

**A SHORT SUMMARY OF REVENUE SHARING SYSTEMS FROM TOURIST HUNTING IN SELECTED  
AFRICAN COUNTRIES**

Marco Pani

The devolution of ownership or proprietorship of wildlife to communities to allow direct receipt of benefits from consumptive and non-consumptive use (note that communities appear to have few direct benefits from the multi-million-dollar tourism industry) can provide crucial incentives for sustainable wildlife management. The fact that many countries have not fully devolved authority or proprietorship rights to communities but have maintained State ownership over wildlife is a major obstacle to achieve effective wildlife conservation over huge wild areas.

Upon all the greatest threat to conservation of biological diversity in many countries arises from competing forms of land use which in many cases leads to land conversion and to elimination of wild resources and biodiversity..

Ownership and rights of access to resources, legislation and economic incentives should be complimentary in creating a climate which is favorable for sustaining wild animals and their habitats. The one foundation principal of sustainable use of wildlife is this: users are more likely to conserve resources when it is in their interest to do so. Another is: cooperation and participation is preferable over regulation.

In the absence of economic benefits accruing from wildlife, negative attitudes towards it will heighten and may place wildlife population under risk of increased poaching, which may reverse the progress made by many countries to date. To compensate for the direct costs associated with living alongside wildlife, which include crop damage, injury and loss of human life and livestock, wild fauna must yield economic returns to the landholders.

Consequently, wildlife populations will be negatively affected through reduced conservation efforts arising from low funding and goodwill from the communities, when in reality wildlife has the economic potential to raise adequate funds to support itself.

Legal, regulated tourist hunting remains one of the main sources of income for poor, rural communities in African countries that use wildlife as a land-use option.

Removing the economic incentive that tourist hunting provides to rural communities could have disastrous consequences on rural livelihoods, on the continued existence of wildlife, on tolerance of destructive species and on control of poaching.

The following summary shows the various systems for revenue sharing of hunting income with Communities in selected African countries.

**COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT REVENUE SHARING FROM TOURIST SAFARI HUNTING.**

	Namibia	Tanzania	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Mozambique <sup>v</sup>
Title / description of CBNRM program	Namibia Conservancies	Wildlife Management Areas	Game Management Areas	CAMPFIRE Program	Tchuma Tchato, Chepenje Chetu and Niassa CBNRM. <b>NO NATIONAL PROGRAM</b>
Community percentage share of fees	100%	<p>Revenue sharing system</p> <p>Block Fees: WMA 75%; TWPF 25%; DC 0%</p> <p>Game Fees: WMA 45%; TWPF 25%; DC 15%; Treasury 15%</p> <p>Conservation Fees: WMA 45%; TWPF 25%; DC 0%; Treasury 30%</p> <p>Observers Fees: WMA 45%; TWPF 25%; 0%; Treasury 30%</p> <p>Permit Fees: WMA 15%; TWPF 25%; DC 0%; Treasury 60%</p> <p>Tanzania Wildlife Protection Fund(TWPF) District Council(DC)</p>	<p>Trophy Fees: Shared between ZAWA and the respective communities on a 50 – 50 basis.</p> <p>Concession Fees: 20% to communities, 80% to ZAWA</p>	<p>100 percent of all Game fees to program distributed with 55% to wards; 41% to RDC; 4% to CAMPFIRE Assoc.</p>	<p>20% of all trophies and concession fees except in Chipanje Chetu where trophy fees are paid directly to the communities and in the Tchuma Tchato Community Programme (Tete Province), where revenue sharing is dictated by Ministerial Decree 63/2003 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33% Local Communities;</li> <li>• 32% Tchuma Tchato Program Functioning (e.g. Maintaining of three Community anti-poaching Units)</li> <li>• 20% District Government and</li> <li>• 15% INATUR (National Tourism Institute)</li> </ul>
CBNRM Area size	160,244 km <sup>2</sup> (about 19,4% of the country)	27,924 km <sup>2</sup> (roughly 3% of mainland)	167,000 km <sup>2</sup>	50.000 km <sup>2</sup> (12,7% of the country)	36,418 km <sup>2</sup> (4,55% of the country)
Number of inhabitants / beneficiaries of CBNRM	175,000 residents	166 villages inhabited by 480,000 people		777,000 households with 2.4 million children (25% of households in Zimbabwe)	

<p>Number of CBNRM units (districts, WMAs, conservancies...)</p>	<p>79 registered conservancies  1 community conservation association in a national park (Kyaramacan Association, managed like a conservancy)  15 concessions in national parks or on other state land held by 20 conservancies (some shared concessions)  32 registered community forests  66 community rangeland management areas</p>	<p>21 [17 more under development]</p>	<p>36 Game Management Areas (GMAs)</p>	<p>36 Rural District Councils (RDCs) are participating in the CAMPFIRE Programme.</p>	
<p>Other community benefits from tourist safari hunting</p>	<p>Employment, meat.</p>	<p>Employment, meat.</p>	<p>Employment, meat.</p>	<p>Employment, meat.</p>	<p>Employment, meat.</p>
<p>Gratuitous Contributions from Operator and hunting clients.</p>	<p>Variable (This includes, education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes, education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes, education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes, education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>	<p>Variable (This includes, education, health care, water, transport, and more)</p>

Governing legislation/regulations for CBNRM	<p>Nature Conservation Amendment Act No.5 of 1996</p> <p>Forest Act, No. 12 of 2001</p> <p>Communal Land Reform Act, No. 5 of 2002</p> <p>Traditional Authority Act, 2000 No 25 of 2000</p> <p>Environmental Management Act No. 7 of 2007</p>	<p>Wildlife Conservation Act No. 5 of 2009</p> <p>Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) Regulation of 2012</p> <p>Non-Consumptive Wildlife Utilization Regulation of 2008</p>	<p>Zambia Wildlife Act, No. 12 of 1998</p>	<p>Parks and Wildlife Act (1996) amended in 2001</p> <p>Zimbabwe Policy for Wildlife (2000)</p> <p>Wildlife Based Land Reform Policy (2008)</p> <p>Communal Land Act 1982</p> <p>Traditional Leaders Act amendment 2001</p> <p>Rural District Act 1988 amended 2002</p>	<p>Forests and Wildlife Law (10/99)</p> <p>It stipulates that 20% of any revenue collected from the use of forestry products and wildlife in protected areas must be distributed the local communities in the area where the resources were extracted.</p> <p>Law 5/2017 establishing the basic principles and rules on the protection, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity within conservation areas.</p> <p>The Council of Minister shall enact decrees to fix the percentages of the value derived from access fees and use of resources for the benefit of local communities that can not be less than 20%.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	--

*Notes: It must be noted that there are intangible benefits to communities deriving from wildlife use such as the empowerment of local population which is encouraging self-esteem and pride, and reducing dependency on government; the exposure to commercial partners and business approaches for Community-based Organizations that are involved in joint ventures: genuine joint-venture partnerships offer significant long-term benefits to communities in the areas of business skills and operation and specialized marketing.*

*Other intangible benefits include the development of a better understanding and working relationships with government, NGOs, and the private sector. Furthermore, there is evidence that local people place importance on non-material benefits and on the existence of wildlife.*