Negotiation on Biodiversity Conservation and its Future Prospects: Evidence from Tanzania's Burunge Wildlife Management Area

Helene Stephene Francis

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/eastafrica/800>

ISSN: 2790-1076

Publisher

IFRA - Institut Français de Recherche en Afrique

Electronic reference

Helene Stephene Francis, "Negotiation on Biodiversity Conservation and its Future Prospects: Evidence from Tanzania's Burunge Wildlife Management Area", *Les Cahiers d'Afrique de l'Est / The East African Review* [Online], 53 | 2019, Online since 07 January 2020, connection on 09 December 2021.
URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/eastafrica/800>

This text was automatically generated on 9 December 2021.

Les Cahiers d'Afrique de l'Est / The East African Review

Negotiation on Biodiversity Conservation and its Future Prospects: Evidence from Tanzania's Burunge Wildlife Management Area

Helene Stephene Francis

Introduction

- ¹ This paper explores how negotiations amongst actors in Tanzania's Wildlife Management Areas are being practiced and their consequences on the maintenance of biodiversity¹ resources. The main objective is to understand the interaction and negotiation between actors for conservation policy interventions. Biodiversity maintenance can consist of three main types: it can follow a centralized approach, rely on privatization, or depend upon co-management systems (Gaesing 2012). In the 1980s, conservation structures in some parts of the world, including Africa and Asia, shifted from purely protected areas to co-management (Ibid.). This shift reflected empirical studies on natural resources indicating that purely protected areas had a negative impact on the surrounding communities and caused tension (Ibid.; Lamarque et al. 2009). McNeely (2002) notes that such areas are characterized by a lack of harmonization in conservation interventions, resulting in tensions, grievances and conflicts. Dewu (2016) adds that insufficient negotiations and exclusion of local communities in the maintenance and use of resources exacerbate conflicts. Based upon these shortfalls, the idea emerged that it was crucial to take into account the practices and expectations of the communities living close to or in the protected areas (Bragagnolo et al. 2016; Sylvester 2016). For instance, in the 1980s and 1990s, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) supported the integration of conservation

and human development activities to enhance the sustainability of biodiversity resources (Neumann 1997; Nelson et al. 2007).

- 2 In addition, the Brundtland Commission of Environmental and Development (1987) advocated for increased interaction between actors in conservation-related policy intervention in order to promote the sustainable use of resources. Different conventions were introduced with a similar objective, such as the Rio de Janeiro climate convention (1992), the Kyoto Protocol (1998); Copenhagen Climatic Convention (Namangaya 2011), and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Both these conventions and global agendas seek to increase the role of local communities in the protection of natural resources as well as for the use of resources. Resources maintenance requests that communities take part in conservation interventions and benefit from them (Kicheleri et al. 2018; Sulle et al. 2011; Moyo et al. 2016; Namangaya 2016). As a consequence of these new international conservation discourses, reinforced through the formulation of policies like Forest Policy 1998, Wildlife Policy of 1998, Forest Act 2002, National Environmental Policy of 1997, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action of 2001, Wildlife Act 2009, a number of programmes have been implemented that aim to increase the inclusion of local communities in conservation policy interventions.
- 3 In Africa, countries like Zambia, South Africa, Botswana and Namibia have successfully managed to integrate local communities (Wilfred 2010; Kicheleri et al. 2018). In others, like Tanzania, the conservation of wildlife resources is less successful. Relevant literature shows that decision-making regarding resource conservation is too centralized (Nelson et al. 2007; Nelson 2011; Benjaminsen et al. 2013) and most conservation interventions in rural areas are met with resistance because of limited access to resource use rights, unfair share of resources, and corruption (Nelson 2011; Benjaminsen et al. 2012; 2013). These outcomes contradict the Tanzania Wildlife Policy of 1998 that stipulates local community consultation, participation and empowerment through resource management. The policy also supports local communities by giving them wildlife user rights, enhancing their engagement and taking responsibility in conservation activities (Shauri, 1999). Lastly, it adopted the establishment of WMAs in order to support conservation of wildlife resources within community land (Kicheleri et al. 2018). Yet, it has been shown that the requirements for establishing the WMAs lack efficiency and may result in too much paperwork (Shauri 1999). These requirements include: call for a village assembly in order to negotiate and agree upon the establishment of a WMA based on Village Council recommendations; after the agreement, villages form a Community-Based Organization (CBO) and register it; the CBO prepares a strategic plan; the respective village prepares a land use plan which then must be surveyed and registered; prepared land use plans are subjected to Environmental Impact Assessment; village prepare by-laws to support the land use plans; the CBO prepares a Resource Management Zone Plan; the CBO applies to the Director of Wildlife for AA status; CBO/AA applies for user rights; CBO/AA enters into investment agreements; thus investment in WMA established depends on the Environmental Impact Assessment. The engagement of actors with varied interests and expectations require intense and repeated negotiations in the sense of “a process of combining conflicting positions into a common position” (Alfredson and Cungu 2008) in fostering policy implementation (Blasiak et al. 2017). Considering that none of Tanzania’s WMAs have been free from conflicts nor successful in fostering resource

maintenance adequately, this paper seeks to understand negotiations concerned with WMAs as an arena in which different actors have different interests and capacities to influence decision-making and implementation. These differential interests and capacities explain why, unlike conceptions of negotiation as an equal and democratic process, actors involved use the different instruments available to them to try to fulfill their own interests, sometimes even resorting to manipulation, intimidation, and concealment of information etc. The identification of the actors involved, their role and resource contribution, and the actual negotiation that took place is based on the in-depth exploration of a case study,² the Burunge Wildlife Management Area situated in Babati District, Manyara region, in northern Tanzania.

The Burunge Wildlife Management Area

- 4 The Burunge Wildlife Management Area (BWMA) can be accessed through the Great North-South National road. It occupies almost 283 km² of the Babati District. Over the years, it has been used as a corridor for wildlife movement, as wild animals move between Lake Manyara and Tarangire National Park. Burunge is one of the areas in Tanzania earmarked for the conservation of wildlife resources due to its location.

Map 1: Location of the study area

- 5 Currently, the BWMA is composed of ten villages with an estimated total population of 35,000 people.³ These villages are Mwada, Minjingu, Vilima Vitatu, Magara, Olasiti, Sangaiwe, Kakoi, Maweni, Manyara and Ngolei. The area is inhabited by different ethnic groups. Some are demographically dominant, like the Maasai, Mbugwe, Waarusha, Barbaig, Iraqw, Nyiramba and Nyaturu. Some ethnic groups have migrated

in the area, such as the Bene, Hehe, Safwa, Manda, Nyakyusa, Kisii, Jaluo and Rundi who come from within or outside the country.

- 6 The study was conducted in the three semi-arid villages of Magara, Minjingu and Vilimavitu. The selection of the three villages for data collection regarding the BWMA and the negotiation process relied upon the high prevalence of conflicts in Minjingu and Vilimavitu and high immigration rates in Magara. In these villages, economic activities depend on farming and livestock keeping (Moyo et al 2016). The main animals kept are cattle, goats, sheep and monkeys and the crops produced include both cash crops (rice, sunflower, sesame, onion, garlic and cotton) and food crops (maize, sorghum, beans, and finger millet). Maize, rice and beans are mostly produced in Magara. A majority of residents in Minjingu and Vilimavitu are either pastoralists and or agro-pastoralists. Some people are involved in other activities such as handcraft, petty trading, beekeeping, fishing, hunting, casual work, etc.
- 7 The process of establishing BWMA started in 2003 and continued until 2006. According to Kicheleri et al. (2018), it followed the Wildlife Management Area Regulation of 2002 which was revised in 2005 and 2012. It was also developed following the Wildlife Conservation Act no. 5 and no. 12 (Kicheleni et al. 2018).

Actors in Burunge WMA

- 8 Several actors with different roles and interests in BWMA were revealed as indicated in table 1. The government and NGOs are part of them, both of whom are interested in promoting conservation. However, grassroots actors including pastoralists and farmers are keen to have more land for grazing and farming respectively. Others, like hand craft makers, see the importance of conservation but need to access doum palm material freely. Concerning the interaction of actors in the WMA arena, one key informant at Villimavitu said:

We are lucky that we have many people to interact with but we have different views with regard to conservation. At the beginning we were told that after contributing our land we shall enjoy a lot of benefits, but this has not happened, especially for most of us poor [people].

- 9 With these claims, Kamanzi (2007) and Gareau (2012) contended that different actors in development policy interventions interact with different perspectives, mandates, experiences, views and objectives, as they originate from different backgrounds. Scholars in natural resources conservation argued that actors' interaction have socially increased complexity, particularly on resource governance and conflicts (Nelson et al. 2007). According to Kicheleri et al. (2018) local communities expected to have direct benefits attained from their land converted into conservation. However, since 2006 their expectations and promises from District officials remain uncertain.

S/ n	Actors	Role	Resources	Interests
---------	--------	------	-----------	-----------

1	Local communities (farmers, livestock keepers, herbalists, traders)	Participate in selecting representatives Propose different land uses Make sure their activities do not obstruct wildlife resources	Provide and decide on appropriate land for conservation	Benefit from conservation; Undertake their activities without any interference; Access basic needs from conservation area with no kind of objection
2	Village assembly	To engage all community members in decision making and approving the size of the land to be allocated for conservation and other uses	Provide land and make decision	To promote community participation in decision-making; Ensure the interests of local communities and benefit from conservation interventions
3	JUHIBU*leaders	Prepare annual report; Share the report with selected community members and District Prepare monthly and quarterly reports Oversee management of WMA and benefit are shared accordingly	Provide assistance such as advice, Ensure allocation of revenue Support local communities in access to resources wherever is needed	Conservation of wildlife resources Ensure equal share of revenue by community members under association Advise member association on the use of revenue
4	District council	Enforcement of laws; Oversee the management of conservation areas; Participate in meetings prepared by JUHIBU	Provide advice and education on the importance of conservation; Provide assistance especially when there is a problem of human encroachment and whenever wildlife encroach on local communities farm	Protection of wildlife; To see actors follow the established laws and regulations
5	Investors (Business operator: ChemChem lodge, Maramboi and Osupuko lodge)	Entering into contracts with the AA to undertake business	Attract tourists; Provide tourism services	Generate and increase profit from wildlife conservation activities

6	Wildlife Division	Responsible for making rules for WMA management	Make rules and submit to the Ministry responsible for Natural resources	To see rules are adhered to
7	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	Receive rules from Wildlife Division	Provide technical support, Approve rules	Support implementation of laws and guidelines
8	Non-Governmental Organizations			
	AWF	Financial and Technical support	Financial support establishment of WMA and, Early funding for construction of JUHIBU* buildings	Interested in conservation of natural resources
	Chemchem Association Foundation	Anti-poaching Enforcement of laws related to conservation of natural resources	Training the community against illegal poaching	Promote conservation and laws responsible for the management of Wildlife resources
	Honey Guide Foundation	Training Village Game scout to resolve Human Wildlife Conflict	Resolving conflict related to HWC	Support conservation
9	Authorized Association	Managing WMA on behalf of the villagers	Connect the local communities and other actors (District, Central government and NGOs working in the area)	Interested in conservation of wildlife Ensure benefits are shared by member association

*JUHIBU: *Jumuiya ya Hifadhi Burunge* is the Swahili name for the Burunge Wildlife Management Area (BWMA)

Source: Field data 2019.

Actor's Role and Resources

- 10 According to the JUHIBU secretary, actors have diverse roles in supporting the conservation of wildlife resources. At village level, community members determine and propose different land uses including land for WMA, whilst the village assembly approves the land use plan. The Ministry of Natural resources and Tourism is responsible for approving rules prepared by Wildlife Division and overseeing its enforcement in collaboration with the local authorities. According to discussion with key informants,⁴ The Wildlife Division has different roles, such as policy formulation, regulation and coordination of conservation activities in collaboration with other stakeholders e.g. African Wildlife Foundation (AWF). These roles are similar to those discussed in the work by Kicheleri et al. (2018). While responding to the question of the

role of actors, a Wildlife Officer acknowledged that, “each of them act accordingly, except local communities in some villages take more time to develop land uses like Vilimavitatu.”

- 11 However, the District Town planner declared that the local community’s roles are influenced by groups and individual interests which are not yet harmonized. According to the Wildlife policy of 1998, the local community has the mandate to plan for their land in collaboration with higher levels of decision-making. Yet researchers see that decisions with respect to conservation are still centralized (Nelson et al. 2007; Nelson 2011; Benjaminsen et al. 2013). Scholars Noel and Kangalawe (2015) quoted from Bruns (2003), argue that actors can fully exercise their role if they are empowered to participate in policy interventions.

Awareness and Negotiation on the Establishment of Burunge WMA

- 12 Awareness creation remains a crucial element in negotiating development intervention practices. According to the Wildlife officer it was first made in order to familiarize the whole community with the program. However, the three villages included in this study had different impressions concerning awareness creation, as an interviewee from Magara explained:

Officers from the district provided us with education on how to manage wildlife around our area. However, I do not know exactly what policy the officials used because we were not given any written documentation to direct us during the awareness campaign.

- 13 Responding on the same issue, in the group discussion one interviewee is quoted as saying:

The education provided by district officials made us aware of the importance of wildlife, although the education needs to be continuous to get clearer information about conservation and the benefits.

- 14 However, Minjingu village had different perceptions with regards to awareness creation, as was illustrated by the Chairman.

We as members of Minjingu, cannot fool you; after meeting with district officers, they explained the intention of the WMA. Following their explanation, we found it might be a good idea, however we asked the officers if we can join the WMA, but we first need to know the contribution of other villages before we make our decision.

- 15 In responding to the similar issue, one person explained that:

We have never been member of WMA, why... These people intended to grab our land because they could not listen to our opinion, and if they wanted us to be part of WMA they could come back and make a clear agreement. But because of their hidden intention, they decided to grab even our investor without our consent.

- 16 Before the commencement of WMA, Minjingu village had its own investor where the village came to agreements concerning the investment and revenue. Unfortunately, after the establishment of WMA, the investor was now paying revenue to the district council.

- 17 In Vilimavitatu village, one elder was quoted as saying that:

Awareness with regards to conservation of wildlife and the surrounding environment was carried out. These officers informed us of the requirement for the

establishment of WMA including; preparation of land use, determine our own land uses and setting aside areas for conservation, prepare bylaws and form association groups.

Concerning the policy, the respondent continues to argue that, “I do remember the policies that were introduced.”

- 18 According to the Wildlife district officer, the awareness campaign was carried out in order to familiarize the community with the Wildlife policy and conservation practices. However, both the discussion and in-depth interviews give the impression that the majority are not clear about the conservation policies. Some literature, Martini et al. (2017), suggests that proper awareness creation has great and long-term consequences regarding the implemented project. The thesis further contends that clear understanding of the project makes the community active in resource maintenance and improving their wellbeing. However, community awareness in the visited villages seem to be only partially done, hence active participation is lacking in Minjingu and Vilimavitatu. These views are in line with Kamaruddin et al. (2016) who point out that, limited awareness among actors in conservation areas may reduce their effectiveness in policy implementation. Likewise, Steg et al. (2014) regard awareness as very important in the management of environment, however, it may or may not influence the engagement of actors. This shows that there are some factors which can influence actor's decisions, like social norms, financial resources and psychological effects (Kamaruddin et al. 2016) quoted from (Zsoka et al. 2013).

Equal Benefits Sharing

- 19 There is evidence that entire communities, especially villages under WMA, have experienced some benefits associated with conservation, excluding villages which have not signed the agreement. Despite the benefits accrued, the revenue collected has been used for development activities such as construction of school classes, toilets, village and ward offices. Table 2 indicates the amount of revenue collected annually, expenditure and what is distributed to each village. However, despite the benefit shared, Minjingu village is an exceptional case, as explained by JUHIBU Secretary, Wildlife Officer and some community members during data collection. The study noted that, although Minjingu appears in the list of villages under WMA, it has never received any money since its inception. Surprisingly, Minjingu as a village has never joined or worked with WMA. Yet the government minutes at district office indicates that the village signed an agreement to join WMA. Nevertheless, the interview carried out with one of the elders in this area claimed that,
- 20 “The former chairman and member who were sent to investigate other villages before joining WMA used to sign false agreements without community consent, the document indicates that the agreement for Minjingu joining the WMA was illusory. The chairman added that “those people who signed the agreement had bad intentions.” On the contrary, JUHIBU secretary argued that, “Minjingu, because of constant conflicts going on and its misconception of the WMA, has not followed the procedures, thus the village has not received any revenue since its inception but their share is kept until when they are ready to follow the required procedures. The secretary further noted that, the district officers together are trying to negotiate with Minjingu, in order to join WMA and enjoy the benefits obtained from conservation intervention.

- 21 In the discussion, the Wildlife District Officer argued that, “Minjingu had a different notion of benefitting compared to others, and due to selfishness, they wanted first to know what other villages will contribute.” The study revealed that Minjingu had entered into a contract with a tour operator and enjoyed benefits before the WMA enterprise. The emerging concern here is equal share of resources without clear information on the contribution of each member.
- 22 The explanation above shows how officials contribute to grievances and conflicts, because of unclear information spreading to grass root level. Similarly, Wertheim (2002) points out that actors sometimes may withhold information in order to further their own interests. On the contrary, Alfredson and Cungu (2008) show that negotiations play a vital role in communicating issues pertaining to actors’ engagement, solving problems and helping to create opportunities during policy implementation.
- 23 Generally, different villages have different perceptions regarding the revenue obtained from WMA. For instance, Magara appreciate the amount that they receive each year as shown in Table 1. However, such contribution has been used for development activities only. Individuals have never enjoyed the money obtained from conservation of wildlife resources. Overall discussion and key informant interviews indicated that individual members and group member association are yet to benefit from WMA. Despite the objective of WMA being to benefit community members and improve their livelihood, community members complain that life is tough, and poverty has increased. Although people are complaining, the revenue collected is used for development activities, which community members were supposed to donate towards. This study’s findings reflect Namangaya (2016) who noted that conservation has reduced the individual contributions needed for development activities, such as the construction of village offices, classes and school toilets.

Financial year	Collection	Expenditure	Shared with Member villages	Revenue enjoyed by each village	Number of Villages
2006-2007	37,496,988.00	8,296,411.00	18,748,494.00	2,083,166.00	9
2007-2008	75,256,890.00	24,243,022.00	37,628,445.00	4,703,555.00	8
2008-2009	64,595,376.00	34,211,010.00	32,297,688.00	3,588,632.00	9
2009-2010	227,618,815.00	101,338,183.00	113,809,407.00	11,380,940.00	10
2010-2011	391,459,764.00	150,325,192.00	195,729,882.00	19,572,988.00	10
2011-2012	473,738,859.93	175,940,789.00	236,869,429.00	26,318,825.50	9
2012-2013	275,430,040.00	163,041,379.00	137,715,020.00	13,771,502.00	10
2013-2014	412,593,088.50	175,515,557.51	206,296,544.25	20,629,654.00	10
2014-2015	820,945,000.00	290,810,232.10	410,472,500.00	41,047,250.00	10
2015-2016	795,272,230.00	383,923,202.82	397,636,115.00	39,763,611.00	10
2016-2017	1,268,810,655.00	460,869,316.22	634,405,327.50	63,440,532.75	10

Source: Burunge CBO report 2018.

Negotiation on Land Uses

- 24 According to the District Planning Officer, over 95% of the residents in Burunge are agro-pastoralists and farmers. Land resources are therefore very important for achieving their day-to-day needs. Despite such importance, land has been a scarce resource due to the population increase (both human population and animals as shown in Table 3 & 4). According to the Village Executive Officer (VEO) of Magara, the population has increased, for instance in 2007 the village consisted of around 900 people, but now the village is estimated to have a population of 4,000 people.

	Population of each village					
Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Village						
Vilimavitatu	3,522	3,665	3,784	3,905	4,032	4,161
Minjingu	2,911	3,038	3,136	3,237	3,342	3,450
Magara	3,356	3,503	3,615	3,732	3,852	3,977

Source: District Planning Officer, 2019

		Total							
Year		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Village name	Type of animals								
Vilima-vitatu	Cows	5,578	5,718	5,991	6,115	6,238	6,360	6,483	6,920
	Goats	6019	5,356	6,594	6824	7056	7,284	7,286	7,521
	Sheep	415	481	502	592	621	695	727	792
	Donkey	75	82	86	98	102	110	123	126
Magara	Cows	532	557	590	710	834	832	959	1,088
	Goats	508	610	617	619	629	626	875	937
	Sheep	178	205	259	273	300	321	347	382
	Donkey	30	33	38	42	47	50	50	53
Minjingu	Cows	9,514	9,739	9,869	10,003	10,129	10,256	10,256	10,380
	Goats	3,947	4,124	4,346	4,580	4,800	5,030	5,264	5,498
	Sheep	1723	1998	2038	2124	2,415	2519	2665	2879
	Donkey	138	150	188	203	217	252	261	295

Source: Livestock officer, 2019

- 25 While responding to the issue of land uses and its scarcity, the District Wildlife Officer declared that the population has increased in recent years due to the birth rate and migration of people from Babati, Arusha, Kilimanjaro and other places. This increase has been caused by a lack of internal control. Other reasons for such an increase in

population are likely to be the presence of arable land in Magara and the potential area for livestock keeping in Minjingu and Vilimavitatu. However, the district is negotiating with some villages to develop and/or redevelop a land use plan in order to accommodate the increased population as well managing wildlife resources.

- 26 Conversely, in Vilimavitatu, redevelopment of the land use plan has been in the process but has been prolonged due to the existence of bush lawyers. According to the Wildlife officer, bush lawyers influence community members, advising not to accept the plan because more land will be used for conservation. On a similar note, the District Town planner indicates that the land use plan in Vilimavitatu is in chaos because the majority need their land to be planned for grazing rather than other uses. During an in-depth interview, it was revealed that negotiations on land uses and land use plan has consumed so much time because community members request the district to reduce the conserved land for other uses.
- 27 Map 2 shows the percentage of land contributed by each village. For instance, the Vilimavitatu conservation area occupies 65.7 while Magara occupies 14.3%. According to the Wildlife Policy, land use plans promote sustainable use and empower local communities to appropriately decide on different uses (Noel and Kangalawe 2015) quoted from (URT 1998). However, Moyo et al. (2016) show that in Vilimavitatu, facilitators used to suggest land for conservation especially in areas in which local communities found to be less productive. Areas suggested by officials, especially those bordering Tarangire National Park and wildlife migratory routes in those days, are today perceived by local communities as being important for farming and livestock activities. Decisions made by officials reflect Wertheim's (2002) argument that, in negotiation process, some actors may manipulate, force or sometimes withhold information in order to meet their own interests.
- 28 In Minjingu, the land use plan has been developed since 1997, when Kakoi and Olasiti was part of Minjingu. According to the Wildlife officer, the two villages, Kakoi and Olasiti, were formed out of Minjingu village, yet up to now lack their own land use. According to the Chairman at Minjingu, "District leaders have forced these two villages to form so as to take our land easily." Nevertheless, the discussion with pastoralists at Minjingu see the conservation as an important activity, but do propose the area to be reduced so as to get more pasture land that may contribute more directly to individual and household livelihood.

Map 2: Burunge WMA and Percentage of land by each village

Conclusion

- 29 Negotiations on biodiversity conservation under Burunge WMA amongst actors are found to be less able to support the active engagement of actors, particularly local communities. This has been attributed to several reasons. The first reason is the interaction of actors with divergent interests and power relations. Generally, actors from the government and Non-Governmental Organizations negotiate and emphasize their interests, rather than realizing the need and expectation of the local communities, thus interfering with the maintenance and proper use of resources. Therefore, clear negotiation amongst actors on land uses and the benefits to be obtained is crucial as it has a great impact on conservation as well as the local community's livelihood. The local community should also be empowered in decision making, in order to be able to determine their own land for various uses whilst projecting future demand based on the changes that are taking place.

The author gratefully acknowledges support for this work from IFRA who supported financially during data collection. Second, the author wishes to thank the supervisors Dr. Ally Hassan Namangaya for great discussion during proposal development and Makarius Victor Mdemu. Also the author is grateful to the officers at Babati district council and respondents from Minjingu, Vilimavitatu and Magara village for their cooperation during data collection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfredson, T., & Cungu, A. 2008. *Negotiation Theory and Practice: A Review of the Literature*. Rome: FAO.
- Benjaminsen, T.A., Goldman, M.J., Minwary, M.Y., & Maganga, F.P. 2013. "Wildlife Management in Tanzania: State Control, Rent Seeking and Community Resistance." *Development and Change*, 44 (5): 1087-1109.
- Benjaminsen, T.A., Goldman, M.J., Minwary, M.Y., & Maganga, F.P. 2012. "Wildlife Management in Tanzania: Recentralization, Rent Seeking, and Resistance." *Geoforum*.
- Blasiak, R., Durussel, C., Pittman, J., Snit, C.A., Petersson, M., & Yagi, N. 2017. "The Role of NGOs in Negotiating the Use of Biodiversity in Marine Areas beyond National Jurisdiction." *Marine Policy*, no. 81: 1-8.
- Bragagnolo, C., M. Pereira, K. Ng, & H. Calado. 2016. "Understanding and Mapping Local Conflicts Related to Protected Areas in Small Islands: A Case Study of the Azores Archipelago." *Island Studies Journal* 11 (1): 57-90.
- Derkyi, M.A.A. 2012. *Fighting over Forest: Interactive Governance of Conflicts over Forest and Tree Resources in Ghana's High Forest Zone*. Leiden: African Studies Centre. <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.390956>
- Dewu, S. 2016. "Fringe Community Attitudes and Protected Areas. Insights from two Protected Areas in Ghana." Master's thesis, NTNU.
- Gaesing, K., ed. 2012. *Collaborative Protected Area Management: Lessons from Sub-Saharan Africa*. Dortmund: SPRING Research Series no. 57.
- Gaesing, K., ed. 2009. *Reconciling Rural Livelihood and Biodiversity Conservation: Lessons from Research and Practice*. Dortmund: SPRING Research Series no. 52.
- Gareau, B.J. 2012. "Worlds Apart: A Social Theoretical Exploration of Local Networks, Natural Actors, and Practitioners of Rural Development in Southern Honduras." *Sustainability* 4 (7): 1596-1618.
- Hall, C.M. 2010. "Tourism and Biodiversity: More Significant than Climate Change?" *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 5 (4): 253-266.
- Kamanzi, A. 2007. *Our Way: Responding to the Dutch Aid in the District Rural Development Program of Bukoba Tanzania*. Leiden: African Studies Centre. <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/12886>
- Kamaruddin, S.M., P. Ahmad & N. Alwee. 2016. "Community Awareness on Environmental Management through Local Agenda 21 (LA21)." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, no. 222: 729-737.
- Martini, U., F. Buffa, & S. Notaro. 2017. "Community Participation, Natural Resource Management and the Creation of Innovative Tourism Products: Evidence from Italian Networks of Reserves in the Alps." *Sustainability* 9 (12): 2314.
- McNeely, J. A. 2002. "Overview: Biodiversity, Conflict and Tropical Forests." *Conserving the Peace: Resources, Livelihoods, and Security*: 31-55.
- Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J.F. 2016. "Failure by Design? Revisiting Tanzania's Flagship Wildlife Management Area Burunge." *Conservation and Society* 14 (3): 232.

- Namangaya, A.H. 2016. "Community Based Conservation and Poverty Alleviating: Rhetoric and Reality in Northern Tanzania Tourism Hub." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Review* 2 (2).
- Namangaya, A.H. 2011. *Resource Use Conflicts in Protected Coastal Areas, Their Origin and Management Options: The Case of Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park, Tanzania*. Technische Universität Dortmund. Faculty of spatial planning. International spatial planning centre (ISPC).
- Nelson, F., R. Nshala & W. Rodgers 2007. "The Evolution and Reform of Tanzanian Wildlife Management." *Conservation and Society* 5 (2): 232-261.
- Neumann, R. 1997. "Primitive Ideas: Protected Area Buffer Zones and the Politics of Land in Africa." *Development and Change* 28 (3): 559-582.
- Noe, C., & R.Y. Kangalawe. 2015. "Wildlife Protection, Community Participation in Conservation, and (Dis)Empowerment in Southern Tanzania." *Conservation and Society* 13 (3): 244.
- Salomaa, A. 2017. "Actors' Roles and Perceptions on the Opportunities to Increase Nature Conservation Effectiveness: A Study of Interaction between Knowledge and Policy Process." *Dissertation es Schola Doctoralis Scientiae Circumiectalis, Alimentariae, Biologicae*.
- Simpson, R.D. 2002. *Definitions of Biodiversity and Measures of its Value*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Steg, L., J.W. Bolderdijk, K. Keizer, & G. Perlaviciute. 2014. "An Integrated Framework for Encouraging Pro-Environmental Behaviour: The Role of Values, Situational Factors and Goals." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, no. 38, 104-115.
- Sulle, E., E. Lekaita, & F. Nelson. 2011. "From Promise to Performance? Wildlife Management Areas in Northern Tanzania." In *Tanzania Natural Resource Forum and Maliasili Initiatives, Arusha*.
- Swingland, I.R. 2000. "Biodiversity, Definition of." *Encyclopedia of Biodiversity* no. 1: 377-391.
- Sylvester, O., A.G. Segura, & I.J. Davidson-Hunt. 2016. "The Protection of Forest Biodiversity Can Conflict with Food Access for Indigenous People." *Conservation and Society* 14 (3): 279.
- United Republic of Tanzania. 1998. *National Wildlife Policy*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers.
- United Republic of Tanzania. 1998. *National Forest Policy*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers.
- United Republic of Tanzania. 1997. *National Environmental Policy*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers.
- United Republic of Tanzania. 2002. *National Forest Act*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printers.
- Vihemäki, H. 2006. *Developments and Conflicts of Forest Conservation in Africa: Participatory Approaches and Forest Control in the East Usambaras, Tanzania*. Helsinki: Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki.
- Wertheim, E. 2002. "Negotiations and Resolving Conflicts: An Overview." Boston (MA): College of Business Administration, Northeastern University. <http://web.cba.neu.edu/~ewertheim/interper/negot3.htm> [archive]
- Wilfred, P. 2010. "Towards Sustainable Wildlife Management Areas in Tanzania." *Tropical Conservation Science* 3 (1): 103-116.

NOTES

1. Biodiversity is described as the varieties of all forms of life on earth, including different living organism. It includes both biotic organism and biotic processes (Simpson 2002; Swingland 2001).
 2. This qualitative study relies upon recorded data from both in-depth interviews and focus group discussion in Swahili. Key informants were farmers, livestock keepers, handcraft makers and hunters as well as BWMA leaders, district officials, village executive officers and ward Executive officers. The data collected were analyzed through content analysis.
 3. Discussion with District Planning officer in 2019.
 4. District Wildlife officer and JUHIBU secretary.
-

ABSTRACTS

This study was carried out in order to understand negotiation amongst actors in the Burunge Wildlife Management Area (BWMA) in Tanzania. It adopted a qualitative approach of negotiation amongst the diverse actors involved, who have different roles and interests, in conservation policy interventions. Firstly, results show that negotiation processes during awareness campaigns amongst the communities targeted lacked consensus because of inadequate information. Secondly, without clear positioning on the share of resources and land rights, notably taking future changes into consideration, unintended and undesirable outcomes occurred. The study concludes that the overall negotiation made lacked an appropriate platform for consensus to be reached, leaving aside the interests of the local communities. Therefore, it recommends that for the future endurance of wildlife management areas in general, negotiation amongst actors should be explicit, with a clear platform on agreed terms.

INDEX

Keywords: biodiversity, conservation, Wildlife Management Area, Burunge, Tanzania

Geographical index: Tanzania | Tanzanie