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### ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMADE</td>
<td>Administrative Management and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>Agro-Ecological Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE</td>
<td>Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community Based Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Community Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMACO</td>
<td>Community Markets for Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>Community Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESW</td>
<td>Economic and Sector Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWSZ</td>
<td>Environment and Wildlife Society of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNDP</td>
<td>Fifth National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>Game Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRZ</td>
<td>Government of the Republic of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDB</td>
<td>Integrated Resources Development Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METT</td>
<td>Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFAT</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTENR</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACSO</td>
<td>Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCF</td>
<td>Natural Resources Consultative Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACRA</td>
<td>Patents and Companies Registration Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRP</td>
<td>Public Service Reform Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWMA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMNCPAS</td>
<td>Reclassification and Effective Management of National Parks and Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>Sector Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED</td>
<td>Support for Economic Expansion and Diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNDP</td>
<td>Sixth National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCZ</td>
<td>Tourism Council of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WECNZ</td>
<td>Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCS</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAWA</td>
<td>Zambia Wildlife Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Zambia is endowed with an abundance of natural resources that include, water, forests and wildlife. The country’s wildlife resources are managed through government-supported National Parks and Game Management Areas (GMAs) and private sector game ranches. The wildlife estate consists of 20 National Parks and 36 GMAs. In the late 1990s, through the Public Service Reform Programme (PSRP), the Zambian Government embarked on civil service reforms with the aim of improving efficiency in service delivery. In part as an outcome of this process, the National Parks and Wildlife Department was transformed into a statutory body, the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) to streamline the management of protected areas, better share the benefits of sustainable utilisation with communities and contribute to tourism growth.

The reforms have, however, not delivered the intended environmental, economic and social benefits. ZAWA has had limited funding and insufficient capacity to fulfill its mandate over a huge national wildlife estate that occupies 30% of the land area of Zambia.

Where funding from external donor was provided, or where partnerships were established, the management of National Parks improved significantly. In some of the National Parks, tourism performed reasonably well. This implies that the substantial degradation of most other National Parks was not due to a misaligned policy, but either to a lack of capacity within ZAWA, or to a lack of finance.

The situation is different in GMAs, which not only suffered from lack of external financing for their development but also became, through safari hunting, the most critical source of revenue for ZAWA. Most importantly, the policy framework in which GMAs operate has many flaws such as in aspects of governance, resource tenure, accountability, which require correction through a new policy. For example, Community Resources Boards (CRBs), the official co-managers of the GMAs were not adequately structured, disciplined or supported. Because benefits from hunting were poorly distributed, governance issues emerged which compromised the progress that had been made during the 1990s in Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM).

In 2012, Zambian National Parks and GMAs are characterised by declining wildlife populations\(^1\), decreasing trophy quality\(^2\), encroachment\(^3\), low management effectiveness\(^4\), inadequate capacity (personnel and finance) in ZAWA and in other Protected Area systems\(^5\), poor investment in infrastructure and low funding from Government\(^6\). This state of affairs does not instill confidence in stakeholders that the current protected area management system is a viable option for biodiversity conservation and for sustained contributions to the national economy.

---

\(^1\) ZAWA Annual Report, 2004; also DSI, 2004, 2011 Pre-Safari Hunting Meeting, NRCF, 2008
\(^2\) NRCF, 2008
\(^3\) NRCF, 2008
\(^4\) Mwima/REMNPASS Project, 2007
\(^5\) DSI, 2004; WWF, 2004
\(^6\) World Bank, 2007
It may be concluded that the development of the national wildlife estate and its contribution to economic growth, employment generation and poverty alleviation has been limited by three principal factors:

1. ZAWA was not permitted to strengthen itself or to operate in an environment free of political influence;
2. ZAWA was required to operate with a budget, including government’s contribution, estimated at 20% of its critical needs; and
3. The interface between wildlife and people, mainly in GMAs and in the private wildlife estate, suffered from a policy framework that did not align incentives, particularly in the ownership of wildlife resources, to expected results.

Aware of the situation, in 2008, the Zambian Government decided to (a) restructure ZAWA, (b) augment its annual budget, and (c) revise its Wildlife Policy and legislation.

At the request of the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR), and as a member of the Sector Advisory Group (SAG), the World Bank provided advice when requested to help streamline the operations of ZAWA, elaborate biodiversity and tourism issues in the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) and initiate the present Wildlife Sector Policy Impact Analysis.

The main objective of this Wildlife Sector Policy review is to consolidate the findings collected from an extensive bibliography published during the life of the current policy, and the analysis of key sector practitioners. The second objective is to analyse these findings with a view to formulating broad recommendations to inform the design of the new vision and new policy of the sector.

This document aims to identify policy issues that would provide a basis for the creation of an enabling environment for the development of the wildlife sector as a growth sector according to the SNDP and the Vision 2030. It contains five provisional priority recommendations that offer practical solutions and six strategic options which constitute policy objectives. The draft document was reviewed by a panel from the Government, civil society and the private sector whose comments were incorporated.

As a next step toward policy revision in any sector, it is mandatory that the Ministry in charge of that sector carries out a broad-based consultation process prior to drafting a new policy for submission to and consideration by Cabinet. Prior to launching this process, it is recommended that the Government defines its medium-term vision and strategy for the wildlife sector including how it should contribute to tourism-led economic growth as measured by Gross Domestic Product (GDP) sector contribution, job creation, rural development, biodiversity and heritage conservation and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Business environment** - The new Wildlife Policy should fully align itself with the national trend to reduce bureaucratic processes and in particular with (a) the national
strategy on licensing, which aims to reduce the overall number of licences, and (b) the newly
drafted Tourism Policy and Hospitality Bill, which aim to streamline tourism-based business and
investment, especially as these relate to wildlife-based tourism development such as obtaining
and operating tourism and hunting concessions, simplifying park entry fees, and decreasing the
number of licences.

**Recommendation 2: Protected area reclassification** - The new Wildlife Policy should
establish new categories of protected areas in conformity with the conclusions of the recently
completed reclassification programme to enable the selection of priority areas and to promote an
integrated approach to resource management and utilisation. It should also create opportunities
for community and private sector participation in setting up new protected areas in open areas
and thereby diversify and expand the wildlife estate.

**Recommendation 3: Partnerships** - The new Wildlife Policy should provide for the process,
procedure and conditions for the development of more partnerships in Zambia as a way of
mobilising additional capacity for protected area management and as a way of decreasing the
public costs of developing and maintaining the wildlife estate. This would not be restricted to
the management of protected areas but embrace a variety of approaches including concessions
for running facilities, tourism joint ventures, community based natural resource management,
and co-management.

**Recommendation 4: Private wildlife estate** - The new Wildlife Policy should recognise and
render stronger support to the role of the private wildlife estate which is growing fast. Incentives
(e.g. tax breaks) and adequate regulations (e.g. wildlife ownership, commercialisation of
secondary products, fencing, etc.) would accelerate its development as a set of conservation
enterprises. Private wildlife estate would contribute to the nature-based tourism industry and to
the maintenance of ecosystem services on commercial land. Additionally, as ranching
enterprises, the estates contribute to food security by diversifying the source of meat protein on
the Zambian market and its environmental suitability. The private wildlife estate could also be
considered as a supporting element of the public protected area system.

**Recommendation 5: Governance of Game Management Areas** - The new Wildlife Policy
should propose a revision and strengthening of the overall governance and disciplines in GMAs
and increasing the share of revenues retained for GMA institutions. It is recommended that
communities organise themselves into legal entities under the Companies Act and enter into
management agreements with private enterprises for the use of GMA resources, possibly under
the guidance of an advisory committee. Such an arrangement should be made in accordance with
the regulation of ZAWA and local communities should also engage with other natural resource
sub-sectors and other stakeholders in GMAs.

---

7 The standard wording is Public Private Partnerships or PPPs. However, it appears to have led to confusion in the
wildlife sector and therefore the term 'Partnership' is preferred. This is because in protected area management the
private partner is usually a non-profit NGO rather than a for-profit company. There is a wide variation in the type,
form and scope of these Partnerships, all of which are valid as long as they are tailored to fit identified needs.
Strategic options

The foregoing recommendations are supported by a series of strategic options for the future Wildlife Policy and legislation that the Zambian policy makers may wish to take into consideration. Key options are discussed below.

1. Financing of conservation – Given that lack of financing is identified as one of the main causes for ineffectiveness of the current Wildlife Policy, the new policy could have a provision that unequivocally apportions to Government the main responsibility for financing the difference between an agreed realistic recurrent cost ceiling for managing the public wildlife estate and revenues generated from competitive statutory and other charges within it. The new Wildlife Policy could also articulate the respective roles of the Government, the Ministry, ZAWA, civil society and the private sector, in raising funds for the development and management of the public, community and private wildlife estate.

2. Citizen empowerment - The new Wildlife Policy should address the need for deliberately encouraging and training Zambians and Zambian businesses to get involved in the tourism industry including its wildlife sub-sector, the management of protected areas and in game farming. Regarding investment, it would be preferable that such encouragement could take the form of tax breaks, reduced licence fees, or scholarships in order to maintain a degree of competition.

3. ZAWA’s role - With the emergence of ‘business centres’ to run the affairs of national parks, and following the recommendations for protected area reclassification, developing various forms of partnership and modification of GMA governance, the policy should recognise that ZAWA’s role will evolve. In some cases, it will remain a managing institution (for the parks that remain managed by ZAWA), in others an associate (for the parks managed in partnerships), and in yet others a regulator (for the GMAs, forest reserves, game farms, game ranches, forest reserves and wildlife in the common areas). These roles should be clearly defined to avoid misunderstanding or potential conflicts of interest.

4. Incentive and market based mechanism - The new Wildlife Policy could provide for incentive and market based mechanisms for sustainable land management such as conservation easements, payment for ecosystem services, trade of carbon sequestration and purchase of development rights, where land holders agree to maintain their areas in a natural state while those benefiting from this maintenance agree to pay for this service. The policy could also recognise the respective wildlife land managers namely ZAWA in National Parks, Forest Department in various forest reserves, communities in GMAs, private companies in game farms who are the land holders and resource owners as producers of ecosystem services. Such recognition would entail providing them with facilities to access compensation mechanisms in a variety of private or public deals under existing and emerging multilateral environmental initiatives such as the BioCarbon Fund, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the REDD+ initiative and other climate change and environmental rehabilitation financing initiatives.

5. Community land trust, easements, and conservancies - The new Wildlife Policy should consider a variety of options for managing wildlife on land outside the wildlife domain but under
customary tenure. On land that they allocate to a form of wildlife-based land use, communities could either (a) engage directly in CBNRM, (b) join forces with a private investor through a joint venture or a Community Private Partnership (CPP) or (c) delegate management to a professional private operator for a fee. In any such case, an option would be to secure the land in community land trust. Another option would be to establish a conservation easement that does not affect tenure but legally prevents land transformation. The selected land can then be managed as a game farm, game ranch or wildlife reserve depending on the development objective and the commercial purpose. Conservancies are an option. They require land use and resource management planning on a substantial scale and delegation of resources ownership, tree and wildlife, to the conservancy itself.

6. Local Government - In line with the Decentralisation Policy, the new Wildlife Policy could have provisions for entrusting district councils with regulating hunting of wildlife in open areas that are not part of the public or private wildlife domain. The current Decentralisation Policy provides for the devolution of natural resource management and associated capacity to the district level. As the planning authorities and the secretariat of district development coordinating committees, district councils could play a key role in mainstreaming natural resource management in district development plans and budgets.

7. Other public entities - In line with the draft Forest Policy, the new Wildlife Policy could have provisions for entrusting the Forest Department with stimulating community and private sector involvement in forest management, including wildlife, as well as regulating hunting of wildlife and/or non-consumptive tourism in Forest Reserves. Other potential public partner entities would be the National Heritage Commission, the Department of Fisheries, and the Department of Water Affairs - all of which could be encouraged to become involved in managing wildlife on the land or water that they administer.

8. Special Licences – To improve transparency in the allocation of public wildlife quota, the new Wildlife Policy should restrict, or even cancel altogether, the ‘Special Licence’ (a discretionary hunting licence delivered by the MFAT and not ZAWA). The need for game meat for special occasions such as traditional ceremonies could be planned by ZAWA within the official public quotas and, with the emergence of game ranching, game meat for special occasions should be procured from private sources either directly or through prior arrangements between wildlife producers and communities. Where communities enterprises are in joint ventures with the private sector in game ranching as it is envisaged, communities will themselves gradually become suppliers of game meat.

9. Role of Non-Governmental Organisations – In complement to Government efforts, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), especially international NGOs, have contributed significantly to conservation in Zambia. Their role would benefit in being encouraged and facilitated. The new Wildlife Policy should provide guidelines for effective engagement with NGOs based on identified areas of need, capacity and opportunity. This engagement should be on the basis of negotiated agreements with clear problem definition, interventions and realistic performance targets.
In conclusion, an improvement of the policy framework could have a large impact on how people and wildlife relate and coexist in Zambia. Most certainly, the wildlife estate already is a significant contributor to livelihood, economic growth and employment. Yet, the potential of the wildlife sector to contribute to economic growth may be at risk. This policy review confirmed that, while important policy measures are necessary, particularly for shared growth, the adoption of a forward looking Wildlife Policy and Act will not be sufficient if it is not accompanied by unequivocal willingness on the part of Government to reorganise and strengthen ZAWA’s capacity and provide financing commensurate to its need.
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Zambia is endowed with an abundance of natural resources that includes, water, forests and wildlife. The country’s wildlife resources are managed through National Parks and Game Management Areas (GMAs.) which altogether represent more than 30 percent of the country.

In 1998, the Zambian Government through the Public Service Reform Programme (PSRP) transformed the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Service and created the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) as a semi-autonomous public institution following a revision of the Policy for National Parks and Wildlife and the adoption of a new Wildlife Act.

ZAWA was given the mandate to manage the wildlife estate and achieve financial sustainability through commercialisation of tourism products and collaboration with communities living in GMAs. Communities, by organising themselves into Community Resources Boards (CRBs), became co-managers of the resource and were thus entitled to benefits. It was envisaged that sharing of benefits, mainly revenue from safari hunting, would contribute to community development as a strategy for poverty alleviation and conservation of natural resources. Government subsidies and donor-funded projects would ensure gradual reinvestment of income into the proper management of National Parks and GMAs.

However, the reform has not delivered the intended environmental, social and economic benefits due to a number of well known challenges that are not all policy in nature, thereby making it difficult to distinguish policy failure from lack of policy implementation. They include:

- the limited political and financial support from past Governments,
- the prevalence of income and food insecurity in rural areas where wildlife also exists, and
- the partial implementation of the 1998 Policy and enforcement of legislation in light of inadequate internal capacity.

In spite of the many challenges faced by the wildlife sector, nature-based tourism made a better than expected contribution to the national economy and appeared under-reported in terms of its contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Still, by 2008, only a few of the National Parks had been developed for tourism and few GMAs performed as intended. Infrastructure in all the remaining protected areas is poor, and large mammal populations are well below carrying capacity.

Therefore, the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR) in 2008 decided to review the Policy for National Parks and Wildlife and Wildlife Act of 1998. The main thrust of the review process is to increase the competitiveness and efficiency of the wildlife sector, to broaden its scope and thereby enhance its economic impact without unreasonably increasing the costs to Government.

To ensure a comprehensive analysis of all the issues and extract lessons learned, in April 2011, the MTENR asked the World Bank to finance the compilation of the existing literature in the sector to inform the proposed review of the Wildlife Policy and legislation.
It was envisaged that a review of existing literature would also provide lessons learnt that would inform new policy directions, set clear goals and performance targets while at the same time create an enabling environment for stakeholders to participate and support sustainable wildlife management as part of the national economic development agenda especially through nature based tourism.

This report identifies policy options that would provide a basis for the creation of an enabling environment for the development of the wildlife sector as a growth sector according to the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) and the Vision 2030.

2. ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIO ECONOMIC CONTEXT

2.1 Physical Location

Zambia occupies a near-central location on the southern African sub-continent covering a total land area of approximately 752,000 km². Most of the country lies on the Central African Plateau with an average elevation of about 1,200 m. This elevation falls to about 350 m in the Zambezi valley bordering Mozambique and rises to 2,164 m on the Nyika Plateau, bordering Malawi.

Fig. 1: National Boundary Zambia.
2.2 Population

The population of Zambia based on the 2010 Census is about 12.9 million, of which 45 percent is below the age of 15 years, and more than one-third (36 percent) is urban. The median age of the population is 17.2 years and the life expectancy at birth is 38.86 years. With 2010 estimates that place the net population growth rate at 1.6 percent, it can be deduced that the population will double by 2053. The HIV/AIDS prevalence rate is 14.8 percent and according to the 2007 Demographic and Health Survey, 1.1 million people are living with HIV/AIDS. The population below the poverty line is 68 percent as per 2003 figures, which also put literacy rate at 80.6 percent. The fertility rate, defined as the number of children born per woman in her lifetime, is 5.07 (2010 est.) while the infant mortality rate is about 10 percent.

2.3 Climate, ecosystems and biodiversity

The climate of Zambia is sub-tropical, characterised by three distinct seasons: a cool and dry season from May – August, a hot and dry season from August to November, and a wet and hot season from November to April.

The country is divided into three Agro-Ecological Regions (AER):

- **Region I** covers the plateau sub-region in southwest Zambia and the Rift Valley region in South Luangwa and Zambezi valleys. This region receives less than 800 mm annual rainfall and covers about 15 million hectares, equivalent to 20 percent of the country.
- **Region II** consists of the sand veldt plateau of Lusaka, Central, Eastern and Southern Provinces and the Kalahari Sand plateau of Western Province. The region receives 800 - 1,000 mm annual rainfall and covers about 27 million hectares, or 36 percent of the country.
- **Region III** receives over 1,000 mm annual rainfall and covers about 33 million hectares, equivalent to 44 percent of the country. This region mostly covers the Copperbelt, Luapula, Northern and North-Western Provinces.

Floristically, Zambia lies within the Zambezian regional centre of endemism, between the rainforests to the north-west and the semi-desert conditions to the south-west. The vegetation is largely savanna, which comprises a mix of woodland and grassland vegetation types.

Mopane woodland characterises Region I, and most wetlands and Miombo woodland occur in Regions II and III. Together, woodland and wetland vegetations cover about 92 percent of the country. Although man-made ecosystems account for only three percent of the total area, natural ecosystems have been widely degraded by human influence, and especially by fire, shifting cultivation, the harvesting of wood fuel, and regulation of rivers for hydropower generation.

A large number of the plant and animal species in Zambia are not found anywhere else. At least 615 species are endemic of which 174 are considered rare, and a further 31 species vulnerable or endangered.
Zambia has enormous economic potential because of its rich endowment of natural resources, and with a per capita income of US$1,070, has reached lower middle income status. Strong growth performance over the last decade (6.3 percent per annum between 2006 and 2010) is the result of well managed macroeconomic policies, high copper prices, and improved investor-friendly policies resulting in growing foreign direct investment. Despite strong growth in recent years, poverty levels remain high (60 percent as of 2010), and the benefits of growth have not trickled down and inequality is on the increase (the Gini coefficient has increased during the past decade from 47.4 to 52.6).

2.4 ECONOMY AND TRADE

Zambia has enormous economic potential because of its rich endowment of natural resources, and with a per capita income of US$1,070, has reached lower middle income status. Strong growth performance over the last decade (6.3 percent per annum between 2006 and 2010) is the result of well managed macroeconomic policies, high copper prices, and improved investor-friendly policies resulting in growing foreign direct investment. Despite strong growth in recent years, poverty levels remain high (60 percent as of 2010), and the benefits of growth have not trickled down and inequality is on the increase (the Gini coefficient has increased during the past decade from 47.4 to 52.6).

8 Of the 36 GMAs, three are inactive namely Luwingu, Mansa and Chambeshi. 'Inactive' means that these GMAs have not been contracted out to a safari operator.
10 DSI, 2004
Real GDP grew by 6.5 and 7.6 percent, in 2011 and 2010, respectively, and services, construction, and mining remained the big contributors to growth. This level of growth is above the sub-Saharan average of 5.5 percent during the same period, making the Zambian economy one of the fastest growing economies in the region. Growth has been led by increases in mining output, boosted by investments in the mining sector in early 2009; an expansion in construction activities; recovery of tourism after the 2008 decline; and a spike in agricultural production, including successive bumper harvests of maize. Services and construction together have on average contributed more than 73 percent to the growth rate between 2008 and 2011, with mining and quarrying adding about 14 percent. Shares of agriculture and manufacturing remain relatively small. High copper prices have driven the mining contribution to GDP.

Looking ahead, Zambia’s medium-term economic outlook remains steady, but vulnerable to risks from a global economic slowdown. Real GDP growth is projected at more than six percent in 2012, based on the expectation of continued growth in the mining, construction, and tourism sectors, as well as renewed expansion in the manufacturing, transportation, and communications industries.

Industrial production includes copper mining and first level processing, construction, foodstuffs, beverages, chemicals, textiles and fertilisers. The agricultural sub-sectors include crop production, livestock, capture fisheries and aquaculture. The main agriculture products are maize, sorghum, rice, peanuts, sunflower seed, wheat, vegetables, cut flowers, tobacco, cotton, sugarcane, cassava, coffee, livestock and poultry, milk, eggs and hides.

The main export commodities are copper, cobalt, electricity, tobacco, flowers and cotton. Copper output has increased steadily since 2004 due to higher copper prices and foreign investment. The main export of services is tourism. The country’s export partners are China (13.8%), South Africa (8.2%), Democratic Republic of the Congo (7.8%), Saudi Arabia (7.6%), South Korea (7.6%), Egypt (7.4%), Italy (6.7%) and India (4.6%) (2008).

The labour force by sector is 85 percent in agriculture, six percent in industry (including mining), and nine percent in services (including tourism) (2004). Electricity production is 9.8 billion kWh, which compares to a consumption of 8.8 billion kWh (2007 est.); 99.5 percent of electricity produced from hydropower.

### 3. THE WILDLIFE SECTOR IN THE PAST DECADE

The current status and management of the wildlife sector is a concern to many stakeholders including Government, civil society, rural communities and the private sector. Current protected areas management is characterised by declining wildlife populations\(^\text{11}\), encroachment\(^\text{12}\), low management effectiveness\(^\text{13}\), inadequate capacity (personnel and finance) in ZAWA\(^\text{14}\),

---


\(^{12}\) NRCF, 2008

\(^{13}\) Mwima/REMPAS Project, 2007

\(^{14}\) DSI, 2004; WWF, 2004
decreasing trophy quality\textsuperscript{15} and poor infrastructure\textsuperscript{16}. Meanwhile, outside the wildlife estate, in forest reserves and in open areas, wildlife has not been managed at all.

This state of affairs does not instill confidence in stakeholders that current protected areas management systems are a viable option for biodiversity conservation, investment, livelihoods and for sustained contribution to the national economy.

Where funding from external donor was provided, or where partnerships were established, the management of National Parks improved significantly. In some of these National Parks, tourism performed reasonably well. This implies that the substantial degradation of most other National Parks was not due to a misaligned policy but to either lack of capacity of ZAWA or lack of financing.

The situation is different in GMAs which, not only suffered from lack of external financing for their development, but also became, through safari hunting, the most critical source of revenue for ZAWA. Most importantly, the legal framework\textsuperscript{17} in which GMAs operated has many flaws, for instance in respect of governance, resource tenure and accountability, which may require correction through a new policy. With benefits from hunting poorly distributed, governance issues emerged which compromised the progress that had been made during the 1990s in Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM).

Outside the formal wildlife domain, rich ecosystems exist in forest reserves and in open areas. Yet, there the Policy and the Act have no other management tool than a hunting ban. As a consequence, given that ZAWA has no means to enforce the hunting ban in open areas and given that the Forest Department is not organised to control wildlife, access to wildlife has been uncontrolled and the spiral of degradation has continued unabated with most of the remaining wild areas becoming void of many wildlife species.

To ensure that the revision the Policy for National Parks and Wildlife of 1998 takes into account the lessons from the past in order to adequately address the foregoing situation, it is important to identify the impact of the 1998 Policy. In addition, it is important to differentiate the failures or successes that are policy in nature from those that are not. In subsequent sections, (1) the policy context is reviewed, (2) the key successes of the current policy are identified and analysed, and (3) less positive outcomes are also analysed in an attempt to identify the policy barriers that have led to these failures.

3.1 **Context**

The existing 1998 Wildlife Policy recognises the role of wildlife in national development and provides for its conservation, management and sustainable utilisation. The following subsection describe how the 1998 Policy (a) did not establish, or operate in, an environment conducive to results, (b) was not fully translated into law, (c) depended on tourism when the tourism sector

\textsuperscript{15} NRCF, 2008

\textsuperscript{16} World Bank, 2007

\textsuperscript{17} GMAs have only partially operated through the 1998 Policy framework since many of the empowering features of the policy were not translated into the 1998 Wildlife Act.
itself operated in a poor business environment, and (d) was not financially supported by Government.

3.1.1 Unfavourable enabling environment

The under-performance of the wildlife sector compared with its potential and the rest of the region may be interpreted as a consequence of an unfavourable enabling environment. The following issues have been identified as common themes throughout the documents consulted and people interviewed:

- Lack of a clear vision and leadership for the sector with recommendations (including those from Government’s own findings) not taken on board\textsuperscript{18},
- Low investment in wildlife management and tourism development from the national budget\textsuperscript{19},
- Lack of subsidiary legislation to guide policy implementation,
- Inconsistent role of ZAWA which is sometimes implementer, sometimes regulator, and
- Lack of suitable of medium to long term financing mechanisms\textsuperscript{20}.

These general issues are supplemented by specific issues related to GMAs and communities:

- Absence of mechanism for reinvestment of GMAs revenues in their management,
- Lack of adequate mechanisms for strengthening, empowerment, and support to, CRBs\textsuperscript{21},
- Poor GMA governance in terms of stakeholders’ rights and responsibilities as well as elite capture,
- Poor definition of user rights in GMAs,
- Inadequate incentives for community and private sector participation in GMA management\textsuperscript{22},
- Poorly defined roles and responsibilities for stakeholders including chiefs who tend to exceedingly influence CRB decisions,
- Inadequate cost and benefit sharing mechanisms\textsuperscript{23}, and
- Inadequate commercial practices such as the allocation of low value quotas (special licences and resident hunting) generating revenues well below potential.

3.1.2 Incomplete wildlife policy reform

The 1998 Wildlife Policy is much more progressive regarding community participation than has been provided for in the 1998 Wildlife Act. In fact, when it comes to CBNRM, the Act cannot be considered as fully aligned with the Policy.

The 1998 Wildlife Policy intent outside National Parks was, “Integrated Resources Development Boards (IRDB)\textsuperscript{24}, other institutions and landholders to conserve and use the resources wisely and

\textsuperscript{18} Cooperating Partners’ Comments on the draft Policy and Wildlife Act, 2009
\textsuperscript{19} Pope, 2006; World Bank, 2007; also Cooperating Partners jointly, 2009
\textsuperscript{20} Cooperating Partners’ Comments on the draft Policy and Wildlife Act, 2009
\textsuperscript{21} DSI, 2007
\textsuperscript{22} DSI, 2004
\textsuperscript{23} WWF, 2004
maximise the returns from doing so. This will benefit not only the landholders but through them their communities and the nation.”

The Policy also states that, “Government recognizes the intrinsic strength of the ADMADE philosophy, whereby local people and other landholders including the State are the accepted as the best custodians of the wildlife and other renewable resources on the land.”

The philosophy rests on the principle that, “Wildlife has inherent economic advantages over other uses of the land, particularly in agriculturally marginal regions of the country, and that realization of this potential can be a powerful incentive to conserve and use the resource in a sustainable way.”

The Policy further provides for the following features, which in 1998 were extremely forward looking:

- Large GMAs would be divided into smaller units to apportion benefits earned from wildlife to its traditional custodians;
- CRBs would have the legal right for conservation, sustainable use and equitable distribution of benefits earned by wildlife outside national parks;
- CRBs would be run by appropriately qualified secretariats;
- CRB meetings would be conducted in a democratic way and proceedings recorded;
- CRBs would receive delegation of wildlife management responsibility and sustainable use through an agreement or an MoU with ZAWA or a GMA management plan;
- CRBs would have the possibility that revenues due to them are paid into a fund;
- CRBs would, through a GMA management plan, identify how benefits would be distributed between households;
- CRBs would share wildlife benefits with women as an incentive for conservation;
- ZAWA, Government and NGOs would provide technical support to CRBs on the conservation and utilisation of natural resources;
- Communities in GMAs would get revenue from various sources including aircraft landing fees;
- All revenues from resource use in the area would be ploughed back into GMAs for socio-economic development as an incentive for conservation; and
- Local communities could consider setting up appropriate recreational activities such as non-consumptive tourism in GMAs.

ZAWA was meant, (a) to coordinate the wildlife industry to ensure that communities derive maximum benefits, and (b) to keep statistical data on all relevant activities to guide the CRB in granting concessions and allocating quotas.

---

24 Referred to as the Community Resource Boards (CRB) in the Principal Act No 12 of 1998
25 ADMADE (Administrative Management and Development) is the second project that tested new approaches for participatory management of wildlife in Zambia.
26 In the Policy these are called Integrated Resources Development Board (IRDB). We refer to them here by calling them CRBs which is how the Act ended up calling them.
As shown above, the 1998 Policy provided a strong foundation for CBNRM. However, some of the key features described above such as full revenue retention and diversification of sources of revenues were not retained by the Act. In most cases, the provision of the Act, such as the design of the GMA management plans or the establishment of CRB secretariats, could not be implemented for lack of capacity and funds. In addition, during the past few years, some communities have developed new aspirations. While some of them have requested full management of part of the GMAs, others have asked to register their entity into associations or trusts. Because the Policy or the Act does not provide for this, ZAWA has not been able to follow up on most requests except a few which were supported by a UNDP-funded project.

Since the Policy was not fully translated into the Act, it is preferable to analyse outcomes of the 1998 Wildlife Policy reform in light of an ‘implied’ policy which must be interpreted from the Act itself.

3.1.3 High cost of doing tourism-business

The Government recognises tourism as a key growth sector after agriculture and manufacturing in the SNDP. However, the tourism sector has been considered as being too foreign dominated and not fully contributing to GDP because of leakage and externalisation of profits. Both of these issues have not been found to be completely factual, with leakage being in fact more accurately described as ‘linkages to external markets’ and ‘profit repatriation’ being marginal in comparison to other industries such as mining\textsuperscript{27}.

In spite of the fact that the economic impact of tourism appears higher than reported in official statistics\textsuperscript{28}, tourism in Zambia remains an emerging industry. Its growth of around 10 percent per year is in fact not competitive with, nor comparable to, other countries in the region such as Kenya or Namibia which have achieved annual growth rates higher than 20 percent in some years.

Accelerated development of tourism has been hampered by a number of factors some of which relate to the general high cost of doing business in Zambia, even though doing business has in general been improved with the licensing sector reform and the establishment of one-stop-shops.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Tourism Policy and the Hospitality Act have not yet caught up with the licensing reforms and investment still remains complicated and costly. This includes (a) failure to provide adequate incentives to investors; (b) lack of national or local tourism planning; (c) a product base that is limited by its poor access infrastructure; (d) inadequate human resource in the accommodation industry; (e) insufficient of marketing\textsuperscript{29}; and (f) poor sector funding from Government. Similarly, the high number of licences required by the current Wildlife Act is not aligned with the national licensing reform. The Hospitality Act is currently being revised so it aligns with the national licensing reform. This should further decrease the cost of doing business in Zambia in the tourism sector.

\textsuperscript{27} World Bank 2007
\textsuperscript{28} NRCF, 2007
\textsuperscript{29} National Marketing has improved in 2011 and 2012 with the establishment of the Zambia Tourism Board and a substantial budget increase.
Investors in nature-tourism face, in addition to all the general cost of doing tourism-business in Zambia, the added cost of doing tourism-business in a protected area. While the Wildlife Act is clear on the procedure of obtaining a concession and investing in GMAs or National Parks, it does add a layer of complication and cost. It also does not provide sufficient investment security such as through adequate tenure, to be attractive to investors. As a consequence, only the few flagship parks have been able to attract investors.

In addition, the development of tourism in National Parks or GMAs is directly linked to ZAWA’s performance in terms of wildlife conservation, infrastructure and commercial capacity. In fact, to guarantee a wildlife product to their clients, many tourism investors have found themselves having to help ZAWA financially for patrol. This comes in addition to the payment of all of their normal contractual obligations.

The future Wildlife Policy needs to provide various incentives to improve participation of international and local investors in the tourism value chain.

3.1.4 Insufficient financing

ZAWA was established as a result of public sector reform. The intention was to provide a modern, scientific and professional body to manage Zambia’s wildlife and support tourism development. ZAWA was also envisaged to be a lean and efficient modern institution with adequate capacity in all its operations. It was intended to be self-supporting without Government abrogating its responsibility for wildlife conservation and yet, in its first year, Parliament did not provide any budgetary allocation for ZAWA.

After 10 years of existence, ZAWA, which is an autonomous public institution, is not in a position to fully deliver on its mandate. This situation has several interrelated causes, including political interference, lack of internal capacity for optimisation of processes and innovations, and lack of financial support. ZAWA has never really benefited from the political support needed to avoid governance issues or external influence on decisions and has never been supported by an adequate budget allocation.

The lack of financial support has overwhelmingly prevented ZAWA from achieving its potential as an institution. The insufficient resources from Government have led ZAWA to remain over-dependent on GMAs for its income and to remain too inward looking while spreading its limited resources too thinly.

Unfortunately, annual funding from the Government has only covered about 15 percent of ZAWA’s annual operations budget needs with revenues covering about 30 to 50 percent thereby creating a large annual shortfall. Lack of adequate funding, though not the only challenge of the wildlife sector, can be considered as the most critical cause for the shortcomings in ZAWA’s management capacity. In fact, ZAWA’s current financial situation can be described as precarious (current cumulative deficit is about US$12 million or K60 billion30), mainly due to failure to meet statutory obligations and it has difficulties in retaining a fully qualified and committed human resources.

30 ZAWA Notes from the 2011 Pre-Safari Hunting Season; ZAWA (personal communication)
This situation emerged despite the 1998 Wildlife Policy being unequivocal on the responsibility of the Zambian Government for financing ZAWA. While the Policy states that, “ZAWA would be made as financially self supporting as possible”, it also states that, “The Government takes responsibility for providing adequate financial resources to ZAWA.”

3.2 Successes

In spite of the many challenges which faced the sector and saw it under-perform in many areas compared with the rest of the region, the key successes below were recorded. In general, the sector performed relatively well in three aspects which were under favourable conditions as described in the following subsections: (a) where funding or partners became available, national park management improved; (b) the private wildlife estate showed substantial growth; and (c) nature-based tourism made a solid contribution to the national economy.

3.2.1 Management of some of the National Parks

The prevailing conditions of National Parks in Zambia can be attributed more to the capacity of management and level of funding from Government than to policy. Whereas the condition of more than half of the National Parks has worsened since 1998, experiences in several important National Parks show that where external funding, technical assistance, or partnership is available, management of the National Parks improved.

3.2.1.1 Where funding was available

Lessons learnt reveal that where ZAWA had adequate financial resources and application of the resources adequately supported, monitored and evaluated in a transparent manner, performance improved tremendously.

The South Luangwa National Park received assistance for almost 25 years which enabled ZAWA to implement a series of Norway-funded projects that supported operations directly and even provided a certain level of autonomy. Through this support, ZAWA was able to secure of biodiversity in most of the Park and demonstrate that, given sufficient time and with adequate investment, some protected areas may generate enough funds to cover their own recurrent expenditure. More importantly, it can stimulate tourism development with positive consequences for the local and national economy.31 In addition, steady support by Norway was accompanied by the equally steady engagement of civil society, through the South Luangwa Conservation Association and other NGOs, which assisted ZAWA with information, equipment, veterinary services and transport when necessary and worked with communities through education programs, farm extension and market linkages. This combination proved successful and did not face any barrier from the 1998 Policy or the Act.

The second park which received major assistance is the Kafue National Park. Norway and the World Bank combined efforts for the past 10 years to restore this park as one of the top tourism destinations in Zambia. Through this support ZAWA was able to improve management and revenues to cover about 20 percent of the park operations. Like in the case of South Luangwa, though at a limited scale, some NGOs and operators have stepped in to provide assistance to

3.2.1.2 Where partners were available

The implementation of partnerships\(^{32}\) for assisted or joint management of National Parks is one of the main successes in the sector. Despite a difficult start in negotiating conditions and agreeing on the roles and responsibilities and in maintaining proper working relationships among the principal parties and with stakeholders especially communities, partnerships have generally delivered on their promise. They offer important lessons on the way forward for protected areas management.

The North Luangwa, Kasanka, Luambe and Liuwa Plains National Parks are under partnership arrangements\(^{33}\). Each of these partnerships is of a different nature. In North Luangwa National Park, the Frankfurt Zoological Society provides hands on assistance to ZAWA and engages in fundraising. At the other end of the spectrum, African Parks Zambia Limited - a Zambian company established by the NGO African Park, ZAWA and the Barotse Royal Establishment - manages the Liuwa Plains National Park largely by delegation of the management right from ZAWA. Both are very successful in protecting the estate and securing wildlife habitat, reducing illegal off-take and creating new sources of income and capacity. In South Luangwa and Lower Zambezi National Parks, private operators of lodges have created conservation associations which are gradually building their capacity to play an even more supporting role. They provide incremental assistance to ZAWA’s operations as well as support peripheral communities through various initiatives.

The extent to which the ‘partnership’ approach is successful is demonstrated by the fact that of all the 20 National Parks in Zambia only eight meet the minimum requirements for management effectiveness\(^{34}\) of which six are under a partnership arrangement. Partnerships have proved important in light of the major limitations facing ZAWA, particularly in terms of capacity and financing. The arrangement relieves ZAWA of the day to day running of a protected area so that

---

\(^{32}\) In protected areas, invariably, the private partner is a non-profit NGO which brings its management know-how and capacity to leverage funds; not a for-profit entity.

\(^{33}\) ZAWA Annual Report, 2004

\(^{34}\) Zambia rates the ‘management effectiveness’ status of its protected areas using a modified version of the World Bank/WWF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). The assessment was carried out by the Reclassification and Effective Management of National Parks and Protected Areas System(REMNPAS) Project implemented by the Zambia Wildlife Authority
it focuses on its internal regulatory function, enhances diversity and competitiveness of management, mobilises new streams of finances to support protected area management and has access to the results of the research results and investment opportunities that are facilitated or stimulated by PPPs\textsuperscript{35}.

The current policy on National Parks and Wildlife does not explicitly provide for partnerships, but indirectly appreciates and encourages the role of the private sector to develop and represent the industry.

In spite of 20 years of experimenting with ‘partnerships’ and seeing the clear advantages that it has brought about in improving management effectiveness and reducing Government’s financial burden, only a handful of the National Parks are under partnerships. In fact, there has been a resistance from past ZAWA Boards and from past Ministries to establish additional partnerships. The resistance arose partly because of the lack of clarity on ZAWA’s role when a park is managed through a partnership and partly due to the general opinion of some decision makers that partnerships amount to a form of for-profit concession for which partners must pay a fee. This practice in effect discouraged potential NGOs who see their assistance as a relief to ZAWA’s financial responsibility for park operations.

3.2.2 Growth of the private wildlife estate

The 1998 Policy for National Parks and Wildlife in Zambia provides for the development of private game ranches. It recognises that wildlife has inherent economic advantages over other uses of the land particularly in agriculturally marginal regions of the country and that realisation of this potential can be a powerful incentive to conserve and use the resource in a sustainable way.

In 2006, there were more than 100 private wildlife establishments in all the nine provinces of Zambia, covering a total of 112,769 hectares with a variety of 43 different species of large mammals and a total population of 21,546 animals\textsuperscript{36}. The industry grew by 267 percent over a five-year period\textsuperscript{37}. It is worth noting that the Southern Province with some of the harshest microclimates, characterised by low rainfall and high temperatures, and agriculturally marginal land, has the highest number of game farms.

3.2.3 Contribution of nature tourism to the national economy

The 1998 Wildlife Policy recognises the role of wildlife in tourism, most of which is nature-based in Zambia. It provides for a comprehensive tourism plan to regulate tourism development and recognises the role of the private sector as sole operator of all tourism operations in protected areas.

Visitors to National Parks report a high level of satisfaction with the Zambian products (84 percent stating that, “They would return”, and 90 percent rating as ‘good or very good’ the Mosi-

\textsuperscript{35} Pope, 2006
\textsuperscript{36} ZAWA Annual Report, 2006
\textsuperscript{37} Wildlife Producers Association of Zambia http://www.wpazambia.com/Articles/GameRanchingInZambia.html
oa-Tunya, Lower Zambezi, South Luangwa and Kafue National Parks. These ‘nature tourists’ are already making a significant contribution to the national economy.

Of the total 669,000 visitors in 2005, 176,000 were classified as ‘nature tourists’. In overall terms including direct and indirect linkages, this represents 16 percent of exports, 6.5 percent of GDP and more than 6 percent of wages, 7 percent of Government revenue and nearly 10 percent of formal sector employment, equivalent to 54,000 jobs which compare favourably with agriculture (56,000), mining (46,000) and manufacturing (56,000). It is also noted that in 2005, nature tourism contributed to 60 percent of the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) target for direct earnings\textsuperscript{38}.

In the 2005 survey, most nature tourists indicated a willingness to pay up to 100 percent more if improvements were made in park management, infrastructure and product development, but also if guaranteed, that donations would be used in park operation. This perception provides a foundation to build on.

3.3 COUNTER PERFORMANCE

The following subsection describes some of the limited successes originating from policy barriers: (a) the management of GMAs was inadequate and did not lead to intended results, (b) there has been confusion with the role of ZAWA as implementer and regulator, and (c) wildlife tenure remained largely open access.

3.3.1 Inadequate GMA management

Over the past ten years, GMAs have been steadily degrading in terms of ecological conditions, social benefits and commercial revenues. While there has been steady increase in participation of the private sector in wildlife management, the performance has not been as envisaged due to lack of an enabling optimal business environment. Furthermore, wildlife resources on customary land, including forest reserves, are largely unmanaged and in the decline.

An authoritative study has concluded that GMAs have failed in their primary function as buffer zones to National Parks\textsuperscript{39}. The study recommends that a new policy direction is required based on a review of GMA governance to inform legislative reform.

The study reveals that GMAs are in decline in terms of animal populations, degenerating hunting blocks and shrinking habitat due to increasing settlements and poor agricultural practices\textsuperscript{40}. Trophy quality is also in decline and most GMA large mammal populations are below 5-10 percent of carrying capacity. The poor state of GMAs is attributed to increasing human activity, high food insecurity, low expenditure on resource protection and poor land use planning and/or lack of implementation of any existing plans. Out of the 36 GMAs, only three meet the minimum requirements for management effectiveness\textsuperscript{41}.

\textsuperscript{38} NRCF, 2007
\textsuperscript{39} NRCF, 2008
\textsuperscript{40} Lewis (undated)
\textsuperscript{41} REMNPAS, 2007
Most GMAs do not have management plans. Although the 1998 Wildlife Act provides for the management of all GMAs in accordance with a general management plan, and recognises that GMAs are on customary land, it falls short of clarity on resource rights and management and planning responsibilities between the community, local government and central government. This constitutes a major disincentive.\(^{42}\)

Commercially, the hunting revenues are also declining and compare unfavourably with regional experiences. Socio-economically, GMAs exhibit welfare levels which are 30 percent lower than the national average. Income generated in the GMAs from hunting is acknowledged as mitigating the GMAs from being worse off. On the other hand, the distribution of this income is very poor and tends to favour the elite in the community. This poor distribution suggests weak institutions, poor coordination, inadequate facilitation and lack of support from ZAWA, Government and NGOs which are provided for in the current policy.

In GMAs the scope of the 1998 Policy has limited the effectiveness of management. GMAs are meant to be reserves for wildlife but the habitat on which it depends is not under the jurisdiction of the Act. This has led to confusion because in spite of the adopted Land Use Plans both CRBs and ZAWA have been rendered helpless in preventing agriculture encroachments in areas allocated to remain wild. In the new policy a more holistic definition of wildlife and habitat will be necessary.

### 3.3.2 Possible confusion with ZAWA role

As part of the policy revision, ZAWA’s role both as implementer and regulator in the sector requires attention. According to the Wildlife Policy, ZAWA is meant to be an execution agency when it manages National Parks and a regulatory agency in GMAs and for the private wildlife estate.

This dual role has at times proved difficult to implement as there are potential conflicts of interest in GMAs, particularly with the evolutions toward conservancies and community trusts, as well as when ZAWA enters into agreements for partnerships. For example, in Liuwa Plain National Park, ZAWA is a board member in African Parks Zambia Ltd., and also a party to the contractual agreement through which ZAWA delegates the management of the Park to that entity. ZAWA is thus part of execution and part of regulation. While it appears that ZAWA has taken both roles deftly, there have been instances when it chose to emphasise its ‘regulator’ role when the partner of the joint venture would have preferred ZAWA to take an ‘implementation partner’ role.

Other instances bring out the tendency by ZAWA to act as executing organisation, even in GMAs where, in effect, it ‘controls’ the CRBs by organising their elections, by leading the design of management plan (and approval of such plans), by selecting safari operators and by collecting revenues. While, all of these functions are vested with ZAWA in the Wildlife Act, they have the potential to curtail commitment and accountability on the part of the CRBs. This is especially the case since ZAWA retains more than half of the GMA hunting revenues.

---

\(^{42}\) Pope, 2006, Metcalfe, 2005
Given the various forms of land where wildlife must be managed, the multiplicity of roles of ZAWA is likely to increase particularly with the publication of a new protected area classification and the emergence of new actors. Still, the new policy should attempt to sort out the various scenarios and provide for each a specific role for ZAWA where the potential for conflict of interests is minimised.

3.3.3 Lack of empowerment of users over wildlife resources management

The 1998 Policy does not provide for ownership of wildlife resources to the citizens or investors. The 1998 Act, on the other hand, categorically confers ownership of all wildlife resources on the State President on behalf of the people. It states conditions under which this ownership may be transferred such as through obtaining a licence to hunt, a certificate of ownership and a permit to keep animals in captivity.

The 1998 Act further states that where any wildlife is resident on a given piece of land, the landholder has the absolute right to harvest it subject to wildlife regulations which are enforced by ZAWA.43

While in National Parks the ownership is clear, the situation is less clear on customary land where the community is collectively considered as the landholder.

In the GMAs which are also on customary land, but are gazetted for sustainable use, while at the same time being under the planning jurisdiction of the respective districts, the situation is even more complex.44 The creation of CRBs in GMAs, considered as co-managers of the resources and entitled to generate revenue from these areas, goes a long way in granting resource rights to communities. However, this has proved insufficient to constitute an incentive mechanism for resource conservation. This is because devolution of resources rights is administered only through ZAWA and only for a single highly controlled economic activity namely, game hunting.

Outside the wildlife domain, there are important landscapes with very high potential for natural resources development. Though under traditional administration, some of these areas are on demand for private sector-led tourism development which might alienate some of the land from the community. Once a title is obtained the community loses out for good as the land never reverts to the community and all the fees accrue to Government.45 The 1998 Wildlife Policy does not recognise community groups outside protected areas and does not provide a procedure and conditions for them to acquire resource rights in the same clear and unambiguous way that is applicable on titled land as an incentive for wildlife production.

However, even on titled land, game ranchers also complain of unclear resource tenure. For example, after buying the animals and taking care of them on their private titled and fenced land, they are still required to declare them to ZAWA and to renew their ownership annually for a fee.

---

43 Section 3 (1) (iii)
44 WWF, 2004; Pope, 200
45 Metcalfe, 2005
4. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The policy challenges lie in creating the necessary incentives to make wildlife the land use option of choice, providing adequate or clear rights of use and access and removing disincentives that make wildlife less economically viable compared with other forms of farming.

4.1 PREREQUISITES TO A NEW POLICY

This section on Policy Recommendations begins with a few issues that need to be emphasised, to ensure effectiveness of the new policy. It is important to recall that, had the 1998 Policy been accorded certain conditions such as having been fully translated into legislation, fully funded and its implementing institution fully strengthened and supported, it is likely that it would by now have been considered a very successful policy. Therefore, as Zambia embarks on the modernisation of its Wildlife Policy it is important to ensure that the ‘other’ reasons for the current state of affairs of the wildlife estate are well known and simultaneously addressed.

4.1.1 Start with a clear vision

Although the Zambian Government considers tourism as a prominent economic growth sector, it has so far not invested sufficiently in the preservation of wildlife as tourism assets. It is cardinal that the industry has a clear knowledge and appreciation of Government’s vision for the wildlife sector in the Vision 2030. Further, it is imperative that in the new Wildlife Policy, the Government should unequivocally define its vision and strategy for the wildlife sector and how it should contribute to tourism-led economic growth as measured by GDP, job creation, rural development, biodiversity and heritage conservation and maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.

4.1.2 Ensure that all policy features are made into legislation

The fact that some of the modern features of the 1998 Wildlife Policy were not included in the Act prevents a full and objective analysis of the outcome of that policy. It is recommended that in future, the Ministry should consider ensuring that the new policy is issued from a broad and well documented consultation. In addition, the new policy and the accompanying new legislation are likely to be more synchronised if they are developed together at the same time.

4.1.3 Finance conservation

Lack of financing has been identified as the reason that weights the most for the failure of the 1998 Policy and Act to deliver on conservation and tourism.

ZAWA’s annual revenues are estimated at US$4.6 million, made up of about US$2.55 million mostly from Livingstone, Luangwa and Lower Zambezi National Parks and about US$2.1 million from GMAs36. On the other hand, ZAWA’s basic operations budget is estimated at US$12 million per year, leaving a deficit of about US$8 million. Although in the past the deficit was reduced by US$1 million provided by the National Budget as well as in some case by finances from cooperating partners and NGO partners for parks under partnerships, the financial

---

gap persisted. This continued deficit in financing has resulted in ZAWA’s performance being unsatisfactory.

**Seeking ZAWA financial autonomy is not a realistic strategy**

A comparison to other park system in the world, including in well endowed countries such as the USA or France, shows that none of the institutions managing protected area system are financially autonomous. In countries with well managed park systems, a solid annual budget allocation is justified by (a) the ecosystem services that protected areas deliver as buffer to climate change, as reservoir of biodiversity, as watershed protection, etc.; (b) the foreign exchange, employment and GDP contribution that visitors generates; and (c) the fiscal revenues to government from national and international visitors expenditures along the supply chain.

As an illustration of the last point, in Zambia in 2005, the fiscal direct and indirect revenues from foreign tourists visiting parks were calculated between US$5 million to US$8 million. The same year the Government budget allocation to the sector was about US$1 million.

This does not imply that ZAWA should be fully funded. In fact, it should not and must be tasked to generate a portion of its budget from commercial operation. While, in South Africa, the biggest source of operational funds for the South African National Parks Board (SANParks) is the South African Government, SANParks takes much effort to develop other sources of funding and was able to bring three of its parks, Kruger, Addo and Cape Mountain, to generate sufficient revenues to cover their own operations.

Because *lack of financing* is identified as one of the main causes for ineffectiveness of the current Wildlife Policy, the new policy should possibly provide unequivocally that Government would finance the shortfall between an agreed realistic total recurrent cost for managing the public wildlife estate and estimated total revenues generated from competitive statutory and other charges within it. The new Wildlife Policy should also articulate the respective roles of the Government, the Ministry, ZAWA, civil society and the private sector, in raising funds for the development and management of the public, community and private wildlife estate.

The new policy could also provide for additional, voluntary ways to source financing. For example, a survey of nature tourists in 2005 revealed their willingness to pay of up to 100 percent more in entry fees (or into a conservation fund) if improvements are made and if these funds are secured for conservation.

In addition, the new policy could also recognise that the development of the wildlife estate, particularly infrastructure would require investment that might not be available within Government but could be provided by cooperating partners. Partners would need to be approached, and might consider investing in the sector if they were assured of an investment climate. Such an investment climate should be made more conducive to attract investors and to provide for a better and more equitable, national wildlife management system.

---

47 NRCF, 2007, The Real Impact of Nature Tourism in Zambia
48 Fearnhead, 2009 in IUCN, 2009
49 World Bank 2007 and NRCF, 2007
4.1.4 Reorganise and strengthen ZAWA

Over the years, ZAWA has been criticised for poor governance, lack of results, low efficiency, complex bureaucracy and suspicion with respect to the private sector. These negative features merely reflect the context in which ZAWA operated. A few positive changes are emerging. There is therefore now no merit in suggesting any reversal of existing forward-looking policy features. This situation is supported by the fact that there is no indication in the review analysis undertaken of national and international literature that the institutional features of ZAWA are fraud. In fact they are comparable to many other institutions which are performing well under a more supportive context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomous public conservation institutions take time to establish but increase efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience from Zambia and Zimbabwe regarding the establishment of ZAWA and the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (PWMA) has shown that: (a) the costs of establishing and maintaining wildlife management institutions are higher than anticipated; (b) establishment of such institutions do not usually lead to financial self sufficiency; and (c) it take more time than initially planned. However, when such institutions are well funded by government, such as SANParks in South Africa or Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) in Tanzania, experience shows that efficiency and management effectiveness improves and their annual budget is translated into economic growth and employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the emergence of ‘business centres’ to run the affairs of National Parks; the recommendations for protected area reclassification; the development of various forms of partnership and the modification of GMA governance, the policy should recognise that ZAWA’s role will evolve. ZAWA will variously continue to be a managing institution, an associate and a regulator in line with its core mandate.

The ZAWA internal reforms could start by a clear strategy with full participation of stakeholders. The 2001 Strategic Plan had identified the desired results which, in fact, remain sound even in 2012. These included, among others (a) ZAWA becoming an effective customer- and performance-oriented institution, and (b) ZAWA creating an attractive investment environment with a sustainable business base that is in careful balance with its biological responsibilities.

It is advisable to precede ZAWA’s organisational reform by an audit of a detailed cost structure, staff deployment, planning processes, assessments of performance against previous targets and a strong understanding of needs. Regional experience has indicated the need for attracting qualified leadership to develop sound practice, reduce bureaucracy and middle management and invest in deploying professionals effectively on the ground especially managers, extension workers, researchers and community facilitators.

This reform is clearly organisational and does not entail policy changes. As ZAWA has produced a document called ‘New thinking’ in which ZAWA explored all the issues described some work may probably have already started. This development will be strengthened by
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50 de la Harpe, 2003, in Fearnhead, 2009
51 Emergence of Parks and Conservation Narratives in Southern Africa, Child in IUCN, 2009
institutional and revenue audits which have already been contracted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Tourism (MFAT).

4.1.5 Improve the business environment in tourism

The Government’s general strategy on licensing is to reduce the number of licences and consolidate their purchase in one-stop-shops\textsuperscript{52}. The MTENR had commenced review of the Tourism Policy to accommodate this national strategy. The MFAT has taken over this responsibility and intends to finalise the Tourism Policy as well as submit the Hospitality Bill to Parliament in 2012.

So far, the wildlife and nature-based tourism industry is considered to be favoured by foreign investors. For the industry to grow, it needs to attract both Zambian and foreign investors. Given the usually delayed and low return on capital investment in tourism accommodations, this transformation might be long but is critical.

The new Wildlife Policy could be made instrumental in addressing the need for deliberately encouraging and training Zambians and Zambian businesses to get involved in the tourism industry including its wildlife sub-sector, the management of protected areas and in game farming. It would also be preferable to encourage investment possibly through tax breaks, reduced licence fees, or scholarships in order to maintain a degree of competition.

Recommendation 1: Business environment - The new Wildlife Policy should fully align itself with the national trend of reducing bureaucratic processes and in particular with (a) the national strategy on licensing, which aims to reduce the overall number of licences and (b) the newly drafted Tourism Policy and Hospitality Bill, which aim to streamline tourism-based business and investment, especially concerning wildlife-based tourism development such as obtaining and operating tourism and hunting concessions, simplifying park entry fees, and decreasing the number of licences.

4.2 Toward a New Wildlife Policy

4.2.1 Reclassify the protected areas system

The 1998 Wildlife Policy provides for the following protected areas categories:

- National Parks
- Game Management Areas
- Wildlife Sanctuaries
- Private Wildlife Estates

National Forests and Local Forests are protected area categories under National Forestry Policy (1998). Others include Natural Heritage Sites and Fisheries Management Areas.

\textsuperscript{52} Zambia Privatisation Agency, 2010
The foregoing categories include protected areas on public land and customary land. Game farms or ranches are currently not considered as protected areas even though they are encouraged.

Through the Reclassification and Effective Management of National Protected Areas System (REMNPAS) Project, Government has developed a systems plan for protected areas, identifying priorities and gaps and recommending a new classification of protected areas\(^53\).

The systems plan reviews the existing protected area categories, characterises them in terms of the IUCN classification and then proposes new categories of protected areas. The new categories are also aligned to the IUCN classification. The reclassification of protected areas promotes an integrated approach to resource or ecosystem management, introduces diversity in the economic opportunities within the different categories and promotes community conserved areas and private conserved areas as part of the national protected area system.

The proposed system also introduces diversity in management approaches and governance systems in line with regional and international best practice where protected area governance is diverse and more stakeholder-driven. The following categorisation of protected areas in Zambia has been agreed with stakeholders and proposed for adoption:

- Natural Resource Sanctuary (IUCN category Ib: Wilderness Area)
- Nature Park: (IUCN category II: National Parks)
- National Reserves: (IUCN category II: National Parks)
- Partnership Parks (Community and Private) (IUCN category II: National Parks)
- Game Reserves (Community and Private) (IUCN category V: Protected Landscape)
- Sacred Areas (IUCN category Ib: Wilderness Area)

This combination of different protected area types ranging from state controlled to private and community land or combinations of these should collectively comprise the wildlife estate with ecological, economic and social benefits that could enhance the successes reported in partnerships and reverse the degradation reported in GMAs. The following three cases from the region illustrate the benefits of promoting diversity in approaches and opportunities and offers valuable lessons for Zambia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity of approaches enables to adapt to opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Pilanesburg National Park in South Africa** was started as a recreation, nature reserve and rural development adventure facility\(^54\). The planning report for the establishment of the park recommended the cropping of ungulates and proposed zoning to accommodate diverse land uses including hunting, intensive use tourism, wilderness buffer and development areas. Since 1977, this park has developed its tourism industry. In 1992 it had 70,000 visitors and now has over 400,000 visitors. Its hunting industry is thriving as is the live trade of animals\(^55\). Proposals for expansion of the national park targeted a community-private partnership and a private property bordering the national park. Proposed expansion of

\(^{53}\) REMNPAS, 2008
\(^{54}\) Johnson et al, in IUCN, 2009
\(^{55}\) As above
the park sought to introduce the ‘big five’ to boost tourism and was projected to create 1,000 temporary and 1,600 permanent jobs.

The **Save Valley Conservancy in Zimbabwe** is a private-public partnership that typifies one of the policy responses in Zimbabwe to the declining wildlife stocks outside state-controlled protected areas. The 1975 changes in legislation gave rights to landholders to use wildlife on their land and stimulated the growth of the multi-million dollar game ranching industry.\(^56\)

In Namibia the conservancy movement was stimulated by clear and deliberate devolution of rights over resources to communities as well as to private land owners. Conservancies made up of both private and community conserved areas, or joint ventures involving both, led to the development of CBRNM and to generating incomes from zero in 1994 to N$42.48 million in 2009.\(^57\) The result was improved socio-economic indicators particularly jobs, community development and enterprise development contributing to household level incomes. This further led to increased community stewardship over natural resources and measurable positive conservation outcomes in terms of securing landscapes, reversing environmental degradation and increasing wildlife populations.

Within a formal reclassification, a critical exercise in prioritisation is necessary in order to set achievable and realistic conservation goals. It is important to complete an objective classification of the wildlife (and forestry) protected areas, not driven just by the need to classify new types of protected areas, but also driven by the need to identify where to invest first and optimise both conservation and economic objectives. As a result, three clear classifications emerge:

a) Areas of paramount biodiversity importance to Zambia, the region and the world over
b) Areas with high commercial potential for wildlife, forestry or fisheries management
c) Areas that do not satisfactorily fit classification a) or b)

**Recommendation 2: Protected area reclassification** - The new Wildlife Policy should establish new categories of protected areas in conformity with the conclusions of the recently completed ‘reclassification programme’ to enable the selection of priority areas as well as promote an integrated approach to resource management and utilisation. It should also create opportunities for community and private sector participation in setting up new protected areas in open areas thus diversifying and expanding the wildlife estate.

The new Wildlife Policy should encourage and provide for the role of the Forest Department, in the management of wildlife on the public forest domain. The new Forest Policy\(^58\) provides for that part of the domain to be reclassified to allow more devolution of management to community or private enterprises as well as diversification of commercial activities including consumptive and non-consumptive tourism.

**4.2.2 Encourage partnerships**

One of the pillars of Zambia Vision 2030 is that many development results will be achieved through various forms of ‘partnerships’. It recognises Public-Private Partnerships (also loosely
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\(^{50}\) Lindsay et al, in IUCN, 2009  
\(^{57}\) NACSO, 2010  
\(^{58}\) The new Forest Policy is not yet adopted.
called PPPs\textsuperscript{59}) as one of the principles “upon which Zambians aspire to live in a strong and dynamic middle-income industrial nation that provides opportunities for improving the well-being of all by 2030”\textsuperscript{60}.

International experience suggests that while the conservation status of state-managed protected areas is on the decline due to various reasons, the quality of wildlife estates run under a form of partnership has been improving. As an example, SANParks improved their income and efficiency tremendously as a result of developing public-private partnerships which included not only park management but provision of different services including concessioning space for restaurants and lodges\textsuperscript{61}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships in the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apart from clear Zambian examples such as Liuwa Plains (African Parks Zambia Limited), Kasanka (Kasanka Trust) and North Luangwa (Frankfurt Zoological Society) other parks in the region managed under one form of Partnership or another include the Addo Elephant Park (Kuzuko Concession) and the Marakele National Park (Marakele Pty Ltd) in South Africa; the Majete Wildlife Reserve (African Parks Management and Financing Pty Ltd) in Malawi; and the Niassa Reserve (Niassa Reserve Society) in Mozambique. What is important about these regional examples is that ‘partnership’ as an approach is being tested vigorously and the parks involved have shown improved management, and has resulted in securing of the parks and opening up of new opportunities for financing and cooperation among stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, regional and local experience has established that partnerships have the potential to reduce the financial burden for natural resource management currently borne by public institutions. However, for better results, the establishment of partnerships should be based on transparency, adaptability and accountability promoted through formally negotiated agreements developed for specific areas under mutually agreed terms and conditions, and clearly defined and balanced roles and responsibilities.

A potential partner may meet a set of minimal criteria such as availability of capital, experience in park planning and management, existence of an appropriately qualified management team, capacity and track record in research, fund-raising and representation of Zambians on the management team. While foreign organisations are likely to have more technical capacity and funds, organisations created in Zambia are more likely to make a long term commitment if their capacity is built and should therefore, be encouraged. The development and negotiation of partnerships will have to take these needs into account.

According to the REMNPAS Project, the expansion of partnerships (referred to as PPPs in REMNPAS documents) in Zambia should include:

- Developing criteria for selecting candidate protected areas for partnerships,

\textsuperscript{59} In this section, to the standard abbreviation PPP is preferred to the broader term “Partnership”, with a capital P, which is not limiting and refers to all sorts of models and approach that involves a public institution, in this case ZAWA, and a partner organisation be it NGO, community or private.
\textsuperscript{60} GRZ (2006) Vision 2030
\textsuperscript{61} Fearnhead, 2009 Privately Managed Protected Areas in IUCN, 2009
- Developing partnership monitoring and evaluation systems and tools, and
- Developing ZAWA’s capacity in the management of Partnerships through appropriate staffing, deliberate training and exposure visits to working Partnerships in the region.

**Recommendation 3: Partnerships**[^62] - The new Wildlife Policy should provide for the process, procedure and conditions for the development of more partnerships in Zambia as a way of mobilising additional capacity for protected area management and as a way of decreasing the public costs of developing and maintaining the wildlife estate. This would not be restricted to the management of protected areas but embrace a variety of approaches including concessions for facilities, tourism joint ventures, community based natural resource management, co-management, etc.

### 4.2.3 Increase the role of Non-Governmental Organisations

Both local and international NGOs play a critical role in supplementing the efforts of Government. They are well placed to test new approaches and have a history of mobilising additional sources of funding and capacity for conservation.

Some NGOs have developed partnerships with ZAWA specifically for park management. These include the Kasanka Trust in Kasanka National Park and the Frankfurt Zoological Society in the North Luangwa National Park. The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) has been involved in protected area management, wetlands management, CBNRM and institutional support to wildlife management in Zambia since the 1960s.

---

**NGOs as engines for innovations**

Regional experience suggests that NGOs can play an even more significant role in capacity building, awareness raising and piloting innovative ideas.

While the Governments of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Botswana are credited for creating policy and legislation that empowered communities with management rights and responsibilities with benefits, NGOs took the lead in making it happen. Local and international NGOs cooperated with Government and developed community support initiatives, generated the funding to implement them and worked closely with Government to ensure that efforts were directed where the needs are felt most. The Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations specialises training communities in identified areas. NACSO also helps communities in negotiating with the private sector, developing constitutions and providing any other necessary technical skills. Some international NGOs such as WWF have played a key role in mobilising financial resources and expertise to support such processes.

The Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) consisted of the University of Zimbabwe, the CAMPFIRE Associations (an umbrella organisation of community groups active in the CAMPFIRE programme), Action Magazine, Zimbabwe Trust and WWF. The group provided technical support and training and more importantly, dedicated a lot of effort in documentation, information sharing and dissemination.

[^62]: The standard wording is Public Private Partnerships or PPPs. Experience shows in protected area management that the private partner is usually an NGO. There is a wide variation in the type, form and scope of these Partnerships, all of which are valid as long as they are tailored to fit the desired outcome.
In complement to Government efforts, NGOs, especially international NGOs, have contributed significantly to Zambia conservation. Their role would benefit in being encouraged and facilitated. The new Wildlife Policy could provide guidelines for effective engagement with NGOs based on identified areas of need, capacity and opportunity. This engagement should be on the basis of negotiated agreements with clear problem definition, interventions and realistic performance targets.

4.2.4 **Stimulate the privately-owned wildlife estates**

In South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, the game ranching industry is bigger and more diversified than in Zambia in terms of size of estate and types of products on offer. Not only state-run protected areas are economically viable but private ones can contribute to tourism development and job creation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Africa Game Ranching Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While Zambia statistics are impressive, a comparison with the same industry in South Africa demonstrates that game ranching in Zambia is just emerging, with potential for growth of at least one order of magnitude. South Africa private game ranches cover 20 million hectares and possess a total population of 2.5 million animals.(^6)(^3) The industry grew from 206 ranches in 1981 to a staggering 10,100 ranches currently. It generates US$ 2.2 million of foreign exchange and creates 141,000 jobs direct and support 564,000 people indirectly.(^6)(^4) It is evident, therefore, that with relatively large tracts of land, game ranching in Zambia has the potential to grow even more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phenomenal growth of the industry has also shown that habitat management and wildlife production are viable business options that people are willing to invest in and should be supported particularly because of their alignment to state objectives\(^6\)\(^5\).

High investment and maintenance costs which include fencing, as they constitute the high cost of capital investment, are barriers to the development of game farms, and participation of Zambian citizens in the wildlife sector. It might be more forward-looking to make the recommendation for fencing or not fencing on a case by case basis. For example, Lilayi Game Farm on the outskirts of Lusaka, surrounded by crops and settlements is a completely different consideration for fencing compared with Mushingashi which is extensive and contiguous with the Kafue National Park.

The new Wildlife Policy should provide for opportunities for community game ranching and private-community partnerships, especially in areas outside protected areas. This can be within the context of partnerships and CBNRM in terms of governance, business development, socio-economic development and habitat protection.

**Recommendation 4: Private wildlife estate** - The new Wildlife Policy should recognise and support more the role of the private wildlife estate which is growing fast. Incentives (e.g. tax breaks) and adequate regulations (e.g. wildlife ownership, commercialisation of secondary
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\(^6\)\(^3\) Speech by Dr Gert Dry, Vice-President of Wildlife Ranching South Africa, 2010

\(^6\)\(^4\) Wildlife Producers Association of Zambia http://www.wpazambia.com/Articles/GameRanchingInZambia.html

\(^6\)\(^5\) Child in IUCN, 2009
products, fencing, etc.) would accelerate its development as a set of conservation enterprises and contribute to the nature-based tourism industry and to the maintenance of ecosystem services on commercial land. Additionally, as ranching enterprises, they contribute to food security by diversifying the source of meat protein on the Zambian market and its environmental suitability. The private wildlife estate could also be considered as a supporting element of the public protected area system.

4.2.5 Reform the management of GMAs

Most GMAs are in a state of decline ecologically, socially and economically. While the current policy delegates GMA management to communities as co-managers, community structures lack the capacity to perform specific functions. Despite there being 74 CRBs in the 36 GMAs, they actually lack the capacity to perform the few functions delegated to them by the Act. It also appears that their capacity may be limited by the fact that they are not ‘real’ institutions because they are established under the ZAWA Act and not the Companies Act. Also, they are subjected to rules that are self-defeating, such as changing all the executive members every two years which prevents capacity building. Furthermore, the 50 percent of hunting revenue shared with communities is not equitably distributed and tends to favour the elite.

The poor state of GMAs is attributed to increasing human activity, high food insecurity, low expenditure on resource protection and poor land use planning and and/or lack of implementation of existing plans.

Only three of the 36 GMAs meet the minimum requirements for management effectiveness. While the current Wildlife Policy provides for the management of all GMAs in accordance with a general management plan and recognises that GMAs are located on customary land, it does not give clear provisions for resource rights, management and planning responsibilities between the community, local government and central government. This constitutes a major disincentive. Further, there is inadequate integration of approaches to GMA management to take on board other land uses and to deliberately make wildlife more competitive. In spite of the foregoing challenges, GMAs, which cover approximately 22 percent of the total national land area, have vast potential if their management can be enhanced.

Experience from the region suggests specific policy responses that turned degraded lands into secured habitats for wildlife and generating millions of US dollars for communities and creating jobs. These include:

- A deliberate policy by government to grant communities clear access rights,
- Continuous capacity building efforts by dedicated stakeholders,
- Communities empowered through joint ventures, and
- Allowing communities with technical support from wherever it can be sourced to determine how best to use the land distribute benefits and make decisions.
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Community-Based Natural Resources Management show results under certain conditions

The conservancy movement in Namibia has grown into a national engine for economic growth and biodiversity conservation in an equitable manner and offers important lessons. There is clear rights of access that come with the approval of a conservancy and a lot of support that the community can draw upon from government and other support organisations.

It is clear that the Namibia legal and policy framework fully empowers communities, provides consistent extension services for capacity building, and promotes private sector participation through joint ventures. This model is clearly delivering results that are yet to be seen in Zambia.

A 2009 assessment of the CAMPFIRE programme of Zimbabwe, despite the economic challenges have yielded the following conclusions:

- Elephant numbers may have increased while buffalo numbers appear either stable or have declined;
- Trophy quality for the ‘big five’ has either been maintained or increased due to effective marketing and trophy hunting, and monitoring systems; and
- Wild land which is also wildlife habitat has been maintained in an intact state in terms of size and quality. This implies that land conversion to other land uses has been drastically reduced.

In Namibia, the trend is similar:

- Community conservation has led to a recovery of wildlife populations including endangered species and an expansion of the wildlife estate to cover ecosystems not well represented in the state-run protected areas;
- Demand for wildlife re-introductions in previously depleted communal areas has also increased;
- There has further been acceptance of wildlife and tourism as legitimate land use options as shown by the increasing number of communities forming conservancies and the increasing number of joint ventures for consumptive and non-consumptive tourism; and
- Cash income, jobs and other benefits in kind and addressing of governance issues have all increased.

The role and status of the community is crucial to the achievements highlighted above. A deliberate policy option for community empowerment needs to be supplemented by concrete actions derived from regional experiences which have yielded positive results:

**Recommendation 5: Governance of Game Management Areas** - The new Wildlife Policy could provide for a revision and strengthening of the overall governance and disciplines in GMAs and increasing the share of revenues retained for GMA institutions. It could be proposed that communities organise themselves into legal entities under the Companies Act and enter into management agreements with private enterprises for the use of GMA resources, possibly under
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69 NACSO cited by NRCF, 2008
70 Taylor in IUCN, 2009; Also Child B, 1995 and Child et al, 2003 as cited by Taylor in IUCN, 2009
71 D Stander, 2006 as cited by Jones and Weaver in IUCN, 2009
72 NACSO, 2007 as cited by Jones and Weaver in IUCN 2009
73 NACSO, 2007 as cited by Jones and Weaver in IUCN 2009
the guidance of an advisory committee and the regulation of ZAWA and engage with other natural resource sub-sectors and other stakeholders in GMAs.

4.2.6 *Encourage CBNRM outside the public or private wildlife domain*

Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) can be described as a form of partnership based on communities managing resources with legal rights held by community institutions and accessing economic incentives for taking responsibility for resource management\(^{74}\). Over the years, CBNRM in Zambia has tended to focus on wildlife, hence limiting the full potential that exists. It is important to constitute a robust broad community structure to be involved in the management of natural resources as opposed to having to constitute new committees for each natural resource\(^{75}\). Structures already exist that should be enhanced.

Where CRBs exist, they should be encouraged to acquire full legal status by registering with the Registrar of Societies in addition to their registration with ZAWA. Communities outside GMAs could have the choice of whether to form a CRB or another community-based organisation provided that they acquire legal identity. This arrangement will change the current situation where the CRB is the only institution that can acquire the right to co-manage wildlife resources in an open area. What is more important is that formation of that community structure and the process of acquiring recognition to partner with ZAWA should be clear and open.

Conditions for acquiring management and use rights to resources in a given area should include the development of an internal constitution or by-laws to provide (a) internal rules and regulations as well as fair representation and accountability\(^{76}\); (b) a management plan to state how the community wishes to use the resources in their area and which particular resources; (c) a geographical definition of the area by way of a map; and (d) a definition of membership of the community by way of a membership register in addition to an application letter. By the time a community is applying for a management agreement with Government over given resources, it should already have acquired legal status by way of registration either with the Registrar of Societies, or the Patents and Companies Registration Agency (PACRA), or, for that matter, a Land Trust under the Lands (Perpetual Succession) Act\(^{77}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBNRM Lessons from Namibia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessons from Namibia highlight a number of key principles that determine implementation of CBNRM(^{78}) and include the following which should all be considered when the new policy is drafted:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Policy should be rooted in local needs** and provide communities with clear choices in terms of how to use their land and if a certain land use is to be promoted, incentives and support should be available to encourage communities.

- **CBNRM should be adaptable to the changing needs and circumstances** including responses to
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\(^{74}\) Johnstone, 2008  
\(^{75}\) DSI, 2007  
\(^{76}\) Rozemeier, in IUCN, 2009  
\(^{77}\) DSI, 2007 following NACSO (year); Also Campbell and Shackleton (year)  
\(^{78}\) Jones and Weaver in IUCN, 2009
external agencies. For example while conservancies in Namibia initially needed support with formation and registration, the need for good governance and accountability soon became evident after registration.

- **Scale is important for CBNRM** as some resources such as elephants, for example, require much more than one area can provide. This is one of the arguments against fencing GMAs as it might compromise ecological integrity. Neighbouring conservancies need to cooperate and plan jointly for some activities.

- **Incentives for conservation other than money** – sometimes the motivation for community involvement in wildlife management is not necessarily to generate huge sums of money but to see wildlife that once existed come back. This seems to have been one of the major considerations for the early conservancies in Namibia.

- **Process and products** – Rather than focus on a pre-determined outcome, it is important to allow an open consultative process to allow the community to set its own goals.

- **Facilitation** – persistent and consistent direct engagement with communities is crucial for capacity building.

- **Critical role of Government** – Government led the enquiries and gathering of lessons that informed the changes in policy and legislation. Government officially adopted CBNRM as part of its official strategy in development plans and poverty reduction programmes.

The new Wildlife Policy should consider a variety of options for managing wildlife on land outside the wildlife domain, but under customary tenure. On land that they allocate to a form of wildlife-based land use, communities could either (a) engage directly in CBNRM, (b) join forces with a private investor through a joint venture or a Community Private Partnership (CPP), or (c) delegate management to a professional private operator for a fee. In any such case, an option would be to secure the land in community land trusts. Another option is to establish a conservation easement that does not affect tenure but legally prevents land transformation. The selected land can then be managed as a game farm, game ranch or wildlife reserve depending on the development objective and the commercial purpose. Conservancies are an option. They require land use and resource management planning on a substantial scale and delegation of resources ownership, tree and wildlife, to the Conservancy itself.

**Botswana Community Land Trust**

A model, comparable to an approach developed in Botswana, has been tried but has not received much attention or support in Zambia. In this model, some representative community members establish a Community Trust which acquires a title for a substantial parcel of pristine land within their own chiefdom. Strong from their institutional set up and their title, the representatives may seek investors in tourism and natural resource management. This approach provides an opportunity for securing large tracts of customary land for wildlife management and tourism without alienating it from their traditional owners.

### 4.2.7 Encourage other public entities in managing wildlife

In line with the Decentralisation Policy, the new Wildlife Policy could provide for entrusting district councils with regulating hunting of wildlife in open areas that are not part the public or private wildlife domain. The current Decentralisation Policy provides for the devolution of natural resource management and associated capacity to the district level. As the planning authorities and the secretariat of district development coordinating committees, district councils
could play a key role in mainstreaming natural resource management in district development plans and budgets.

Further, in line with the draft Forest Policy, the new Wildlife Policy could consider entrusting the Forest Department with stimulating community and private sector involvement in forest management, including wildlife, as well as regulating hunting of wildlife and/or non-consumptive tourism in forest reserves. Other potential public partner entities would be the National Heritage Commission, the Department of Fisheries, and the Department of Water Affairs, all of which could be encouraged to become involved in managing wildlife on the land or water that are administering.

4.2.8 Provide incentives for all forms of wildlife-based land uses

The new policy should provide for other avenues for establishing incentives for wildlife-based land use everywhere and lower its cost to Government, citizens and investors. It should recognise the importance of ecosystem services and the need to pay for such services as well as the fact that the vast and diverse wildlife estate is a global good in ecosystem terms whose maintenance and opportunity cost must be partially offset by the global community.

The principle is that the holder of the land is the producer of the various ecosystem goods and services and the users of those services and goods, especially where these are accessed in a different location, are considered as the buyers of those services and goods. For example, by the time tourists are arriving in the South Luangwa National Park to view game or in Mumbwa GMA to hunt, ZAWA would have invested in the management and maintenance of the ecosystem in order for the animals to live there and would have incurred costs for doing so. At the same time, communities would have either not harvested the animals for their own use or not cut down the trees for their own benefit in order to maintain the habitat and the wildlife for a hunter from Lusaka or overseas to come and shoot it. Markets are emerging to link the producers of the various ecosystem services and buyers so that business transactions can take place directly between these two partners and generate incentives for sustainable use of resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community-owned Conservation Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An example from Uganda involves Government, World Bank and GEF support communities with income- generating activities and paying school fees for children in return for the communities not to disturb critical gorilla habitat in the Mgahinga Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT)(^7^9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another example in Uganda involves the Government agreeing to manage and restore Kibale and Mt Elgon National Park in order to sequester carbon, manage water resources and recreate a habitat for diverse wildlife with funding from a Dutch Foundation to improve water availability for electricity generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Kenya, a project supported by USAID, GEF and the Belgian Government pays the Kenya Wildlife Service, a Landholders Association, and the District Council US$480,000 per year to give each land

\(^7^9\) Ruhweza et al. with the Eastern and Southern Africa Katoomba Group, 2008
holder US$8/acre of land contributed to a targeted 60,000 acres to be managed for wildlife without necessarily losing the land\textsuperscript{80}.

In Northern Tanzania in the Sumanjirio Plains, Terrat Village pulled out of a proposed Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and instead set up a Village Trust which entered into a private conservation easement under which a consortium of tour operators pay the Village Trust approximately US$5,000 a year in return for the community to tolerate wildlife on their land which they want to keep as grazing land. The reason for the community at Terrat avoiding the WMA was to maintain autonomy and plan the use of their land to cater for their interests, as opposed to giving priority to wildlife and sharing any financial benefits with the Government, while under the easement they receive 100% of the income and still maintain some conservation objectives\textsuperscript{81}.

The new Wildlife Policy should provide for incentives and market based mechanisms for sustainable land management. Such mechanisms would include conservation easements, payment for ecosystem services, trade of carbon sequestration and purchase of development rights, where land holders agree to maintain their areas in a natural state while those benefiting from this maintenance agree to pay for this service.

The policy would need also to recognise the different wildlife land managers, such as ZAWA in national parks, Forest Department in various forest reserves, communities in GMAs, and private companies in game farms who are the land holders and resource owners, as producers of ecosystem services. It will be necessary to provide the wildlife land managers and producers with facilities to access compensation mechanisms. This could be done in a variety of private or public deals under existing and emerging multilateral environmental initiatives such as the BioCarbon Fund, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the REDD+ initiative and other climate change and environmental rehabilitation financing initiatives.

\textbf{4.2.9 \textit{Align agricultural and conservation objectives}}

The role of agriculture as a source of livelihood for rural Zambia even in prime GMAs cannot be ignored when considering development in wildlife. A comparison of household income between agriculture and wildlife in the Sichifulo, Mulobezi GMAs which were prime GMAs in the late 1990s, was very revealing. Household income from agriculture far outstripped income from wildlife\textsuperscript{82} because households have full control over their agricultural production systems and the resulting income, while this is not the case for wildlife where the impact of benefits at household level is almost negligible. This explains why hunting blocks in the Sichifulo, Mulobezi GMAs are among the ones that have been downgraded from prime to secondary.

Agriculture will therefore continue to threaten wildlife and its habitats if comparatively it appears to generate more income directly to the household than other land uses, even though it uses methods that are not compatible with wildlife conservation. GMAs are characterised by high poverty levels, low food security and low income at household level which are the main drivers for illegal harvesting of resources.

\textsuperscript{80}National Museums of Kenya with the Eastern and Southern Africa Katoomba Group, 2008
\textsuperscript{81}Nelson F. et al (2009) Payment for Ecosystem Services as a framework for Community Based Conservation in Northern Tanzania, Conservation Biology, Volume 24 No 1, 78-85
\textsuperscript{82}Whitehead (?),(undated), CONASA Project
This is the significance of an approach that combines improved agricultural yields from intensive conservation agriculture with improved land husbandry, using the incentive that farmers complying with improved agricultural technology are guaranteed access to stable prices and extension services. Directing this effort at identified households which are vulnerable and illegally harvesting resources, especially wildlife and charcoal, can have substantive impacts on rates of illegal resource use. This is especially so if there is coordination and unity of purpose among wildlife, forestry, agriculture authorities, NGOs and the private sector in developing this business approach to agriculture linked with conservation compliance at household level.

Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) offers a model that has some important lessons in developing an approach based on creating market-based incentive for farmers to adopt new lifestyle and farming technique, and gradually to move away from unsustainable and illegal use of wildlife. COMACO has more than 20,000 members and has operated successfully in the Luangwa Valley, by improving livelihoods and income at a significant scale and by establishing incentive for compliance toward various conservation criteria.

Improved access to income generated from wildlife and other natural resources such as honey, timber and nature tourism can enhance the value of wildlife compared with other land uses especially in marginal areas. Access to markets, improved technology and value addition are critical if agriculture is to contribute positively to the reduction of pressure on the wildlife resource by generating improved household incomes from improved yields.

4.2.10 Are ‘Special Licences’ necessary?

The 1998 Wildlife Act provides for so-called ‘Special Licences’ which are available to the Minister of Tourism at his or her discretion. A 1999 study revealed that, over a fairly short period of time, K2 billion in potential income to ZAWA and to CRBs may have been lost to special licences. While the current legislation authorises this type of licence and ZAWA considers it as part of its CBNRM programme, its effectiveness and implementation undermine efforts aimed at promoting sustainable use of wildlife. The licence allocates animals outside the official quota system and to the lowest users in terms of economic value to be derived.

To improve transparency in the allocation of public wildlife quota, the new Wildlife Policy should restrict or even cancel altogether, the ‘Special Licence’. The need for game meat for special occasions such as traditional ceremonies could be planned by ZAWA within the official public quotas and, with the emergence of game ranching, game meat for special occasions should be procured from private sources either directly or through prior arrangements between wildlife producers and communities. Where in game ranching communities enterprises are in joint ventures with the private sector as it is envisaged, communities will themselves gradually become suppliers of game meat.

---

81 Lewis (undated)
84 K2 billion is equivalent to about US$1 million.
5. CONCLUSION

Over the past decade, the Zambian wildlife estate has not been sufficiently organised and funded to maintain its integrity and provide a firm foundation for economic development through tourism and biodiversity conservation. There can be no doubt that potential exists to sustainably exploit the wildlife sector to meet national objectives as outlined in national development plans and the Vision 2030.

The wildlife sector has faced a number of challenges that include limited Government investment in natural resource management, inadequate human and financial resources to implement policies. In the face of these challenges, it has been sufficiently demonstrated that increased cooperation with stakeholders including communities, private sector and cooperating partners has made it possible to improve the performance of tourism and the management of some protected areas. More could be achieved in releasing this potential if partnerships are strengthened and the sector is re-oriented and positioned to make the best of its assets.

Based on Government’s own reports and reviews over the past decade and experiences from the region, this situational analysis report proposes that the new Wildlife Policy should provide for (a) a more business oriented approach to conservation to make better gains from tourism; (b) a revision of the classification of protected areas to diversify opportunities for and increase chances for conservation; (c) development of public-private-partnerships including communities and civil society to increase available capacity; (d) realigning of the GMAs to reverse the general decline; and (e) promotion of the private wildlife estate which is growing fast as a back-up to the national protected area system. Further, the situational analysis report acknowledges that the current Wildlife Policy has many forward-looking provisions that have not been adequately tested.

It is therefore an opportunity to discuss the status of the sector and compare with the rest of the region through candid introspection that will guide the development of new policy. The future will depend on mobilising the necessary synergy to reverse negative current trends of decline. This could be achieved by broadening the number of actors, the approaches and the landscapes where wildlife is managed and by establishing the wildlife estate even more as a valuable tourism asset and an engine of economic diversification, employment and livelihoods.

Given a suitable policy reform, adequate investment in parks to boost nature tourism, organisational reform of ZAWA and improvement in GMA management and governance, the existing potential of Zambia’s wildlife resources could be more fully unleashed.
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY


   Government recognises the role of wildlife in national development, especially through tourism most of which is nature or wildlife based in Zambia and provides for the creation of National Parks and Game Management. The Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) is mandated to manage wildlife inside and outside protected areas. Outside national parks communities and other landholders are encouraged to be involved. An agreement, management plan or memorandums of understanding guide the relationship between ZAWA and communities. Government also recognises the ADMADE philosophy and sets up a fund in which all revenues from utilisation of resources should be kept by the community according to proper accounting practices.


   This draft, which was never finalised, upheld most of the provisions of the 1998 policy. It re-emphasised the potential of wildlife to contribute to poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and introduced community partnership parks and private-public partnerships. It introduced CRBs and CBNRM in terms of terminology, block tourism in national parks, designation of RAMSAR sites. It also tried to give ZAWA more authority in GMAs.


   Cooperating Partners (CPs) observe that management of National Parks is mainly an issue of financial and organisational capacity at ZAWA and that in response ZAWA has successfully tested various forms of private-public partnerships. The document highlights important matters that were not considered such as the recommendations of the Protected Areas (PA) system plan, proposals for new PA categories, strengthening of GMAs, diversification of resource use, zonation of GMAs, institutional reform to make ZAWA a regulator and licensing reform as part of the broader Government effort to reduce the cost of doing business.

   CPs also felt that the policy failed to provide a clear vision for the sector and did not consider earlier recommendations to improve the performance of the sector e.g. management of community and wildlife estate, diversification of resource use in GMAs, optimisation of community structures for resource management. Emerging issues such as partnerships, trade in live animals, trans-frontier conservation areas, climate change, carbon trading, and reclassification of protected areas were also left out.
The meeting provided an overview of the 2010 season which achieved 60 percent quota utilisation, implying a loss for ZAWA which is sinking in deeper financial crisis with the cumulative deficit reaching K60billion. For the 2011 season, it was noted the USA was likely to take elephant trophies collected in 2011 onwards, the lion quota was decreasing due to a population decline which was to affect ZAWA income. It was also noted that ZAWA still owed the CRBs K5billion which it hoped to reduce in 2011. Hunting in the Chikuni Community Partnership Park was to be discussed with the partners.

For the 2013 season, proposals include sub-division of GMAs into smaller fenced units on 35-40 year leases with the land remaining customary and the operator dealing directly with the community. Operators will be given more responsibility while ZAWA will be reoriented to become a regulator which will also support restocking. This is seen as part of ZAWA’s sustainability strategy.


Zambia has identified tourism along with agriculture, mining and manufacturing as the most important sectors for economic development, but it faces many problems including inadequate Government funding, poor infrastructure and insufficient human resources. Most tourism is wildlife related hence the close relationship between tourism and the performance of ZAWA.

Unfortunately ZAWA’s capacity was never fully developed leaving it over dependent on hunting revenue from GMAs. Despite problems in the sector including it being considered as too foreign dominated and externalising profits, this study confirms that tourism already contributes significantly to the national economy. It also reports that tourists are satisfied with their experience and are willing to pay more if there are improvements.

It also finds that leakage is minimal and that much of it is spent on marketing the country. It notes that GMAs are generating some benefits which unfortunately are not reaching the intended beneficiaries. The high potential of the sector can be unleashed through more private public partnerships, improved Government support, encouraging Zambian investors, improving GMA management and more infrastructure development.


The report profiles the work of the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) in addressing the frustrations of a dualistic land tenure and administration system that distorts incentives for dynamic community and private sector partnerships. Chiefs may allocate land to investors without consultations with communities and convert it to leasehold after which all fees accrue to Government and not to the community while the community loses all rights to that land. There is no clarity as to who is entitled to manage and benefit from natural resources in open areas in rural Zambia.
Community Trusts possess full juridical personality and all members of the community are entitled to membership through village and area committees and chiefdom level boards. The main thrust is to convert strategic parcels of customary land into leasehold in the name of the trust and then seek investors and partners for development as both customary and statutory landlord. In this way customary land would be alienated from the community back to itself in the form of the trust. The trust would then keep control of its land and manage investments directly through sub-leases.

The trusts being piloted in Sekute and Mukuni chiefdoms are designed to avoid land converted from customary to leasehold tenure slipping out of the control of the community by using the advantages of private title for its own purposes. Downward accountability of the trust board to the trust members through an annual general meeting and through a general assembly held every three years are key governance components.


The report compiled by Development Services and Initiatives (DSI) proposes that US$50million is needed to protect the resource base and US$100 million in capital investments in buildings, roads and capacity building over the next ten years to improve ZAWA’s self sufficiency. This investment can generate economic impact of US$500 million annually. If measures are taken to reinvest most of the revenue in the management of GMAs and governance improves, the output of Zambia’s hunting sector could be increased by five to ten times in 20 years and generate more than US$250 million in total economic impact.

However, financing should be linked to clearly defined performance criteria such as tourism turnover, law enforcement success, infrastructure quality, or direct community benefits.

The report further states that investors need to perceive ZAWA as a genuine development partner administering the sector in a manner that is even handed, positive and reduces bureaucratic transaction costs. A more forward-looking policy environment that encourages landholder and foreign investment is needed. Restricting game ranching to 5,000 hectares, insisting on fencing, and precluding game ranching from park buffer zones, when large areas of unfenced buffer zones are at the heart of Zambia’s comparative advantage are highly retrogressive to economic growth, and ignore basic economic principles and the experience of best practice.

Inadequate personnel in ZAWA, under-capitalised private sector, an inexperienced civil society, the lack of exposure to best practice and an overly inward looking perspective that is relatively uninformed by progress elsewhere are among the major problems.

While money is needed to achieve this potential, it is not the most important constraint. Apart from over-centralisation of the sector in one weak organisation (i.e. ZAWA) and not sufficiently considering regional best practice, poor human resource development for the wildlife sector need to be addressed.

The report compiled by Adam Pope states that PPPs are an innovative model for protected area management that originated from some of the challenges that ZAWA faced in terms of effective and comprehensive management of protected areas post National Parks and Wildlife Service.

They include those where the partner has management responsibility typically referred to as PPPs and those where the partner only provides resources termed a Public-Donor Partnership (PDP).

Partnerships take over administration of an estate, promote diversity and competitiveness in wildlife management, create new sources of finances and research results and investment opportunities. However, Partnerships need to be reviewed and monitored, and require a robust regulator and enabling policy framework.


This study compiled by Dr Garetth Johnstone, contributes towards effective use of Partnerships in PA management in Zambia. It finds that public-private partnerships (PPPs) offer the possibility of private sector businesses, conservation NGOs taking over some, or all of the management functions in selected wildlife protected areas thereby securing and using their own financial resources. It identifies different types of partnerships and recommends the strengthening of national capacity for managing partnerships and the development of tools for evaluating them.


This submission concerned the declaration of a community partnership park which should not change its status for a minimum of 20 years. It provides conditions for entry, management by partnerships, appropriate governance structure, 100 percent revenue retention and restrictions and/or conditions for mining, hunting and domestic animals.


The study conducted by WWF analyses the institutional and policy bottlenecks for PA management in Zambia and discusses them in detail. Among its key recommendations is the articulation of co-management through Partnerships, stakeholder participation, addressing gaps in policy such as definition of user rights, the role of ZAWA as a regulator, chiefs as facilitators, community capacity building in resource management, engagement with other service providers such as micro-financing institutions and developing linkages with livelihoods.

The report notes that community participation in conservation came as a response to the 1980s decimation of wildlife. It, however, reports failure by GMAs to play their intended function as buffer zones to national parks and recommends a review of GMA governance to inform new policy direction.

Trophy quality is declining as is revenue generation; animal populations are in decline, habitats are under pressure due to human activities and poverty levels are high.

Only three GMAs of the 36 meet the minimum requirements for management effectiveness. Some GMAs have little support while others have negative influence from local politicians.

Comparison of CBNRMs in the region shows that it can help reduce poverty if community institutions are organised and supported effectively to participate in natural resource development. The Namibian Conservancy model for example has shown tremendous progress in generating income, creating jobs, rehabilitating degraded areas and increasing wildlife populations through joint ventures with the private sector which might be beneficial to the GMAs.


This special tool, adapted by Dr Henry Mwima was developed by IUCN and uses the following parameters which include context, planning, process, outputs, outcomes, threats and pressures.

It identifies the most serious threats and pressures across NATIONAL PARKSs including fire, poaching, illegal fishing and subsistence agriculture while the most serious problems across GMAs include poaching, human encroachment, fire, deforestation, subsistence agriculture and not the least, illegal fishing.

Management effectiveness is comparatively higher in NATIONAL PARKSs than in GMAs. In terms of inputs, process and outputs there is generally inadequate resource allocation, inadequate management tools, inadequate delivery of services and lack of effective implementation of management programs and actions.

Using a baseline of intermediate (scoring category) management effectiveness category as a cut-off point to determine which PAs meet the minimum management effectiveness, the results of the baseline information suggests that only eight NATIONAL PARKSs including (in descending order): South Luangwa, Liuwa Plain, North Luangwa, Lower Zambezi, Mosi-Oa-Tunya, Kasanka, Kafue and Lochinvar and three GMAs (in descending order): Lupande, Chiawa and Sandwe) meet the minimum management effectiveness requirements.

The report compiled by Development Services and Initiatives (DSI) observes that poor performance of community structures is largely due to limited capacity, inadequate benefits, poor governance, unclear resource rights and inadequate policy and legislation.

Where an appropriate mixture of incentives is in place, including clear resource rights, good governance and strong institutional arrangements and markets for natural resource products including tourism, the magnitude and extent of benefits, partnerships and biodiversity conservation increases.

It concludes that it is more efficient and effective that for higher levels of engagement with Government departments and the private sector there should be a single community structure for multiple natural resources. The following characteristics are crucial: acquisition of full legal status, linkages with Government and traditional authorities, a plan for capacity building, good governance, transparency and accountability in decision making and financial management both by the traditional leadership and institutional leadership.


Seven types of public-managed protected areas which include Forest Reserves, National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Game Management Areas, Fishery areas, Ramsar sites or Wetlands areas and Heritage sites are legally recognised in Zambia.

These different protected areas are managed by the Zambia Wildlife Authority, Fisheries, Forest Department and National Heritage Conservation Commission.


The report identifies four main types of protected area governance as Government protected areas (government agencies at various levels make and enforce decisions); Co-managed protected areas (various actors together make and enforce decisions); Private protected areas (private landowners make and enforce decisions); and Community conserved areas (CCAs) (indigenous peoples or local communities make and enforce decisions).

The following protected area categories are supported by policy and legislation in Zambia: National Forests, Local Forests, Joint Forest Management Areas, National Parks, Game Management Areas, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Private Wildlife Estates, Natural Heritage Sites, Prescribed Fishery Areas, Commercial Fishing Areas, and Fisheries Management Areas.
Suggested protected area categories for the protection of forest resources to ensure that identified gaps are filled and to capture opportunities that may occur from a diversified approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resource Sanctuary (IUCN category Ib: Wilderness Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature Park: (IUCN category II: National Parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Reserves: (IUCN category II: National Parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Parks (Community and Private) (IUCN category II: National Parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Reserves (Community and Private) (IUCN category V: Protected Landscape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Areas (IUCN category Ib: Wilderness Area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Lewis D, (Undated) *Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO); Scaling up Conservation Impact through Markets that Change Livelihoods.*

Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO), a company limited by guarantee buys produce from peasant farmers while offering a stable and assured price as an incentive for promoting improved farming methods.

It organises farmers into producer groups, provides training in improved farming methods, provides inputs to increase production, buys surplus yields at good prices, monitors compliance with required farming methods and provides an additional pay out to farmers who adopt improved farming methods and sell their crops to COMACO.

COMACO reaches 40,000 farmers in the Luangwa Valley and purchased over 3,000 tonnes of produce in 2009 and sold them for more than K2.2 billion. The 2010 projection was K5.8 billion with approximately 39 percent going back to the farmers. Though still financially subsidised, the business is growing (100 percent over the previous two years) and financial sustainability was projected for 2011/2012.

COMACO is reducing illegal wildlife off-take, improving household incomes and household food security and planning to provide similar approaches to charcoal producing communities.

The report makes several recommendations including building on the business approach, incorporating incentive mechanisms that encourage farmers to adopt good farming practices and technologies. It illustrates how improved yields lead to improved food security and if access to market is provided, how it can improve household incomes, reduce the drive for illegal harvesting thus promoting conservation.

It also recommends an ecosystem and cooperative approach among the different players including ZAWA, Forest Department, Ministry of Agriculture, and Food Reserve Agency to mention but a few.

A four-part volume containing 14 papers by regional experts focusing local and national institutional struggles over natural resource use, tenure and control


A five-part volume containing 26 papers by regional experts discussing Southern Africa’s search for a conservation paradigm that is acceptable and replicable in response to modern challenges facing conservation.


A database of all the conservancies in Namibia including their management, enterprises, joint ventures, income, natural resources, human population and size.


Zambia’s only long term development strategy which recognises tourism as a growth sector and lists public-private partnerships as a means to delivering the projected economic growth in which Zambia is a prosperous middle income country by 2030.


A response to the Convention on Biodiversity which profiles Zambia’s biodiversity and ecosystems according to present state of knowledge, takes stock of current biodiversity conservation measures and recommends strategies for improving biodiversity management.


An inventory of current planned, pilot and current PES systems in the region describing each initiative.


Self explanatory

A stock taking of the current CBNRM activities and issues in Zambia as a first step towards the establishment of a CBNRM performance monitoring and evaluation system


Self explanatory