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Wildlife is “one of the great agricultural transformations” in (southern) Africa

Financial analysis

Economic analysis

For Landholder (Financial)

- Tourism
- Hunting
- Meat
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Economic output

Vertical Integration in Sector

Economic Multipliers

Meat Viability

Shifting from a Commodity (beef) to a Bio-Experience (wildlife) Economy
Policy actions (price proprietorship)

1. Devolve ownership
2. Develop markets

Policy actions (no change)

1. Centralise ownership
2. Restrict / ban use

Kenya (lost 2/3 of its wildlife)

- G Zebra: 13,500 (1975) – 2,000 (2007)
- Impala, warthog, giraffe, topi, hartebeeste declined 70% in Mara

South Africa

- 1964: 575,000
- 2007: 18.6 million

Namibia

- Wildlife doubled+
- Cattle decreased 55%

Zimbabwe

- Wildlife 4X
- Cattle declined

Trends in Wildlife & Livestock Numbers
South Africa 1964-2007

Gross Income from Hunting in Zimbabwe

Number of Trophies
Value

The poorest people live with the best wildlife – how do we transfer wildlife technology from private to community sector?

Three challenges:
1. Making wildlife/NR viable
2. Devolve to community
3. Micro-governance

Micro-governance
- Elite capture
- Equitable benefit sharing?
- Community participation?

Poor conceptualization and operationalization.
CBNRM (the Vision)

- Maximize value of wildlife
- Assist communities to get organized (constitutions, membership)
- Whole community chooses how to use income
- Ensure private benefit
- Tax people (not wildlife) for social goods
- Face-to-face Accountability (quarterly) to members
- Participatory, activity-based budgeting
- <1% misappropriation
  20X number of projects
Technology Transfer

Ecotourism on Amazon River in Ecuador

REDD+ Carbon payments in Tanzania
However, our research in southern Africa shows a fundamental difference between:

- representational multi-village governance
- participatory single-village governance
Committee-based Management
Representational governance
Multi-Village

Allocation of Revenues in Eight Community Resource Boards, Kafue, Zambia

Allocation of Expenditure in 43 Village Action Groups in Lupande GMA 1996-2001

Allocation of Expenditure in Eight Conservancies in Caprivi (2007)

Sankuyo, Botswana 2010 Expenditure

Masoka Community, Zimbabwe

Community-based management
Participatory democracy
Single village (face to face)
Equitable Benefit Sharing and Community Size in CBNRM Communities in Southern Africa

\[ y = -0.236 \ln(x) + 1.8396 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.4418 \]
Economic/Governance ‘Games’

Representational budgeting

Participatory budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equitable</th>
<th>Benefit Sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWS workshop</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maun, Group 1</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maun, Group 2</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with Budget Process

- Representational Budget
- Participatory Budget

Level of satisfaction 1= v low; 10=high
Taking Research into Action
And unlocking elite capture
The ‘governance dashboard’ – a model for participatory pro-poor research?
Work with community to identify performance metrics

Develop and test instrument

Visualize preliminary results, create excitement and obtain mandate for ‘Action Research’

Collect data with community

Take / support corrective action e.g. participatory activity-based budgeting

Return results to leadership (and followership) the same week

Social learning / adaptive management cycle
Analyzing Data

Statistically

Can the data statistically differentiate between governance in different communities?

Socially

Can the data be explained by a causal model (as explained by the community)?

PROCESS:

1. Clarify data to community
2. Refute/agree
3. Explain causes (model)
Single Village with fair-good governance

Did CBO committee give you a financial report in the last year?

% of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>I did not attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial accountability

Multi-village with governance problems

Do you trust the CBO leadership to manage and account for your finances?

Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, I strongly distrust them</th>
<th>No, I don't trust them</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Yes, I trust them</th>
<th>Yes, I trust them a lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gunotsoga Okavango Community Trust
Using Peer Review of Data to create Social Demand for Change

Information is powerful and needs to be handled carefully

Transparent Data (visualization x discussion)

Dissatisfaction with Status Quo

Agreement to change

Recommendations

1. Complete analysis of questionnaire
2. Quarterly Report
3. Constitution report

Implementation of Change ???

Constitutions; Accounts; Information systems
Is there opportunity to change the way universities learn with poor people?

1. Improved landscape governance
   - SDI Monitoring
   - Adaptive dialogue

2. Transdisciplinary PhD/Master’s (develop science)

3. Block-release MBA/MPA (train senior managers)

4. Support Colleges (train government staff)

Transfer curricular to regional universities and colleges

- Local adaptive management SDIs
- Performance audit service to implementing agencies
- Regional SDI databases
Thank you

• bchild@ufl.edu
(Mis) Allocation of conservation (intellectual) capital


Ecology: 91%
Economics: 9%
Governance: 0%