for the alteration of the vegetation structure and habitat transformation.

A funds drive organized by the Trust received wide support from the public especially school children who are the future stewards of our heritage. Collections were set aside in the fire kitty to facilitate the urgent implementation of firebreaks on the park boundaries. Occurrence of fire in the park is common as the peripheral communities often start the fires and aided by strong winds and dry vegetation precipitate catastrophe as evidenced in the August 1998 catastrophe.

The establishment of fire breaks as an effective management initiative is critical to prevent the reoccurrence of fires but insufficient funds have deterred this particular initiative to be carried out. To combat this problem, F.O.T will continue to try and raise funds in assisting out this particular project.

IV. CURRENT ISSUES

IV.1 Nairobi National Park

BACKGROUND

Since late July of 2003, over 26 cows, 14 goats and 10 sheep have been killed by the lions in the Kitengela area alone by lions that strayed too far from the Nairobi National Park. This has been caused by the migration of their prey and source of food from the park due to prolonged drought. The lions have been left with nothing to prey on so they go where the food is. In this case, this would be the Kitengela dispersal region into the Maasai lands and their livestock.

In the current conflict, the Maasai morans have vowed to kill every lion that tries to kill their cattle, sheep or goats. In July, the Maasai launched a massive counter-attack against the lions, holding a rare ceremony that signaled the beginning of an all out war against the lions. Led by their elders, the morans conducted a ritual, called the *emayian*, a symbolic blessing ceremony signifying the beginning of a battle. As of August of 2003, there have been 10 lions hunted and killed by the neighboring Maasai community living in the NNP/Kitengela dispersal region. The Nairobi National Park lions' saga has precipitated a dangerous confrontation between the Maasai community in Kitengela on the one hand and the Ministry Environment, Natural Resources and Wildlife and the Kenya Wildlife Service on the other.

Yet as one Masaai moran states, the situation is not by choice of the community but a necessity. "It is due to this impunity on the part of the government that we have resolved to take up arms and defend our cattle, our heritage."¹³ The Masaai have a long history of tolerance and co-existence with wildlife. Unlike members of other communities, they do not hunt game for meat or other products. In the past, eating game meat by a Masaai was regarded as taboo. The Masaai have traditionally lived alongside the wildlife and practiced conservation, as evident in their Many of the Masaai warriors are past victims of the wildlife, each with stories of lost family members and limbs as a result of their proximity to the wildlife.

As the controversy gained media coverage, pressure on KWS to fence the Park increased from both sides as the attack on the lions increased. The Minister for Environment, Natural Resources and Wildlife committed helicopters and no less than 50 security personnel to track down and arrest those who are known to have killed the 10 lions at the Nairobi National Park. Yet this is not very effective in both government's inefficiency to actually enforce this as well as the Masaai's refusal to back down. Their livestock is more important to them than their lives and as they have experienced harrowing suffering at the hands of wildlife, the thought of going to jail for killing them does little to deter their hunt on the Nairobi lions.

¹³ Masaai elder, Jared Ole Leloon Maise. Quoted from **Maasai elder to Govt: Stop these marauding lions**. By Dann Okoth. East African Standard. July 7, 2003.

KWS as of July 28 has contained lions in the Nairobi National Park to end the human-wildlife conflict. The KWS is feeding lions on carcasses from herbivorous animals from a game ranch in Athi River twice in a week to restrain them from killing farmers' livestock. The organization captured all lions from the Kitengela area and they have now been contained in the park to ensure that they do not kill any more livestock. Yet the communities are still hesitant of this claim and want reassurance that this will not happen again during the next drought as it is not possible to sustainably keep the lions restricted to the park all year-round.

IV.2 Aberdare National Park

BACKGROUND

As one of Kenya's five main "water towers", the forests of the Aberdares play a critical role in supporting the country's economy. They are the main source of water for Nairobi. Fifty-five percent of Kenya's electricity is generated by water flowing from the Aberdares and Mt. Kenya.¹⁴ The Aberdare Range is located in central Kenya on the Equator. The Range stretches over 125 kilometres from Nyahururu in the North to Limuru in the South. It is the third highest mountain in Kenya, with two main peaks, Oldonyo Lesatima (also known as Sattima) and Kinangop, which reach, respectively, altitudes of 4,001 and 3,906 meters.

The forest belt covers a major part of the range. Most of the forest is gazetted as forest reserves. However, parts of the upper forest zone fall within the Aberdare National Park. The forest belt of the Aberdare Range is characterized by a high diversity of forest types, because of the wide altitudinal range (from 1,800 to 3,600 metres) and the climatic differences between the slopes.

However, over the last decades, most of the forests of the Aberdares have been the focus of irregular settlements and large-scale illegal exploitation, such as charcoal production and logging of indigenous trees. The Government is committed to improving the current situation in the Aberdares that calls for urgent policy responses. In 2002, Rhino Ark, in response to increasing public outcry about widespread forest destruction in the Aberdares, requested the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), KWS and the Kenya Forests Working Group (KFWG) to undertake an aerial survey of the Aberdare Range forests.

The review revealed extensive indigenous forest destruction in critical catchment areas, large scale encroachments, as well as rampant charcoal production. Although some few localized actions were taken, the overall situation on the ground did not show any significant improvement. Illegal activities went on unabated in many areas. Since its inception in 1987, Rhino Ark has launched a number of initiatives aimed at conserving the Aberdares, its habitats and wildlife. These initiatives include the construction of 320 kilometers of fence around the Aberdare Range forests to reduce human-wildlife conflict and protect the natural ecosystem from illegal exploitation.

Logging

The magnitude of forest destruction through logging of indigenous trees is very high. Logging of indigenous trees has been banned since the 1986 Presidential Ban on the Exploitation of Indigenous Forests. Since that time, licenses to harvest indigenous trees have been granted on an exceptional basis, but no such licenses have been issued recently in the Aberdares. All the nearly 10,000 recently logged trees recorded in the Aberdares are the result of illegal activities.

Charcoal production

¹⁴ Butynski, T. *Aberdares National Park and Aberdares Forest Reserves Wildlife Fence Placement Study and Recommendations*. 1999.

Some 14,500 charcoal kilns were recorded in the Aberdare Range forests. Such an extremely high occurrence of charcoal production sites represents the largest single threat to the forests and is the main cause of destruction of the forest cover in many areas. Charcoal production inside forest reserves is illegal in view of the extensive destruction of tree cover associated with traditional charcoal production methods, and also the fire risks it presents to the forest ecosystem.

Overgrazing

Extremely high numbers of livestock were recorded throughout the lower elevations of the Aberdare Range. Some 18,497 head were counted from the aircraft with many more remaining unseen in the forest. Although there is provision within the Forest Act for subsistence grazing (presumably not to the detriment of forest regeneration), these numbers imply uncontrolled access by opportunist farmers turned pastoralists. Furthermore, the presence of such herds is in direct competition with an increasingly beleaguered wildlife population affected by this and other human-induced activities. Small wonder that wildlife is constantly seeking to flee the area through ancient migratory routes, long since sealed off by settlement.

Policy mismanagement and abuse by the area by the community had added to the destruction of the Aberdare forest range.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based the existing programs and policies undertaken by private organizations in order to alleviate human-wildlife conflict, what can policies can government and private institutions undertake to alleviate these situations?

The main issue in both NNP and Aberdares is the lack of policy enforcement. The government plays no hand in protecting the rights and livestock of the communities in the Kitengela dispersal region as well as enforces the bans on logging and charcoal production.

Nairobi National

In order to alleviate human-wildlife conflict between the lions of the Park and the Masaai community, KWS must take steps to provide benefits to groups whose livelihoods are threatened by wildlife. These policies include:

- stricter enforcement on compensation for loss of life and wildlife for communities living in dispersal region
- incorporation of Kitengela communities into KWS policy formation regarding Nairobi National Park
- added monetary benefits to communities, especially during periods of increased wildlife interaction, such as drought
- education to communities of the activities of KWS as well as the benefits of wildlife

Fencing

There are currently no fences in NNP yet with the increase of media coverage on the Masaai-lion conflict as well as international pressure, the question of fencing as a solution to the conflict has become a hotly debated issue. The main issue of fencing is that NNP is not a self-contained ecosystem and the animals rely on migration into the dispersal region. A fence would prohibit the wildlife from leaving the Park area thus resulting in a disruption in the balance of ecosystem leading to overgrazing, disease and the decline in population.

The upside to fencing is that it puts an end to the human-wildlife conflict. Yet even in this, fencing is a short-term solution to a long-term problem that in fact, creates brand new problems. KWS is ignoring the source of the conflict which is the community's resentment towards the wildlife that they see no benefit from. If the Masaai were gaining some revenue from the wildlife use of their land in the dispersal region or compensated for loss of wildlife then they would be hesitant to kill the wildlife.

Alternative solutions

KWS should look to the actions of FoNNaP as a model of alleviating community-wildlife conflict. Instead of putting up a fence to separate the two, they should employ policies that show that the two can coexist and provide incentives or just that. A land lease policy, like the Kitengela Wildlife Lease Program, can be effective in providing the Masaai community with extra income to supplement their livestock and cover any loss of revenue they receive from predation by the wildlife.

An effective compensation policy is also another way to allay the crisis. As of now, KWS has a policy of compensation for loss of livestock and human life to wildlife yet the monetary sum is paltry (K. shs. 10,000 for livestock and K. shs. 30,000 for humans) and does not nearly match the long-term loss of income that the livestock or human could have produced. Also getting this money, even with a clear case of unprovoked wildlife predation, is often slow and difficult with many families still waiting on their compensation after years.

Ecotourism is also another method to create benefits for the community from the wildlife. As previously mentioned, some 20,000 wildebeest and zebra migrate into the Kitengela dispersal region year-round, attracting other animals, mainly predators and birds as well. During these periods of migration, tourists could view these animals in a more natural habitat than the Park. The Masaai should be able to take advantage of this by setting up community-run game ranches. As shown from the example of the ACWTP in Amboseli, ecotourism can reduce the poverty of the Maasai by diminishing their reliance on livestock which is often susceptible to the rise and falls of the unreliable climate. By generating income from wildlife the community will see the direct benefits from wildlife.

Aberdare Forest Range

The forests of the Aberdare Range are being devastated by large-scale unrestricted, illegal human activities of logging, charcoal production and overgrazing of the land by both the wildlife in the area and the livestock of the communities. The ongoing assault on these forests poses grave threat to Kenya's water security, biodiversity conservation and economic development.

Poor enforcement and abuse of forest regulations by those in charge of their application are clearly major contributing factors, as well as the use of wood fuel to meet over 70 percent of domestic energy needs in Kenya. High fuel price and low levels of employment are worsening the situation by producing a high demand for charcoal and people willing to take the risk of engaging in an illegal activity. This is the main cause for the

Prompt and effective policy responses are required to prevent further devastation of the Aberdare Range forests; its integrity is already in great jeopardy. These responses should take fully into account successes experienced in forest conservation, in particular those related to the protection measures put in place on Mt. Kenya since 2000, as well as the partial fencing of the Aberdares.

Fencing

Currently, roughly 160 kilometers of fence have been erected in the Aberdares and country-wide fund-raising activities are under way to secure the necessary funds for the completion of the fence. Electrified fencing is a management tool which has proved effective in Southern and Eastern Africa to control movement of wildlife, manage access - through agreed protocols - of people into protected areas and to reduce illegal, uncontrolled damage to the protected area products and natural resources. It can be among the most suitable solutions in areas where wildlife and high density farming communities are learning to live side by side. However, the effectiveness of a fence in controlling either wildlife or people depends on a number of factors, including: location, community acceptance, maintenance and manning.

In the Aberdares, the 160 kilometers of fence has succeeded in keeping some illegal activities at a very low level, in particular charcoal production. Logging still remains a persistent threat inside the fence, as well as livestock grazing, although their occurrence is less than in neighboring unfenced forest. People gain access to fenced forest through unmanned gates, by digging trenches underneath the fence and by short-circuiting the electric fence. Cultivation of crops, including tobacco and marijuana, is still high inside the fenced area. Cultivation of tobacco was occurring before the fence was erected.

Despite this contradiction, fencing the forest is now the leading solution for the Aberdare problem and will continue in order to prevent human-wildlife conflict and protect indigenous forests from illegal activities. Future fence alignment should follow the existing gazetted forest boundary.

However fencing should not be the only solution and other alternatives should be sought, especially those that integrate the community in the surrounding region. Fencing cuts off the wildlife from the surrounding area, thus inhibiting their movement and biodiversity. In order to sustain the biodiversity of the Aberdare Range for a long period of time, the Kenyan government should find more community-based solutions to the destruction of the Aberdares without relying too much on foreign investment. The community within the Aberdare range are all in a sense "stakeholders" in the forest range as their livelihoods are dependent on the state of the forest and in extension, the people of Kenya are as well as the Aberdare is an important water source for the country.

Alternative solutions

It has been suggested by the review team at UNEP that the government should consider nominating the Aberdare Range as a UNESCO World Natural Heritage Site. This would shift some of the burden of protecting the range from the domestic to international officials. If the Aberdare Range is seen as world natural heritage, then its protection would be more strictly enforced.

An integrated management plan for the Aberdare Range should be developed in consultation with all main stakeholders, taking into account traditional subsistence uses. A land use policy should be developed to induce land use planning that takes fully into account environmental constraints. If they were to implement a program similar to the ACWTP's land rental policy in Amboseli, where landowners are paid rent for the land that they decide to set aside for tourism. As the Aberdares is in many ways a "tragedy of commons", a land tenure system should be implemented. A landowner would be more loath to overgraze his land because it is his and he has nowhere else to go, than he would land that is used by everyone.

V. OBSERVATIONS/CONCLUSIONS

Fencing

Fencing, a controversial issue of wildlife conservation, is not completely black and white. Where it would be detrimental to wildlife sustainability and biodiversity in the case of Nairobi National Park, it has proven its effectiveness in the Aberdares in restricting the illegal activities that contribute to the destruction of the forest range. Yet, activities such as logging and charcoal production are more prevalent in the fenced part of the forest than the unfenced areas. Fencing should not be seen as the final solution but merely as a “Band-aid” to the conflict that serves merely as a transitional policy until community-government-wildlife conflict can find some reconciliation.

KWS should first seek out alternatives to fencing, focusing on how to create an environment where humans and wildlife coexist successfully instead of looking to complete separation as the answer. When polled, the majority of people in communities did not support the killing or complete translocation of wildlife¹⁵ thus showing that the issue against the wildlife is more that the people see no benefit from them to want them on their land rather than a wholly negative view on wildlife in general.

Water

As issue that is equally as important and crucial in the human-wildlife conflict is that of water resources. Water, alone, is scarce, but tourism also adds to the problem of water provision as tourist sites and game ranches use up a lot of water for the neighboring regions.

For both cattle and wildlife the critical resource is water. Permanent surface water is extremely scarce but can be provided effectively either by drilling boreholes or by tapping into existing pipelines in the area. According to the people in the Amboseli Park region, approximately 80% of the permanent sources of water are located in the center of the park¹⁶. Additionally, women and children have to endure a 10-15 kilometer daily trudge across the Amboseli basin into the middle of the park to fetch water for domestic use. This increased human presence in the park, coupled with human-elephant-livestock convergence at the watering points, creates tremendous tension resulting in occasional deadly conflicts.

In order to give an incentive for the landowners to approve of wildlife tourism in their areas, and to investors to develop the areas, water provision should be guaranteed for the community in exchange for tourist sites to be set up in their community. This combination means that the immediate practical needs of the herders are being met, whilst at the same time enabling the introduction of the wildlife tourist development.

Government enforcement and policy change

¹⁵ GOSSOW, H. and Kassily, F.N. **The People-Wildlife Problems in Kenya and their Solutions: Some management considerations.**

¹⁶ Amboseli Community Wildlife Tourism Project. www.amboseli.org

The source of these conflicts lies in poor policy management on behalf of the government. Privatized institutions and community groups themselves must take on the roles of conflict managers because of the government's traditional stance on taking the side of the wildlife. KWS has yet to develop a clear policy towards wildlife and ecotourism and as much of their funding comes from outside private investors, often their actions reflect those of their donors.

The government must play a greater role in wildlife conservation but with some limitations. It should be their responsibility to enforce policies such as the bans on logging and charcoal production in the Aberdares as well as making sure that fenced areas are manned to prohibit individuals from sneaking in to log or illegally cultivate. Also, they need to encourage more community-based conservation through ecotourism. Although government traditionally has not involved itself in ecotourism as it has always been a role of the private sector, through trade shows encouraging other countries to invest in community-run ranches and subsidies for ranches and reserves run by the community, they can increase the benefits to the community.

Community ecotourism exploitation

Government should not take sole responsibility for alleviating human-wildlife conflict. The private sector has always been in the forefront of wildlife conservation and human conflict. In this respect, the community must take the lead in providing benefits for themselves using the wildlife. Sustainable use of wildlife not only through controlled culling and game hunting but also through ecotourism can benefit communities if they ensure they are the direct recipients of the revenue.

Communal group ranches have little control by the people that receive the benefits as a result of lack of resource control. Too often communities are often cut out of the chain of benefits by the government and local community councils. They see only a small fraction of the ecotourism profits yet are often the ones who run the ranches and must bear the burden of the wildlife and tourists who inhabit the area. Exploitation of the community in ecotourism is all too much of a common practice and it is up to the communities themselves along with joint collaborations with the private sector to ensure that they have some collective bargaining power.

Similar to farmers' associations, a group of NGOs and private institutions are in the process of creating a network of community ecotourism organizations. The working idea behind Kenya Community Tourism Network (KCTN) is to empower the communities through the creation of an umbrella organization that facilitates information-sharing between the communal groups. Communities should be educated to be made aware of their rights and the possibilities available to them through ecotourism. The KCTN would also advise communal groups on methods to alleviate human-wildlife conflict as well as set up institutions like a trust so as to cut out the middle man which often pockets most of the tourist revenue so that the community sees very little of it.

Organizations like the KCTN and others that work directly with rural landowners in simple terms to inform them of the power that they can have in their own communities towards wildlife policy can work to end human-wildlife conflict. Recognizing that the problem lies in the socio-economic issues that lie deep within Kenyan society is the first step to addressing the issue.

The fact remains that in order for Kenya to have sustainable wildlife conservation, they must work with the community and incorporate communal forms of wildlife management as well as the benefits of ecotourism in order to create a situation in which the rural population and landowners can learn to cooperate with the wildlife rather than come into conflict. This study was an exercise in examining the ways in which organizations at national parks have been successful with dealing with the human-wildlife issue through various community-building measures. Hopefully in the future, more parks will adopt community-building strategies whether through ecotourism or clear land policies that will make it more beneficial for communities and wildlife to share one ecosystem.

VI. APPENDIX

- BELL, R.H.V. 1986. **The Man-Animal Interface: An assessment of crop damage and wildlife control.** In *Conservation and Wildlife Management in Africa.* (Eds. R.H.V. Bell and E. McShane-Caluzi). U.S. Peace Corps.
- BUTYNSKI, T. (1999): **Aberdares National Park and Aberdares Forest Reserves Wildlife Fence Placement Study and Recommendations.** Africa Biodiversity Conservation Programme. Zoo Atlanta.
- CHURCH, Colin, Michael Gachanja, Christian Lambrechts and Bongo Woodley. **AERIAL SURVEY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE ABERDARE RANGE FORESTS.** Division of Early Warning and Assessment. United Nations Environment Program. April 2003
- COLERIDGE, E. and Mathai, N. (2002): **Conservation Status of the Aberdare Ecosystem as Influenced by Attitudes of Communities towards the Forest and Electric Fence: Social, Economic and Political Factors in the Area.** KFWG and Rhino Ark. Nairobi, Kenya.
- EMERTON, L., Ndugire, N. and Bokea, C. (1998): **The Costs of Environmental Degradation to the Kenyan Economy:**KWS. Nairobi, Kenya.
- GOSSOW, Hartmut and Frederick N. Kassily. **People-wildlife Problems in Kenya – Demands and Options for a Solution: Management implications of a case study.**
- GOSSOW, H. and Kassily, F.N.,. **The People-Wildlife Problems in Kenya and their Solutions: Some management considerations.** Proc. 2nd International. Wildlife Management. Congr., Gödöllő 1999.
- KASSILY, F.N. 2001. **Human Dimensions in Wildlife Resources Management in Kenya: A Study of People – Wildlife Relations around two Conservation Areas.** DISS Univ. Agric. Sciences Vienna. 273 pp.
- MEDA, William. **Kenya Wildlife Service Review,** Media Relations Manager, Kenya Wildlife Service
- MOSS, Cynthia - 'Elephant Memories' - **A Record of the Work Being Carried on by the Amboseli Elephant Research Programme** by its Director University of Chicago Press 2000
- MOSS, Cynthia - '**Portraits in the Wild' - Anecdotes of Kenya's wildlife**
- SMITH, David Lovatt - '**Amboseli - Nothing Short of a Miracle' - A brief history of the area over the last hundred years.** 2nd Ed, East African Educational Publishers, 1998

SMITH, David Lovatt - **'My Enemy, My Friend' - Covering Crucial Years of Kenya History, 1952-56.**

WESTERN, David - **'In the Dust of Kilimanjaro' - A Scientist's View of Amboseli.**