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

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

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

by (6) (e) The 2004 (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28) (29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (34) (35) (36) (37) (38) (39) (40) (41) (42) (43) (44) (45) (46) (47) (48) (49) (50) (51) (52) (53) (54) (55) (56) (57) (58) (59) (60) (61) (62) (63) (64) (65) (66) (67) (68) (69) (70) (71) (72) (73) (74) (75) (76) (77) (78) (79) (80) (81) (82) (83) (84) (85) (86) (87) (88) (89) (90) (91) (92) (93) (94) (95) (96) (97) (98) (99) (100)

- 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
-

- 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 asan souel40

- 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

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.

se3.28 Tw 0.34 0 Td [(f)-8(10(no)10(t)286(l)6(i)6(es)14TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 4.23 0 Td (,6-0.0144(has)

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

- The idea of having game scouts

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:

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	

Tuesday 28TH February 2017

Annex 2

Participants List

	Olderkesi participants	Email
Women	Noonkipa Ntaya	
	Sayiato Kaura	
	Raen Karbolo.	
Youth	Moses Lenjir	

<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>Are there any existing interventions by CWCT to strengthen local social norms to protect wildlife?A r e t h</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>action against IWT rather than stronger collusion in IWT</p>	<p>livestock grazing, etc. The backbone behind the success of Mara ecosystem is local people.</p>
<p>Communities have sufficient information and power to resist third party (politicians) interference</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Intangible and indirect costs of living with wildlife (e.g. disease) are known and can be accounted for</p>	<p>Yes, e.g. disease malignant catarrhal fever and an eye disease (gazelle to sheep). These costs should be considered as part of compensation</p>

Additional payments to government rangers will reduce illegal grazing

	<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