

## INCENTIVES FOR ENHANCED COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN AMBOSELI, KENYA

MICHAEL LIMO KIPKEU, SAMSON W. MWANGI & JAMES NJOGU

Department of Peace, Security and Social Studies, Egerton University, Nakuru, Kenya

### ABSTRACT

The paper focused on the incentives for enhanced community participation and securing more space for wildlife conservation in Amboseli ecosystem. The threats against wildlife in Amboseli ecosystem continue to escalate due to an increase in habitat fragmentation, change in land use and human population pressure outside the park. Loss of wildlife habitat outside the park should be halted to ensure that there is viability and large abundance and diversity of species. The real threat to wildlife conservation in the ecosystem is not the commercial poaching, but wildlife's inability to compete economically with alternative land use. Wildlife numbers in Amboseli ecosystem have increased and the region has become nationally important from a wildlife perspective.

However, the communities living around Amboseli national park have little economic or social interest in wildlife because of the centralized management and financial benefits directed to the state. In the absence of a supportive legal-institutional environment for private or community conservation initiatives, the current situation cannot be considered secure because the benefits are not sufficiently linked to wildlife. If wildlife resource is to survive outside ANP, local communities must be able to profit from it and have a much greater say in management decisions.

**KEYWORDS:** Community- Based Conservation, Wildlife Benefits, Social Interest and Competition with Other Land Uses

### INTRODUCTION

Wildlife management and conservation involves various costs and benefits, which should all be taken into account to achieve an optimal outcome. In Kenya, most of our national parks and reserves are heavily dependent on surrounding community and private owned lands for their ecological survival and integrity. Others rely on such lands for corridors and dispersal areas.

These national parks and reserves and the larger ecosystems are already under threat with significant loss of biodiversity and have attracted a wide range of competing and conflicting land uses due to lack of systematic land use planning and unplanned developments – cultivation, human settlements and tourism facilities development. This is the case with Amboseli. This has resulted in loss of habitats, land fragmentation, blockage of migratory corridors and increasing human wildlife conflict. The cooperation of communities and private landowners is essential for wildlife conservation. Currently there are inadequate incentives to motivate communities and land owners to adopt land use practices that are compatible with wildlife conservation and management.

The land that hosts wildlife outside protected areas is owned by private landowners and communities. Their cooperation is crucial for the success of conservation activities, as the majority of these lands are subject to a

multiplicity of uses some of which conflict with wildlife conservation. With proper incentives, land use practices that are phasing out wildlife such as agriculture can be minimized or confined to appropriate areas

## **LOCALIZED SUCCESS OF COMMUNITY BASED CONSERVATION**

Since the mid 1990's there has been a rapid expansion of community based conservation (CBC) in Kenya. Currently the land area where communal or private landowner wildlife conservation is taking place covers approximately 30,000km<sup>2</sup> or 5,5 percent of the country land mass and is expanding (KWS Enterprise Data Base, 2013). This equates to 68% of the formal protected area network for wildlife, and nearly equals the protected area network in the Arid and semi-Arid Lands (ASAL). Lands becoming increasingly tolerant to wildlife in the ASAL have doubled in the last decade. In the wildlife sector, community involvement and participation in wildlife conservation were prompted in recent times (1990) by the recognition that if wildlife was to survive, including in the formal protected area network there needed to be engagement in conservation by landowner.

Engaging landowners however required additional stimulus to photo-tourism. Photo-tourism had, since the 1977 hunting ban, been the primary way to benefit from wildlife, but it was recognized that this had limitations in most areas and was inconsistent business. Consumptive use of wildlife was reintroduced in 1990 under a cropping programme for meat and skins which lasted until 2003. Elliot and Mwangi (1997) observed that the common reason why the programme was short lived was given as mismanagement; but critical analysis reveals that it failed by design due to the restrictive policy environment, inadequate capacity by KWS to monitor the programme which meant that less than 5% of the value added from wildlife products accrued to landowners.

## **COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION**

According to Emerton (1999), community-oriented approaches to wildlife conservation usually have a strong economic rationale. They are typically based on the premise that if local people participate in wildlife management and economically benefit from this participation, then a "win-win" situation will arise whereby wildlife is conserved at the same time as community welfare improves. While most community conservation activities have the ultimate goal of maintaining wildlife populations, they simultaneously aim to improve the socio-economic status of human communities in wildlife areas.

As Child (1995) pointed out, over the last four decades ago the realization dawned that the real threat to wildlife was not the illegal or commercial hunting, but wildlife's inability to compete economically with alternative uses of the land. It was being replaced significantly by agriculture, even in areas where one would expect a diverse and robust spectrum of indigenous animals to have a comparative advantage. Thus began a search for solutions that in many ways brought it back to incept underlying the ancient protected areas-that wildlife and natural resource must satisfy the community needs.

During this period, different approaches have provided the basis for the interventions to conserve wildlife. From the 1950s-80s the dominant approach was to create or revitalize national parks and other protected areas as the basis for conserving declining numbers of wildlife species. Recently termed "fortress" conservation by Adams and Hulme (1998), these areas were established with the expectation that enhanced park management would improve wildlife conservation and assure sustainability. Nevertheless, the number of many charismatic species both within and outside the

designated protected area continued to decline. A key cause can be traced to the exclusion of important stakeholders such as pastoralists, and agro-pastoralists, who live in, or near, these protected areas, from customary sources of livelihoods assets particularly land and water. Many of these local people withheld their support for this initiative, and some went further viewing wildlife as legitimate quarry for poaching and /or a threat to be eliminated (Coupe, et al., 2002).

Brown (1998) observed that this failure of fortress conservation to achieve its objectives has resulted in the institutionalization over the last decade of a counter-narrative, community conservation. Conservation practitioners now link wildlife conservation with sustainable development using participation as the new driving force to give beneficiaries (often communities rather than individuals) a greater opportunity to voice their preferences, needs and concerns about initiatives. Most conservationists are now convinced that if wildlife resource is to survive outside the protected areas, local communities must be able to profit from wildlife and have a much greater say in management decisions (Getz et al., 1999; Hulme and Murphree, 1999).

These community-based approaches are based on the principle that for wildlife to survive local people must be able to profit from and manage the animals living around them as a form of land use, taking the initiative in conserving the resource out of their own economic interest (Child, 1995; Rihoy, 1995; Western and Wright, 1994). While this more grassroots and decentralized approach has considerable potential for better-reconciling wildlife conservation with human needs and economic realities, it nevertheless involves complex ecological, economic, cultural, and political factors and rarely leads to easy answers. However, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Maasai and other indigenous peoples living around the park to maintain their traditional modes of living in the face of modern circumstances. Numerous changes have been brought to bear on their way of life as they are increasingly influenced by external commerce and other cultures.

Over the years, Amboseli has been a focus of research looking at a range of issues within the ecosystem that may be relevant too but not specifically aimed at examining the aspects of community needs and aspiration with regard to wildlife conservation within this region. Analysis of previous research works undertaken in this area has identified an array of systemic historical habitat loss and fragmentation in the ecosystem owing to recurrent drought, land subdivisions and land sales, increasing human population and changing land uses in pastoral lands adjacent to the park. However, the studies do not provide a sustainable guide on practical wildlife conservation in Amboseli Ecosystem which will ensure stable wildlife populations alongside other competing land uses. While parks and protected areas have been the traditional approach to conservation, many protected areas worldwide are rapidly becoming "Islands" as the wild lands around them are converted to alternative, often incompatible, uses in the face of relentless pressures from the expanding scale of human activities outside the protected areas (Western, 1994). This is the case with Amboseli. The African continent is specifically most affected by conflicts between people and wildlife often related to competition for land due to the ever increasing human populations which has led to increased pressure on marginal land around protected areas such that the migratory corridors and dispersals areas are being constrained (Wilcove, 1998). Conservation thus requires a perspective that stretches well beyond the boundaries of the parks and involves national policies as well as programs affecting rural communities which has not been emphasized by many of the studies done within the Amboseli Ecosystem.

## **CONSERVATION, BENEFIT SHARING AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS**

The creation of communal conservancies in Amboseli ecosystem was until very recently driven by conservation organizations on the basis of areas of importance for wildlife species. More recently however, there has been an increasing

desire by communities to form their own conservancies. The premise is that the livelihood benefits that are being enjoyed by established communal conservancies are stimulating the demand (Nelson, 2000). The benefits range from gainful employment, improved infrastructural development to monetary gains, a fact that reflect the people's desire to engage in wildlife related enterprises.

The new wildlife act 2014 legally recognizes the role, scale, development and conservation importance of community or private wildlife conservancies. When the government can provide economic incentives to local communities, they may be able to provide more effective protection to biodiversity than they could through protected areas, especially when local people are able to earn real benefits from their conservation actions. For example Wildlife protected areas in the Amboseli ecosystem such as Kitirua concession area, Elerai, Oldonyo Wuas conservancy, Kimana Wildlife Sanctuary and Selengei Conservation Area, the members established these conservancies as protected areas to attract tourism, generate income from game viewing, create employment, and build environmental awareness in the surrounding communities. Income from tourism has been a major incentive to wildlife conservation and maintaining areas attractive for tourists. The community conservation initiatives highlighted above, demonstrate that nature conservation is not the exclusive preserve of the state. In the long term, it is the individual, the group, and in the end, the community that will make conservation work.

According to Springer, Campese and Painter (2011), rights of indigenous people are often particularly relevant for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, due to the frequent overlap of high biodiversity areas and indigenous lands, and the vulnerability of natural resources-dependent customary livelihoods to changes in access or use. Indigenous peoples' tradition ecological knowledge, traditional system control, use and management of lands and resources, and traditional institutions for self governance also contribute substantially to conservation. Indigenous rights also relate to rights to control and management of lands and resources through customary institutions and laws; rights to development and equal benefit sharing including to determine the development or use priorities and strategies on their lands, territories and resources and to benefit equitably from conservation and sustainable use of such areas; rights to traditional knowledge and indigenous heritage; redress for deprivation of peoples' means of subsistence and development, and for land taken without free, prior, informed consent. Evidence from other essential natural resources shows that if the institutional management regime for natural resources is centralized, but the mandated authority is unable to fulfill its role due to inadequate capacity or capability and yet rights and responsibilities are not relinquished, a management vacuum is created which tends to lead to resource overexploitation due to lack of access, control or ownership rights and lack of incentives to conserve (King, 2000)

While a myriad of community rights related issues can arise in conservation, there are some particularly common and/or challenging issues that call for attention. These include: participation in decision making; free, prior, informed consent; tenure security, especially conflicts between customary and statutory tenure. Other issues are cultural rights and bio-cultural diversity; sustainable development and equitable benefit –sharing; displacement and restrictions on resource access; and law enforcement. Review of various studies from a conservation perspective don't provide a practical framework for engaging local communities at a policy level to inform and advise on measures to increase participation in decision-making regarding conservation matters and enhanced livelihoods which this paper has made efforts to address. It is thus necessary to examine relationships between rural resource users and conservation. Communities will be motivated to conserve wildlife if the benefits exceed the perceived costs. Policies which reduce benefits and increase costs create

disincentives to conserve wildlife. Communities which feel that they do not derive any benefits from wildlife on their land have little incentive to conserve that wildlife (Irandu, 2003). A strategy for addressing the economic incentives and disincentives for community based wildlife conservation starts with an understanding of what motivates to do what they do.

## WILDLIFE UTILIZATION OPTIONS

**Table 1: Wildlife Utilization Options**

Wildlife Utilization Options	Percentage			
	Low	Moderate	High	Total
Revenue sharing from government controlled Park	10	12	72	100
Community Sanctuary	16	16	68	100
Traditional uses	17	39	44	100
Cultural Manyatta's	12	26	62	100
Lodge and Camps	24	43	33	100
Hunting	95	0	5	100

From Table 1, majority of the respondents (72 percent) considered revenue sharing from the government controlled Park as the most viable option to utilize wildlife in the area. Community sanctuaries and cultural manyattas were cited by 68 percent and 62 percent of the respondents respectively. This study concurs that community sanctuaries and establishment cultural Manyatta's are determinants in individuals' coexistence with wildlife as they collectively create a tourism package in the ecosystem. Development of lodges and camps is moderately recommended by 43 percent of the respondents as an option for wildlife utilization in the area.

The lodges and camp sites that dot the ecosystem thrive because of the wildlife conservation initiatives in the Amboseli National Park and the surrounding group ranches. It is worth noting that hunting was the less option recommended as an option for wildlife utilization in this area. This implies that with proper land use policies in the area, the local community would like to continue having wildlife on their lands.

## EQUITABLE SHARING OF BENEFITS FROM WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

This study sought to establish measures that can bring an equitable sharing of benefits from wildlife conservation to the rural community in the Amboseli ecosystem. Analysis of the qualitative data indicated that the respondents asserted the need for Amboseli park management to disseminate information on revenues generated from Amboseli and the expenditures in running the park for appreciation of the benefits and costs of conservation in the ecosystem. It was further revealed that initiated projects by the government and other conservation NGO's are implemented without knowledge of the entire community and thus proceeds from land leases benefits a few. With proper communication, all community members will believe in the conservation crusade as they will collectively share the accruing benefits /costs of wildlife conservation in the ecosystem.

### Future of Wildlife Conservation

**Table 2: Options for Creating More Space for Wildlife Conservation**

Options for More Wildlife Space	Percentage				Mean Scores
	Low	Moderate	High	Total	
Adopt land use practice compatible with wildlife conservation	9	12	79	100	8.26

Table 2: Contd.,

Enumerate the Benefits/liabilities of wildlife outside Amboseli	8	13	79	100	8.21
Enabling Institutional arrangements that enhance wildlife conservation	18	24	58	100	8.01
Enhanced Benefit sharing and community rights	4	21	75	100	8.24
Adoption of land use plan which guide land use types within certain areas	14	29	57	100	8.13

From Table 2, Adopting land use practices compatible with wildlife conservation, enumerating benefits/liabilities of wildlife outside Amboseli, enabling institutional arrangements that enhance wildlife conservation, enhanced benefit sharing and community rights and adoption of land use plan which guide land use types within certain areas are highly recommended measures for creating more space for wildlife conservation in the Amboseli ecosystem as the mean scores were within this range ( $8.0 \leq ME < 10.0$ ) equivalent to was equivalent to 8.0 to 10.0 on the Likert scale. It was established that more space for wildlife conservation is required so as to secure the ecosystem for sustainability to provide resilience to critical ecosystems as well as species as climate change and climate variability poses new threats. This calls for an integrated and adaptive ecosystem management approach to sustain wildlife and habitat diversity by empowering the local community to take control of their natural resource, secure their livelihoods and protect their communal land and environment.

Adopting land use practices compatible with wildlife conservation, enumerating benefits/liabilities of wildlife outside Amboseli, enabling institutional arrangements that enhance wildlife conservation, enhanced benefit sharing and community rights and adoption of land use plan which guide land use types within certain areas are highly recommended measures for creating more space for wildlife conservation in the Amboseli ecosystem as the mean scores were within this range ( $8.0 \leq ME < 10.0$ ) equivalent to 8.0 to 10.0 on the Likert scale. These findings supports those by Springer, Campese and Painter (2011) that rights of indigenous people such as rights to development and equal benefit sharing including rights to determine the development or use priorities and strategies on their lands, territories and resources and to benefit equitably from conservation and sustainable use of such areas are often particularly relevant for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

Findings indicated that that livestock production has a significant compatibility with wildlife conservation in the Amboseli ecosystem. Findings in Table 2 support assertions by McNeely (1993) that enhancing equitable sharing is key in securing more space for wildlife conservation and this calls for adoption of policies that that can necessitate development of marketing facilities for livestock, providing security against raids from wildlife, retain rights to graze an agreed number of livestock in the government controlled park. This in effect confirmed that coexistence between Maasai pastoral culture and wildlife in the ecosystem for over a long time and that livestock production is more compatible as it is easier to manage and integrate with wildlife (Campbell et al., 2003).

Maasai pastoralism is highly compatible with wildlife and the potential for the local communities to sustainably manage and benefit from this resource is promising. However, implementation of effective community participation in the management and conservation of wildlife in the Amboseli ecosystem faces political, cultural, and economic obstacles which will be critical in determining the outcomes of both conservation and community development efforts in the area of this study.

Statistical results indicated that adopting land use practices compatible with wildlife conservation, enumerating benefits/liabilities of wildlife outside Amboseli, creating enabling institutional arrangements that enhance wildlife conservation, enhanced benefit sharing and community rights and adoption of land use plan which guide land use types within certain areas are highly recommended measures for creating more space for wildlife conservation in the Amboseli ecosystem as the mean scores were within this range ( $8.0 \leq ME < 10.0$ ) equivalent to was equivalent to 8.0 to 10.0 on the Likert scale.

However, there were no significant benefits to local community from tourism or wildlife resources and that the government and tourism investors were the sole beneficiaries despite assertions that revenue sharing from the government controlled Park is the most viable option to utilize wildlife in the area and that community sanctuaries and cultural Manyatta's are determinants in individuals' coexistence with wildlife as they collectively create a tourism package in the ecosystem.

Equitable sharing of benefits from wildlife conservation to the rural community in the Amboseli ecosystem would be enhanced by ensuring that benefits from wildlife conservation are used to develop the region through enhanced corporate social responsibility activities leading to infrastructural development in the area. It was established that such activities need to focus on road construction, construction and equipping of schools and health facilities, provision of bursaries to needy school going children and drill water boreholes to enhance water reliability in the region.

Equitable sharing of benefits from wildlife conservation would be enhanced through enactment of compensation programs in which the government compensates livestock predation based on the market values in addition to compensation for property damages, employment of community members, direct payment of cultural services rather than through drivers, revenue sharing from park collections, establishing conservancies as most dispersal areas are in community lands and quick response to incidences of human wildlife conflict

## CONCLUSIONS

This study was informed by the Social exchange theory as advanced by Blau (1964) whose premise is that interactions are only likely to continue if both parties feel they are coming out of the exchange with more than they are giving up—that is, if there is a positive amount of profit for both parties involved. The need to reciprocate for benefits received in order to continue receiving those serves as a "starting mechanism" of social interaction. Rewards and costs are important concepts that form the basis of most social exchange theories.

Rewards are exchanged resources that bring pleasure and satisfaction, while costs are exchanged resources that are perceived as a loss or punishment. The land owners in Amboseli ecosystem would benefit directly from leasing their land for biodiversity conservation and by way of reciprocity would forfeit all other rights to use the leased land for conservation only and not engage in other activities that are detrimental to their coexistence and provide space for wildlife conservation to thrive.

With proper land use policies in the area, the local community would like to continue having wildlife on their lands. This confirms the view by Irandu (2003) that the fundamental cause of declining wildlife populations and biodiversity loss is that the Maasai communities who live around Amboseli National Park have little economic or social interest in wildlife due to centralized management and financial benefits which are directed primarily to the Kenyan state.

The communities living around Amboseli National Park will seek to experience a sense of reciprocation through their involvement in conservation activities to ensure that they receive reasonable returns for leasing or putting easements on their land for wildlife use only, while the conservation agencies have to ensure that payment for easement and leases is sustained. Results from this study shows that, human activities within the Amboseli ecosystem have led to widespread habitat fragmentation, reduction in wildlife distribution range, shrinking of dry season dispersal areas, blockage of migratory route/corridors and increased human-wildlife conflicts due to competition for resources such as water, forage and space. The vast areas of pristine wildlife habitats have been lost or degraded as a result of land subdivisions to individual private properties and conversion of rangelands to crop cultivation and subsistence use. In other cases, uncoordinated fences have been erected that have created barriers to seasonal movements of animals. Consequently, the ecological limitation of the ecosystem calls for the management of wildlife resource in an inclusive manner involving the local communities.

This study makes a number of recommendations for policy that need to be put on place to enhance community participation in wildlife conservation and win more space for wildlife conservation. The study has also made recommendations on areas that more research need to be undertaken on.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

While the Government has accepted community participation approaches in the management of natural resources that provide rural communities with secure tenure of their natural resources, the commitment to develop appropriate supporting legislation and technical capacity has been lacking. In fact, even where legislation is in place, rights of access to and use of natural resources have not been clearly defined. Communities have not received the necessary assistance to develop capacity to independently carry out their conservation activities. The result is that communities are unable to realize the optimal benefits from the wealth of resources on their lands.

A significant proportion of the Maasai community concurred that wildlife is beneficial to them. This study however found out that some respondents had not fully associated wildlife with any benefits for their livelihoods despite evidence that wildlife had contributed to the economic status of the region. This study recommends increase in public education awareness on conservation and wildlife management matters and also emphasizes the need for consultations with and the consent of landowners when designating areas that need protection as wildlife dispersal areas or migratory routes/corridors within their properties.

### **Policy Recommendations**

#### **Participation of Local People in Conservation and Management of Wildlife Resource**

The drive for the local people to control and benefit from wildlife resource within their areas of jurisdiction is now widely accepted concept for managing protected areas in many parts of the world. In Amboseli, wildlife constitutes important natural resource that must be conserved and managed by people in partnership with government and private sector. It is in recognition of this fact that the proposed (Wildlife Conservation and Management Draft Bill 2013) strongly articulates the need for the participation of local people in the management and conservation of wildlife resource.

It is therefore imperative that the management of the wildlife resource in the ecosystem has to be inclusive and involve the local communities. Decentralized wildlife resource management is key to sustainable development and

equitable benefit sharing arrangement. In order to meet the conservation goals and local community's livelihood needs, the increase of public education and awareness on conservation and wildlife management is critical.

### **Operationalize Land management Acts**

Policies and legislation such as the Land Use Policy and the draft Land Act (2012), the draft Land Registration Bill (2012), Wildlife Conservation and Management Draft Bill (2013) should be used to secure conservation areas through easements, leases, outright purchase by the government or other organization, as well as use of economic instruments that ensures payment for ecosystem services.

### **Establishment of Ecotourism Ventures**

To protect wildlife outside the Amboseli Park, measures for the establishment of more community based conservation projects such as creation of communal conservancies must be explored. Communal conservancies could be a mitigation measure of the current and ongoing land subdivision in Amboseli. Communal conservancies would perhaps be a way of managing wildlife outside the park where a group of legally constituted pastoralists could be encouraged to pool their individual land resources together to manage and benefit from wildlife and tourism on their communal land.

Throughout the group ranches now, ecotourism investments have provided income and employment opportunities, which have led to improved infrastructure and more positive local attitudes towards wildlife. Community wildlife sanctuaries and other ecotourism ventures that provide direct benefits in the areas adjacent to ANP need to be developed in addition to establishment of buffer zones through formation of conservancies and sanctuaries to reduce undesirable human activities (poaching, livestock grazing, settlements and agriculture). These ecotourism investments should be managed to reduce exploitation of the local communities and improve equitable distribution of tourism benefits with investors.

### **Strengthening of Community Based Ecotourism to Promote Conservation**

Community based ecotourism is today accepted as one of the most proactive tools of managing and ensuring the future of wildlife resources. This becomes even more critical where protected areas border privately owned land and where such private land is used by wildlife as its habitat. In Amboseli the land in the group ranches serves as important wildlife habitats. Emphasis must focus on ensuring that the benefits of tourism are attained more significantly by the community. Strengthening community based enterprises will reduce dependency on KWS and local development partners. It will also ensure that wildlife is viewed in a more positive manner throughout the group ranches. The viability and future of wildlife especially on privately land will also be guaranteed. For the community to become an integral part of conservation efforts, they must reap the benefits of conservation. Eco-tourism enterprises constitute one such way of furthering conservation as well as development.

### **Initiate Land Banking and Direct Land Purchases**

Land Banking for Conservation programs need to be effected in which land required for present and future needs is reserved to mitigate against fragmentation of wildlife habitats and degradation. Conservation organizations may lease land at market prices from landowners or group ranch members so that it may be set aside for wildlife. Outright land purchase for conservation using the Lake Nakuru Model in which KWS purchased land around Lake Nakuru and amalgamated it into the Deed Plan for the Lake Nakuru National Park.

### Funding Conservation Initiatives

The study revealed that the land owners in Amboseli are interested in conservation. One problem that they are continually faced with is funding to support their conservation interests and activities. Donor funding to support these social development initiatives is needed in almost all the group ranches. The group ranches themselves must however devise their own initiatives for funding. The Amboseli ecosystem and the wildlife resources found therein is their heritage. The group ranches must play a significant role in protecting their own natural resources by establishing a Conservation trust which is nonprofit outfit that can qualify for donor funding if its main objects are to conserve wildlife and wildlife habitats for promotion of sustainable development. The establishment of a conservation trust by all the members of the group ranches will go a long way in promoting conservation.

### Enhanced Inter-Departmental Linkages

Successful interrelationship and coordination between the government departments dealing with land, environment and natural resources, wildlife and finance. A mechanism needs to be established to coordinate the efforts of the multiple actors towards securing of the priority corridors and for resource mobilization and accountability.

### Revised Revenue Sharing Formula

The Commission for Revenue Allocation (CRA) in February 2012 released a formula to guide the horizontal share of revenues based on five parameters, namely population (60%), equal share (20%), poverty (12%), land and infrastructure needs (6%) and fiscal discipline (2%). However, given that 12% of the country's GDP is accounted for by tourism, 70% of which comes from wildlife, it is therefore, imperative that communities who host and interact with wildlife on their lands should be considered by the national exchequer for resource allocation and revenue sharing as a reward for continued existence and conservation of wildlife for a sustained tourism sector.

### REFERENCES

1. Blau, P., (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley.
2. Campbell D.J., H. Gichohi, R. Reid, Mwangi, A. Chege, L. & Sawin, T. (2003), "Interactions between people and wildlife in Southeast Kajiado District, Kenya", *The Land Use Change, Impacts and Dynamics (LUCID) Project*, Working Paper Series Number 18, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Nairobi, Kenya, Website: <http://www.lucideastafrica.org>
3. Campese, J. (2009), "Rights-based Approaches to Conservation: An Overview of Concepts and Questions" in Campese, J., T. Sunderland, T. Greiber, and G. Oviedo (eds), 2009, *Rights-based Approaches: Exploring Issues and Opportunities for Conservation*, CIFOR and IUCN: Bogor, Indonesia, Pp. 366.
4. Coupe, S. V. Lewis, Z. Ogutu and C. Watson (2002), *Living with Wildlife Sustainable Livelihoods for Park-adjacent Communities in Kenya*, ITDG Working Papers, Southampton Row, London.
5. Emerton, L., (1999), "The Nature of Benefits and the Benefits of Nature: Why Wildlife Conservation has not Economically Benefitted Communities in Africa", *Community Conservation Research in Africa: Principles and Comparative Practice*, Paper No. 5, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester

6. Elliot, J. and Mwangi, M. (1997), *Increasing landowner earnings from wildlife cropping in Laikipia*, *Wildlife Economics Study*, Discussion Paper CEC-DP-2, African Wildlife Foundation, Nairobi.
7. Hulme, D. and Murphree, M., (1999), 'Communities, wildlife and the "new conservation" in Africa', *Journal of International Development*, 11(2), 277–285.
8. Irandu, E. M. (2003), *Wildlife Tourism and Local Communities in Kenya*, Paper presented at ATLAS-Africa
9. King, A. (2000), *Managing Without Institutions: The Role of Communication Networks in Governing Resource, Access and Control*, Cuvillier Verlag, Gottingen.
10. KWS Enterprise Data Base (2013).
11. McNeely, J. A., (1988), *Economics and Biological Diversity: Developing and Using Economic Incentives to Conserve Biological Resources*, Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
12. Rihoy, E., (1995), 'The commons without the tragedy: Strategies for community based natural resources management in Southern Africa', Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference, Lilongwe, Malawi, SADC Wildlife Technical Coordination Unit.
13. Western, D., (1994), Ecosystem Conservation and Rural development: the case of Amboseli, In: Western D, Pearl MC. (eds), *Conservation for the Twenty - First Century*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA, Pp. 15-52.

