

**FAO/UNEP
INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON
PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABLE
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
*HOW CAN THEY BE RECONCILED?***

**Harare, Zimbabwe
26 – 29 October 1999**

FINAL REPORT

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2000**

Opening Ceremony

1. The FAO/UNEP International Technical Consultation on Protected Area Management (PAM) and Sustainable Rural Development (SRD) was held in Harare, Zimbabwe from 26 to 29 October 1999. It was attended by 63 participants from 18 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, United Nations agencies (UNESCO, UNEP), Bilateral Organizations (DFID, GTZ) and International NGOs (IUCN, WWF).
2. The Opening Ceremony was honoured by H.E. Mr S. Kaya Moyo, Minister of Mines, Environment and Tourism and Ms Victoria Sekitoleko, FAO Subregional Representative for Southern and Eastern Africa, SAFR. The session was chaired by Mr T.C. Chipato, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism of Zimbabwe. Welcoming remarks were presented by Ms V. Sekitoleko. She stressed the importance of both conservation and development, and the need to address them equally and to associate them. She recognised the good cooperation between FAO and national institutions as well as with other UN agencies, such as UNEP and UNESCO, and commended the good example of conservation and development in Southern Africa, in particular in Botswana and Zimbabwe, where participation in conservation and management of wildlife resources has been subject to innovative and substantial efforts.
3. In his opening address, the Honourable Minister of Mines, Environment and Tourism, Mr S. Kaya Moyo, warmly welcomed participants from all countries and organizations. With regard to the subject of the consultation, he emphasised the multiple challenges to Protected Areas, the most important being human pressures of various kinds. The Minister then described the ways various countries have found of responding appropriately and effectively to these pressures. He cited examples of important legal and institutional measures adopted by Zimbabwe, highlighting the decision to operate the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management as a Statutory Fund, which gives it financial autonomy. The Minister concluded his speech by raising a series of issues to be discussed in order to better address constraints on optimal approaches to protected area management and sustainable rural development.

Election of Officers

4. The plenary session started with the election of meeting officers. Mr T.C. Chipato (Zimbabwe), Antonio Perera (Cuba) and P.K. Sen (India) were elected respectively Chairperson and First and Second Vice Chairpersons of the Consultation. Mr. Bernard Fosso (Cameroon), was elected rapporteur.

Setting the Stage

5. The Consultation then proceeded with hearing and discussing background papers on: i) the theme of the Consultation, i.e. "How Can Protected Area Management and Sustainable Rural Development be Reconciled?"; ii) collaborative management of protected areas; iii) recent international initiatives on forest conservation and protected areas; iv) trends in park tourism; v) the role of policies, laws, land tenure and land reform; and vi) conservation of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture in protected areas.
6. The introduction to the general theme of the consultation opened with comments on the rarity of meetings which address both PAM and SRD and the difficulty of integrating the activities of the different departments responsible for them. The different perspectives of PAM and SRD were then reviewed and used as a basis for further analysis of the process of reconciling PAM and SRD. Issues addressed in the analysis included: sustainable development and land use planning, definitions of rural development, definitions of protected areas, linking protected areas and rural development, community conservation approaches, integrated conservation and development projects and ecodevelopment. A number of case histories were then used to demonstrate that rural populations are looking at economic benefits when choosing land use options. Wildlife and conservation are of low priority as an option,

given the strength of development needs. Conservation must therefore speed-up processes of change and develop stronger win-win positions.

7. **Collaborative Management of PAs** involves arrangements in terms of which managers seeks to develop partnerships with all the stakeholders for sharing the rights and responsibilities relating to a given PA. Collaborative management promotes equity among stakeholders, particularly the local communities. Factors that underpin collaborative management were reviewed. They include: strong policy and legal support, trust and co-ordination among stakeholders, accountability and conflict management mechanisms, the existence of strong local institutions, the availability of enough trained people, regular monitoring and evaluation. It was concluded that in order to continue collaborative management over time, and to ensure the sustainability and viability of PAM, the integration of PAs into landscape or regional level planning is required.

8. **International initiatives on Forest Conservation and PAs** in the framework of the IPF/IFF process were reviewed. Reference was made to i) the Australian Government initiative and major discussion paper on forest conservation and PAs entitled “International Forest Conservation: Protected Areas and Beyond”; ii) the Brazil-USA initiative on the International Expert Meeting on Protected Forests Areas (Puerto Rico, March 1999). These have made conservation feature significantly on the IFF agenda. A number of needs were identified in order to maximise the wide range of benefits from PAs at national and international levels.

9. **Ecotourism** was reviewed. The basis of successful ecotourism is the attainment of appropriate levels of environmental quality and consumer services. Increasing competition in the industry has stimulated policy development to improve the realization of tourism potential. Common constraints on ecotourism development include inadequate appreciation of the economic dimension, manifested, for example, in the low entrance fees charged by many parks; lack of investment in staff training, infrastructure and tourism support resources, inappropriate and ineffectual financing mechanisms, lack of tourism management competence. To overcome these constraints new models of management are being used, such as the creation of parastatal agencies, new fee structures are being implemented and partnerships with the private sector are being developed. Key issues for future success are the development of a management framework emphasizing staff expertise in tourism and financial management and the implementation of an appropriate legislative and policy framework.

10. **Aspects relating to, and Role of Policies Laws and Institutions** were reviewed, showing that much progress was achieved in concepts, views and values to promote a new paradigm of conservation, including community based management, sharing of benefits, pluralism and decentralization. Increased efforts will be needed however to i) formulate articulate policies, laws and regulations that update conservation approaches and integrate them with development in rural areas around PAs; ii) promote and support modern PA administration, equipped with all the new tools of communication, economic valuation, active extension methods and able to meet the new challenges; iii) thus provide adequate institutional support to research, education/capacity building and extension for biological conservation.

11. **Conservation of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture in protected areas will** strengthen the case for protected areas, but is also worth doing in its own right because modern societies depend totally on the maintenance of productive agricultural systems. Agricultural production depends, in turn, on biodiversity and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. Species of wild plants and animals that provide food, medicine and other services to rural people are probably the most relevant to protected area managers. An entry point into conserving these species in protected areas is to involve the local people who use them in their conservation, and ultimately to make them fully responsible for it.

Regional Overviews

12. Regional overviews of the situation of conservation, management of protected areas and sustainable rural development were presented, highlighting major problems, constraints, opportunities and achievements.

13. The review of **Africa** recognized differences between the West, Central, East and Southern regions, but identified poverty and inadequate institutional arrangements as common features. It highlighted the cultural, religious, and economic dependence of communities on natural resources and also stressed major constraints, including outdated legislation, poor financing, insufficient support for research and inadequate human resources. Possible strategies and a number of principles for reconciling conservation and rural development were reviewed, including system plans and management plans for protected areas.. The importance of capacity building and the need for curriculum adaptation to face new challenges were stressed. Examples of on-going, innovative community based resource management and use, especially in Eastern and Southern Africa, promise a better future in conservation and rural development.

14. In **Asia and Oceania** there is an extremely rich mosaic of biodiversity. Three thousand protected areas covering, more than 8% of the region, have been designated to protect this biodiversity. Financial and technical constraints, incongruous PA management practices, involving exclusion of people and focussing only on ecological and biological concepts, are to a great extent responsible for the various difficulties that PA's are facing. Integrated conservation and development programmes initiated in this region have been perceived by some PA managers as a tool to win local support for PA management by offering them employment and some usufruct sharing. Lack of confidence in protected area managers still prevails. However, where management has been resilient, adaptive and beneficial to people, prospects of success have been good.

15. The regional review of **Latin American and the Caribbean** identified three stages in the integration of protected areas and rural communities: i) the original policy of eliminating human populations from protected areas; ii) an evolution towards the establishment of buffer zones on the periphery of protected areas; iii) more recently, the increased participation of rural communities in the planning and management of protected areas, including some instances involving cooperative management schemes. Nevertheless, conflicts still exist between protected area administrations and many rural communities, who feel that they do not receive sufficient benefits to compensate for being deprived of the benefits formerly received from the natural resources of the area. Current trends for solving conflicts include: increasing knowledge of the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of rural communities, identifying community expectations, and articulating local development plans with protected area management plans. Priorities for effective management include: ensuring financing and possible self-financing, decreasing conflicts with local populations, and strengthening bio-regional planning and management, and biological corridors. There need to be profound changes at the turn of the century in the relationship between rural communities and protected areas, including the institutions responsible for them. There is also a need for training in rural development issues and conflict resolution for rural communities, NGO's and protected area personnel, and better linkages with and benefits to the rural communities.

Other contributions and discussions

16. The representative of UNESCO presented a paper on "Sustainable Development through the World Network of Biosphere Reserves: Conserving and Managing Biodiversity into the Coming Decades." He emphasized that the already widespread and ever increasing human impact on the closely linked ecosystems that make up the biosphere requires a bio-regional approach for the conservation and sustainable use of land and seascapes. UNESCO's World Network of Biosphere Reserves provides a well defined yet flexible framework for people-based conservation and sustainable rural development. In practice the 25-year-old network still lacks universal coverage, and not all reserves correctly follow the Biosphere Reserve paradigm. UNESCO facilitates networking and

training to encourage Biosphere Reserve managers in this task. Critical understanding of the land and economic land use is vital and needs the inputs of farmers, foresters and fishers, as well as agricultural and social scientists. He ended by stressing the value of a transdisciplinary approach; UNESCO therefore looks forward to building more effective relationships with other conservation partners.

17. The Representative of the WWF introduced the work of his organization on indigenous/traditional people and protected areas in cooperation with IUCN. The World Commission on Protected Areas and WWF collaborated in an extensive two-year joint consultation with many indigenous and other traditional peoples' organisations from various parts of the world, and with other conservation organisations and protected area managers. The process also benefited from many discussions that indigenous peoples' organisations had held themselves on the matter, as well as from various on-the-ground experiences where the concept of partnerships for protected areas had been tested. The result of this process was the development and adoption by both organisations, in April-May 1999, of a Joint Policy Statement called *Principles And Guidelines On Indigenous And Traditional Peoples And Protected Areas*. The document contains an introductory conceptual background and a set of principles and guidelines on key issues, such as rights of indigenous and traditional peoples, traditional knowledge, co-management arrangements, benefit sharing, and transfrontier areas.

18. The delegates from Zimbabwe, India, Cameroon and Morocco made summary national presentations on current issues and ongoing activities that are relevant to protected area management and sustainable rural development.

19. In Zimbabwe, the continuous adaptation of legislation and policies is stressed. Concepts of sustainable use, sharing responsibility with local government at the provincial and district levels, and community based resource management are thus progressively taken into account, while increasing the wildlife estate. The Community Area Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) is the flagship of the Zimbabwean approach to community based management and improved access to resources for rural people. This programme provides a sense of ownership and the actualization of conservation benefits for local populations. Another important feature of the Zimbabwean approach is the ploughing back into local development and conservation measures of proceeds from the sale of ivory, made possible by the downgrading of the African elephant to CITES Appendix 2. A significant development is that the Wildlife Department is now operating as a Statutory Fund, which allows it to retain all the revenues it generates for conservation programmes. To enhance the reconciliation of conservation and rural development, Zimbabwe is presently engaged in serious discussions with neighbours such as Mozambique and South Africa on the Transfrontier Conservation Area Initiatives (TFCAI).

20. The Indian delegation described the important national park system of their country and their approach to PAM. India has championed eco-development and the use of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects. Lessons learned from these experiences have been used in new approaches to conservation and protected area management. However pressure on resources accruing from high population growth (doubling in the last 25 years) along with a large increase in cattle (80% in the last 25 years) has drastically reduced the scope for community based resource management in the effectively protected areas, which cover only 1.5% of the country.

21. The Cameroon presentation highlighted the country's exceptionally rich biological diversity and the variation in landscapes, from the northern woodlands to southwestern coastal ecosystems. The country has an important protected area system and is promoting community participation in its management.

22. Morocco has high biological diversity and varied landscapes. The establishment of its protected area system dates back to 1942 and builds on important lessons learned in the course of

moving from the authoritarian establishment of the first national park to the present, largely participatory approach to protected area establishment and management. This approach is characterized by: i) its promotion of conservation with people in densely populated areas, through the establishment of the so-called “open parks” (multiple use and adequate zoning); ii) thorough consultation with and involvement of populations; iii) development of ecotourism, aiming at income generation (each park should be able to generate resources) and better protection of the park.

23. After briefly discussing the issues introduced by the various presentations and the voluntary contributions, the Consultation divided into four Working Groups to discuss the following issues:

- Protected Area Management and Sustainable Rural Development;
- Collaborative Management;
- Ecotourism;
- Policy, Legislation, Regulations and Funding.

The reports of the Working Groups are in **Annexes 1 – 4**.

24. During a plenary session on the final morning of the consultation the Working Groups presented reports on their findings and recommendations, which were discussed by the participants.

25. Points raised in the discussion of the Working Group reports included the following:

- the importance of keeping alive the dialogue on protected area management and sustainable rural development;
- FAO has the core competence to take a strong initiative to reconcile conservation and sustainable rural development;
- it is imperative that communities are included in the development of ecotourism as partners and not merely as passive beneficiaries;
- in developing ecotourism, due attention must be paid to the domestic market, which should not be neglected because of undue emphasis on the foreign market;
- it may be useful to recognise a difference between ecotourism and nature-based tourism, the former being small scale and involving local communities, the latter being high cost international tourism;
- there is an urgent need to review policies, laws, and institutions with a view to assimilating new paradigms of conservation and sustainable development;
- the results of the consultation must be reflected in future events, including the 5th World Parks Congress to be held in Durban in 2002;
- WWF indicated that the conference it is organising in Maputo in May 2000 on Planning and Designing Forest Protected Areas will be considered a follow up to this consultation.

26. During the final plenary session on the last afternoon of the meeting there was a vote of thanks to FAO, UNEP and the Government of Zimbabwe for implementing the consultation and the Working Group Reports, a general report and a Final Communiqué were adopted.

27.

**FAO/UNEP INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
Protected Area Management and Sustainable Rural Development**

FINAL COMMUNIQUE

We, the participants, from 18 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean and six international and bilateral organisations, in the FAO/UNEP International Technical Consultation on Protected Area Management and Sustainable Rural Development held in Harare, Zimbabwe from 26 to 29 October, 1999

Having considered the documentation on the issues arising from the interaction between protected area management and sustainable rural development,

Considering the deliberations of the consultation in plenary and working group sessions, which were enriched by the participants' broad variety of experience,

Recognising the legitimate needs for both conservation and rural development and the complexity of reconciling these needs,

Recognising the diversity of ecological situations, and categories of protected areas and livelihood systems which were discussed in this consultation, and

Appreciating that there is a shared conviction that the past narrow, authoritarian approach to protected area management should be broadened to accommodate the wider needs and aspirations of society, and in particularly rural communities,

Advocate the following:

Review and analysis of existing policies, legislation, strategies and programmes which govern the creation and management of protected areas with a view to strengthening both these institutions and the communities, so as to better assimilate the new paradigms of conservation and the sustainable development of rural communities.

Promotion and evaluation of collaborative protected area management to develop replicable models of effective conservation and sustainable rural development

Increasing the flow of sustainable benefits to rural communities from resources located in, and activities based on protected areas, without undermining the objectives for which the areas were established

Urge that governments focus on meeting the needs of marginalized populations and communities in and around protected areas by making special provision for them in rural development policy and planning.

Urge FAO, UNEP and other international intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations both to recognise the critical importance of the issues relating to protected area management and sustainable rural development, and to ensure that the dialogue on these issues is continued, especially at a regional level.

**Report of the Working Group on
PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

Introduction

Recognising that in practice, there still exist formidable obstacles to reconciling economic development and the conservation of biological diversity, this session aimed to identify and analyse these obstacles.

Four key issues were identified:

1. **rural poverty:** natural resources are used by rural people to satisfy basic human needs and fulfil livelihood strategies, thus putting pressure on the resource base;
2. **population expansion:** whilst it is difficult to identify a clear linear relationship between population growth and natural resource depletion, it is accepted that over time human population pressure will create an increased demand for resources;
3. **low capacity** at local, regional and national levels and the reticence of government officials to adopt new protected area (PA) management paradigms were recognised as problems;
4. **inadequate policy instruments and legislative frameworks confine** the potential for local level resource tenure, management and involvement in decision making.

Discussion

It was acknowledged that these problems are partly due to the heritage of past approaches to protected area management, that are now in many instances widely regarded as inappropriate. Previous highly centralised “command and control” mechanisms for PA management marginalised people, and sectoral bias restricted the potential for alternative holistic approaches. Furthermore, PA management was not grounded in the principles of national or local sustainable development. These issues, set against changing socio-economic scenarios meant that sustainable financing measures for PAs were not adopted.

Given this context, and in order to examine these problems in greater depth, the working group identified, in turn, the threats that exist for protected area management and for sustainable human development in and around PAs. From this synthesis, opportunities for reconciliation were highlighted, and recommendations for future approaches to PA management interventions were made.

Constraints on protected area systems

A number of constraints that hamper the conservation of biodiversity in PA systems were identified, and include:

- many countries have inadequate or ecologically or biogeographically non-representative PA systems;
- ecological “islands” in isolated areas may be non-viable;
- broader ecological services may not be fully considered in cost/benefit analysis of the PA;
- civil unrest or military conflict curtail many PA management activities;
- population pressure on the resource base by both humans and livestock;
- resource depletion through over-use of the resource base;
- the “magnet” effect of successful conservation and development projects resulting in in-migration;
- desertification and land degradation processes not only impact PAs directly but indirectly through reduced productivity in rural areas;

- the lack of good governance such as reduced democratic processes, lack of transparency and accountability negatively impacts on successful conservation.

Threats to communities and their development processes

Similarly, a number of threats to human development were highlighted that prevent reconciliation across the PA/ people divide, and include:

- marginalisation of people, who become excluded from the political process and decision-making;
- inadequate incentives or inequitable distribution of benefits, e.g. higher benefits from “rich” PAs, or between dominant and marginalised members of rural society;
- unstable tenure, lack of ownership and limited access to natural resources;
- cultural dilution through loss of access to sacred sites, commercialization of culture;
- inadequate local institutions and disempowerment of local authority systems;
- “traditional” conservation measures have been subsumed into broader policy processes;
- crop destruction by wildlife and threats to human lives, livestock and property;
- transmission of wildlife diseases to livestock;
- continued expansion and creation of new PAs reduces stability and increases probability of eviction;
- exclusion from facilities and social services;
- livelihood strategies may be influenced by presence of PAs ;
- need for conflict resolution delays the development process;
- management plans frequently obscure local complexities and micro-politics e.g. ethnicity and traditional leadership.

Potential strategies for new approaches

Recognizing that many opportunities exist for increased synergy between conservation and development processes, it was acknowledged that long-term strategies must be adopted at multiple levels. These processes must be based on the principles of democratization, ownership, empowerment, transparency and accountability. At the same time, an equitable balance must be achieved between ecological services and the sustainable use of natural resources.

Thus, a holistic ecologically sustainable development philosophy was presented, based on the following principles:

- use a bio-regional approach to land-use planning;
- integrate ecologically sustainable development and resource conservation practice into livelihood strategies, e.g. village forest reserves, bush meat harvesting, grazing capacity;
- facilitate equitable participatory decision-making processes;
- recognize local heterogeneity and site-specific PA management issues;
- create enabling policy and legislative frameworks to support both “modern” and “traditional” authority systems;
- capacity building for all levels of participants from policy makers to grass roots community stakeholders;
- increase training and integrate these issues in the education curriculum;
- foster awareness and advocacy at multiple levels;
- encourage multi-level dialogue to facilitate working with PAs, e.g. between donors, governments, NGOs and national, regional and local levels (use conventions: such as UNCED Agenda 21, Conventions on Biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification to enable inter-governmental initiatives);
- ensure sustainability of funding mechanisms;
- set and monitor equitable and ecologically sustainable limits;

- facilitate ongoing monitoring and evaluation to feed back into the policy process;
- carry out relevant, problem-solving applied research projects;
- Transfer of technology, e.g. improved cropping methods, micro-enterprises;
- disseminate information, create awareness with the media, policy makers, communities and other stakeholders;
- foster partnerships with NGOs, communities, donors, private sector and others.

Recommendations and Conclusions

Drawing on this analysis, the following approaches were recommended at the national and local levels:

National processes:

- Legislative and policy processes must provide an enabling environment for secure tenure, access and control over natural resources and peoples' involvement in the decision-making process;
- Policies on population must address the population pressure/ resource depletion interface at international, national and local levels;
- Governments must have greater capacity to mitigate natural resource degradation, including "natural" disasters affected by climate change;
- Foster political will through legal provisions, strong advocacy, and relationships with NGOs;
- Raise awareness of all stakeholders and civil society through the media to publicise integrated conservation and rural development approaches;
- Increase coordination of efforts between local, regional and national levels, adopting inter-ministerial harmonization across sectoral boundaries;
- Ensure compatibility of regional level initiatives with national policies;
- Avoid external policy prescriptions for reconciliation of conservation and development objectives;
- Conservation must be seen to have an increasingly "human face" by local communities and their political leaders;
- Conservationists should seek an equitable distribution of resources at a national level so that communities in remote areas receive rural development inputs;
- The group noted the special case where indigenous people are contained within a PA (and recognize the importance of the policy guidelines by IUCN/WWF on such issues) and people have recently migrated into a PA due to war, drought and so on.

Local processes

- Facilitate participatory planning, monitoring and implementation processes for both conservation and development activities;
- Support locally appropriate mechanisms for conflict management across the PA/village interface;
- Adopt solutions for increasing benefit flows from PAs; e.g. compensatory schemes, equitable distribution of dividends from tourism, sustainable use of natural resources;
- Ensure equitable distribution of benefits avoiding perpetuation of local elites and maintaining sensitivity to divisions of power according to ethnicity, gender or age;
- Delineation of "community" and determination of who benefits;
- Build the capacity of local formal and informal institutions, including the provision of a supporting legal and policy framework;
- Encompass "traditional" mechanisms for natural resource conservation;
- Ongoing participatory monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of these approaches.

Appreciating that many of the approaches identified by this group are not new and have been stated in other fora such as the World Parks and Protected Area Congress in Caracas, a commitment to an holistic and integrated development paradigm should be fostered at multiple levels in order to bridge

the divide between PA management and rural development. Countries and regions should analyze the conditions that have led to our repeated failure to implement many of these past recommendations.

The group's immediate conclusion was that there has been a lack of political will and professional capacity to move the process forward. Furthermore, there was the recognition that population pressure and poverty continue to pose a threat to sustainability of PAs. In order to reconcile conservation objectives with development objectives, it was concluded that future approaches should be based on the fundamental principles of democratization, empowerment, ownership, transparency and accountability.

Report of the Working Group on COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS

Introduction

The aim of Collaborative Management of Conservation Areas is to render these areas more permanent and sustainable by making them socio-politically acceptable. This is especially important at the local level where most conflicts are likely to occur between the area and people living in the region. Social acceptability is but one of three imperatives of any successful human endeavour – the others are economic viability and ecological sustainability – and is the topic to which the group restricted its deliberations.

It is important not to confuse collaborative park management with Community Based Resource Management and to use different terminology for these two very different concepts. It is also important to clarify the language and objectives of park management in order to accommodate collaborative management unambiguously.

Discussion

Policy

For Collaborative Management to be an option, Central Government Policy must exist which:

- requires collaborative management;
- devolves the authority to manage collaboratively;
- describes the institution to which power is to be devolved;
- defines the power of the institution to which authority is to be devolved.

Implementation

Implementation of a policy of Collaborative Management requires that in addition to the usual sort of park/reserve executive there is a local board or authority to which certain decision making functions can be devolved from central government. This board does not have authority over the park executive, but the executive is required by policy to implement those decisions over which the board has jurisdiction. It is important that in all cases this board, its precise authority and relationships with the executive are unambiguously defined.

Park Management Board/Authority

This board should comprise a mix of Government representatives and representatives of interest/ stakeholder groups. The composition of the board should guard against government losing its authority as the “owner of the land”; responsible for ensuring that it is maintained for the purpose for which it has been set aside.

Stakeholder Groups

The following were recognised:

- a) Subsistence users
- b) Commercial users
- c) Representatives of impacted groups e.g. stockowners
- d) Support groups.

A suggestion from the floor indicated that it may also be important to include representation for local government.

In selecting a) and d), institutions should be devised to determine and register the most appropriate people to be represented on the Board. In the case of c) it is important to define major conflicts and determine how they should best be represented on the Board so as to manage and mitigate the conflicts.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. Policy and regulations on PAs should evolve towards decentralisation with local communities having greater participation in management to safeguard their legitimate rights in terms of the policy.
2. At the policy level the Government should determine the roles and responsibilities of the State in relation to other stakeholders. At the operational level relationships should be determined in terms of policy through dialogue.
3. Dialogue, trust building and conflict management should be evolved, based on integrity and credibility, arising from transparent accountability. As such linkages consolidate, they should be institutionalised
4. The group felt that partnerships for the collaborative management of PA s could only be developed between the stakeholders and the PA authority.
5. Rural development and social development agencies should be involved in meeting the operational aspiration of the Park Management Board with core support groups represented on the Board. This does not reduce the need for all types of public relations and networking between the Park and all interested parties, so as to integrate the Park into rural development and, as far a possible, to convert it from a sump for non-existent public funding into an engine for rural development.
6. Formation of partnerships for collaborative management with rural and social development agencies and other appropriate candidates for partnership.
7. Initiation of collaborative management should not be dependent on outside financial support for its motivation, although it is accepted that such funding may be necessary at the implementation of desired action.
8. A framework of incentives and disincentives should be developed to achieve management objectives.
9. Government through Park management should lead the process of collaborative management. With its particular competence FAO is a particularly appropriate agency to carry the torch for this aspect of PA management.
10. The need for people to use resources from PAs is site specific – but the aim should be to free up the ability to use such resources and to allow it where this has conservation merit and does not endanger the plant and animal populations in the Park.
11. The strengthening of capacity building in stakeholder groups is part and parcel of the collaborative management process.
12. Empowerment of the stakeholders is part of the ongoing process. This should extend to include similar training to change PA staff attitude and to equip them to implement this new paradigm in park management.

Report of the Working Group on ECOTOURISM

Introduction

The aim of the group was to provide a preliminary checklist of prerequisites for successful ecotourism development.

Discussion

On the basis of initial discussions the following salient issues were identified:

- the formulation of a National Ecotourism Strategy
- the structure and mandate of the agency responsible for developing ecotourism
- the collection and use of statistics
- capacity building
- coordination
- involvement of the private sector
- community involvement

Each of these issues was discussed until the group was satisfied that it had been adequately analyzed and understood. The discussion produced a number of conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. A National Ecotourism Strategy is needed to optimize ecotourism development. Its formulation should involve the following:

- i) An expert assessment of the potential for ecotourism. If this assessment concludes that the potential for ecotourism is substantial and its development is feasible, then:
- ii) A government policy commitment to support the development of ecotourism is essential.
- iii) An exercise to raise awareness of ecotourism in the public and private sectors and in civil society.
- iv) A participatory exercise to formulate the strategy, involving all actual or potential stakeholders, whose identity needs to be established by careful and comprehensive analysis of who could benefit from or be impacted by ecotourism. The strategy should consider both the domestic market and the international market for ecotourism.
- v) A realistically funded program for the systematic development of ecotourism.

2. *Institutional structure and mandate*

i) The agency responsible for developing ecotourism should be a public body, fully accountable to government [which has overall responsibility for natural resource management], but with operational and financial autonomy, encompassing organizational, decision-making and financial freedom on issues such as conditions of service, planning and spending, negotiating commercial concessions with the private sector, determining park entrance fees, and so on.

ii) The role of government with respect to ecotourism is to create an enabling policy and legal environment and a regulatory framework.

3. *Statistics*

The collection, analysis and presentation of appropriate statistics are crucial for planning and for gaining due recognition and support in the public domain.

4. *Capacity building*

i) Within the **agency** itself, ecotourism management competence needs to be developed to deal with aspects such as: research and monitoring, statistics, tourism planning, interpretation of natural and cultural features, public relations, business management, marketing.

ii) In **communities** adjacent to protected areas, capacity building is needed in relation to entrepreneurial skills, production and marketing of arts and crafts, resource management, providing hospitality to tourists, acting as tour guides, and so on.

iii) The **private sector** needs conservation awareness and also needs to be sensitized to issues of community upliftment, training and so on.

iv) Sensitizing and awareness raising is needed in **government departments** with actual or potential influence on ecotourism.

5. *Coordination is necessary or desirable at various levels*

i) The adoption of **global** standards, such as those for design of facilities, consumer services, statistical data collection and so on, will increase the marketability and improve the management of nationally based ecotourism operations. Global NGOs can provide support on issues such as community involvement in ecotourism.

ii) At the **regional** level, cooperation between counterpart agencies in neighbouring countries is beneficial and governments can contribute on issues such as visas, air fares and so on.

iii) At the **national** level, government departments, other agencies, NGOs may have a role to play in ecotourism development. Research can be outsourced to universities or consultants.

iv) At the **sub-national** level, provincial, district and local governments and NGOs may be involved in ecotourism and communities should be involved in it.

6. *Private sector involvement*

The probability of successful ecotourism development will be enhanced by private sector involvement.

7. *Communities*

To stimulate socio-economic development and reduce the potential for conflict between conservation and people, there is an urgent need to increase the flow of benefits to neighbouring communities from park tourism. Ways that have been found of doing this include: making concessions to private operators conditional on community involvement, putting visitor facilities in community areas so that locals can be involved, creating partnerships between private operators and local communities.

Report of the Working Group on POLICY, LEGISLATION AND INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

In starting its work, the group discussed a number of general issues relating to:

the nature of National Parks administrations, their origin and evolution and how this heritage affects the approach to management of protected areas and linkages with populations;

the notion of protected areas and the diverse opportunities for flexibility offered by the various categories of PA in overall conservation policy;

the need to consider protected areas within a larger geographic scope and with the ecosystem approach, including its economic and social dimensions;

the need and ways for protected area management to integrate the new values of democratisation, decentralisation, pluralism, and the deployment of active extension methods within the context of local cultural and societal values;

the need for modernised protected area administration, which should allow more involvement of the private sector or assume the form of more flexible parastatal mix of government and private sector.

These forms should allow better opportunities of direct funding of conservation by itself. Regarding the linkage between the management of protected areas and sustainable rural development, the group interpreted it as a situation of mutual benefit in which the PA should contribute to the quality of life and wellbeing of the local rural population, including health, equipment, food security, access to clean water, and so on, and a sense of ownership of the PA and a commitment to its conservation by the local population.

Discussion and Recommendations

The group identified a number of major constraints and responses to these, on which recommendations were made regarding policy, laws, institutions and funding.

Policy Issues

The group identified the following *constraints*:

- the narrow scope of the traditional approach to protected areas, extreme compartmentalisation, limited management options, unduly sectoral planning of national parks;
- the scarcity of linkages between conservation policies and agriculture;
- the inadequate and late incorporation of changes in concept into the design and management of PA systems and policies;
- the lack of flexibility of the overall protected area system;
- a lack of integration between the policies of conservation and other sectors.

The group *recommended* the following:

1. Policies should often be revisited to reflect new concepts and changes in the management of PAs in order to allow participation of and benefits to local communities.
2. The concept of protected areas is still valid and essential for conserving natural resources and landscapes, but policy should embrace a larger geographic scope and the ecosystem approach, while being integrated into overall land use.

3. National PA policies and systems should avail themselves of the large flexibility offered by all PA categories, so as to allow for emerging ideas of more open protected areas and better integration with development.
4. To allow for national fora and elaborate consultation processes to discuss conservation policies in order to build linkages and harmonisation between conservation and the policies of other sectors, especially rural development; the involvement of people is the start of participation and appropriation (the process around Hwange National Park in Zimbabwe was given as a good example).
5. Encourage cooperation among countries with similar conditions, to share experience and know-how with the assistance of international organisations, including FAO, UNESCO-MAB, the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, WWF and bilateral organisations. Transboundary initiatives should be supported by regional and international policies.
6. It was noted that the preparation of the 5th World Protected Area Conference to be held in Durban, South Africa in 2002, offered an opportunity to reflect, exchange views and promote common policies, on regional, and international cooperation on conservation and sustainable rural development.

Laws and Regulations

The following *constraints* were identified:

- the lack of reviews and updating;
- the multiplicity and lack of integration of laws;
- ineffectual or non-existent cooperation in law enforcement;
- the lack of a participatory approach to formulating policies and laws;
- the lack of involvement of local communities;
- the lack of political support for the enforcement of laws.

The group made the following *recommendations*:

1. To provide for regular review of laws and regulations in the face of the variability and multiplicity of laws at the country level.
2. To diligently enact enabling measures for the appropriate enforcement of laws and regulations.
3. To encourage coordination among enforcement agencies for the better enforcement of laws and regulations for conservation.
4. To provide for education and awareness raising programmes on laws and regulations, especially using local languages.

Institutions and Other Aspects

The group identified the following *constraints, difficulties and weaknesses*:

- clonal reproduction of old services;
- inadequately trained personnel;
- difficulty in valuation of resources and benefits from goods and services provided by PAs, resulting in the low economic and social significance of the sector;
- the lack of an overall approach to funding issues, the need to devise new and innovative ways of fund raising;
- inadequate support for essential activities like research, extension and education.

The group made the following *recommendations*:

1. improve the living and social conditions of PA management personnel through better housing, education, health facilities, salaries and allowances; providing adequate means of transport for conservation activities and interacting with local groups;
2. adjust management styles to new situations and needs, promoting to some extent autonomy, flexibility and initiative;

3. promote linkages with other sectors and alliances among institutions, especially the line institutions dealing with rural development, to build synergies and better use of limited resources;
4. voluntary allocation of resources for rigorous training and retraining modules to develop in cooperation with appropriate training and higher learning institutions in which programmes will encompass social sciences, economic aspects, innovative extension approaches, and aspects relating to rural economies and development;
5. exchanges of personnel among countries to facilitate exchange of practical experience in conservation, rural development and field training.

Funding Mechanisms

The following *constraints* were identified:

- inadequate returns of funds generated by PAs to conservation, PA management and local development;
- low priority in resource allocation.

The group made the following *recommendations*:

1. promote arrangement by which rural development funds would target the development of buffer zones, and conversely conservation programmes to allocate substantive parts of their funding to local community development; this should be achieved through integrated projects linking conservation and rural development.
2. promote activities generating financial returns through non-destructive use of resources, including non-wood forest products for local rural development.
3. design and promote innovative, new resource generating mechanisms including endowment funds, micro-credits, and self-help arrangement.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**BANGLADESH****Mr Mohammad Nurul ALAM**

Member-Director

Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council

Ministry of Agriculture, Farmgate

Tejgaon, Dhaka 1215

Tel. ++8802 9126612 - Fax ++8802 9130844

BOLIVIA/BOLIVIE**Mr Sergio EGUINO BUSTILLOS**

(Servicio Nacional de Areas Protegidas)

Chief of the Unit of Programmes and Projects

Ministry of Sustainable Development and Planning

Av. 20 de Octubre No. 2782

La Paz

Tel. ++591 2 434420 - Fax ++591 2 434540

E-mail: Lpabon@zuper.net**BOTSWANA****Mr Obert GWAPELA**

Wildlife Officer – Chobe Park Manager

Department of Wildlife and National Parks

P.O. Box 17

Kasane

Tel. ++267 651625 - Fax ++267 651623

E-mail: dwnp@gov.bw**CAMEROON/CAMEROUN****Mr Bernard FOSSO**

Chief of Service

Environment and Forestry

Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas

Yaoundé

Tel. ++237 239228 - Fax ++237 239236

CUBA**Mr Antonio PERERA PUGA**

(Director of Protected Areas)

Director

Dirección del Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas

Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente

Calle 18A N° 4114 entre 41 y 47, Miramar, Playa

La Habana

Tel. ++53 7 227970 - Fax ++53 7 240798

E-mail: tonyperera@unepnet.inf.cu

GHANA**Mr Nicholas K. ANKUDEY**

Ag. Executive Director
 Wildlife Division
 Forestry Commission
 Ministry of Lands and Forestry
 P.O. Box M.239
 Accra
 Tel. ++233 21 666129 - Fax ++233 21 666476

GUINEA/GUINEE**Mr Mamadou DIA**

Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts
 Chef, Section Aires Protégées
 Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts
 Ministère de l'agriculture et l'élevage
 B.P. 624
 Conakry
 Tel. ++224 223907

Mr Cécé Papa CONDÉ

Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts et
 Directeur Adjoint Centre Forestier
 Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts
 Centre Forestier de N'Zérékoré
 Ministère de l'agriculture et l'élevage
 B.P. 624
 Conakry
 Tel. ++224 223907
 N'Zérékoré – B.P. 171
 Tel/Fax ++224 910389 - Tel. Sat +874 781 485091

INDIA/INDE**Ms Ruchi BADOLA**

Associate Professor
 Wildlife Institute of India (WII)
 P.O. Box 18
 Chandrabani, Dehra Dun
 Tel. ++91 135 640112 - Fax ++91 135 640117
 E-mail: ruchi@wii.gov.in

Mr B.D. BHAGAT

Principal Chief Conservator of Forests – Bihar
 Ministry of Environment and Forests
 C/o FAO - 55 Lodi Road
 New Delhi
 Tel. ++91 651 500455/503889 - Fax ++91 651 500413

Mr S.K. CHAKRABARTY

Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) and
 Chief Wildlife Warden, Karnataka
 Aranya Bhavan (2nd Floor)
 18th Cross Malleswaram
 Bangalore – 560 003
 Tel. ++91 80 3345846 - Fax ++91 80 3346389
 E-mail: ccfewlfb@bgl.vsnl.net.in

Dr C. DYAVAI AH

Conservator of Forests
 (Wildlife)
 Mysore
 Tel/Fax ++91 821 480110

Mr P.K. SEN

Director Project Tiger
 Ministry of Environment and Forests
 Bihaner House, Annex 5
 Shahjahan Road
 New Delhi 110 011
 Tel. ++91 11 3384695 - Fax ++91 11 3384428
 E-mail: dirpt@envfor.delhi.nic.in

Mr R.C. SHARMA

Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, and
 Managing Director
 M.P.M.F.P. Federation
 Vikas Bhawan, M.P. Nagar, Zone-I
 Bhopal – 462011
 Tel. ++91 755 555869/553245 - Fax ++91 755 552628
 E-mail: mfpfed@mp.nic.in

Mr R.C. SHARMA

Conservator of Forest and
 Field Director, Pench Tiger Reserve
 Seoni (M.P.) 480661
 Tel. ++91 7692 50794 - Fax ++91 7692 50794

Ms Nishi SINGH

Director (Finance)
 Ministry of Environment and Forest
 Paryavaran Bhawan “B” Block
 CGO Complex, Lodi Road
 New Delhi
 Tel. ++91 436 23044/3384175 (home) - Fax ++91 436 9252
 E-mail: nishisingh79@hotmail.com

Mr V.K. SINHA

Chief Wildlife Warden – Kerala
 Forest Headquarters
 Vazhuthacaud - Trivandrum – 695 014
 Kerala
 Tel. ++91 471 322217 - Fax ++91 471 322217

Mr Ram G. SONI

Chief Wildlife Warden - Rajasthan
 4074 Swarn Path, Mansarovar
 Jaipur – 302020
 Tel. ++91 141 380832 - Fax ++91 141 380832

Mr G.A. PATEL

Chief Conservator of Forests
 Gujarat State Forestry Department
 Gandhinagar – 382 001
 Gujarat State
 Tel. ++91 2712 30007 - Fax ++91 2712 21097

Mr Rajeev Kumar TYAGI

Conservator of Forests and Field Director
 Ranthambhore Tiger Project
 Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan
 Tel/Fax ++91 7462 20223
 E-mail: rktvagi@nda.vsnl.net.in

Mr V.K. UNIYAL

Field Director, Project Tiger
 Periyar Tiger Reserve
 Parampuzha, S.H. Mount
 Kottayam, Kerala
 Tel/Fax ++91 481 565940

KENYA**Mr Ali A. KAKA**

Assistant Director, Parks/Reserves
 Kenya Wildlife Service
 P.O. Box 42076
 Nairobi
 Tel. ++254 2 501010 - Fax ++254 2 605828/505866/501752
 E-mail: kws@kws.org
 Website: www.kws.org

MALI**Mr Yafon BERTHE**

Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts
 Conseiller Technique
 Ministère du Développement Rural et de l'Eau
 B.P. 61
 Bamako
 Tel. 222979/233006 - Fax 231023
 E-mail: dnaer@malinet.ml

MOROCCO/MAROC**Mr Mohammed RIBI**

Directeur du Parc National de Souss-Massa
 Direction Régionale des Eaux et Forêts du Sud Ouest
 B.P. 107
 Inezzane
 Tel. ++212 8 333880 - Fax ++212 8 840525

NIGERIA**Mr S.S. AJAYI**

Professor
 Director, Centre for Environmental Protection and
 Natural Resources
 University of Ibadan
 Ibadan
 Tel. 02 8101868
 E-mail: library@kdl.ui.edu.ng

SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD**Mr Mavuso MSIMANG**

Chief Executive
 South African National Parks
 P.O. Box 787
 0001 Pretoria
 Tel. ++27 12 343-9770 - Fax ++27 12 343-9959
 E-mail: mavusom@parks-sa.co.za

Mr Richard PARRIS

Director: Parks
 South African National Parks
 P.O. Box 787
 0001 Pretoria
 Tel. ++27 12 343-9770 - Fax ++27 12 343-2832
 E-mail: rochelled@parks-sa.co.za

SUDAN/SOUDAN**Mr John AWANG AWOK TUT**

Director of Conservation and Tourism within the
 Wildlife Conservation and General Administration
 Ministry of Interior
 P.O. Box 336
 Khartoum
 Tel. ++249 11 772593 – 781864 - Fax ++249 11 770458

TANZANIA/TANZANIE**Mr Simon AWEDA**

Park Warden
 Tanzania National Parks
 Natural Resources and Tourism
 P.O. Box 3134
 Arusha
 Tel. ++255 57 3471/4082 - Fax ++255 57 8216

Mr S.A. KAIHULA

Principal Game Officer
 Wildlife Division
 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
 P.O. Box 1994
 Dar-es-Salaam
 Tel. ++255 51 866408/866418/866375 - Fax ++255 51 865836/863496
 E-mail: Direction of Wildlife – wildlife-division@twiga.com

Mr Adolf B. MATUNGWA

Field Project Officer
 FAO/UNDP/GEF East-African Cross-Border Biodiversity Project
 Plot 47 Old Moshi Road
 P.O. Box 1041
 Arusha
 Tel. ++255 57 8398 - Fax ++255 57 8791
 E-mail: biodiversity@cybernet.co.tz

Mr M.G. MTAHIKO

Principal Park Warden
 Tanzania National Parks
 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
 P.O. Box 3134
 Arusha
 Tel. ++255 57 3471/4082 - Fax ++255 57 8216/4075

Mr W.A. RODGERS

Regional Technical Adviser
 FAO/UNDP/GEF Cross-Border Biodiversity Project
 Plot 47 Old Moshi Road
 P.O. Box 1041
 Arusha
 Tel. ++255 57 8398 - Fax ++255 57 8791
 E-mail: war@twiga.com

THAILAND/THAILANDE**Mr Theerapat PRAYURASIDDHI, Ph.D.**

Technical Forest Official
 Natural Resources Conservation Office
 Royal Forest Department
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 61 Phaholyothin Road
 Chatujak, Bangkok 10900
 Tel. ++66 2 561-4292 ext. 797 and 579-7048 - Fax ++66 2 579-7048
 E-mail: Theerapat@hotmail.com

UGANDA**Mr Saul KAYE**

Deputy Director
 Planning, Monitoring, Research and Concessions
 Uganda Wildlife Authority
 P.O. Box 3530
 Kampala
 Tel. ++256 41 346280/7/8
 E-mail: uwapu@imul.com

Mr Moses OKUA

Deputy Director
 Field Operations
 Uganda Wildlife Authority
 Ministry of Tourism Trade and Industry
 P.O. Box 3530 - Kampala
 Tel. ++256 41 346651

ZIMBABWE**Mr Mark CHIBANDA**

World Health Organization (WHO)
Box CY 348
Causeway, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 728991 - Fax ++263 4 728998

Mr Graham CHILD

Zimbabwe DIFID
11a Old Calton Road
Mount Pleasant, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 304387 - Fax ++263 4 308 569
E-mail: child@africaonline.co.zw

Mr J. CHISIPO

Journalist
12 Mhakure Road - Zengeza 2
Chitungwiza

Ms A.M. CHISHAWA

Ecologist
Box BE 398
Belvedere, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 795461 - Fax ++263 4 790470
E-mail: safire@internet.co.zw

Mr Moses T. CHOTO

Deputy Director (Management and Conservation)
Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management
Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism
P.O. Box CY 140
Causeway, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 724025 - Fax ++263 4 724914
E-mail: nationalparks@gt.a.gov.zw

Mr David GWAZE

Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism
Box HG595
Highlands, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 49878 - Fax ++263 4 497070
E-mail: frchigh@iafrica.harare.com

Mr Charles JONGA

Campfire Association
Mukuvisi Woodlands
Box 661
Harare
Tel. ++263 4 747436
E-mail: cjonga@yahoo.com

Mr W.M. MAKOMBE

Director

Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management

Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism

P.O. Box CY 140

Causeway, Harare

Tel. ++263 4 724027 – 792786/9 - Fax ++263 4 724914

E-mail: nationalparks@gt.gov.zw**Mr M. MATIZHA**

Freelance Journalist

Commonwealth News

Box 3488

Harare

Tel. ++263 4 792721 ext. 31

Mr D. MARONGWE

Assistant Secretary

Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism

P. Bag 7753

Fax ++263 4 748541

E-mail: ozone@gt.gov.zw**Mr S. MATANHIRE**

ART/ZIMTRUST

Planning Officer

P.O. Box 4027

Harare

Tel. ++263 4 722957 - Fax ++263 4 731719

E-mail: matanhire@zimtrust.samara.co.zw**Mr Phillip MAZINGI**

Principal Natural Resources Officer

Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism

Natural Resources

Box CY 385

Causeway, Harare

Tel. ++263 4 705671/705661 - Fax ++263 4 793123

Ms Abby MUGUGU

Programme Officer – Natural Resources and Gender

Zimbabwe Trust/Africa Resources Trust

Box 4027

Belgravia, Harare

Tel. ++263 4 708841 - Fax ++263 4 795150

E-mail: fanik@africaonline.co.zw**Mr C. MUTSIWEGOTA**

Forestry Commission

Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism

Box 467

Bulawayo

Tel. 60989

Ms Lucia MUZA
Principal Research Officer
Ministry of Land and Agriculture
Agronomy Institute
Box CY 550
Causeway, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 704531

Mr Stephan F. OSWALD
Adviser
GTZ
Box 2406
Harare
Tel/Fax ++263 4 498024
E-mail: sfp@harare.iafrica.com

Mr Adam TAUZENI
Freelance Journalist
Zimbabwe Farmer's Magazine (ZFU)
427 Mandela Way
Banket

Mr R.T. TSIKAI
Photographer
Ministry of Information
P.O. Box 8150
Causeway, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 702067

Mr Stephen TSOROTI
Consultant
Zimbabwe Southern Media Features
Box CY 2651
Harare
Tel. ++263 070 22644

Ms Lucy WELFORD
PhD Research Student
UK/Zimbabwe, Cambridge University
37 Lewisan Avenue
Chisipite, Harare
Tel. ++263 4 496621
E-mail: lucy@sirius.icon.co.zw

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE
(IUCN)

Mr Misael KOKWE
Ecosystems Programme Coordinator
IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa
P.O. Box 745
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel. ++263 4 728266/7
E-mail: mak@iucnrosa.org.zw

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

Mr Jinhua ZHANG
 Programme Officer
 Division of Environmental Information, Assessment
 and Early-Warning
 P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi – Kenya
 Tel. ++254 2 623832 - Fax ++254 2 623943
 E-mail: Jinhua.Zhang@UNEP.org

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

Mr Trevor SANKEY
 Programme Specialist in Environmental Sciences
 UNESCO Nairobi Office
 P.O. Box 30592
 Nairobi - Kenya
 Tel. ++254 2 622364 - Fax ++254 2 215991
 E-mail: trevor.sankey@unesco.unon.org

WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE (WWF)

Mr Gonzalo OVIEDO
 Head, People and Conservation Unit
 Avenue du Mont-Blanc
 CH-1196 Gland – Switzerland
 Tel. ++41 22 364-9542 or 364-9506 - Fax ++41 22 364-5829
 E-mail: goviedo@wwfnet.org

Mr Edward B. WILSON
 Regional Representative
 WWF Regional Office for Southern Africa
 10 Lanark Road
 Belgravia, Harare
 Tel. ++263 4 252533/4 - Fax ++263 4 252533/4
 E-mail: ewilson@wwf.org.zw

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

Mr El-Hadji SENE
 Chief
 Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)
 Forest Resources Division, Forestry Department
 00100 Rome, Italy
 Tel. ++39 06 5705 5978 - Fax ++39 06 5705 5137
 E-mail: Elhadji.Sene@fao.org

Mr Douglas WILLIAMSON

Wildlife and Protected Area Management Officer
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)
Forest Resources Division, Forestry Department
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel. ++39 06 5705 2332 - Fax ++39 06 5705 5137
E-mail: Douglas.Williamson@fao.org

Mr Kyran D. THELEN

Senior Forestry Officer
FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, RLC
Casilla 10095
Santiago, Chile
Tel. ++56 2 337-2214 - Fax ++56 2 337 2101
E-mail: Kyran.Thelen@fao.org

Mr P.D. KONE

Senior Forestry Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa, RAF
P.O. Box 1628
Accra, Ghana
Tel. ++233 21 244051 - Fax ++233 21 244076668427
E-mail: pape.kone@fao.org

Mr Michel LAVERDIERE

Forest Conservation Officer
FAO Subregional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa, SAFR
P.O. Box 3730
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel. ++263 4 791407 - Fax ++263 4 700724
E-mail: michel.laverdiere@fao.org

Ms Chipso MOTSI

FAO Secretariat
Subregional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa, SAFR
P.O. Box 3730
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel. ++263 4 780140/5 - Fax ++263 4 700724
E-mail: motsi@zic.co.zw

Ms Lucy LUNA

FAO Secretariat
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)
Forest Resources Division, Forestry Department
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel. ++39 06 5705 3507 - Fax ++39 06 5705 5137
E-mail: lucy.luna@fao.org