

## IPSI Case Study Summary Sheet

### Basic Information

Title of case study <i>(should be concise and within approximately 25 words)</i>			
Conservation for tourism in Kenyan rangelands: a new threat to pastoral community livelihoods			
Submitting IPSI member organization(s)			
Conservation Solutions Afrika			
Other contributing organization(s) <i>(IPSI members and/or non-members)</i>			
Author(s) and affiliation(s)			
Mordecai O. Ogada (Conservation Solutions Afrika)			
Format of case study <i>(manuscript or audiovisual)</i>	Manuscript	Language	English
Keywords <i>(3-5 key concepts included in the case study)</i>			
Kenya, Conservation, Tourism, Wildlife, Pastoral			
Date of submission <i>(or update, if this is an update of an existing case study)</i>		25 August 2016	
Web link <i>(of the case study or lead organization if available for more information)</i>	<a href="https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:5769/SEPLS_in_Africa_FINAL_lowres_web.pdf">https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:5769/SEPLS_in_Africa_FINAL_lowres_web.pdf</a>		

### Geographical Information

Country <i>(where site(s) or activities described in the case study are located – can be multiple, or even “global”)</i>									
Kenya									
Location(s) <i>(within the country or countries – leave blank if specific location(s) cannot be identified)</i>									
Longitude/latitude or Google Maps link <i>(if location is identified)</i>									
<a href="https://www.google.com/maps/@0.1540839,35.6492414,7z?hl=en">https://www.google.com/maps/@0.1540839,35.6492414,7z?hl=en</a>									
Ecosystem(s) <i>(please place an “x” in all appropriate boxes)</i>									
Forest		Grassland	x	Agricultural	x	In-land water		Coastal	
Dryland		Mountain		Urban/peri-urban		Other <i>(Please specify)</i>			
Socioeconomic and environmental characteristics of the area <i>(within 50 words)</i>									
The sites where the majority of these conservancies are located are mainly wildlife habitats in the rangelands of northern and southern Kenya, where the local community are Maa-speaking pastoralists. The geographical and temporal niches exploited by the human and wildlife communities in these areas are maintained by the connectivity of habitats and freedom of human, livestock, and wildlife movement between them.									
Description of human-nature interactions in the area <i>(land-use, traditional resource management practices etc. – within 50 words)</i>									
The main benefits obtained by pastoralists from their environment are pasture and water for the livestock. They also obtain wood for fuel and construction of livestock corrals and houses. These resources are shared with the wildlife populations. These lands are community-owned and commonly grazed.									

## Contents

Status ( <i>"ongoing" or "completed"</i> )	Completed	Period ( <i>MM/YY to MM/YY</i> )	2016
Rationale ( <i>why activities or policies described, or information shared in the case study are needed – within 50 words</i> )			
<p>The creation of social, mechanical, and economic barriers to the free movement that has maintained the biodiversity in these socioecological production landscapes is serious threat to their existence and the diversity they support. The disruption of human societies that have learned to coexist with wildlife will ultimately damage the natural and human environment, an effect that will be felt far beyond the landscapes in question.</p>			
Objectives ( <i>goals of activities or policies described, or of producing the case study – within 50 words</i> )			
<p>The "community-owned" wildlife conservancy model was an idea that emerged from the central theme, "benefits beyond boundaries," of the 2003 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) World Parks Congress held in Durban, South Africa. This study explores how this model and the various interests embedded in it threaten the social and ecological integrity that conserved the wildlife and ecosystems for generations.</p>			
Activities and/or practices employed ( <i>within 50 words</i> )			
Academic study, literature review, field observation.			
Results ( <i>within 50 words</i> )			
<p>The prevailing thinking that currently informs the implementation of conservation projects in Kenya has its origins in the laws and regulations that were put in place by the colonial government to manage wildlife and exclude local people from wildlife areas (but now enforced by non-state actors). This paradigm is largely responsible for the difficulties currently faced in the effective and sustainable management of wildlife and other natural resources in Kenya.</p>			
Lessons learned ( <i>factors in success or failure, challenges and opportunities – within 40 words</i> )			
<p>A major challenge that the proponents of the conservancy model have failed to meet in Kenya is the inclusion of local communities as intellectual participants in conservation; The tourism industry has continued to exert a strong influence over conservation practice in Kenya, as the "primary users" of wildlife populations; Pastoralism existed in the Kenyan rangelands for several centuries before the introduction of structured conservation.</p>			
Key messages ( <i>within 40 words</i> )			
<p>It is important that movements like the International Partnership for Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) identify the reasons for the dominance of tourism interests in the conservation sector in Africa, and reintroduce support for the existing livelihoods that have maintained these ecosystems for centuries.</p>			
Relationship to other IPSI activities ( <i>if the case study is related to any other IPSI collaborative activities, case studies, etc.</i> )			
<p>This case study originally appeared in the publication "Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes in Africa".</p>			
Funding ( <i>any relevant information about funding of activities or projects described in the case study</i> )			

## Contributions to Global Agendas

CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets (<https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the CBD’s Aichi Biodiversity Targets respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

Strategic Goal A				Strategic Goal B					
■	■			■		■			
Strategic Goal C			Strategic Goal D			Strategic Goal E			
■								●	

UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>)

The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the “direct” or “indirect” contributions to the SDGs respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

							■	
■		■			●			