



**Strengthening role of local communities in combating IWT
KWCA workshop
1-2 March 2017
CORAT Africa, Nairobi, Kenya**



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 Killitome 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 the wider KWCA network provided an opportunity to draw in comparable experience from a wide range of conservancy settings, and to identify critical opportunities and strategies for influencing policy to better support community conservancies in their wildlife stewardship efforts.

The intended outputs of the workshop were:

- an understanding of the challenges faced and strategies used by different conservancies in the KWCA network with regard to illegal wildlife trade (particularly rhinos and elephants);
- KWCA network gains an understanding of the Communities – First Line of Defence (FLoD) approach and lessons learned to date;
- identification of key areas for improved policy and legislation;
- identification of opportunities to influence policy and legislation; and
- identification of additional sites for application of the FLoD approach.

The full workshop agenda is available in [Annex 1](#) to this report.

Welcome and introductions

Dickson Kaelo, Chief Executive Officer of the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA), opened the meeting. He made reference to the Biennial Conservancy Managers meeting which had just concluded and noted that a subset of conservancies had been asked to remain for the current workshop, in particular those which had been long-established and which face a current threat from illegal wildlife trade. He noted that the framework from IUCN and IIED provides a way to more deeply understand how communities can work better and be more empowered to understand how to work on this challenge, particularly as illegal activity ebbs and flows.

Dickson then introduced Ann Kahihia, Assistant Director, Community Wildlife Service, KWS to officially open the workshop. In her opening address Ms. Kahihia noted that

national parks and reserves do not represent entire ecosystems and that community and private conservancies are therefore essential to ensuring the space for wildlife. She paid tribute to KWCA, which has filled the link between KWS, the regulator, and the conservancies and noted that conservation is now seen as a viable land use. African countries such as Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe are all different, but have engaged with each other to learn from each other's experiences. While this work is not currently well-resourced, she was pleased to see different partners engaging on the issue and welcomed the work of IUCN and IIED.

Introduction to “First Line of Defense – Strengthening Local Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade”

In the introductory session, IUCN and IIED gave a series of presentations to:

- 1) provide an overview of the First Line of Defense approach to strengthen local community engagement in combating illegal wildlife trade;
- 2) provide an overview of the Kenya pilot project; and
- 3) provide results from the initial pilot sites.

In her presentation Holly Dublin, Senior Advisor to IUCN ESARO and Chair of the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group, explained how until now the role of communities in the fight against illegal wildlife trade in high value species had been neglected in current national and international strategies to combat illegal trade. This prompted IUCN and its partners to develop a theory of change (ToC) to guide policy makers, donors, and practitioners in partnering with communities to combat IWT. The 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. There are a number of key assumptions and enabling actions associated with the pathways. This ToC and its assumptions are now being tested against real life situations on the ground using a dynamic and participatory action research methodology.

Following the presentation, a number of points were raised in the discussion:

- A focus on livelihoods and social insecurities is more important than species and habitats and can be complementary in combatting criminal networks in the long term.
- With increasing agriculture, human-wildlife conflict is increasing, and the importance of zonation and land use planning is critical if tourism is to be a real possibility in these areas.
- Acknowledgement of the tradeoffs between different options for generating livelihoods is critical.
- Many development agencies are engaging in conservation work, and their real mandate is development and livelihoods.

In his presentation, Leo Niskanen, Technical Coordinator, Conservation Areas & Species, IUCN ESARO described the current efforts to test the ToC in three pilot sites – the Kilitome, Olderkesi and Olkiramatian-Shompole conservancies in southern Kenya. The objective of this work, which is funded by the UK Government's Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund and the US Department of Interior, is to better

understand the conditions for stronger engagement of local communities to combat - rather than participate in – IWT, particularly with respect to poaching of African elephants, while positively contributing to local livelihoods as a basis for practical guidance for anti-IWT policy and programme development in Kenya and beyond. This project is being implemented by the IUCN ESARO Conservation Areas & Species programme, the IUCN SSC CEESP Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group, the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group, IIED, KWCA, Cottars Safari Service, Big Life Foundation and South Rift Association of Landowners (SORALO). Mr. Niskanen described the methodology and the different tools that have so far been used to conduct action research at two of the conservancies – Kilitome and Olderkesi - and how this has contributed to the continuous evolution of the Toc. This project is anticipated to result in the following outputs: (1) Case studies for each pilot site, analyzed against the theory of change (2) revised site-specific Theories of Change (3) Guidance developed for designing and strengthening community engagement projects in the context of IWT at site level as well as lessons of broader applicability and national, regional and global levels.

Following the presentation, a number of points were raised in the discussion, including the following:

- Many managers and designers have different motivations than just reducing poaching and this was explored through the discussions with key informers, and reflected in the revised ToCs.
- Information flows are critical – if there is a benefit, but no one is aware of it, can it be useful as an incentive?

In her presentation, Dilys Roe, from IIED, summarized the results from the action research work at the Kilitome and Olderkesi conservancies. The similarities and differences between the communities' and the project implementers'/designers' ToCs and between these and the IUCN framework ToC were discussed. With regard to Kilitome, a key difference was that in Kilitome the ToC is not just about combatting IWT, but rather about achieving sustainable wildlife based land use. So, a reduction in illegal killing is just one of the outcomes while the community has more concern about land conversion to agriculture and loss of habitat connectivity than illegal killing. Similarly, the Cottar's ToC at Olderkesi has a vision that extends beyond just reduced poaching. The overall ambition is to sustain a functioning and intact natural ecosystem.

The main similarities between the two conservancies were summarised as follows:

- Both are adjacent to government reserves.
- Both are similar size (Kilitome 6,000 acres, Olderkesi 7,000 acres).
- Little or no poaching of high value species is currently happening in either site.
- Both see conservation as a means to protect land (rather than as an end in itself).
- Revenue streams are largely based on lease fees, training and employment of scouts (but also bursaries school support and other investments also in Olderkesi).
- Both go beyond poaching and aim for sustainable land use management as the ultimate objective.
- Both raised issues about the unfairness of responses to human wildlife conflict.

The main differences were noted as follows:

- Number of members – 6,000 in Olderkesi, <100 in Kilitome.
- Land tenure – still communal (group ranch) in Olderkesi, already sub divided in Kilitome.
- Benefit distribution – to individuals in Kilitome, to Olderkesi Community Wildlife Trust (and then community projects) in Olderkesi.
- Largely pastoral economy in Olderkesi, mixed pastoral/agricultural in Kilitome.
- Tourism investor is also the NGO partner in Olderkesi, Kilitome has a tourism partner and two NGO partners.
- Clear governance structure in Olderkesi, less clear in Kilitome.
- Both want income from non-wildlife sources but in Kilitome this is working against the land use plan, in Olderkesi want to have proper zoning.
- Kilitome sees fencing as part of the solution, Olderkesi sees it as part of the problem.

Exercise 1: threats and context

In the next part of the workshop Dilys Roe facilitated an exercise to establish the threats faced by different conservancy groups. Each conservancy group was asked to note the species of concern in illegal trade and the severity of that threat. They were also asked to note whether poachers were internal to the community or coming in from outside, as well as to elaborate on any particular issues related to illegal wildlife trade in their conservancy groups.

The full results of the exercise are available in [Annex 2](#) at the end of this report. Most groups reported elephant, rhino, lion and leopard as species of concern. Cross-border trade in bushmeat was also noted as a concern. Illegal harvesting of sandalwood, cheetah and sea turtles were also noted as of concern in some conservancy groups. Generally, the poachers were identified as both from within the area as well as coming in from outside. Many and diverse issues were raised in the discussion, all of which are captured in the Annex.

Each Conservancy was also asked to fill out a “Conservancy Context Form”. These have been captured and are available in [Annex 3](#).

Exercise 2: Engaging with the Theory of Change: efforts and strategies

Holly Dublin facilitated two exercises with the participants to determine the importance of the four pathways and to elaborate the strategies being undertaken by the conservancies represented at the workshop.

The first exercise was to establish how important each conservancy felt each of the four pathways were in reducing illegal killing of wildlife. Each conservancy manager received 10 stickers to allocate across the four pathways. The full results of the exercise are available in [Annex 4](#).

The second exercise was to learn more about the interventions that are being used by each Conservancy in each of the four pathways. Some key findings summarized

below, detailed results are summarized in a separate Excel spreadsheet (**Annex 5**) that has not been included in this report due to its length but can be made available on request.

For Pathway A, education and awareness of the value of wildlife, penalties for wildlife crime and of law enforcement were the most common strategies employed. Other categories of interventions included: access measures (improve roads, outposts, focus on hotspots), informer networks, better monitoring of wildlife, partnerships, patrols, social norms, training and equipment (arms, vehicles, training, dogs).

For Pathway B, education (bursaries, scholarships, schools, teachers, food) was the most common category of interventions. Other main categories included: communications (equipment / infrastructure), awareness raising, supporting cultural practices, corporate social responsibility, improved governance, health (infirmary / mobile clinic), jobs (lodge, conservancy, other), security, leasing land, sustainable revenue, transport and water.

For Pathway C, physical separation of wildlife and people and compensation were the most common interventions. Other main interventions included: funds (repair damage, hospital bills, burial), governance, monitoring and evaluation, rapid response to HWC incidents, training and updates on HWC updates.

For Pathway D, land and livestock management as well as livestock enterprise were the most common categories of interventions. The other main categories of interventions included: access to finance, agriculture, crafts and cultural enterprises, improved access to water, jobs, miscellaneous capacity development, supplies of local produce to tourism, and other non-wildlife non-livestock enterprises.

Summary and closing of Day 1

Dickson Ole Kaelo noted that the exercises on the first day had been extremely useful in helping to organize thoughts around how current interventions link to overall goals. He encouraged each conservancy to think about its own 'Theory of Change' and also noted that the results of the discussions validated the overall Theory of Change presented by IUCN and IIED. He noted in particular the link between human-wildlife conflict and illegal wildlife trade. Drawing attention to the second day of the workshop, he encouraged participants to think about the policy needs in relation to the pathways of the ToC.

Overview of relevant policies and legislation

In their presentation, Dickson Ole Kaelo and Gladys Wariara of KWCA described the policy framework for community engagement in wildlife management and IWT in Kenya. Topics covered included Kenya's 2010 "green" constitution and related national policies and laws. The Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013 and proposed amendments, as well as the 2016 Land Act were covered in detail. The importance of CITES COP 17 decision to establish an inter-sessional working group to consider how to effectively engage rural communities in CITES processes was noted. Key county-level policies were covered, including the County Integrated Development Plan, County spatial plans, and County bill on community conservation / development.

A detailed account of major policy and legislative gaps with respect to community engagement and IWT was then given, followed by a Pathway by Pathway analysis of developments and gaps, which was as follows:

Pathway A – disincentivise killing of wildlife for IWT

Developments

- Legal recognition of community scouts as wildlife security officers
- Powers and functions of scouts strengthened
- KWCA national scouts SOPs in place but yet to be endorsed by KWS

Gaps

- KWS training costs for scouts is relatively high
- Poor working conditions, equipment and low remuneration / incentives for scouts
- KWS scouts training focuses on para-military
- Mistrust between communities and wildlife officers fuelled by perceptions of unfairness in application of laws
- Reliance on donors to fund scouts programs and support salaries

Pathway B – increasing incentives

Developments

- Legal recognition of conservancies
- Wildlife Act requirement for development of incentives for communities and landowners
- Provision of consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife user rights
- Adoption of eco-tourism by conservancies as destinations
- Conservancy support by some county governments
- Capacity building of conservancies by NGOs and tourism partners
- Adoption of alternative income generating activities apart from tourism, e.g. livestock, carbon trading

Gaps

- Wildlife as national government resource yet costs are borne by individual households
- Absence of incentive and benefit sharing guidelines, current draft lacks specifics
- Proposed fiscal incentives require inter-ministerial and political goodwill which is currently absent
- Inadequate income from conservancy to households, perception that tourism operators retain majority of benefits and cases of elite capture
- Donor funding for conservation largely availed to NGOs due to local capacity concerns
- Inadequate incentives to promote private sector investment in conservancies

Pathway C – decreasing costs of living with wildlife

Developments

- Compensation for life and property provided for in Act
- Compensation process devolved to county levels
- Compensation scheme and insurance provided under Act
- Compensation values increased

Gaps

- CWCCC largely non functional
- Sustainability of compensation program questioned
- Other costs e.g. pasture/water, diseases not factored
- Huge costs of establishing, registering, planning & leasing land +taxes

Pathway D – supporting non-wildlife based livelihoods

Gaps

- Conservancies definition and scope in WCMA fails to recognize other compatible land uses
- Over-reliance on wildlife based tourism to generate income
- Absence of sustainability and business planning in conservancies
- Weak link between wildlife and non-wildlife livelihoods
- Benefits from wildlife mostly channeled to social needs rather than IGA
- Concern that social benefits from conservation may bias government support against benefitting communities
- Women and youth excluded from benefit sharing arrangements

Next, Diane Skinner then presented on the “**Rules of Engagement**” that have emerged out of various international policy statements over the past few years. These rules 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

These 'rules' provide a useful summary of international commitment to engaging communities in combatting wildlife crime. She also noted a number of upcoming international policy events, at which IUCN, IIED and partners would be engaging to integrate lessons from work such as the Kenya pilot project on Communities: First Line of Defense.

Exercise 3: Identifying key policy and legislation needs and opportunities for influencing policy over the next 12 months and beyond.

Dilys Roe facilitated an exercise to identify key policy issues as well as strategies for influencing these policies. In the first part of the exercise, each Conservancy was asked to identify the two most important policy issues they face. These were then grouped into categories. The full results are available in [Annex 6](#).

The overall categories were:

- Compensation
- CWCCC operationalization
- County government support to conservancies
- Revenue sharing
- Taxes & bureaucracy
- Land use planning
- Land Grabs & encroachment
- Arming scouts
- Legalising sandalwood & sand
- Sustainable financing
- Marketing conservancies
- Poaching
- Community education
- Weak judicial process

The second part of the exercise was to identify whether there were any policy-influencing opportunities for each of the categories, who would need to take action and how this work would be carried out. The full results are available in [Annex 7](#), although there was not time to fully analyze each of the issues.

It was noted that the conservancy communities are a key constituency and represent a very large electorate, which presents an important opportunity. Regional associations could therefore be very important lobbies. It was also noted that it is useful to have a champion in parliament and other government structures. Finally, the importance of making the business case for conservancies is critical to solving many of the policy issues noted.

Closing

The meeting closed with short remarks and votes of thanks from KWCA and IUCN.

The full participants list for the workshop can be found in [Annex 8](#) to this report.

Annex 1 – Agenda



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs



Strengthening Local Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade

KWCA Workshop

Wednesday 1 – Thursday 2 March, 2017

CORAT AFRICA, Nairobi, Kenya

Time	Agenda item	Presenter / Facilitator	Details
Day 1: Wednesday 1st March 2017			
0900 – 0930	Welcome and introductions	Dickson Ole Kaelo	<i>Plenary session</i> - Welcoming remarks -Dickson Kaelo - Introductions - all
0930 – 1030	Introduction to “First Line of Defence – Strengthening Local Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade”	Session facilitator – Diane Skinner	<i>Presentation –Holly Dublin, Leo Niskanen, Dilys Roe, Diane Skinner</i> - Background - Introduction to theory of change - Kenya project approach - Preliminary findings Olderkesi - Preliminary findings Kilitome - Workshop overview Q&A Plenary session
1030 – 1100	<i>Group photo, followed by Coffee & tea</i>		
1100 – 1230	Exercise 1: Threats and context	Session facilitator – Dilys Roe	<i>Group and individual work</i>

Time	Agenda item	Presenter / Facilitator	Details
1230 – 1330	Lunch		
1330 – 1600	Exercise 2: Engaging with the Theory of Change: efforts and strategies	Session facilitator – Holly Dublin	<i>Individual work and plenary</i> Exercise 2a: Pathway weighting Exercise 2b: Detail on strategies being employed
1600 – 1630	Tea and coffee		
1630 - 1730	Summary and closing of Day One	Dickson Kaelo	<i>Plenary session</i> Presentation – Dickson Kaelo - Review of discussions - Looking ahead to Day Two
0830 – 0900	Overview of relevant policies and legislation	Dickson Kaelo	<i>Plenary session</i> Presentation - see presentation guidance under preparation.
Day 2 – Thursday 2nd March 2017			
0900 – 1200 (with tea break)	Exercise 3: Identifying key policy and legislation needs and opportunities for influencing policy over the next 12 months and beyond.	Session facilitator – Dickson Kaelo & Dilys Roe	<i>Plenary session</i>
1200 – 1230	Meeting close	Session facilitator: Dickson Kaelo	<i>Plenary session</i> <i>Closing remarks</i>
1230 – 1330	Lunch		

Annex 2 – Results from Exercise 1 (Threats and context)

Conservancy group	Species of concern in illegal trade	Severity of threat (0-L-M-H)	Internal / external poachers	Other issues relevant to IWT
Amboseli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Rhino - Giraffe - Impala (cross border bushmeat) - Lions (retribution) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - elephant (H) - Rhino (H) - Giraffe and Impala (H) - Lion (L) 	Both	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced communications • CC leads to drought leads to increased needs • Sand harvesting • Enhanced technologies (drones) • Advanced weapons • Ready market(s) exist • International crime syndicates
Laikipia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rhino (2 private and 2 community) - Elephant - Sandalwood (through UG and TZ) – very lucrative and large volumes - Leopard (skins) – opportunistic and retribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rhino (very H) - Elephant (M) - Lion (L) - Sandalwood (very H) 	Both	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political involvement (impunity and corruption) • Judiciary process (impacted by corruption) • Poverty • Involvement of KWS staff (e.g. transfer of confiscated material) • Conflict resolution / retribution linked to poaching • Changing techniques in response to law enforcement efforts & techniques • Involvement of conservancy staff • Livestock encroachment
Mara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant (also retribution killing outside MMNR) - Rhino - Leopard (skins) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant (M) - Rhino (H) - Leopard (M) - Lion (L) 	All both except game meat (external)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market(s) exist • HWC (esp HEC) • Enhanced technology use by poachers • Corruption • Unemployment of youth

Conservancy group	Species of concern in illegal trade	Severity of threat (0-L-M-H)	Internal / external poachers	Other issues relevant to IWT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lion (claws also opportunistic) - Game meat (cross-border with TZ) 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of poison arrows, poison water points • Links between goods traders, duka owners and poaching
NRT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Sandalwood - Mangrove forest - Rhinos - Lion - Leopard - Sea turtles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant (H) - Sandalwood (very H) - Mangroves (H) - Sea turtles (H) - Rhino (H) - Lion and leopard (L) 	Both	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HWC / HEC – Ivory taken • Natural deaths – ivory taken • Illegal firearms • Politicians involved (e.g. sandalwood) • Poverty – displacement from elephants • KFS involvement • Sea turtles – delicacies in hotels • Lion and leopard – claws, teeth, lion manes • Corruption
Taita Taveta / Tsavo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Rhino (black) - Leopard (skins) - Cheetahs (live) - Pangolin - Sandalwood (Chyulus, Taita Hills, Kasagau) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant (M) - Rhino (L) - Leopard (L) - Cheetah (L) - Pangolin (L) - Sandalwood (M) 	Both	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bushmeat (local and cross-border) triggers poaching • Livestock influx and incursion • Encroachment – quarrying and mining (gemstones and sand) • Bushfires • Lion poisoning by herders • SGR – construction crews • Criminal syndicates for natural resource extraction (arms, movement) • Political involvement and corruption • Transnational banditry (Tanzania and Somalia) • Poverty

Annex 3 – Results from Conservancy Context Form

	Conservancy Name	County	No of Households	No of People	No of Villages	No.of Towns	Names of Towns	Mail Livelihoods of the conservancy Members
1	Lemek	Narok	400	1,000	40	1	Aitong	Conservation , and livestock
2	Naboisho	Narok	600	9,000	9	5	Olesere, Nkoilale, Sekenani, Talek, Aitong	Primary livestock, very little agriculture
3	Olderkesi	Narok	6,000	14,000	25	5	Olposimoru; Enkoirerol; Nkoswuash; Emorua Dikir; Kipayaipaya	Primary Livestock, very little agriculture and conservation
4	Olare-Orok Motorogi	Narok	288	600	70	3	Talek Mararianta; Aitong	Mainly livestock, some agriculture
5	Olkinyei	Narok	68	178	39	5	Kishemoruak; Nkoulale; Olkinyei; Sekenani; Olesere	Primary livestock, very little agriculture
6	Enonkishu	Narok	33	300	1	-	-	Primarily livestock and tourism
7	Mara North	Narok	750	5,000	80	3	Aitong; Mara-Rianta; Ngosiani	Primary livestock , very little agriculture
8	Oloisukut	Narok	59	2,000	8	3	Kirindon; Olookwaya; Mpata	Mainly livestock, some agriculture
9	Pardamat Conservation Area	Narok	850	12,000	4	8	Mbitin; Olemoncho; Olesere; Endoinyo Erinka	Primary livestock and conservation

	Conservancy Name	County	No of Households	No of People	No of Villages	No.of Towns	Names of Towns	Mail Livelihoods of the conservancy Members
10	Mara Siana	Narok	1,252	-	3	3	Nkoilale; Sekenani; Oloolaimutia	Primarily livestock, very little agriculture
11	Malkahalaku	Tana River	780	9,800	6	2	Kone; Assia	Livestock and Wildlife
12	Lower Tana Delta	Tana River	2,000	16,000	16	3	Semikaro; Shirikisho;	Mainly livestock, some agriculture
13	Ndera Community	Tana River	-	10,000	12	-	-	Mainly agriculture, some livestock
14	Westgare Community	Samburu	500	7,500	8	2	Archers: Wamba	Primary livestock, very Little agriculture
15	Ltungai Community Conservancy	Samburu	3,500	16,000	15	3	Suguya Marmar; Luosuk; Loongewan	mainly livestock, some agriculture
16	Kalama	Samburu	13 Zones	7,000	13	3	Archers; Lerata A; Lerata B	Primarily livestock, No agriculture
17	Namunyak	Samburu	6,000	30,000	22	5	Wamba; Lengasaka; Lerata; Ndonyowasin; Sereolipi	Primarily livestock, very little agriculture and Other non-land-based livelihoods (eg industry, business)
18	Kitenden Corridor	Kajiado	30	2,500	10	n/a	n/a	Primary livestock, very little agriculture
19	Kanzi and Motikanju (Chyulu Hills)	Kajiado	3,500	17,000	14	6	Kisanjani; Olkaria; Elangata Enkima; Olorika; Kuku, Iltal	Mainly livestock, some agriculture
20	Sidai Oleng Kimana Sanctuary Conservancy	Kajiado	844	5,000	50	3	Kimana; Loitoktok, Isinet	Mainly Livestock, some Agriculture & Other non-land based livelihoods

	Conservancy Name	County	No of Households	No of People	No of Villages	No.of Towns	Names of Towns	Mail Livelihoods of the conservancy Members
21	Amboseli Land Owners	Kajiado	450	4,500	54	4	Kimana; Namelok; Olkelunyet; Impironi	Primary agriculture, very little livestock
22	Satao Elerai-Amboseli Region	Kajiado	8	300	30	2	Kimana; Loitoktok	Primary livestock, some agriculture and Tourism business
23	Selenkay	Kajiado	3,600	14,000	4	4	Lenkism; Ittulita;; Ilorrero; Kiserian	Main livestock, some agriculture
24	Naretunoi	Kajiado	30	150	-	-	-	Mainly livestock, some agriculture and other non-land based livelihoods
25	Lumo Community	Taita Taveta	-	-	5	-	-	Main agriculture, some livestock
26	Taita Hills Wildlife Sanctuary	Taita Taveta	-	-	-	2	Mwatate, Maktau	
27	Rukinga	Taita Taveta	16,000	80,000	200	8	Maungu; Voi; Mwatate; Taita Village; Masengi; Macknon; Kilibasi; Kasigau	
28	OI Pejeta	Laikipia	4,500	23,000	18	1	Ngare Nyiro, Lamuria; Ngobit; Matanya; Debatas	Mainly Livestock and Agriculture
29	Iingwesi	Laikipia	850	8,000	7	2	Isolo; Timau	Mainly Livestock, some Agriculture
30	Naibunga	Laikipia	5,800	12,000	48	1	Dol-Dol	Mainly livestock, some Agriculture

	Conservancy Name	County	No of Households	No of People	No of Villages	No.of Towns	Names of Towns	Mail Livelihoods of the conservancy Members
31	OI-Lentille	Laikipia	1,500	18,000	16	2	Kimanjo; Oldonyiro	Primary Livestock, very little agriculture
32	Biliqo-Bulesa	Isiolo	2,500	15,000	6	2	Bulesa; Biliqo	Primary livestock, very little agriculture
33	Nakuprat-Gotu	Isiolo	3,000	17,000	7	2	Ngaremara, Gotu	Primary livestock, very little agriculture
34	Lepama Community	Isiolo	-	9,500	5	1	Isiolo	Mainly livestock, some Agriculture
35	Oldonyiro	Isiolo	800	8,000	25	3	Labarislereki; Oldonyiro; Kipsing	Primary Livestock, very little agriculture

Annex 4 – Results from Exercise 2a (Pathway weighting)

Region	Conservancy name	Pathway A					Pathway B					Pathway C					Pathway D				
Amboseli	Kanzi & Motikanju (Chyulu)																				
Amboseli	Kitenden																				
Amboseli	Sidai OIeng Wildlife Sanctuary																				
Amboseli	Eselenkei																				
Amboseli	Satao Elerai																				
Amboseli	OI Donyo Wuas																				
Amboseli	ALOKA																				
Laikipia	OI Lentille																				
Laikipia	Naibunga																				
Laikipia	OI Pejeta																				
Laikipia	Iingwesi																				
Mara	Lemek Conservancy																				
Mara	Naboisho Conservancy																				
Mara	Olderkesi																				
Mara	OI kinyei																				
Mara	Mara Siana																				
Mara	Oloisukut																				
Mara	Pardamat																				
Mara	Mara North																				
Mara	Olare Orok																				
Mara	Enonkishu																				
NRT	Oldonyiro (formerMpuskutuk)																				
NRT	Leparua Community Conservancy																				
NRT	Nakuprat-Gotu Community Conservancy Ltd																				
NRT	Biliqo Bulesa																				

Region	Conservancy name	Pathway A					Pathway B					Pathway C					Pathway D				
NRT	Ltungai	■					■	■	■			■	■	■			■	■			
NRT	Namunyak	■	■	■			■	■	■	■		■					■	■			
NRT	West Gate	■	■	■			■	■	■			■					■	■			
NRT	Lower Tana Delta	■	■				■	■	■			■	■	■			■	■			
NRT	Ndera Community Conservancy	■	■				■	■	■			■					■	■	■		
NRT	Kalama	■	■	■			■					■	■	■			■	■			
Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Malkahalaku	■	■				■	■	■			■	■				■	■			
Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Rukinga	■	■	■			■	■				■	■				■	■	■		
Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Lumo	■	■				■	■	■			■	■	■			■	■			
Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Taita Hills	■					■	■	■			■	■				■	■			
Nairobi Nat Park	Naretunoi	■	■				■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■			■	■			

Annex 5 – Results from Exercise 2b (Interventions by pathway)

Summarized above, detailed analysis available as a separate spreadsheet.

Annex 6 – Results from Exercise 3a (Identification of policy issues)

Category	Conservancy group	Individual card
Revenue-sharing from Parks	Amboseli	Revenue sharing of the Amboseli Reserve as it was originally a community resources
Revenue-sharing from Parks	Mara	Increase percentage of national revenues to the local community
Legalizing sandalwood and sand	NRT	Sandalwood harvesting is illegal according to the Act yet due to corruption it is harvested in huge volumes. It is necessary to legalise and give it as a user right
Legalizing sandalwood and sand	NRT	Legalising and commercialisation of sandalwood
Legalizing sandalwood and sand	Amboseli	Note enough natural resources right use (e.g. sandalwood and sand)
Arming scouts (simplifying process, reducing cost)	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Getting national police reserve status for community scouts
Arming scouts (simplifying process, reducing cost)	NRT	Conservancy scouts were not in positions to access fire arms to protect wildlife
Arming scouts (simplifying process, reducing cost)	Mara	Arm conservancy scouts
Poaching	Mara	Poaching of game meat
Poaching	Mara	Ivory case along boundary line
Poaching	Laikipia	Poaching
Poaching	Mara	Poaching of elephant and rhino
Marketing conservation	Amboseli	Marketing community conservancies
Conservancy voice	NRT	Failure to involve the conservancies community members in conservation related policies development
Revenue-sharing within conservancies	Amboseli	Equitable sharing of revenue generated amongst all community members
Revenue-sharing within conservancies	Amboseli	Revenue sharing

Category	Conservancy group	Individual card
Revenue-sharing within conservancies	Mara	Incentive to people holding wildlife on their land to minimize fencing and open up wildlife corridors
CWCCC operations	Amboseli	The functionality of CWCCC and whether it should be enhanced or scrapped
CWCCC operations	Amboseli	Functionality of CWCCC
CWCCC operations	NRT	Reconstitute CWCCC membership whom most are from the county government (9 county govt, 4 conservancy)
CWCCC operations	NRT	CWCCC have no capacity to fast track compensation
CWCCC operations	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Operationalize CWCCC to tackle pressing conflict issues
CWCCC operations	Mara	Operationalize CWCCC as soon as possible
CWCCC operations	NRT	Operationaliation of CWCCC
CWCCC operations	Amboseli	Operationalization of CWCCC
CWCCC operations	Mara	Government should facilitate the operationalization of the CWCCC in order to make compensation feasible
County government support to conservancies	Amboseli	Enhance governance on community conservancies
County government support to conservancies	Laikipia	Low county support to conservancies and conservation activities
County government support to conservancies	NRT	Support to conservancy by the County Government and the national Government to be enhanced (Isiolo doesn't recognize conservancy)
County government support to conservancies	Mara	Support by county government to community conservancies
County government support to conservancies	Laikipia	County government inertia for conservation / NRM (capacity, priority, short-term goals, lack of county-level legislature)
County government support to conservancies	Mara	County government to set aside funds to support conservancies
Taxes & bureaucracy	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Exempting the conservancy from taxes

Category	Conservancy group	Individual card
Taxes & bureaucracy	NRT	County government imposes heavy taxes on community livelihood projects instead of helping the community to stand on its feet
Taxes & bureaucracy	Mara	Cost of establishment of a conservancy should be subsidized or made affordable
Taxes & bureaucracy	Tsavo	Simplification of conservancy registration process and exemption from stamp duty
Land grabs and encroachment	Tsavo	Land tenure and ownership and resolving boundary dispute
Land grabs and encroachment	Laikipia	Encroachment and insecurity
Land grabs and encroachment	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Illegal cattle incursions to Conservancy areas from outside
Land grabs and encroachment	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Land demarcation - no clear boundaries, some local community members have encroached onto ranches
Land grabs and encroachment	NRT	Address community land ownership - Encroachment and land grabbing - Community to be given block title deed
Land use planning	NRT	Conservancy management plans be developed to facilitate proper planning of conservancies
Land use planning	Mara	Holistic management
Land use planning	Mara	Lack of land use plan leading to unplanned development within the region
Land use planning	NRT	Lack of zoning in the conservancy has resulted in communities farming in wildlife prone areas - this increased HWC cases
Compensation	Mara	Compensation on property damage by wildlife
Compensation	Mara	Compensation scheme - no clear compensation scheme for costs emanating from wildlife. These costs deprive livelihood resources which many communities depend on this making them poor and thus developing negative attitudes towards wildlife resource
Compensation	Amboseli	Compensation needs to be done in accordance of time
Compensation	NRT	HWC compensation policy - the money to be given to Conservancies for verification and paying the affected people
Compensation	Mara	Specific timelines for compensation to be done

Category	Conservancy group	Individual card
Compensation	NRT	Compensation (due to HWC) within the conservancies - there is need for compensation committees to be funded so that compensation can be done effectively
Compensation	Mara	Compensation hopes
Compensation	Mara	Hopes for livestock compensation
Compensation	Mara	Compensation on livestock predation
Compensation	Mara	Human-life loss through snake bite
Compensation	Laikipia	HWC
Compensation	Mara	Livestock loss by predators
Compensation	Laikipia	Compensation mechanism remains unclear and puts conservancies at undue pressure
Community education	Amboseli	Community education
Community education	NRT	Lack of education awareness extensions to the community on the importance of conservation
Sustainable finance	Taita Taveta / Tsavo	Reliability of funding and sustainability in the long-term coupled by internal capacity (community) to manage projects
General	Amboseli	Increase engagement between community and conservation agencies
General	Laikipia	Lack of state support to engage with IWT
General	Mara	Lack of national and county government support to the conservancies, e.g. to facilitate strengthening of the security to curb illegal wildlife trad
General	?	Weak judicial process

Annex 7 – Results from Exercise 3b (Policy analysis)

Issue	Policy opportunity	What & How?	When?	Who?
Compensation	<p>Parliamentary committee on environment Amendment of act (eg remove snake bite)</p> <p>Regulation (CWCC chairman)</p> <p>Compensation to happen or not? (1)Throw out the whole thing, (2)remove the whole thing, (3)keep it or (4) have an insurance scheme (5) Only death and injury, remove livestock and crops? from compensation</p> <p>Make sure money allocated for compensation in Ministry – including back payment – check budget line for compensation</p> <p>Insurance scheme – possible establishment of insurance schemes with insurance schemes</p>	<p>Petition to committee</p> <p>Comment on private members motion</p> <p>Review regulation (by KWCA and CWCC members) (KWS website for download</p> <p>Act amendment</p> <p>Lobby the Cabinet Secretariat –start now</p> <p>Consultation on proposals</p>	<p>Within next month</p> <p>ASAP – next few months</p> <p>Budget submitted in June</p> <p>?</p>	<p>KWCA members</p> <p>KWCA members + CWCC + conservation alliance</p> <p>KWS but KWCA to push + CWCC</p>

CWCC operationalization		Regional CEO's meeting with Cs on general issues	Mid-March	KWCA Regional CEO's
	Review of national budgets for CWCC in Ministry	Lobbying for budget (KWS)	Budgets to be submitted in June	KWS + CWCC council chairs
	Next meeting of Council of Governors for environment	Conservancy chairs to raise with country governors	? – need to find out	Conservancy chairs and individual members
	Committee on environment in parliament	Lobbying of MPs Create a regional conservancy managers from as a lobbying body Identify champions (political or bureaucrats)		Need a policy liaison
County government support to conservancies	County Spatial Plans	Join the committee Provide your plans as your contribution – shape files so c. govt can overlay	National plan was launched and is the trigger for county level planning – in the next few months	Individual conservancies need to lead, the KWCA regional association
	County Integrated Development Plans	Innovative ways to engage with county e.g. office provision, possible VAT rebate for conservancies, etc. Representation of conservancy members on board of MMCA		

	County budget processes	Lobby so conservancies taken into account and your communities are included (example Baringo this did)	Budgets agreed in June Find out when budget decisions are made and by whom	KWCA regional managers, members
Revenue sharing	Amendment to better define benefit		March – guidelines on incentives and benefit sharing will be finalized	KWCA is having a meeting with KWS to feed comments on the guidelines
	Incentives and benefit sharing guidelines			
	Query budget on expenditure of 5% from national parks			
Taxes & bureaucracy	Simplify system			
	Reduce taxes – recommendation that conservancies should be exempted; also businesses that are operating, (e.g. legal licenses shot from 20K to 80K, had to lay off staff) (Currently only NP exempted for tax)	Lobby 2018 budget and finance bill CBNRM desk at office could be used (WWF paying for desk at moment) Lobby for exemption from stamp duty Regulations to community land act 14 regs	Jan 2018 Not sure – find out	

Land use planning				
Land Grabs & encroachment				
Arming scouts				
Legalising sandalwood & sand				
Sustainable financing				
Marketing conservancies				
Poaching				
Community education				
Weak judicial process				

Annex 8 – Participants list

REGION		CONSERVANCY	NAME	EMAIL
AMBOSELI	1	Kanzi	Samson Parashina	admin@maasai.com
	2	Sidai Oleng Wildlife Sanctuary	John Parit	jparit@yahoo.com
	3	Eselenkei	David Kitasho	maakitasho@gmail.com
	4	Satao Elerai	Wilfred Ngonze	camp@sataoelerai.com
	5	OI Donyo Wuas	Bern Kiptoo	monitoring@biglife.org
	6	ALOKA	Samuel Kaanki	moraneducation@biglife.org
	7	Kitenden	James Moonka	jamesmoonka@gmail.com
LAIKIPIA	8	OI Lentille	Timothy Mosyanny	timothyole@icloud.com
	9	Naibunga	Julius Mamayo	jmamayo@gmail.com
	10	OI Pejeta	Moses Muthoki	mosesmuthoki@olpejetaconservancy.org
	11	Iingwesi	Patrick Leresi	Iingwesi@nrt-kenya.org
MARA	12	Lemek Conservancy	Benjamin Koke	kokebenjamin@gmail.com
	13	Naboisho Conservancy	Benson Ketere	benson@seiyaltd.com
	14	Olderkesi	James Kaigil	jkaigil@yahoo.com
	15	OI kinyei	Simon Nkotoi	snkoitoi63@gmail.com
	16	Mara Siana	Evans Sitati	esitatinapwora@gmail.com
	17	Oloisukut	Derick Megeesh	dmegeesh@gmail.com
	18	Pardamat	Jackson Taki	jackson@maraconservanices.org
	19	Olderkesi	Sylvester Kipees	sylvestorkipees@yahoo.com
	20	Mara North	William Kipeto	william@seiyaltd.com
	21	Olare Orok	Raphael Kasoe	rkasoe@yahoo.com

REGION		CONSERVANCY	NAME	EMAIL
	22	Enonkishu	Douglas Kamaru	douglas.kamaru@enonkishu.org
NRT	23	Oldonyiro (formerMpuskutuk)	Peter Lekurut	naapu@nrt-kenya.org
	24	Leparua Community Conservancy	Wilson Lemillion	leparua@nrt-kenya.org
	25	Nakuprat-Gotu Community Conservancy Ltd	Hassan Godana	nakuprat-gotu@nrt-kenya.org
	26	Biliqo Bulesa	Mohamed Duba	biliqo-bulesa@gmail.com
	27	Ltungai	Moses Kinapu	ltungai@art-kenya.org
	28	Namunyak	Tom Letiwa	namunyak@nrt-kenya.org
	29	West Gate	Christopher Lekuye	westgate@nrt-kenya.org
	30	Kalama	Michael Lenaimado	mleaimado@gmail.com
	31	Lower Tana Delta-Coast	Kusso Iddi Ahmed	tanadelta@nrt-kenya.com
	32	Ndera Community Conservancy-Coast	Malika Maro	ndera@nrt-kenya.org
TAITA TAVETA/TSAVO	33	Malkahalaku	Mohamed Kamanya	kamanya@tsavocon.org
	34	Rukinga	Erick Sagwe	eric@wildlifeworks.com
	35	Lumo	Samuel Mwabili	manager@lumoconservancy.com
	36	Taita Hills	Richard Obanda	richard.obanda@sarovahotels.com
Nairobi National Park	37	Edwaro Lousli		ed-l@sbglobal.net
KWS	38	Anne Kahihia		annkahihia@kws.go.ke

REGION		CONSERVANCY	NAME	EMAIL
KWCA	39	Dickson Kaelo		dkaelo@kwcakenya.com
	40	Joyce Mbataru		Imbataru@kwca.com
	41	Gladys Wariara		gwariara@kwcakenya.com
	42	Faria Tarus		ftarus@kwcakenya.com
IIED	43	Dilys Roe		dilys.roe@iied.org
IUCN	44	Leo Niskanen		leo.niskanen@iucn.org
	45	Diane Skinner		skinner.diane@gmail.com
	46	Holly Dublin		holly.dublin@gmail.com
	47	Edith Mbigi		edith.mbigi@iucn.org

