



NAPA

News from African Protected Areas

Nouvelles des Aires Protégées
en Afrique

N°86
May 2015



Edito

Geoffroy MAUVAIS
PAPACO coordinator

Ebola and conservation

A few months ago, I visited a reserve in Kenya (Samburu), which is among the most famous (and most visited) of the country. During each of my previous visits in this protected area, I had a strange feeling, a mixture of wonder, when gazing at the wildlife, whose density in this reserve is above the norm, and disillusionment while enduring the overly high tourist density whenever a cat would appear (see photo below) or any other sort of a rare species. You can therefore imagine the extent of my surprise during my last visit, upon encountering almost no tourist throughout the length of my stay. In the hotel where we stayed, of a capacity exceeding 120 beds, we were only four guests! And when in mid-afternoon, we crossed the steps of a young female leopard hunting near the river, there was no other vehicle to disturb our peace for nearly an hour... In such a place and in front of such a spectacle, it was nothing short of a miracle!



Instinctively, I thought that the insecurity, real or perceived, that exists in Kenya, was the cause of

this desertion by tourists. And it certainly contributes to the situation. But guides, rangers, the hotel manager... all with whom we spoke pointed towards another cause, far more surprising: the Ebola virus.

It is surprising because Kenya is in no way affected by the epidemic. We can even say that its present repartition (in West Africa) is much closer to Europe than it is from this part of Africa.

The Ebola virus became known in 1976 when two outbreaks developed simultaneously, in Sudan and in the DRC (from where the virus got its name). Since then, there have been several episodes that died down quite quickly each time. The one that started in March 2014 in Guinea and quickly spread to Sierra Leone and Liberia is by far the deadliest of them, with a mortality rate of around 50% for the infected. Ebola is a zoonotic disease, which means that it is transmitted from animals to humans. Transmission occurs through close contact (usually consumption of an animal, found dead or sick) with different species of forest bats, monkeys, antelopes... Passed to humans, it then spreads through close contact with a sick or died person. Symptomatic treatments help in healing and vaccines are currently being tested on the ground.

The best prevention against the apparition of a new episode of the disease in humans is probably to avoid eating bush meat. That makes sense but it's not what happens on the ground. You can be easily convinced of that by travelling in Central Africa where you'll see in each and every village on the edge of the road, monkeys or duikers, hanging tied to a branch waiting for a hungry - and foolhardy - buyer.

The worst prevention is to stay away from African parks and reserves in countries where the disease does not exist. These areas require visitors to survive and to cover their costs and tourists' desertion could push local people, without tourism revenues, to turn to hunting to compensate, thus increasing the risk of contracting the disease by eating wildlife. In any case, the fall of tourism in a country like Kenya can only have a disastrous impact on many parks that have made it their main source of income.

In summary, the two lessons we should learn from this tragic epidemic in relation to conservation: do not eat bush meat, and support the parks by our visits... we retain neither one nor the other. Too Bad!

This NAPA presents the second part of our study on the **private governance** of PA in Africa.

Papaco is also on Twitter
@Papaco_IUCN



Professional training course on PA Management: the 11th edition of the University Diploma has started in Lope National Park (Gabon)

Direction 4 of the road map for African PAs

Nineteen students, coming from six different countries (Cameroon, Chad, Congo, DRC, Central Africa, and Gabon), have gathered at the WCS training center, in Lope National Park, on the 20th of April, to begin the 11th edition of the PA management training course, organized by IUCN and WCS, in collaboration with the University Senghor of Alexandria, in Egypt. Targeting young professionals working in and around PAs (PA managers, NGOs, private sector...), this training course builds on theory and practice, on the ground, and lasts eight weeks...



The eleventh promotion of the UD at Lopé NP



Would you like to help us?

The Papaco is currently preparing a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on PA management and is seeking for video material, movies, interviews, pictures... on management and governance of protected areas in Africa. If you have such a material in good quality and would like to share with a wide audience, please contact:

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org

Thanks in advance!

Governance of protected areas in Africa – Privately Protected Areas (part II)

Directions 1 to 3 of the Road Map for African PAs



With the support of the French Agency for Development (Afd), the Papaco is conducting a series of studies on governance of protected areas in Africa.

This NAPA presents a summary of the results for private governance (part II, study conducted by Equilibrium – see www.equilibriumresearch.com).

See the full report on www.papaco.org (once back online!)

A - Private protected areas experiences in Africa

Introduction

In the last NAPA (n°85), we talked about how privately protected areas (PPAs) might be defined in an African context and how policies and agreements could support the development of a PPA network which meets the definition and principles laid out in recent technical guidance from IUCN. PPAs are already important in some African countries, but research shows that distribution is very uneven. They are very common in countries like South Africa and Namibia, fairly common in several countries of the east but virtually unknown in parts of Francophone West Africa and the Congo Basin. Is this due to political differences regarding land ownership, cultural differences in the way in which people regard nature and conservation, or purely a historical accident, whereby they have gained popularity and support in some areas and not in others?

In the following article we map out, through examples, the present day experience with PPAs in

sub-Saharan Africa. Whilst not a comprehensive review of the whole continent, the examples selected represented different aspects of private conservation in Africa and focus on the range of quality of governance associated with PPAs. As explained in the last issue, we take “private” here to encompass ownership by individuals, tourism operators, other non-profit or for-profit corporations, religious institutions and research bodies, but omit discussion of reserves managed by communities or indigenous peoples, as these are considered Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs). PPAs are becoming increasingly important in addressing the critical conservation challenges of the continent; an understanding of how they are established, what drives their owners and what role they play in conservation is essential to building a comprehensive picture of African protected area systems.

1. Tanzania

There are currently only three areas which could unambiguously be considered as PPAs in Tanzania, one marine and two terrestrial areas. The marine PPA, Chumbe Island Coral Park Ltd (see box 1), was gazetted in 1994 and is a solely private sector initiative. Another marine PPA, Mnemba Island, was not a success and has since been reabsorbed into the state governed MPA network. There is no active policy to promote further private governance. However there is scope for MPA authorities to make management agreements to confer management responsibilities to other 'institutions' which in practice can be, and has been, applied to private sector entities. The government is currently exploring the option of leasing management responsibility of two or three state-governed marine reserves to private sector tourism entities. Terrestrial PPAs are supported by the Wildlife Conservation Act No 5 of 2009. There are currently two PPAs, Mwiba (40,000 ha) and Kasulu (157,500 ha), under this Act. Both sites are linked to the Mawalla Group, a Tanzanian Real Estate company. Mwiba Ranch was initiated by Mawalla Trust Limited and is managed by Ker & Downey Safaris (T) Limited in collaboration with Mwiba Holdings Limited and Makao Village. Kasulu Game Ranch is solely a Mawalla Trust Limited initiative but much of the site's management (e.g. anti-poaching activities, research, monitoring and community development) is managed by the Friedkin Conservation Fund (FCF) which operates as two separate but related entities – one is a non-profit corporation registered in the United States, the other is known as 'The Friedkin Conservation

Fund of Tanzania' and is set up in Tanzania as a charitable Trust.

Box 1: Chumbe Island Coral Park

Chumbe Island, situated 12 km Southwest of Stonetown, Zanzibar, was the first MPA in Tanzania and the initiative of a private investor (a former development worker) who initiated Chumbe at a time when Zanzibar started opening for foreign private investment, mainly in tourism development. Chumbe Island Coral Park Ltd. (CHICOP), owned by two shareholders, holds Management Agreements for the 33 ha Chumbe Island Reef Sanctuary (CRS), gazetted in 1994, and the 20 ha Chumbe Closed Forest Habitat (CFH), gazetted 1995. The Management Agreement and the land lease for CFH are both for 33 years, while the lease for CRS is for ten years and has already been renewed twice in 2004 and 2014. Through the lease and Management Agreements CHICOP has the right to define management zones and strategies and to define what resources may be legitimately used and how. The Management Agreement also gives CHICOP the right to arrest, or otherwise penalize, offenders in cooperation with the Police force and Ministry of Fisheries Development in case of the MPA.

The intention of CHICOP was to develop a financially sustainable model of MPA management through revenue generated from ecotourism, and the site was chosen for the high biodiversity of the shallow fringing coral reef, which is also ideal for environmental education. In the early 1990s, there were no specific policies and legislative acts available for MPAs in Zanzibar. Management capacity was insufficient to meet the challenges of rapid environmental deterioration and investment continued to be directed into unsustainable development. The main threats to biodiversity conservation were (and still are) overexploitation of marine and terrestrial resources, population increase, tourism, poverty and a lack of environmental awareness. Chumbe Island was a good candidate for conservation because it was uninhabited, traditionally closed to fishing because of its location near the shipping channel between Zanzibar and mainland Tanzania, and thus not subject to traditional resource use. Yet the island had not been included in earlier proposals for MPAs in the country.

The Legal Gazettement order defines the Reef Sanctuary as a no-take-area, where “No fishing or any extractive use shall be permitted in the area so declared”, even for research. The CFH Forest Reserve is also a no-take zone and includes the whole island, except for an already cleared area of 2.44 ha that was leased to CHICOP for building the Eco-lodge and Visitors' Centre. Permitted uses include recreation (swimming, snorkelling and underwater photography), education and research. The company objectives are not-for-profit; while operations follow commercial principles the revenue generated funds MPA

management, conservation activities and environmental education programmes.

A management plan was developed in 1995 with the involvement of stakeholders (CHICOP staff, GoZ departments, local fishermen and dive companies). The plan was revised and updated in 2006 for another 10 years, again based on consultations with stakeholders. The plans clearly define objectives, activities, research regulations, and Do's and Don'ts both for visitors and staff. Assessments of MPA management have highlighted the area's effectiveness. The Management Agreements provide for an Advisory Committee formed by GoZ representatives of the Departments of Environment, Fisheries, Forestry, leaders of four neighbouring fishing villages and a representative of the Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS) of the University of Dar es Salaam. The Advisory Committee meets at least twice yearly. Meetings have been held according to schedule since 1995 to discuss the Management Plans, project progress and any issues. There have been no major disagreements on actions to take so far, though recommendations of the Advisory Committee are not binding for the CHICOP Management.

Major strengths of CHICOP

- Financial sustainability is secured. Revenues from eco-tourism operations on Chumbe are directly re-invested in conservation and education programmes – all data such as guest occupancy, number of school trips, etc. are reported in progress and audited financial reports to GoZ agencies. All the management costs and environmental education programmes for local schools have been fully covered by the ecotourism operation since 2000.
- Design and planning of the MPA's area and regulations were undertaken with local resource users. Initial meetings with neighbouring communities before developing CHICOP and consultations with a wide variety of stakeholders for development of the Management Plan helped to ensure that the role of MPA is understood and supported by local resources users, civil society and the Government of Zanzibar.
- Participative governance structures and processes are managed through regular meetings of the Advisory Committee and local communities. Employing and training local fishers as Park rangers has helped enforcement through education, and was a condition for the rangers to be respected and accepted by local fishers and their communities.
- Monitoring and research projects have been carried out consistently since establishment. The site's professional network has widened due to co-operation with research institutions and participation in national and international meetings/conferences.

- The MPA has benefited local communities by generating income, employment and a market for local produce; developing new work skills; demonstrating sustainable resource management; and restocking commercial fish species in adjacent areas (spill-over).

Challenges of CHICOP

- Ambiguous regulations and wide discretionary powers of civil servants in the area of land leases, building permits, business licenses, immigration and labour laws encourage corruption and are thus hurdles to doing business by delaying project implementation and increasing costs.
- Employing people from local rural communities requires enormous investment in training and skill development, which adds to investment costs and delays business operations and income.

2. Namibia

The data on PPAs in Namibia presents a confused picture. Although there are a range of areas that could be considered as PPAs only a few really meet the IUCN definition of a protected area. The data held on the WDPA (six private reserves and 25 Freehold conservancies) is clearly incorrect and the database needs updating as appropriate. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) has no official definition of such PPAs but it does maintain a centralized register of private game parks and nature reserves established under Section 22 of the Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975.



NamibRand, ©Niels Oddendal

According to Zimmerman et al. (2012) the register indicates that the 153 private game parks and nature reserves cover an area of 13 116 km², which is equivalent to 1.6 per cent of Namibia's land

surface. However the same authors consider the list incomplete as it includes reserves subsequently de-proclaimed and some Government Gazettes include private game parks or nature reserves that are not contained in the register. Private Game Reserves not established under legislation are not recognized officially by MET and do not appear on any official data base, however there are at least eight unregistered private game reserves (covering 5,470 km²) that could fit the IUCN definition of a protected area. Four such Private Reserves are listed on the WDPA, including the Gondwana Cañon Park and the NamibRand Nature Reserve (see boxes 2 and 3). MET has prepared a Parks and Wildlife Bill which when enacted by the National Assembly will replace the outdated pre-independence Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975, which remains the primary legislation governing parks and wildlife conservation in Namibia. It is expected that the new legislation will make provision for the recognition of the currently unregistered private game reserves and larger landscape conservation areas that link state-run PAs with neighbouring conservation areas under different types of governance. Once this is in place, there will clearly be a need to review all the PPA data available and assess if the sites listed meet the IUCN definition.

Box 2: Gondwana Cañon Park

The Gondwana Collection is a series of freehold properties owned by one for-profit company across different parts of Namibia and developed for tourism and conservation. Three of these properties, the Gondwana Cañon Park, the Gondwana Kalahari Park and the Gondwana Namib Park are managed as Private Game Reserves such that they fall within the IUCN definition of a protected area.

Gondwana Cañon Park in Karas Region, covers an area of 126,000 ha. All rights are vested in the company owning the land except for the right of arrest and penalising offenders. This, and others matters related to the illegal use of wildlife, is under the authority of officials of the MET. Some use of resources is restricted by national legislation (e.g. conservation of protected tree species, rare plants, etc.) and use of game animals is governed by the Nature Conservation ordinance of 1975. The land owner has the right to harvest certain species of game for personal use, to buy and sell game and to reduce numbers for management purposes, subject to MET authorisation.

All of the Gondwana parks have a well-developed management plan with clear conservation objectives and have successfully restored degraded former farmland. Wildlife includes springbok, oryx, red hartebeest, blue

wildebeest, ostrich, giraffe, plains and mountain zebra, kudu and klipspringer¹ and more recently re-introduced black rhino. There is no internal fencing. There are three lodges, a self-catering camp and two camp sites. There has been good cooperation with MET and joint activities include research, game counts, mapping, clean ups and marketing.



NamibRand, ©Niels Oddendal

Box 3: Namib Rand

The NamibRand Nature Reserve, located in southern Namibia, is a private not-for-profit nature reserve established to help protect and conserve the unique ecology and wildlife of the south-west Namib Desert². The aims are to conserve the pro-Namib, the area along the eastern edge of the Namib Desert, in order to facilitate seasonal migratory wildlife routes and to protect biodiversity. NamibRand is one of the largest private nature reserves in Southern Africa, extending over an area of 202,200 ha. The Reserve shares a 100 km border with the State-run Namib-Naukluft National Park in the west and is bordered in the east by the escarpment. It has no game proof fencing as it aims to allow natural wildlife movements.

The reserve consists of 13 former livestock farms rehabilitated into a single continuous natural habitat. Joint management initiatives and agreements were signed with neighbours in 2008. Landowners retain the title deed to their land but relinquish individual management. In 2001 all landowners belonging to the reserve voluntarily signed the articles of association and adopted a constitution that sets aside the land for conservation. The articles of association make provision for landowners to serve as directors on the reserve's managing board and the board employs a CEO, two wardens and their management teams to implement the management plan. All rights are vested in the land

¹ www.gondwana-collection.com/home/attractions/gondwana-canyon-park/

² www.namibrand.com/Conservation.htm

owners and the management board except for the right of arrest and penalising offenders.

When purchased, the 13 livestock farms comprising the NamibRand Nature Reserve employed around 40 workers. Under conservation land use, more than 150 people are employed on the reserve, mainly by the tourism concessionaires. Habitats are improving from the degraded former livestock farmland. By 2010, wildlife populations on NamibRand appeared to have stabilized, recovering significantly from numbers recorded when intensive conservation efforts began.

The NamibRand Nature Reserve aims to achieve biodiversity conservation balanced with financial sustainability. It uses low-impact ecotourism as a means towards sustaining its conservation efforts through charging various forms of park fees in the same way as state-run national parks. The five tourism concessions in the reserve each pay a daily, per-bed fee to the reserve. The funds generated through these park fees enable the reserve to be financially self-sustaining.

The reserve has a management plan and a tourism and economic development plan. The reserve maintains a conservation policy of minimal interference with ongoing monitoring, implemented through the management plan. Staff members are responsible for implementing the management plans and internal accountability is strong due to the structure of the board and reporting of the CEO to the board. Research is aimed at directly benefit management and national scientific knowledge base. The Reserve has recently established the NamibRand Desert Research and Awareness Centre (NRAC) which supports and guides local and international researchers³.

Both examples of potential PPAs in Namibia share similar strengths and challenges, which include:

Strengths

- Legitimacy is derived from the ownership of the land and the right to decide how the land should be used. There are no issues concerning people being removed from the land.
- Internal accountability is strong due to the structure of the land owning company and the company provides information to the public about its activities in the PPA and conservation activities and research are reported on its web site.
- Costs and benefits are internalised within the PPA and the owning company.

Challenges

- This governance type does not necessarily provide long-term security in terms of the conservation status of the land. The status depends on the

company owning the land. If the company went bankrupt or decided to sell the land the status of the area could change.

- Continued investment in PPA management might depend on continued good commercial performance of the tourism operations or the willingness of the investors to subsidise the conservation operations.
- Under current Namibian legislation there is no formal legitimacy from the state.
- PPA managers are accountable to the company owning the land not to broader society.
- The State has no power to ensure that the PPA conforms to any national or international protected area standards or criteria.

As mentioned above, a clear next step for PPAs in Namibia is to bring PPAs within the formal protected area system through legislation. One option for this is for new legislation to make provision for the MET to conclude contractual agreements with the owners of freehold land, or the representatives of freehold conservancies, to have such land declared in the government gazette as a PPA. The MET would also have the ability to cancel an agreement and de-proclaim the land if it is mismanaged or failed to meet national or international protected area standards or criteria. The incentive for private land holders to enter into such agreements would be for the state to devolve more use rights over wildlife to the landholders and relax current bureaucratic controls (permits and authorisations for various uses of wildlife).

3. Madagascar

With one exception, Berenty Reserve (see box 4), all protected areas in Madagascar are officially under shared governance. Madagascar National Parks (MNP) is however keen to involve the private sector in conservation and is increasingly seeking to establish management partnerships with specialist institutions for the expansion and professionalization of key services, e.g. tourism infrastructure provision, applied research, and small-scale private sector enterprise development. Protected areas outside the official MNP network have to have a legally recognised promoter, in most cases Malagasy or international NGOs, although mining companies, universities and private individuals have also taken the initiative to establish new sites. Sites are managed through community-based management committees.

³ www.namibrand.com/Conservation.htm

All protected areas are legislated by the Protected Areas Code or COAP, which was revised in 2008 to accommodate new categories and governance models although, due to the political crisis that engulfed Madagascar in 2009, the revised COAP has not yet been ratified.



Madagascar, Andohela

Box 4: Berenty Private Reserve

Berenty Reserve⁴ is a small, approximately 10km², private reserve of gallery forest along the Mandrake River, set in the semi-arid spiny forest ecoregion of the far south of Madagascar. For more than three decades the primatologist Alison Jolly (who started the research at Berenty), researchers and students have visited Berenty to conduct fieldwork on lemurs. The reserve is also a favourite for visitors who want to see some of Madagascar's endemic bird species, which include owls and couas.

The site was established in the 1930s but is not designated or part of Madagascar Protected Area System as COAP does allow for PPAs within Madagascar Protected Area System. Incorporating Berenty would provide more long term security for the site, although it is of note that the size and condition of habitats appear to have been maintained over the last 70 years.

Berenty was established by a French settler family (the de Heaulmes) during the colonial period. The de Heaulme family, owners of Berenty Estate, cleared the majority of their land for a sisal plantation in 1936 beside the Mandrare River in agreement with local clans of the Tandroy tribe, but decided to maintain one corner as a reserve because it was 'too beautiful' to clear. The reserve is home to six species of lemur, the south's largest colony of Madagascar fruit bats, and 103 bird species, 56 of which breed in the reserve.

⁴ www-personal.umd.umich.edu/~fdolins/berenty/

All decision-making about reserve management is made by private landowners, although rights to drive cattle to water along a path through the reserve were negotiated with local elders upon establishment. The right to arrest, or otherwise penalize, offenders lies with the State gendarmerie.

Strengths

- Governance structures and rules are extremely streamlined, clear and uncomplicated.
- Private property is generally recognised as legitimate.
- The reserve is a very profitable and well-known tourism destination as a result of habituated lemurs. It is likely to be maintained for conservation so long as tourism remains profitable.

Weaknesses

- PPAs are not recognised in the protected area system, and the site is thus not obliged to follow norms and guidelines.
- Neighbouring communities have little formal voice, although they also have no formal rights.
- Maintenance of the PPA is dependent on private decision-making, thus vulnerable to changing priorities (e.g. as a result of the changing profitability of different land uses) and even 'degazettement' as a result of changing priorities of owners.



Lemur Catta, Madagascar

4. The Gambia

Current biodiversity policy is weak in regards to encouraging the private sector to take part in conservation activities in Gambia. PPAs are restricted to forest areas administered under the Department of Forestry (DoF), with only one potential forest PPA (box 5) although information is scarce. However new policy and legislative frameworks are being developed, calling for increased private involvement in protected areas.

Forest parks/reserve are not included in the national estimate of 4.27 per cent coverage of

protected areas, despite some having clear conservation objectives. This is because the exact coverage of these national forest parks and reserves is disputed. Many of the parks/reserve on record at the Department of Forestry (DoF) no longer exist or are completely degraded and categorization of forest parks and reserves does not follow IUCN system. Despite the lack of information and data on PPAs, the new forestry policy (2010-2019) is committed to decentralization and synergy, and encourages support and involvement of the private sector in natural forest resource management.

Box 5: Koofung Private Forest Reserve

Koofung Private Forest Reserve was set up in 1990. The site protects 25 ha of coastal forest in Gunjur, Kombo South in the West Coast Region of the Gambia. Although not listed in the WDPA management of the site equals a category Ia. The reserve is designated under the Forest Act, 1998 and provides a safe haven for many species of small mammals and birds.

Although there is a communal land tenure system over much of Gambia, Koofung was allocated to the present land owner during land distribution by members of the traditional land owners. The private land owner decided to create a private forest for the purpose of protecting habitat and species of wildlife still found in this area. The private land owner has control of all rights associated with the reserve, and, for example, appoints forest guards to help control and protect resources within the forest; despite this there are frequent cases of illegal collection and hunting. The private owner makes all management decisions, often seeking expert's advice and services when necessary. Access to resources within the PPA is not permitted and the ongoing conservation management activities seem relatively successful. The management procedures and measure are however not well articulated and management decisions often lack enough background knowledge of issues and their linkage with internal and external issues.

Strengths

- Decisions to address management issues are taken quickly as there is no bureaucratic management system to follow.
- All matter related to the management of the park is shared with Department of Forestry.
- Revenue from PA entrance fees are shared via a method and formula that is open to scrutiny by all and resources are allocated to priority management areas.

Challenges

- The park is not integrated into broader land use planning and there is no mechanism to assess and accountability and transparency.

- The forest park needs to strengthen its management capacity by hiring the service of experts to develop a management plan and strategy for effective protection.
- There is need to collaborate with the government and to develop a long term resource mobilization strategy.
- Mechanisms for stakeholder engagement and dialogue should be clearly formulated.



5. The Republic of Congo

Although there are no PPAs in the Congo of the type described above, the provisions of Law 37-2008 of November 2008 allow for this type of governance, although the implementing legislation has not yet been adopted. Other forms of private governance, which link state and the private sector, are however being developed here, as outlined in box 6.

Box 6: Odzala-Kokoua National Park

Odzala-Kokoua National Park is situated in the north-west of the Republic of Congo. Covering 13,546 km² of pristine wilderness the park protects an extensive and well conserved forest ecosystem and savannah habitats, it has high biological diversity including high concentrations of lowland gorillas.

The park was established in 1935 during the French Colonial period and was extended to its current area in 2001, in consultation with local communities. The NGO African Parks took over the management of Odzala-Kokoua in November 2010 under the terms of a partnership agreement with the Government of the Republic of Congo. This agreement provides for the creation of a dedicated non-profit entity, the Odzala Foundation, which will have overall jurisdiction over the park. Although the agreement is still being developed, this could possibly be considered as a change of governance type from state to shared or even private depending on the final form of the Odzala Foundation and the rights it exercises. The management framework

and partnership agreement between African Parks and Government is for a period of 25 years.

Management is aimed at achieving dual objectives of conservation of natural capital and sustainable development of natural resources and is developed with the agreement of stakeholders who are part of the Steering Committee managing the Park. The State holds sovereign rights (particularly legal ownership of protected area) and the Agency for Wildlife Conservation and Protected Areas (ACFAP) coordinates use rights. Other rights are managed by African Parks and the local community, such as management, arresting offenders, establishing subsidiary agreements, and proposals to use specific resources after agreement by State, especially with view to establishing ecotourism and/or game related activities. There are no customary rights within protected areas but dispensations are granted to local community members with Odzala Kokoua land rights. It is hard to judge the effectiveness of this still developing partnership with the private sector, but some suggested best **practices include:**

- Better understanding of the needs of local communities in the Management Plan and better integration of representatives onto the Steering Committee
- More transparent assessment of protected area management needs developed, involving all stakeholders
- Improvements made in the system of communicating decisions and results achieved (particularly in relation to investments and profits of stakeholders) to ensure healthy transparency
- Efforts must be made to strengthen (i) fairness of rights and duties applicable in protected area and (ii) respect for individual and collective rights of local communities involved.

B - Strengths and weaknesses of the PPA governance type

To understand the strengths and weaknesses of the PPA governance type we drew on IUCN's principles of good governance for protected areas developed by Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2013, p 59-60).

Legitimacy: Our survey has found many examples of PPAs which do not have official status (e.g., Berenty Private Reserve in Madagascar). Although this is not in contravention of the IUCN definition of a protected area (Dudley, 2008), lack of official standing in any form does have some drawbacks. Such sites do not necessarily provide long-term security for conservation, PPA managers are accountable to the company/trust/individual owning the land rather than to broader society, and sites tend not to be recognised in national and international reporting mechanisms.

Reaching all stakeholders: Whatever the form of PPAs, there will be a need to engage with stakeholders, and most specifically with local communities (as should be the case in all protected areas worldwide). The development, management, enforcement and monitoring of the PPA should be participatory even in PPAs with a single owner. In most cases some form of benefit sharing will also be in place. Best practices should ensure revenue is shared via a method and formula that is known and was agreed by all parties. According to Nelson (2012) communities in Kenya have engaged at the national policy level more than is typical in most African countries. The reason given is the involvement and assistance of organizations such as the Northern Rangelands Trust, East African Wildlife Society and African Conservation Centre. The author notes that: “working with these NGOs as well as private freehold ranchers and tourism operators, communities participated in the Kenya Wildlife Working Group, which became an influential group ... [and] actively engaged in reform processes around wildlife, land, and the implementation of the new constitution” (Nelson, 2012, p 34). This suggests that stakeholder engagement is not usually a matter of chance but depends in part on the managers of PPAs creating opportunities and encouraging local communities and others to engage.



OI Pejeta, Kenya

Box 7: OI Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya

A former ranch in Laikipia County, OI Pejeta Conservancy is a not-for profit organisation famous for rhino conservation and high quality tourism. The management of the Conservancy also showcases many best practices for PPAs (the Conservancy was recently recognised as one of the pilot sites to be included on IUCN's Green List of Protected Areas for its excellent

management). Examples related to good overall governance include diversification of its revenue streams through enterprise such as beef and wheat farming to provide alternatives to an over reliance on tourism, and the establishment of a Community Development Programme which focuses on health, roads, water, education and agricultural extension. Activities which highlight the close working relationships with communities around the Conservancy include allowing organized grazing of community livestock in the Conservancy when grazing outside the area is scarce, which in turn helps develop tolerance of wildlife outside the Conservancy by neighbouring communities, who are then willing to participate in conservation issues.

Based on Kootsositse et al., 2014.

Empowerment: In South Africa government policies such as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE), aimed at redressing the inequalities of Apartheid by giving previously disadvantaged citizens of South African economic privileges, has clearly had an impact on some PPAs, although there does not seem to be one coherent approach to implementing the policy. Elsewhere in Africa, PPAs have been noted as increasing opportunities for participation, as in Odzala-Kokoua National Park in the Republic of Congo, but this is clearly not always the case.

Cultural identity: Probably all PPAs in Africa will have had a long history of use and social interactions with a range of peoples. Ensuring that current communities retain (and even reinforce) their cultural identity should be an important part of a PPA's management ethos. Unfortunately this is not always the case and Brooks et al. (2011) note how private game farm owners in South Africa create a particular version of history, revolving around ideas of wilderness, in order to sell tourism.

Limited support: In some cases, individually owned PPAs are not always considered as part of the local populace and thus do not command the same political support as community protected areas. However this is not invariably the case and for instance in Gondwana Cañon reserve in Namibia, opportunities for participation by a wide range of stakeholders had built support for the PPA. Mechanisms for sharing pooled wildlife resources in southern Africa mean that privately owned conservancies can easily be expanded to incorporate community-owned land and thus by default could be part of an overall conservation landscape with attendant support.

Resource rights: The issue of who has control of a range of resource rights over land/sea managed for

conservation is clearly of fundamental importance when considering good governance. There has been a marked devolution of rights to individuals in many parts of Africa over the last few years, but this still does not always reach local stakeholders/communities. In Zambia, for example, the failure of the 1998 Wildlife Act to recognize communities as the rightful owners of the land or wildlife in game management areas (which is in contradiction to the Lands Act of 1995) is clearly hampering conservation efforts and the development of effective PPAs.



Motivations: Champions are fundamental to leading private land conservation initiatives (either individual land owners or leaders in private sector organisations) and the case studies above highlight the roles of individuals. The fact that many PPAs (or protected areas with shared governance between individual owners) are set up by groups of landowners and/or are parts of a landscape of protected areas of various governance types indicates that champions are also capable of building social capital and promoting collective action among several private owners.

Working with local communities: Particularly in the case of conservancies or protected areas with shared governance, there must be trust between partners and confidence in each other to be able to work more effectively together. According to field studies in the greater Ewaso ecosystem in Kenya by Eliot et al. (2014), PPAs owned by individuals in Kenya are seen as good neighbours to surrounding local communities when they have outreach programmes, generate opportunities for local community spin-off enterprises, support the fundraising efforts of community protected areas and add to local security. The greater Ewaso ecosystem includes the first private wildlife

sanctuary in Kenya (Solio established in 1970) and now includes at least 16 individually or family-owned PPAs established. Such relationships have a direct bearing on conservation outcomes. Support from local communities was highlighted as critical to success in both Chumbe MPA and Mwiba Wildlife Ranch in Tanzania for instance.

Effective, supported enforcement: Motivation at community level can also be a powerful driving of success in enforcement. Enforcement was deemed to be effective in Chumbe MPA in Zanzibar, Tanzania, because local fishing communities recognised its role in boosting fish stocks.

Flexibility: PPAs often have greater management efficiency because decision making is easier and resources can be more quickly mobilised in the absence of government bureaucracy. PPAs in the Ewaso system in Kenya, for example, are cited by other protected areas as enabling a more rapid and flexible response to problems (e.g. security, problem animals) because of their resources, technical skills and operating systems (Elliot et al., 2014).

Education: Several conservancies in South Africa have founded Wildlife Colleges that provide ecological education and diplomas in game ranging and management. However laudable these efforts are, commentators (e.g. Spierenburg & Brooks, 2014) note that educational and employment opportunities rarely pay attention to local socio-economic differentiation or to aspirations and the meaning various groups attach to the concept of personal development.



Financial security: The private sector is often better based to raise funds, manage funds effectively and develop management which

combines commercial profit motive operations with conservation success in protected areas that conform to the IUCN criteria. PPAs in Africa have a history of securing funding for conservation often owing to individuals, either land owners, NGO staff or trustees, involved having extensive personal and business networks and/or the personal commitment and passion of their owners to conservation.

Box 8: Ensuring financial security in PPAs

It is naive to assume that conservation does not need funding from some source. The expansion of state governed protected areas is clearly putting a large financial burden on governments in terms of management costs (which rise as threats increase) and increased expectations of outreach activities linked to protected area development and management. Private management in contrast can often have stronger incentives to keep overheads down and to generate income than governmental protected area agencies.

PPAs also open up funding opportunities that are not always applicable to state or community-managed protected areas, such as tax breaks (including on inheritance tax), easements, grants and subsidies open to private owners who set aside some or all of their land as PPAs. For NGOs, the often small and discreet nature of PPAs that focus on a particular landscape feature (such as a wetland area or patch of remnant forest); or species with limited habitat needs (e.g. rhinos); or habitats under immediate threat from development; can be useful in developing targeted, locally relevant fund-raising campaigns for land purchase and management.

To some extent, PPAs are also exemplars of a neoliberal approach to conservation which sees land, fauna and flora as a 'natural assets' which have value. This philosophy promotes the development of a market willing to pay for resources and the involvement of the private sector in biodiversity conservation to develop the value and manage the market. One of Africa's primary assets is its appeal to tourists who wish to see mega-fauna, experience cultural diversity and enjoy good weather, accommodation and facilities. This asset has been clearly identified by several of the organisations involved in PPAs in Africa.

Using tourism to fund conservation has provided a financial model for community involvement in PPAs, and in the best examples has allowed the development of governance models of PPAs that include nearly all the involved stakeholders. However, there is also always a danger that economic motives (profit) may override ecological objectives and therefore compromise conservation principles. Declines in tourist numbers can also be sudden and unexpected. Increasing insecurity and the 'threat' of Ebola is currently having a major impact on some tourism destinations in Africa, in particular Kenya. Without tourism funding many PPAs

are going to face financial challenges, local people are likely to lose employment and conservation objectives are likely to be superseded by at best an increased focus on livestock farming and at worst increased poaching.

Using tourism as the basis for financing conservation needs to be based on sustainable and realistic budgets, for example, in Tanzania the cost effective operations of CHICOP mean only ca. 40 per cent occupancy is required for basic management. Therefore, prospects of sustainability are good even during slumps in tourism arrivals. CHICOP has thus become the first financially self-sustaining MPA in Africa and probably worldwide (see box 1).

Poverty reduction: A study of 10 PPAs operating as ecotourism businesses in South Africa found conversion to conservation led to increase local wages and employment levels, relative to the forms of land use that they replaced, although the inverse is true for hunting based game ranches (Langholz & Kerley, 2006). However, a study carried out in KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape of South Africa (Spierenburg & Brooks, 2014) found that reserves, i.e. wildlife conservation areas, did not generate more employment than the livestock ranches they replaced, and that local people were only accessing low-income service jobs rather than the more lucrative jobs such as wildlife guiding. This latter situation highlights the need for effective education and development. The way that revenue is shared between stakeholders is also important; PPAs that make money only for a small minority are unlikely to gain widespread support. In Koofung Private Forest Reserve, Gambia's only PPA, transparency in distribution of revenue is identified as an important element in building community support.

Land rights: The issue of social engagement in private governance of conservation highlights the tensions around the term 'private'. For many this term can suggest areas are that are exclusive, where people are kept out, or even worse, displaced from their land. In South Africa, there are many outstanding or unresolved claims on land scheduled for transformation from conventional agriculture to wildlife production (see box 9).

Voluntary conservation: PPAs are often voluntary and therefore rely on incentives and encouragement, rather than coercion or enforced involvement, which requires a better understanding of the social and economic factors that underpin land managers' willingness to engage in land management initiatives.

Box 9: Another form of colonial land

Spierenburg and Brooks (2014) are critical of the role of private sector involvement in wildlife management in Africa. They maintain that game farming and/or wildlife production is presented by landowners as a way to continue the dominance of a small number of landowners over control of land. Areas are being enclosed by game fencing, which creates new forms of inclusion, of wealthy private wildlife areas, and exclusion by blocking off old access routes across farms and creating entrenched private game farms and reserves.

Due to the wildlife-based nature of the land use, the presence of farm dwellers in these environments is actively minimised as far as possible and evidence of buildings and former farm worker dwellings is removed. For example, the impact of this sudden and effective enclosure of land in the Karoo, South Africa, left farm dwellers excluded from grazing land and other common property resources on the farms, and in addition, the loss of home and identities which were closely tied to the land including their significant relationships to ancestral spirits mediated through the land. As Spierenburg and Brooks (2014) conclude: "Empty now of both people and their livestock, the private game reserves that emerged out of this initiative are sealed-off enclaves and the burial sites within them devoid of significance for visiting eco-tourists, the new denizens of this space".



Conclusions

The final example in this article reinforces the need for the conservation community to be specific about what it means by PPA (see article in last issue of the NAPA newsletter which outlined the definitions and principles published by IUCN in 2014 in Stolton et al.) and then to develop best practices around this definition. It is very unlikely that some game farming and/or wildlife production would meet the definition. This does not mean, of course, that the conservation community should not be trying to

develop good governance in all areas with any form of conservation ethos. But these areas should not be considered as PPAs.

Acknowledgements

The study of PPAs in Africa was informed by a literature review and case studies from five countries. We would like to thank the case study authors for their material which made the above review possible:

Tanzania: Wayne Lotter, Krissie Clark, Jason Rubens, Sibylle Riedmiller and Abigail Wills

Namibia: Brian T. B. Jones

Madagascar: Charlie Gardner

The Gambia: Alagie Manjang and Famara Drammeh

The Republic of Congo: Jean-Claude Heymans

References

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Dudley, N., Jaeger, T., Lassen, B. Broome, N.P., Phillips, A. and Sandwith, T. (2013). *Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xvi + 124pp.

Brooks, S., M. Spierenburg, L. O. T. Van Brakel, A. Kolk and K. B. Lukhozi. (2011). Creating a commodified wilderness: Tourism, private game farming and 'third nature' landscapes in Kwazulu-Natal. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 102:260-274.

Dudley, N. (Ed) (2008). *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp.

WITH Stolton, S., Shadie, P. and Dudley, N. (2013). *IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types, Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Elliott, J., H. Gibbons, D. King, A. King and T. Leménager (2014). Exploring Environmental Complementarity between Types of Protected Areas in Kenya, *Focales*, n°19. Paris, France, AFD.

Kootsositse, M. V., Mulama, M. Otieno, M. M. and L. Sello. (2014). Innovative ways of addressing current challenges on protected areas' management systems in Africa, *News from African Protected Areas – NAPA*, 81: December 2014. Nairobi, Kenya, IUCN PAPACO.

Langholz, J.A. and G.I.H. Kerley. (2006). Combining conservation and development on private lands: An assessment of ecotourism-based private game reserves in the Eastern Cape. *Centre for African Conservation Ecology*. Report No. 56.

Nelson, F. (2012). *An analysis of international law, national legislation, judgements, and institutions as they interrelate with territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities. Report no. 2. Africa regional*. Bangalore, India. Natural Justice and Pune and Delhi, India, Kalpavriksh

Spierenburg, M. and S. Brooks. (2014). Private game farming and its social consequences in post-apartheid South Africa: contestations over wildlife, property and agrarian futures. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. 32:2, 151-172

Stolton, S, Redford, K. H. and N. Dudley. (2014). *The Futures of Privately Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Zimmermann, I., Humavindu M. and U. Nakamhela. (2012). *The Ecological, Social and Economic Implications of Private Game Parks & Private Nature Reserves in Namibia*. Windhoek, Namibia: NAM-Place Project, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

See the full report on www.papaco.org
(once back online!)



FFEM – PPI: Request for proposals for consultancy services

In the frame of the implementation of the Small-Scale Initiatives Program (PPI) of the French Global Environment Facility (FFEM), IUCN is looking for a **qualified consultant specialized in beekeeping**, to undertake a diagnostic survey on value chain related to this activity. The terms of references can be obtained with Arsene SANON (arsene.sanon@iucn.org). Technical and financial bids should be sent to arsene.sanon@iucn.org by the **6th of May 2015**.

IUCN and the University of Oxford release a study entitled, "Learning our Lessons: A Review of Alternative Livelihood Projects in Central Africa"

By S. Wicander and L. Coad

The bushmeat trade across West and Central Africa has been estimated to be worth as much as USD 200 million a year. However, when hunting becomes commercialized or intensified, wildlife populations suffer, and dramatic population declines and local extirpations occur in heavily hunted areas. One of the most widely discussed approaches to increasing the sustainability of hunting is the provision of alternative protein and income-generating sources (or 'alternative livelihoods') to communities that are otherwise dependent on bushmeat for food and/or income. However do these approaches to conservation achieve their goals?

Such projects have been implemented at least since the early 1990s; however, despite significant expenditure, expected to exceed USD 6 million over the next five years in Central Africa alone, the evidence of project impacts has not been reviewed: in short, we do not know how effective they are.

The study 'Learning our Lessons: A Review of Alternative Livelihood Projects in Central Africa' evaluated the effectiveness of alternative livelihoods projects in Central Africa. Its findings, released in a report by IUCN and the University of Oxford indicate that although many projects were co-designed with communities and implemented by national or local managers:

- Many projects are based on untested assumptions
- Projects are not funded at high enough levels or for long enough time periods to have impact.
- Some projects fail community needs and expectations
- Some alternative activities were inappropriate for local markets

Suggestions include having a more robust and realistic project development effort, longer timelines, and better community engagement.

More information, including the full report and associated briefs, is available here:

https://www.iucn.org/news_homepage/news_by_date/?20091/Learning-our-Lessons--A-Review-of-Alternative-Livelihood-Projects-in-Central-Africa

personnel who work for governmental or nongovernmental conservation and tourism organizations, in academia, in the private sector, and in community-based and indigenous tourism and conservation initiatives in or near protected areas.

Themes and Topics Covered

Planning for tourism and public use in protected areas: zoning, management plans, carrying capacity, stakeholder involvement, and destination planning

Legal and policy frameworks

Tourism and climate change

Institutional arrangements: role of different government actors and levels of government; local communities, landowners, academia, businesses, NGOs, indigenous people, universities, industry associations, user groups, volunteers, and concessionaires and other public-private partnerships

Infrastructure: transportation networks; hotels; campsites; souvenir shops; restrooms; food and fuel; emergency services; signage; staff housing and facilities; and public services (water, sewerage, electricity, trash disposal, communications, etc.)

Interpretation and environmental education: guided and self-guided walks and trails; visitor centers; night programs; wayside exhibits; publications; and the role of guides and outfitters

Funding tourism programs in protected areas

The workshop will combine a series of modules and activities on cross-cutting issues that involve intensive and active engagement of the participants. Teaching methods will include lectures, discussion sessions, small group exercises, participant presentations, and informal exchanges among participants, faculty and invited speakers. The workshop will also include a variety of activities to build camaraderie and help participants understand the challenges to sustainable tourism in natural areas and the importance of highly trained personnel. These include interpretive hikes and spending time with concessionaires, outfitters, and services providers to experience firsthand protected area tourism programs.

2015 seminar dates: September 11-26, 2015.

For more information and to apply online, visit <http://warnercnr.colostate.edu/cpamt-tourism-course>



Colorado State University
WARNER COLLEGE OF Natural Resources

Planning and Managing Tourism in Protected Areas

Mobile Seminar - September 11-26, 2015

The Mobile Seminar on Planning and Managing Tourism in Protected Areas is an intensive, 2.5 week field-based training event for individuals working to promote sustainable tourism and outdoor recreation in parks and nature reserves worldwide.

The seminar will build the skills of participants to plan and manage public use and outdoor recreation programs in protected areas to build support for conservation, contribute to public health, fund protected area management, and provide economic benefits to local communities and national economies. Ideal participants will be mid-level professional and technical

NAPA – CONTACTS

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org
beatrice.chataigner@iucn.org

Program on African Protected Areas & Conservation
PAPACO - Program Officer – Green List

www.papaco.org and www.iucn.org

The opinions expressed in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN