



**Strengthening Local Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade:
Kilitome and Olderkesi Conservancy Stakeholders Workshop
AA Lodge, Amboseli
27 - 28 February 2017**

Summary workshop report



Background

The important role that local communities play in combating illegal wildlife trade (IWT) is increasingly being recognized as a key component in effective anti-poaching strategies and has been enshrined in a number of recent global policy statements and commitments. However, to date there has been little guidance available on how to effectively engage communities in practice.

The project “**Strengthening local community engagement in combating illegal wildlife trade**” aims to help address this gap and is funded by the UK government Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund.

IUCN, IIED, KWCA and other project partners have been working to better understand the conditions for stronger engagement of local communities to combat IWT in African elephants and other species, while positively contributing to local livelihoods. The project has been undertaking action research in the Olderkesi and Kilitome Conservancies with project partners Cottar's Safari Service and Big Life Foundation to test and adapt a dynamic 'theory of change' that provides a framework for understanding how communities can best combat IWT.

This workshop with stakeholders from the Kilitome and Olderkesi Conservancies provided an opportunity to validate findings and share lessons learned from the research carried out at the conservancies in August and October 2016 respectively.

The intended outputs of the workshop were:

- Preliminary findings from the research are shared with the Olderkesi and Kilitome stakeholders
- The draft theories of change and case studies constructed for the two conservancies are validated and/or adapted based on feedback from the stakeholders
- Conservancy stakeholders gain an understanding of the similarities and differences between the approaches and contexts at the two conservancies
- Identification of common priorities for improving relevant policy and legislation at County & National Level

A full agenda is available in **Annex 1** to this report. The participants list is found in **Annex 2** to this report.

Meeting of the Olderkesi Conservancy stakeholders

The morning of the first day (27th February) was dedicated to discussions with the stakeholders from the Olderkesi conservancy.

Welcome and introductions

After a brief round of self-introductions, the meeting participants were welcomed by Calvin Cottar from Cottar Safari Service.

In his opening remarks Mr. Cottar explained how this workshop provided an important opportunity for the communities to be heard and emphasized the need for an interactive dialogue. He touched on a number of key challenges, such as increased selling of land, widespread and growing poverty and the need to try to keep land open. He expressed concern over the fact that wildlife was increasingly not seen to be part of the future of Maasai communities. In his view there is an urgent need to align the interests of all people who want wildlife to remain and enhance its potential to become a viable livelihood option while recognizing that this required efforts to ensure that wildlife will generate more income to those who live with it. Mr. Cottar also reflected back on the October 2016 visit by the IUCN team to Cottar's camp which he referred to as "an eye-opening experience". Key take home lessons for Cottar's included that not enough was being done in the Olderkesi community to disseminate information about what Cottar's is trying to do and how it is engaging with and assisting the community. Many were not aware of the full range of benefits generated and some were not familiar with the aims and objectives of the conservancy. In particular, women had not been sufficiently included in the discussions and they were generally much less aware than the elders and the youth about the value of wildlife and what benefits wildlife and the new conservancy could bring. He expressed hope that the participatory action research process this project was piloting would help clear the air, remove politics from the discussion and help focus on what is important: people's livelihoods and wildlife. He described his vision of low intensity, high-end tourism to help secure large areas and keep the area attractive to tourists. In this respect, the importance of careful land use planning cannot be over-emphasized. The Olderkesi Community Wildlife Conservation Trust is growing into an effective community based structure that will be key to success. As urbanization is inevitable, an important strategy is to try and make urban areas more attractive for people to move to with water, power, medicine, education and opportunity, thus creating enough space for cattle, people and wildlife.

Introduction to "First Line of Defense" and the Kenya project

In his brief opening remarks Leo Niskanen (IUCN ESARO) reminded the stakeholders about the visit in October 2016 to Olderkesi during which many questions were asked and in-depth discussions took place around a wide range of issues, such as law enforcement, benefit generation, human wildlife conflict, value of non-wildlife based alternative livelihoods, etc. Now it was time to share what had been learned and to hear from the Olderkesi representatives whether or not the research team had got "the Olderkesi story" right. He noted that the workshop also aimed to share lessons and experiences between the Olderkesi and Kilitome conservancies. Leo presented the overall goal and expected outcomes and main activities of the project "Strengthening community engagement in combating Illegal Wildlife Trade" funded by the UK

government Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund. This was followed by a brief overview of the project activities to date and planned activities to the end of the project in March 2018.

Following Leo's introduction, Holly Dublin, Chair of the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group and Senior Advisor to IUCN ESARO, introduced the background, rationale and objectives for the initiative "*Local communities: First Line of Defense against Illegal wildlife trade*". She described the development and evolution of a dynamic 'theory of change' (ToC) which serves as a framework for understanding how communities can best combat IWT. This ToC consists of four pathways for community-level actions: (A) strengthen disincentives for illegal behavior, (B) increase incentives for wildlife stewardship, (C) decrease costs of living with wildlife, and (D) support livelihoods that are not related to wildlife. The ToC includes key assumptions and enabling actions associated with these pathways, which were also explained. Several lessons emerging from case studies of community engagement in the fight against IWT from around the globe include the following:

- current approaches to enforcement, focusing primarily on state policing, are inadequate or and many are failing;
- some state-led law enforcement actions have created threats to communities, governance and, ultimately, to conservation due to human rights abuses and negative livelihood impacts;
- some have (i) undermined the legitimacy of conservation regulations and approaches based on trust-building (ii) led to displacement of poaching to other areas (iii) increased prices and increased incentives to poach;
- alternative livelihoods are often additional livelihoods rather than substitutes for poaching (a single alternative activity is unlikely to substitute for all the tangible and intangible benefits of illegal activities);
- there is a need to understand the broader land use dimensions of wildlife crime. Some wildlife policies have led to wildlife having little or no socio-economic value to the people who live with it, thus exacerbating habitat loss from the major threat in many areas of agricultural expansion, exacerbating human-wildlife conflict, and diminishing incentives for people to refrain from poaching, to protect wildlife from illegal killing, or to sustainably manage it;
- communities can be powerful and positive agents of change by knowing what is happening on the ground and by being highly motivated where they have a strong sense of ownership and perceive poaching as stealing from them; and
- building strong cooperative relationships between communities and arresting authorities is critical.

"Rules of Engagement" developed through a consultative process involving governments, NGOs, indigenous and local community representative groups have been developed. They provide a useful summary of international commitments to engaging communities in combatting wildlife crime. These are as follows:

- Advance or recognize and respect the rights of local people to manage and benefit from wildlife and their habitats
- Acknowledge and address the costs to communities from living with wildlife

- Build the capacity of local people to manage and benefit from wildlife and their habitats
- Build capacity of local people to tackle IWT
- Build the capacity of local people to improve their livelihoods and reduce poverty
- Strengthen the voice (active participation) of local people in conservation/IWT debate and dialogue
- Include local people in wildlife monitoring and enforcement networks
- Generate benefits from wildlife, both tangible and intangible
- Share benefits equitably
- Support and engage communities living with wildlife as active partners in conservation
- Build partnerships that are transparent, accountable and constituted on the basis of mutual respect
- Recognise and strengthen the legitimacy of local communities as critical negotiating partners.
- Involve local stakeholders and promote sustainable livelihoods and local community development around wildlife conservation and its sustainable use

Discussion

A brief plenary discussion took place focused on the important role that land use planning plays in reducing conflicts between people and wildlife and between competing land uses.

“The Olderkesi Story”

The main objectives of this session were to determine whether the research team had accurately understood the “Olderkesi story” and whether anything had changed since the site visit in October 2016. Dilya Roe (IIED) presented the findings from the research, first by examining the ToC in the light of the discussions with Cottars Safari Service, and then in the light of the discussions with community members. A broad summary of the main points follows.

The Cottars Safari Service ToC

The Cottar’s ToC has a vision that extends beyond just reduced poaching. The overall ambition is to sustain a functioning and intact natural ecosystem.

Pathway A

Cottars supports game scouts and informers which is broadly consistent with the IUCN ToC framework.

Pathway B

Cottars believe that the most important thing is for communities to get more benefits from wildlife so they have a greater incentive to look after it. This is the model on which the conservancy is based. Cottars pay a lease fee for the land and provide other benefits to the community (education, jobs, etc.). In return, the community keeps the conservancy area for wildlife and tourism.

Pathway C

With respect to Pathway C, Cottars believe that reducing conflict from wildlife is not so much about lions killing cattle or elephants eating crops, but rather about cattle and wildlife competing for grazing. Fundamentally, people and wildlife should live in different places – wildlife in the conservancy and people and cattle outside the conservancy – so that there is less conflict, although there is also a plan for a “conservancy herd” of cattle.

Pathway D

Cottars believe and support the idea of alternative non-wildlife livelihoods outside the conservancy as part of the overall incentive package to reduce pressure on wildlife. Cottars believe that the conservancy can not only help with stopping the killing of wildlife, but also with reducing overgrazing and the number of individuals fencing off their plots of land. Cottars believe that the conservancy will also reduce in-migration of outsiders in search of grazing.

In summary, Cottars believe that if the conservancy works as planned, and there is more income and other benefits for local people, this will result in changes in behaviour which will help ensure that Olderkesi remains a place that is good for both wildlife and people.

The community's ToC

Pathway A

- Not everyone agrees on the level of illegal killing of wildlife in Olderkesi. Some think it is a hotspot, others think there is not much poaching at the moment.
- There are some traditional Maasai beliefs that prevent killing of wildlife – especially elephants – but the community believes that these are not enough on their own to stop poachers.
- Most community members think that the high penalties for poaching in the Wildlife Act are fair and have helped reduce poaching.
- Most people trust the Maasai Mara National Reserve (MMNR) rangers and will report poaching or suspicious activities to them. However, some think MMNR rangers might be involved in poaching themselves in some cases. Others are fearful that they will be arrested if they report poaching. However, most of the conflict between local people and rangers is not about poaching but about grazing in the reserve.

Pathway B

- Local people are proud of the wildlife at Olderkesi and see living with wildlife as part of their future and their children's future.
- Local people also feel that the wildlife at Olderkesi belongs to them. However, only the elders and the youth felt that they had strong rights to decide how it is used and managed. The women did not feel they had rights to decide what happens to wildlife in their conservancy.
- Many people in Olderkesi support the new conservancy and want the benefits that they can see in other conservancies. However, some people think the conservancy will mean they lose their land.
- Some members of the community have already benefitted a lot from Cottars. But others have not. Many people are not aware of some of the benefits such as

support to schools. Women have not had much opportunity to have their voices heard.

Pathway C

- Most think that it is not fair that killing of wildlife by people is given more attention than killing of people by wildlife.
- It was not possible to test the main assumptions on which the Cottars model rests as the conservancy has only recently been established:
 - that competition for land (i.e. grazing) is the major factor affecting the coexistence of wildlife and livestock;
 - that providing separate spaces for livestock and for wildlife will eliminate competition for grazing as long as communities received payments for the opportunity costs; and
 - that local people will be willing to relocate away from wildlife areas (i.e. the conservancy) if payments are sufficient.

Pathway D

- At Olderkesi there are plans for investment in agriculture development (maize); small enterprises (e.g. motorbike taxis)
- As the conservancy was not yet operating at the time of the visit it was not possible to test this model. However, most of those interviewed felt that additional income is needed and many people would be interested in small businesses.

Which pathway do elders, youth and women think most important?

Overall, it was found that the elders and the youth thought that getting more income from wildlife was the most important factor to help stop illegal killing of wildlife. Women thought that more law enforcement was needed to stop illegal killing. Everyone agreed that more income earning opportunities – outside of tourism and the conservancy – were needed.

Discussion

This presentation was followed by an extensive group discussion with active participation from all three groups (elders, women and youth). The discussion centered on the following questions:

- Have we got the story right (the Theory of Change)?
- Has anything changed since the site visit?

Key points raised:

Elders:

- Poachers typically come from neighbouring conservancies or Tanzania not from Olderkesi; Olderkesi communities actively report all incidents to authorities, they have come to realize that “wildlife is more valuable than cows”.
- “We no longer have hunters who live in bush and depend only on meat”.
- The new heavy penalties against poaching have been a major deterrent.
- Lack of compensation for wildlife damage by the government is a huge challenge; “we have never seen anyone compensated”.

- Youth have a different vision to elders and many aspire to a future that does not necessarily include wildlife.
- The communities appreciate support from Cottars which started long before the conservancy was started – bursaries, transport to hospital, infrastructure, jobs.
- Since the conservancy was formed people have moved out; however the drought is a challenge, people are coming into graze livestock as little pasture elsewhere.
- Having too many cows and too many lodges is not helpful (e.g. case of Siana) better to have more quality and less quantity, and charge for a more exclusive product.
- A key challenge is having livestock and wildlife together. How do we mix the two so that the Maasai can live as they are used to? Can we get guidance? Could rotational grazing be explored in the conservancy?

Youth:

- Highest priority is to have employment for youth – create small businesses, etc.
- Right now the drought is a big challenge, good number of livestock have been lost, this is putting pressure on the community
- Need to put more water access points outside conservancy to help reduce people coming into the conservancy to access water
- The community does not tolerate poaching; anyone who engages in IWT will be swiftly dealt with

Women:

- HWC is a huge problem, more people are killed by wildlife than the other way around. KWS does not respond to HWC incidents.
- Benefits of living with wildlife should be larger than costs in the long term.
- Currently benefits from livestock are higher than from wildlife – communities can sell livestock and get immediate direct benefit. Livestock provides food security as well as insurance in the case of crises, such as medical and educational needs. Cows are the backbone of Maasai culture.
- The communities have seen that practical benefits are coming from tourism and the conservancy e.g. schools.

This was followed by a prolonged discussion about the idea of establishing a “conservancy herd”, a concept proposed by Calvin Cottar, and other ideas such a rotational grazing. Key points:

- The proposal is to have a high quality herd on the Conservancy to supply a ready market for high quality beef. The revenue from this would be shared with all members through a dividend process. This would be more equitable, than the current situation where just a few people own most of the livestock.
- Some (mainly the youth) would prefer a controlled and managed system of grazing, rather than a conservancy herd.
- Women also said that they need to have access to the conservancy during the dry season and agree that having a manageable grazing system is better, rather than having a conservancy herd, which might not be “big enough or be useful for rescuing individuals and families during hard times”.

- Calvin Cottar feels the conservancy herd should be piloted as an option for the conservancy before deciding definitively on its merits and demerits. The attitude that “cattle is God-given” can contribute to bad land management. The first priority should be to get the grass growing and get the Conservancy rehabilitated. Shoats should not be welcomed to the Conservancy. Focus on better breeds of cattle not numbers: “one high quality cow can be worth more than ten cows”.

Other points were raised during the general discussion:

- Olderkesi has the opportunity to avoid the mistakes from other Mara conservancies. It should strive to maintain its role as an elephant corridor and key migration dispersal area.
- There is a need to work towards a holistic land use plan incorporating conservation, food security, farming, microfinance, solar systems, etc. Olderkesi still has the chance to get it right. We should not repeat the same mistakes witnessed elsewhere.
- One of the issues that came out of the field research is that there was an unequal distribution of knowledge between the different groups within the community. A notable finding was that women were not as aware of the benefits emanating from the conservancy and from Cottar’s operations than elders and youth.
- Opportunities to expand the conservancy should be explored but only with the right partners. Cottars are actively looking for new partners.
- It is important to monitor performance to determine how well the Conservancy works and to assess new ideas like the conservancy herd; adaptive management of interventions is needed.

A number of information gaps with respect to the facts and assumptions in the ToC were also briefly discussed in groups. The results of this discussion are summarized in **Annex III** to this report.

Meeting of the Kilitome Conservancy stakeholders

The afternoon of the first day (February 27th) was dedicated to discussions with the Kilitome Conservancy stakeholders. The meeting was structured in the same way as the morning session with the Olderkesi group.

After brief welcoming remarks from Anthony Kasanga of the Big Life Foundation, Leo Niskanen and Holly Dublin gave introductory presentations (summarized in above section and not repeated here for the sake of brevity).

The Kilitome Story

Leo Niskanen presented the results from the stakeholder interviews and community consultations which were carried out at Kilitome in August 2016. He noted that unlike Olderkesi, the Kilitome Conservancy has been operational for some years (formed in 2010) and is a partnership between African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), Tawi Lodge and the community. Summary of the key issues presented is as follows.

Long term vision

As with the Olderkesi conservancy, the vision for Kilitome goes beyond only reducing poaching pressure on wildlife. The long-term goal of the Kilitome community is to achieve sustainable wildlife-based land use, particularly to prevent more land being converted to agriculture, or other land uses that are incompatible with wildlife.

Pathway A

The findings from Kilitome seem broadly consistent with the IUCN framework ToC. Communities are engaged actively as part of an effective community scouts programme supported by the Big Life Foundation. They act as “the eyes and ears” on the ground and strong social norms are in place against illegal behavior. The community scouts collaborate closely with KWS and have formed an effective network with the community scouts in neighbouring conservancies. The community scouts are respected, trusted and supported by the communities. The community has a clear sense of pride in wildlife. There is a strong belief that the establishment of the community scouts programme, combined with the heavy penalties for poaching in the Wildlife Act are behind the reduction in poaching. No elephants have been poached for ivory for several years in the Kilitome area. The community scouts programme could be strengthened further if a few more scouts were employed and if more equipment were made available for the scouts to carry out their duties more effectively.

Pathway B

Also consistent with the framework ToC, findings suggest that the generation of benefits is key to the Kilitome stakeholders and constitutes a main pillar for the conservancy. The conservancy members have set aside land to benefit from wildlife through lease fees, jobs, scholarships and other tangible and intangible benefits. However, at present it is felt that the level of benefits generated does not meet the expectations of the conservancy members. The lease fees paid are very small and very few jobs and scholarships have so far been provided for the community. The community believes that the conservation fees should be increased. There does not seem to be sufficient transparency in how much revenue is generated by the conservancy and how this revenue is used. There is a strong feeling that KWS should do more to share revenue with the communities from Amboseli National Park, as it

benefits from the surrounding conservancies. This should include paying part of the lease fees and the scouts' salaries. More sustainable and substantial revenue generation will have to be found to stop conservancy members leaving the conservancy. Big Life, AWF and others are currently exploring possibilities for Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes to supplement the volatile revenue stream from tourism.

Pathway C

Costs of living with wildlife are perceived as high and exceeding the benefits of living with wildlife. Kilitome community members have agricultural plots outside the conservancy and these are frequently raided by elephants. Several people, including small children, have been killed by elephants and in retaliation the communities have killed and injured a number of elephants. Although the problem has escalated in recent years, people do not believe that it has (yet) reached a point that local people would start to actively poach elephants, or to allow others from outside to come in and kill elephants for ivory. Hyenas and predators also cause problems in Kilitome but these problems are not as severe. There is a predator consolation scheme which is appreciated by the communities although this is not enough to compensate for the full cost of livestock lost to predators. However, there is no crop-damage compensation scheme in place despite provisions for this in the Wildlife Act. KWS is very slow to respond to incidents where people are killed or injured, or when their livestock or property is damaged by wildlife, but they do react quickly and strongly when people kill wildlife in retaliation, a situation that is felt to be deeply unfair by the communities. The communities want to see quick action by KWS and the County government in response to conflict incidents, including compensation for crop damage. Communities believe agricultural areas should be fenced off and land use plans respected, not just in the Kilitome area but the wider landscape to which the conservancy is connected.

Pathway D

The communities felt that other non-wildlife related alternative livelihoods, such as jobs at a cement factory or at a mechanic workshop, would not have a positive effect on poaching. On the contrary they felt that the more the communities shifted to such alternatives the less they would want to have wildlife-based land use as a part of their future livelihood strategies, old traditions of living with wildlife would disappear and the motivation for keeping wildlife for tourism and to protect it from poachers would weaken. They also felt that development of non-wildlife based alternative livelihoods would lead to more settlement by outsiders with less of a tradition of or interest in wildlife-based land use. All these factors would contribute to erosion of the foundations for wildlife-based land use.

Discussion

As was done with the Olderkesi group, the Kilitome stakeholders were posed the following questions which were discussed in the following session:

1. Have we got the story right?
2. Has anything changed since the site visit?

The participants confirmed that overall the presentation was an accurate reflection of the situation in Kilitome. A summary of key points discussed were as follows:

- The idea of having game scouts was to provide employment / activity for young men to keep them from illegal activity. This is also the idea behind the Maasai Olympics.
- Generally, wildlife is still perceived to have benefit. It is still perceived like livestock. While benefits are very small, they do exist. There was a time when there was no benefit from wildlife and there was more poaching, although this was being perpetrated by outsiders.
- As there has been a decline in poaching in recent years this could well be because of the alternative income being generated from farming. Without farming there might well be a higher incentive to poach.
- A big challenge is that some people are now doing agriculture inside the conservancy and people are selling land inside the conservancy. Initially the idea was to have 100 parcels of land, 60 acres each, in 2008 they had 92 parcels and now there are only 85. Therefore, seven members have pulled out already and two more are currently being farmed in violation to conservancy rules, so actually there are only 85 plots of 60 acres each left constituting the conservancy.

In summary, the key point that emerged from this discussion was that although the Kilitome community initially felt that alternative non-wildlife related incomes would be a bad thing, it is clear that many are already engaging in non-wildlife related livelihoods (particularly agriculture, but also there is a rapidly growing town close to the conservancy), and that these may have contributed to reduced poaching, but are likely to be negative in achieving their overall vision for the conservancy which aims at securing large tracts of open land for wildlife to use.

A number of assumptions and facts that the team wanted to double-check and verify with the participants were also discussed with the group. These are summarized in **Annex IV** to this report.

Joint meeting of stakeholders from Olderkesi and Kilitome Conservancies

Introduction

The second day (28th of February) was dedicated to sharing of lessons between the two conservancies.

The session started with a general overview of the two conservancies given by Diane Skinner (IUCN SSC CEESP SULi).

Next, Dilys Roe and Leo Niskanen gave an abbreviated overview of the findings from Olderkesi and Kilitome incorporating the feedback from the previous day's discussions.

Buzz groups

Key similarities and differences between the two conservancies were then discussed in conservancy "buzz groups". The main points discussed were as follows:

Olderkesi conservancy group feedback

Differences:

- Lack of transparency around payments: how much and for what.
- Kilitome is proposing fencing of farms while Olderkesi is removing fences to secure wildlife corridors.
- Fencing could be good for food security – "socially beneficial but not ecologically" – but needs to be carefully considered within the context of the overall land use plan.
- Incompatible land use e.g. agriculture.
- Reducing space in conservancy as owners are leaving while Olderkesi is trying to attract more landowners.

Similarities:

- Both have lease payments and bursary schemes.

Kilitome conservancy group feedback

Differences:

- After seven years Kilitome still has no school feeding programme, unlike at Olderkesi where the conservancy has only just started.
- Kilitome would expect more benefits as there are only 100 owners vs. 6,000 owners at Olderkesi.
- Olderkesi is still a group ranch, Kilitome is sub-divided with title deeds.

Similarities:

- Both have management plans (not being enforced at Kilitome, too early to judge for Olderkesi).

The two conservancies then joined together and were divided into three groups: youth, women, elders to discuss more about similarities and differences. Feedback from the groups is as follows:

Youth Group feedback:

Similarities

- Lease payments.
- Zoning for grazing/no grazing.
- Employing game scouts.
- Both derive benefits from wildlife.

Differences

- Kilitome individuals benefit from payment, while at Olderkesi the lease fee goes to group.
- Kilitome is subdivided and in private ownership; Olderkesi is still a group ranch.
- Olderkesi has a school feeding programme, Kilitome has none.
- Maasai way of life is changing. Both groups see conservancies as a way to protect land.

Future priorities:

- Improve security and flow of information e.g. if someone is hurt by wildlife this is known (currently can take 2-3 days before an incident is discovered)
- Increase revenue to members, individuals need more benefits to dissuade them from selling land
- Implement new Wildlife Act but deal with discrepancies e.g. Kshs 20 million fine if an animal is killed vs. Kshs 5 million compensation if a person is killed

Women's group feedback:

The women's group had the same similarities and differences as the youth group.

Future priorities:

- The main issue is to reduce HWC.
- Electric fencing agricultural areas (should be done by the Conservancy). You can't do without food.
- Improve water supply within the Conservancy, so that the animals don't move out of the Conservancy during the dry season.
- Kilitome is gaining education benefits from KWS, not anyone else, need to do more to improve education.
- Support for craft-based businesses.

Elders group feedback:

Benefits

- Different amounts of benefits are being accrued to different individuals.
- Kilitome needs more transparency.
- Need more local community members on staff in Kilitome.

- Bursary - there are currently two high school students (Kilitome).

Similarities

- Grazing systems
 - Grazing zones
 - Conservancy herd
- Cows are cultural assets, not just economic assets.
- Sheep do not need conservancy grazing to survive.

Long term solutions need to improve or add value:

- Employment in the area – camps, scouts.
- More bursary schemes.
- Community development projects (e.g. water, schools, livelihood improvements). Note that KWS helps with this and others like AWF and BLF can too.

Other points were raised in subsequent plenary discussion:

- It is unlikely that the government will ever be able to compensate effectively for wildlife damage.
- The government is planning to amend the Wildlife Act and so it is important for communities to share with government what their views are. KWCA could play an important role. It is always good to speak with one voice.
- Even in Namibia initially there was no community land under conservation and now a significant part of the country is under community conservation.
- Communities have seen how wildlife can derive income but only a few are currently benefiting.

Workshop closing

After a few final reflections and an overview of next steps, the workshop was closed with a word of thanks from IUCN and from the participants.

Annex 1 – Agenda

Strengthening Local Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade: Kilitome and Olderkesi Conservancy Stakeholders Workshop AA Lodge, Amboseli 27 - 28 February 2017

Monday 27th April 2017

Time	Agenda item
0830 – 0900	Registration
0900 – 0930	Welcome and introductions
0930 – 1000	Introduction to the project
1000 – 1030	<i>Coffee & Tea</i>
1030 – 1100	The “Olderkesi Story”
1100 – 1230	Discussion
1230 – 1330	<i>Lunch</i>
1330 – 1400	Welcome and introductions
1400 – 1430	Introduction to the project
<i>1430 -1500</i>	<i>Coffee & Tea</i>
1500 – 1530	The “Kilitome Story”
1530 – 1700	Discussion

Tuesday 28TH February 2017

Time	Agenda item
0800 – 0830	Registration
0830 – 0900	Welcome and introductions
0900 – 0930	“The Olderkesi story”
0930 – 1000	“The Kilitome story”
1000 – 1030	<i>Coffee & Tea</i>
1030 – 1045	Community Buzzgroup
1045 – 1200	Facilitated discussions
1200-1230	Closing remarks
1230 – 1330	<i>Lunch</i>

Annex 2

Participants List

	Olderkesi participants	Email
Women	Noonkipa Ntaya	
	Sayiato Kaura	
	Raen Karbolo.	
Youth	Moses Lenjir	
	Oltimpau Mpatiany	
	Ngotiek Nyarket	
Elders	Kelian Pirikany	
	Francis Rarin .	
	Moisanka Ntaya.	
Administration	Branice Yiamoi	
	Sylvester Kipees	sylvesterkipees@yahoo.com
	James Kaigil	jkaigil@yahoo.com
Chairman	Lialo Karbolo	
	Kilitome participants	
Elders	Joshua Punuka	
	Joshua Tuluapei	
	Samuel Kaanki	
	Joseph Parmuat	
	Amos Ntete	
Youth	Samar O. Kool	
	Jeremia Sumulek	
	Samar Kool	
Women	Kayiaka Parsaloi	
	Nankinyi Lorkinyei	
	Katito Risie	
Tawi Lodge	Peter Gordon	
	Other participants	
IIED	Dilys Roe	dilys.roe@iied.org
IUCN	Leo Niskanen	leo.niskanen@iucn.org
	Finley Ombene	finley.ombene@iucn.org
	Holly Dublin	holly.dublin@gmail.com
	Diane Skinner	skinner.diane@gmail.com
Calvin Cottar Safaris	Calvin Cottar	calvin@cottarsafaris.com
Big Life Foundation	Anthony Kasanga	data@biglife.org
	John Gisa	jgisa5@gmail.com
AWF	Edwin Tambara	etambara@awf.org

Annex 3

Olderkesi fact-checking and assumptions

Fact-checking	Response from the group
How many private landowners does Cottars Camp lease the land on which it sits (not the conservancy)?	There are 8 “sites” – each has between 15 and 34 families: 1. Cottars Camp 2. Little Cottars 3. Noorokon 4. Airstrip (CIA) 5. Fly camp 6. El-ngabolo 7. Olpalagilagi 8. Osanag
How many community scouts has Cottar’s trained and how many informants has it employed? Are any of these formally employed? And if so, by whom?	15 trained at Manyani training center, there are also 3 forest scouts; in total have 18 scouts, also 2 informants/undercover employed by CWCT. Two of the informers also operate in TZ, they also work with KWs
How many teachers employed?	Cottars help employ 6 teachers paid by Cottars Wildlife Conservation Trust (CWCT). Another teacher works outreach. Also a community development person employed
Where is the school CWCT is paying bursaries and meals for?	Next to the airstrip. At that school, meals and water provided.
How many people employed at Cottars lodge?	55% of the people employed from the local community. Targeting 75% local people employment
How many people are members of the Olderkesi group ranch?	6,000 individuals are registered as members of the Conservancy. If women are widows are considered, the number is 13,000-15,000 people
Who has accurate information on annual poaching numbers for elephants? rhinos? And what are these numbers?	KWS Occurrence books, go back to 2015, incidents, injured animals. Etc. Very few poaching cases.

<p>Prior to the Conservancy being formalised did any of the following happen?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less land subdivision • No more agriculture and deforestation in the proposed conservancy area • No more livestock grazing in the proposed Conservancy area • Permanent villages moved out of the proposed Conservancy 	<p>Some of these things were happening but not all. Some people had already started moving out of the area before the conservancy was formed</p>
<p>Is the community expecting other tourism investors to also be operating in the Conservancy area now that it has been agreed?</p>	<p>Many felt they wanted to go with Cottars exclusively, some though there should be more camps but outside the conservancy, some of the youth stressed that more camps bring more employment so community should not say not to the idea of not having more camps</p>
<p>Why were local politicians not supporting the Conservancy? What were they getting out of not supporting its formation?</p>	<p>They were not part of the decision-making process. Land Committee and Conservancy Committee control the conservancy and they were supporting a different political party.</p>
<p>Does every member of Olderkesi group ranch have a share in OCWT? the Conservancy?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Are there any existing interventions by CWCT to strengthen local social norms to protect wildlife?</p>	<p>No specific activities on this, although these beliefs do exist and are used as a tool to start conversations.</p>
<p>Assumptions</p>	
<p>Community rangers will use equipment and training to combat IWT rather than using it to poach themselves</p>	<p>No reported killing since the training – so assumption holds true. Movement during the area is generally controlled, so strangers coming into the area are discouraged.</p>
<p>Collaboration between communities and enforcement agencies will lead to stronger</p>	<p>Yes – assumption holds true. They don't collaborate to kill wildlife – other problems and conflicts do exist e.g. vis-à-vis</p>

action against IWT rather than stronger collusion in IWT	livestock grazing, etc. The backbone behind the success of Mara ecosystem is local people.
Communities have sufficient information and power to resist third party (politicians) interference	Yes, they have the information. They recognize the motivations of politicians and are suspicious of them. They feel that they can disagree, and can speak their mind, feel they've got the power.
Intangible and indirect costs of living with wildlife (e.g. disease) are known and can be accounted for	Yes, e.g. disease malignant catarrhal fever and an eye disease (gazelle to sheep). These costs should be considered as part of compensation
Additional payments to government rangers will reduce illegal grazing	Calvin paying rangers top-up, helps with a small upkeep, water, a motivational payment. It is about building a relationship and promote coexistence, aiming at reduction in illegal grazing. But they are also allowing illegal livestock in, so that they can arrest them. "They get a lot of money for arresting cows, it's a racket". The rangers would still do their job without these payments but would not be as strict. There is a big problem when you have a drought influx with a lot of illegal grazing which overwhelms the rangers.
Sustainable finance for required benefit generation is available	They believe this is a long-term conservancy that should expand. Believe that financing will be made available e.g. through MMWCA, AWF, other operators.
Communities are willing to relocate from wildlife areas if payments are sufficient	Yes – very much. Most people have already moved. Drought is a challenge, some are outsiders from Siana but they will also move once all the Olderkesi community has left.

Annex 4

Kilitome fact-checking and assumptions

Fact-checking	Response from the group
What are the total number of people benefitting from the 100 paid landowners?	The group was unable to answer this question. There was confusion about the parameters (direct beneficiaries? families? residents?)
What is the Conservancy fee for each guest? Is it daily?	Guests pay \$20 once (not daily) Lease fee is 750 KES per year per acre (45,000 per year per landowner for 60 acres)
Are there any statistics on human-wildlife conflict impacting the Kilitome landowners (inside and outside the Conservancy)	Big Life has this information but were unable to provide it at this meeting. This requires follow up
What are the annual ivory poaching figures for elephants in Kilitome?	Big Life has this information but were unable to provide it at this meeting. This requires follow up
What are the annual number of elephants for retribution killing in Kilitome?	Big Life has this information but were unable to provide it at this meeting. This requires follow up
Assumptions	
Intangible and indirect costs of living with wildlife are known and can be accounted for?	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elephants felling trees, resulting in climate change• Elephants (and wildlife) create footpaths, soil erosion – disappearance of grass species, soil erosion• Disease transmission to livestock• Restriction of people traveling at night• Preventing women from collecting firewood• Costs of mitigation measures, e.g. fence, lights, etc.
Communities have sufficient information and power to resist third party interference?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally do not have necessary information, there is lack of transparency; information sharing would help, but it is not happening.• They do feel they have the power to resist because of lease agreements and management plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement of the process (with management plan) is very difficult – corruption, elite power.
Communities that have full knowledge about how benefits from wildlife are being shared and distributed will value it more?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No knowledge about how benefits are being shared. Don't know how much Tawi is getting and therefore the proportion that is coming to them.
Do you think the fact that Kimana has grown and incomes have increased has driven the reduction in elephant poaching?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of Kimana residents are non-Maasai and if the town wasn't there they would poach.