https://prism.ucalgary.ca

Open Theses and Dissertations

2014-05-01

A Comparative Policy Framework Analysis of the Impact of International Environmental Agreements and Processes on Local Community Development in Kenya

Ouko, Evans Mark

Ouko, E. M. (2014). A Comparative Policy Framework Analysis of the Impact of International Environmental Agreements and Processes on Local Community Development in Kenya (Doctoral thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada). Retrieved from https://prism.ucalgary.ca. doi:10.11575/PRISM/24668 http://hdl.handle.net/11023/1473 Downloaded from PRISM Repository, University of Calgary

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

A Comparative Policy Framework Analysis of the Impact of International Environmental Agreements and Processes on Local Community Development in Kenya

by

Evans Mark Ouko

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

APRIL 2014

© Evans M. Ouko 2014

Abstract

Policy and technological factors outside the immediate boundaries of environmental resource areas are increasingly viewed as critical to the outcomes of chosen management strategies. In particular, the derivation of commons policy by most developing countries from a similar set of international treaties and processes often results in uncertain and unintended consequences on local development. I undertook a multi-scalar policy analysis case study with a mixed methods approach of Kenya forestry governance by examining how external factors influence national policies and selected local community development projects in order to contribute to theory and programmatic improvements. Political ecology was adopted as the broad investigative tool toward multiple socially constructed realities for different actors. Study participants were located at local, national and international agency levels with a focus on international treaties and processes impacting on forest governance.

I found that international actors had, in practice, acquired significant stake-holding of contested forest areas in Kenya through their categorization as globally significant biodiversity habitats. The emergence of horizontal and vertical networks and coalitions propagated skewed power relationships in the new multilevel management arrangements. Normative goals of international environmental treaties aimed at benefitting local communities were routinely superseded by higher level interests with preference for the maintenance of the status quo such as neoliberal-informed and centralized commons management.

I recognized the centrality of a shared commons in the rural development agenda and the need to adopt more redistributive contextualized policies and intervention programs that give relevance to accepted and relevant local cultural practices if more sustainable outcomes are to be achieved. More collaborative efforts and linkages at vertical and horizontal levels within and between Community Forest Associations, development cooperatives at regional and national levels, and deliberate linkages to international nongovernmental organizations that support their beliefs in practice will be critical in reversing the power

i

imbalances observed in forest governance. Because ICDPs have evolved into major development mechanisms in Kenya's overall development process I recommended that a comprehensive and inclusive political definition of its boundaries and aims should be undertaken in order to rationalize its operations within the overall development agenda.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and encouragement of many individuals. I wish to thank Dr. Dianne Draper, my supervisor, for the helpful advice, critical insights and constant encouragement that helped to bring this work to a successful conclusion. Dr. Miriam Grant, my co-supervisor, for the belief, help and advice right from the beginning of the program. I would like to acknowledge the important influence that Dr. Conny Davidsen (who served as both my co-supervisor and supervisor during the first five years of my program) had in helping me to shape and formulate the critical study questions of this academic journey. I would like to thank Dr. Davidsen in particular for her insights and critique that helped to shape and complete chapter 7 and for her commentary in initiating chapter 6. To my thesis committee member, Dr. Chui-Ling Tam, and the entire Department of Geography academic staff for challenging my worldviews and helping me to see the world in new, more interesting ways. To all the departmental support staff, in particular, Ms Paulina Medori who helped to make the rough journey of the graduate student so much smoother. I wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for the timely scholarship support that vitally both eased and enriched this study. I would be remiss not to thank Rita Yembilah, Sarah Skett, Tatenda Mambo and Chris Moxham, my colleagues in arms for the endless academic discussions and banter alike that helped to bring smiles in the face of academic adversity. I wish to thank all the study participants at community, state and international levels who volunteered their time and shared experiences with so much enthusiasm in the hope of contributing to a better development in Kenya and beyond. I would also like to thank all family and friends who always believed in me, encouraged me when I was down, and pushed me when I slowed down. I heard them all loud

iii

and clear from Kenya, Jamaica and Canada. And finally my gratitude to my wife and partner in life, Claudia, the one who I lean to at all times. This is as much her effort as mine.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to the memory of my late father, Benjamin Muga Ouko who never failed to remind us of the benefits of education; and to my mother, Felicitas Ouko, the best mum anyone could ever hope for.

Table of	Contents
-----------------	----------

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Dedication	V
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	X
List of Figures and Illustrations	xi
List of Plates	xii
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	xiii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Problem	1
1.2 Purpose of the study	5
1.3 Research Objectives	8
1.4 Organization of the Dissertation	8
CHAPIER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Development Theories	11
2.3 Governance and International Environmental Agreements	18
2.4 Factors Influencing Community Projects	21
2.5 Evolving Management Systems of Common Pool Resources	22
2.5.1 Importance of Scalar and Temporal factors in Community Livelihood Pr	ovision
	23
2.5.2 From Co-management to Adaptive Management	26
2.6 Cultural and Political Ecology Approaches to the Study of Protected Areas	28
2.6.1 Cultural Ecology	28
2.6.2 Political ecology	29
2.6.3 Merging of cultural and political ecology into new directions of research	131
2.7 Geography and Development in Kenya	32
2.7.1 A Brief Description of the Geography	32
2.7.2 Common Pool Resource Policy and Development in Kenya	35
2.7.2.1 Shamba System: An Example of Contested Approaches to Forest	
Management in Kenya	37
2.8 Summary: balancing development paradigms	38
CHADTED THREE CONCERTIAL RESEARCH ERAMEWORK	40
3.1 Introduction: Theoretical and Political Boundaries of the Research	+0 /10
3.2 Adoption of a Policy Analysis Approach	+0 42
3.2 Autoption of a Foncy Analysis Apploach	+∠ ⊿ר/
3.2.1 Instoneal Developments of 1 oney Analysis	∠+∠ ۸۲
2.2.2 Adapting Foncy Analysis and Network Theories for the Research	40 10
2.2.5 rolley Network Allarysis	40 50
2.2.5 ACE and DNA, compared and contracted	3U 52
5.2.3 ACF and FINA. compared and contrasted	

3.3 Analytical Frameworks for Social-Ecological Systems	54
3.3.1 Socio-ecological systems model	55
3.4 Specific Research Methodologies	58
3.4.1 Research Objective 1	58
3.4.2 Research Objective 2	59
3.4.3 Research Objective 3	60
3.4.4 Research Objective 4	61
3.5 Research Questions	62
3.5.1 Central research questions	62
3.5.2 Procedural research questions	63
3.6 Justification for Case Study Approach	63
3.7 Selected Project Objectives and Local Demographics	66
3.7.1 Arabuko-Sokoke	68
3.7.2 Kakamega	69
3.7.3 Shimba Hills	70
3.7.4 Mount Elgon	71
3.7.4.1 Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve	71
3.7.4.2 Mt. Elgon National Park	71
3.8 Fieldwork and ethical considerations	72
3.8.1 Recruitment of Participants	72
3.8.2 Data Collection	73
3.8.3 Ethical Considerations	73
3.8.4 Gender Implications	74
3.8.5 Data Analysis	74
CHAPTER FOUR: PROJECT OUTCOMES	76
4.1 Introduction	76
4.2 Findings and Discussions.	
4.2.1 Program Goals and Strategies	
4.2.2 Project Management	
4.2.3 Project Beneficiaries and Agenda-Setting in ICDPs	
4.3 Project Goals: Moneymaking and Satisfaction of Basic Needs	
4.4 Misplaced Goals: The Neglect of Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Conservation	n Efforts
T	95
4.5 The role of the state	
4.6 Conclusions and Recommendations	100
CHAPTER FIVE: THE IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON INTEGRATED	
CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (ICDPS)	104
5.1 Introduction	104
5.2 The spread of livelihoods, poverty and conservation linkage	105
5.3 Impact of Globalization on Environment and Development Agendas	107
5.4 The IUCN and WWF: Examples of Spreading the Conservation Message	111
5.4.1 The IUCN	111
5.4.2 The WWF	112

5.5 The Impact of Globalization on Kenya's Environmental Policies	114
5.6 Case Study Projects	115
5.6.1 Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program (MERECP)	116
5.6.1.1 Project Background, Development and Global Influences	116
5.6.1.2 Program development	117
5.6.1.3 Grassroots and Institutional voices at Mt Elgon	120
5.6.2 Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protection	cted Area
System in Shimba Hills	123
5.6.2.1 Project Background, Development and Global Influences	123
5.6.2.2 Multilevel Management	124
5.6.2.3 International obligations in a contested landscape	125
5.6.2.4 Grassroots and Institutional Voices at Shimba Hills	127
5.7 Discussion	129
5.7.1 Global Consensus and Policy Movement	130
5.7.2 Scalar and temporal factors in project outcomes	131
5.7.3 The New Rural Agenda	132
5.8 Conclusions and Recommendations	133
CHAPTER SIX: LINK BETWEEN GLOBALIZATION AND LOCAL DEVELOP	MENT
FACTORS ON THE OUTCOMES OF ICDPS	136
6.1 Introduction	136
6.2 Local Community Development, Conservation and Collective Action in Keny	/a.138
6.3 Research Findings	141
6.3.1 Project Background	141
6.3.2 Kipepeo Project	142
6.3.3 Emergence and Function of Honey and Silkworm-rearing Collectives	143
6.3.4 Neoliberalized Conservation and the Need for Alternative Development	147
6.3.5 Power: Decision-making, Participation, Gender and Age Relations	152
6.4 Conclusions and Recommendations	162
	,
COMMON DOOL DESCUDEES. THE CASE OF COMMUNITY FOREST	
COMMON POUL RESOURCES – THE CASE OF COMMUNITY FOREST	
ASSOCIATIONS IN KENTA AND IMPEDIMENTS TO SUSTAINABLE C	160
7 1 Introduction	100 169
7.2 Decentralization and Develution: Regional Dewar Struggles	100
7.2 Decentralization and Devolution. Regional Power Struggles	1/5 174
7.2.1 Regional Forest Management. Connects and Resolutions	1/4 170
7.2.2 The NGO Trap. Positives and Negatives of External Actor involvement	1/9 10/
7.5 Conclusions and Recommendations	104
CHAPTER EIGHT: ENVIRONMENTAL POLICYMAKING: THE PLACE OF NO	ON-
STATE ACTORS IN KENYA FOREST GOVERNANCE	188
8.1 Introduction	188
8.1.1 Major operational research questions for policy analysis	190
8.2 Timeline of Kenya Forest Policy Change and the Genesis of Forests Act, 2005	5190

8.3 Summary of Forest Act 2005 and the Draft Forest Policy	194
8.4 The State of Domestic Goal Achievement	196
8.5 Beliefs, Interests, Coalitions and Networking: the Case of two NGOs	197
8.5.1 Nature Kenya	197
8.5.1.1 Organizational goals and beliefs	197
8.5.1.2 Networking and coalition-building	198
8.5.1.3 Policy impacts	200
8.5.2 Forest Action Network (FAN)	202
8.5.2.1 Organizational goals and beliefs	202
8.5.2.2 Networking and coalition-building	202
8.5.2.3 Policy impacts	203
8.6 International NGOs and Policymaking in Kenya	205
8.7 The state and policymaking	207
8.8 Discussions	210
8.8.1 Policy Networks	210
8.8.2 Beliefs and Coalition-Building in Forest Governance	213
8.9 Conclusions and Recommendations	215
CHAPTED MINE, CONTHEGIC AND CONCLUCIONS	010
CHAPTER NINE: SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS	
9.1 Introduction	
9.2 Summary of Study Objective Findings	
9.2.1 Study Objective 1	
9.2.2 Study Objective 2	
9.2.3 Study Objective 3	
9.2.4 Study Objective 4	
9.3 Emerging Issues of Multilevel Forest Governance	
9.3.1 Locating the Forest Commons in the Development Process	
9.3.2 Mapping the Forest Governance Community	
9.5.5 The Flace of Local Community Institutions in Co-management of th	2 FOIEST
0.3.4 Knowledge Dower and Desource Flows	235
0.3.5 Re envisioning Local Development Strategies within ICDPs	230
9.5.5 Ke-envisioning Local Development Strategies within ICDI's	240 242
9.5.0 Global Networks and Local Foncy Transformation	242 244
9.4 Study Contributions to Knowledge and Purtier Research Implications	244 245
9.4.1 Contributions of my Research Implications	24J 246
7.4.2 Futurer Research implications	240
REFERENCES	248
APPENDICES	270

List of Tables

Table 3-1 Selected Project Attributes	. 67
Table 4-1 Hierarchies in ICDP Management	. 82
Table 4-2 Major project achievements and shortcomings	. 84
Table 4-3 Indicators for capital assets assessment	. 86
Table 4-4 Averages of community respondents' perception of Livelihood Capital Assets change since Project Commencement	. 86
Table 4-5 Percentage Participant Satisfaction with Project Communication Processes	. 89
Table 4-6 Percentage of total income derived from project's income generating activities	. 93
Table 4-7 Community perception (2010) of forest use rates of change since project commencement	. 96
Table 8-1 Timeline of significant forest policy changes and events in Kenya	191

List of Figures and Illustrations

Figure 1-1 Map showing locations of four case study sites	7
Figure 2-1 Agro-Ecological Zones of Kenya	34
Figure 3-1: Chart showing thematic connections of the research	41
Figure 3-2 Multi-tier framework for analyzing a socio-ecological system (SES)	55
Figure 3-3 Study Conceptual Framework	75
Figure 4-1 Radar Diagram of Indicators for Project Participants	87
Figure 9-1 Summary of prevailing and proposed project scenarios	227

List of Plates

Plate 4-1 Kakamega Forest Honey and Silk Marketplace	. 89
Plate 4-2 Board display of multi-stakeholder involvement in Kakamega Forest Project	100
Plate 6-1 Female-dominated collective involved in tree-seedling production at Arabuko- Sokoke	159

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACF	Advocacy Coalition Network
AEZ	Agro-Ecological Zone
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Land
ASFADA	Arabuko-Sokoke Forest Adjacent Dwellers Association
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community-based Organization
CBS	Central Bureau of Statistics
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CFA	Community Forest Association
CI	Conservation International
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
COP	Conference of the Parties
DfID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
DIFAFA	Dida Forest Adjacent Area Forest Association
DPSIR	Driving Forces-Pressures-State-Impacts-Responses
EAC	East African Community
EACFEP	East African Coastal Forests Ecoregion Program
EAWLS	East Africa Wildlife Society
EMCA	Environmental Management and Coordination Act
EMPAFORM	Strengthening and Empowering Civil Society for Participatory Forest Management in
	East Africa
EPSC	Ecoregion Program Steering Committee
EU	European Union
FAN	Forest Action Network
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FLR	Forest Landscape Restoration
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
ICDP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
ICG	Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area
	System
ICIPE	International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology
ICLEI	International Council for Local environmental Initiatives
ICRAF	International Center for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Center)
IDRC	International Development and Research Center
IGA	Income Generating Activity
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INGO	International Non-governmental Organization
IUCN	World Conservation Union
KEFRI	Kenya Forest Research Institute
KFMP	Kenya Forests Management Plan
KIFCON	Kenya Indigenous Forests Conservation Program
KWFT	Kenya Women Finance Trust
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
LVBC	Lake Victoria Basin Commission
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MENR	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

MERECP	Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program
MoE	Ministry of Environment Kenya
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Midterm Review
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Agency
NES	National Environment Secretariat Kenya
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NMK	National Museums of Kenya
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NSM	New Social Movement
NTF	National Task Forces
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PNA	Policy Network Analysis
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RAMSAR	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
SAP	Structural Adjustment Program
SES	Social-Ecological System
SHIFOGA	Shimba Hills Forest Guides Association
SSG	Site Support Group
TNC	Transnational Company
TPR	Tripartite Project Review
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WCS	World Conservation Strategy
WRI	World Resources Institute
WWF	World Wildlife Fund for Nature
WWF-EARPO	WWF East Africa Regional Program Office

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Research Problem

The uncertain and often disappointing outcomes of integrated community development and conservation projects (ICDPs) in developing countries have been widely documented by researchers of common pool resources (Adams et al, 2004; Balint 2006; Balmford et al 2001; Gorenflo & Brandon 2006; Sunderlin et al 2005; West et al 2006; Zimmerer & Young 1998). The underperformance of the ICDPs – projects aiming to satisfy both development and conservation goals – is attributed to many varied and complex reasons. Kellert et al (2000) blamed institutions at local and national levels; others highlighted the lack of adequate technical capacity by local community beneficiaries to engage in diversification projects such as butterfly farming (DFID 2001). Even the increasingly popular eco-tourism enterprises have been shown to be susceptible to unequal benefit-sharing at local community levels (Sindiga 1999; Southgate 2006). Some researchers have argued that external resources transferred to Kenya by international development and conservation organizations in support of the globally valued park-system fall far short of compensating for reduced resource benefits formerly available to neighbouring communities (Muriithi & Kenyon 2002; Norton-Griffiths & Southey 1995). Akama (1996) suggested that the Western model that has been the basis of protected area planning in Kenya does not reflect the realities and needs of rural societies in Kenya. Many of these studies concluded that external projects are often not only incompatible with local community structure and processes but may even destabilize them, leading to unintended or negative consequences.

Kenya is representative of the widespread practice for most of the 20th century, whereby the ownership and management of wildlife resources by the state became a panacea for managing the commons in the face of competing interests (Ostrom 1990; 2007). Moreover observations in Kenya showed that integrated community and development projects rarely resulted in more equitable distribution of power and economic benefits, reduced conflict, increased consideration of traditional or more modern environmental knowledge, protection of biodiversity, or sustainable resource use (Kellert et al 2000). Most ICDPs in the 1980s were based on a protected area concept with the aim of increasing benefits derived from alternative livelihood activities thereby reducing threats to conservation by people (Bruner et al 2004; McShane 2005). But by the 1990s the inability of states to manage their resources in a sustainable manner was clearly observable in many areas of the developing world (West et al 2006).

Kenya has gone through an interesting environmental policy development process in recent decades concerning growing conflicts in areas bordering economically important common pool resources (Juma and Ojwang, 1996). Neoliberal-informed development policies in all sectors of development, including the management of the commons like forest areas, resulted in growing disillusionment at local community levels with state-led governance programs. Researchers have criticised the deterministic, rational approach to rural development that conforms to the prevailing neoliberal paradigm for most post-colonial governments in the developing world (Sayer & Campbell 2004). The general failure of neoliberal approaches to improve the livelihoods of rural communities dependent on the commons led to a growing consensus around more locally-adapted development as advanced by the influential "Our Common Future" report (WCED 1987). The report led to a widespread acceptance of the sustainable development concepts and its accompanying notions of more equitable access in the management of the commons for local communities; use of indigenous and local knowledge in management; global partnerships in the management of environmental resources; intergenerational view in the utilization of resources; and a more comprehensive development that takes account of environmental sustainability.

There is a need to re-examine the concept of sustainable development in developing countries within a framework of improved livelihoods for their most vulnerable citizens dependent on common pool

resources. Forestry is a sector that contributes significantly to development in Kenya and is crucial to the well-being of rural communities often short of alternative economic opportunities (Ngugi & Nyariki 2005). Forestry is closely linked to agriculture in terms of an often conflicting relationship for growing populations in need of more land resources. Moreover, both national economic goals and international obligations relating to ecosystem sustainability mean that the state places restrictive measures to ensure the protection of forest ecosystems. This has created a climate of alienation for a majority of forest-adjacent communities in Kenya.

The socio-ecological tensions witnessed in Kenya, like elsewhere in the world have elicited possible new solutions and theories by experts of the commons. For example, greater participation by local communities in management as advocated for by international global agreements been encouraged. But such decentralization processes often failed to meet their desired objectives of improved livelihoods at local community level despite the high expectations that accompanied their introduction (Ribot 1995; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006; Tole 2010; Western, Wright & Strum 1994). Many states struggle to find the right balance for all stakeholders in such decentralized regimes. Bureaucrats often retain most of the decision-making authority at higher levels of government. Decentralization regimes for forest areas present urgent and complex challenges for governments especially because of an increasingly complex spectrum of competing interests at local, national and international levels (Clement 2010; Kaimowitz & Sheil 2007). Forests are a particularly contested common pool resource whereby centralized management has been prone to failure because the dependency of local communities on the forest resources is often neglected in decision-making (Larson, Pacheco & Toni 2007; Ribot, Ribot, Lund & Treue 2010). The convergence of many actors with varying interests in forest governance makes it a complex arean of competing interests, power differentials and negotiation.

3

It is necessary to look beyond the performance of local government units and to consider the relationships among governance actors, and institutional arrangements at different levels of governance (Ostrom 1990). For example, West et al (2006) assert that protected areas are a form of globalization and for this reason call for an anthropology of protected areas that bridges the gap between political economies of globalization and the subtle but profound local social effects caused by the creation of alien environmental categories unknown or inappropriate to local surroundings. Some researchers suggest that, given the globalization process, a theory of global public goods would provide a new motivation for a different type of development assistance (Kaul et al. 1999). This theory calls for a more systematic linkage of aid – the operational side of international cooperation – with international agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), that require countries to forego development opportunities in order to conserve pristine forests. Thus, there is a need to transform international cooperation from its traditional place as "external affairs" into policy-making applicable to most, if not all, domestic issues (Kaul et al. 1999).

International environmental agreements like the CBD and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) explicitly advocate for inclusionary strategies whereby local communities participate in the management of common pool resources. An interesting but as yet little explored cause is the impact of international policies and strategies on the outcomes of ICDPs at local levels. Given the many incentives harboured in international environmental agreements that aim to ameliorate the chronic needs of protected area communities, a shortage of successfully adopted projects - for both livelihoods improvement and conservation measures - serves as an indictment of global governance processes (Dearden et al, 2005; Bruner et al 2004). There is increased awareness that the globalization process means that the impact of international treaties on local communities' development strategies can be better understood when we examine local level actions interacting with other horizontal and vertical scales (Sherwood 2002; Skyttner 2005). My study strives to contribute to knowledge in the field of multilevel

policy analysis, policy implementation, and the consequence of this on the outcomes of ICDPs in developing countries. My contention is that there has been a failure of policy either through misidentified goals of environmental agreements, or the miscommunication of these goals, given the multi-scalar nature of the process that leads to implementation at local community levels.

There is lack of theory linking environmental resource change to poverty reduction. This lack of clarity is likely to exacerbate the plight of the poor who are most dependent on ecosystem services and therefore vulnerable to their degradation (Agrawal 2002; Ostrom 1990). A contribution to new knowledge, both theoretically and empirically, requires that specific causal processes of development that impact on places, on people locally and externally, and the fuller nature of development intervention are investigated. Furthermore, place-based studies can lead to grounded theory that benefits from comparative studies of different causal processes and factors across place-based studies. In addition to examining livelihoods in selected places, two other core concepts for development geography are scale and network policy adaptation, and project development (Bebbington 2003). A focus on the theme of networks is necessary in order to envision the ways in which development as capitalist expansion and development as intervention are conceptually related (Bebbington, 2003; Lemos & Agrawal, 2006; Naughton-Treves et al 2005).

1.2 Purpose of the study

There is widespread evidence that many co-management common pool resource projects supported by international policy instruments have not achieved their stated conservation and development goals. These shortcomings are attributable to a combination of misplaced project goals, wrong implementation strategies and failed policies and laws. Specifically, there is a shortage of theoretically-informed research about the impact of both spatial and temporal factors in co-management of common pool resources given

external inducements to local communities. This means that the outcomes of internationally informed and derived development initiatives are likely to remain largely unsatisfactory to local communities unless the multi-scalar impacts on the localization and implementation processes are better understood.

The purpose of this research is thus to understand what policy and implementation factors have contributed to the success of four co-management projects derived from international environmental agreements in two regions of Kenya where my four case study projects are located (see Figure 1.1 and Appendices 1 to 4). The country's wide variety of co-managed projects allows for urgently needed comparative empirical studies in adaptive co-management. Co-management is defined as a partnership arrangement in which the community of local resource users, government, other stakeholders and external agents (NGOs, academic and research institutions) share the responsibility and authority for the management of the resource. My study examines the arenas and mechanisms of policy and resource transfers and exchange at multiple scales. In order to achieve these goals, I utilized four main analytical approaches in my research: power structures and differences; learning and diffusion of norms; networking; and institutional capacities. I examined the impacts of multi-scalar interactions on national and local level policies. I also assessed the impact of these policies and resource transfers on ICDPs at local community level.



Figure 1-1 Map showing locations of four case study sites Source: Adapted from KIFCON (1994)

1.3 Research Objectives

- To determine the similarities, differences and contradictions of the normative goals of selected international environmental agreements with national policies and local community goals through comparative policy analyses, given the efforts aimed at harmonizing them.
- 2. To determine the adaptability, resilience and learning capacities of local communities which lead to differences between the normative project goals and actual outcomes.
- To assess how the scalar and temporal factors of the projects impact on human needs and conservation goals given the state of the ecological resources and livelihood patterns in order to determine the sustainability of the projects.
- 4. To determine the effects of network and institutional interactions on both the harmonization of international environmental agreements, national policies and local community goals, and on the differences in local community project outcomes.

1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 is a literature review that provides the theoretical background to development, cultural and political ecologies of decentralization influenced by globalization and the impact of this on local governance.

Chapter 3 locates the theoretical and political boundaries of the research. I located the study within the interpretative approach to qualitative research. The methodological design is multi-scalar with emphasis on tracing the movement of ideas and resources that shape policies and eventual project design and implementation from the international level to the local level. Aspects of pragmatism are incorporated to establish the outcomes of specific projects. I used mixed methods of data collection including quantitative

values for comparative purposes. I also utilized selected case study projects with detailed data collection from multiple sources of information including observations, interviews, documents and reports. The research questions were broad and focused on the specific livelihood contexts.

In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, I analyze the impact of four externally supported integrated development and development projects (ICDPs) on the target populations. Chapter 4 focuses on mapping community-wide impacts as opposed to limited quantitative analyses on the livelihoods of selected participants. I compare the project goals and community needs in order to determine how the synergies and mismatches impact on project outcomes. Chapter 5 links the impact of global policies at national and local levels and its impact on the outcomes of ICDPs. My research shows how global movement of resources and the resultant influential networks result in the convergence of policies worldwide and the impact of converging policies on local projects. Chapter 6 highlights how the failure to account for local community conditions affects the outcomes of projects. The main contention is that ICDPs do not operate in isolation from the rest of the development process. The self-help notion of development known as "harambee" in Kenya is shown to be critical in the unsatisfactory outcomes of projects. The tendency of the projects implementers is to utilize such collective action groups as their vessels for community resource distribution without a full measure understanding of their objectives, moral philosophies and modes of operation.

In Chapter 7, I examine in detail one specific forest management regime in Kenya – Participatory Forest Management (PFM) – a consequence of the strong global influences that encourage decentralized modes of management for common pool resources. I focus on the modes of regional-level interaction between the two institutions of forest governance, the state forest management agency – Kenya Forest Service – and Community Forest Associations during the early stages of the new regime. I highlight the importance of nongovernmental organizations in these interactions and make recommendations for the improvement

of these forest governance mechanisms in order to avoid the emergence of new forms of top-down paradigms couched in the new language of participation.

The previous chapters have shown that policies and the policymaking process strongly influence the outcomes of projects. In Chapter 8, I analyze how non-state actors engage in the environmental policymaking process – both overtly and covertly – and their interactions at local, national and international levels. The main goal is to examine the policy formulation process for the Kenya Forest Act and the Draft Forest Policy. The examples of two Kenyan NGOs provide the main analytical bases. Policy Network Analysis (PNA) and Advocacy Coalition Network (ACF) approaches are combined to show how networks, resources and belief systems influence the policymaking process. In using the PNA, I adopted a structural perspective to explain the distribution of power among actors in a social system as a function of the position they occupy in one or more networks. The essential premise of the actor-oriented ACF is that policymaking occurs in a policy subsystem inhabited by several multi-actor advocacy coalitions which compete to influence policy in line with the policy beliefs which bind each coalition together.

In Chapter 9, I summarize and conclude the findings of the study and highlight the complex linkages between policymaking, project formulation and implementation, and development outcomes in general.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I briefly discuss the evolution of development theories in general in order to demonstrate how current dominant development paradigms influence economic policies in developing countries like Kenya. I aim to show how the greater development process is linked to the process of adopting and assimilating integrated development and conservation projects. I highlight the connection of development to international environmental management policy with particular emphasis on the place of ICDPs. I aim to show the strong connection between the governance of common pool resources like forests and other sectors of development in Kenya. I also discuss some major methodological approaches to the study of common pool resources relevant to my research. I conclude with a brief geographical description of Kenya and the place of forestry in the economy.

2.2 Development Theories

At independence, most developing countries were viewed by the rest of the developed world as undifferentiated economic entities that required a simple nation-state guided process of modernization to ensure progress (Schuurman, 2000). Modernization theory developed from a union of evolutionary theory, welfare state economics, structural functionalism and cold-war capitalist ideology (Perz 2007). The consequent characteristics are transitions into urbanization, industrialization, and population growth classically described by Rostow (1960); a focus on nation-states; internal regulation of national societies through various social institutions that generate change and complexity while ensuring a 'homeostatic' equilibrium (Perz 2007). Marx and Weber are considered the modern founders of the study of capitalism. Marx offered that the inbuilt crises of capitalism would eventually destroy it through proletarian revolution. On the other hand Weber imagined that capitalism's inner compulsion to rationalize economic life would enervate the human will needed for economic reproduction (Blim, 2000). These pioneers both noted that capitalism historically concentrated economic and political power in the hands of the few. As a consequence ordinary people were inherently disadvantaged within capitalist systems. In the background of the coldwar capitalist expansion became increasingly influential as the struggle to recruit newly independent countries into the opposing market-driven and socialist-informed development camps. Kenya chose the sphere of the American-led modernization when it achieved independence in 1963.

Neo-classical economic theories framed in the theory of modernization arose after the Second World War. Capitalism and socialist development, as informed by Marxian ideology were the dominant approaches in operation. Neo-classical development was based within the three pillars of growth, planning and aid; and the guiding philosophy was the idea of manipulative intervention. In general, the ordinary people in the Third World were seen as homogeneous and that progress guided by the nation state would lead to improved livelihoods for them (Schuurman, 2000). Markets were thus supposed to maximize social welfare. Some writers have suggested that since the state gained pre-eminence in this system, the leaders offered ordinary people the promise of material advance in exchange for political support (Preston, 1999).

But increased unemployment and growing gap between the rich and poor necessitated further refinement and the idea of 'noneconomic factors' emerged. This led to a union, encouraged by the World Bank, of the Keynesian 'nationalist' school and the more orthodox neoclassical tradition that stressed the importance of trade and comparative advantages in the development process. Nevertheless underdeveloped economies producing primary commodities continued to be subjected to deteriorating terms of trade in relation to the industrialized nations. Industrialization was seen as the way out since it was supposed to create jobs for the masses and earn vital foreign exchange for the country. But the level of investment remained too low and an external stimulant in the form of foreign aid subsequently was promoted. Furthermore, all these measures tended to give rise to dualistic economies in underdeveloped economies.

Meanwhile the transnational companies (TNCs) represented the face of emerging global corporate power. TNCs influenced the pattern of international investment by moving it to the periphery and to anywhere they could find cheap labor, political stability and other incentives (Hettne, 1990). Through practices such as transfer pricing, TNCs thrived at the expense of developing countries that lost out on taxes and income after World Bank and IMF-enforced liberalized trade (in the environment of neoliberal dominated economic agendas of developing countries that were forced to engage in more liberalized trade by the World Bank and IMF (Morrissey & Rai 1995). Proponents of free international trade suggested that the ordinary people would benefit from the creation of jobs created by the TNCs. But these tended to be low paying jobs and the industries so created tended to stifle innovation in the developing countries resulting in increased poverty.

'Underdevelopment' and 'dependency' are defined similarly as the social, economic and political conditions prevailing throughout the Third World that are not due to the persistence of an 'original' state of affairs, but are the results of the same world-historical process in which the First World became 'developed'; the development of the latter involved a closely associated course of development for the former, a process of subordinate development or underdevelopment. Underdevelopment and dependency theories refer to the self-perpetuating and self-reproducing structures that have maintained the status quo (Hettne, 1990). And yet even the underdevelopment theorists tended to view societies as homogeneous and anticipated that the ordinary people would benefit as long as the structures of development were

appropriately improved (Schuurman, 2000). For underdevelopment theorists there is an underlying belief that the a majority of citizens can benefit from a nation state that independently seeks to modernize by finding an appropriate niche within international trading relations and thereby creating greater wealth for the citizenry (Preston, 1999).

The inability of the neoclassical approach and all its derivatives to improve the livelihoods of a majority of people in developing countries led to the rise of normative approaches to development under the banner of an 'alternative' development (Hettne, 1990). These normative approaches focus on the content of development rather than its form. They are compatible with the emergence of green politics in the West. No universal path to development is advocated since every society must find its own strategy that reflects its own needs. In developing countries neoclassic strategies were based mainly on revival and preservation rather than modernization (Hettne, 1990). There are different historical manifestations of alternative development approaches: conservative romanticism, utopian socialism, anarchism, populism, and green ideology (Hettne, 1990). Utopian socialism promotes a classless society in which the people leaving in harmony with the environment are able to sustain their livelihoods. The green ideology or eco-development in developing countries seeks to promote the rational use of environmental resources as informed by indigenous knowledge. In general, these paradigms suggested that local communities had distaste for industrial civilization.

The basic needs approach is described as egalitarian since it gives priority to redistribution rather than growth. It tends to favor agriculture and the informal sector while advocating for increased real incomes. The objective or positive school describes basic needs as something that applies to all human beings and is quantifiable. But the subjective or normative school is a qualitative concept that partly falls in the realm of philosophy and religion and implies self-reliance on the part of ordinary citizens (Hettne, 1990). The positive school seeks to provide these basic needs through state-planned systems that operate through a

market system that provides incentives to producers to enable them to create the goods at reasonable prices. In normatism, the ordinary people are seen to have indigenous knowledge borne from culture and their social systems that makes them innovative enough to sustain their livelihoods as long as the development climate offered to them by this approach remains intact.

In the late 1980s, a list of policy prescriptions that came to be known as the Washington Consensus came to be associated with a brand of neoliberalism that promoted a menu of the so-called Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) in developing countries that included devaluation, cutbacks in public expenditure, removal of price controls and restriction of money supply (Williamson 1989; Gore, 2000; Harrison, 2005). 'Defective knowledge' in the South was seen as a major constraint and technical assistance was projected as the democratic solution. Participatory approaches could be employed and hence 'power' given to the people. The inclusion of communities and civil society represents a common ground with post-modernism (Porter, 1995). Harrison (2005) further suggests neoliberalism is a project to expand and universalize free-market social relations. Thus is not solely concerned with the removal of the state from the economy, but is also about *shaping* the economy, the state and the society. Here the livelihoods of ordinary people who are likely to suffer from the negative consequences of the market economy are ameliorated by mechanisms such as poverty reduction strategies and technical aid. The deficiencies of the approach in terms of improving the ordinary lives of the people are tacitly acknowledged by Breton Woods Institution such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) but the belief in the market system remains strong.

The anthropology of modernity recognizes that all societies create their own modernity. For example, by the 1990s new development economics saw a convergence around social institutions including NGOs, citizenship and human rights. This was seen as an opportunity to design, in the 'new' context of globalized markets and the re-emergence of civil society, new configurations of state, markets and civil

organizations unencumbered by outmoded or ideological notions of central planning or unhindered free markets (Watts, 1995). The striking feature in this confluence of analytics is the centrality of civil society; markets that are socially embedded, economic dynamism that demands social capital, and economies built around trust, obligation and accountability. Civil society promoted alternative modes of development driven by a political and practical emphasis in the so-called 'New Social Movements (NSM) (Watts, 1995). But Hettne (1990) challenged the practicability of this confluence when he suggested that since the idea of balanced growth had already proven to be a very difficult endeavor, the addition of social development would only add to the complications resulting in continued misery for the ordinary people.

The threat of diminishing resources is receiving greater recognition today and hence the pre-eminence of the concept of sustainable development. This idea is linked to the search for alternative development since the early 1970s that increasingly recognized both the social and environmental costs of development (Hettne, 1990). The ever-present threat of scarcity means a limit to growth as evidenced by rising resource conflicts in many parts of the world. Since sustainable development is territorial (Adams 1995), it requires a transfer of power to local communities and the improvement of specific areas and situations. Ordinary people are recognized by proponents of sustainable development to be the drivers of a sustainable future since they interact with the environment at the most intimate level (Adams et al 2004).

Following widespread criticism of neoliberalism, a variant that has been termed 'inclusive' neoliberalism has arisen. It retains core conservative neoliberal macroeconomic and pro-market policy settings, but adds 'positive liberal' approaches emphasizing 'empowerment' to enable participation of countries and people in global and local markets (Craig & Porter, 2006). These authors postulated that a decisive shift had occurred from marketizing neoliberalism that presented new opportunities for a development that accounted for 'territorial constraints and opportunities'. The focus of this new variant of neoliberalism was on poverty reduction and good governance. Harrison (2005) contests this view and claims instead

that neoliberalism is still very much a project aiming to universalize free-market social relations by shaping the economy, the state and the society. Such criticisms can be assuaged by incorporating the ideas of participation, and intra- and intergenerational equity into neoliberalism. Postmodernism can also incorporate ideas investing more resources in rural areas in order to improve livelihoods in those areas.

In the 1990s several shades of theories that radically challenged the neoliberal paradigm arose. These included critical theory (Sachs 1992), post-structuralism and post-modernism (Escobar, 1995). Many of these critiques of neoliberal policies advocated for placed–informed development and were generally covered under the umbrella of post-development theory. Post-development theory, the paradigm that pronounces the 'end of development' calls for 'alternatives to development' rather than just alternative development (Parfitt 2002). The proponents of post development attributed the negative consequences that arose from the action of development as intrinsic to development, rather than being unintentional side effects of its poor implementation. In short, the assumptions and ideas that are inherent to development are irredeemably flawed. Post-development rejects the basic premise of development that some areas of the world are 'developed' and others are not and that the so-called underdeveloped areas should embark on the road to replicating the developed nations (Escobar, 2000; Matthews, 2004). Post-development theorists, in similar vein to proponents of an Alternative Development, believe that each society must look from within to improve their livelihoods. There is a call to social movements of the ordinary people to effect change.

There are different historical manifestations of alternative development: conservative romanticism, utopian socialism, anarchism, populism, and green ideology (Hettne, 1990). Utopian socialism promotes a classless society in which the people living in harmony with the environment are able to sustain their livelihoods. The green ideology or eco-development in developing countries seeks to promote the rational use of environmental resources as informed by indigenous knowledge. In general, these paradigms suggested that local communities had distaste for industrial civilization.

Radical environmentalism challenges the dominant ideas of modernization that influence sustainable development. It has a strong eco-socialist strand involving redefinition of needs, redistribution of resources, reassessment of the industrial mode of production, replacement of private ownership in favor of social justice, and a search for new forms of social order which eliminate alienation, state control and centralization (Pepper 1984). Adams (1995) summarizes the post-materialist project as a desire for non-hierarchical and decentralized structures of decision-making and a rejection of Fordist industrialization and consumerism.

But alternative approaches to development, including postmodernism, have been criticized in several circles. For example, Kiely (1999) is of the opinion that local capital leads to similar problems that foreign capital has been blamed for. He is critical of the approach that lumps all development approaches into one since this is not too different from the modernization theorists who tend to generalize and assume that societies are geared towards following the linear path towards the ideal Western style of living.

2.3 Governance and International Environmental Agreements

Global environmental agreements devote major sections to issues of sustainable development, equitable distribution of wealth and poverty alleviation. There has been increased perception of the importance of such agreements on the management of natural resources at the national level. For example, in a global survey, 34 percent of respondents indicated that in 1992 global environmental agreements had no influence on national protected area policy but by 2002 this had declined to only 13 percent (Dearden, Bennett & Johnston 2005). And yet there is little systematic analysis of how existing financial

instruments for environmental policy can be more efficient in the context of multi-scalar and multistakeholder environments (Klein et al 2005).

In Article 11 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the international community acknowledges the importance of incentive measures in achieving the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The CBD has a range of incentive measures to encourage the conservation or sustainable use of biological diversity as advocated for by many experts in the field of conservation (Southworth et al 2006). These include positive economic, legal or institutional incentive measures designed to encourage beneficial activities. Positive incentive measures include payments for organic farming and public or grant-aided land purchases or conservation easements.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) provides several channels of elaborate funding. For example the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) enables the transfer of financial and technical resources to developing countries from industrialized countries that aim to fulfill their obligations of reducing greenhouse gases under the Convention. But the focus of the UNFCCC on national and international level issues has been criticised for neglecting the need for equitable sharing of environmental resources in projects funded by the World Bank-managed Global Environmental Facility (GEF) (Klein et al 2005; Thomas & Twyman 2005).

Governance and policy processes are important tools for translating the development goals of international environmental agreements in Kenya as elsewhere (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2006; Byron & Treweek 2005; Daniels & Bassett 2002). In a study of local community conservation activities around Lake Nakuru in Kenya, political forces at national and regional level levels constrained participation (Daniels & Bassett 2002). For this reason, scale and networking in policy formulation are two core concepts for development geography (Bebbington 2003; McShane 2005). Moreover, a focus on the theme of networks is necessary in order to envision the ways in which development as capitalist expansion and development as intervention are conceptually related (Bebbington, 2003; Lemos & Agrawal, 2006; Naughton-Treves et al 2005).

Adger et al (2001) demonstrated in several case studies that policy-making institutions are distanced from the resource users and that local scale environmental management actions possess their own inertia and have to deal with alternative manifestations of environmental change and livelihood imperatives. Local ecological knowledge across generations and its integration together with rituals and traditions, and world view and culture, reinforce sustainable dimensions of their social-ecological system (Balint and Mashinya, 2006; Tucker, 2008). For this reason community-based conservation projects implemented in conjunction with protected area management should pay closer attention to development indicators including property rights, capacity, governance and revenue (Agrawal & Ostrom 2001; Balint 2006; Crofts 2004; Juma & Ojwang 1996; Lambin et al 2001; Logan & Moseley, 2002; Mackenzie 2003; Pressey et al 2004; Sayer & Campbell 2004; Tiffen et al 1994; West et al 2006).

Initiatives such as the *The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide* offer comprehensive step-by-step approaches to sustainable development planning processes at the local level: partnerships, community-based issue analysis, action planning, implementation and monitoring, and evaluation feedback (ICLEI & IDRC 1996). The individual characteristics of such local governments have nevertheless often proved insufficient to explain the variation in governance outcomes in decentralized regimes (Andersson & Ostrom, 2008). Kaul et al. (1999) suggested that to make international cooperation work, a more efficient public policy should be re-engineered to create: (i) a clear jurisdictional loop, reaching from the international (regional and global) level and back to the national; (ii) a participation loop, bringing into the process all actors – governments, civil society and business, all population groups; and an incentive loop to ensure that cooperation yields fair and clear results for all. The purpose of governance and policy
processes research should therefore examine multiple jurisdictions and compare their responses in order to learn whether and how the purposes articulated in the international environmental treaty are realized at the community level (Adger et al 2001; Biermann 2007). Such empirical research would have to consider problems of the overall architecture of earth system governance, of agency beyond the state, of the adaptiveness of governance mechanisms and of their accountability and legitimacy, and of the modes of allocation in earth system governance identified as the five governance challenges that lie at the core of earth system governance (Biermann 2007).

2.4 Factors Influencing Community Projects

Pro-poor conservation approaches that deliberately invest resources outside large, strictly protected areas have been widely advocated by development experts (Kaimowitz & Sheil 2007). But appropriately positioning integrated conservation and development projects in relation to other complementary conservation activities operating on a variety of spatial and temporal scales is a major challenge of ecosystem or regional-scale conservation approaches (McShane 2005). Adams et al (2004) suggest failure is likely unless necessary links that connect poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation are formulated.

Context should be taken into consideration in the analysis by making a distinction between the physical and social context of environmental decisions (Adger et al 2003). Physical attributes of environmental resources such as size, the incompatibility or rivalry of use, joint use, difficulty of exclusion, and fluctuation of yields are important factors in environmental decision-making (Adger et al 2003). Social attributes include the size of the group that is involved or affected, the existence and character of coalitions within the group, homogeneity or heterogeneity of the group and its external coalitions, and the nature of social relations in the group (Adger et al 2003). Moreover, a realization that communities are

not homogeneous but consist of different levels of power and authority acting within institutional structures is crucial if sustainable conservation is to be achieved (Agrawal & Gibson 1999). Zimmerer & Young (1998) acknowledge that it is important that the social organization of the project finds an effective balance at local, regional as well as the national levels.

Some critiques of community conservation attribute it to populist postmodernism that ignores unsustainable levels of population growth (Attwell & Cotterill 2000). But such protectionism advocates have been criticised for overlooking the social and political processes that determine social justice and are crucial in successful community conservation involvement (Brechin et al, 2002; Neumann 1997). Furthermore, calls for renewed exclusionary strategies ignore the threat of ever-growing populations with limited or no alternatives for sustaining their livelihoods (Adams et al 2004; Balmford et al 2001). Even proponents of the community conservation have cautioned that in trying to make parks socially acceptable, conservation areas should not be held responsible for curing innately structural problems such as poverty, unequal land distribution and resource allocation, corruption, economic injustice, and market failures (Brandon et al 1998). But my research contends that this innately structural problem cannot be delinked from protected areas because their creation in itself is an inherently political process.

2.5 Evolving Management Systems of Common Pool Resources

Hardin (1968) famously concluded that only two state-established institutional arrangements—centralized government and private property—could sustain the commons over the long run. He presumed that resource users were trapped in a commons dilemma within which they were unable to extricate themselves. But his theory has been criticized for ignoring many examples where social groups have successfully countered the threats of resource degradation by developing and maintaining self-governing

institutions (Dietz et al 2003). Such institutions might not always have succeeded, but neither have Hardin's preferred alternatives of private or state ownership and control (Ostrom 1990).

Agrawal (2002) suggests that the multiplicity of causal variables and the context have created significant gaps in explanations of how common property institutions work. As many as 35 critical factors have been identified in the organization, adaptability, and sustainability of common property (Ostrom 2007; Agrawal 2002). Systematic tests of the relative importance of the factors important to sustainability, equity, or efficiency of commons are scarce and a fully developed theory of what makes common-pool resource management sustainable is missing (Agrawal 2002; Berkes 2002; Cash & Moser 2000; Ostrom 2007). This section briefly presents some recent important directions that the study of commons management has taken.

2.5.1 Importance of Scalar and Temporal factors in Community Livelihood Provision

The individual characteristics of local level governments are often insufficient to explain the variation in governance outcomes in decentralized regimes (Andersson & Ostrom, 2008). Scale is thus an important analytical concept in common pool resources because; first, environmental problems can have different spatial and temporal scopes; and second, institutional responses to environmental problems can be taken at different, and often multiple, levels. It is increasingly recognized that environmental governance is often neither small-scale nor large-scale, but multiple-scale (Berkes, 2002; Carpenter et al 2006; Mol & Van Den Berg, 2004; Young 2002). The global expansion of conservation has driven new spatial arrangements - some contiguous, some not - in the relationships between people and natural resources Zimmerer (2006a).

This expansion demands an understanding of conservation, and its interactions with livelihoods, that works across distinct scales of analysis and action. The mismatch between the scales at which natural and human systems organize leads to failures in feedback, when, for instance, benefits accrue at one scale, but costs are carried at another (Carpenter et al 2006). Livelihood in this case refers to a highly complex, all-encompassing concept, which is not restricted to the ecological or to the economic or productive aspects of life (de Haan & Zoomers, 2003). Carney (1998, p. 7) defined a widely utilized definition of livelihood as follows: 'a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living." A livelihood is described as sustainable when it can recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future (de Haan & Zoomers, 2003).

Crofts (2004) argues that there is a need to recognize the importance of linking protected areas to the rest of the landscape and seascape through ecological and other environmental processes, and also to society both adjacent to and further afield from protected area boundaries. Linkage to the larger society has been specifically recognized in the UNESCO Biosphere Reserves areas of terrestrial and coastal/marine ecosystems or a combination thereof, which are internationally recognized within the framework of UNESCO's Programme on Man and the Biosphere. Each Biosphere Reserve is intended to fulfill three complementary functions: a conservation function to preserve genetic resources, species, ecosystems and landscapes; a development function, to foster sustainable economic and human development; and a logistic support function, to support demonstration projects, environmental education and training, and research and monitoring related to the local, national and global issues of conservation and sustainable development (UNESCO, 1996).

Another method that aims to show the connection between environmental goods and the larger society is the ecosystem approach. The ecosystem approach was adopted formally by the signatory governments to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in 2000. It is defined as `a strategy for the integrated management of land, water and living resources that promotes conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way' (CBD, Decision V/6, 2000). The aim is to enable the attainment of a balance between the three objectives of the Convention: conservation of biological diversity, sustainable use of natural resources and equitable sharing of genetic resources (Crofts, 2004).

Simple community-based systems and single-use resource management were utilized in the past to work out basic principles although in reality these systems were multilevel (Armitage et al 2007). It is now increasingly recognized that it is necessary to look beyond the performance of a local government unit to consider the relationships among governance actors, problems, and institutional arrangements at different levels of governance. This recognition that multi-scale interactions have a significant impact on the management of shared resources has altered past notions of the co-management discourse (Berkes 2002; Cash & and Moser, 2000). There has been a shift from a purely scientific and formal management of ecosystems towards the notions of resilience and adaptability of both the ecological and social aspects interacting in a complex system taking cognizance of both time and space (Berkes et al 2003; Dietz et al 2003; Newell et al 2005). This is conceptualized as a learning and adaptive management approach that focuses on improving policy and practice in the face of uncertainty. It can be utilized as a tool to frame the philosophical, methodological, and practical challenges associated with the management of natural resources (Armitage et al 2007).

The joint management of the commons approach taken by Carlsson & Berkes (2005) offers one such learning approach to problem-solving. This strategy focuses on how different management tasks are organized and functionally distributed as opposed to structural arrangements of the system. Carlsson & Berkes (2005) listed the steps that this study followed in examining the problem-solving approaches of selected communities: defining the social-ecological system under focus; mapping the essential

management tasks and problems to be solved; clarifying the participants in the problem-solving processes; analyzing linkages in the system, in particular across levels of organization and across geographical space; evaluating capacity-building needs for enhancing the skills and capabilities of people and institutions at various levels; and prescribing ways to improve policy making and problem-solving.

2.5.2 From Co-management to Adaptive Management

The co-management discourse is primarily concerned with user participation in decision-making and with linking communities and government managers. Conversely, the adaptive management discourse is primarily about learning-by-doing to deal with uncertainty. Non-linear feedback processes, and system self organisation challenge established assumptions of scientific certainty, stability paradigms in both ecological and social sciences, and the primacy of expert-driven solutions (Armitage et al 2007). Fabricius et al (2007) suggested that adaptive co-management develops through leadership and vision, the formation of knowledge networks, the existence or development of polycentric institutions, the establishment and maintenance of links between culture and management, the existence of enabling policies, and high levels of motivation in all role players. Apart from more collaborative dialogue between all stakeholders, the need for complex, redundant, and layered institutions; a mix of institutional types; and designs that facilitate experimentation, learning, and change have been advocated (Dietz et al 2003). These researchers also listed 5 requirements of adaptive governance in complex systems: provision of information; dealing with conflict; inducing rule compliance; provision of infrastructure; and preparation for change. The emergent outcome is adaptive co-management that focuses on the local scale but its flexibility allows it to operate across multiple levels and with a range of local and non-local organisations (Armitage et al 2007).

There are adaptations that are occurring through slow, persistent change that may transform the original social-ecological system (SES) through a relatively smooth adaptive process. Nevertheless, this adaptation makes the system more vulnerable to global technological and economic fluctuations. The other type of challenge is top-down intervention that does not recognize the original adaptive mechanisms inherent in local SESs. Such interventions directly affect the functioning of the original SES. With this challenge, the SES might become severely disrupted and lead to relatively rapid severe consequences such as heavy overharvesting caused by top-down interventions that do not recognize local coordination mechanisms (Janssen et al 2007).

Projects co-managed with local communities evolve in diverse ways, with different linkages and partnerships and different strengths and needs (Andersson & Ostrom, 2008; Berkes 2007). As the process of globalization proceeds, such analyses may help identify which vulnerabilities are more likely to become most challenging for particular local SESs. If, at the global scale, a collection of many small-scale SESs may better address environmental problems than could a smaller number of larger scale nation-states, then it is critical to understand the robustness–vulnerability trade-offs inherent in small-scale SESs (Janssen et al 2007).

A learning approach focused on improving policy and practice in the face of uncertainty, adaptive management is often presented as a tool to frame the philosophical, methodological, and practical challenges associated with the management of natural resources. Management strategies and policies are considered experiments and learning is encouraged through structured experiment and management flexibility (Armitage et al 2007). Such changes in direction represent an alternative discourse about how to approach the theory and practice of natural resource management and environmental governance.

2.6 Cultural and Political Ecology Approaches to the Study of Protected Areas

Protected area and Integrated Conservation and Development Programs (ICDPs) research require methodological approaches that account for the political nature of their establishment, implementation and management processes. This section briefly presents the state of knowledge on the role and effectiveness of cultural and political ecology as an appropriate approach for such research. The reasons why these approaches are adopted (see chapter 3 on methodology) as a framework for research are presented here.

2.6.1 Cultural Ecology

Cultural ecology is a positivist approach notable for its serious attention to the logic of local people in ecological knowledge in the management of their landscapes (Steward 2006). For example, Steward's methodological model was based on the comparison of many cases of similar kinds of production in order to identify enduring cultural traits. Cultural ecology received further recognition through Robert Netting's cultural ecological research with rural cultivators who practice intensive, permanent, diversified, agriculture on relatively small farms in areas of dense population (Netting 1993). Nettings demonstrated that although local production is immensely complex and highly variable, it operated in a sensible, rational, and relatively comprehensible manner – whether in Nigeria or Switzerland (Netting 1993). Robbins (2004) observed that cultural ecology continues to open the door to a range of productive questions, which allow for a continuation of explorations of the complex and sophisticated adaptations of people who had historically been characterized as backward. Research is expanding further into the area of traditional ecological knowledge and management, with increasing recognition of the role of regional economic cycles in setting the terms of subsistence (Berkes 1999).

Cultural ecology has been criticized at several levels. For example, its central logic of adaptation often leads to problematic reductionist conclusions. It suffers from a teleological flaw that if people perform a certain activity then this should be equated to an adaptation (Trimbur & Watts 1976). Cultural ecology has faced other criticisms related to its concept of "carrying capacity" (Behnke & Scoones 1993) and the analytical bounding of subsistence populations and short time-scales of research over which arguments for long-term adaptation were made (Orlove 1980). Robbins (2004) concluded that the most problematic aspect of cultural ecology is that the thrust of some cultural ecological argument explicitly naturalises and, by implication, legitimizes what can be seen as contingent social behaviours and practices. This is blamed on cultural ecology's disinterest in resource politics, which means that is difficult for cultural ecologists to explain outcomes they observe in the world. Vayda (1983) sought to offer a solution to this dilemma by arguing that nesting local interactions within larger and larger scales leads to an understanding of driving processes in an empirical and inductive way. But Robbins argued that this remained an atheoretical description and did not explain why it happened nor did it reveal underlying persistent processes.

2.6.2 Political ecology

Political ecology has a range of definitions that reflect the emphasis of my study. For example, Hempel (1996) defined political ecology as the study of interdependence among political units and of interrelationships between political units and their environment that are concerned with the political consequences of environmental change. The goal of political ecology is to explore and explain community-level and regional political action in the global sphere, in response to local and regional degradation and scarcity. Watts (2000) defined political ecology as a method for understanding the complex relations between nature and society through the careful analysis of forms of access and control over resources and their implications for environmental health and sustainable livelihoods. He focused on

explaining environmental conflict especially in terms of struggles over knowledge, power and practice on the one hand, and politics, justice and governance on the other. The seminal work by Blaikie & Brookfield (1987) on the social dynamics of land degradation described political ecology as combining the concerns of ecology and a broadly defined political economy. They suggested that together this encompassed the constantly shifting dialectic between society and land-based resources, and also within classes and groups within society itself. In his comprehensive review Robbins (2004) described political ecology as empirical, research-based explorations to explain linkages in the condition and change of socio-ecological systems, with explicit consideration of relations of power.

Political ecology employs a contextual approach to examining issues of human-environment interactions. Political ecology critiques traditional approaches that claim an apolitical ecology while refusing to acknowledge systems of power and influence in examining the interactions. Political ecology examines the broader systems rather than blaming proximate and local forces. Political ecology views ecological systems as power-laden rather than politically inert and also takes a normative approach without attempting to claim the objectivity of disinterest. Some of the so-called apolitical approaches such as "ecoscarcity" and "modernization" have been shown to harbor political assumptions in any case (Robbins 2004).

Descriptions of appropriate areas for political ecology research have been provided by several scholars (Blaikie & Brookfield 1987; Robbins 2004). Research linking environmental change to political and economic marginalization emerged first in the 1970s and 1980s as an attempt to apply dependency theory to the environmental crises of the period. Later on, problematic effects of global and regional conservation efforts, including World Heritage Sites, national parks, and biodiversity zones, also became increasingly apparent in the 1990s, and political ecology on the topic benefited from a growing interest in the historical development of conservation. This was followed by a growing interest in environmental

conflict as many environmental issues became increasingly politicized in both regional and global contexts that resulted in global agreements and debates on climate and biodiversity. Local community groups subsequently adopted most of the same issues leading a new social activism depicted in a number of peasant movements. These so-called four 'theses' of political ecology were subsequently identified as degradation and marginalization; environmental conflict; conservation and control; and environmental identity and social movement (Robbins 2004).

2.6.3 Merging of cultural and political ecology into new directions of research

Zimmerer (2007) argues that cultural ecology – at its interface with political ecology – is commonly engaged with, and adds to, a number of topical areas, theories, concepts, and methodologies that characteristically owe to the interactive or dialogic mode of inquiry. He coins the term - 'borderlands' in order to indicate sustained in-depth, multi-way interactions and hence 'connectivities'. He suggests that the most relevant to cultural and political ecology are those areas or networks that may be termed 'environmental borderlands'. These environmental borderlands refer to ideas, concepts, methodologies, and topical issues that bridge or interconnect human and bio-geophysical systems.

Urgent challenges facing marginalized peoples, such as climate change, biological conservation, and water resource management have helped generate the still growing interest in the environmental borderlands. These challenges require diverse approaches, both interdisciplinary and intra-disciplinary within the environmental borderlands of geography. Moreover the important role that 'place' plays in environmental governance, including participation by marginalized peoples, and such influences as local and subject-level influences of political, economic, and environmental policies can be informed by cultural and political ecology (Agrawal, 2005; Mitchell 2006).

Robbins (2004) argued that political ecology emerged gradually from cultural ecology by giving pride of place to power relations in a previously rather positivist adaptation agenda. Paulson & Gezon (2005) suggested that early political ecologists underestimated the extent to which meaningful constructions of the world – in other words, cultural contexts – influenced action. Thus, the interface between cultural and political ecology can be clearly conceptualized and utilized to analyze the impact of resource use and conservation decisions on marginalized peoples.

2.7 Geography and Development in Kenya

Kenya is located in East Africa between latitudes 4°21'N and 4°28'S and between longitudes 34°E and 42°E. The country covers an area of 587,000km² with water bodies accounting for 11,000km² of this area. It has a population of 33 million and is defined not only by its diverse ethnic makeup, but also by its contrasting ecology, climate and relief. The land that stretches from the sea level to the snow-peaked Mt. Kenya and bisected by the Great Rift Valley has resulted in diverse ecological and climatic patterns. The contrasting livelihoods of the population sometimes conform to but in other cases defy the physical attributes of the land.

2.7.1 A Brief Description of the Geography

Only 12 percent of Kenya receives reliable rainfall while the rest suffers from erratic and unreliable rainfall. Temperatures range from a mean minimum of 10°C to a mean maximum of 34°C, with great diurnal variations. Kenya is prone to cyclic droughts particularly in the Arid and Semi Arid Lands (ASALs). The large water bodies like Lake Victoria, Lake Turkana and the Indian Ocean generate lake-land and sea-land-breeze circulations with an intense cycle that contributes to the overall precipitation pattern over the country (Camberlin & Planchon 1997; Mukabana & Pielke 1996; Nieuwolt1979). The

considerable annual variability of the rainfall makes any planned farmland and rangeland management very difficult.

Given Kenya's varied climate, the landmass has been classified into seven distinct agro-ecological zones (AEZs) (Jaetzold & Schmidt 1982; Figure 2.1). In many ways the agro-ecological zones offer the simplest theme for characterizing the regions of Kenya. This is because despite the increasing trend towards an urbanized society, the majority of the population still derives its living either directly or indirectly from agricultural activities. Agriculture engages 70 percent of the population and contributes 26 percent of the GDP (ETC 2006).

Agro-ecological zones are distinctive and often influence the economic activities that take place within them. AEZ-1 is Afro-alpine moor-land and grassland or barren land above the forest line. AEZ-2 is land comprising forests and derived grasslands and woodlands, which contain most of the country's indigenous and planted forests. AEZ-3 offers the best agricultural value with intensive crop and livestock production. AEZ-4 is considered as medium agricultural potential area. AEZ-5, 6 and 7 are the ASALs and are largely utilized for extensive livestock production.

Of the total land area, about 16 percent (9.4 million ha) is of high to medium potential (HMPL) and the remaining 83 percent (48 million ha) are ASALs (ETC 2006). Of the 9.4 million ha HMPL, 2.8 million ha is crop land, 2.8 million ha is for grazing (mostly dairy), 2.0 million ha is in forest, 1.1 million ha national parks and reserves and 0.5 million ha is for urban areas and infrastructure. Most of these high potential

Figure 2-1 Agro-Ecological Zones of Kenya



Source: Sombroek, Braun & van der Pouw (1982)

areas are found in the central and western highlands. They also harbor the biggest populations and urban centers. These areas harbor highly fragmented lands exacerbated by subdivision through inheritance. The result is the characteristic patchwork of small multi-cropped lands in the regions of Central and Western Kenya. In the ASALs, about 9 million ha support agriculture; 15 million ha supports extensive livestock rearing, and the remaining 24 million ha is only suitable for nomadic pastoralism.

The main food crops like maize, wheat, sorghum, millet, cassava, Irish and sweet potatoes, bananas, mangos and other fruits and vegetables are widespread to varying degrees in AEZ 3 and 4. The main cash crops like tea, coffee, horticulture (flowers and vegetables) and dairy cattle are found in the high potential areas of AEZ 3. Beef cattle, goats and sheep are mainly found AEZ 4. The ASALs host about 34 percent of the population. Most of the land is under pastoralism while the higher elevated areas allow crop cultivation and irrigation agriculture where possible. Nevertheless ASALs have enormous natural capital epitomized by wildlife, minerals (like soda ash), water (lakes and rivers) among others. Often, the artificially created parks are a source of conflict with the neighbouring communities that have previously freely utilized these areas. Parks tend to transform the landscape by limiting use to tourism.

2.7.2 Common Pool Resource Policy and Development in Kenya

The balance between use and conservation of common pool resources is critical to the ecological and socio-economic wellbeing of Kenya. The country is endowed with a rich natural heritage that is highly threatened. It is home to an estimated 6,500 plant species of which 260 are endemic. Furthermore, the country harbors more than 1,000 bird species and over 350 species of mammals (ranking second in Africa for these animal groups) (Biggs et al. 2004). For this reason, Kenya has invested in an outstanding network of protected areas covering 8 percent of its total land area in order to safeguard its natural resources; support nature-based tourism; and achieve biodiversity, watershed protection, and other environmental objectives. Tourism is a mainstay of the economy. In 2005, 2.1 million tourists visited Kenya and the sector generated US\$ 700 million and employed 176,000 people (CBS 2006).

But Kenya's important natural heritage is in a state of continued decline. Forest ecosystems are particularly contested and are under severe threat of decline; for example between 1990 and 2005 the area under forest shrank by 5 percent while other wooded area was reduced by 1.7 percent (Global Forest Resources Assessment, 2005). The closed forest area that is now estimated at 984,000 hectares represents an alarmingly low 1.7 percent of the country's total land area (KEFRI/KFS, 2007). The continued decline of the forest habitat is worrying given its importance in livelihood provision and ecosystem integrity. Moreover, despite the increase in the number of wildlife sanctuaries, it is estimated that by 1986, the country had lost about 48% of its wildlife habitat. Furthermore, it is estimated that 51 species of Kenya's mammal population (14 percent of total number of species) are now threatened with extinction (IUCN 2006).

Hyde et al (1996), World Bank-affiliated workers, have argued that market-induced responses to increasing scarcity will correct many forest allocation problems and limit potential deforestation. They link any forest-related problems to spillover from existing macroeconomic and agricultural policies that discourage forest investment. They claim that many forest rights are static, final and unresponsive to economic change and to the developing economic validity of private (or well-managed common) ownership of natural forests. They further claim that it is a myth that all forests everywhere support multiple and significant nonmarket values (Hyde et al. 1996 p.242). This is a typical positivist view of a market cure for all. The Kenyan situation which thus remains on a forest depletion trend despite the very limited forest resources does not lend credence to the view that market forces necessarily reverse forest depletion once a critical stage has been reached.

The major challenge to Kenya's rich wildlife heritage is that areas with concentrations of high biodiversity often overlap with the densely populated areas (Balmford et al 2001; WRI 2007). An estimated three million people live within a radius of five kilometres of forests (World Bank 2007). It is

estimated that more than 4 million rural households depend on forest products for their day-to-day needs, products that are worth nearly US\$100 million a year (Emerton et al, 2001). About 75 percent of the population relies on either firewood or charcoal for their energy consumption (MoE 2002). For instance, 5000 ha of forest land are converted to agriculture annually through pressure on forests from communities living along forest margins in Kenya (Odera 2001). In Kenya, as elsewhere, the wellbeing of poor people can be sustainably improved through more equitable and secure access to local ecosystem services (Adams et al 2004, WRI 2007). This means that a reversal of the rapid loss of biodiversity is only possible if an appropriate balance can be found between the health of resources and ecosystems, and the health and quality of human life especially at the community level.

2.7.2.1 Shamba System: An Example of Contested Approaches to Forest Management in Kenya

Although Kenya legally adopted a participatory forest management approach in 2005, there are several examples of previous co-management initiatives between state agencies and local communities. This section briefly describes one such co-management system that has been utilized in various forms in forest governance over several decades with varying results and great debate on its merits and demerits. It is a recurring theme in Kenya forest governance and deserves mention for a better understanding of the contested nature of the management of the commons in Kenya.

Apart from natural forests, the Kenya Forestry Service (KFS) manages forest plantations that cover about 170,000 ha (FAO 2003). Plantations of exotic tree species were established by former colonial authorities to provide raw materials for expanding timber industries and reduce pressure on remaining natural forests. Labour shortages and financial constraints within the state forest agency led to the establishment of a mutually beneficial forest management arrangement known as the Shamba System from the early years of formalized forest management in Kenya (Kagombe & Gitonga, 2005). It involved local farmers utilizing

the same land for short rotation crop farming during initial stages of tree establishment until canopy closure, resulting in mutual benefits for both the forest department and the farmers who suffered from land shortages.

This system worked well over the years but consequent mismanagement led to a series of bans with the last one imposed in 2003 (Kagombe and Gitonga, 2005). There were claims that farmers failed to complete their side of the bargain in successfully tending the tree seedlings and some attempted to settle permanently on assigned pieces of land (Witcombe & Dorward 2009). Other experts have called for the re-examination of the mechanisms of the Shamba System in order to improve both the establishment of forests in Kenya but also the livelihoods of the negatively affected populations (Kagombe & Gitonga, 2005). Although the ban is still largely in effect, the KFS has recently established a number of pilot study locations with a view to designing a more widely acceptable variation of the system.

The consequence of the ban is that forest adjacent households have lost a vital source of livelihood which has led to increased food insecurity. The overall result has been an intensified alienation of the forest from adjacent communities who complained of the limited user rights in the old forest law. The new Forest Act envisages greater co-management and access to forest and has led to renewed hope that the benefits of the Shamba System might once again be available to forest adjacent communities.

2.8 Summary: balancing development paradigms

Technocratic and rational planning approaches for environmental resource management clearly are dominant in Kenya at the present moment. The main reason is because the notion of sustainable development was in fact conceived within the modernization paradigm of rational planning and efficiency as exemplified by neoliberal approaches. But given that the neoliberal approaches have fallen far short of their goals in developing countries, it is unsurprising that environmental management goals have also failed to reach their mark. On the other hand, post-development approaches have tended towards the opposite extreme in advocating for a pullback from the development agenda of neoliberalism. But this utopian dream is unlikely to be achieved given the totalizing effect of the neoliberal agenda. A hybrid of these two extremes might be necessary to achieve the desired balance between a neoliberal agenda insensitive to local factors in development and approaches that attempt to isolate local development processes from the impact of external economic forces.

The policy terrain affecting areas bordering forests is often conflict-ridden between issues such as use and protection; co-management and state management; neoliberal approaches or more equitable sharing of resources at community level; contradictions between development approaches and conservation objectives, and inconsistencies in institutional and regulatory frameworks. The terrain is further muddied by the multi-scalar influences on policy and project implementation that are often in tension with local level needs. The new Forest Act 2005 in Kenya that encourages joint participation and grants user rights offers hope to local communities that more meaningful development can be achieved in these areas

Chapter Three: Conceptual Research Framework

3.1 Introduction: Theoretical and Political Boundaries of the Research

This research examines multilevel policymaking processes that impact on natural forest management in Kenya and the effects that these processes have on integrated forest management projects at community level (Figure 3.1). This research was situated between social constructivism, structuralism and pragmatism approaches (Creswell 2007). I examined the complexity of views of individuals, small groups of individuals and institutions rather than attempting to narrow meanings into a few categories, and relied on the subjective views of the participants. I assumed that these subjective meanings are negotiated socially because meanings are formed through interaction with others within historical and cultural norms. This research lies squarely within the interpretative approach to qualitative research with flexible guidelines, a focus on theory developed depending on the researcher's view shaped by the experience of examining embedded and hidden networks, situations, and relationships; and making visible hierarchies of power, communication and opportunity. The emphasis was on the values, beliefs, feelings, assumptions and ideologies of individuals rather than on methods of research. My background is important because it shapes the interpretation by "positioning myself" in the research. Theoretical ideas and notions are set aside in order for an analytic, substantive theory to emerge (see further details on fieldwork and ethical considerations in Section 3.8 in this chapter).

The methodological design is multi-scalar with the emphasis on tracing the movement of ideas and resources that shape policies and eventual project design from the international level to the local level. My methods incorporated aspects of pragmatism in order to establish the outcomes of specific projects.



Figure 3-1: Chart showing thematic connections of the research

This approach enabled the evaluation of the actions of different actors, situations and the eventual outcomes. This meant that I adopted some mixed methods of data collection including quantitative values for comparative purposes. I utilized selected case study projects that involved detailed and in-depth data collection from multiple sources of information including observations, interviews, documents and reports. The research questions were broad and focused on the specific context in which people live and work.

3.2 Adoption of a Policy Analysis Approach

This section outlines the process of selecting a policy analysis methodology for this study, beginning with a brief historical discussion of the important ideas and the shifts in recent decades regarding the approach to policy analysis. Post Second World War approaches assumed a controlled – mostly by government – process that was clearly discernible from start to finish. These early approaches favored, positivist, textbook approaches but these were gradually challenged by more participatory and complex methodologies that recognized the non-linear process that shaped policies. I discuss more recent approaches, such as the policy network analysis (PNA) and Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), and explain the reason why I adopted them as the method for my research.

3.2.1 Historical Developments of Policy Analysis

The writings of Harold Lasswell (1951, 1956, 1971) were crucial in shaping the policy sciences. He envisioned a multidisciplinary enterprise capable of guiding the political decision processes of post WWII industrial societies. He called for the study of the role of "knowledge in and of the policy process". But the policy-analytic enterprise largely failed to take up Lasswell's bold vision and instead followed a much narrower path of development (Fischer et al 2007). Policy analysis took an empirical orientation geared more towards managerial practices than to the facilitation of democratic government *per se*. Contrary to the multidisciplinary methodological perspective that was common in the 1960s, policy analysis in the 1970s and 80s was shaped by a more limiting methodological framework derived from the neopositivist/empiricist theories of knowledge that dominated the social sciences. Largely due to the dominance of economics and its positivist scientific methodologies on the development of the field (Fischer et al 2007), this approach generated an emphasis on vigorous quantitative analysis, the objective

separation of facts and values, and the search for generalizable findings whose validity would be independent of the particular social context from which they were drawn.

In the 1970s and 1980s the predominant theoretical framework of the policy process was the textbook approach also referred to as the 'stages-heuristic'. The textbook approach viewed the policy process as a series of stages: agenda setting, policy formulation and legitimation, implementation, and evaluation (Nakamura 1987; Keeley & Scoones 1999). According to Sabatier (1999), a positive aspect of this framework during its period of popularity was that, through compartmentalization of very complex policy processes, it enabled excellent research within the particular stages. The numerous empirical studies and theoretical debates concerned with single stages of the policy cycle contributed substantially to a better understanding of the prerequisites, elements, and consequences of policymaking, but they have also triggered a rising critique challenging the underlying policy cycle framework. This critique primarily questioned the analytical differentiation of the policy process into separate and discrete stages and sequences. Implementation research studies have revealed that a clear-cut separation between policy formulation and implementation hardly reflects the real world policy-making, neither in terms of hierarchical or chronological sequence, nor in terms of involved actors. For this reason, scholars like Sabatier (1999) suggested that this so-called stages-heuristic had outlived its usefulness and needed to be replaced by more advanced models. The stages-heuristic framework has been criticized particularly on the following grounds:

• With regard to description, the stages model is descriptively inaccurate because empirical reality does not fit with the classification of the policy process into discrete and sequential stages (Sabatier 1999; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993)

- Conceptually, the policy cycle lacks defining elements of a theoretical framework. Specifically, the model does not offer causal explanations for the transition between the different stages (Sabatier 1999; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993)
- The model is based on an implicit top-down perspective which frames policymaking as a hierarchical steering by superior institutions. The model focuses on single programs and decisions and on the formal adoption and implementation of those particular programs. Thus, the interaction between diverse programs, laws, and norms and their parallel implementation and evaluation does not gain the primary attention of policy analysis (Jann & Wegrich 2007)
- The policy cycle perspective systematically ignores the elements of the policy process that are related to problem-solving. For example symbolic or ritual activities, or activities related purely to the maintenance of power do not feature in the stages model and thereby ignore the reality that policymaking is frequently a by-product of politics and not the main objective (Jann & Wegrich 2007)
- The model ignores the role of knowledge, ideas and learning as influential independent variables affecting all stages of the policy process (not only the evaluation stage) (Jann & Wegrich 2007).

In summary, the stages-heuristic framework leads toward an oversimplified worldview. The role of prior policies in shaping policymaking as well as the interaction between diverse cycles, stages and actors is not systematically taken into account. However a central feature of the policy process in modern societies is the interaction between policy related activities at different levels (including local, regional, national and international) and arenas (governmental, parliamentary, administrative, and scientific communities) of governance.

Other popular policy analysis frameworks have been described by Sabatier (1999), including the Institutional Rational Choice framework that focuses on how institutional rules alter the behavior of intensely rational individuals motivated by material self-interest. An alternative framework is the Multiple-Streams Framework – based on the "garbage can" model of organizational behavior. The Multiple-Streams Framework views the policy process as composed of three streams of actors and processes. These are first, a problem-solving stream consisting of data about various problems and proponents of various problem definitions; second, a policy stream involving the proponents of solutions to policy problems; and third, a politics stream consisting of elections and elected officials. These three streams normally operate independently of each other, except when a "window of opportunity" permits policy entrepreneurs to couple the various streams. If successful, the result is a major policy change. Two other frameworks that have gained widespread acceptance in the last two decades are the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) and Policy Network Analysis (PNA). I discuss the latter two frameworks in the following section.

The more 'bottom-up' perspective that emerged in recent decades focuses on policies as courses of action that are part of on-going processes of negotiation and bargaining among multiple actors (Dobuzinskis, 1992; Keeley & Scoones 1999). Moreover, in the complex, uncertain and variable contexts of rural resource management, an emphasis on local negotiation, collaboration and incremental field-level action may be more appropriate than the classic linear model (Agrawal & Gibson 1999; Andersson & Ostrom 2008; Armitage et al 2007). Conversely, some theorists argued that policy change has its foundation in an inherently political process that involves a deep relationship between knowledge and power that should stand at the centre of analysis (Escobar 1995; Foucault, 1991).

The major epistemological thrust that has emerged over the last decade in the policy sciences has been reflected in the transition from an empirical (often described as a "positivist") methodology to a more context-oriented "post-positivist" methodology and with it, a return to the democratic orientation that Laswell (1951, 1956, 1971) envisioned. Fischer et al (2007) outlined the three components of the post-

positivist movement, namely that: (1) many scholars suggested that the shortcomings of the policy sciences were possibly due to its positivist methodologies. These methodologies were once historically based on the tenets of social welfare economics (for example, benefit/cost analysis) that were fundamentally flawed, thus resulting in analyses that also were flawed; (2) the post-positivist epistemological orientation argued for an alternative policy approach, one that featured different variations of greater citizen participation (as opposed to technical, generally removed, elites); and (3) policy theorists began to realize the socio-political issues were too complex to be analyzed by reductive approaches, and that differing contexts often required different perspectives and epistemologies.

While deliberative democracy or participatory policy analysis has been promising to many theorists, it has also been severely criticized by others as being "too cumbersome" or demanding too much time or including too many participants to move toward policy closure. For this reason, recent new frameworks such as ACF and PNA, that seek to bridge this gap, have increasingly gained widespread popularity, particularly in the more developed countries as I discuss in more detail in the next section.

3.2.2 Adapting Policy Analysis and Network Theories for the Research

Policy analysis has shifted from a rather simplistic pipe model of analysis into an integrated multilayered concept viewed simultaneously as progressing forward but with continuous feedback in the process (Fischer et al 2007). Policy analysis encompasses several disciplines and could be country or region specific and the changes in policy analysis concepts tend to underscore its multidisciplinary and multi-origin nature. Initial views of one controlling hand – the government bureaucracy – initiating and managing the process to its logical conclusion has in recent years been widely discredited with the realization that many other actors are involved to varying degrees both in terms of resources and beliefs (Easton 1965; Fischer et al 2007; Parsons 1995). Contemporary policy analysis recognizes that networks

of actors endowed with different goals and resources have roles that are equally as important as government in determining the policy process. Initial assumptions and concepts have been gradually replaced by the newly dominant theories of networking in the policy process. An analysis of the internal and external actors and their power relations is important if a fuller understanding of the policy process is to be achieved. Moreover, the globalization concept can serve to reveal how the policy process is impacted by both local and external forces.

In explaining policy change, analysts often try to balance competing social and political interests in a structured framework (Agrawal 2001; Bennett & Howlett 1992). But for more insightful analysis, the policy networks approach has the advantage of moving debate beyond tensions existing between state and society, and framing them instead as a product of the agency of actors engaged in a policy arena where processes of interaction, compromise and construction of coalitions are important (Coleman and Perl 1999; Hajer & Wagenaar 2003; Keeley & Scoones 1999). Policy change can also be viewed as the outcome of overarching knowledge constituted within various policy discourses (Dobbin et al 2007).

The structure versus agency debate in environmental policy change suggests two relatively distinct approaches. The first approach is a more confrontational, advocacy stance, whereby the emphasis is to develop counter-narratives and strategize in order to take advantage of policy spaces to build alternative actor-networks (Roe & van Eeten 2004). The second approach emerges from a position that recognizes the contingency of different knowledge claims and so places more emphasis on developing institutions that promote communication and address policy issues through participatory processes of argumentation and deliberation (Sabatier 1999). These two approaches could be combined in order to highlight complex dynamics and structural constraints, as well as opportunities for agency, action and change (Keeley & Scoones 1999). I compare and contrast the two approaches in the following sections, briefly discussing the origin of the two approaches and comparing them to reveal their strengths and weaknesses.

Subsequently I adopted a research strategy that combined the two approaches as the most comprehensive way of analyzing forest policy development processes in Kenya

3.2.3 Policy Network Analysis

Hugh Heclo (1978) introduced the concept of "issue networks". He suggested that it is through networks of people who trust in each other's knowledge, that substantial policy issues and options get debated and defined although rarely in a controlled or well-organized way. Such horizontal relationships include individuals, organizations, lobbyists, and legislators. More traditional forms of policy research have tended to focus on the hierarchical policy process. The network approach looks at the policy process in terms of the horizontal relationships that define the development of public policies. Policy networks are concerned with the more relational and informal aspects of policymaking. Greater diversity in society and in policy process has shown the network metaphor to be a better fit with modern policymaking than other traditional models (Parsons 1995).

The issue networks concept eventually developed into the concept of social network analysis, particularly under a democratic and participative regime (Hajer & Wagnaar 2003). The concept is characterized by its use of "networks" as the temporal unit of analysis. That is, public policy issues are no longer the exclusive domain of governmental units. Thus, Rhodes (1990) defined policy networks as clusters or complexes of organizations connected to each other by resource dependencies and distinguished from other clusters or complexes by breaks in the structure of the resource dependencies. One of the shortcomings of network analysis is in bounding the scope of the analysis, but in any case, it is an approach that is more consistent with the wide range of institutional actors who constitute the policy process compared to the more limiting positivist approaches.

The issue networks concept has been used to analyze policymaking and implementation from local to international levels (Coleman & Perl 1999; Raab & Kenis 2007). Common to these network studies is a relational perspective that focuses on actors, their interests, and especially their relations as the key explanatory factors. The role of networks in policymaking became an important issue on the research agenda in the late 1980s. Policy researchers began to theoretically and empirically focus on how networks between public, private and non-profit actors shaped processes of policymaking and governance. These were more horizontal forms of governance that developed out of a changed distribution of power. It was seen as a promising instrument of political research because different theoretical approaches could be combined and because it offered the possibility to go beyond the mere description of formal institutional structures and to investigate which actors dominated the political decision making process in different policy fields (Windhoff-Heritier 1993).

Smith (1993) advanced six propositions about the relationship of state autonomy and networks collated from literature:

- 1. The type of network relationships varies across time, policy sectors and states
- 2. State actors have interests which shape the development of policy and policy networks
- The autonomy of the state in making and implementing policy is affected by the types of policy networks which exist
- 4. Types of policy networks affect policy outcomes
- 5. The type of policy networks provides a context for understanding the role of interest groups in policymaking. Networks are the 'enstructuration' of past policies, ideologies and processes.
- 6. The types of network will affect the way in which policy changes.

In summary, policy network analysis adopts a structural perspective in attempting to explain the distribution of power among actors in a social system as a function of the position they occupy in one or more networks (Knocke 1990). The term actor in this case describes any social entity including an individual person as well as a corporation. A policy network is defined by a relatively stable set of actors, their linkages, and the network boundary. The linkages between the actors serve as channels for communication and for the exchange of information, expertise, trust and other policy resources. The boundary of a given policy network is not determined beforehand but arises instead from a process of mutual recognition dependent on functional relevance and structural embeddness. Unlike the better defined Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), policy networks is a generic concept and various categories such as "issue networks", "iron triangles" and "corporatist structures" can be identified (Kenis & Schneider 1991).

3.2.4 The Advocacy Coalition Framework

The ACF is a policymaking framework developed to analyze intense public policy problems (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1988, 1993; Sabatier 1999). It is used as a lens to understand and explain belief and policy change when there is disagreement and technical disputes involving multiple actors from several levels of government, interest groups, research institutions and the media. Thus, unlike PNA that stresses the role of resources in structuring an actor's proximity to policy-making, the ACF emphasizes belief systems and policy-oriented learning. The essential premise is that policymaking occurs in a policy subsystem inhabited by several multi-actor advocacy coalitions which compete to influence policy in line with their various beliefs. The ACF seeks to explain policy change by identifying the source of the beliefs supporting that change. The process of competition between advocacy coalitions generates policy-oriented learning. The ACF stresses agency over structure in explanations of change.

Generally policymaking occurs in a policy subsystem, which is a policy area that is geographically bounded and encompasses policy participants from all levels of government, multiple interest groups, research institutions, and the media. Within a policy subsystem, policy participants coordinate their behaviour with allies in advocacy coalitions to influence policy. To influence policy, policy participants both specialize in a policy subsystem to effectively achieve their objectives, and maintain their participation over long periods of time to ensure their objectives are achieved (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993. The policy subsystems are set within, are affected by, and sometime affect, a broader societal context. The ACF groups the broad societal context into two categories: relatively stable parameters and external events.

The relatively stable parameters are: (1) basic attributes of the problem area, (2) basic distribution of the natural resources, (3) fundamental socio-cultural values and social structure, and (4) basic constitutional structure (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993; Sabatier 1999). The relatively stable parameters are stable over long periods of time; approximately 100 years or more. They are important because they structure the nature of the problem, constrain the resources available to policy participants, establish the rules and procedures for changing policy and reaching collective decisions, and broadly frame values that inform policymaking. Because of their resistance to change, the relatively stable parameters are usually not strategically targeted by policy participants.

Sometimes it is difficult to define the geographic and substantive boundaries of a policy subsystem because some policy subsystems are bounded within broader policy subsystems and because some policy participants are active in more than one policy subsystem. There is no single rule for defining policy subsystems. This flexibility gives the ACF applicability but makes it hard to apply. Policy subsystems should therefore be ascertained empirically. External events that can affect the policy subsystem include: (1) major socioeconomic changes, (2) changes in public opinion, (3) changes in the systematic governing coalition, and (4) policy decisions and impacts from other systems. Furthermore, the ACF defines three mechanisms leading to minor or major policy change: (1) external shocks, (2) a hurting stalemate, and (3) the general accumulation of scientific/technical evidence (Sabatier 1999).

Over time, actors tend to coalesce into a number of advocacy coalitions competing for influence. Each coalition is bound together by the shared policy core beliefs of their members through coordinated action. An actor's overall belief system contains other levels. The most entrenched beliefs are the deep core beliefs which include basic ontological and normative axioms. Policy core beliefs work at the next level. Less entrenched than these are secondary aspects – views on specific elements or issues in the policy subsystem and the instrumental decisions considered necessary for policy-core maintenance. Secondary aspects are altered more readily with experience, in the light of new information, or for strategic purposes. This means that actors in the ACF hold a three-fold, nested, belief system. They tend to associate in advocacy coalitions along policy-belief lines whilst compromising over secondary aspects. Policy core beliefs can change too, but only when they become seriously out of step with real-world experience.

Competing coalitions will use persuasive testimony to alter rules or budgets, or seek to recruit or influence important government personnel, and try to shape public opinion. In this respect, the ACF is agency oriented since no mention is made of structural constraints preventing actors from building coalitions and seeking influence. In addition to the competitive process in ACF, policy-oriented learning takes place both within coalitions and between coalitions. Thus it is possible to conceptualize the actors organized in a policy network.

The competition between coalitions is mediated by the policy broker. The policy broker's function is to find some reasonable compromise which minimizes conflict. This compromise, shaped by the broker's own policy beliefs, affects the policy process, the outcomes of which feed back to fuel further competing interpretations. The policy broker occupies an important role in ACF accounts of policy change. Yet the model has been criticized for lacking elaboration beyond an implicitly pluralist characterization (Jordan and Greenaway, 1998).

Policy-oriented learning rarely results in major policy change, as it is the secondary aspects which tend to be modified by endogenous learning whereas it is wholesale shifts in dominant policy core belief which are associated with major policy change. The ACF has been criticized for neglecting the mechanisms behind major policy change (Mintrom & Vergari, 1996). The ACF offers a list of exogenous factors as a response: socioeconomic change, changes in public opinion, change in government, authoritative intervention, and impacts arising from other policy subsystems.

3.2.5 ACF and PNA: compared and contrasted

PNA and ACF both draw on Heclo's "issue networks", a view of increasing complexity of civil society and the importance of interactions of experts from various sectors within a particular policy area (Heclo 1978). It possible to conceptualize a policy subsystem made up of two or three coalitions of actors as forming a network structure. While a structural approach focuses coalitions in terms of relations between actors, the ACF adds the concept of belief systems. The recourse to exogenous factors sets the boundary for the ACF, just as it does for PNA. The overlapping properties of these two approaches allows for the analysis of both arguments and conflicts as well as the organizational structure of the system.

Overall, a careful application of PNA and the ACF core analytical devices, of policy resources and beliefs (broadly defined) can contribute fruitfully to explaining elements of policy change and stability in Kenya. For this reason I analyzed the belief systems of different actors while studying the multi-level structure of environmental policies at community, national, and international levels. This meant that shifting beliefs advocated in sectors or impinging upon sectors over time necessarily had to be taken into account. The resource interdependencies which enabled some beliefs to become policy practice ahead of others were duly considered. The interplay of resources and beliefs suggested it was analytically important to appreciate the structure and agency-oriented approaches driving PNA and the ACF. Resources and beliefs interplay suggested another dimension to the logical practice of policy change analysis: just as interaction between networks and external factors forms one dimension, so interaction between beliefs and resources is another, related, dimension. Similar to Smith (2000) this research combined the more fundamental agency-oriented and structure-oriented emphases on beliefs and resources associated with the ACF and PNA, respectively, in order to enrich the policy analysis.

3.3 Analytical Frameworks for Social-Ecological Systems

This section outlines the methodology I used to examine the project design, implementation process, and the eventual outcomes at the community level. I viewed the project as conceptually linking the social and the ecological attributes of the selected and geographically-bounded case studies. This is in recognition of the increasing number of analytical frameworks emerging in literature that attempt to address various angles of social-ecological systems. Some well-known analytical frameworks for social-ecological systems include the Driving Forces-Pressures-State-Impacts-Responses (DPSIR) model (Harremoes & Turner, 2001), Vulnerability Framework (Adger 2006), "lack of entitlements" or "capabilities" approaches (Adger, 2006; Maxim & Spangenberg 2006; Sen 1993), and contextual factors analysis (Edwards and Steins 1999). Most of these frameworks are adequate in particular situations; for example, where economic or quantitative measures are required (Spangenberg et al., 2002). But the analysis of causal relations within complex, multi-scalar and temporal perspectives, as proposed here, requires a different analytical framework. The Ostrom (2007) model – reviewed in greater detail in the next section

– offers a flexible framework that provides more useful features than these previous models because it links social and ecological factors directly at different scalar and temporal levels.

3.3.1 Socio-ecological systems model

Cash and Moser (2000) argued for the conceptualization of environmental problems through the lens of scale in order to provide an alternative perspective in assessment and management. They suggested that such an approach should consider: (1) to utilize boundary organizations – institutions which serve to mediate between scientists and decision-makers, and between these actors at different scales; (2) to utilize scale-dependent comparative advantages – to coordinate the allocation of resources, technical expertise, and decision-making authority to best capitalize on scale-specific capabilities; and (3) to employ adaptive assessment and management strategies – to construct long-term, iterative, experiment-based processes of integrated assessment and management. The nested framework for analyzing interactions and outcomes of social-ecological systems developed by Ostrom (2007) offers an appropriate analytical scalar approach (see Figure 3.2).





In the Ostrom framework the natural and social systems are viewed as one system with critical feedbacks across spatial and temporal scales. In this approach, complexity should be recognised in order to develop diagnostic methods to identify variables that affect the incentives and actions of actors under diverse governance systems. To achieve this, the nested attributes (or niche) of a resource system should be examined as well as the resource units generated by that system that jointly affect the incentives of users within a set of rules crafted by local, distal, or nested governance systems. As structural variables change, participants need to have ways of learning and adapting to these changes.

Whereas there is a need to identify and measure relevant variables, not all these variables are relevant in every study because SESs are partially decomposable systems. Partially decomposable systems are modular, whereby each component acts primarily according to its own intrinsic principles. Each component is influenced by the others only at its inputs; its function (processing of those inputs) is not influenced by other components but is intrinsically determined (Simon 1969; 2000). This means that it is possible to determine the component's properties in isolation from the other components, despite the fact that they interact. The organization of the entire system is critical for the function of the system as a whole, but that organization does not provide constraints on the internal functioning of components (Sawyer, 2004). Thus, for the purposes of this research, individual projects were examined independently with the assumption that their intrinsic values (including indigenous knowledge, learning capacity, norms, and governance mechanisms) determined how the inputs, such as external finances and technical knowledge, were utilized.

Ostrom (2007) identifies three aspects of complex subsystems that are important for achieving a better understanding of complex SESs and crafting ways to improve their performance. These are: (1) the conceptual portioning of variables into classes and subclasses in order to build coherent and cumulative scientific understanding; (2) the existence of relatively separable subsystems that are independent of each
other in the accomplishment of many functions and development but eventually affect each other's performance and allows for policy-making in one part of the system without imposition of uniform formulas on the larger system; and (3) the nature of complex systems (greater than the sum of their parts) so that changing one variable can lead to very different outcomes.

Figure 3.2 is a general framework that captures the highest tier variables that must be analysed when examining SESs. At this level it is possible to analyse how the attributes of a resource system (RS), the resource units (RU) generated by the system, the users (U) of the system and the governance system (GS) jointly affect and are indirectly affected by interactions (I) and resulting outcomes (O) achieved at a particular time and place. Each of the broad categories in Figure 3.1 can be unpacked into multiple conceptual tiers depending on the policy question under investigation.

I adopted this framework in an effort to contribute to the further understanding of using a particular set of variables in an empirical setting. In particular, I sought to reveal the endogenous development of different governance arrangements, use patterns and outcomes, given external financial inducements or imposed rules under the regime of international environmental agreements. The major challenge posed is defining all variables so that the conceptual logic of linking more specific concepts to more general concepts is clear and open to further discourse and development (Ostrom 2007). Sustainable development planning calls for the careful factoring of economic, community, and environmental conditions into the design of development projects (ICLEI & IDRC 1996). Such an idealized scenario is often not possible in community conservation projects and this study focuses on why certain development variables take precedence over others during project implementation.

3.4 Specific Research Methodologies

3.4.1 Research Objective 1

My first objective was to determine the similarities, differences and contradictions of the normative goals of selected international environmental agreements with national policies and local community goals through comparative policy analyses, given the efforts aimed at harmonizing them.

This objective seeks to map the existing policy framework from the international, national and local levels and determine what synergies, similarities and contradictions exist at the different scales. The premises and assumptions of existing policies were critically examined from the country level perspective in relating to the international and local levels. The issue of problem structure is critical here. The problem structure refers to the characterization of problems in the policy process and how these problems are solved practically given the institutional structure (Mitchell 2006). In addition to the problem structure, Mitchell (2006) noted that important distinctions include the number of actors involved, the asymmetry in power and incentives among actors, and the positions taken by nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and civil society with respect to the problem.

Three of the most important global environmental agreements in Kenya - Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora CITES – have been selected in order to determine how the problem structures have been defined, and how they relate to the relevant institutions. Kenya is signatory to sixteen international environmental treaties, but most of them have no clear financial and technical resources aimed at achieving their goals. Indeed, most agencies will look to the three chosen treaties to offer the sort of incentives that will enable their implementation. The three treaties have clear action plans that allow for determination of how well they have been adopted and implemented in Kenya. For example, for the CDB that was ratified in 1994 (together with the UNFCC), there is the Kenya National Biodiversity and Strategy Action Plan produced by Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (NES 2000). There are also national guidelines for adopting the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the UNFCCC (Republic of Kenya, 2001). CITES was ratified 1978, much earlier than the other two but its focus has been on megafauna, such as elephants, while ignoring flora (Manek 2001). CITES's long period of existence can be compared and contrasted with the much more recent UNFCCC in order to examine how governance processes eventually determine the outcomes of the implementation strategies. It is particularly relevant to forests management following the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Kenya Forest Service (formerly the Forest Department) and the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). KWS is the host organization of CITES and the MoU was agreed upon given the comparative success of KWS in managing animal resources in comparison to the myriad of problems encountered by KFS in managing forests.

3.4.2 Research Objective 2

My second objective was to determine the adaptability, resilience and learning capacities of local communities which lead to differences between the normative project goals and actual outcomes.

I examined all actors including communities, project implementing agencies and civil agencies in regard to their local involvement and impacts on the local adaptability, resilience and learning capacities in comanagement. The indigenous knowledge and governance mechanisms existing before the introduction of the project were determined in order to analyse whether or not they were taken into account in project development. Non-participants in the case study areas were included in the analysis in order to establish why some community members were left out of the project. Co-management can be conceptualized as a continuous problem solving process. The joint management of the commons approach that I followed in order to examine the project variables has been described by Carlsson & Berkes (2005) as follows:

- 1. Defining the social-ecological system under focus;
- 2. Mapping the essential management tasks and problems to be solved;
- 3. Clarifying the participants in the problem-solving processes;
- Analyzing linkages in the system, in particular across levels of organization and across geographical space;
- 5. Evaluating capacity-building needs for enhancing the skills and capabilities of people and institutions at various levels.

3.4.3 Research Objective 3

My third objective was to assess how the scalar and temporal factors of project implementation impact on human needs and conservation goals given the local ecological and sociological variables.

For this objective, I examined the spatial and temporal suitability of the forest- and conservation-related activities relative to the livelihoods of the local community. Forests are constantly changing at the scales of individual trees, forest stands, and landscapes; thus I analyzed the adaptability of the projects to these kinds of changes (Zimmerer & Young 1998). Caldecott (1996) recommends that in order to determine whether a project is adapted to the ecological and social realities of the project area, a large scale project can be sub-divided into smaller units until a scale is reached at which its appropriateness to the target community can be answered. Target indicators of the conservation projects were examined and contrasted with perceived community expectations in order to determine success according to the different actors.

The learning processes for the actors involved in the project were analyzed in order to determine the direction of the feedbacks and how this affected the functioning of the project.

3.4.4 Research Objective 4

My fourth objective was to determine the effects of network and institutional interactions on both the harmonization of international environmental agreements, national policies and local community goals, and on the differences in local community project outcomes.

The purpose was to examine how the policy network operates at multiple jurisdictions and determine how the aims of international environmental treaties are translated at the community level. Since the main objective was to understand the response of the national government, local administration and local community to international policy changes, the unit of analysis was institutional rather than a person (Lurie 2003). Agenda 21 recognizes that local authorities play a crucial role in constructing, operating, and maintaining economic, social, and environmental infrastructure, overseeing planning processes, establishing local environmental policies and regulations, and implementing national environmental policies. For this reason Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 recommends that all local governments create their own action plans for sustainable development. My main goal was to determine how communication procedures affected the points of intersection for the different actors. Because the research traced policy change down to the lowest level of government affected, the local government at the district level was the unit of analysis.

3.5 Research Questions

I chose to use a research questions approach because, in contrast to hypothesis-testing, questions allow for open-ended research that can better inform the governance and policy processes. For many of these questions, before/after scenario approaches were utilized in analyzing the impacts of the projects. To add clarity and manageability to the central research questions I broke them further down to procedural sub-questions. Procedural sub-questions unpack an overall research question by breaking it down into the research procedures that were used (Stake 1995).

3.5.1 Central research questions

The following four central research questions are general empirical questions that help to elicit themes for further investigation in order to add to knowledge and clarify doubt. The four central research questions are listed respectively according to the four research objectives discussed in detail in section 3.4 above.

- 1. What are the differences between international, national and local conservation goals and what factors influence these differences during the adoption and planning process from the international environmental agreements level to the local community projects level?
- 2. What are the differences between initial project goals and actual outcomes, and what factors influence community resilience, adaptability and learning capacity during project implementation?
- 3. How have the ecological and socio-economic policies and politics influenced the sustainability of local community projects over time and space?
- 4. How do the network and institutional interactions of actors at international, national and local levels affect the formulation of normative goals and actual outcome of conservation projects?

3.5.2 Procedural research questions

In my research the procedural research questions were aligned to the interpretative approach combined with aspects of pragmatism in analyzing participant views and project outcomes. The research process and research reporting process became clearer and more manageable by breaking down the overall research question into procedural research questions. I relied on the procedural sub-questions to naturalistically guide the research process.

- 1. What are the normative goals at local, national and international levels? Who are the actors involved in formulating the normative goals at all levels and how does this influence policy?
- 2. What were the project outcomes? What were the obstacles to successful implementation? What are were the adaptability, resilience and learning mechanisms of local communities?
- 3. What attempts were made by project developers to identify synergies between ecological, socioeconomic and political issues? Have the spatial and temporal aspects been taken into account in project development and implementation?
- 4. What specific collaborative management strategies can be identified? What stakeholders or interest groups drive the process more than others? What interaction patterns among the actors affect the normative goals and project outcomes?

3.6 Justification for Case Study Approach

Case studies endeavour to conform to the logic of inference through careful case selection and investigation of rival hypotheses (Young et al 2006). Aggregation, comparison, and contrast of case studies can serve to identify broad patterns which in turn can be used to inform policy processes (Bebbington, 2003; Gerring 2004; Sunderlin et al 2005). A comparative approach allows for an

assessment of different contexts and an analysis of the implications. A comparative approach is not an exercise in direct comparison with similar methodology applied across in all sites in relation to a fixed set of variables. The complexities and particularities of each individual policy process do not allow for such comparative approaches. In each case study site emerging policy stories are pursued, uncovering their histories, investigating their contexts, mapping the networks and coalitions and evaluating their effects. My methodology is necessarily qualitative and eclectic. Unlike quantitative techniques, causal qualitative analysis of a small number of cases facilitates investigation of the following aspects (identified by Mitchell and Bernauer, 1998):

- 1. Important but difficult to quantify variables (such as power, interests, or leadership);
- 2. Theoretically important, empirically rare, or previously ignored cases;
- 3. Innovative (but, by their nature, rare) international environmental policy strategies; and
- 4. Causal, rather than merely correlational, relationships. In particular, a case study allows for evidence that a specific independent variable is influenced by a dependent variable via an hypothesized causal pathway.

I undertook a preliminary selection of case study areas and communities in Kenya that had benefited from global environmental agreements and were involved in co-management of established conservation projects. My case study selection was based on temporal and spatial differences between the communities to allow for a comparative framework. This strategy enabled the analyses of different combinations of community characteristics and project goals and implementation process and a consequent determination of the more critical associations that allowed for adaptability and resilience of SESs given a specific project implementation strategy.

Kenya offered a rich variety of projects that provided opportunity for empirical studies of adaptive comanagement of natural resources at the community level. Kenya's unique natural heritage has led to a rich network of protected areas that were often supported by the financial and technical resources from international sources. One of my research goals was to identify opportunities and constraints surrounding the emergence of adaptive co-management by examining the premises and assumptions of existing policies. I hoped that such comparative studies in Kenya could contribute to co-management research and help in improved implementation of integrated conservation and development projects in Kenya and developing countries in general.

For the purpose of this research, one resource system – the forest sector in Kenya – was the unit of analysis because it allowed for easier comparison of the four selected cases. Furthermore, the threatened forest reserve areas in Kenya have all benefitted to a certain degree from development instruments supported by international environmental treaties (Matiru 2000). The dependence and history of use by neighboring communities also has been well recorded (KIFCON 1994; Kigomo 2001; Mogaka et al 2001; Tiffen et al 1994).

Two regions that have been a focus of community co-management in Kenya for many years and thus can readily provide information and data in Kenya are (1) in Western Province, the last remnants of tropical rainforests in the country, as well as montane forests; and (2) the threatened coastal rainforests (Kiringe et al, 2007). Western Kenya is one of the most densely populated regions in Africa and this higher proportion of potential users was contrasted with the lower densities neighboring the coastal forest reserves. Thus, the two regions complement each other in their problematic (See the two locations in Figure 1.1).

The specific organizations that I contacted in the preliminary selection of the projects were: the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF), the World Conservation Union (IUCN), and Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation (NORAD). Contacts also were made with governmental officials from the Ministry of Environmental and Natural Resources, the Kenya Forestry Service, the National Environmental Management Agency (NEMA), and the Kenya Wildlife Service. Four projects were selected from these two regions after discussions with contacts in the field (see section 3.8 for further discussions on fieldwork and ethic considerations). The four projects represented potentially varying strengths and weaknesses in terms of their interactions at the local, national and international levels, as well as the size and duration of the project. The Arabuko-Sokoke forest (Coast) and Kakamega forest (Western Kenya) projects were established by the same program called 'Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenva'. This choice of program controlled for institutional capacities and suggested that any differences in project outcomes could most likely be attributed to factors linked directly to the local community. The other selected case study projects were in Shimba Hills (Coast) and Mt. Elgon (Western Kenya). Table 3.1 provides a summary of the key attributes of the four case studies.

3.7 Selected Project Objectives and Local Demographics

In this section I briefly describe some important characteristics of the four selected communities. The section provides some important socio-economic and ecological variables that impact on project formulation and implementation.

Case Study	Project Title	Aims	Start	Scale	Population density	Implementing Agencies	Funding
Arabuko- Sokoke (Coast Province); coastal rainforest	Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya	To promote the strengthening of the national protected area system of forest reserves through improved incentives in collaborative forest management with local communities	Dec. 2004	Small	Medium	 UNDP ICIPE Local community 	• GEF • USAID
Kakamega (Western Province); tropical rainforest	Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya	To promote the strengthening of the national protected area system of forest reserves through improved incentives in collaborative forest management with local communities	Dec. 2004	Small	High	UNDPICIPELocal community	 GEF EU- Biodiversity Conservation Program ICIPE
Shimba Hills (Coast Province); coastal rainforest	Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System	Institutional support and capacity development for the stakeholders involved in the Coastal Forest Eco-Region	May 2007	Large	Medium	 UNDP WWF East Africa State Institutions Civil Society Local community 	• GEF • WWF • ICIPE
Mt. Elgon (Western Province); montane rainforest	Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program	Integrate conservation and management needs of Mt Elgon Ecosystem into the national, regional and international development frameworks and processes	July 2005	Large	Medium	 East African Community Secretariat State Institutions IUCN Civil Society Local community 	• Royal Norwegian Government

 Table 3-1 Selected Project Attributes

3.7.1 Arabuko-Sokoke

Arabuko Sokoke Forest Reserve (see map in Appendix 1) has an area of 41,763 ha, and is bordered by 51 villages with a population of about 110,000 people. A single household averages about thirteen individuals with a majority of the households consisting of multiple families. Forest products benefits were estimated to be US\$135 for each household (Emerton 1992). By selecting the two neighbouring forest communities of Dida and Malindi situated next to the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, I was able to focus on the impacts of the projects on the two communities without worrying about ecological differences that could impact on project outcomes.

The Nature Kenya project aimed to form at least two Community Forest Associations to manage 4,000 ha of forest in the area. Income generation activities were derived through insect-rearing activities. At least 300 community members were to have been trained in management and utilisation of wild and mulberry silkmoths and African honeybees for income generation by the end of the project. In addition, two community Forest Associations empowered to run silk and honey businesses, were supported by a partner organization – Viking Ltd. The number of farmers involved in commercial insects was projected to exceed 1,000 farmers two years after project completion. The establishment of 10 operational apiaries (average 20 hives each), 7 silkmoth rearing houses and 3 wild silkmoth farming sites had been planned. This project had also intended to establish two marketplaces (including processing and packaging facilities) for silk and honey products by the end of the project.

3.7.2 Kakamega

Kakamega Forest (29,450 hectares) (see map in Appendix 2) is a Forest Reserve under the management of the Kenya Forest Service but a part of it is also gazetted as a National Reserve under the Kenya Wildlife Service. This gives rise to possible conflicts due to the differing mandates of the two state organizations. The density of the large and growing human population that surrounds the forest has been estimated to be over 1,000 individuals/km². The 57 surrounding villages harbour a population of 171,000 people in about 19,000 households. Historically and currently most forest adjacent households access the forest for domestic needs. Up to 85 percent of adjacent households carry out at least one extractive forest activity with an estimated US\$160 value per household (Emerton 1992).

The project aimed to form at least two Community Forest Associations to manage 4,000 ha of forest in the project area. Income generation activities were to be through insect-rearing activities. At least 300 community members were to be trained in management and utilisation of wild and mulberry silkmoths and African honeybees for income generation by the end of the project. In addition two community Forest Associations empowered to run silk and honey businesses were supported by a partner organization – Viking Ltd. More than 1,000 farmers were expected to be involved in commercial insect production by two years after project completion. The establishment of 10 operational apiaries (average 20 hives each), 7 silkmoth rearing houses and 3 wild silkmoth farming sites is planned. There should be two marketplaces (including processing and packaging facilities) established for silk and honey products by the end of the project.

3.7.3 Shimba Hills

The 38, 493 ha Shimba Hills Ecosystem (see map in Appendix 3) lies approximately 40km south of Mombasa on the Kenyan coast. The ecosystem consists of moist coastal forests with high plant diversity and a high rate of endemism. The Shimba Hills Ecosystem is part of WWF's Eastern Africa Coastal Forest Ecoregion, one of the world's 25 biodiversity hotspots. The reserve is surrounded mainly by resource poor farming communities.

The purpose of the pilot Kwale Forest Landscape Restoration Project that ran from 2004 to 2006 was to enhance the landscape forest functions of the Shimba Hills ecosystem and the surrounding landscape, as well as the production capacity for sustainable social and economic development. The initial pilot project – funded mainly by WWF-EARPO and Bamburi Cement Company – was scaled up to a larger Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) project that was implemented by WWF and funded in conjunction with GEF and ICIPE. The project documents (CEPF 2009; CEPF 2009b) listed some of the achievements of this project as: the creation of a management committee bringing together the relevant key stakeholders; the planting of 12,000 seedlings in 6 schools in target communities around the Reserve; 33,000 seedlings planted; and 110 community members trained on general tree management, forestry and nursery management. The main objectives of the scaled up project were to: extend the project sites to cover the whole perimeter of the Shimba Hills National Reserve; extend buffer zone plantations along the whole reserve boundary; enhance community tree nursery support; enhance community livelihood support to all communities along the reserve boundary (bee keeping, butterfly farming etc); initiate enrichment planting within the reserve; and initiate innovative farmland protection against wildlife damage.

3.7.4 Mount Elgon

The 90,258 ha Mt Elgon forest (see map in Appendix 4) was gazetted in 1932. Parts of the forest reserve were converted into a national park in 1968 and in 1978 the higher altitudes were converted to a national reserve under the management of the Kenya Wildlife Service. This conversion created the potential for conflict with The Kenya Forest Service in the same manner as the Kakamega case study noted above. Mt Elgon National Park, the Trans-Nzoia Forest Reserve, the Mt Elgon Forest Reserve, and Chepkitale National Reserve all form part of the larger Mount Elgon forest ecosystem. Because of its value and uniqueness, Kenya and Uganda were in the process of nominating the trans-boundary ecosystem as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The forest is bordered predominantly by peasant farmers with per capita landholdings averaging 0.8/ha. They are mostly involved in crop production and animal rearing. In addition beekeeping, lumbering, and poultry keeping are common activities in the area.

3.7.4.1 Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve

Three most common ethnic groups are the Sabaot (40%), Luhya (30%) and Kalenjin (20%). The closest settlement to the forest edge is the Chepkengen settlement – about 3 km from the forest – with a population of 2000. The user groups include herdsmen (about 20 males) all of whom own at least fifteen cattle as well as some agricultural land; about 400 individuals (380 male and 20 female) form the non-resident cultivator group; firewood collectors (1000 females, 20 children and 50 males); and an undetermined number of mostly male pole collectors.

3.7.4.2 Mt. Elgon National Park

About 5000 individuals live less than 5 km from the forest's edge. The user groups are categorized as follows: firewood collectors (about 3000 individuals – 2950 females, 50 males and 50 children); hunters (30 males); pole cutters (300 males); water collectors (2700 individuals - 1400 females and 1300 males);

medicine collectors (8 individuals - five females and three males); honey collectors (10 males) (Hinchley et al 2000; Soini 2006).

3.8 Fieldwork and ethical considerations

I conducted the fieldwork for this study in Kenya between June 2009 and December 2009. There was a follow-up one month fieldwork in May 2011 that focused mainly on national policymakers and NGO practitioners.

3.8.1 Recruitment of Participants

I recruited a total of 115 study participants. I followed up on suggested possible participants from a list established in the field by my contacts on the ground. I selected the participants for this multi-level research as follows:

- The many international United Nations environmental organizations and development aid
 organisations based in Kenya provided a good pool of possible environmental specialists and
 administrators directly involved in the selected projects.
- At the national level, the participants included government administrators and specialists; environmental specialists at national NGOs and project implementing agencies. I also interviewed government project specialists and forest officers at the local District level.
- Local community leaders including local community-based organisation heads and NGOs; local leaders targeted included the chiefs, women and youth group leaders.
- I conducted random sampling of all potential participants at the community level. I conducted twenty household-level interviews as well as two group interviews at each case study site.

3.8.2 Data Collection

- I mapped and synthesized existing policies at local, national and international levels by
 undertaking a document analysis including the three global environmental agreements: CBD,
 UNFCCC and CITES; national policy papers and laws; and scientific publications and
 information from Internet websites will be the basis for mapping and synthesizing.
- I conducted semi-structured interviews with key policy actors, as well as conservation managers affiliated to national and international institutions.
- I undertook sample surveys using closed-ended questions at the household level in order to determine degree of project impact on livelihoods. I adopted an outcome assessment approach (Sayer et al 2007) to analyze this data. This approach seeks to incorporate local involvement in the development of indicators that are dynamic, able to evolve over time and thereby form the basis for adaptive management that is necessary in complex social-ecological systems.

3.8.3 Ethical Considerations

Ethics approval for this research was received and renewed appropriately from the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board for the duration of the study. Participation was voluntary and dependent on a signed or verbal consent. Pseudonyms or actual names were used only with the consent of the participant as provided for by written or verbal consent, and so long as I felt that it was safe to do so.

3.8.4 Gender Implications

Two main gender-related issues that affected my methodological approach were the following:

- i. Identification of official and possibly hidden actors influenced by gender dynamics;
- ii. Working with research assistants of both genders to address the above issues.

The research design strived to ensure that the participant ratio reflected the actual ratio of men and women actors within the case studies because project success often hinged on gender-affected issues of access, trust or understanding of underlying values.

3.8.5 Data Analysis

There was an overlap of data collection and data analysis as part of the methodological approach while further developing and validating the research methods in the field. In order to better manage the data and also become more familiar with each case study as a stand-alone entity, I undertook within-case analysis (Eisenhardt 1989). Within-case analysis required detailed write-ups that enabled unique generalizable patterns of each case to emerge. I utilized radar diagrams to display my findings because they provided a powerful visual image around which to analyze policies and provide a link to governance aspects of community conservation.

In order to minimize my own bias, I looked at the data in divergent ways. For example, I selected categories or dimensions in order to look for within group similarities coupled with intergroup differences. I paired and contrasted the cases in order to look for similarities and differences between them. This led me to unanticipated categories and concepts. I also divided the data by source in order to corroborate patterns, and thus offer stronger evidence.

The conceptual research framework described in this chapter is summarized in Figure 3.3. In the following Chapters 4 to 8, I present my research findings largely based on this conceptual research framework. In chapter 4, I endeavour to show the impact of externally conceived integrated and conservation development projects (ICDPs) impact on the livelihoods of local communities in the four selected communities.



CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Figure 3-3 Study Conceptual Framework

Chapter Four: Project Outcomes

4.1 Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to assess the impact of externally supported Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) on the target populations. The main focus is on mapping community-wide impact as opposed to a limited quantitative analysis on the livelihoods of selected participants. This is because in previous chapters, it has been shown that the resources available were too limited to have any significant direct impacts on the vast majority of the individuals residing within the program areas. The emphasis, then, is less on what the official project documents claim to have achieved in terms of financial and physical capital for the direct beneficiaries, and more on the social capital built up to enable improved natural resource management and capital creation. Such an analysis helps to locate ICDP contributions to the wider development process and its impact towards more sustainable communities.

In this chapter I consider the preferred options used by the program implementers in order to achieve their and the communities' proposed goals. Analyzing the options selected is particularly important given the aforementioned limits to program resources. I analyzed the goals of the programs and the strategies of implementation; for example, whether to source the resources through state institutions or through nongovernmental organizations, or directly to community groups. The issue of whether or not the programs were linked to the wider development process is also critical in informing such an analysis. I also examined the continued preference for market strategies as the vessel for linking development and environmental protection.

ICDPs have been adopted by both development focused and conservation-focused institutions alike. Consequently ICDP has been defined as "...approaches to the management and conservation of natural resources in areas of significant biodiversity value that aim to reconcile the biodiversity conservation and socioeconomic development interests of multiple stakeholders at local, regional, national and international levels" (Franks & Blomley 2004). A spectrum of complex ICDPs exists all around the world. The assumption of the suitability of ICDPs for improved livelihoods worldwide has often occurred without due regard to their appropriateness for local development factors. Thus, there is a need for localization and definition of categories that contribute to more positive project outcomes. I also analyzed issues of participation and unequal power relations in project decision-making.

4.2 Findings and Discussions

4.2.1 Program Goals and Strategies

The multilevel nature of the projects means that the goals were intended to mirror the needs of players scaling the global to the local spectrum. For example, the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) is the UN body charged with supporting member states' efforts towards achieving environmental sustainability. The GEF focuses on funding the attainment of global benefits rather than supporting local development needs. It funds only agreed incremental costs necessary to achieve global environmental benefits. In principle, the local benefits should be funded by the recipient country. Often, the components intended to generate local benefits are funded mainly or entirely by co-financing institutions. In the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) project the co-financers included the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) through its Global Environmental Facility (GEF) mechanism (main sponsor), Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), British High Commission and Toyota Environmental Grant Facility. Local benefits are defined as outcomes that, directly or indirectly, have positive impacts upon people and ecosystems within or

adjacent to project areas and that provide gains, present and future, in the livelihoods of communities and to the integrity of ecosystems (GEF 2006).

Global environment benefits are defined as outcomes that, directly or indirectly, have positive impacts on global environmental sustainability through reducing the risks of climate change and stemming biodiversity loss among others (GEF 2006). The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) funds projects through designated agencies. UNDP is one of the three implementing agencies. It contributes to the administrative and technical functions from both the GEF Regional Technical Advisors and in-country GEF focal points based in the project host countries. This means that what is perceived as the norm at global levels determines what is supported by local levels. The Funding of ICIPE for the commercial insects projects was in line with these beliefs. The different objectives at various levels are illustrated by this statement by Mr. Mbugua (Program Manager, WWF): "We set a livelihood initiative in terms of conservation but the community sees only the livelihood component." When the WWF project started the Shimba Hills Forest Guides Association (SHIFOGA), the Association had to rewrite its constitution in order to fit WWF ideals and standards. SHIFOGA modified its mission, vision, and objectives to include more long-term objectives and more balanced gender equation.

The overall strategy of the ICIPE project was focused on developing linkages between participatory forest management (PFM) and sericulture and apiculture technologies for improved livelihoods. The hope was that by linking them to productive buffer zones, commercial insects enterprises could motivate participants to maintain forest biodiversity and protect the environment as well as increasing their economic well-being. But the concept of participation was left largely undefined, and the necessary connections to promote the idea and spread it to the wider community were lacking. The project relied solely on a limited definition of success that relied on the number of people adopting the project activities. Although there were claims that destruction of the forest areas had diminished during the project duration,

this was not only contradicted by a majority of the community respondents, it was also not possible to attribute any perceived improved forest conservation to the projects themselves given their small size and a lack of a scientific basis for such claims.

On the other hand, the Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program (MERECP) project at Mt. Elgon and the WWF project at Shimba Hills defined broader ecosystem goals for improved governance of the forests under consideration. Such comprehensive strategies would necessitate more elaborate strategies linking all the stakeholders in their shared concern for improved forest governance. Particularly, the incorporation of local communities in forest management would be expected to be a major priority. Furthermore, these projects were implemented during the process of enacting a new participatory regime for the management of forests in Kenya. This clearly offered the projects a unique opportunity to engage the process by informing the ongoing policymaking and implementation process. However, the Community Forests Associations (CFAs) – the mechanisms for local communities to engage in the new participatory forest management (PFM) - were suffering from severe lack of resources to actively engage in forest governance despite the presence of the major projects under review here (see Chapter 5). The Shimba Hills project also used the concept of supporting small groups or collectives in projects that were considered beneficial for improved forest governance. In essence this was similar to the ICIPE project, only that the activities were more varied and spread wider. But again even in the Shimba Hills Project the beneficiaries were limited in comparison to the total population and size of the forest zones under consideration. The fourth project under review, the Mt. Elgon MERECP project was unable to overcome its complex bureaucracy for the first three years of implementation. A Norwegian Government official conceded in an interview that the MERECP project as originally conceived was mired in high-level bureaucracy that resulted in most of the finances being used to support meetings, seminars and workshops for program personnel and in some cases state officials according to one. Apart from the supply of some equipment to the state institutions at KFS and KWS, no resources reached the community level in this

phase. A project manager of the newly-installed management organization of the redesigned program at the Lake Victoria Development Authority observed the following:

"The first phase was extremely ambitious and the objectives were unfocused. Moreover the Program failed from beginning to focus on its trans-boundary context and failed to identify vehicles to promote trans-boundary conservation."

The failure of the program to engage the locals in the early formulation process led to a redesign phase that was intended to promote more direct engagement at local community levels. The MERECP program was in the process of adopting the popular practice of using community-based organizations as vessels for improved ecosystem environmental management. This was largely similar to the strategy adopted at the three other forest zones. There was no clear strategy to support the CFAs in the Mt. Elgon area or to engage the larger community in a sustained process of participatory forest governance.

4.2.2 Project Management

Project conceptualization and implementation must contend with complex and often conflicting consequences of multilevel governance. I found that management decisions are largely shaped by the location of power in the decision-making process in highly bureaucratic structures that leave little room for local level participants to maneuver. The issue of participation in forest management is tackled in greater detail in Chapter 5, where it is shown that the tendency was to propagate old top-down regimes of management continue despite a new regime aimed at integrating local communities in forest governance. All the projects under review in this study were conceived with a major aim of helping to concretize the participatory forest management strategy among stakeholders in their locations of action. The achievement of participatory forest management was an important criterion for determining the success of the projects.

In all four sites, I found a complex structure of top-down management of the projects under review. Table 4.2 shows the numbers and types of organizations that had a stake in the projects under review. The MERECP program provides a good example of the complexity and multi-interest nature of these globally conceived ICDPs. The upper management structure of this program included the Norwegian Government, the East African Community (EAC) and the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) in effect resulting in three levels of decision-making by actors external to the implementation process at the local community level. In total there were 19 institutions involved in the Kenyan section of the program. These included the following:

- Donors (Norway and Sweden the two countries tend to leverage funding); Norway (70%) is the 'funder' and Sweden (25%) is the 'sleeping partner'
- Regional EAC IUCN operated on behalf of EAC (Lake Victoria Basin Management Authority (LVBMA)
- Government of Kenya reference points were Environment and Mineral Resource Ministry in Kenya, NEMA, KWS, KFS, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Lands and Housing, Ministry of Planning and National Development, Ministry of Finance
- 4. Mt. Elgon and Transnzoia Districts' Local Administration

The Mt. Elgon scenario was mirrored by the Kwale Management Team for Shimba Hills. Here TPR (Tripartite Project Review) – Government of Kenya, UNDP and WWF met annually. The TPR did not change the objectives of the program but focused on what they termed the modalities of implementation. This implied a rigidity of process and a lack of adaptability with new knowledge and changing conditions on the ground. These negative characteristics were a hindrance to more functional and equitable collaborative management in all the ICDPs under review.

Institutions	Local (Mgmt task)	Local NGO	Intl NGO	Bi- and multi-lateral	State
		(Mgmt tasks)		organizations	
Arabuko-	CBOs - Undertaking the	Nature Kenya	ICIPE [academic-	UNDP [through GEF]	National Museums(Kipepeo/Kaya
Sokoke	apiculture and sericulture tasks;	(Selecting	oriented] (Research and	(funding)	conservation)
	Representatives in the Kipepeo	participants,	technological input; hives		
	Marketplace Management	buying and	and silkworm housing		KEFRI(Forest research)
	Committee	selling, training)	provision)		
		Kenya			KFS (Forest management)
	CFAs - Selection of the				
	participants; Attempts to influence				KWS (Wildlife management)
	forest management activities				
Kakamega	Self-help groups (CBOs), CFAs,		ICIPE [academic-	UNDP [through GEF]	KFS (Selection of participants,
	Individuals (Undertaking the		oriented] (Research and	(funding)	forest management; granted
	apiculture and sericulture tasks;		technological input; hives		marketplace site)
	Representatives in technical		and silkworm housing		
	management team of the		provision)		
	marketplace)				
Shimba Hills	Self-help groups. User groups and		WWF		State:
	Individuals (E.g. Lima –soaps;				KFS. KWS, NMK, Coastal Forest
	Kaya Kinondo – ecotourism;				Conservation Unit, Ministries of
	Gogoni (jatropha, seedlings)				Agriculture, Arid Lands
	CFAs				
	Ngambi (higher council of elders -				
	imposes rules in culturally				
	important Kaya forests)				
Mt Elgon	10 CBOs (pilot livelihood		IUCN(Project	EAC (Delegates	KWS, KFS (Programs
	projects)		management before	management to	administration at community level
			program redesign)	individual nations)	in the redesigned phase)
				Norwegian and	LVBC
				Swedish governments	
				(program funding)	NEMA (Overseer)

 Table 4-1 Hierarchies in ICDP Management

4.2.3 Project Beneficiaries and Agenda-Setting in ICDPs

In view of the skewed goal-setting agenda shown in the previous section, it is necessary to examine who are the real beneficiaries of the projects within and without the community. Documents for the ICIPE and WWF projects provided specific summaries of direct beneficiaries of project resources. In all the four project areas the numbers of project participants represented only a small fraction of the target populations. Table 4.3 presents a summary of the general population – both participants' and non-participants' – views on the project impacts in addition to a few important examples of direct benefits to the participants. Table 4.3 emphasises the community perceptions and research observations in the field rather than quantitative outcomes of the projects. Table 4.4 depicts capital asset indicators used as the basis for developing the overall livelihood capital assets. The overall livelihood assets – a measure of community perception of livelihood change since the commencement of the project - are then shown in Table 4.5.

Figure 4.1 is a radar diagram of indicators developed from Table 4.5. Tables 4.4, 4.5 and Figure 4.1 reveal that the benefits of the projects to the direct beneficiaries were modest at best while the impact on the wider community itself was minimal. Moreover, a majority of non-participants felt they were unfairly denied the opportunity to benefit from the projects and this led to increased tensions throughout all four communities.

Table 4-2 Major project achievements and shortcom	nings
---	-------

	Major Achievements	Major Shortcomings
Arabuko- Sokoke	 Took advantage of existing structures and institutional linkages to build on; this allowed better use of limited project resources Branding of the honey improved its marketability (KBS Diamond Mark) 27 self-help user groups participated in the project 	 Poor communication (92% of respondents unaware of it before its start and inability to receive technical advice or influence market prices) Inaccessibility of project managers to community participants No links to farming More remote locations ignored (West and North of forest); concentrated in areas already better endowed (East and West) skewing wealth disparities even further Project linked to existing Kipepeo Project, thus largely excluding potential new participants and exacerbating local inequalities No clear participatory forest management activities including Forest Management Plan writing; exacerbated by limited state agency involvement Low adoption rate of sericulture activity that requires more financial and technical resources than the apiculture activity No efforts towards localizing the project by supporting local craftsmen to build the requisite hives and silkworm housing Late payments by the project's marketplace leading to disillusionment
Kakamega	 Contributed to formation of Kipiri Community Forest Association in Kakamega Participatory activities such as seedling production for sale to KFS; animal grazing in agreed forest areas Construction of marketplace for honey processing and packaging, and silk processing 	 No linkage to farming including the discontinued Shamba System that about 80 percent of both participants and non-participants wanted Non-involvement of the community in joint forest management (over 90 percent had not heard of the PFM concept) Limited state involvement in project and Forest Management Plan writing; still mainly a KFS preserve Underperforming marketplace with limited funds to pay for products and non-functioning equipment Late payments by marketplace leading to reduced participation Small farms by a majority meant that not enough land could be devoted to planting mulberry for silkworm feed
Shimba Hills	 30 organizations; 50 umbrella groups supported in the project for various developmental projects like 	 Ad hoc nature of participant selection led to claims of unfairness by 85 percent of non-participants Limited involvement by KFS personnel (50 percent of active CFA member

	 Jatrophus seeds for soap production; ecotourism support in cultural forest conservation (Kaya Kinondo) State agencies support for equipment (KFS, KWS) 	 claimed that it was very difficult to meet the state officials) Limited efforts aimed at marketing project products was the reason about 60 percent of participants gave up on the activities
Mt Elgon	 Previous phase – to upscale government programs - capacity building equipment provided to KWS, KFS including computers, motorbikes, GPS equipment, camping gear Now ³/₄ joint patrol of KFS and KWS in forest reserve Security – MERECEP coordinated border security between KWS and Uganda counterparts; had 4 major operations to detect illegal activities 10 CBOs in training to enhance understanding of revolving loan and leadership skills in redesigned phase 	 No direct funding to PFM capacity-building for local communities Ugandan decentralized administrative processes for management and financial control expected to function in Kenyan centralized systems resulted in almost total program standstill. Government officers tend to personalize matters and once they move on from the post, problems multiply, and this means that we need the stability brought on by systems, e.g. the old program had developed the beginnings of M&E (very small, yes) but due to a lack of systems, it means that this effort has to start from zero once more Level of bureaucracy Ownership e.g. of documents is unclear since a multiplicity of owners from states of Uganda and Kenya Undefined state role including the functions of the focal ministry No mechanism in place to transfer resources directly to communities Trans-boundary project goal not achieved

Natural Capital: Access to forest products — timber, firewood, medicines, silkworm cocoons, butterflies, grazing rights, fruits, water

Physical Capital: Quality of housing, water supply, electricity, roads/accessibility, telecommunications, total household income, income from tree products (on-farm), numbers of livestock, income from non-timber forest products (e.g. butterfly farming)

Social Capital: Village environmental or natural resources committees functioning, village participation in landscape level initiatives, Participatory Forest Management (PFM) operating, awareness of zones/boundaries, capacity to manage group finances

Human Capital: Access to education—distance to primary schools, access to health care facilities, skill levels and opportunities, involvement in innovative projects

(Adapted from Sayer et al 2007)

Table 4-3 Indicators for capital assets assessment

	Arabuko-Sokoke	Kakamega	Shimba Hills	Mt. Elgon
Natural Capital	3	2.5	2	1
Physical Capital	2.5	2	2	1
Social Capital	3.5	3	2.5	1.5
Human Capital	3.5	3	2	1
Financial Capital	2.5	2	1.5	1

(Scores from 1–5, 1 being the lowest, and 5 the highest)

Table 4-4 Averages of community respondents' perception of Livelihood Capital Assets change since Project Commencement

The ICIPE project outcome document showed that participants in Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega received 300 and 150 hives respectively over the duration of the project. In Kakamega, sericulture groups established the 1.21 ha of the mulberry silkworm feed and received 5000 silkworms These figures were small when compared to the total population of about 50,000 in both project locations.

The project outcomes document also notes that project participants were actively engaged in the participatory forest management committees set up in their areas. But this study found that this integral goal was not directly incorporated into the project design in the first place, thereby greatly diminishing the possibility of informing the implementation process of the new dispensation. I found that 78 and 91 percent of respondents in Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega respectively were unaware that one of the main goals of the ICIPE project was to act as a pilot study for participatory forest management techniques in

Kenya. In Mt. Elgon and Shimba Hills where the goals were centered on forest governance (as opposed to livelihood alternatives), it was even more surprising that practically no direct resources were on offer to CFAs or to the community in general to improve the capacity for PFM engagement. For example, a WWF program manager confirmed that the design mirrored the Forest Act 2005 that aimed to support collaborative forest management. I found that there was widespread reluctance on the part of the project initiators to expend greater resources on improved, technological, managerial, and negotiating capacities necessary for engagement in the new regime for local communities. The reason offered for this was the difficulty in justifying the use of funds to project donors for measures that were not easily quantifiable at the end of the project.



Scale from 1-5 (from worst to best condition; area inside pentagon represents level of performance) Source: research data

Figure 4-1 Radar Diagram of Indicators for Project Participants

I contend that community education should have been at the core of all project design with the new dispensation of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) and Community Forest Association (CFA) formation. Organizational management support should have been central to improving collaborative governance of Kenyan forests. There was little evidence at the local community level of project resource use matching such project statement goals. In each of the four areas, observations revealed only disparate small group livelihood activity strategies unconnected to the larger processes of social capital creation through supporting community-wide actions for preparing them to engage gainfully in forest governance. This meant that local communities were still at a big disadvantage, for example, in the process of writing the legally required forest management plan – the basis for negotiations for access to forest resources between CFAs and the Kenya Forest Service (KFS). (See Chapter 5 for further discussions on the resulting issues of inequalities in power involved in the process).

The lack of community-wide impacts by the projects under review can be attributed in part to the failure of the project administrators to establish clear and accessible lines of communications in their zones of operation. The communication strategies of the projects were criticized by a majority of the participating individuals in all the cases studies. But comparing the two project sites of the ICIPE project, there was a significant difference as shown by a 38 percent and 24 percent of project participants for Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke respectively (Table 4.6). This was attributed to the less entrenched management structures in Kakamega in contrast to an entrenched structure based at the long-established Kipepeo Project (see chapter 6 for further discussions on the emergence of this organization). ICIPE is research oriented; it meant they had specific academic on the ground and were willingly to transfer the daily management responsibilities to the organizations in charge of the Kipepeo Project. This propagated further the old problems of accessibility and communication at the existing project.

Project site	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Arabuko-Sokoke	24	76
Kakamega	38	62
Shimba Hills	28	72
Mt Elgon	4	96

 Table 4-5 Percentage Participant Satisfaction with Project Communication Processes

The communication processes at local levels for the Mt Elgon program were almost nonexistent since the program initially concentrated its efforts at higher state institutional levels and completely failed to establish channels of communication at the local level. In Shimba Hills the communication suffered more because of state involvement as opposed to just WWF. The architecture of the marketplace in Kakamega (Plate 4.1) in itself exemplified the lack of consultation in formulating and implementing the project. Many people in the community were perplexed by a building design that did not reflect any local traits.



Source: author Plate 4-1 Kakamega Forest Honey and Silk Marketplace

The acting out of the global agenda at the local level gives rise to many complementing and conflicting interests. Moreover, assumptions and dominant metaphors on the environment contribute to the framing of project goals that do not conform to local conditions. These uncertainties can be further compounded by adopting non-legally defined norms and concepts simply because it is fashionable to do so. For example, the Buffer Zone was ostensibly a 5-km zone from forest boundaries that the case study projects used to delineate the borderline for support. It is a non-existent legal term but was commonly adopted in project planning to delineate project borderlines, thereby automatically creating insiders and outsiders in the realm of forest governance in Kenya. The concept automatically creates a categorization of project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries without due consideration of the possible negative and positive impacts of external factors. The overarching buffer zone concept determined the operations, scope and process of forest management in the study areas. The danger of utilizing the concept without legally and scientifically defining it in the pilot study project in Arabuko-Sokoke, for example, presented the possibility of misinforming the policymaking process since it was meant to be a showcase of participatory forest management implementation in Kenya. Mr. Ritan, the warden in charge of Mt. Elgon Forest National Park, suggested that big problem of poaching was undertaken by outsiders not residents in the district, but the negative impacts were borne mainly by the local residents who faced reduced incomes because a degraded tourist experience resulted in reduced visits. This indicates the need to link these project goals and agendas to the larger development process both spatially and policy-wise. My study found that both the definition of what constitutes forest buffer zones and the need for better mapping of the impacts of the subsequent external factors on these zones was vital to improved forest governance in Kenya.

4.3 Project Goals: Moneymaking and Satisfaction of Basic Needs

The worldwide trend towards decentralization and democratization in the 1990s had a strong impact on the governance of common pool resources in Kenya. These strong movements of change resulted in calls for increased local community involvement in the governance of environmental resources. Such pressures eventually led to pilot projects for participatory forest management in selected locations in Kenya in the late 1990s in order to inform a proposed new forestry law. The aim of these projects was ostensibly to inform a policymaking process in Kenya that was transformative in its intentions. The previously exclusionary management paradigm was to be replaced by a collaborative strategy that fully integrated forest adjacent communities. Interestingly, the pilot phases took a neoliberal turn as the largely NGO-run projects came up with alternative market-based livelihood sustenance objectives as the way to "involve" local communities in forest management. The major livelihood projects were honey production, butterfly farming and non-timber forest products (NTFPs); but amazingly no direct management responsibilities were ever handed down to the local communities throughout the pilot phase. Despite a concerted effort by major stakeholders within state agencies and international conservation organizations, the Kenya Forest Act of 2005 was considered a victory for supporters of participatory forest management because it included a major section on local community participation in forest management (see Chapters 6 and 7 for detailed discussions on the policymaking process).

The global hegemony of market policies for development was evident in all four project cases. They all adopted strategies consistent with multilateral organizations' and INGOs' beliefs that promoted market-oriented instruments for development (see Chapters 7 and 8 for discussions on the spread of such beliefs and policies). In the ICIPE project the focus was clear. The two market-oriented activities promoted – sericulture and apiculture –had minimal impact on the forest ecosystem itself. The project outcomes document proclaimed one of its apparent successes as follows:

"This project responded well to the UN-COP guidance under the CBD by promoting capacity building of local communities, generating off-farm employment and creating local business capacity" (Raina et al 2009, p. 6).

In Shimba Hills the strategy was more disparate with no clear preference for particular livelihood means but adherence to the philosophy remained true; promotion of market-oriented livelihood means that ostensibly reduced reliance on the forest. The Mt Elgon program was more comprehensively targeted to better ecosystem governance and advocated for institutional improvements in order to improve the management of environment resources. The articulation of the role of local communities in the governance of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem was unclear and the consequence was that local communities were ignored in the first phase of the project. The following presents evidence of the preponderance of neoliberal-informed policies in achieving forest conservation in such globally-conceived and supported projects.

The ICIPE project implementers claimed that they had achieved the goal of improving the capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilise both wild and mulberry silkmoth and honeybee biodiversity to increase income. Furthermore, the extent of the impact to the livelihoods of the participants was in considerable doubt since although these were projects designed to profit from the benefits of the market, the participants faced challenges in their profit-making ventures within the structure of the project itself. For example at Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke, participants were mostly dependent on the project-established Marketplaces (see Chapter 6 for discussions on the inequalities pervasive at these Marketplaces in terms of product price determination). The small size of the project was criticized by both participants and non-participants for effecting insignificant livelihood impacts on the population. A majority of direct project beneficiaries said their involvement resulted only in minimal impacts on their livelihoods (Table 4.7).
	Arabuko-Sokoke	Kakamega	Shimba Hills	Mt Elgon
Project activity	12.5	8.4	7.5	Less than 1

Table 4-6 Percentage of total income derived from project's income generating activities

At the participant level, the Arabuko-Sokoke project contributed the greatest improvement to livelihood income percentage (12.5 percent) among the four case study sites. Kakamega in contrast stood at 8.4 percent. This lower percentage can be attributed to the time factor since the Arabukoko-Sokoke participants had been involved in similar activities for a longer period and had established the necessary capacities. This shows the importance of allowing communities time to assimilate new ideas and innovations. I also found that, due to more amenable management and communication factors, Kakamega presented better opportunities for improved productive capacities. The lower income gain in Kakamega was largely attributable to a more diverse portfolio of economic activities in Kakamega that ensured that the respondents were not as dependent on project income as their counterparts in Arabuko-Sokoke. In average monetary terms the Kakamega participants gained more than the Arabuko-Sokoke participants.

The focus on market-led livelihood improvement should lead to improved satisfaction of basic needs as its ultimate goal. The majority of people in the forest-adjacent communities struggle to satisfy their basic needs such as food, water, shelter and clothing. ICDPs consequently should have as their core aim the satisfaction of these basic needs. In this regard, it was important to interrogate the mainstays of the local economies in order to find their synergies and contradictions with the activities supported or advocated by the projects. The importance of farming to the sustained development of the four forest zone communities, similar to all other communities in Kenya, was evident. Moreover farming was closely linked to the discontinued Shamba System. Similar to Kakamega, there was disappointment that the introduction of PFM did not result in the return of the Shamba System since this was widely recognized as the closest concept to participatory forest management for more than half a century among the case

study communities. It was surprising that this was not part of the project agenda as the new more participatory regime was took shape on the ground.

The Cheptais CFA Chairman, Geoffrey Chestit (CFA Chairman) suggested that the expectation that the Shamba System would be reintroduced was the main reason that implementation of the PFM notion was initially so enthusiastically received in his community. But interest soon waned when there was no promise of a quick return to the popular system. I found that the Shamba System was opposed by many state officials. For example Mr. Dickson Ritan (KWS Senior Warden, Mt. Elgon National Park) regretted that the Shamba System has been partly reintroduced in the area on a trial basis (not as part of the MERECP under review in this study). He suggested that in his view Mt Elgon required exclusive protection status with zero activities allowed because it harboured a park of national and international importance. According to him a "conflict-inducing Shamba System" was inappropriate within or near the protected zone. These were the kinds of competing interests crucial at local community level but which were not within the portfolio of my four case study projects.

I found that the market-focused activities for small selected groups resulted in grossly inadequate impacts that contributed only slightly to the improvement of the livelihood incomes of the selected participants. The fallacy of relying solely on market-based alternatives neglected the inclusion of strategies that recognized the need for redistribution of resources if the communities were to take ownership of the process of more sustainable forest governance. The projects' inability to integrate with the larger regional developmental agenda meant that they had minimal impact on improved economic prospects for the larger community.

94

4.4 Misplaced Goals: The Neglect of Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Conservation Efforts

The question of human-wildlife conflicts can often be traced back to issues of power disparities in agenda-setting contexts (Redpath et al 2013; Winterbach et al 2012). Conflicts often are a consequence of converging global beliefs on conservation of environmental goods that contradict local utilization needs. The uniqueness of the ecosystems and biodiversity importance of the four case study sites were important factors that historically influenced the adoption of particular conservation strategies. The conservation strategies were framed largely in the language of the global environmental movement. The rich ecological values of these areas were the main reasons advanced by conservation advocates to ensure improved ecosystem protection. National governments in developing countries like Kenya are under pressure from intergovernmental organizations to implement these international norms without regard for their suitability for local conditions. The consequence is that the state is often accused of colluding with international bodies in attaching greater value to conservation priorities and disregarding the wellbeing of the local populations (see Chapters 5 and 8 for further discussions on global influences on national conservation priorities).

Basic needs satisfaction can be greatly impacted by issues of human-wildlife conflicts. The project outcomes document for the ICIPE project claimed that habitat monitoring in buffer and core zones in the final year of the project revealed that there had been no loss of habitat in the focal project forest areas of Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke Forests. The document also claimed the monitoring results indicate that the resident communities made no new demands on the forests and no illegal encroachment was reported during the project period. It was further claimed that illegal activities such as tree cutting in the buffer zones had reduced by 50 percent by the final project year. But these claims contrasted sharply with the perceptions of not only the majority of people in the two study communities who were non-participants, but also with the small minority of direct project beneficiaries. Table 4-8 depicts community perceptions

of forest use change; note that the perceptions are not necessarily linked to the projects under review since many respondents were unaware of the existence of the projects in the first place.

Community (project	Same rate of change	Reduced rate of	Increased rate of	Main products involved in assessment of rates of change in forest use
start date)	(% of respondents)	change	change	
Arabuko- Sokoke (2004)	28	27	55	Firewood, timber, medicinal plants
Kakamega (2004)	12	10	78	Charcoal-making, Hunting (buffaloes, birds, wild pig, dikdik, porcupine, and squirrel, buffalo), wild honey collection, mining for gold, timber, medicine plants, firewood, settlements, grazing
Shimba Hills (2007)	29	22	49	Poaching, timber, firewood, charcoal
Elgon (2005)	21	16	63	firewood, grazing, charcoal, building timber and staking wood for tomatoes, hunting for meat, medicine, honey

Table 4-7 Community perception (2010) of forest use rates of change since project commencement

The claim that conservation had improved was rejected overwhelming by 85 percent of the participants and all non-participants. Most said their need for forest products had only slightly reduced and felt that for most of the community the need was still as high or even increased given deteriorating economic conditions and reduced size of land holdings with time. But they also admitted that they hunted wild animals not only to protect their property, but also as a source of food and other products. Hunting of wild animals is not permitted in Kenya. In Kakamega, Aggrey Mambiri (50 years old, farmer) was representative of most community respondents in declaring that he continued to witness a steady decline of forest health although like most he could not quantify the destruction. But anecdotal evidence in terms of collecting firewood and spread of farms in former forest areas reinforced his belief that forest destruction was widespread despite the present and other projects aimed at ameliorating the situation. I found that the local communities were highly critical of what they perceived as unfair rules that denied them access to the forest while their private property was destroyed by legally protected wildlife. Michael Butukhu (65, a farmer) near the Mt. Elgon National Park described the situation before a section of the Park was fenced off: "It was like family planning, because man was active at night fighting off animals, and during the day, the woman did the same." Another community member in Shimba Hills was categorical in stating: "When destruction of our property by wild animals occurs without compensation, this can only mean we will also be wild to the wild animals." A forest officer at another forest described a dangerous situation that occurred under his jurisdiction as follows:

"This is a very densely populated area and since the previous year there has been rampant poaching and this has led to great animosity/conflict with the forest office; indeed when forest guards and a forest manager had arrested nine people for illegal activities, there was an attack by over 200 people armed with crude weapons. The forest guards had to fire in the air to scare off the mob that was looking to release their colleagues."

The nine people were charged in court but the incidence contributed to a growing animosity between a majority section of the community who felt alienated from the forest resource on the one hand, and state agencies and conservation agencies on the other hand.

In Mt. Elgon all local community respondents called for the repair and extension of the fence constructed along the Mt. Elgon National Park. All the respondents agreed that a major goal of the MERECP should have been to repair and extend the 21-kilometre Park fence – constructed under a previous project – to surround the Forest Reserve zone as well. Its importance was illustrated by comments that maize yields had increased on average from 2.5 bags to 10 bags/acre after construction of the fence in an area where households owned only two acres on average. Surprisingly, no specific goals were defined in the study areas to tackle this widespread problem. Thus, complaints about non-compensation or delayed payments after animal damage to private property were common in the four areas. In any case there was general

agreement that compensation levels were low in comparison to what locals and participants lost as a result of reduced access to forest products..

4.5 The role of the state

Any large-scale integrated development requires a coordinating entity. In the projects under review, it can be argued that the mandate for coordination resides with the state because the targeted resources – the forests – are under state control. The definition of ICDP implies a comprehensive development approach linked to other factors of the development process that presupposes crucial state involvement. In essence, when the state is not involved in an integral way in the formulation and implementation of the ICDPs, the potential for a flawed outcome is greatly magnified. I found that the state was not always an integral part of these initiatives. Moreover, in cases where the state was involved, it often brought along the baggage of bureaucracy that stunted project progress instead of the positive role of a facilitator.

The ICIPE-managed commercial insects project is an example where the state took a hands-off approach. The extent of its involvement was in granting participants access to state forests for the collection of silkworm cocoons or, in some cases, the location of their beehives. But state institutions did not engage the participatory forest management component of the project. Surprisingly, there was little effort made by the state and the project planners to act on the participatory forest component of the project. In the WWF-led initiative at Shimba Hills, state involvement was mainly limited to a tripartite body that included the mandated ministry in discussions of the performance of the project. The state could not alter the basic objectives or strategy of the project. On the ground in Shimba Hills, WWF attempted to engage state institutions in the monitoring of project activities, but this was largely an informal practice with limited state influence on project practice on the ground. Similar to the ICIPE project, the role of the state in ensuring an integrated development strategy was lacking. The MERECP project in Mt. Elgon offered

98

the closest example of a state-led ICDP. It was managed by a state body – the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) – and funding was channeled through government ministries. State agencies such as the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and the Kenya Forest service (KFS) had the role of project executors at the local community level. In this particular case, there was an innate lack of an integrated development strategy as well. The role of the state should be to link such projects to the larger community, province and country but this never occurred in practice. Perversely, the bureaucratic problems both within the state and at IUCN – the project executors contracted by the state – resulted in the failure of the initiative during the first three-year phase.

The inherent tensions between state agencies and NGOs in the development process are discussed in detail in Chapter 7. These tensions had negative impacts at local community levels. The commercial insect project was categorized as a 'livestock' project by state authorities. It was therefore under the jurisdiction of the two Ministries of Livestock and Agriculture. These ministries have funding aimed at supporting local initiatives within their mandates. Several local community respondents complained that when they applied for these resources, their proposals were rejected. The reason offered was they did not deserve any extra funding since they were already supported by a well-endowed non-profit organization such as ICIPE among others. The government officials even made reference to the signage outside the project's marketplace as proof of a major coalition in place to support to the project (see Plate 4.2). They failed to note the irony, that the names of their own ministries were listed on the same board.

In summary, my research identified a dysfunctional involvement of the state in the development initiatives. The role of the state is uncertain, particularly in cases where the overall management of the project is under a non-governmental entity. State officials are reluctant to expend any state resources to engage more comprehensively in such a project since they viewed such projects as outside their purview. In state-led ICDPs, bureaucratic and administrative hurdles led to slow, rigid resource transfer processes and the project objectives were progressively diluted or altered as the chain of transfers proceeded towards the local level. This dilution and alteration process manifested itself at local levels in small livelihood activities in contrast to the original big ideas of improved environmental governance and community-wide integrated development.



Source: author Plate 4-2 Board display of multi-stakeholder involvement in Kakamega Forest Project

4.6 Conclusions and Recommendations

ICDP conception and implementation process in Kenya was beset with inequalities in decision-making powers in spite of the prevailing philosophy of greater participatory development. The daily struggles to satisfy basic needs left local community groups vulnerable to the objectives and demands of external forces. The community groups had few options but to alter their small development group mandates and sacrifice their immediate personal needs in order to conform to largely externally conceived ideas untested under local conditions. ICDPs should re-engage with the larger community if they are to make more significant impacts in forest governance in Kenya. Proper identification and delineation of local community stakeholders is crucial from the outset to reinforce participation. For this reason, I recommend that the concept of community (or local community stakeholders) be redefined in Kenyan ICDPs and integrated into the larger concept of development in order to initiate a more comprehensive engagement for more sustainable livelihoods. For example, the non-legally defined but widely adopted concept of a five-kilometre buffer zone boundary created conflict of insiders and outsiders with differential rights to project engagement. Moreover, such exclusionary practices did not allow for more coherent and integrated landscape, regional or national-level development planning. Furthermore, issues of humanwildlife conflicts and basic need requirements such as water and education were recurring themes in the forests-parks-human habitat nexus that required concrete incorporation into the projects for wider acceptance and more positive outcomes but which did not happen.

The major question addressed in this chapter was whether or not projects with global objectives can contribute significantly to the improvement of local livelihoods in the four case studies. The main conclusion is that ICDPs have big ideas but the multilevel process and multi-stakeholder interactions dilute and alter the ideas into small disparate activities at local levels with ultimately insignificant on the livelihoods of local communities. The allocation of resources in ICDPs was inefficient or contradictory in many cases. Financial resources were lost in complex rigid administrative structures that revealed the multilevel characteristic of the process to be a hindrance rather than an advantage. Only a small minority benefitted and often differences in resource-ownership were exacerbated at household, local and regional levels. The consequence was that no significant impacts were made in terms of satisfying local community basic needs. Similarly, the objective of improved conservation was not met. The fallback position of project managers to a neoliberal model of market-oriented small production was common in the hope that this would translate to wider economic growth and offset the need for forest products. These

101

expectations were unfulfilled in the Kenyan case studies similar to findings in other ICDPs (Adams et al 2004; McShane 2005; Berkes 2007; Kaimowitz and Sheil 2007). I agree with Fletcher (2012) who concluded that the neoliberally-framed ICDPs have failed to tackle issues of resource distribution and, in making the assumption that economic growth can address all issues of social inequality, have paradoxically served only to enhance the conflict between conservation and development interests instead of contributing to acceptable compromises.

The insistence that externally-sourced resources must be funneled through state mechanisms – a demonstration of Kenyan state 'sovereignty' – only added to the suffering of local communities. This state demand created major bureaucratic bottlenecks in MERECP. Policies that allow for unhindered flow of resources by removing the middleman roles of state agencies and ministries are necessary. The state should enact policies and establish processes that contribute to the integration of externally conceived projects into the overall development plan at local and national levels. This is where state resources and actions should be located. The government should place less emphasis on administrative functions and financial management. Furthermore, state institutions, particularly development related ones, should be involved in ICDPs from the initiation stage in order to more efficiently facilitate the integration of proposed initiatives into the overall development process early in the process.

A possible but largely ignored function of ICDPs is participating in and informing development policies and processes in contested areas of global interest. This omission was observed even when such policylearning objectives were expressly part of project objectives. The Kenyan cases largely ignored the window of opportunity offered by a new Kenya forest framework law aimed towards more participatory governance. For example, the Kenya Forest Service is now mandated to engage in business and generate profits from state forests. Since the framework Forest Act 2005 is open to negotiation and interpretation, it is uncertain if and how such revenues can be shared with forest-adjacent communities. Moreover, the decades-long debate in Kenya on the Shamba System remains crucial to the outcome of the new participatory regime. This means that fundamental issues about forest tenure – that could have benefitted from the experience of learning-by-doing approach inherent in ICDPs - were omitted at a critical stage.

Chapter Five: The Impact of Globalization on Integrated Conservation Development Projects (ICDPs)

5.1 Introduction

Kenya has been an active participant in the global expansion of conservation policies and processes since its independence from Britain in 1963. This involvement followed its inheritance – with limited changes – of the colonially conceived and implemented protected area policies that radically transformed the social, cultural and economic landscapes of the country. This chapter examines how the Kenyan environment and development policy process has been influenced by global trends and events. A brief summary of the global development of policies in recent decades and the movement of resources in resultant networks reveals how the major global players have emerged. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) – two INGOs integral to Kenyan environment and development policies – provide examples of how their foundation beliefs, philosophies and policies have contributed to a global convergence that shape ICDPs in developing countries today.

This analysis is informed by two ICDPs case studies undertaken at Shimba Hills in the Kenyan coastal Province and Mt Elgon Forest Ecosystem in Western Kenya. The synergies and contradictions that arose during their conception and implementation within complex competing and complementary global, national and local interests highlight the difficulties of meeting their normative goals. The consequences of these multilevel interactions on the livelihoods of local participant communities form the focus of this chapter. The analysis shows how the agendas of stakeholder organizations within global governance structures impact on conservation and development practice. I investigated the effectiveness and relevancy of these projects to the targeted communities and made recommendations on how to improve their relevancy and impact at the local community level.

5.2 The spread of livelihoods, poverty and conservation linkage

The inseparable linkage between livelihoods, poverty and conservation became more apparent to conservationist and development analysts from the early 1970s. Research showed that rapid expansion of protected areas in developing countries often led to unjustifiable limitations on the livelihood opportunities of adjacent communities (Fisher et al 2005). The rigid policies that had been introduced by colonial authorities and subsequently adopted by independent governments tended to ignore the local community livelihood dependency component in devising strategies for the protection of sensitive areas. The 1972 UN Environment and Development (UNCED) Conference in Stockholm recognized the growing human impacts in vulnerable areas. Recommendations from that conference emphasized the need for careful planning of development projects to mitigate environmental damage particularly in developing countries. This led to a new emphasis on "rational" planning in development strategies strongly influenced how UN and other international bodies viewed environment-human relationships.

In the late 1970s, the conservation community argued strongly for ecological considerations to be reflected in development planning (IUCN 1980). The focus of the strategy was on promoting strong linkages between conservation and development that were seen as compatible and mutually supportive, needing only rational planning in order to co-exist. Multi-lateral and bi-lateral relations between developing countries and donor countries of the West were impacted by these new policies. International NGOs such as OXFAM pressured their own governments and recipient state governments to adopt policies that recognized the rights of local communities to actively participate in the management of their resources. There were increased calls for the implementation of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) and other types of community-based conservation and resource management approaches (McShane & Wells 2004).

Recent developments have seen attempts to bring the livelihood component into clearer focus. Adams et al (2004) observed that failure of integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs) was likely unless necessary links that connect poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation were formulated. The higher level arenas of policy-making and resource transfers had an important influence on the development agenda at this time but claims of success in transferring development goals and decisionmaking to lower levels of governance have elicited intense debate on their effectiveness.

Some critiques of community conservation ascribe the failure of these efforts to populist postmodernism that ignores the unsustainable levels of population growth (Attwell & Cotterill 2000). Similarly protectionism advocates have been criticized for overlooking the social and political processes that determine social justice and are crucial in successful community conservation involvement (Brechin et al, 2002; Neumann 1997). Furthermore, calls for renewed exclusionary strategies ignore the threat of ever-growing populations with limited or no alternatives for sustaining their livelihoods (Adams et al 2004; Balmford et al 2001). However, even proponents of community conservation have cautioned that in trying to make parks socially acceptable, conservation areas should not be held responsible for curing innately structural problems such as poverty, unequal land distribution and resource allocation, corruption, economic injustice, and market failures (Brandon et al 1998).

The competing and complementary interests of conservation and development present complex scenarios that can best be explored in practice. A critical mapping of the transfers of knowledge and resources that occur between the multiple levels of the conservation and development agendas can help to clarify the positives and negatives of the global agenda and contribute to improved governance of forest resources. The following section presents a summarized history of the critical conferences, ideas and institutions on conservation and development that emerged from the early 1970s. I also discuss the convergence of ideas and policies and their impacts on national and local development processes.

5.3 Impact of Globalization on Environment and Development Agendas

The global spread of conservation and development ideas intensified from the early 1970s. The beliefs and ideas are predominantly based on Western ideals about conservation and protection of nature (see Chapter 8 for details of how these beliefs and policies percolate through established networks and structures). Their suitability for developing country policies regarding economic growth and progress has led to varied and often unintended consequences. In this section I examine the origin and spread of these ideas on the global arena, and trace the evolution of the ideas and the process of transfers of knowledge among the international, national and local levels. My analysis of two influential international nongovernmental organizations – the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF) – highlights the emergence and spread of these ideas. These two organizations are particularly appropriate since they played a major role in the two case studies examined later in this chapter.

In 1972 the Stockholm Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Part I, paragraph 6) stated:

"A point has been reached in history when we must shape our actions throughout the world with a more prudent care for their environmental consequences. . . . To defend and improve the human environment for present and future generations has become an imperative goal for mankind – a goal to be pursued together with, and in harmony with, the established and fundamental goals of peace and of world-wide economic and social development."

The Declaration noted that in order to achieve this environmental goal it was imperative to seek the acceptance of responsibility by citizens and communities and by enterprises and institutions at every level in a common effort. The main argument was that the sum total of individual actions in all fields and places would have a fundamental impact and shape the world environment of the future. The Declaration noted that local and national governments would bear the greatest burden for large-scale environmental

policy and action within their jurisdictions. This declaration – at what was, at the time, the largest ever meeting of its kind focusing on the human environment – began a fundamental global shift of how human and environmental relations were viewed. These globally shifting ideas on the environment and development agenda were broadly laid out by scientists who sought to protect the world's ecological diversity through a mainly protectionist agenda.

By the 1980s, the protectionist policies were increasingly discredited. The recognition of the link between poverty and ecological stability, and the growing acceptance of the right of communities to derive their livelihoods from local natural resources became more prominent in global discussions. In 1986 the UN Declaration on the Right to Development recognized in its preamble that development was a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting from it.

The highly influential 1980 World Conservation Strategy (WCS) introduced the concept of sustainable development (IUCN/UNEP/WWF 1980). The three main objectives of the Strategy were: maintenance of essential ecological processes and life-support systems; preservation of genetic diversity; and sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems. These views were reinforced further by the publication of the influential *Our Common Future: a Report of World Commission on Environment and Development* (WCED1987). Belief was growing at the global level that traditional forms of national sovereignty were incompatible with the realities of ecological and economic interdependence. The concept of 'the global commons' consequently gained wide acceptance. *Our Common Future* identified poverty as a major cause and effect of global environmental problems and suggested that it was futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompassed the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality.

The watershed publication: *Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living* (IUCN, UNEP, WWF, 1991) stated that this community of life links all human societies, present and future generations, and humanity and the rest of nature. It noted that the protection of human rights and those of the rest of nature is a worldwide responsibility that transcended all cultural, ideological and geographical boundaries. It In other words, the responsibility is both individual and collective. The Strategy aimed to inform the World Summit on Environment and Development held the following year in Rio de Janeiro, Argentina.

Agenda 21 was the most prominent outcome of the 1992 Rio Summit, outlining the global plan of action to deal with development and environmental issues. Agenda 21 noted that humanity was confronted with a perpetuation of disparities between and within nations, a worsening of poverty, hunger, ill health and illiteracy, and the continuing deterioration of the ecosystems on which humanity depended for its well-being. Agenda 21 promoted international cooperation for the integration of environment and development concerns that targeted the fulfillment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future. Agenda 21 called on governments and intergovernmental organizations to act in full partnership with indigenous people and their communities in order to establish both the processes of empowerment of the people, and arrangements to strengthen the active participation of indigenous people and their communities in the national formulation of policies, laws and programs relating to resource management and other development processes that may affect them.

Two other important outcomes of the Rio Summit were the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The two conventions affirmed in their preambles that the global nature of climate change required the widest possible cooperation by all countries and their participation in an effective and appropriate international response.

This was to be in accordance with common but differentiated national responsibilities that reflected their respective capabilities, and social and economic conditions. The objectives of the CBD are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources through improved access to genetic resources, initiate appropriate technology transfers, and protect stakeholder rights over those resources and to technologies (Article 1).Article 6.a called for the development of national strategies, plans or programs for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, or for the adaptation of existing strategies, plans or programs that would reflect the measures set out in the Convention. Article 8.a called for the establishment of a system of protected areas or areas where special measures would be taken to conserve biological diversity. The CBD also has specific articles calling for benefit sharing with local and indigenous communities.

The growing international consensus on governing the environment led to changes in the operations of leading development institutions such as the World Bank. There was greater emphasis on forest protection and attempts for more inclusion of local communities in governing the commons (World Bank 1994). The World Bank established the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) in 1991 to avail grants and concessional funding to developing countries for projects and programs that were to benefit the global environment. Such funding would enable governments of developing countries to address global environmental issues they would otherwise be unable or unwilling to undertake. Moreover, richer countries could use the facility to channel funds toward these issues (World Bank 1994). Two of the four priority areas of the GEF are global warming (particularly as linked to destruction of carbon-sequestering forests), and the destruction of biological diversity through the degradation of natural habitats and the overuse of natural resources.

5.4 The IUCN and WWF: Examples of Spreading the Conservation Message

The globalization of environment and development principles has been propagated by many individuals and organizations for over half a century. Two of the most influential organizations have been IUCN and WWF. They are an integral part of the global policymaking arena, influence other INGOs as well as multi- and bi-lateral organizations, and actively participate in program formulation and implementation at national and local levels. As major actors in the two case studies examined in this chapter, it is imperative to know what informs their practice. This section briefly examines how and why the two organizations were created in order to better understand their actions and influence in program implementation at local community level in Kenya.

5.4.1 The IUCN

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) was founded in 1948 as the International Union for the protection of Nature and was at the time the only international organization concerned with the broad area of nature protection. IUCN's primary rationale was to strengthen the nature conservation movement by networking to link expert individuals and national organizations and to pool environmental information at the global level on the assumption that if IUCN helped to share the world's knowledge, its national members would work more effectively and nature would benefit (Holdgate, 1999).

The Development of IUCN policy and practice occurred in three distinct stages (Zettelmeyer et al 2008). Zettelmayer and his colleagues identified three stages. First stage, ideas that emanated from the 19th century from educated elite focused on protecting nature from the threat of people. These views persisted until the 1960s and 1970s. Nature was to be preserved 'in the common human interest' mainly through the establishment of protected areas and the removal of the locals. But the exclusionary approach of local communities that depended and interacted with such natural habitats was a serious detriment to their livelihoods since it denied them access to their traditional resource base.

The second stage, the "conservation with development" movement, that took root in the 1980s redefined the relationship of people and nature. The high costs of the previous exclusionary approach combined with ethical arguments about the unequal distribution of costs and benefits of conservation propagated this new thinking. Poverty was identified as a cause of unsustainable practice while traditional knowledge was recognized as an important conservation resource in addition to a traditional right to resource use. Areas around protected areas were identified as buffer zones and the development of inclusionary mechanisms included "Integrated Conservation and Development Projects" (ICDP) and "Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). But the final emphasis of these mechanisms remained the conservation of nature as the final goal. Most of the current practice of IUCN around protected area management falls in this category.

In recent years, the third stage of IUCN's thinking has adopted a more holistic approach after realization that conservation and development are two intertwined objectives that require trade-offs without favouring one or the other (Fisher et al 2005). This approach seeks to include local people with emphasis on the poor and attempts to view the problem through the lens of multiple geographical scales at local, national and global levels.

5.4.2 The WWF

The WWF was conceived in 1961 as a major conduit to attract funding in the conservation field that was starved of the necessary financial support. WWF was formed by several world leading conservationists

and organizations including IUCN (WWF 2012). The Manifesto stated that while the expertise to protect the world environment existed, the financial support to achieve this protection did not (WWF 2012). Thus, the WWF was established as an international fundraising organization to work in collaboration with existing conservation groups. These strong early foundational linkages between the two organizations have maintained to the present day as illustrated in this chapter.

In 1975 WWF expanded its mandate from the narrower confines of species-related conservation projects into protecting habitats by supporting the growth and expansion of national parks and nature reserves. In 1984 WWF introduced the concept of using Third World debt reduction to protect the environment. Through the debt-for-nature swaps, WWF promoted the conversion of portions of national debt into funding for conservation. WWF cemented its links with global financial multi-lateral institutions in the 1990s. For example, in 1997 the World Bank President introduced a partnership with WWF to bring 500 million acres of forest under independent certification as sustainably managed by 2005, and to establish an additional 50 million acres of new forest protected areas. These linkages – earlier revealed from the debt-for-nature swaps – showed the growing influence of neoclassical economic notions of rational management of natural resources in the policies advocated by WWF and other INGOs. The imposition of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) by Breton Woods Institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) during the same period further alienated local communities from vital environmental resources (see Chapter 2 for further discussions on how the World Bank's imposed strategies served to further impoverish local communities in developing countries).

In summary, I have shown in this section how global networks arose in the conservation and development field. These networks managed to exert a monopoly on financial and technical resources that disadvantaged developing country governments and local communities and left them beholden to the demands of the global players. The prevailing metaphors on environmental conservation and consequent

strategies for their management are mainly aimed at satisfying Western notions of maintaining the environment undisturbed for future enjoyment. The belief that neoliberal-informed strategies that promote alternatives to local forest use has gained widespread prominence because of the strong linkages created between the INGOs and major multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and IMF. Moreover, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) such as IUCN and WWF strongly influence overseas development strategies of most western governments.

5.5 The Impact of Globalization on Kenya's Environmental Policies

Kenya did not escape the influence of the global processes discussed in the previous section. For example the country endorsed the adoption of Agenda 21 at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). Agenda 21 proposed that Governments, in cooperation with international organizations, where appropriate, should adopt a national strategy for sustainable development based on, *inter alia*, the implementation of decisions taken at the Conference. Kenya's accession to Agenda 21 in addition to several other international treaties, have served to steer the Kenyan environmental agenda firmly in the direction of global ideas.

Agenda 21 specifically called for the development of national strategies for the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of biological resources. In line with these recommendations, a multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral Task Force was established in 1996 to function as a broad-based consultative and advisory group to steer the development of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). A major grant from the WWF Eastern Africa Regional Program Office helped in its production. Kenya finalized a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan in March 2000 (MENR 2000). The overall objective of the NBSAP was to address the national and international undertakings elaborated in Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. This article aimed to ensure that the rate of biodiversity loss at that time was reversed, and that levels of biological resources were maintained at sustainable levels for posterity.

The policies, strategies and action plans developed and adopted by the Kenyan Government mirror the global trends without offering any significant alterations (see chapters 6 and 8 on how this occurs in the program implementation and policymaking processes respectively). The influence of global policies and ideas are visible in individual pieces and policies touching on the environment. In Section 45-48 of Kenya's *Forest Act 2005*, the legislation outlines how local communities are to participate in forest management through the mechanism of community forest associations. The mechanism mirrors the global trend of greater inclusiveness of local communities in resource management. The *Wildlife Act Chapter 376* is under review and is expected to address issues related to promoting rural livelihoods and collaborative natural resource management, and compensation and opportunity costs. Kenya's 1999 *Environmental Management and Coordination Act* (EMCA) includes most of the major global agreements developed during the last four decades. It takes priority over all pre existing legislation, provides for cross-sectoral coordination and is managed by the National Environmental Management Agency (NEMA).

5.6 Case Study Projects

This section presents my two case studies; both have been strongly influenced by the multilevel processes that have determined how policies and programs have been undertaken in developing countries. I examine the consequences of these influences on project outcomes. The study locates important areas where multi-stakeholder efforts could begin to effect positive changes on the outcomes of projects as well as approaches that could be reinforced and multiplied in order to make the projects more inclusive and informative to the overall development process of developing countries like Kenya.

5.6.1 Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program (MERECP)

5.6.1.1 Project Background, Development and Global Influences

The Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program (MERECP) was a 4-year (2005-2009) transboundary project focused on natural resource management (IUCN 2005). It was implemented by the governments of Kenya and Uganda under the aegis of the East African Community – a regional intergovernmental organization that also includes Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Because of its importance as a catchment area for the River Nile among other water bodies, its status had wider international implications with interests spreading from Kenya to Uganda and further north into Egypt and Sudan. These wider international interests played an important role in drawing the interest and resources of multi lateral organizations such as the United Nations as well as bi-lateral bodies such as the Royal Norwegian and Swedish international development agencies.

Mt. Elgon ecosystem contains within it several protected areas on the Kenyan side including Mt. Elgon National Park, Trans-Nzoia Forest Reserve, Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve and Chepkitale National Reserve (See map of Mt Eglon Forest categorization in Appendix 4). These protected areas have given rise to human-wildlife conflicts with implications for forest ecosystem management. The forest resources are an important means of livelihood for the rapidly growing adjacent communities which have limited alternative livelihood options. I found that the local population had little awareness or interest in the transboundary ecosystem issues important to the project planners.

5.6.1.2 Program development

There are many reasons why Mt. Elgon is a contested ecosystem. It is vital to the social and economic functioning of the area, and is a water catchment supplying millions of people in Uganda and Kenya. It is also an important area for species conservation due to the richness of endemic plant and animal species on the mountain. Most of the montane forest is gazetted as Forest Reserve in Kenya (73,705 hectares) and managed by the Forest Service. A section of the forest on the north-east slopes falls within Mt. Elgon National Park (16,900 hectares) under the jurisdiction of the Kenyan Wildlife Service (Soini 2007). The National Park was established in 1968. Portions of the Mt Elgon ecosystem are managed by the Bungoma County Council under the Trust Land Act. The Mt. Elgon ecosystem is categorized as one of the five main "water towers" of Kenya that form the basis of the country's water supply (KFWG 2000). The forest has species that are globally threatened making it a priority for species conservation and a target for tourism development.

In the 2001-2005 EAC Strategic Plan, the East African Community (EAC) Secretariat and partner states identified Mt Elgon as a trans-boundary ecosystem requiring a regional conservation management program and sustainable development. MERECP was developed in response to the need for a regional approach to the management of this important trans-boundary ecosystem, part of the water catchment area for the Lake Victoria, the Nile and Lake Turkana. MERECP's main purpose was: "To enhance the conservation status and benefits of Mt Elgon ecosystem for environment quality and livelihoods" (IUCN 2005, p.26).

The purpose was to be realized through four objectives; a) promotion of the conservation and management of natural resources and biodiversity in and outside protected areas; b) enhancement of sustainable development in Mt Elgon Ecosystem; c) integration of the conservation and management

117

needs of the Mt Elgon ecosystem into national, regional and international development frameworks; and d) effective implementation of MERECP as a regional trans-boundary program (IUCN 2005). Transboundary natural resource management requires the safeguarding of viable ecosystems and important components, appropriate and harmonized national legislation and regulations, and political and institutional support for such legislation and regulations.

MERECP's vision, goal and purpose recognized the ecosystem approach as endorsed by several international processes and institutions such as the Millennium Development Goals and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and also, crucially, by the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation of June 2006. Funding from the Royal Norwegian Government was possible because the objectives of the MERECP program coincided with its own policies. The ecosystem approach emphasizes the importance of participatory approaches in management of protected areas and ecological networks (7th COP Meeting of the CBD, 2004).

The EAC appointed the IUCN in 2005 to provide a Technical Advisory role and financial management services to the program as well as the day-to-day management and coordination of MERECP activities. The focal institution for coordinating MERECP activities in Kenya was the Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources. Other partner institutions included the National Environment Management Authority, the Kenya Wildlife Service, the Kenya Forest Services, the Mt. Elgon County Council, the Trans-Nzoia District and the Mt. Elgon District.

An official Midterm Review (MTR) estimated that in the period 2005/2006, between 65.8 to 86.4 percent of grand total expenditures were spent on administration, coordination and meetings. Field activities accounted for only 34 percent of grand total expenditures and only 12.6 percent when ICRAF expenditures were taken into consideration. In 2007, the respective figures were between 46.3 and 62.4

percent for administration, and 28 percent for field activities. The Review concluded that too many activities were spread over a large geographical area. Less than 50 percent of the targeted activities had been implemented during the first half of the program. The MTR's opinion was that the program was not cost effective and if the costs of administration and coordination continued to be high, the program would not achieve any significant impacts.

The frequent delays in the disbursement of MERECP budgets adversely affected project implementation. There were also delays in the signing of the project agreements (PAIMA) - a pre-requisite for any funding. Based on the recommendations of the MTR in 2008, the program management and coordination was transferred from IUCN to the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) in Kisumu Kenya – a specialized institution of the East African Community that is responsible for coordinating the development plans for Lake Victoria Basin (IUCN 2009). The initial planned duration of the MERECP project from 2005-2009 was altered and extended to 2010 due to implementation delays that severely hampered the performance of the project.

The redesigned framework of MERECP concentrated on a few sub-district level communities for testing and demonstrating impact of livelihood improvements and community based ecosystem protection and natural resource management (NRM). The redesign selected 20 sub-district level target areas (10 each in Kenya and Uganda) to concentrate investment streams for livelihood improvement and ecosystem protection. Existing, registered, and functioning community based organizations (CBOs) were the main targets.

IUCN was ill-prepared to implement the MERECP. Partnership and inclusion are integral concepts of the new global agenda for sustainable development activities that respect the rights of local communities and all stakeholders to shape and manage the process of natural resource efforts. But in the case of MERECP,

the inability or reluctance of IUCN to delegate and network with appropriate local institutions was criticized by a vast majority of both major institutional actors as well as the local community groups. In my research, I found that large INGOS such as IUCN exhibited bureaucratic shortcomings similar to those of state institutions. IUCN had failed to create workable partnerships with Government agencies, local NGOs and local community groups. More streamlined and structured partnerships and networks can allow large INGOs such as IUCN to delegate activities that it is not specialized in while the organization adopts a greater overseer role and ensuring the overarching goals of integrated resource governance and development are adhered to.

5.6.1.3 Grassroots and Institutional voices at Mt Elgon

5.6.1.3.1 Goal-setting

The MERECP program documents mirrored global agendas and policies that called for greater local community development. But MERECP failed to establish a mechanism for local community inclusion during its first three years of implementation. Consequently some of the livelihood issues that MERECP failed to specifically address but were widely mentioned by the local community in interviews I undertook for this research included the following: improved agricultural practice; greater access to forest resources such as non-timber products including firewood, fruits and medicinal plants; human-wildlife conflict reduction and compensation for damages; and the establishment of clear mechanisms for equitable revenue-sharing between the Kenya Wildlife Service and the local community from tourism activities in Mt Elgon National Park.

A clear example of MERECP's failure to adapt to the situation on the ground was exemplified in the nonrecognition of the opportunities offered by the new Participatory Forest Management regime in Kenya. MERECP started about the same time that the new Forest Act 2005 was enacted in Kenya. The strong capacity-building goals of the MERECP presupposed that it would have been flexible enough to realize the potential for experimenting and informing the process of a crucial piece of legislation that would impact on the Mt Elgon ecosystem. But again the involvement of MERECP was severely lacking in its first phase, particularly with respect to the participatory aspects of the Forest Act. Jackson Tutei, Chairman of the Cheptais Community Forest Association (CFA) in Mt Elgon, wondered why MERECP remained remote and inaccessible at a critical time of community mobilization and Community Forest Association formation.

Chapter 6 discusses how skewed power relations undermine the ability of CFAs to engage on a more equal footing with the Kenya Forest Service in negotiating access to forest resources. A more flexible MERECP could have streamlined its agenda to support the CFAs in the write-up of forest management plans because this is where the power issues are played out between the parties before the signing of the necessary forest management agreement.

5.6.1.3.2 Time, Size and Project Management

In the redesigned phase of the MERECP project, a revolving fund strategy was adopted as its main vessel of program implementation. But the need for a longer time frame than the initially planned four-year project was clearly discernible if this new strategy were to prove more successful. The revolving funds plan envisaged that the repayments made would expand the fund base and enable the the program to spread more widely into the community as other groups joined the process.

In a group interview with eight members of the CFAs and two CBOs, there was general consensus that selecting only one group to receive \$10,000 in Mt. Elgon for the pilot phase would have minimal impact. Despite interest in receiving funds, the lack of experience with such revolving fund schemes elicited worries among some Chemutei Women Group members because of a risk of defaulting that could result

in the loss of collateral such as farm animals. The 30 members of the group would each receive an undetermined amount of the funds as loans. Three members of the Group, Judith Chepkwemoi (coordinator), Eunice Sudi (member), Eunice Makwa (Chairperson) described their plans for the funds. All the three women planned to invest in some form of agriculture. They did not plan to buy or invest on farm as a group because they predicted inevitable conflicts and therefore preferred private investment.

The loanees were expected to repay MERECP within one year including an undetermined interest amount. They had undergone one of two planned training sessions but there was consensus that this was grossly inadequate for the planned activity. There was consensus that they needed more time to repay the loans. No discussions or negotiations had taken place on the loan repayment schedules or on interest amounts with MERECP. Moreover, it was uncertain what the management structure of the revolving fund would look like in the future. A culture for saving and interest payment was a new concept for many in the community and would require far more years for assimilation than the envisaged one-year turnaround for loan repayments. This study concluded that the new strategy needed a period closer to ten years in order to embed itself in the philosophy of livelihood-making within the local community as well as establishing a self-sustaining management structure independent of MERECP.

5.6.1.3.3 The state and bureaucratic hurdles

MERECP failed to account for its trans-boundary nature that required rationalized approaches to its implementation given the different development policies in Kenya and Uganda. Failure to ensure that its strategies conformed to individual country regulations was blamed for the Program's failure to implement any local community projects on the Kenyan side of the border in contrast to the Ugandan side. Mr Sikoyo (MERECP Program Administrator, at Lake Victoria Basin Commission) described the administrative hurdles that the Program faced in Kenya. He explained that when the program was designed there was an assumption that the Uganda system of financial transfers and budgetary

122

management would work in Kenya. Uganda has a de-centralized system of administration and financial transfers in contrast to the highly centralized Kenyan system. In Kenya any amount of KShs 500,000 and above must pass though the Treasury and then on to the appropriate Ministry and eventually through the regional Provincial and District administrations. This resulted in a bureaucratic bottle-neck that delayed the arrival of the funds at the District level for two years. After the Midterm Review (MTR) the MERECP was redesigned in order to resolve problems associated with the disbursement of funds by more clearly articulating the roles and responsibilities of fund recipients. The redesign of the Program is also supposed to allow for 60 percent of resources to flow to local communities. But even with the new arrangements, the District Commissioners – government functionaries – must append their signatures before funds are transferred to the selected groups within their areas of jurisdiction and this continues to cause delays.

5.6.2 Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System in Shimba Hills

5.6.2.1 Project Background, Development and Global Influences

The Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System (ICG) Program is under the management of WWF with support of a number of organizations including GEF through the UNDP. WWF has been involved in many conservation and development activities along the Kenyan coast over several decades. The main reason for its interest is the protection of what it views as an ecosystem of global significance. This project was part of a larger ecoregion initiative that included activities in Tanzania and Mozambique.

The Eastern Africa coastal forests areas of Kenya, Somalia and Tanzania are categorized under the Afrotropical Ecoregion category. The Northern Zanzibar-Inhambane Coastal Forest Mosaic ecoregion and the Eastern Arc Montane Forests harbor densities of plant species that are among the highest in the world (Myers et al. 2000). The forest habitat in this ecoregion is highly fragmented, with the over 200 separate patches further threatened by agriculture and other human activities. Shimba Hills National Reserve is one of the few protected areas. The status of the ecoregion is labelled critical and endangered. Several global institutions have been involved in efforts to protect the ecoregion. These include INGOs such as IUCN and WWF, and many bi- and multi-lateral development institutions. Many of these institutions have channeled their resources through various forms of integrated conservation and development projects.

The UNDP, through its environmental financing mechanism of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), played an important role in this project. The situation analysis confirmed to UNDP that the targeted forests are located in one of the 25 global biodiversity hotspots as classified by WWF (UNDP 2007). The project intended to build on previous experience gained from piloting participatory forest management (PFM) at Arabuko-Sokoke forest. It was envisaged that the newly introduced participatory forest management (PFM) policy would provide a basis for more successful collaborative links with local communities for improved ecosystem management.

5.6.2.2 Multilevel Management

The UNDP Country Office in Kenya was designated as the project Implementing Agency and WWF East Africa was the Executing Agency (UNDP 2007). Project activities were to be undertaken by relevant governmental, non-governmental and inter-governmental agencies with private sector partnership where appropriate. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) oversaw project activities at the national level with responsibility to make recommendations and approve budgets and work plans. The project was administered under the overall framework of the East African Coastal Forests Ecoregion Program (EACFEP) of WWWF-EARPO. The institutional framework for EACFEP consisted of three levels: The Ecoregion Program Steering Committee (EPSC) was constituted out of the existing Regional Task Force;

124

National Task Forces (NTFs) composed of representative professional from universities, national and international NGOs and research experts from institutions responsible for conservation and management of coastal forests. This body, chaired by a coordinator hosted by the National Focal institution, was responsible for coordination and implementation of national program activities. Similar to the MERECP in Mt Elgon, again the management structure was vast and complex.

The complex institutional management structure left little space for local community groups to shape the direction of the project. The case of the Shimba Hills Forest Guide Association (SHIFOGA) was typical of how local groups engaged with the project. The group's main activities were conservation education and awareness, butterfly farming, and tree seedlings (most of which they sold to schools). SHIFOGA rewrote its constitution, mission statements, vision, and objectives in order to fit the WWF mandate and standards. According to Ali Mwakutunza (Chairman SHIFOGA), the one positive outcome from this was that the organization adopted a more long-term view to its operations and a better appreciation of the need for more equitable gender balance in decision-making for sustainable development.

5.6.2.3 International obligations in a contested landscape

The contested nature of the Kenyan coastal forest ecosystem is highlighted by important national economic activities. These include tourism; mining (e.g. titanium is estimated to generate US\$ 47 million per annum); limestone quarrying for cement production; and woodcarving (generating an estimated annual income of US\$ 25 million). For a vast majority of the population, the most important livelihood activity in the landscape remains farming. All these economic activities impact on the management of coastal forests. The complex management requirements are further compounded by differentiated forest management and ownership types. The project was located in Kwale District that harboured a total of 47 forest sites. These were categorized into 13 Forest Reserves, 33 National Monuments (mostly the culturally important Kaya forests of which 18 were less than 2km²), and one National Reserve (Shimba

Hills). The dominant forest area was the Shimba Hills National Reserve, thus granting the state the dominant management role in the area. The Shimba Hills forest area is estimated at 63 km2. This forest area includes a National Reserve under the management of the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and three Forest Reserves managed by the Kenya Forestry Service (KFS). The management complexity is further compounded since some areas are doubly gazetted as both National and Forest Reserves.

Measures taken to protect the coastal forest ecosystem were viewed as aiding the government to be in compliance with its international treaty obligations for the protection of the environment. It was important that the project objectives coincided with international agreements that Kenya had acceded to over the last 3 decades. The project was also in line with one of Kenya's main targets for 2015 in its Millennium Development Goals (MDG) strategy: mainstreaming sustainable development and reversing the loss of environmental resources. The project conformed to the 1999 Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA). This Act provides framework legislation for the management of the environment and sustainable development in Kenya. Some of the relevant principles that this project satisfied are listed in Section 3 of the Act: a) the principle of public participation in the development of policies, plans and processes for the management of the environment; b) cultural and social principles traditionally applied by local communities for the management of the environment or natural resources; and c) principles of intergenerational and intergenerational equity. All these principles revealed the global convergence of ideas on environment management in Kenya.

There was an estimated 400 elephants in the National Reserve in a small and isolated ecosystem surrounded by a dense human population (KWS 2012). Human-wildlife conflicts, particularly elephant crop-raiding, were widespread and contributed to the impoverishment of many locals. The conflicts are intensified because the National Reserve is isolated and there is no practical way of linking the relatively small ecosystem to a larger elephant habitat (Luke and Maunder 2007; Thouless et al 2008; KWS 2012).

This meant that the one unifying complaint among the local community respondents was the destruction caused by animals to farm crops and the danger to their personal safety. An electric fence around the Reserve was incomplete and ineffective since elephants easily broke through or found paths around it.

Some conservationists also were worried that the elephants' destructive feeding habits were a threat to some fragile and threatened plant species in the Forest Reserve. The project implementers at WWF had not considered the possibility of total elephant relocation as a possibility although this was under consideration by Government agencies (KWS 2012). Such a drastic step would have a significant impact on both the livelihoods of the adjacent populations, as well as the tourism attraction of the area. Although the ICG Program claimed to adopt an ecoregional approach accompanied with a long-term view (WWF 2006), I found such claims to be unfulfilled in Shimba Hills since possible solutions to the elephant menace had not been considered by project planners. This inaction by the project planners led to widespread disenchantment of the local population with the continued protection of the elephants. I found that more efficient compensation mechanisms and increased support for improved farming techniques merited further consideration in the short-term. If the project were to remain true to its vision of a broad ecoregion approach, then it had to tackle the large, controversial problems regardless of the size of the resources available in order to contribute to a long-term vision for the ecosystem.

5.6.2.4 Grassroots and Institutional Voices at Shimba Hills

Neoliberal economic development policies have increasingly shaped the development portion of ICDP approaches supported by INGOs such as WWF. The Lima Self Help Group at Shimba Hills founded in 2003 through the initiative of Nchalika Juma and her husband, exemplified this trend. The group is involved in farming and making of soaps, lotions, creams, and shampoos. Although the membership is balanced in gender (eight females and seven males), the women are much more active and undertake most

of the activities. WWF provided them with start-up funds to buy, operate and house a jatrophus seed oil extraction machine for soap-making. The outcomes of the activity in terms of improving their livelihoods were rated as moderate in a group interview I conducted with four of its members. The typical example of livelihood improvement was an improved ability to afford the purchase of school provisions for their children. Finding larger markets for their products was a major problem. The group members conceded that their advertising and marketing capabilities were limited at best. This was important because although four of their herbal products had been certified by the Kenya Bureau Standards, they had only one assured buyer at one coastal hotel. Such a small market could not significantly impact on the livelihoods of the group members and yet WWF saw fit to support such a venture.

Tourism has been an integral part of the Kenyan coastal region for decades. Although ecotourism is still a novel idea in most other regions of Kenya, it has been more easily accepted and assimilated by several groups in the region. The close proximity of the forest to the beach hotel circuit, combined with a world-famous reputation of a unique ecosystem has provided several local communities with opportunities to engage in ecotourism. Nature trails and local village cultural visits are among the popular initiatives undertaken by several groups. This is exemplified by the Kaya Kinondo Ecotourism project that was started in 2002. According to Gerald Gambo, the WWF Project Manager, initial skepticism for the project by local elders was overcome when they were convinced that the sacred cultural sites and beliefs of the community would be respected. The ecotourism venture received support from the Ford Foundation, the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) and the WWF over the duration of its existence. The CEPF is a joint initiative of Conservation International (CI), the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the John D. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation and the World Bank. The money was used for mobilization meetings, training, and visitor centre construction.
This ecotourism venture attracted national and international recognition for what external donors termed a model of inclusion, in combination with culturally sensitive conservation and socio-economic improvement goals. For example, international volunteers were attracted to work in the project as well as to establish a number of offshoot activities. Income from the project supported several women's groups in other income generating activities such as wood carvings. Its modest local achievements included the provision of books to two schools; boreholes dug, thus saving community members' time spent fetching and paying for water. But the most acclaimed outcome is the Kaya Kinondo Village Bank; a community owned and managed financial services association that is linked to the Kaya Kinondo Ecotourism Project. It was founded to supplement the minimal tourism income generated by the project. It was envisaged that improved financial management and saving capacities would lead to more environmentally friendly economic investments. Training was provided to community members and several people were trained on how to set up and run a village bank. Experience with the failure of such village banks in the past led to initial skepticism. When an initial membership of just over 100 had grown to over 500, the Bank was able to offer modest loans to its clients. My research found that the impact of ecotourism was minimal, but that the entrepreneurial capacity of the local inhabitants had certainly benefitted from the establishment of the Village Bank. This increased locals' appreciation for saving and investment.

5.7 Discussion

In this section, I present a summary of the global consensus that has framed environmental and development issues. I also show the close-knit institutional relationships of major actors (e.g. WWF and IUCN) that play an important role in the framing and transfer of the policies and t through wellestablished networks of meetings and regional and national offices is shown. I found that the linkages of INGOs to global financial institutions played an important role on the programs that were funded and implemented in developing countries. I discuss the importance of scalar and temporal factors in ICDPs: although these are crucial to the success of such efforts, the programs and projects initiated at local communities often neglect to take adequate account of these factors. I make recommendations on how to overcome political hurdles and skewed power issues in participation. Finally, I conclude that the complexity of ICDPS should not only be acknowledged but embraced because this can contribute to a more democratic and deliberative process in programs by accommodating many views in a commons approach for locally-appropriate solutions.

5.7.1 Global Consensus and Policy Movement

I found that the evolution of major ideas on environment and development, and the consequent consensus-building at global forums was led mostly by institutions headquartered in Western countries. Because the major institutions that informed the process have established networks and bases both horizontally in other western countries as well as vertically in developing countries, they exert major influence on how information is gathered and disseminated in the process of global policy making. The philosophies and policies of major global opinion shapers such as IUCN and WWF drive the negotiations and outcomes of global negotiations. The close-knit network of dominant players at the global level ensures that once ideas are accepted at that level, a well developed network spreads them quickly through a series of now well-established conferences, forums, and institutions. Their ownership of resources and ability to influence other institutions that harbor resources means that developing countries are often at a disadvantage and their need to access the global resources often forces them to adopt most of the ideas without adequate localization measures.

5.7.2 Scalar and temporal factors in project outcomes

Scale is an important analytical concept in common pool resources because:(1) environmental problems can have different spatial and temporal scopes, and (2) institutional responses to environmental problems can be taken at different, and often multiple, levels. Thus, it is increasingly recognized that environmental governance is often neither small-scale nor large-scale, but multiple-scale (Berkes, 2002; Carpenter et al 2006; Crofts 2004; Mol and Van Den Berg, 2004; Young 2002). Positioning integrated conservation and development projects in relation to other complementary conservation activities operating on a variety of spatial and temporal scales is a major challenge of ecosystem or regional-scale conservation approaches (McShane 2005). The global expansion of conservation areas demands an understanding of conservation, and its interactions with livelihoods, that works across distinct scales of analysis and action. The mismatch between the scales at which natural and human systems organize leads to failures in feedback, when, for instance, benefits accrue at one scale, but costs are carried at another (Carpenter et al 2006).

Scalar factors had a big impact on the outcomes of MERECP. Its importance as a catchment of international importance was a main driver of how the MERECP was conceived and implemented. In addition, the unique mountain ecosystem attracted global conservation concerns leading to a concentration of external resources on the National Park and a neglect of the larger ecosystem often under the management of local District administrations. On the other hand, the Kenyan Government was interested in ensuring the integrity of the National Park in order to develop and grow its tourism potential and increased state revenue. The local inhabitants on the other hand were mainly concerned with obtaining a livelihood and were largely unaware of the global interests that the area attracts. There is a clear need to develop a democratically negotiated system that benefits all interested parties if the persistent resource conflicts are to be minimized. The diverse and conflicting interests witnessed at Mt Elgon were largely mirrored at Shimba hills. Unlike the watershed benefits of Mt Elgon ecosystem, the

much smaller Shimba Hills are attractive to the global community for their richness in unique but threatened biodiversity. For this reason there is a concentration of major INGOs focused on conservation issues in the area. The Mt Elgon ecosystem on the other hand attracts more of the bi- and multi-lateral interests operating mostly at state levels. But in both instances, there is a disconnect with the targeted communities.

5.7.3 The New Rural Agenda

The new rural agenda stands in uneasy tension with international treaties and agreements because it moves away from a defensive to an aggressive position on the commons. It exploits opportunities to create or recreate new commons as well as defending existing ones. This is posed as a better option to privatization or state control in certain places and at certain times depending on local conditions. Despite the tensions between the two sides, the creation of strong partnerships that build trust and recognize the needs of all sides is important. This can be recognized in the small but comparatively more successful case observed at Shimba Hills. The Kaya Kinondo benefitted from strong linkages at multi-levels over a period of almost two decades. The stakeholders had learnt to trust each other and the interests of all sides were placed on the negotiating table for more democratic decision-making. The disconnect of institutions in Mt Elgon, for example between IUCN and the East African Community Secretariat, and the hands off approach of the Norwegian Development Agency was not amenable to the creation of strong lasting and trusting relations. This was understandable in some ways because the program had been in operation for only a few years. But the critical problem was that MERECP had not strived to set up a deliberative process that built up these multi-level, multi-stakeholder linkages. The activities remained disparate and unlikely to create the necessary forums and spaces for equitable negotiations and outcomes. Critically, the local participants had no avenues for participating in the decision-making process.

West et al (2006) assert that protected areas are a form of globalization and called for an anthropology of protected areas that bridges the gap between political economies of globalization and the subtle but profound local social effects of the creation of nature and environment in places where those categories of people's surroundings did not exist before. Researchers have criticized the attempt to discover 'designer development', whereby a deterministic, rational approach to rural development has been the prevailing paradigm for most post-colonial governments in the developing world (Sayer and Campbell 2004). The local communities have a critical dependence on non-marketed common property resources for their livelihood. In many rural areas most households rely on common resources of water, common forests and pastures. The wellbeing of these societies depends critically on the availability, quality, and sustainability of these resources. Access to them is critical for survival; harnessing them for use and their maintenance are important livelihood tasks to be undertaken often on a collective basis as a community. These collective livelihood streams are unlikely to benefit from short-term ICDP activities that include a small minority of the community and which are likely only to lead to conflicts and tensions when a majority receives no direct benefits.

5.8 Conclusions and Recommendations

- The effectiveness of the international agreements and the instruments they offer as possible solutions demand further scrutiny. This study has found them to be vessels of convergence of Western ideas and thinking on the management of contested ecosystems.
- 2. The normative goals of the international policies that are aimed at improving the livelihoods of local communities are often diluted or neglected all together when actual laws and are formulated at the national level. There is a clear tendency for state agencies to maintain the status quo.

Chapter 6 provides a detailed discussion of this tendency in Kenya in regard to the Participatory Forest Management regime.

- 3. The imposition of neoliberal forms of development on local communities disrupts longestablished communal livelihood strategies. There should be a sustained effort in the process of educating, organizing, and identifying actions, which empower local people to influence their development destiny through self-determined democratic governance. These will require recognition of local level governance, both formal and informal, which have a major impact on the outcome of projects (Chapter 7 discusses how long-established local mechanisms of development can have profound effects on outcomes of ICDPs).
- 4. Local ownership of projects is unlikely unless a more bottom-up approach is adopted in order to counter the bureaucratic tendencies of both state agencies and large INGOs. But such a community-empowering approach should not be equated with mere proposal-writing to potential funding agencies. This is because disempowered communities have little alternative but to adjust their proposals to match the mandates of the supporting organizations. This study concludes that project formulation and goal-setting presents a crucial node for re-imposing the participatory agenda in multilevel projects. This re-imposition requires innovative re-thinking in strategies that strive to break from the shackles of prevailing dominant metaphors of human-environmental interactions such as the maintenance and protection of unchanged ecosystems and the neoliberal approach to socio-economic development. Instead the focus should be on a new rural agenda that expressly recognizes the centrality of the commons and the need for more equitable strategies for the distribution of the resources in local community development.

5. It is recommended that ICDP projects encourage deliberative processes in order to inculcate democratic processes that open channels of communication for local communities engage as equal partners in decision-making. The innate fear of conservationists of irreversible environmental changes should recognize that few of these areas have remained unchanged. Deliberative processes recognize the multiple centers of power (even at the local level) as observed in the village council of elders in the Kaya Kinondo project at Shimba Hills. An approach that recognizes the complexity of the system, the link to the larger development process, the multi-scalar influences, in the governance of the commons will eventually see a greater influence of local voices in the formulation of international policies and eventual program formulation better suited to their needs.

Chapter Six: Link between Globalization and Local Development Factors on the Outcomes of ICDPs

6.1 Introduction

Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) do not operate in isolation from prevailing development practice in Kenya. They reflect the predominance of neoliberal approaches that have shaped Kenya's economic development. Kenya adopted modernization principles as an integral part of its development policies after independence in 1963. Kenya's approach itself is a reflection of the growing hegemony of neoliberal practice worldwide as exemplified by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund development strategies in developing countries. But such policies have led to growing poverty and inequalities at local and regional levels. The search for alternative modes of development resulted in the political leaders encouraging the expansion of the Kenyan self-help tradition known as "harambee" from local community initiatives to larger scale regional projects. The harambee philosophy is a widespread and popular cultural mechanism for development at both community and national levels in Kenya. It is recognized as the best known collective action for development of its kind in Africa (Hill 1991; Ngau 1987; Thomas 1987). The Harambee ideology originated out of the material basis of the community "workparty" structures found in a majority of Kenyan societies (Hill 1991). The self-help projects are initiated through the voluntary pooling of resources in order to meet identified social or economic needs. On a smaller scale, it involves livelihood improvement activities such as bush-clearing, planting, weeding and harvesting, and engagement in small business. On a larger scale at regional and national levels it fulfills bigger social objectives such as the construction of schools, dispensaries, irrigation schemes and roads.

Harambee-type collectives and their emerging variations continue to shape socio-economic activities and grassroots rural development processes. And yet they have received surprisingly little scholarly attention over the last few decades in regard to their development impacts. Even less analytical focus has been placed on their everyday implications on collective livelihood and conservation models in rural Kenya. Most harambee studies in the early 1970s and for the next two decades focused on its links with the Kenyan political process (Barkan & Holmquist 1989). A major conclusion of these studies was that politicians misused the ethos of harambee in order improve their popularity by appropriating leadership positions in the harambee process (Thomas 1985). This capture of harambee practice by the political elite reduced its popularity as a regional and national level development mechanism and may have discredited its collective merits in academic thinking. Although many development practitioners are aware of the local cultural importance of harambee, most of them make little effort to understand how these impacts on the projects that they initiate and manage despite the potentially crucial role it plays on the outcomes of any initiatives. This tainted notion of harambee may have contributed to the dearth of research on harambee from the late 1980s – a period which coincided with the initiation of ICDPs. Regardless of the prevailing problematic reputation of harambee, there is evidence on the ground that it continues to play an important role in Kenya rural development practice.

My main purpose in this chapter is to examine how external projects can integrate local institutions and culture in order to strengthen their positive impacts and encourage wider acceptance. I analyze the harambee group approach to development in Kenya at its interface with livelihood diversification strategies of conservation and development approaches, including its potential for both positive and negative impacts. I highlight the potential role of harambee in creating positive and innovative linkages between market-led development and community organization. I focus mainly on the Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke Forests cases with respect to how such groups form, function and adapt in order to improve member livelihoods, and how ICDPs themselves are impacted by the harambee phenomenon.

6.2 Local Community Development, Conservation and Collective Action in Kenya

The major drive to establish protected forest and wildlife areas in Kenya occurred during the colonial period at the start of the 20th century. The colonial rulers and subsequent post-independence governments introduced policies aimed at promoting two major economic initiatives: first, establishing the basis for profitable commercial forestry by designating selected areas as protected state lands, and second, placing the foundations for tourism activities linked to a large and elaborate park system (Mogaka et al 2001). These economic goals – which largely excluded adjacent local communities from reaping any tangible benefits from what had previously been open resource goods – remained largely the same and were adopted without any meaningful changes by the newly independent Kenyan state in 1963. The natural resource-dependent communities had few alternative livelihood streams available to them (KFMP 1994; Norton-Griffiths & Southey 1995). But the growing recognition of the strong link between natural resources and local community livelihoods of rural communities in the 1970s led to global agreements such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). These global movements encouraged the search for more sustainable use of natural goods. Kenya actively participated in these global processes and attempted to meet the stated goals by initiating integrated conservation and development projects at the grassroots levels largely informed by the World Bank- and International Monetary Fund-led economic growth principles.

Local development and natural resource management are directly impacted by wider national economic policies. The modernization principles of market-led integrated and development projects largely failed to uplift the majority of rural dwellers from their subsistence livelihoods in Kenya (Muriithi & Kenyon 2002; Norton-Griffiths & Southey 1995). Moreover, the Kenyan government progressively reduced social safety nets such as free schooling and medical treatment as prescribed by the World Bank and the

International Monetary Bank (IMF) structural adjustment programs from the late 1980s (Kimenyi 2002). The government increasingly lacked the resources to finance its programs and pay its personnel. This resulted in increased destruction of many of areas of the commons as a culture of corruption and illegal activities became prevalent. Furthermore, the worsening economy led to growing unemployment in urban areas which further exacerbated many rural households' poverty levels because of widespread dependence on remittances from relatives working in towns and cities. These factors intensified the dependence of forest-adjacent communities on protected area products for their daily livelihood needs. The deteriorating economy diminished the ability of the Kenyan government to financially contribute to integrated conservation projects. This resource gap was then largely filled by local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) whose development agenda and effectiveness also became a source of great debate and controversy (Mitlin et al 2007).

The often conflicting goals of conservation and livelihood production continued to present a major challenge to the stakeholders into the 21st century. Several studies showed that most targeted Kenyan forest communities had not gained any tangible benefits from integrated conservation and development projects (Muriithi & Kenyon 2002; Norton-Griffiths and Southey 1995; Akama 1996; Larson et al. 2007; Sunderlin et al., 2005). Moreover women and poorer community members often endured inequalities in benefits and costs when forest governance changes were introduced even when improved participation was ostensibly an integral part of the strategy (Ribot et al. 2010). The emphasis in many of these studies was on the resulting direct economic benefits from such projects. They neglected the important evolutionary aspects of the community conservation project concept and practice which, for example, opens avenues for learning-by-doing (Adams & Hulme 2001). Indeed, the influential early 1990s analyses of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) by Wells and Brandon (1993) suggested an important but often ignored conclusion; that many of the projects had been hurriedly declared failures

and therefore missed the opportunity for reviews, experimentation and learning that are vital in such innovative ventures.

In this chapter I endeavor to elaborate both the lessons learnt and the opportunities missed in selected livelihood-conservation projects based on local community collectives in the coastal and western regions. The arena of neoliberal development initiatives and the harambee concept of development deals with both compatible and contradictory aims that is potentially significant for the future success of ICDPs in Kenya and beyond. The major aim is to show that the continued neglect of the possible compatibilities and incompatibilities in neoliberal informed initiatives have a major impact on how the outcomes of such projects are perceived. I identify the risks and opportunities inherent within hybrid versions of collectivesbased neoliberalist informed conservation projects. I compare and contrast the two forest-adjacent communities by assessing their historical modes of community production and economic livelihood activities. I take into account multiple causal factors beyond those related to the immediate project by including political, cultural, economic, institutional, and technological factors. My major objective with this collective action approach is to investigate the factors that motivate individuals to coordinate their activities to improve their collective well-being in increasingly market-dominated development climates (Gibson et al 2000; Ostrom 2010; Sandler 2004). I determine the efficacy of utilizing collectives as the instrument of choice for introducing alternative income-generating activities into these forest-adjacent communities by examining their main characteristics. I identify the project beneficiaries and losers by tracing the forest resource streams (Shackleton et al 2010). I undertake this in the context of tacit power and scale relationships and the broader subtext of community, knowledge, valuation and culture as expounded by the different actors through the mechanism of the collectives.

6.3 Research Findings

6.3.1 Project Background

Arabuko-Sokoke - an ecologically important coastal forest - and Kakamega Forest- the westernmost portion of the African equatorial forests - have been at the forefront of experimentation with participatory forest management (PFM) in Kenya for the last 20 years. In the 1990s the Kenya government began the process of formulating and enacting a new collaborative forest policy. The pilot studies meant to inform the process were largely ceded to NGOs because of limited government resources. Neither these independent institutions nor their counterparts at the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) made serious attempts at granting actual management responsibilities to the local communities. The NGOs – with tacit approval of the KFS – instead concentrated on initiating alternative livelihood projects for a few selected collectives. This case study analyzes the impact of two income-generating activities (IGAs) – beekeeping and silkworm rearing. The main aims of the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) in initiating these activities centered on both scientific research and local community development which had important implications for the project scope, management and perceptions at the local level (Raina et al 2009). The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) provided major funding through the United Nations Development Agency (UNDP). The ICIPE project intended to build on the achievements and experiences of the Kipepeo Project that had been ongoing within Arabuko-Sokoke Forest-adjacent community for about a decade (Gordon and Ayiemba 2003). The establishment of the Kipepeo Project had important implications on the selected case study and for this reason the following section briefly describes its initiation and the current state and perceptions of the project participants and non-participants and relevant stakeholders of the Kipepeo Project.

6.3.2 Kipepeo Project

Arabuko-Sokoke is the largest remnant of the great coastal forest that once stretched from southern Somalia to Mozambique. It is ranked as the second most biodiverse forest in Africa for bird conservation. In 1993, when butterfly farming was first introduced to the surrounding communities, 83 percent of the farmers in the area wanted some or all of the forest cleared for cultivation (Gordon and Ayiemba 2003). In order to conserve the forest, Ian Gordon, a University of Nairobi ecologist, decided to elicit the support of the local people in conservation efforts by introducing a livelihoods improvement project (Gordon and Ayiemba 2003). The Kipepeo Project was aimed at involving local community members in butterflyrearing for eventual pupae export to Europe and the US. Meetings held in five villages convinced 133 households on the benefits of participation. The project initially received funding from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) through the National Museum of Kenya and subsequent support from the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and Birdlife International. The National Museums of Kenya – a state agency with a mandate to conserve Kenya's natural heritage – was charged with overall management of the project. Over the next decade the project incorporated into its portfolio other income generating activities (IGAs) such as beekeeping, silkworm-rearing and mushroom production.

The higher than expected financial returns in the first years of the project led to a rise in the number of participants and a greater appreciation of the need for forest conservation according to its founders (Gordon and Ayiemba 2003). But less than six years later, falling prices and growing competition led to increasingly negative perceptions (Ashley 2000). Initially the participants worked independently but two years after the start of the project eight Kipepeo self-help groups were created at the behest of the project managers. Each group had its own constitution, a bank account, and was registered with the Department of Social Services. The Kipepeo Project management retained a small percentage of the participants' income on behalf the group to be used to cover its activities. A study of the Kipepeo Project found that

there was a high degree of risk involved particularly at low levels of production (Ashley 2000). For this reason many poorer group members had given up on the activity and only about a dozen of the top earners significantly boosted their income. Furthermore, the participants were dependent on selected group representatives for the supply of caterpillars and sale of pupae. There were many complaints that these individuals wielded too much power and there was growing mistrust in the Project's records maintenance.

6.3.3 Emergence and Function of Honey and Silkworm-rearing Collectives

The founding and aims of the participant collectives played a crucial role in the outcome of the project. Harambee-type collectives engage in diversified livelihood activities that are dependent on locally available resources. In forest-adjacent communities, they play an important role in the governance of the resource and in external development projects initiated in their areas of operation. Some of the collectives were created through well organized grassroots initiatives specifically as forest user groups that specialize in diverse activities such as medicinal plant collection, hunting, and wood carvings. Many of these activities were part of their traditional lifestyles but had become illegal when the state took over the custodianship of the forests as public goods. Several of the activities, including medicinal plant collection, together with other legalized activities such as butterfly trapping for rearing activities are still common in these forests and their sustainability largely depend on the proper functioning of forest user groups largely based on harambee-type of collectives. In this section, the role and characteristics of collectives on project outcomes are examined with the help of several examples. Collectives have strong components of both social cohesiveness and business-like livelihood production which both complement and contradict their aims. The need for adaptation to synchronize with the externally conceived aims of the project is discussed. Given its socio-economic history I review the appropriateness of the introduced income-generating activities to the community. The section shows how initial enthusiasm for the project was often followed by skepticism and even rejection by both participants and non-participants.

Most of the collectives were already in existence and many had to adapt their functions and structures in order to conform to the project requirements including legal registration with the appropriate government ministry. The major aim of collectives was to improve the livelihoods of the members by engaging in cooperative ventures and enterprises. All of them started as informal groups with highly flexible rules of membership and conduct. Their major aim was to ensure a safety net for all members through group support particularly in times of hardship or helping with livelihood activities that required more labour than was available within the household. They strived to utilize the individual strengths of the members. For example, individuals were often willing to contribute resources such as land well beyond the agreed equitable share for the good of the group. The Makundi Plar Farmers Youth Group in Kakamega was founded in 2003 just after a government change in forest policy that banned an important livelihood base known as the shamba system. This was an agroforestry-based reforestation system that allowed selected farmers to grow their crops within forest boundaries while they tended the young tree seedlings to a stage where they could survive on their own. The forest authorities consequently allocated the farmers other forest areas in need of reforestation and the mutually beneficial cycle was repeated (Witcomb and Dorward 2009). Some of the newly disenfranchised farmers contributed to the group by completing shortterm courses for improved farming techniques at agricultural colleges and passed on their newly acquired knowledge to the other group members. The group's main aim was to engage in improved farming techniques and diversified cropping including tomatoes, egg plant, capsicum and lettuce. They aimed to improve their income by expanding their markets into the larger neighbouring towns. Ufuoni Women's Group at Arabuko-Sokoke started principally as a cultural dance and song group that earned additional income for members through contracted performances. Shipala Adult Basic Centre in Malava District of Kakamega Province founded in 2006 after the commencement of the case study project, focused on adult

education in activities such as tree-rearing and improved farming techniques for improved livelihoods. The group planned to venture into fish-farming and poultry-keeping for income diversification.

The availability of external project resources greatly impacted on the informal character and social goals of the collectives since they were required to enact formalized constitutions with legal registrations as community-based organizations in order to qualify for funding. The Magangani Butterfly Farmers Group at Arabuko-Sokoke represented one of the few collectives that had gone to great lengths to conform to this 'modernization' requirement as perceived by both government and project funders. They held elections every two years and met once a month. Small fines from the individual's share of enterprise income were routinely levied for absence without a valid excuse. They had diversified into beekeeping, mushroom farming, agro-forestry and a catering service in order to improve their income. The group was started in 2001 by two friends who solicited a donation amounting to KShs 100,000 from the Kipepeo Project founders to enable them to form and initiate a butterfly-rearing collective. Despite the noteworthy attempts to adhere to formal rules and conduct, there were no examples of member expulsion for rulebreaking because of strong social cohesion bonds that ensured even absentee members were always welcome back. In contrast to most other collectives, membership had continued to grow over its nine years of existence. Group members attributed their relative success to good leadership. This study found that strong and respected leadership qualities were important factors in maintaining an acceptable balance between the two harambee objectives of individual and improved social integration.

The success of Magangani Butterfly Farmers Group in integrating the requirement for formalized rules with its social objectives was the exception rather than the rule. Adopting formal rules did not automatically lead to an automatic formal functioning of the organizations. Although collectives had constitutions and rules, most of them continued to operate informally. Sanctions were rarely enforced because as Mama Mariam at Arabuko-Sokoke explained: "A majority of the members were likely to be expelled from the collective simply for non-attendance of meetings". Less than half of the original members were actively involved in the beekeeping and silkworm-rearing initiatives. External resources were cause for increased collective tensions mainly because of a greater focus to equate individual project returns to individual investment which disregards the larger community and individual economic circumstances. For example, widows could not contribute as much as husband and wife teams or the richer members of the collective. The social safety net for more vulnerable community members accounted for in harambee arrangements were weakened by the more formalized market-oriented approaches adopted by the project.

Initially there was enthusiasm for the income generating activities (IGAs) in most of the collectives, however this gradually dissipated when the expectations of some members were not realized within a given timeframe. Most members expected tangible benefits within one year of initiating the IGAs. These expectations were unfulfilled particularly since silkworm rearing operations required longer establishment periods of up to two years, improved technological capabilities and financial investment. The neglect of cultural modes of development organization coupled with limited external resources led to widespread project disappointment in Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke. This led to a common phenomenon of 'shrinking' collectives observed in 80 percent of the surveyed groups in the two communities as individuals gradually lost interest. I observed that the introduction of external resources which ignored the harambee notion of socially-sensitive development was an important factor in the resultant conflicts in the collectives. This was to the detriment of other collective activities, including previous enterprises and other plans for diversification. There was a persistent informal social function inherent in the collectives. The project founder insistence on adherence to formal arrangements created instability in the groups in contrast to informality that supported social cohesion functions and collective stability. The harambee notion of social good proved a stronger motivation than greater individual profits and impacted on the potential growth and benefits of the IGAs.

6.3.4 Neoliberalized Conservation and the Need for Alternative Development

The project was envisaged as a 'community' livelihoods improvement initiative (Raina et al 2009). The practice of using collectives as the vessel for the distribution of project resources did not prevent the takeover of the enterprises by individuals who took advantage of the market-focused individual-supporting characteristics of the project. In practice it promoted a largely private market-based strategy of livelihood improvement. But the uncritical adoption of market approaches without consideration of social characteristics and development strategies of local societies led to unsatisfactory outcomes. The veneer of 'community' was largely related to the distribution of limited project resources through the collectives but the focus on market led to both elite capture and underperforming projects when individuals were unable to contribute a required share in enterprise capital. In this section I argue that more inclusive local level development institutional reform should be the main focus of externally-generated development initiatives. The creation of more resilient institutions is much more important than short term gains of improved incomes for a limited number of participants.

The project implementers assumed that the neoliberal model of market-oriented development would automatically benefit the community. Although the project was tagged as 'community' enterprise, it in effect supported the role of the individual as the enterprise catalyst by often dealing directly with individual suppliers even when they belonged to a collective. Furthermore there were no mechanisms in place to support the stability of the collectives by ensuring that significant benefits supported the more under-privileged members as well as the vast majority in the community non-participants. Finding the appropriate balance between individual and collective needs was crucial to the success of IGAs. The example of a retired civil servant, John Mambo – a pseudonym - with expertise in sericulture and beekeeping was particularly illustrative of this balancing act. A silkworm and beekeeping collective was founded largely through his personal efforts in 2004. The collective attained its maximum membership of

30 before it gradually reduced to twelve. The group's constitution mandated each individual to plant a quarter acre mulberry garden for feeding the silkworms, but this was ignored by half the members. John therefore decided to sacrifice a much larger portion of his own land in order to cover the shortfall. Because he had personally vouched for the success of the group to project implementers, he was worried that his reputation might be tarnished in the event of a complete failure of the beekeeping and silkworm-rearing initiatives. He was nevertheless critical of the project developers for failing to take into account collective enterprise problems by establishing more mechanisms to ensure initiative success.

Ninety percent of project respondents in both communities admitted that farm produce was insufficient for their livelihood needs. The two main reasons were inadequate farm sizes and the high prices of fertilizers. The need for alternative streams of income meant that they were ready to adopt non-traditional forms of livelihood enterprises. But the ability of externally conceived and funded IGAs to fill this gap was questionable. A common problem of the collectives was a shortfall in both capital and technological know-how for optimal enterprise performance. This research found a continued high degree of dependency by the participants on external technical and financial support at the end of the official project period. Nevertheless, 60 percent continued to participate in the project because of a shortage of viable alternatives even though it contributed less than 5 percent to their livelihood needs. The remaining 40 percent were more satisfied with the project outcomes because it contributed between 5 and 20 percent to their livelihood needs while requiring comparatively less time than other livelihood activities such as farming. The project impact on the larger community was negligible given its lack of wider community engagement.

Post-harvest matters elicited the most complaints from project participants in both communities. The main problem was the low prices for suppliers of honey and silk products given the lack of alternative markets. The project constructed a new marketplace in Kakamega that was meant to process and bottle

honey but the facility had failed to meet its objectives because of a lack of finances to hire adequate manpower despite evidence of a high area demand for honey. Furthermore, payments to the local suppliers were often late and widely perceived as too low. A lack of manpower and technical knowhow also rendered the installed silk-processing machines unusable and cocoons were instead transported 400 kilometers away to Nairobi for processing at ICIPE headquarters. Indeed, the long-term maintenance of the plant is uncertain because both its ownership and responsibility for maintenance are unresolved by the project funders. At Arabuko-Sokoke, the project participants were dependent on inflexible institutional marketing arrangements in place for about 15 years. The ICIPE project managers - often on the ground only for brief periods and mostly only for research purposes – did not implement any operational changes to the satisfaction of the community participants who had hoped that a new stakeholder like ICIPE would take into account their long-term calls for improved prices and greater technical assistance after many failed requests to the established Kipepeo Project. The inability to run the project as a sustainable business arose from a disconnect between running it largely as a conservation-research activity while seeking to contribute to improved livelihoods as a by-product rather than developing a clear communityrooted livelihood development component. Moreover, delayed payments for product deliveries at the marketplace collectives discouraged greater investment in quality and growth for a majority of the collectives in both communities. But a greater entrepreneurial spirit was evident in Kakamega where the marketplace manager indicated that about 20 non-participating individuals had made inquiries on how to start a silkworm-rearing enterprise and a few had gone on to establish mulberry tree stands in anticipation of future involvement. This finding can be attributed to lesser bureaucracy in Kakamega where the participants and potential participants could engage more directly with the project managers without the encumbrances of other stakeholder institutions observed in the Kipepeo Project at Arabuko-Sokoke

Financial management and profit sharing was critical in ensuring the stability of the newly more formalized collectives. A lack of openness in financial matters led to conflict and reduced participation.

At three of the collectives in Arabuko-Sokoke the members suspected that their chosen pupae collection and delivery representatives under-recorded individual contributions by falsely claiming they had been rejected at the marketplace. Most of the collectives required more elaborate record-keeping system as exemplified by the Magangani Butterfly Farmers collective in order to improve accountability. They used an open board that was accessible to all the members to record individual contributions. Furthermore, there was a critical need to improve the marketing capacities of the collectives if they were to engage in the kind of profitable enterprise envisaged by the project funders. The need for a quick financial return for the mostly poor participants in both communities was an impediment to their ability to obtain higher prices for their products since they were unwilling or unable to widen their market base or take a stronger stand for higher payments. All the participants felt that the honey prices that ranged from KShs 625 to 1,200/- per kilogram depending on the grade were far from adequate. About 75 percent of the participants were willing to invest even more in honey production if they could obtain a 50 percent rise in the price of honey. The scenario was similar for the sericulture enterprise where prices for domesticated silkworm cocoons ranged between KShs 350 and 625 per kg and the wild silk varieties fetched KShs 200 per kg. Beekeeping was more popular because it required less investment of time, space and resources. Honey production provided greater opportunities for expansion and bigger markets than silk production. For example, in Kakamega, several farmers privately obtained beehives and approached participating collectives and the marketplace workers for advice on best practice. All interested individuals excluded from the project in Kakamega wanted to be engaged in beekeeping in contrast to less than 20 percent who expressed interest in sericulture. This could be attributed to the historical familiarity of honey production as opposed to the new sericulture venture that required more effort and resources to improve its acceptance in both Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke. But the opportunities for growth were hampered by rigid project management structures that encouraged supply only to the marketplace despite problems of honey processing caused by the lack of manpower at the facility. The impact of the project was

potentially much more significant had it intentionally engaged the participants in capacity-building for marketing to a wider base.

In summary, I found that purely market-based IGA strategies contradicted the tenets of harambee collectives that promote mutually-shared benefits. Despite the advantages of collective-based enterprises in the two communities noted so far, there is still a clear need for them to adapt and incorporate innovative forms of operations in order to succeed in the more competitive and complex modern economic system. For example, the ability to invest greater resources within the collective was a determining factor in the share of resources that individuals within the collectives received in return. This created conflict and diminished membership as the poorer members of the group realized little benefit from participation. More equal benefit-sharing is possible by utilizing harambee strategies such as offering more time and labor for those who are unable to meet set criteria of material and financial contributions. Such considerations were not part of the business-like arrangement of the project under review and the result was inner collective conflicts. Stronger forums and linkages for advocacy in the collectives are necessary for their long-term stability. This implies that networking and learning from IGAs can encourage community acceptance and adoption. For example, fourteen groups involved in honey production in Kakamega were interested in starting a honey processing plant. But because of weak collective linkages mainly precipitated by a market-based approach that ignored communal ties, they failed to forge the necessary cooperative ties through their shared notion of harambee that would have enabled them to benefit from the economies of scale. Their inability to cooperate also meant that they were unable to collectively negotiate better product prices. These groups could learn from the experiences of the youth-focused Makundi-Plar Collective in Kakamega that had volunteered to train other emerging youth groups and were more willing to engage with other groups for mutually beneficial outcomes.

6.3.5 Power: Decision-making, Participation, Gender and Age Relations

The distribution of the limited project resources resulted in many complaints of exclusion by nonparticipants. Furthermore, even within participating collectives, individuals complained that certain more influential, richer members of the group had a monopoly on the benefits. The project formulators stated that they lacked the resources to engage a larger proportion of the community given the small budget and strong research component of the project. This section explores the issues of participation and nonparticipation in greater detail. An example of product price determination offers important insights into the inflexibility of project management processes and the powerlessness of the local participants to effect change. Interviews with non-participants revealed their sense of exclusion and calls for more equal distribution of project resources and benefits. Further inquiry found that a majority of the non-participants were unaware of both the project objectives and size of available project resources. Similar problems of benefit sharing were observed among the participant collectives themselves. The major aim of this section is to show how the management structure of the project and the decision-making power of the stakeholders impacted on its goals of improved forest conservation and improved livelihoods in the community. The hierarchy of power within the collectives and community in general also played an important role in enabling both project participation and sharing of the benefits. Issues of gender and age are also shown to be critical in collective action. A particular emphasis is on the power conflicts that arose due to non-synchronization of the project to the objectives of harambeee collective organization due to externally developed project goals. Finally suggestions are provided on how such power differences can be alleviated by better refining the objectives of the project and ensuring that the collectives assume a more prominent equalizing community role by improving their networking and learning capacities.

Power hierarchies and resultant tensions were observed from the onset of the project. ICIPE's resources were largely welcomed in both communities because the mostly poor community members were initially

grateful for any external aid. The project implementers believed that the collective approach contributed to faster social learning and networking that could lead to wider individual household investment and adoption of the newly introduced livelihood enterprises (Personal interview 2009 with Dr. Raina, ICIPE). The project developers assumed that even the silkworm-rearing activity would elicit great interest and support in Kakamega where it was largely unknown. ICIPE allocated minimal internal personnel resources for direct project management of the livelihood activities at local community level. At Arabuko-Sokoke project management was delegated to the long-existing and collaboratively managed Kipepeo Project. This decision resulted in minimal overall community impact as things continued "as usual" according to an overwhelming majority of the local participants. The existing Kipepeo Project collective database was utilized to select and largely add on to the resources of already participating collectives with minimal efforts made to include new participants. The new project was perceived by 85 percent of participants and non-participants as a continuation of the Kipepeo project that had resulted in widespread community disappointment for the duration of its 15 years in existence.

Project and wider community-related conflicts observed in the earlier model Kipepeo Project also arose in the ICIPE project at Arabuko-Sokoke. There were few attempts to learn from past experience in order to make the necessary management changes by the project sponsors. A statement by an ICIPE-based project manager for Kakamega was illustrative of the reluctance of project implementers to make the necessary hard changes: "We made a point of touring the area and explaining to them exactly what the goals of the project were." The implication was that the visit was not made with the intention of finding out the needs of the local community and positively correlating them with other project goals. A representative of UNDP dealing with GEF projects in Nairobi made an even more telling statement:

"Community dynamics and their diversified interests have not been taken care of and this means projects are less workable. There is need for a better social component but this is not provided for in a conventional Global Environmental Facility (GEF) technical projects. The social aspect is not a GEF mandate and therefore the necessary enabling environment that is necessary has hardly been catered for in this project."

Project participants at Arabuko-Sokoke were disappointed that ICIPE delegated the project management role to Kipepeo Project resulting in missed opportunities for change and renewal of widely perceived long-standing rigid and unfair management practices. Earlier unresolved complaints against Kipepeo Project included inaccessible channels of communication, low prices offered for their products by the Kipepeo Marketplace, few training opportunities to improve their technical skills in hive maintenance and a lack of transparency in the selection process of participant collectives. In contrast, the Kakamega collectives did not have to deal with an established and rigid intermediary such as Kipepepeo. The participant collectives were chosen by ICIPE in a largely informal process mainly on the advice of the local Kenya Forest Service office and area chiefs.

The general criteria for choosing the collectives in Kakamega were a verifiable and consistent engagement in development activities by well-known collectives. The long-established and more resource-laden collectives were more likely to be selected in Kakamega. This mirrored the capture and retention of most incoming external resources by the elite in Arabuko-Sokoke where most participant collectives were those that had long-established links with the Kipepeo Project with few opportunities for involvement by new entrants. The elite – in most cases the founders of the collectives – were perceived as unfairly retaining a major portion of the income by other collective members in 70 and 50 percent of the collectives in Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega respectively. Leadership positions were mostly monopolized by the richer collective members since the poorer members were compelled to remain passive because the business-like structure of the collectives meant that the decision-making authority resided with those who made greater individual contributions to the enterprise. The project managers utilized collectives to distribute their resources but consequently focused on the productivity of the enterprises without analyzing the causes of the inter- and intra-collective problems that negatively

impacted project outcomes. They generalized them as normal group dynamic problems. Their focus on individual effort and contributions only served to intensify the rising inequalities caused by the IGAs.

Similar to Arabuko-Sokoke, there was limited awareness of the project activities and goals by the larger community in Kakamega. Nevertheless there was greater optimism about the potential for growth and benefits of the introduced IGAs. This study linked this optimism to their freedom from entrenched interests and rigid management structures that made them more flexible and open to new development partnerships and ideas. For example they were more flexible in marketing their products and venturing into alternative modes of livelihood activities to a far greater degree than their Arabuko-Sokoke counterparts.

The project resources were extremely limited and could only realistically directly benefit a select few in the community. About US\$ 2 million was spent in the 4 year project in the two case study areas. Project documents stated that 300 and 150 beehives were installed at Arabuko Sokoke and Kakamega respectively. Most collectives received between 10 and 30 beehives for the establishment of apiaries. There were five mulberry silk rearing houses in Kakamega and 6 wild silk farming sites housing three different species. Honey production was recorded at 800 kilograms in Kakamega and 400 kilograms in Arabuko Sokoke. These resources pale in significance when compared with target populations of 171,000 and 110,000 of mostly subsistence farmers living on the margins of of Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega Forests respectively. It was therefore unsurprising that over 95 percent of the possible target community was excluded from direct project involvement in both communities. But the approach adopted in initiating the project in the community and its goals raised more controversy than the actual sharing of direct project benefits. The sense of unfair exclusion was common among non-participants aware of the project. They complained that certain well-connected individuals and their close friends in the community received all the project resources. But of particular note, this project found that a majority in the

community were unaware of the project despite the rapid rural appraisals and qualitative social assessments having been undertaken to allow for the characterization of the forest adjacent populations and their dependence on forest resources (GEF 2004). Requests for immediate inclusion and complaints about external project dominance by influential members of the community were the two most common responses when uninformed individuals learnt of the project's existence. A majority of the non-participating community members complained that they were unaware of the project's existence and were therefore unfairly excluded.

Of the non-participants, 35 percent expressed no interest in project participation. This was surprisingly high given the assumption of external project funders that local communities automatically welcome any additional development resources that may improve their livelihoods. A majority of the disinterested respondents attributed it to inadequate information and negative past experiences with failed externally initiated projects. At Arabuko-Sokoke the three main reasons for reluctance to participate if given the chance were a failed aloe production project where the initiators failed to buy the mature crop from the farmers; the Kenya Women Finance Trust (KWFT) – a microfinance institution targeting women – a loaning scheme that bankrupted several community members; and the long-running Kipepeo Project that failed to deliver on its early promises. The first two reasons were mostly individually-made investments while the last encountered similar problems to the current case study of a pure market focus in a collective arrangement. Further inquiries into how they perceived past project aims revealed their repeated failure to disseminate their goals and, just as important, their boundaries and limitations.

Of the excluded community member respondents with knowledge of the project, 82 and 75 percent suspected that their lack of political connections and social status contributed to their exclusion in Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke respectively. Many of the observed collectives were dominated by founding families or close-knit groups of friends. They were characteristically exclusionary particularly in situations of sudden injections of limited external resources that offered no obvious benefits to the wider community. Mark Nicha (pseudonym), 48 years old of Kakamega attributed his household's exclusion to the uncoordinated and limited communication process of the project initiators. His family became aware of the project only after witnessing the operations of a local collective. His son, Moses Nicha (pseudonym), 24 years old, complained that it was extremely difficult for poorer families to successfully lobby for inclusion in externally funded projects when they involve the completion of many application forms administered by corrupt middlemen and organizations. Similar comments were made in both Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke and highlighted the commercialization and politicization of development aid at local levels. Requests by the Mark Nicha family to join the neighbouring participating collective were rejected in what they assumed to be the reluctance of the members to share the benefits of the enterprise. I concluded that the relative inflexibility of the market-approach characteristic of the sericulture and apiculture activities was as the main reason this family was excluded. This shows the need for externally-initiated projects to seek community-wide acceptance by offering, at the very least, avenues for learning improved management and technical know-how for non-participants who might be interested in engaging in similar or other livelihood-improvement activities.

Gender was a strong influence in the constitution of the collectives. Apart from two collectives in Kakamega, the collectives were female-dominated. Four of ten collectives in Kakamega and eight of ten collectives in Arabuko-Sokoke had no male members. The Shehe Collective in Kakamega with a membership of 11 men out of a total of 33 was typical of the mixed gender groups. The members of the collectives had an average age of 45 except for two collectives in Kakamega – Makundi Plar and Isiekuti Youth Group – that deliberately targeted individuals younger than 40 years. These two collectives were formed by the youth in response to what they perceived to be an unfair preference for older women groups by external donors. Nevertheless the older women usually encouraged younger women, particularly their daughters in law, to get involved in the project activities. Gender was more balanced

within the Kakamega youth groups because many of the comparatively young couples were willing to work together. These youth groups showed the potential for greater gender cooperation in harambee collectives than the older and generally more conservative generations. The tradition of gender-based development initiatives is gradually evolving although strong views on the need for separate initiatives are still widespread particularly within the predominantly Muslim culture of the Arabuko-Sokoke community (Plate 6.1). The perception that patriarchical societies in Kenya deny women equal access to resources meant the project managers had a preference for women dominated groups. Moreover, women were far more willing participants in harambee-based initiatives in both communities which served to propagate female majorities in most collectives.

The somewhat gendered nature of the collectives was seen to impact project outcomes. Maria Adeng (a pseudonym) of Arabuko-Sokoke was married with two children and had never attended school. She had received only limited information on the project from a neighbour, but because she was reluctant to antagonize her unsupportive husband she refrained from seeking more details for possible participation. This was reflective of about 40 and 15 percent of the non-women participants in Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega respectively. Although the project collectives had a majority of women membership, a certain category, especially the less educated and those from poorer households were more likely to be excluded because of household gender inequalities. Moreover, the predominance of women in the collectives did not always mean they retained the resultant project benefits. Both female and male respondents agreed that although a majority of men avoided collective initiatives, most husbands demanded a share of the benefits. This was an extension of the intra-household inequalities whereby men controlled the budgets and women rarely retained their own bank accounts.



Plate 6-1 Female-dominated collective involved in tree-seedling production at Arabuko-Sokoke Source: author

The deliberate involvement of men in certain aspects of the project could help to alleviate some of the potential gender conflicts and project shortcomings caused by their absence. I recommend a more balanced gender representation for differentiated tasks that correspond to the cultural sensitivities of the local communities. For example, a majority of the women were reluctant to undertake beehive maintenance because they were afraid of beestings and were forced to hire outside male help. Benson Tsuma – a male participant in Arabuko-Sokoke – suggested that the project managers should have been more flexible and encouraged better gender balance within the collectives once it became clear that most women were reluctant to tend the hives. The gender factor also impacted on the potential for marketing

and expansion of collective enterprises. The low participation of men in most collectives relegated the two livelihood enterprises to the periphery of the local economy because men largely retained control of most means of production such as land and capital. Their integration into the IGAs has the potential to lead to wider acceptance within the community and attract more personal investment in the enterprises for possible transformative change far beyond the scope of the project.

Gladys Chai, 29 years old, a widow with three children, was unaware of the project. She was not interested in externally-funded projects due to previous negative experiences within the community. She was willing to join an appropriate enterprise-oriented collective but only with clearer evidence of likely future benefits. She criticized market-oriented projects that did not account for a form of safety net particularly for low income individuals like her. She was among 50 percent of women respondents in Arabuko-Sokoke who were reluctant to engage in external development initiatives because of a previous negative experience with a loan provision scheme run by the Kenya Women Finance Trust (KWFT). Several respondents in this study claimed that some participants in that scheme lost their property listed as collateral because they could not afford to pay back the loans. The loan scheme was a purely private initiative with no provisions for collective engagement but it is possible that the outcome might have been different had it incorporated the advantages of the social safety nets and community integration aims of harambee collectives.

There was low participation of the younger age-groups in the project in both communities. The respondents attributed this to the reluctance of youth to engage in collective centered livelihood enterprises in preference for white collar jobs. Barion, 23 years old, of Shehe Collective in Kakamega, suggested that the youth avoided collaborative projects because they were less inclined than their parents to engage in labor-intensive activities. National policies that have failed to promote rural and agriculture-based enterprises have been blamed for this trend (Mwabu and Thorbecke 2004). But two comparatively

successful youth-based collectives in Kakamega proved to be exceptions to the rule of collectives dominated by the older generation. Evans Alikula, a member of Makundi Plar Farmers Youth Group, attributed wider youth acceptance of the enterprises as significant modes of livelihood because they diversified their portfolio and promised greater income. I found that growing unemployment and land shortages in Kakamega was significant in encouraging youth to adopt and experiment with newer forms of livelihood-making such as silkworm-rearing. The youth overwhelmingly felt that they had borne most of the burden of increased unemployment and landlessness in Kenya. There is therefore a particular need to ensure that such projects strive to deliberately incorporate them. A strategy that specifically targets the younger generations in such innovative enterprises is likely to have a wider impact when specific measures to include them are integrated into the project from the onset.

In summary, it is a mistake to assume immediate acceptance or widespread interest for IGAs that fail to take into consideration local contexts of governance, cultural organization, gender sensitivities, aspirations of the youth, and community development goals. Specifically, external projects need to examine and adapt to local processes of self-organization and entrepreneurial structures for wider positive impact. There is a possibility for balancing both the advantages of socially-sensitive commercial strategies of harambee collectives and the incorporation of beneficial management and marketing solutions offered by market-based strategies. Despite the egalitarian principles of harambee groups, the stability of collective-based IGAs requires strong and committed leadership that do not succumb easily to elite capture. Decision-making authority is potentially an important source of instability on prevailing power structures, governance mechanisms, and mutual social recognition that impact on community development strategies and processes. There is consequently a need for context-based leadership structures and the incorporation of the social cohesion principles of harambee-like collectives.

6.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

I found little evidence of social networking and adoption of the enterprises linked to the introduction of this project as intended by the project founders. Indeed the overall goal for improved forest conservation as a result of adopting these supposedly more forest friendly livelihood enterprises seemed far removed from the reality of daily household livelihood activities since the participants had made few changes on previous forest utilization practices. The small-sized projects under examination contributed little to tangible local forest conservation prospects in the short-term. Nevertheless, I contend that such small and experimental livelihood projects have a significant role to play by providing learning opportunities of how collaborative forest governance function in practice. For example, the new and ostensibly more participatory Kenyan forestry governance system allows for well-defined forest user rights to what are in effect much larger collectives – known as community forest associations (CFAs). The organizational characteristics of the collectives potentially provide a learning arena to contribute to improved CFA operations in the future. This potentially valuable benefit is not specifically stated in the project objectives but provides an important opportunity for experimentation with improved collaborative forest management practices that could prove invaluable to a much bigger population than the current limited scope of the project. The impact was potentially much greater had the CFAs and the Kenya Forest Service been formally brought into active partnership with the project implementers with the specific goal of learning how groups function in forest-based enterprise.

The case under observation epitomizes the small scale and limited resources that many alternative projects have to contend with. The project documents assume improved conservation by undertaking training for community members in forest appreciation, sustainable use of the forest resources and equitable sharing of benefits and cost of conservation. These were overly ambitious aims that required more refinement to more specific and realistic goals. From the onset it is clear that the project did not

intend to address political issues such as control over resources, community empowerment and local institutional-building that have been described as crucial to the success of such undertakings (Campbell and Vainio-Mattila 2003). There was urgent need for change in how area residents earn their livelihoods given a growing population and a threatened forest resource. Such necessary changes could be significantly informed by the learning opportunities offered by such small but potentially transformative projects. For example, a study in Kakamega Forest found that despite their dependence on forest resources, local communities had an interest in conservation even where they were excluded from extracting forest products (Guthiga et al 2008). Nevertheless when such externally initiated projects make little or no effort to inform them of their goals from the onset, the majority are reluctant to support it and perceive it as a further impediment to their already limited access to forest products. A major goal of such external projects should be at the very least to establish mechanisms that allow them to act as laboratories for contextualized learning on how to conduct culturally-sensitive livelihood projects with the ability to disseminate new knowledge on a community-wide basis.

Harambee collectives emerge as self-organized units of socio-economic support and livelihood activities. They adapt to local livelihood systems, enable networks with similar groups, and may transcend into different purposes depending on the needs of the community. I found that the foundations of harambee are more easily recognizable in the smaller group initiatives for mutual aid in livelihood production activities and small enterprise formation. This self-help approach to livelihood sustenance eventually leads to collective production of surpluses for exchange and sale within and outside the community. This strong entrepreneurial objective of Harambee-like collectives is balanced by a social cohesion and community integration goals that seek to ensure that the livelihood needs of individual members are met and community wellbeing is maintained. For example, forest user groups do not operate in isolation but rather form networks that ensure the wellbeing of the forest for the greater good of the community. Their engagement in business practices seeks to maximize their profits but only as long as it benefits the

collective as a whole. They have a potential for community-wide benefits since collectivist orientations can lead to higher levels of entrepreneurship (Pinillos & Reyes 2011). I found that any actions that focused on benefitting an individual while neglecting the rest of the group members only served to destabilize the functions and stability of the group.

Claims of inefficient utilization of resources by harambee collectives by project managers were not based on any analytical research on collectives and therefore failed to identify their merits. Assumptions that harambee projects lead to inefficient utilization of resources are often mistaken at two levels. First, rushed analyses that investigate purely economic returns constitute a short-sighted perception of what harambee project participants view as benefits. Neoclassical economics and rational choice theory predict a tragedy of the commons scenario since what appears individually rational leads to a collectively irrational result. But opponents of rational choice theory argue that it makes wrong assumptions about the selfish and rational nature of humans. Social norms and conventions lead people to contribute to collective action even with the possibility of benefiting without sacrificing their own time or goods (Ostrom 1990). Second, such analyses ignore the network of other economic and entrepreneurial outcomes of such activities by limiting the scale of their analyses purely on the outcomes of the intended specific alternative objectives by quantifying the number of beneficiaries. Moreover, a quantitative study found that in countries with a medium to low development level, the higher collectivist orientations corresponded with higher levels of entrepreneurship (Pinillos & Reyes 2011). Such findings show that further consideration of alternative approaches to conservation of natural resources deserve closer investigation in order to reveal the similarities, contradictions and complementarities to local development factors. Because harambee-like collectives have important objectives of producing basic goods as well as achieving a surplus for sale, deeper analyses of how collectives engage successfully in entrepreneurship would greatly benefit the conservation objectives of such alternative livelihoods projects.
The project managers' decision to work with existing collectives conformed to political expediency of community inclusion in such initiatives. In reality the dominant neoliberal informed paradigm of the market approach in these kinds of alternative livelihood improvement projects prevailed. I found that because the project managers did not analyze the functions and underlying basis of the harambee-like collectives, the enterprises were creating tensions within the larger community and ultimately failing to meet their second major objective as well - forest conservation. I concluded that traditional institutions such as harambee collectives are not intrinsically 'anti-developmental' as often assumed by development experts but have properties that could significantly contribute to community development when incorporated into ostensibly more modern proposed strategies and programs for livelihood improvement. I found that initial motivation for the creation of these groups contribute significantly to social structural connections and continuities create positive synergies with the more neoliberal practices that external development-conservation projects introduce into such communities. The social capital built up from such projects could significantly contribute to larger community development particularly from the improved institution building; well-connected networks of collectives for improved learning and negotiating capacity; and improvement of other livelihood means particularly in agriculture. The project developers did not take advantage of the business-like characteristics of the collectives and instead focused on the ability of the individual members to undertake the IGAs. There was also an assumption of improved forest conservation although this was always unlikely given the limited scope of the project itself. Significant livelihood improvement could on the other hand play a major role in improved conservation in the area when coupled with better networking and social cohesion efforts.

Access to forest resources and sharing of project benefits often corresponded with the ability to control the necessary resources by all levels of stakeholders. For example, ICIPE's major organizational mandate is entomological research and hence its major interest was the outcome of its apiculture and sericulture studies. Consequently few resources were expended on ensuring that issues of governance and decisionmaking that are crucial to natural resource management were taken into account before and during the implementation of the project. The project was conceived as a community livelihoods initiative but in practice it promoted a private market-based livelihood enterprise. It did not account for the characteristics of the collectives chosen as vessels of implementation. Transforming such projects into more inclusive 'community' initiatives requires a thorough understanding of how collectives function as mechanisms of development in the context of local communities. The project lacked mechanisms for learning and adapting during its implementation. The underlying assumption of community-based conservation was misplaced given a lack of identifiable mechanisms for transferring acquired knowledge for improved forest conservation to the wider community. It is important to recognize the central place of local collectives in social capital building and as nodes of experimentation in the management of the commons in Kenya. The social integration characteristics of the collectives can be the basis for ensuring wider community acceptance by making projects more open to public scrutiny and flexible to change. There should be an emphasis on environmental justice particularly for the most vulnerable groups in the community including the poor, women-headed households, and the jobless and landless youth.

In conclusion, it is clear that collective action in market-based ICDPs give rise to complex, context-based outcomes. I found limited contribution of projects to improved community forest conservation because of a failure by the implementers to recognize the advantages of the harambee collective philosophy for social action in development matters. The goal of such externally conceived projects should be to create more tangible community benefits particularly in the form of conservation information-sharing and improved livelihoods technological learning. This approach requires a careful balancing of the often conflicting aims of business enterprise and environmental conservation projects. One of my major findings was that the project utilized collectives as ready-made vessels for channeling development resources without taking into account their functional complexities that have a strong normative component in addition to their profit-making aims. The assumption that IGAs could seamlessly transform

the collectives into pure business-like entities was misplaced. The comparatively more successful collectives had strong leadership that inspired their members to accept both their social obligations and collective livelihood responsibilities. Slightly greater project impacts were discernible in Kakamega where two of the collectives were willing to adopt more innovative and marketable activities by engaging in diversified crop production because of improved technological and management capacities acquired from engaging in the beekeeping and silkworm-rearing enterprises. The more rigid management structures at Arabuko-Sokoke allowed for less experimentation and learning that resulted in much lower community integration than observed in Kakamega. The major conclusion of this chapter is that such integrated projects should aim at building the institutional resiliency and management capacity of collectives in order to prepare them for a potentially vital role in the management of the commons and overall rural development processes in Kenya. The neoliberal capital production hegemony can be countered by restoring values of social equity, better delineation of community boundaries, identification of vital community development characteristics, more equitable access to resources, support of political empowerment and democratic principles. This would counter the disruptive effects of bureaucratic intervention, donor-driven ideologies and purely market-driven strategies in community-based natural resource management.

Chapter Seven: The Spread of decentralized management of common pool resources – The Case of Community Forest Associations in Kenya and Impediments to Sustainable Change

7.1 Introduction

Contextual factors play an important role in the type of decentralized regimes that emerge. It is necessary to critically examine decentralization and adaptation processes not only with regard to the local context, but particularly from a cross-scale perspective of interaction in order to more fully understand the present and future states of decentralization processes. Kenya presents a good case study for examining how decentralization processes occur after a long period of top-down bureaucratic management of forests. The country has very limited forests areas that are nevertheless vital to its ecosystem diversity and the livelihoods of the numerous forest adjacent communities (Akotsi, Gachanja & Ndirangu 2006; Juma & Ojwang 1996; Kenya Ministry of Environment 2002; Kigomo 2001; Kiringe, Okello & Ekajul 2007; Kituyi et al. 2001a/b; Matiru 2000; Mogaka et al. 2001; NES 2000; Okidi, Kameri-Mbote & Akech 2008; Thenya et al. 2008; WRI 2007). Kenya followed a top-down forest management approach for over a century before eventually adopting a more collaborative law in 2005. The 2005 Forest Act introduced a new institutional structure for Kenya's forest governance which presents a tremendous opportunity for a more democratic and representative regime (Ogweno, Opanga & Obara 2009).

One of the most significant changes of the 2005 Forest Act was the introduction of Community Forest Associations (CFAs). These enable local communities to co-manage designated forest blocks in a Participatory Forest Management (PFM) regime (Government of Kenya 2005). Membership in the newly created community forest associations is open to any person living within a five kilometre distance of the local forest boundary (KFS & KFWG 2009). The CFAs will potentially grow into large cumbersome organizations once locals become aware of the potential benefits of membership given the high densities of the populations residing within the zones of inclusion. The 2005 Forest Act mandates the CFAs to protect, conserve and manage the forest according to a negotiated management plan and a mutually signed management agreement. The new CFAs have become the new local organizational units that are to be empowered through the gradual decentralization of forest planning activities and decision-making authority by working collaboratively with the regional offices of the Kenya Forest Service.

Following the new constellations of forest authority and service, the former Forest Department was also restructured into a corporate government agency under the new name Kenya Forest Service (KFS), with a specific new mandate to engage in partnerships and commercial activities independent from the parent Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. The major tasks of KFS are to conserve, develop and sustainably manage Kenya's forest resources within its organizational structure, comprised of 10 ecologically demarcated conservancies, 76 zonal forest offices and 150 forest stations. A sixteen person Management Board oversees the functions of the Kenya Forest Service with membership shared equally between public officials and nongovernment individuals. One of the key functions of the Management Board is the development of guidelines for co-management partnerships between the Kenya Forest Service and mandated partners. The Management Board oversees the creation of and appointments to the management committees of lower levels such as the forest conservancies and zonal forest offices, provides strategic oversight and coherent management guidelines for the mid-level forest administration personnel involved in local forest communities through the regional offices of Kenya Forest Service.

As a result, the newly created interface between CFAs and the Kenya Forest Service is of particular interest for the kind of decentralization intended by the 2005 Forest Act, and makes these mid-level institutional interactions crucial to the slow shift in power and politics of forest governance. The implementation process for this framework law offers a rare opportunity for positive change towards a more widely accepted decentralized regime. The implementation of the new law depends on subsidiary

legislation and regional level regulations, which offer the often necessary flexibility for locally specific needs but also make the realities on the ground open to varying interpretations by the actors, and prone to be exploited for the benefit of those that hold more power. This is a sensitive area of success or failure during the fluid times of blurry decentralization changes and slow administrative transfers of power.

Despite the crucial importance of regional forest administration levels in enabling successful partnerships on the ground, this mid-level sphere has received little critical analysis across similar processes worldwide. There is a growing body of literature that aims to explain how and why decentralized management of forests succeeds or fails (Colfer & Capistrano, 2005; Fabricius et al. 2004; Shackleton et al. 2010), but most studies tend to focus on either the lack of local community management capacity or inappropriate enforcement and governance structures that result in the marginalization of weaker actors in the collective decision-making (Larson & Ribot 2007; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006), or bureaucratic constraints, lack of resources and enforcement gaps of the state (Cruz & Repetto 1992; Ribot, 2002; Ribot & Larson, 2005). There are fewer studies that examine how regional forestry personnel balance between the directives of their superiors at the higher levels and the needs of the local communities that they deal with on a daily basis (Andersson & Ostrom 2008; Andersson, Gibson & Lehoucq 2006; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006). The level of regional forest administrative agencies and their related policy networks is sometimes viewed as a simple practical implementation issue (Ostrom 2007; Walby 2009). This view neglects the distinct agendas, personal networks and power interests that operate at this level. Decentralization processes can gain important insights from institutional ethnographies (Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006). Localized and contextualized analyses of policy implementation on the ground are necessary to avoid declarations of ungrounded new panaceas or blueprint approaches without recognizing local realities behind the policy ideas (Ostrom, Janssen & Anderies 2007; Sunderlin et al. 2005).

Despite the interesting interface between local communities and the responsible regional administration, the relationship between decentralization and devolution often remains conflictive and blurry. Decentralization is the political act by a central government to formally cede powers to actors and institutions at lower levels within its own political-administrative and territorial hierarchy (Knox & Meinzen-Dick 2000; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006). The state maintains the final decision-making power within a top-down regime. Devolution, on the other hand, refers to the actual transfer of powers for management and decision-making to a variety of lower-level non-state actors outside the governmental hierarchy in a way that grants them a certain degree of autonomy (Knox & Meinzen-Dick 2000; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006). Brugere (2006) similarly distinguishes between decentralization as the transfer of decision-making and financial responsibilities from a central authority (the state) to lower levels of government; and devolution as a transfer of rights and responsibilities to user groups at the local level. There is a wide spectrum within which these two approaches can be organized and the success or failure of decentralized governance systems might well hinge on how these two approaches relate.

A related area of conflict in state-community relationships is that of unresolved questions in implementation practices between partnership, collaboration and co-management. Partnership "is a dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labor based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner" (Brinkerhoff 2002, p21). Collaboration refers to interactions among actors who pool their resources to solve problems with due regard to issues of inclusion, power-sharing and joint decision-making (Ostrom 1990). Co-management involves a formalized sharing of power and responsibility between the government and local resource users aimed at bridging levels of governance (Berkes 2009). The 2005 Forest Act adopts co-management formalized approach to forest governance. The definition of cooperative environmental management concepts is complicated by overlaps in decentralization literature (Plummer & FitzGibbon 2004), but overall the three concepts will be understood within these definitions for the purpose of dissertation.

The regional forest administration levels are potentially significant arenas for enabling necessary state and public partnerships (Gupta, Grandvoinnet & Romani 2004). These possibilities are critically examined in this chapter through a political ecology perspective in order to understand the dynamics of power, knowledge and know-how transfers between the state and the local community. The chapter specifically focuses on the power and knowledge processes of forest policy implementation practices at the level of the regional forest administration. This chapter analyzes the experimental pilot phases and implementation processes for co-management in four selected communities. I analyze the functions and processes of the state forest agency at the regional levels and how these relate to the higher levels of government and the local community. The focus is on the degree of autonomy that has been ceded by the central government to these regional levels through decentralization and how the newly empowered regional bodies impact on the type of collaborative practice that emerge. The analysis includes an examination of important nongovernmental organizations that have played a leading role in connecting local communities and government during the implementation of the new forest law.

The chapter is organized into two main sections. The first section focuses on the research findings with emphasis on the impacts of the newly introduced Participatory Forest Management regime at the regional levels. The focus is on the modes of interaction between the two institutions of the state forest management agency – the Kenya Forest Service – and the newly formed Community Forest Associations. The first section concludes with an analysis of the influence of nongovernmental organizations on the emerging decentralized forest governance regime. In the final section I discuss the main findings and conclusions. I highlight the strengths and weaknesses of decentralized forest management and suggests a way forward for the evolving framework law for forest governance in Kenya. The main recommendation is that the implementation process should incorporate a broad coalition of the main actors at regional levels and these should work within adaptive and flexible mechanisms that reflect the contextual conditions.

7.2 Decentralization and Devolution: Regional Power Struggles

This section presents the research findings under two subsections. The first subsection highlights how the interactions of middle and lower level forest personnel are evolving after the enactment of the 2005 Forest Act. High level bureaucrats have been reluctant to decentralize decision-making to the regions. This has left middle level personnel open to widespread criticism because a majority are still following the standard operating procedures of the old top-down regime because they lack the decision-making power to do otherwise. There is also widespread disillusionment with the slow process of devolvement of management authority to the Community Forest Associations; this is threatening the long-term sustainability of the new partnership regime. But evidence is emerging of the importance of empowering regional forest personnel for improved co-management partnerships. This is highlighted by the personal initiatives of some regional officers who are engaged in popular informal collaborative activities with local communities in anticipation of the formalized partnership agreements. The second subsection examines how the nongovernmental organizations have taken advantage of their position of power at regional levels to propagate a forest protection agenda. In contrast, NGO resources have provided opportunities for positive interactions between local communities and regional forest personnel and contributed to a buildup of trust and willingness to cooperate. These attributes are vital to the success of future partnerships in forest governance.

7.2.1 Regional Forest Management: Conflicts and Resolutions

Most local communities are willing to engage in co-management partnerships under proper incentive regimes, simplified procedures and reduced transaction costs in a way similar way to how collaborative plantation forestry management in Kenya occurred (Witcombe and Dorward 2009). Most of the Community Forest Associations lack technical and management capabilities such as organizational auditing and ecological monitoring techniques. But these shortfalls can be overcome by tendering these activities to external consultants once management responsibility is relinquished to the CFAs. Kenya Forest Service officers at the local field stations acknowledged the willingness of many community members to collaborate in forest management even without the promise of immediate benefits. There was widespread disenchantment at community levels because of the five-year delay in devolving management responsibility and the resulting benefits to the Community Forest Associations. About 55 percent of community respondents in the four communities were unwilling to invest any more resources until tangible management authority was handed to them. The members of one Community Forest Association in Kakamega described how they had volunteered for joint patrols but the local forest office had not acted on their offer. The shortage of personnel within the Kenya Forest Service has forced it to out-source the production of tree seedlings to the local community. But the Kenya Forest Service often delayed or failed to pay for tree seedlings deliveries in all four communities. About 75 percent of all community respondents said the forest officers were too rigid in their management decisions. The Chairman of the Cheptais Community Forest Association in Mt Elgon suggested that greater management authority should be transferred to the regional offices for faster decision-making. A community member who had been involved in collaborative programs with the forest office for about a decade in Arabuko-Sokoke described the situation as follows:

"The foresters are transferred too often and they rarely stay for the duration of the project. This leads to uncertainties and confusion in the attempts to establish working relationships with the state forest agency." (Benson Tsuma, personal interview, August 2009)

Regional instabilities in leadership and the inability of the Kenya Forest Service regional personnel to make decisive decisions in management matters was a common complaint in all four communities. Many field officers complained that they had not been granted commensurate decision-making responsibilities despite the urgent need for such powers given the growing community demands for greater forest user rights and a multiplication of forest resource interests at local, national and international levels. The local and regional Kenya Forest Service personnel were perceived as unreliable partners who could not be relied upon to establish long-lasting bonds. No resilient structures had been built at the regional level to ensure that projects initiated by previous foresters would survive such transfers. Such shortcomings could not always be attributed to a lack of financial resources. For example, the trans-boundary Mt Elgon Forest presented unique management challenges that exposed the inadequacies of rigid central government procedures. Norwegian government aid to the trans-boundary Mt Elgon Ecosystem Conservation Program was a potentially significant opportunity for the establishment of successful co-management regimes. The disbursement of funds for the project was based on Uganda governance structures that allowed for direct financial transfers to non-state actors. But in Kenya such bilateral financial development aid must pass through a complicated inter-ministerial structure. No tangible community projects had been implemented at the end of the five-year project cycle because of these bureaucratic hurdles.

Governments cannot always be trusted to follow-through on forest decentralization promises even when strong decentralization laws are passed (Poteete & Ribot 2011). Ribot, Agrawal & Larson (2006) described how governments can reverse and appropriate more power even while claiming to decentralize in developing countries. A community leader in Shimba Hills described a widely-held perception in all four communities on the power retention tendencies of forest personnel: "Former District Forest Officers were selfish and did not want to share resources with the community. They provided us with little information during the formation of the Community Forest Association and left it without roots on where to start or go. The Community Forest Association has not brought us any progress. It is difficult working with foresters; they fear well-informed communities that will demand their forest user rights. The foresters are trying to protect their interests by prolonging the licensing agreements with private individual and companies before the Community Forest Associations are allowed to co-manage the forest." (Community Leader, Shimba Hills, personal interview, October 2009)

Such sentiments provide evidence of entrenched self interest at the regional level (Poteete & Ribot 2011). The Kenya Forest Service continues to operate with virtually the same top-down philosophy of its predecessor, the Forest Department. The organization still epitomizes an inflexible and non-adaptive governmental institution built upon enduring bureaucratic structures. In theory, the forest conservancy and forest division committees should be better informed about local conditions because representatives from the Community Forest Associations are members. But so far these committees have not contributed much in the process of implementing the new co-management regime because the higher level bureaucrats have not decentralized significant responsibility to these lowers levels. In reality, the extra layers of management have increased the level of uncertainty at many local-level forest offices. Two forest officers suggested that the old Forest Act had allowed them comparatively greater flexibility because of its simpler structure. But there should be less haste in condemning these new forums of decision-making before the formal agreements have been signed. They are potentially places of increased opportunity for local communities and other stakeholders to significantly influence and advance their interests in the new co-management regime. Ribot, Lund & Treue (2010) suggested that the expected benefits of democratic decentralization in forestry governance are rarely realized because democratic decentralization itself is rarely established. The middle ranges of forest governance at forest zone and forest conservancy levels represent the best forums for such democratic decentralization of an evolving and negotiable framework forest law.

The District Forest Officer in charge of Arabuko-Sokoke Forest suggested that the Kenya Forest Service was understandably cautious in signing the management agreements because collaborative forest management is a new concept. About 75 percent of the Kenya Forest Service regional personnel interviewees were positive about the eventual success of Participatory Forest Management regime as illustrated by a quote from a regional forest officer in Kakamega:

"I am optimistic that, given time, Participatory Forest Management will take root. This will be possible because the Kenya Forest Service has developed decades-long coping mechanisms. Once the subsidiary legislation and Community Forest Associations have legal mandate, blame is unlikely to be directed toward our organization." (Regional forest officer, Kakamega, personal interview, October 2009)

This statement implies a continued belief in centralized management and a clear doubt in the ability of local communities to engage productively in forest co-management. Most forestry personnel assumed that they would retain a virtual monopoly in decision-making with a minimal allowance for supervised forest user rights granted to the Community Forest Associations. They openly suggested that the state had certain comparative advantages that would ensure they remained the dominant actors in forest governance. The main advantage cited was the vast and permanent network of institutions and personnel on the ground. The continued belief in state management is based on misplaced economic assumptions concerning the accuracy of information, monitoring capabilities, sanctioning reliability and zero costs of administration (Ostrom 1990). Limited consideration has been given to the cost of creating and maintaining a new agency such as the Kenya Forest Service. Decentralizing decision-making to the regional levels can reduce the costs of administration and decision-making in addition to allowing for contextual considerations. Moreover, devolution to the Community Forest Associations will take advantage of the existing management capacities and gain their support in propagating sustainable forest practices.

Despite the bureaucratic obstacles to the formalization of co-management, there was evidence that some regional level officers were beginning to appreciate and adopt the co-management philosophy. The District Forest Officer at Mt Elgon oversaw the establishment of collaborative activities that included contracted community tree seedling production, seedling plant outs and joint forest patrols. The Kakamega District Forest Officer stated:

"It is true that since the policy that banned tree felling in natural forests was affected, we were uncertain on how to engage the local community in sustainable forest practice. But the 2005 Forest Act has really assisted in initiating informal forest management partnerships. In the past the training of forest officers made them rather militaristic and very formal in dealing with the public. But now we have in-house training make us more diplomatic because giving orders does not equate to positive communication. We are now able to engage with the community more productively to ensure better forest conservation" (Kakamega District Forest Officer, personal interview, November 2009)

Such sentiments reflected a slow but gradual change in the beliefs of middle-level Kenya Forest Service personnel. Interview data suggested that forest personnel at regional levels had begun to recognize their strategically significant positions in enabling successful partnerships. This was in spite of the extremely slow process of implementing the new partnership law which has proven to be a major barrier to the building of more resilient partnerships at the critical regional nodes (Adams et al. 2004; Agrawal & Ostrom 2001; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006). Decentralized management is more likely to provide a better fit for local needs than generalized national level prescriptions (Kaimowitz & Sheil 2007; Sayer & Campbell 2004; West et al. 2006). The analysis of the political and institutional structures of government institutions and an investigation of their norms and power interests are just as important – if not more so – in determining the outcomes of the implementation process for the new collaborative forest governance regime (Agrawal & Ribot 1999; March & Olsen 1996). The continued dependence of higher level executives on standard top-down operating procedures has been detrimental to the implementation of the participatory regime in Kenya.

One District Forest Officer complained that the painstaking effort of producing locally-relevant management plans was often negated by executives at the Kenya Forest Service head office. Whenever draft management plans were sent to the head office for approval they were redrafted to conform to a uniform template that obscured site-specific factors. Retention of decision-making authority at higher levels of the Kenya Forest Service and to a lesser extent at the lower regional levels in contradiction to the devolution process could be attributed to two main factors. The first factor was the acute shortage of government resources necessary to retrain its personnel and retool its institutions of management at the regional levels. The second factor was the reluctance of the higher level bureaucrats to relinquish decision-making authority to the regional levels. Decentralization is an iterative, contested and ongoing process in which the actors continuously attempt to retain and expand their interests (Poteete & Ribot 2011).

7.2.2 The NGO Trap: Positives and Negatives of External Actor Involvement

The Kenya Forest Service (KFS) is critically short of the resources necessary to fulfill its collaborative forest governance mandate. The KFS requires a substantial injection of resources if the goal of sustainable forest management is to be attained. The additional resources that nongovernmental organizations and bilateral donors offer are readily welcomed by the government (Tole 2010). This has given these external actors substantial influence on the policymaking and implementation process of the new law at both local community and state levels. The government largely relinquished the initiation and management of the pilot phase projects that were meant to inform the framing of the new participatory law to the NGOs and donor agencies. The preference by a majority of them for the propagation of protective forest policies meant that practically no experimentation with co-management was undertaken at the local community level. Contentious issues such as forest benefits-sharing between the local community and the state have not yet been debated or tested. In this section an analysis is made of the income-generating projects that

were largely supported by the nongovernmental organizations both during the pilot phase and after the passing of the new forest law, often as an alternative to tangible co-management of the forests. A discussion follows on why tangible co-management practice was supplanted by a search for alternative forms of livelihoods.

From about 1990 to 2003, approximately US\$ 2 million had been spent in various projects within the Arabuko-Sokoke and Shimba Hills Forests (Githitho 2004). During the field research coastal forest conservation projects involving the Global Environment Facility, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and government of Kenya agencies among others had a budget of about US\$ 3.2 million (GEF 2004). The District Forest Officer in charge of Arabuko-Sokoke Forest expressed a sense of accomplishment that the 2005 Forest Act was modeled after the pilot studies and other collaborative projects undertaken in the area since the 1990s. The Arabuko-Sokoke and Shimba Hills forest communities have benefitted from donor-funded livelihood alternative projects such as butterfly farming and honey production in successive projects lasting about 15 years. About 60 percent of the local community respondents had improved perceptions on the need for forest conservation as a result of these alternative income streams. Moreover, both the local community and Kenya Forest Service personnel respondents attributed the joint forest patrol initiative to the expectation for improved future incomes from such alternative projects. Progressive collaborative partnerships have emerged from the long-term collaboration between the local population, the Kenya Forest Service and external donors. Nevertheless 50 percent of the community respondents in Arabuko-Sokoke were critical of the local forest office's efforts towards encouraging more collaborative practice. Respondents felt that access to the forest for undertaking activities related to their income-generating activities was still grossly limited. The Shimba Hills community had a slightly higher dissatisfaction rate

of 64 percent, but Kakamega and Mt Elgon both had dissatisfaction rates above 80 percent (based on all interview data; 2010).

There was a strong link between successful collaboration management and the establishment of sustainable livelihood alternatives at all four community examples. External resources played an important role in disseminating information and connecting the actors in projects aimed at establishing more collaborative practice. At Arabuko-Sokoke and Shimba Hills, over 70 percent of the community respondents were aware of the existence and functions of Community Forest Associations. But the figure was below 25 percent in Kakamega and Mt Elgon forest communities in Western Kenya where fewer external resources had been invested. The larger population numbers in these areas also meant that a higher percentage of the residents neither received the conservation message nor benefitted from the alternative income generating activities. The introduction of alternative modes of production in these communities led only to a temporary reduction in the demands for greater forest user rights during the pilot and implementation phases of the new law. The small scale of the projects and their economic unsustainability soon led to renewed demands for concrete engagement in forest management as prescribed by the law.

The dominant top-down approach had been only minimally reversed even at the more extensively supported coastal forests. Substantially more resources will be required to create more resilient and widespread collaborative regimes. The alternative livelihood projects have benefitted less than 10 percent of the households in all four communities; 82 percent of all local community respondents had not altered their forest use practices. They were disappointed by the slow pace of granting them increased forest user rights and management responsibility. Successful collaborative partnerships at local and regional levels will require long time spans in excess of the 15 year effort at Arabuko-Sokoke. The following statement

by a retired civil servant and current farmer who had yet to join a Community Forest Association in Kakamega reflects the widespread disappointment with the implementation process:

"The new policy of Participatory Forest Management will take long to implement as usual with government. Eventually the local population will have no alternative but to revert back to illegal forest use. There has been no special effort to make people aware of the new paradigm and the people are starting to give up again. Things are probably worse than they were ten years ago". (Kakamega community respondent, personal interview, October 2009)

This was the dominant perception among community respondents regarding the dissemination and implementation process of the participatory regime (see also Mbuvi et al. 2009). There is a danger that the collaborative linkages established so far will be lost as the local populations become increasingly disillusioned. There is a policymaking and programmatic implementation disconnect in collaborative forest practice in Kenya. Although the new law intends that local communities be integral players in the management of local forests, the programs and projects initiated thus far are geared towards finding alternative market-oriented means of livelihood. The empowerment of the communities requires a constant process of leveraging existing sources of power effectively and uncovering new sources of power (Poteete & Ribot 2011). Community Forest Associations should form stronger regional and national bodies - in tandem with other similar-minded organizations - to counter the tendency of NGOs and other donors to sabotage substantial co-management practice. The KFS needs to recognize that it cannot indefinitely postpone the task of initiating and supporting a working co-management regime without the substantial loss of necessary goodwill of the local communities. NGOs and donor institutions will, at least initially, play a critical role by injecting much needed financial resources and acting as an intermediary between the government and local communities in collaborative forums. Concerted efforts aimed at linking the two processes of policymaking and implementation should provide the necessary momentum to steer the process towards a more inclusionary and beneficial engagement for a majority of the local community. The full inclusion of the CFAs in the write-up of management plans represents the

most immediate window of opportunity for building trust among the main actors and rationalizing the policymaking and implementation processes.

Most NGOs were seeking to propagate their own interests in Kenya forestry governance. While nongovernmental organization practitioners claim to support decentralization and democratization agendas for managing the commons, their actions on the ground often contradicted this position. Their common belief was that forest resources are limited and will be destroyed by any sustained utilization practices and instead supported a strong protectionist agenda. They focused their resources towards finding alternative livelihood income-generating means for the forest-adjacent communities in these communities. The local communities considered the NGOs to be close allies during the debates for more inclusionary forest management but in practice the NGOs have knowingly or unknowingly subverted the implementation process. This mirrors the concept of "repertoires of domination" where the NGOs, like other interested actors, seek to defend or entrench their positions (Poteete & Ribot 2011).

Nevertheless, a comparison of these community examples showed that areas that had a longer experience with collaborative management had begun to achieve a modicum of flexibility, resilience and stability at the district forest station office levels. Intensive interaction activities with local communities and non-governmental organizations lasting more than a decade will be required to institutionalize and promote acceptance of co-management practice at the individual government officer level. Such long time periods are mandatory in order to reach a level of resiliency and flexibility that are a hallmark of successful collaborative management systems. Channels of communication with reverse loops that allow for learning-by-doing will be critical in the implementation of the new dispensation (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2004). This also reflects Doherty and Horne's (2002) conclusion that managers should become more involved in the creation and maintenance of active networks of stakeholders. The crucial nodes of

information exchange and places for trust-building will increasingly shift from the main Kenya Forest Service headquarters in the capital city of Nairobi to the conservancy and district levels.

7.3 Conclusions and Recommendations

The analysis shows that if the administrative decentralization of forest management fails to equip midlevel personnel with effective authority transfers and capacity training on new collaborative paradigms in their relationship with local communities, then mid-level personnel are likely to propagate bureaucratic barriers against the emergence of true devolution to community forest associations. Community forest associations lack willing and powerful partners at the regional level who have enough decision-making authority to respond with reliable and quick management responses. This is likely to result in further forest degradation and illegal deforestation once the communities' disillusionment with incapable regional forest administration partners becomes more entrenched.

The legal vision of the 2005 Forest Act was not only to decentralize but ultimately to devolve power to community forest associations once they were ready, but the implementation has been blocked in its early stages because of non-harmonized changes of capacity and authority between the forest administration and the communities. There has been a failure by the stakeholders to consider the slow decentralization of decision-making authority which needs to be controlled and defined in order to ensure viable forms of partnerships throughout the process. The analysis indicates that this gap could be addressed by adaptive formal regulations which would specify gradual transfers of decision-making powers from high-level to regional forest service personnel, and again between the regional personnel and the emerging capacities of community forest associations.

Throughout this process, the political ecology analysis showed a reluctance of the higher level bureaucrats to relinquish actual decision-making authority to the regional levels. The entrenched interests of bureaucrats at higher levels must be taken into account in policy analyses of the post-2005 Forest Act processes. These should be countered by a strategic and explicit devolution of power to the regions. Predicting the long-term policy outcomes of the new regime will be difficult, but the existing institutional arrangement at state and community levels shows that there will be an increase in conflicts at the regional levels of governance as long as the Kenya Forest Service personnel are not granted the tangible powers to make necessary contextualized decisions. There is a critical need for the creation of an accountable and secure domain of autonomous decision making at the regional levels of forest governance in Kenya if decentralization is to succeed. A broad coalition of actors from all sectors of the society and government at the regional is necessary to overcome the centralizing tendencies of government in Kenya forestry governance. Such coalitions will provide greater legitimacy to local level government officials who often lack fallback positions when confronted by their offsite superiors. The first objective should be to build the capacity of Community Forest Associations to legally challenge the state where they feel their rights are denied according to the new law. Nongovernmental organizations and other external donors have the influence to act as important intermediaries during the implementation process.

Local communities are increasingly disillusioned by the slow implementation process for devolved management to the Community Forest Associations by the state. When the benefits of devolution and collaboration are evidently tangible, it was found that there was a corresponding willingness to collaborate with the Kenya Forest Service. More resources should be directed at reforming the bureaucratic procedures and personnel beliefs in order to rationalize beliefs and personnel with the new reality of devolved management. Theory suggests that the close proximity of local agencies through decentralization improves efficiency, equity and responsiveness of bureaucracies to the demands of local populations (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2004; Hill & Hupe 2009; Ribot, Agrawal & Larson 2006; Walby

2009). I found that the middle ranges of forest governance at district and conservancy levels represented the best forums for democratic decentralization of a negotiable framework law. The investment of more resources at the regional field offices of the Kenya Forest Service will lead to faster assimilation of comanagement ideals of mutual learning, open communication and greater trust. Kenya is unlikely to benefit from such theoretical predictions as long as appropriate forums for decision-making at the regional levels are not put into practice through decentralized decision-making. At the moment, local communities are disadvantaged because inefficient and delayed responses from the state have propagated the old top-down regime. In essence, the Community Forest Associations lack equal partners in comanagement at regional and local levels. The power to make decisions should be delegated to lower levels of the forest agency if mutually beneficial and lasting partnerships are to be created.

The Kenya Forest Service has an acute shortage of the resources necessary to retrain and retool its institutions of management at the regional levels. For this reason the pilot and early phases of implementation of the new law have been largely ceded to external agencies such as nongovernmental organizations, conservation and development agencies. This practical separation of the policymaking and implementation processes of collaborative forest governance in Kenya has been detrimental to the objective of establishing decentralization regimes at regional levels. The nongovernmental organizations, together with the state, have been complicit in slowing or obstructing experimentation with tangible comanagement during the implementation process. Similar to central government, they have argued that forests are highly threatened and a protective approach is still necessary. This contradicts the widely held agenda of many of these nongovernmental organizations that local communities deserve substantial forest user rights. But at the same time their resources have provided opportunities for positive interactions between local communities and regional forest personnel and contributed to a building of trust and willingness to cooperate. Values such as trust are so critical in the long run and so they cannot be undervalued.

There is widespread concern among the CFAs and other participatory forest management proponents outside of government that the kind of devolvement offered by the Forest Act 2007 propagates the top-down structure reminiscent of the old forest management regime. This would imply that not much has changed from the previous forest management regime. Nevertheless, the conclusion of this study is that the open and flexible governance mechanisms provided by the new management regime highlights opportunities within the Kenyan legal system for CFAs if they can organize themselves to counter the century-old hegemony of full state control of forestry resources. The complex and uncertain nature of Participatory Forest Management systems requires all the actors, including nongovernmental organizations, to embrace the democratic principles of decentralization in order to encourage the create stronger partnerships with CFAs particularly in seeking legal redress where state institutions attempt to overstep their mandate. Moreover it is critical that the forestry sector in Kenya adopts an adaptive approach during the implementation of the framework law in order to respond to the varied contexts in forest-adjacent communities.

Chapter Eight: Environmental Policymaking: The Place of Non-State Actors in Kenya Forest Governance

8.1 Introduction

The analysis and discussion in Chapter 6 showed how after three decades of operating in a virtual legal vacuum, the practice of participatory forest management (PFM) in Kenya was finally granted legal recognition through the enactment of the *Forest Act 2005*. The new framework law introduced the principal of participatory forest between the newly mandated Community Forest Associations (CFAs) and the state forest management agency – the Kenya Forestry Service. But the question of what factors drove an initially reluctant government to accept decentralized forest management remained unanswered. Moreover, the role played by local and other non-state actors in the framing of new policies and laws needs further investigation in order to understand the impact of the law and policies more fully. Furthermore the extent to which the new dispensation satisfies competing interests is unclear as exemplified by growing community level disenchantment with the implementation process.

The main objective of this chapter is to analyze how non-state actors engage in the environmental policymaking process – both overtly and covertly. An analysis of forest policy formulation process from the early 1990s into the first decade of the new century is undertaken. The basis of the analysis is the multilevel interactions of selected NGOs with other stakeholders. Two approaches that have been rarely used in Africa, the Policy Network Analysis (PNA) and the Advocacy Coalition Network (ACF) are combined in order to show how networks, resources and belief systems have interacted in the forest policymaking process. The PNA adopts a structural perspective to explain power distribution among actors in a social system as a function of the position they occupy in one or more networks. The actor-oriented ACF is particularly appropriate for a political ecology study like this one. The essential premise

of the ACF is that policymaking occurs in a subsystem inhabited by several multi-actor advocacy coalitions which compete to influence policy in line with their policy beliefs (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1988; 1993; Sabatier 1999). A key feature of ACF is that belief systems can be conceptualized as public policies or programs. A belief system can help to reveal causal relationships and assumptions attached to various policy instruments since it involves identifiable value priorities and perceptions (Villamor 2006). This study assumes that belief systems of the policy actors or advocacy coalitions can be altered by the influence of external perturbations outside the system (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1988; 1993; Sabatier 1999). Since the policy issue in this study is the creation of a functional joint forest management in Kenya, the unit of analysis is the participatory forest management policy-making subsystem. The connections of rural communities to NGOs and other non-state institutions that influence policymaking is investigated because such organizations often claim the space of local community representation. The focus is on the regional activities of the NGOs and the forums at which they interact with other stakeholders in order to influence policy.

The beliefs of policy actors are captured by the research questions and a conceptual analysis of various key texts and documents. The focus is on identifying the catchwords and trends of activities, processes and project actions by the main stakeholders in the field over the last two decades in order to identify their preferences and trace the impact of these preferences on forest policy and laws. I assume that direct involvement in policymaking by interested parties is not always possible, thus coalition achievements are to be identified by tracing network activities linked to influencing policy. Two examples of organizations that have been at the centre of forest policy change in Kenya – Forest Action Network (FAN) and Nature Kenya – are utilized to reveal the complex, non-linear involvement of non-state actors in the policymaking process.

8.1.1 Major operational research questions for policy analysis

- 1. What were the main problems encountered in the policymaking process leading to the adoption of the *Forest Act 2005*, the Draft Forest Policy and adopted programs?
- 2. Who were the main participants in policymaking including the main advocates and opponents?
- 3. How did actors who were engaged in the field of PFM influence the decision-makers?
- 4. What beliefs including their arguments, priorities and intentions influenced the positions of the main actors?

8.2 Timeline of Kenya Forest Policy Change and the Genesis of Forests Act, 2005

This section briefly traces the emergence of important forest policy, legal and political changes in Kenya over a century that have shaped forest governance in Kenya (Table 8.1). The complex, multi-scalar and multi-stakeholder nature of the process and the influence of global forces on forest management principles are discernible. Political and economic considerations are recognized to have been major change drivers towards a more participatory regime.

In the early 20th century Kenya forest governance policy was aimed at ensuring adequate supply of timber to both state institutions and private commercial concerns. The colonial authorities instituted protectionist measures to ensure adjacent local communities had minimal access to forest products. They were allowed to collect firewood from fallen trees and twigs and not much else until the time of independence in 1963. Local community hopes of improved access after a newly inaugurated independent government were quickly extinguished as the colonial top-down protectionist approaches were retained.

Year	Policy Change
1902	• The Forest Department (FD) was created in 1902 with the appointment of the first Conservator of Forests; emphasis on timber production
1932	• Start of ecological forestry; enactment and revision of the first Forest Act in Kenya with reference to non-timber values such as aesthetics, soil
	and water conservation
1941	 1941 Forests Ordinance; creates nature reserves with no consumptive utilization permitted
1957	White Paper No. 1; start of social forestry that recognizes multiple use
1963	Independence from Britain
1964	• The Forests Act Chapter 385; provision for the establishment, control and regulation of central forests and forest areas; creation of nature reserves within existing forest reserves by Minister for nature preservation; Director of Forests issues licenses/permits, collects royalties or fees from permitted users
1968	 White Paper No. 1 of 1957 modified and adopted, restated and published as Sessional Paper No. 1 of 1968
1992	 Kenya participation in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED); signatory to Agenda 21 and other Declarations
1994	Development of the Kenya Forestry Master Plan;
	• Pilot Phase projects on participatory forest management begin;
	National Environment Action Plan (NEAP), 1994
1997	• In 1997, authority granted officially to the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest Management Team to pilot PFM
1999	• The National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA), established by the Environmental Management and Co-ordination Act (EMCA)
	of 1999; provides overall environmental policy coordination
2000	 Draft Forest Bill 2000 advocated a conducive environment for PFM but not presented to Parliament in 2000
	• Initiation of PFM activities by Kenya Forests Working Group (KFWG), Forest Action Network (FAN), Nature Kenya and international
	partners
	The Kenya National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
	 Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations adopted by Kenya
2005	• Forests Act No. 7 of 2005 approved and repeals Forest Act (Chapter 385); the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) replaces the FD
2007	• Establishment of Kenya Forest Service (KFS) in line with the new Forests Act to replace the former Forest Department
	Community Forest Associations (CFAs) sensitization and capacity building by NGOs such as FAN and Nature Kenya
	• Draft Forest Policy (2007) to guide the development of the forestry sector
2011	 New Kenya constitution - recognizes right of local communities to manage their own local affairs and resources and ensure equitable sharing of national and local resources including forests in a devolved system of government

Adapted from KFMP 1994; Ongugo et al (2007); Ogweno et al 2009 **Table 8-1 Timeline of significant forest policy changes and events in Kenya**

Sessional Paper No. 1 of 1968 set out the official forest policy for Kenya leading up to the end of the 20th century and deviated little from previous protectionist colonial policies. The main aim of the policy was to ensure an adequate supply of timber for industry while protecting the natural forests by restricting local access ostensibly to avoid the tragedy of the commons. It set out a hierarchy of management that allowed local authorities to demarcate certain limited forest areas for management as trust lands within their respective jurisdictions. The policy inevitably alienated local communities from a resource that they had depended on for generations.

In the 1970s the environmental movement firmly established root in Kenya after the decision by the UN to base its newly created preeminent environmental governance institution – the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) – in Kenya following a transcendental meeting in Nairobi that was instrumental in linking issues of environment and development. The location of UNEP and other UN bodies such as the United Nations Office for Africa placed Kenya in the vanguard of international environmental policymaking in comparison to most other developing countries. It was easier for international and local entities to interact and influence Kenya policymaking at close quarters with a potential for a faster assimilation of globally conceived ideas and philosophies.

In a radical departure from the norm, the initial task of drafting a new Kenya forest policy was entrusted to a private concern - Price Waterhouse Coopers in 1996 rather than to centralized government institutions. The business oriented organization unsurprisingly recommended a shift in the management of plantation state forests as well as indigenous forests towards more intensified private sector involvement. Furthermore it proposed the establishment of a semi-autonomous institution responsible for the protection and management of indigenous forests. This early draft omitted the politically-sensitive question of community participation in forest governance. Forest governance efforts in the period between 1990 and 2001 did not stop the accelerated politicization of its management. Forest areas were parceled out for political expediency with little regard for legal procedure. For example, Mt Elgon and Mau forest were opened for settlement schemes for political expediency while forest officers at local levels parceled out forest zones for personal gain as a free-for-all ensued. Endemic corruption meant that forests were felled indiscriminately and a vicious cycle arose as possible reinvestment revenues were lost to an already resource-poor sector. The wanton destruction had repercussions on partnerships that the government had established with international bodies in the environmental management field. For example, the Kenya Indigenous Forests Conservation Program (KIFCON), which had received significant financial support from international development partners such as the Finnish International Development Agency, was discontinued in 1995 due to perceived endemic corruption.

Nevertheless the perseverance of several civil society groups, NGOs and some international development partners led to the formulation of *Forest Bill, 2000* that had a specific chapter dealing with community participation. Due to lack of political will, the Forests Bill, 2000 was however never presented to Parliament. But due to the impetus of a newly elected government in 2002, a new version, *Forests Bill, 2004* was presented to Parliament for debate. Despite the seeming wide stakeholder consultation and a certain degree of consensus over the previous decade, a majority of the Members of Parliament voted against the Bill because they claimed it would further alienate their constituents from their rightful share of forest resources. Nevertheless *Forest Bill 2004* evolved into the *Forests Bill, 2005*, which was presented to Parliament for enactment in July 2005 and subsequently approved. It is notable that only minimal changes were made in the newly enacted Act from the previously rejected one. The following two sections summarize the major aims of Kenya forest policy and laws.

8.3 Summary of Forest Act 2005 and the Draft Forest Policy

The complexity of Kenyan policymaking is exemplified by the seeming reverse order of the process. The main instrument for achieving its objectives - Forests Act 2005 was passed by parliament while its accompanying guiding principle – the Kenya Forest Policy – remained in draft form seven years later. This was attributed to various administrative and political hurdles according to a number of interviewees in the policy arena.

The major elements of the draft Kenya forest policy are:

- 1. Contribute to poverty reduction, employment creation and improvement of livelihoods through sustainable use, conservation and management of forests and trees;
- 2. Contribute to sustainable land use through soil, water and biodiversity conservation, and tree planting through the sustainable management of forests and trees;
- Promote the participation of the private sector, communities and other stakeholders in forest management to conserve water catchment areas, create employment, reduce poverty and ensure the sustainability of the forest sector;
- 4. Promote farm forestry to produce timber, woodfuel and other forest products;
- Promote forest extension to enable farmers and other forest stakeholders to benefit from forest management approaches and technologies; and
- 6. Promote forest research, training and education to ensure a vibrant forest sector (MENR 2005).

The main guiding principles of current Kenya forest law can be summarized as follows:

- 1. Involvement of forest adjacent communities and other stakeholders in forest management and conservation.
- 2. Forest management planning will be based on an eco-system approach.
- Provision of appropriate incentives to promote sustainable use and management of forest resources.
- Institutional transformation of the Forest Department into a semi-autonomous Kenya Forest Service.
- 5. Recognition of local and global forestry issues and challenges to ensure fair contribution of the forestry sector in economic development (*Forest Act 2005*)

Details on the participatory aspects of *Forests Act 2005* have already been discussed in Chapter 6. The main elements of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) regime are listed below:

- Integrated approach to forest management, conservation and development (including sustainability concerns, ecological values and social interests)
- Management to entail sustainable multiple forest uses and benefits (including timber, fuel, food and other forest products, as well as biological diversity and resources, protection of ecosystems and watersheds, recreation and tourism, and other environmental services such as carbon sequestration)
- 3. Existence of adequate planning tools (in particular management plans);
- 4. Existence of environmental and social impact assessments/audits (e.g. certification schemes);
- Transparent forest concessions and other contractual arrangements, with provisions for accountability;
- Community-based arrangements, decentralization of responsibilities and devolution of powers to local actors.

 Commitment to inter-sectoral development sustainable use of forest resources and international conventions and other agreements to promote sustainable management, conservation and utilization of forests and biological diversity (*Forests Act 2005*, Part IV).

8.4 The State of Domestic Goal Achievement

The content analysis and interviews in the field summarized the following important findings:

- Forest Act 2005 with a section on Participatory Forest Management specifically through Community Forest Associations (CFAs) has been passed;
- Kenya Forest Service (KFS) replaces the former Forest Department the new body is a quasiindependent state agency (parastatal) that is able to engage in enterprise development with private and other non-state entities;
- Management agreements between KFS and CFAs pending due to bureaucratic bottlenecks that reveal the continued centralized practice of forest management in Kenya;
- No delegation of management responsibility to local communities even in pilot phases of implementation;
- Draft Forest Policy that is ostensibly in use in Kenya but not legally enacted in Parliament because of a myriad of political considerations particularly by Members of Parliament representing forest adjacent communities; and
- 6. Programs and projects in the field structured overwhelmingly as alternative commercial livelihood activities mostly supported by external funds from international NGOs often in collaboration with their long-established national NGO partners in Kenya.

8.5 Beliefs, Interests, Coalitions and Networking: the Case of two NGOs

The evolution of Kenya forest governance into a more collaborative regime as discussed in the previous sections was the result of complex and multi-scalar interactions of interested actors. The following section studies two Kenyan nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that have been at the forefront of promoting participatory forest management. First, Nature Kenya was initially focused on the conservation of threatened bird species but soon realized that the involvement of local communities was mandatory for success in any conservation-oriented undertaking. Nature Kenya's partnership with Birdlife International (an international NGO) in carrying out its mandate ensured an important source of funding. The Forest Action Network (FAN), on the other hand, is predominantly a policy research and advocacy organization. FAN's long engagement in forest policymaking in Kenya shaped its belief that successful forest management requires more equitable and participatory strategies for any measure of success. FAN strove to base its policy advocacy from the perspective of local communities and thus, was actively engaged in capacity-building, organization management and coalition-building at community level with the intention of preparing local forest-adjacent communities for a new participatory dispensation.

8.5.1 Nature Kenya

8.5.1.1 Organizational goals and beliefs

Mr. Paul Matiku, Director, Nature Kenya described the operations of his organization in a personal interview. Nature Kenya started out as The East Africa Natural History Society. Its core value is to promote nature through the conservation of species and protection of vulnerable sites and habitats in collaboration with local communities. The genesis of Nature Kenya's organizational beliefs was discernible by its strong involvement in global level events. The organization is very active in Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and is always represented at the CBD Conference of the Parties (COPs)

meetings worldwide. Mr. Matiku stated that Nature Kenya believes in the CBD's three major goals of biological conservation, equitable access, and sustainable use and strives to promote them by gathering extensive scientific data and evidence to support these causes. The organization is also interested in promoting other international treaties such as the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention), and African and Eurasian Waterbird Agreements.

Nature Kenya promotes community partnerships through the formation of Site Support Groups (SSGs). In the SSGs leadership capacity training is provided with the aim of producing grassroots champions of change. Greater community engagement is achieved through the support of governance and livelihoods improvement measures. The organization scopes a community in order to identify environmental-oriented groups or to otherwise stimulate an environmental agenda if it determines that this is lacking. They plan 3-5 year programs of capacity building including phone calls and field visits. They are involved in advocacy and environmental education, promotion of a naturalist agenda including bird watching, and local community group organizational capacities such as accounting and leadership development. According to Nature Kenya's own yearly ranking, the organization had achieved what it termed as full maturity in 17 areas nationally in establishing SSGs.

8.5.1.2 Networking and coalition-building

Nature Kenya is actively engaged in coalition-building and networking with international NGOs as well as multilateral organizations such as the World Bank. But Mr. Matiku admitted that strong bonds and coalitions for influencing environmental policy in Kenya is difficult and requires perseverance and patience. He gave one example where Nature Kenya was involved in policy formulation through its incorporation into the National Liaison Committee that aims to conserve the so-called Important Bird Area sites and other sensitive biodiversity areas. The Committee is housed by the Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG). The Committee constituted 23 government and local and international NGOs that

advocated for change through meetings, workshops and publications. The degree of influence of Nature Kenya was multiplied because its Important Bird Areas Program was part of the Birdlife International African NGO-Government Partnerships for Sustainable Biodiversity Action – an initiative adopted by the Kenyan state. This cemented a strong state-NGO linkage at the national level via a globally conceived pathway.

Nature Kenya's main goal of preservation of important bird areas did not easily coincide with local community needs. Like a majority of Kenyan NGOs, including science research-based and policy-oriented, Nature Kenya was obliged to support community livelihood improvement projects in their areas of operation in order to establish a degree of trust and effective working relationships. Mr. Matiku provided one example of creating partnerships at Arabuko-Sokoke Forest. Attempts led by some local politicians for the degazettement of one forest area appealed to many local residents in need of more farmland. But a collaborative effort between Nature Kenya and a majority of local residents aimed at showing the importance of preserving the forest as a matter of self-interest successfully countered the forest excision attempts.

As discussed in Chapter 6 Ian Gordon, a professor at University of Nairobi initiated the Kipepeo Project in order to combat poverty around the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest as an additional component to a major research objective of the project. He managed to build a network of interested institutions that benefitted from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) small grants program. The Project secured further funding from the European Union with Ian Gordon as Project Manager. The National Museums of Kenya (NMK) – a state institution – was incorporated into the project because it was the mandated custodian of the Kayas – small patches of the coastal forests of cultural importance to coastal communities and protected also for their rich biodiversity. The Kipepeo Project eventually incorporated other state agencies active in the forest sector including the Kenya Forest Service (KFS), Kenya Forest Research Institute (KEFRI), and Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS).

The project expanded through the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for the sustainable management component of the Arabuko-Sokoke ecosystem. The individual leadership and influence of Ian Gordon was again in evidence during this transition period. Ian Gordon had joined the International Council for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and had ideas of establishing an expanded commercial insect-based project based in Mwingi in central Kenya and Kakamega in western Kenya in addition to the initial coastal Arabuko-Sokoke that had stalled due to lack of funding. ICIPE consequently ensured the continuation of the Kipepeo Project by securing further funds for the period 2004-2008 in a 5-year program (the case study now under review). The restructured Kipepeo Management Team is overseen by Nature Kenya that facilitates the work plans, and a budget of around US\$220,000 per month.

8.5.1.3 Policy impacts

ICIPE programs significantly impacted the incorporation of commercial components in the new forest policy in Kenya. The coalescing of similar beliefs was discernible in the activities of ICIPE. Everlyn Nguku (ICIPE Project Manager, Kakamega) agreed that ICIPE was significantly influenced by international trends and policies in formulating its commercial projects and programs over the last two decades. For example, Australian Aid through UNDP provided a small grant in conjunction with ICIPE to start a marketplace in order to scale up production and expand commercial activities. The hegemony of global environmental movement dictated the adoption of business-oriented projects as a means of improving the livelihoods of forest-adjacent communities.
I found that in the intervening years the Kipepeo Project had been the single most influential empirical source of evidence-based policymaking for the enacted *Forest Act 2005* and the Draft Kenya Forest Policy. In particular Kipepeo Project influenced Part IV of *Forest Act 2005* dealing with community participation issues because the Project acted as a national pilot case study for participatory forest management. The organizational beliefs and strategies of the major actors in the Kipepeo Project have greatly influenced Kenya's forest policy.

Mr. Matiku's was personally uncertain – like a majority of other individuals in the NGO sector – about the merits of the resultant *Forest Act 2005* in regard to the ability of CFAs to improve local community access to forest resources. The uncertainty showed by a leading figure in the pilot phase confirmed that the state still holds most of the cards in the policymaking process. Mr. Matiku summarized the prevailing scenario as follows:

"CFAs have a right to forest products but lack the capacity to manage them; and the Kenya Forest Service has no capacity to protect the forest but it retains the power to make decisions"

This example has shown the existence of multi-scalar networks and coalitions aimed at promoting the participatory paradigm. Nature Kenya has established strong partnerships for periods close to two decades with several international bodies such as Birdlife International as well as the locally-based but internationally focused ICIPE. All these organizations have strong biodiversity conservation beliefs that prefer largely untouched forest ecosystems in order to advance their aims. The resulting coalitions are stronger at the international level than the ones that Nature Kenya has formed at the national levels. Both levels of coalitions and networks tend to covertly propagate the protectionist belief at local forest mainly because local community institutions are largely left out of the coalitions. Forest-adjacent communities have often no alternative but to accept the commercially-based alternative livelihood strategies supported by external project implementers.

8.5.2 Forest Action Network (FAN)

8.5.2.1 Organizational goals and beliefs

FAN is the most active forest specific policy-oriented NGO in Kenya. The organization was engaged in various advocacy and coalition-making efforts in the policymaking process leading to the *Forest Act 2005* and the draft Kenya Forest policy. The main mandate of FAN is to influence the enactment of sustainable forest policies by engaging with the state and like-minded organizations. It does this through networking and publication of articles in newspapers, magazines and books. The organization was closely associated with the drafting of the new law mainly through its influential Executive Director, Dr. Dominic Walubengo.

8.5.2.2 Networking and coalition-building

A major activity of the organization – both before and after the new forest law was passed – was sensitization and advocacy among local communities about the participatory regime. One example that epitomizes FAN's advocacy activities is the program "Strengthening and Empowering Civil Society for Participatory Forest Management in East Africa" (EMPAFORM). This was a partnership program implemented in the three East African countries of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. The program promoted a pro-poor approach to PFM in order to increase local community control over forest resources and more equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of forest management and conservation (FAN 2006). Two of the participating CFAs at the Kenyan coast – the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest Adjacent Dwellers Association (ASFADA) and Dida Forest Adjacent Area Forest Association (DIFAFA) – eventually served as the main pilot cases for CFA formation and function in Kenya.

The element of international coalition-making of EMPAFORM in three countries gave it greater legitimacy according to a number of interviewees involved in the program. The partnership involved nine organizations from across East Africa including Forest Action Network (FAN), Care Kenya and Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) – the main forest research agency for the Kenyan Government. Quarterly meetings were organized on a rotational basis among the three. The program faced differentiated challenges within the three countries that required place-specific solutions. Tanzania was at a more advanced stage in the development of joint forest management practice. It had well-established community networks emanating from village governments created under the socialist-leaning system of government known as Ujamaa. Uganda had established several collaborative forest management programs with community-based organizations (CBOs). Kenya had only just enacted a participatory forest management law that had been tested in several pilot locations and required further refinement by the passing of necessary subsidiary legislation. The necessary subsidiary legislation will include the rules and regulation governing the establishment of Community Forest Associations (CFAs). FAN has been at the forefront of campaigning for improved community benefits in the formulation of these rules and regulations in Kenya.

8.5.2.3 Policy impacts

Mr Ochino, a FAN program manager, stated that the EMPAFORM utilized the CFAs as their entry points into the communities, particularly in areas where Birdlife International (Nature Kenya) still had operational projects. Mr. Ochino suggested that the two organizations approached the question of forest management from different angles: FAN was interested in stronger community partnership policies while Nature Kenya was more interested in established strategies and practices that would ensure the survival of a biologically important habitat. FAN foresaw a management practice that allowed a certain degree of forest utilization, while Nature Kenya preferred very low level forest utilization activities and instead promoted alternative livelihood practices. Nature Kenya had a more global outlook on the need to

preserve the forest while FAN had a more national and local outlook. Nevertheless the two organizations were willing to compromise since the major aim was the survival of the forest for prosperity. Such partnerships and networks were crucial in the spread of awareness and policy influence at the local community level.

FAN, similar to Nature Kenya, aided and supported in the formation of CFAs among communities neighbouring the coastal forests. They helped in the required legal registration process of CFAs at the Attorney General's office. CFA registration is a long, expensive and technically challenging process for local communities that encompass written by-laws, organizational strengthening including management, improved negotiation skills, conflict resolution, fundraising; and proof of gender and youth inclusivity in leadership positions. The ultimate goal of the EMPAFORM program was to establish community forestry networks in each of the three countries linking CBOs to each other, and to NGOs at the national level, and thereby promoting improved access to information, sharing of experience and joint action on issues of common interest. The program stressed that these were intended to be community-based networks that derived their strength and legitimacy from organizations and social movements at community level. FAN was the host of the newly created community network in Kenya known as the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations.

This example reveals the action necessary in creating functional coalitions in a developing country like Kenya. The EMPAFORM epitomized coalition-formation at its best in a place that none existed before. The impact of the newly created National Alliance of Community Forest Associations could not yet be assessed but the need for it was recognized by the NGO community because the state could not be trusted to make decisions beneficial and more equitable to local community without pressure from outside. This example shows that although a network of like-minded organizations existed at the national and international levels, a coalition created on the belief for more equitable benefit-sharing and greater decision-making powers for local community groups was not in place and needed instead to be created from the ground up.

8.6 International NGOs and Policymaking in Kenya

Programs and projects implemented in Kenya in the last three decades with the support of international funding through INGOs have had a major impact on policies and programs adopted. The programs examined in this study along the Kenyan coast were among the most influential in influencing the forest policymaking process as confirmed by a majority of interviewees in the field. An examination of the program conception, objectives and implementation and the consequent resultant networks, partnerships and coalitions reveal the importance of global bodies in impacting forest governance and development in general. One example of a well entrenched INGO is World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF). Its Eastern Africa Regional Program Office (EARPO) is based in Nairobi. It has been involved in several important forest governance programs along the Kenyan coast for over two decades in programs aimed at fulfilling its global mission in selected countries. A program manager at the WWF office described how his organization functions in practice.

WWF's mission is to conserve nature and reduce the most pressing threats to the diversity of life on Earth. Its vision is to build a future where people live in harmony with nature. The organization has a global view that seeks to save the planet. It wants to inspire the cause of conservation from the smallest community to the largest multinational organization. It seeks to be the voice for those creatures that have no voice. Its major goal is that by 2020, WWF will conserve many of the world's most ecologically important regions by working in partnership with others. WWF worked in partnership with Conservational International – an INGO with similar visions and goals – in activities aimed at conserving Kayas – important Kenyan coast cultural forests sites valued for their biodiversity. The WWF program was planned with the aim of benefitting from the UN's Global Environmental Facility (GEF) that aims to cover only the incremental conservations costs in ICDPs based in environmentally-sensitive areas. The program manager confirmed that the projects were conceived precisely to fulfil WWF's mandate of protecting an area categorized as a world biodiversity hotspot. These programs and projects are discussed in further detail in Chapters 4 to 7.

WWF program personnel suggested that all their projects strive to influence policy formulation to varying degrees. The projects usually produce policy briefs to be shared with relevant government agencies. WWF is also often involved in policy workshops at national and regional levels. The Program Manager suggested that policymaking in Kenya requires extensive consultation and consultants contracted by government to incorporate the many varied views into a working document. I found that most of these consultants are often employees of the major NGOs such as WWF itself, or academics with strong links to the NGOs. This is because the environmental policymaking arena is composed of well-defined networks and coalitions that have been formed over periods of over twenty years in most cases. WWF is involved in many of the regional consultations by facilitating workshops at provincial and national levels. The organization also offers its technical expertise by sitting in relevant working groups whenever invited to do so. The Program manager referred to the networks and coalitions as "a kind of gentleman's agreements although sometimes these are strengthened to a certain degree by signing of Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) between collaborating parties". For example WWF had signed several MoUs with a state agency – the National Museums of Kenya – in its efforts to support the conservation of the Kayas.

I found that a majority of international and national NGOs based their strategies of forest conservation in providing livelihood alternatives and supporting protectionist policies. In many ways the new Kenyan environmental and forestry laws reflect international treaties and laws with few attempts made to adapt them to national local factors.

8.7 The state and policymaking

The Kenyan government in the past solely managed gazetted forests. It was a centralized system that depended on protecting the forest by strict policing and provisions for fines and jail time for individuals found guilty of breaking forest laws. The state made policies, laws and regulations that favoured the protection of the forests from adjacent communities, but favoured the large sawmills that harvested them for commercial purposes. But changing views at local, national and international levels resulted in increasing calls for a change from centralized forest management to more equitable, community-friendly policies and laws that accounted for forest-dependent communities. This section examines the ideas, views and beliefs that have shaped how in recent decades the Kenyan government has adapted to demands for change and how this has influenced the policymaking process.

The beliefs and interests of state bureaucrats at national, regional and local levels revealed the impact of closer interaction with communities and the forest resource has on individuals. For example, local forest officers who had daily interactions with community members often had views and beliefs closer to the people on the ground and were therefore willing to initiate more intensified co-management activities than envisaged by their counterparts at higher levels. Higher level bureaucrats based at the Kenya Forest Service headquarters often held markedly different views on the policy requirements held by middle and local level officers. These differences play a role in the outcomes of interactions that occur within those institutions and with outside actors. Mr. Avude (DFO, Mt. Elgon District, a regional level bureaucrat) suggested that flexibility and authority needs to be decentralized to middle and local level forest officers in order to make area-conducive decisions. Because subsidiary laws are still lacking, it is left to the innovativeness of local level administrators to effect more locally-friendly actions at the ground level.

Devolvement was not a popular concept among a majority of Head Office government bureaucrats. But this intransigence of relinquishing some degree of power was reflected at lower levels of management with the KFS structure as well. Mr. Avude, a District Forest Officer, preferred that most important decision-making authority remain with KFS. He believed, like a majority of middle-level bureaucrats, that local communities lacked the capacity to effectively contribute to forest management. The widespread belief among the majority of state personnel interviewees was inevitable forest destruction if case local communities were to be granted unsupervised forest user rights. Most forest officers preferred a slightly enhanced access to forest products to local community groups directly under their supervision. In this regard they readily interpreted the participatory management sections of the new law as granting them the final say on any contentious management issues. I found that given a lack of subsidiary legislation necessary to clarify the framework forest law, centralized management remained the norm. The belief that government is and will retain ultimate ownership and control of state forests is pervasive throughout the KFS hierarchy and is fueled by a need for job preservation and doubt that local communities can be genuine co-management partners.

There were also differences among horizontal state institutions. For example, the Mt. Elgon Forest ecosystem is managed under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and the Kenyan Wildlife Service (KWS). A KWS Warden was of the opinion that the Mt Elgon Forest ecosystem required an exclusive protection status for natural forest areas with zero activities allowed in the natural forest areas and multiple uses only in plantation forestry. He was against the shamba system – a reforestation strategy that allowed individuals to temporarily farm within forest areas while they tended the tree seedlings until the seedlings were too large to allow for any further farming. This is a mutually beneficial arrangement for the individual who is granted access to much needed land, and the KFS which benefits from free labour offered by the farmers. The long held aim of the KFS to

supply commercial interests was clearly in conflict with the more protectionist aims of the KWS that wanted to preserve wildlife for tourism and posterity purposes.

There was critical convergence and divergence of beliefs in the interactions between state officials and NGOs. Although some NGOs have successfully forged trusted partnerships with some government agencies, a majority in government did not trust most of them. Most state personnel suggested that NGOs have an uncompromising activist agenda that deliberately conflicts with government in order to gain favour with foreign donors. Nevertheless there was consensus among state officials that up to 80 percent of capacity building in community forest management activities could be attributed to NGOs. Mr. Bundotich, (at KFS headquarters) went further to suggest that KFS could explore the possibility of channelling its own funds through NGOs in order to take advantage of positive NGO attributes such as efficiency and locally-adapted knowledge. Mr. Bundotich further observed that the state encouraged NGOs to participate in appropriate forest governance working groups in order to generate policy documents. I found that the state agencies often took advantage of these NGO partnerships to bridge the gap in resources and technical capacity within their own organizations.

The difference in power was apparent with the requirement that all forests be managed in accordance with an approved management plan. This means that any application for communities to manage forest must be accompanied with at least a draft management plan. These are technical planning tools that the CFAs cannot undertake to the satisfaction of the Kenya Forest Service. There are 120 forest blocks that all require unique management plans and I found indications that the government was already attempting to implement uniform plans for many of these areas. Consequently, the opportunities to negotiate contracts that will favour local communities are unlikely when the power to write the crucial management document is in the hands of the opposing side. Unless the CFAs are able to network and create coalitions that can garner enough resources to hire technically proficient experts in order to balance the playing

field, top-down management tendencies are likely to prevail. The NGOs, which have accumulated forest resource data and experienced personnel, would appear to present a likely ally to local community interactions with the state. But I found that often the opposite was true on the ground. Most of the national NGOs – largely influenced by their international coalition and network partners – were reluctant to call for more extreme forms of devolvement that would allow the CFAs to make significant management decisions. National NGOs had a vested interest in ensuring continued material and financial support for their programs from their international connections. I found broad support for programs that advocated for alternative livelihood means by a vast majority of national and international level institutions.

8.8 Discussions

8.8.1 Policy Networks

Structure plays a major role in the policymaking process. It refers to questions of power and degree of contribution is attributed to how much influence the more powerful have to bear on the process. Government bureaucrats and by extension, politicians are well-paced to be decisive actors in the process. Power-dependency theory is a core analytical device in PNA. This is because modern policy problems are complex and resource poor developing country governments are often incapable of addressing policy issues single-handedly. Responsible state agencies are therefore often dependent upon the cooperation and resources of non-state actors (Smith 1993).

I found a policy-network of loose issue networks at the national level. But some of the stakeholders, particularly at the international NGOs level, have strong, long-established networks that seek to propagate their ideas to the rest of the world from their well-established resource bases. For example, I observed such strong bonds between WWF, IUCN and Conservation International. The bonds between international NGOs and national and local NGOs reveal power differences that often force local NGOs to change their programs in line with INGOs in order to attract the necessary funding from such international benefactors.

The World Bank policies changed markedly in the late 1990s in Kenya after the failure of the SAPs to improve the economy. The rational management of environmental resources promoted by SAPs proved to be grossly inadequate and even detrimental to development. There was therefore a renewed willingness to support programs that took into account the rights of local communities to benefit from the commons. Programs were redesigned to include components that allowed for some measure of access and comanagement of the natural resources even still within the confines of a rationalized scientific basis. This movement was greatly influenced by INGOs that increasingly established strong partnerships with Breton Woods Institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as well as with the associated western Governments. For this reason they are well-placed to influence the decisions of both multilateral and bilateral funding agencies in regard to environmental conservation issues in developing countries.

The national NGOs strive to take advantage of the state's dependency on such international funding for management of the commons. The national NGOs have established loose networks with the INGOs and positioned themselves as important intermediaries with local communities, as well as being more reliable, open and democratic partners than the state in propagating sustainable development programs in Kenya. Increasingly more resources have been channeled through NGOs rather than government agencies that are viewed as inefficient and undemocratic. This has led to tensions between state agencies and NGOs as a competition for resources has ensued. The impact at the local level is less emphasis on the local needs in project design, and instead NGOs and other recipients of international funding have strived to impress their international benefactors by propagating externally-conceived goals.

I found a policy-network continuum that ranged from tightly knit policy communities to looser issue networks. But the more effective partnerships were the smaller ones between single organizations directly linked to government agencies often with an almost ad hoc appointed commission to undertake research on behalf of the state agency. This conformed to the premise in PNA that the proximity of network members to policy decision-makers privileges their interests and works to reinforce the status quo.

Because of the constraints found within loose networks in terms of decision-making and complex bargaining necessary for significant policy shifts, an examination of exogenous factors was appropriate for the Kenyan situation. For example, it was clear that significant policy shift towards participatory forest management was influenced by economic and political considerations that superseded individual and institutional considerations in the purview of existing networks. Policy debates had been ongoing in a climate of calls for greater democracy, development regeneration and constitutional change in Kenya from the late 1980s and towards the turn of the century. The realization that the centralized regime structure of state agencies lacked the resources to police a majority of forest areas in an era of economic rationalization was critical in the shift in belief and strategy. The eventual successful push for constitutional changes that allowed for more equitable, participatory and accountable management of development resources, accompanied by new government more amenable to such changes eventually resulted in the enactment of Forest Act 2005 after a long period of inertia. The insights provided by the analytical lens of policy network analysis could be further refined by bringing the entire policy process into focus by incorporating the advocacy coalition framework as discussed in the following section.

8.8.2 Beliefs and Coalition-Building in Forest Governance

Network's influence of on policymaking shown in the previous section did not clearly reveal why specific policies were accepted by the stakeholders and included in the new laws and policies in Kenya. The implementation of these policies and laws also began to show that the expectations of the different players did not always match those of existing networks. For this reason, the beliefs, often revealed by their programs on the ground, provided evidence why certain policies were made and the direction the policymaking process was likely to take (See Appendix 1 for a detailed example of local, national and international actors' beliefs in the forest policy subsystem at the Kenya coastal region). The differences in beliefs among network members led to a paradoxical situation where the stakeholders seemed to agree on some issues but their strategies and programs reveal divergent beliefs. For example, at Arabuko-Sokoke Forest, INGOs and some national NGOs with strong international connections held a core belief in protectionism for the survival of biodiversity. This belief differed markedly from the community-based organizations and most locally-based NGOs that believed in sustainable livelihoods and equitable development. A majority of state personnel held the view that a form of centralized management of the state was necessary in ensuring the survival of the forest ecosystem. For them decentralization of decision-making authority of state agency personnel to lower levels of the management structure was the goal as opposed to devolution of management and ownership rights to community groups. All actors believed in the importance of ensuring the survival of the forest. Local community groups based their belief on the basis that the forest commons was a source of livelihood and was to be used sustainably while reflecting less on the need for the survival of specific species.

The secondary beliefs of the actors elicited the most varied responses in terms of preferred local community programs. For example the common belief that communities had a right to benefit from local forests was interpreted in varied ways within the policy subsystem. It was clear that post-modernism

beliefs that were dominant in multilateral institutions such as the World Bank impacted on the programs that other actors implemented at local community level. The loose coalition of the World Bank/IMF/INGOs axis ensured that the hegemonic private enterprise policies for development in the form of commercialized alternatives to community management prevailed in a majority of cases in Kenya. A majority interviewed state officials also preferred alternative livelihood means because they held on to the belief that local communities lacked the technical know-how to sustainably manage forests. There was an element of self-preservation among the Kenya Forest Service personnel in wanting to ensure their job security by limiting the co-management functions of the CFAs. Local community respondents believed that they had a right to sustainable livelihoods based on forest resources without undue state inference. They were aware that uncontrolled access was a danger to the sustainability of the forest and were often willing to reinvigorate long-held collective development strategies as discussed in Chapter 6.

The strong financial monopoly of INGOs in forest governance enables them to play a policy broker role since they can influence and push all the actors towards compromise. The ideal requirement that a policy broker be independent is not fulfilled in this case because they often incorporate their own worldviews into the process. Nevertheless without playing this role, it is likely the coalitions would take a much longer time than the two decades it took to introduce the participatory forest management policies. But conversely, the main objective of a majority of these INGOs is to preserve nature in order to ensure the survival of specific species and biodiversity in general. For this reason the programs and policies that they have helped to broker have highlighted their preferences for finding alternatives to direct forest use, as opposed to greater management and ownership rights for local groups in forest governance. The programs are often informed by the global visions of the INGOs and these diminish the ability of local organizations to push through their agendas in the negotiation forums.

The ACF helped to clearly locate a forest policy subsystem in Kenya. The policy subsystem in Kenya conforms to the definition of Sabatier (1998) that postulated that organizations and groups of people need to interact over a decade or more to influence policy formulation and implementation within a policy domain. The sources of the beliefs could be identified in four policy coalitions in Kenya. The simplest way to categorize them was international, national, local and the state. But this was far from the true nature of these coalitions that often formed a continuum of beliefs. The loose forms of coalitions observed in the forest governance subsystem in Kenya led to changes in the perception that communities were necessarily bad for sustainable forest management and the consequent introduction of participatory forest governance. But a common worldview on how forests could contribute to the country's development agenda had not been achieved. This was highlighted by the strong protectionist lobby within both the well-established national NGOs at the international NGOs who ensured that the new participatory forest management regime granted local communities only superficial management rights while tangible decision-making remained in the hands of the state.

8.9 Conclusions and Recommendations

- Representatives of advocacy coalitions have deliberately targeted the benefit-sharing aspects of the international treaties (in line with their core beliefs) and ensured that the new law allows for the participation of local communities in the management of forests through the Community Forest Associations
- Although local community demands are recognized in the new law, the core beliefs of representatives of international NGOs and groups in the market principle led to adoption of alternative livelihoods in the implementation process

- 3. The core belief in top-down management in government has resulted in a very weak institutional framework for implementation in contrast to a robust looking participatory forest law (influenced by agents of structural power).
- 4. The Kenyan government has both overtly and covertly encouraged NGO involvement because it has often lacked the resources necessary in many aspects of forest management. Apart from the reduction in costs it has consequently been able to garner goodwill with many international NGOs influential within multilateral and bi-lateral institutional circles such as the World Bank, European Union and Western governments that are often the source of a major portion of finance for funding forest programs in Kenya.
- 5. A majority of NGO practitioners continue to favour a protective regime as revealed by their programs and projects at local community level. The INGOs and national NGOs are implementing alternative livelihood programs instead of supporting capacity-building and offering technical support necessary to facilitate greater co-management capacities at local levels.
- 6. NGOs greatly influence forest policymaking in Kenya because of the power they have from globally-sourced resources and the strong international coalitions they have created among themselves and with multi- and bi-lateral organizations that grant them both access and influence with concerned government decision-makers. But they cannot claim to represent local interests because a majority of them retain forest protectionist beliefs incompatible with even well-nuanced and rationalized local community forest utilization practices. They prefer instead alternative commercialized activities with minimal or no impact on the forest resource.
- 7. The major driver for the eventual approval of Forest Act 2005 in parliament was the entry of a new government that felt the enormous pressures, less from the electorate, but more from the civil society that had operated in tandem with the opposition during the struggle for greater democratization in Kenya. There was a latent network between environmental conservation groups and the new national leaders, some of whom had been active in the NGO spehere. This

network did not last for too long but the window of opportunity that it provided resulted in the enactment of the new law.

- 8. The democratic space available to local communities is narrow but significant movements have occurred particularly around election time when they have leaned on their local parliamentary representatives to force changes in forest governance policy. The windows of opportunity for local communities to influence change are concentrated around these intense election periods.
- 9. The size and time-span of community implemented programs is linked to the policymaking process often in unintended ways. Long-running programs with strong linkages to well-endowed institutions at national and international level have been critical in shaping the participatory forest management types adopted in Kenya.
- 10. The implementation process of the PFM was in its initial stages for this study. But early indications were that the core belief of the state in centralized management had not been fundamentally altered. The tendency to revert back to top-down strategies remained as exemplified by interpretation of the PFM as a decentralized process with transfer of limited decision-making powers to KFS officials at district and provincial levels. The CFAs were unlikely to negotiate significant forest access because the necessary management plan negotiations powers were skewed towards the powerful state agency. The concretization of more equitable strategies will require long-term coalition building by community level organizations such as the nascent National Alliance of Community Forest Associations because local communities cannot depend on national and international NGOs who hold protectionist beliefs.
- 11. Loose coalitions at the national level had to counter stronger global coalitions in policy and often the global level coalitions prevailed
- 12. Major forest policy changes have been driven by external economic policy subsystems and political events such as a more inclusive and accountable government; constitutional change, and the failure of the World Bank mandated structural adjustment programs (SAPs).

Chapter Nine: Synthesis and Conclusions

9.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings of my research. The complex linkages that exist between international and national policymaking and the impact of these linkages on project formulation and outcomes in Kenya are highlighted. It is important to note that the thesis chapters are necessarily linked and complementary and should not be viewed independently. The major focus of this final chapter is to highlight these linkages and make recommendations on how complex multilevel development processes can be modified for the mutual benefit of all actors. I place particular emphasis on how skewed power relations disadvantage local communities and identify the avenues available to them that could allow them to begin to redress their circumstances. The first section provides a summary of the findings of the four major objectives of this study outlined in chapter one. This is followed by a section on six emerging issues of multilevel forest governance in a globalized world which, in turn, is followed by summary of the major conclusions and recommendations of the study. The chapter concludes with a section on the theoretical contributions of the study and further research implications.

9.2 Summary of Study Objective Findings

9.2.1 Study Objective 1

The first objective was to determine the similarities, differences and contradictions of the normative goals of selected international environmental agreements with national policies and local community goals through comparative policy analyses, given the efforts aimed at harmonizing them. This objective is analyzed mainly in Chapters 5, 7 and 8. A major conclusion is that although the normative goals of

international environmental treaties such as Participatory Forest Management may seem to favour local community development, in reality the interests of major actors at international and national level have led to the retention of top-down approaches that hinder locals from attaining the promised opportunities. The resultant networks and coalitions, both horizontally and vertically, have been skewed towards a more protective regime for the forest commons while ignoring or downplaying sections of the international treaties geared towards access to the commons and indigenous and local rights to the natural resources. Strategies and beliefs largely shaped by predominant Western notions of pristine forest retention and informed by neoliberal economic beliefs are summarized and suggestions on how to begin countering these hegemonic tendencies are offered.

Forest use and conservation perceptions were largely similar throughout the study communities who valued them for livelihood provisions and wide recognition for a need to utilize forests sustainably in order to ensure their future wellbeing. The decades-long alienation of local communities from tangible forest management created a hurdle to reigniting a sense of ownership if successful partnerships were to be created in the new co-management regime. The slow but steady increase in the awareness of the potential benefits of engaging in PFM is likely to lead to greater demands for inclusion and intensified stresses on an already limited forest resource base. The solutions reside in strategies that prioritize the community over the individual instead of the predominant business oriented goals currently promoted in most ICDPs.

Kenya forest governance requires flexible hybridized systems of management between the state and local institutions. The framework law should be viewed as initially intended – a continuous adaptable and flexible process of learning and experimentation – and not as the initial implementation process that has tended to promote former state hegemonic control over the forest resource. Policies that attempt to promote complete protection of the highly threatened forest resources have already failed due to the highly

dependency levels of adjacent populations to the resource. The renewed top-heavy control of the new participatory regime negates both the resources that have gone towards its making as well as the potential for working partnerships that it promises. Initially, a few well-defined property rights can provide crucial lamposts towards the path of increasingly collaborative relationships between the state and local management institutions that might eventually not be CFAs as currently defined. This is because the boundaries of stakeholder communities at the local level, as currently defined within the CFA mechanism, remain open to interpretation and is likely to result in conflict in determining access to forest resources. At the commencement of the co-management process less destructive forest uses such as collection of medicinal plant, water and firewood from fallen trees and branches can be allowed. After improved linkages between local community institutions and boundary organizations (particularly locally-based ones such as FAN and the fledgling CFA national body) it is highly likely that improved knowledge will lead to harvesting of particular tree species for wood-curving trades or particular batches of forest for actual timber harvest for both the community use or for small-scale business engagement in timber trade. This should be foreseen and planned for within long-term policies lasting over two or three decades. I conclude that without the progressive growth of rights both in forest knowledge and property rights, that the path towards irreversible forest ecosystem destruction is unavoidable in the next two decades. A much bolder vision that foresees the engagement of local community institutions in actual silvicultural practice within well-defined areas of operation must form part of the long-term strategy of forest governance in Kenya.

Property rights attributes are the most problematic issue in forest governance in Kenya. There is a serious lack of clarity concerning ownership of the resource both within the new participatory dispensation as well as the growing emphasis on cross-scale management propagated by the ratification of international conventions such as the CBD and UNFCCC. The complexity magnified further by the growing importance of ICDPs within the development process which gives undefined powers and roles in

decision-making to INGOs and bi-lateral and multi-lateral organizations in the governance of forest resources. These jurisdictional problems are predominantly a product of overly ambitious "big" global visions that create new rights over local resources for global interests. The globalization of conservation tends to ignore national and local level resource deficiencies and the necessary adaptations to local development factors that are vital in ensuring that equitable rights of users at the local level are respected, maintained or returned.

9.2.2 Study Objective 2

The second objective, to determine the adaptability, resilience and learning capacities of local communities which lead to differences between the normative project goals and actual outcomes, was tackled mainly in Chapters 4 and 6. A major finding of the study was that local communities had inherent capacities to assimilate new development ideas but they had little space to adapt the ideas to their local needs because higher level interests tended to be less adaptable and flexible to the possibility of a more dynamic management of the forest commons. Major needs of local communities such as reduced human-wildlife conflicts, or improved domestic water access, were largely unaccounted for by the ICDPs and consequently the inherent capacities of the communities to assimilate the ideas were a secondary factor to the success of the externally-conceived development strategies. A major need for local communities is for external projects to deliberately target improvements towards community institutional resiliency and management capacity of the commons as highlighted by the example of harambee collectives in Kenya (see Chapter 6).

Resilience thinking helps me, the researcher, to look beyond the static analysis of social systems and ecological systems, and to ask questions regarding the adaptive capacity of societies and their institutions (Berkes & Folke 1998). Moreover, coalitions in a sector require perturbations for change to occur

(Trosper 2003; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1999). In this regard resiliency of policy and governance systems determines, both negatively and positively, the outcomes of forest area management practice in Kenya. Top-down regimes of management have acquired a resiliency that could only be altered significantly by internationally propagated, paradigm-shifting beliefs promoting local participation. Nevertheless the perturbations in Kenya forest governance have so far not been strong enough to fundamentally alter the protection paradigm.

Despite many seemingly community-friendly normative goals of internationally-informed commons management policies, the local outcomes were largely unsatisfactory. I have concluded that it is during the implementation process of major policy change that power imbalances among actors are most open to manipulation in arenas of negotiation. I recommend that local communities be fully integrated into the interpretation of framework laws and overall development strategies for their specific zones. This involvement should include the integration of important development mechanisms such as ICDPs within the overall local development agenda.

9.2.3 Study Objective 3

The third objective was to assess how the scalar and temporal factors of the projects impact on human needs and conservation goals given the highly threatened state of the forest ecological resources on the one hand, and community livelihood patterns on the other, in order to determine the sustainability of the projects. This was examined mainly in Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7. The global movement of resources and emergent influential networks in ICDP implementation largely determined the goals of projects to the detriment of local populations. The need for a greater devolution of decision-making powers to regional state authorities is highlighted in Chapter 7 as an important step in the process of enabling more participatory co-management of the forest commons. An important conclusion is that ICDPs should be

recognized as important development drivers and consequently strategically located within the overall development structure. I recommend that major national development resources should be allocated towards them with significant components aimed at ameliorating the livelihoods of the large populations of marginalized populations who live in areas bordering the commons. The project resources available from external sources were miniscule in comparison to the target populations and areas. Thus, I recommend that the kinds of smaller ICDPs formulated and implemented in these cases should be deliberately framed as vessels for learning and experimentation with a much longer time views linked to other regional and national projects in order to begin to build up knowledge for locating ICDPs in the larger development enterprise.

Middle level state managers occupy a crucial node in the new collaborative regime of forest management in Kenya. Greater devolved decision-making authority than they have been granted by the head office so far, could create much needed connections and trust-building with local institutions that would lead to better suited local management decisions. The new framework is open to interpretation (as defined by subsidiary legislation) but still recognizes the primacy state in forest management. The early consequences of the skewed power relations are exemplified by the inability of resource-poor CFAs to cover growing negotiating costs with the KFS that would enable them to acquire more tangible forest user rights. Delegating significant decision-making powers to provincial or conservancy level state managers (for example granting them discretion in determining the location and size of forest zones allocated to CFAS), will reduce the transaction costs on both sides and lead to growing trust, greater efficiency and more locally-nuanced management decisions.

Although access to markets for forest products will be important in developing sustainable forest practices in forest-adjacent zones, such marketing opportunities should always be referenced in relation to their impact on the larger local community to promote complementarity with cultural and social characteristics

and encourage wider acceptance. Programs could be designed to ensure that percentages of individual earnings are channeled towards a community budget that can support wider community development projects suited to local requirements. This could help to appease a great majority who may never directly benefit resource-wise from the forest.

9.2.4 Study Objective 4

The fourth objective was to determine the effects of network and institutional interactions on both the harmonization of international environmental agreements, national policies and local community goals, and on the differences in local community project outcomes. These were analyzed mainly in Chapters 5 and 8. The main conclusion was that influential global networks and coalitions lead to the convergence of development and conservation policies and strategies worldwide. This tendency for convergence was evident by the uniform strategies and goals of projects conceived or supported by the major global and development bodies in Kenya. I recommend innovative re-thinking of project strategies that deliberately break from dominant metaphors of human-environmental interactions that include the maintenance and protection of unchanged ecosystems and the neoliberal approach to socio-economic development. Instead there should be a shift towards a new rural agenda that expressly recognizes the centrality of a shared commons and the need for more equitable strategies for the distribution of the resources in local community development. The need for redistributive policies that give relevance to local cultural practices and lead to greater equity for the contending actors will be crucial to a more sustainable commons management.

The mass mobilization of social movements including NGOs, CBOs and world events (i.e. shift to democratization and decentralization) as well as economic factors that have diminished government resources, moved a hitherto reluctant Kenyan government to enact a new law that introduced participatory

forest management. Long-existing and enduring interdependencies both within and outside governments – including private business – have nevertheless proven to be major hurdles in the implementation process that aims to tangibly improve the livelihoods of forest-adjacent communities.

Globalization has led to the evolution of the concept of community in determining the ownership of the forest commons. The contestation of commons ownership and the consequent impact on management responsibilities and access to its resources at multiple levels has not been matched by either the policies nor the strategies employed at local levels to a degree that ensures greater equity to forest-adjacent communities. Thus, more sustainable forest management outcomes are dependent on examining the impacts of these external forces (that often require measures to counter interests that do not conform to the local ones). I recommend that local community groups forge networks and coalitions with international organizations whose beliefs are more aligned with theirs in terms of protecting local and indigenous rights to the commons and support for strong community approaches to commons managements as the best path towards more sustainable forest management.

The strong collaboration between United Nations agencies and INGOs such as WWF and IUCN and private multinational concerns should disavow them from mostly self-appointed roles of intermediaries between the state and local communities in the governance of the commons. This is because neoliberal and forest protection agendas have merged at the global level and impacted the design of ICDPs while ignoring local level conditions and needs. The intermediary or boundary role coveted by the INGOs requires a much greater modicum of neutrality that is unlikely to be cultivated at the global nodes of interest. Potentially beneficial paradigms such as participatory forest management and indigenous rights to the commons may feature support at all multilevel points of interest, but in this study I concluded that the best intermediaries or boundary organizations are nationally based NGOs with strong research credentials and conducive organizational mandates and aims. In Kenya the Forest Action Network (FAN) and Nature Kenya were identified as potential intermediary organizations of this kind.

9.3 Emerging Issues of Multilevel Forest Governance

In this section I summarize my findings in six major themes that connect my research objectives. I discuss the prevailing scenarios in Kenya and recommend possible alternative opportunities and scenarios that might help to reform, reorganize or even transform development practice in Kenya and beyond. The prevailing and proposed scenarios are summarized in Figure 9.1.

9.3.1 Locating the Forest Commons in the Development Process

The diminishing forest area of Kenya presents a grave danger to the development prospects of the country as a whole. During the five decades following independence in 1963 forest governance was dominated by largely unsuccessful state-led policy initiatives. Natural forest decline persisted even in the face of a complete ban on forest harvesting activities. Various attempts at identifying the causes and responsibilities of the actors resulted in horizontal and vertical scalar conflicts among the many contending interests. Forums and opportunities for negotiations among various interest groups about the place of forest in the Kenya's development process have proven highly problematic and controversial. The centralized management of forests has continued to be the pillar of forest governance and has proven impervious to reform despite various changing development and conservation philosophies globally and nationally.



Source: research data

Figure 9-1 Summary of prevailing and proposed project scenarios

This study identified several important issues that hinder progress towards more equitable and sustainable forest governance in Kenya. One major issue was the failure to properly define the boundaries of forest policy management and debate in Kenya and consequent division of user rights at various levels of interest. The country's closed canopy forests harbour only a minority of the woody biomass; woodlands, and wooded grasslands together constitute a higher total volume of woody biomass, due to their vast extent. Furthermore, selected studies and anecdotal evidence suggest that closed canopy forests are only a minor contributor of fuelwood at the national level (WRI 2007). More sustainable governance systems require a better recognition of where the borderlines of the forest resource lie. One of my major findings was that the path to a more resilient management and ecosystem is significantly linked to redefinition of what constitutes the forest resource and the eventual inclusion of the "missing forest". This remains a critical omission within the arenas of debate on forest policymaking.

The metaphor of the missing forest can be extended to describe Kenya's development policy and economy. The uniqueness of the forest resource incorporating ecological and livelihood values sets it apart from other sectors of the economy and necessitates negotiated flexible policies in order to integrate it into overall development planning strategies. Chapters 5 and 8 showed that the policy development process is strongly influenced by both international trends and the dominant neoliberal economic paradigm. Efforts towards localizing the policies were extremely difficult because decision-making powers were skewed towards external decision-makers who have largely favoured and been influenced by dominant environmental and development ideas in external arenas of policymaking. The situation is exacerbated by forest policy described in neoliberal terms within the overall development process in Kenya. Relatively limited efforts at localization have expended (for example, at the Kayas along the coast) to recognize unique cultural aspects in forest management despite the important of the social component among forest-adjacent communities. In a majority of cases there has been a sustained historical exclusion of forest-adjacent communities from forest resources that has played a role in their

diminished knowledge of forest management practice and provided an excuse for state authorities to minimize their involvement in co-management—a position contrary to a new participation paradigm. But community exclusion neglects the long culturally shared interests of forest-adjacent communities with shared interests and goals in ensuring the wellbeing of the forest for their own developmental purposes. I recommend more tangible involvement of local communities in forest management particularly integrating them into redistributive policies to ensure greater equity in forest governance. Redistribution may seem to directly contradict dominant neoliberal strategies but this need not necessarily be so. The possibility of merging these two strategies was discussed in Chapter 6. I showed that profit-making is part of the cultural and development paradigms of many Kenyan communities. It is precisely such redistributive strategies that could begin to shift the prevailing, seemingly irreversible, forest destruction in most forest-adjacent areas.

Neoliberalism is strongly related to ideas of technocentrist environmentalism (O'Riordan 1981). Adams (1995) suggested that technocentrist environmentalism involved technocratic management, regulation and 'rational' utilization of the environment. Technocentrist approaches are inherently reformist and advocate for improved and more 'rational' planning. *Our Common Future* (WECD 1987) espouses these very themes of efficiency, multilateralism, and environmentally sustainable growth within a Keynesian-managed world economy (Adams 1995). These themes are consistent with existing economic paradigms of the industrialized North. It is unsurprising that these ideas of rational thinking have strongly influenced the management of the commons in Kenya while failing to take into account the vastly different historical, social and cultural circumstances that shaped the country's development process. The result is enforced adoption or encouragement for often unsustainable business-oriented solutions to forest governance witnessed in Kenya. Moreover the notion pushed by international agreements and development bodies based in these countries—that these countries must now preserve these forests for

posterity—raises pertinent issues of justice and equity for forest-dependent countries and national development.

The influence of globalization on conservation has led to the incorporation of the new cultural and political ecologies of decentralization but its aims and local impacts have not been negotiated and are consequently ill-defined in the overall development strategy of Kenya. This is illustrated by the extreme difficulty of identifying criteria for common points of interest between the forest commons and other sectors of national development in resource-dependent countries like Kenya. For example, the political choice for integrating national development aspirations with those of local communities – ICDPS – has not been accompanied by necessary legal and technical definition of the term in order to fit it within the overall development strategy despite its central place in the management of economically vital forest commons. This is identified as a critical omission in a largely land-scarce and agricultural-led development country like Kenya that must be rectified for better balance between the country's economic and ecological needs.

Zimmerer (2006) introduced the concept of 'unintended consequences' in describing a frequent outcome of the efforts to address the combination of conservation and development goals. He suggested that the notion of 'spaces of hope' identifies new spatialities that can lead to benefits for a broad base of local people, especially the currently less powerful, as well as the potential to help sustain the health of environments. These spatialities can be conceptually viewed to extend further to the networks of environmental scientists, activists and 'global citizens' that actively engage via the consumption and production of ideas, information and opinions with spatially extensive (frequently global) policy and political organizations (Zimmerer 2006). In the Kenyan situation, I found the notion of 'spaces of hope' to be overly optimistic since the multi-scalar nature of governance has led to a coalition of like-minded stakeholders at higher levels that has managed to retain that largely protective regime in Kenya's forest

governance, largely in opposition to the needs of local communities. At the moment ICDPs are exacerbating or creating new inequalities particularly in regard to issues of gender and class. There is need to begin to effect change at the local level and spread it both vertically and horizontally in reverse of current project practice.

I also recommend a proper legal definition of ICDP that locates it squarely within the unfolding phenomenon of new conservation geographies and the overall development process. Thus far, forestadjacent communities are paying a much greater disproportionate price than higher level actors by the continued denial to any significant forest user rights within prevailing governance structures. The direct allocation of state and multilateral resources to ICDP practice within the development budget will be necessary when considering the ICDP as an integral mechanism for propagating a more just development to the large population of forest-adjacent communities in Kenya.

9.3.2 Mapping the Forest Governance Community

Mapping the community in order to allocate forest user rights – within and between asymmetrical power relations at local, national and international levels – is one of the most complex but necessary steps towards a more equitable management of the commons. A first step in such mapping is to recognize the concept of communities in place in forest-adjacent zones; governance interests are not located at one level but spread unequally along vertical and horizontal zones of ownership. Comprehensive community mapping should include the processes, partnerships and networks that structure the interactions among and between the actors and consequently shape the outcomes of the governance the forest commons. The consequences of failing to properly map out communities were highlighted in Chapter 7. The 5-kilometre forest-adjacent zone utilized as the limit of community inclusion is not a legally mandated category and is

bound to be a major source of major future controversy as knowledge and potential benefits of the new PFM regime become more widespread.

Both the state and other levels of implementers of ICDPs routinely utilize the 5-kilometre zone of inclusion as a basis for their operations in PFM and ICDP implementation. My research led me to conclude that these activities are unlikely to be successful unless a clear community-wide and consequently region-wide and nation -wide category is negotiated and legislated. The 5-kilometre zone categorization is not intrinsically wrong but its exclusive implications requires that it comprehensively be negotiated through a process that takes into account both the needs of the immediate beneficiaries and those who are not directly involved in management but are significantly impacted nevertheless. For example, forests have an important provision to both the region and national needs in fuel and timber production that are outside the immediate 5-km zone. How these linkages are developed will determine the direction and the success of PFM within the national development strategy.

I found all forest-adjacent communities to be highly disadvantaged in their interactions with state institutions in the PFM process because the important factors of community size, composition, norms and resource dependence had not been defined and yet contractual negotiations for local forest management between the state and the CFAs were already underway. This was a highly premature exercise in most of these areas since only small minorities of mostly not very well informed community members were involved and the potential for future legal challenges of any agreements is real since a majority of the potential beneficiaries are either unaware of the process or are practically unable to contribute to the process due to technical, financial and time limitations. For example, an overwhelming majority of the local population in Mt. Elgon was unaware of the new governance paradigm. This knowledge gap was further exacerbated by communal conflicts between different ethnic groups unwilling to cooperate in the process. Political solutions aimed at improving ethnic relations will be part of the solutions towards a

more harmonious forest governance system in the area. In comparison, Kakamega – the other western Kenya research community – has far more sophisticated local community institutions targeted at forest management. These institutional arrangements have evolved from over three decades of realization that the ecosystem is highly threatened given the high local demands placed on the resource. The mere preponderance of external actors with vested interests in the preservation of what has been categorized as a threatened, biodiversity rich and easternmost tropical forest habitat has served to influence the creation and mandates of many of these local institutions.

The two western Kenya cases nevertheless pale in comparison to the much more intensive multilevel interactions that have occurred along the coast at the two cases of Arabuko-Sokoke and Shimba Hills. In essence, international interests have acquired greater ownership rights to the forests than the local communities with resultant stricter protective measures in these areas after the categorization of the forests as global biodiversity hotspots. But differences between the coastal cases were still identifiable. For example community activism was more intensive at Arabuko-Sokoke because the compact nature of Arabuko-Sokoke in comparison to the larger and more diverse Shimba Hills ecosystem served to galvanize the communities around Arabuko-Sokoke into demanding greater forest user rights.

9.3.3 The Place of Local Community Institutions in Co-management of the Forest Commons

The universal disenchantment with pre-PFM forest policies in all the case study communities was attributed by community respondents predominantly to the minimal or total denial of access to forest resources. But a growing disenchantment with the new participatory regime, even at the early stages, did not portend well for its future effectiveness. The major cause for the problems encountered at local levels during the early implementation process was the tendency for internationally-derived normative goals of community participation to be superseded by the often hidden objectives of higher level actors. For

example, state and international conservation and development institutions colluded to ensure a largely protective regime remained in place in order to protect their specific interests to the detriment of the local populations. Furthermore, interpretation of the participatory forest management framework law led to the creation of more management layers in the national forest management agency that ostensibly should have improved state-local partnerships but this served only to further propagate top-down management practices.

Complex resource systems link ecological components and social components such as economic systems, institutions and organizations (Gunderson 2003). Social systems are comprised of three types of structures (signification, domination, and legitimation) that enable power and resources distributions, patterns of authority, in addition to norms, rules, routines and procedures (Giddens, 1987). In this study, I identified the efficacy of institutions at the local level as a necessary component in enabling more just, multilevel governance of the commons in Kenya. Institutions are defined in this case as the set of norms and rules that people use to organize activities (Ostrom 1990). The harambee collectives in Kenya (see Chapter 6) provided an important example of local institutions and organizations shaped by longstanding norms, culture and practice. Their centrality to sustainable community development projects was aptly demonstrated. Important institutional characteristics incorporate properties of resilience and renewal. Resilience provides complex systems with the ability to persist in the face of shocks and disturbances. Berkes & Folke (1998) listed sources of organizational resilience as follows: cultural capital, traditional knowledge, and common property systems that work in tandem as a mechanism to link people to their environment. The failure to develop a coherent strategy to connect them to the wider development project, particularly in the arena of commons governance, reveals a prevailing reluctance by external actors to acknowledge and utilize positive local community institutions. Harambee collectives exemplify the necessary linkages and connectivities across time at local community level that are crucial for

navigating uncertain transition periods that encompass significant policy and governance changes by providing necessary social resilience in managing complex resource systems such as the forest commons.

An important property of social systems in response to uncertainty is innovation. This was well-illustrated in Kakamega where a youth group identified improved farming techniques and non-local crops as an avenue to improved income soon after intensified restrictive state policies further diminished access to forest resources. The ICIPE commercial insect project reviewed in this study promoted novelty particularly through its sericulture and improved beekeeping techniques and components in order to counter threats to the forest. Nevertheless success for such novelties introduced by external projects is highly dependent on community-wide acceptance both individually or communally in recognition of a higher social wellbeing dependent on the outcome of the project. I concluded that the scale and source of novelty is vital in shaping the outcomes of development initiatives. Butterfly-farming was more widely accepted than sericulture because its introduction occurred gradually over a longer time period which enabled community assimilation and the creation of strong productive linkages and connections within the larger community development enterprise and external markets. Moreover, this previously alien enterprise was more developed in some areas of Kakamega than the Arabuko-Sokoke because the participating groups felt a greater sense of ownership for the innovation although they had largely imitated their coastal counterparts. On the other hand, the butterfly-farming innovation was predominantly externally-initiated and managed for the entire duration of its existence at Arabuko-Sokoke. These findings demonstrated that collectives and communities in general tend to better assimilate innovative ideas introduced by their own members rather than external agencies. Thus, I recommend the promotion of intensified networking among forest-adjacent groups as an important step towards inculcating a sense of ownership and spread of necessary innovative and sustainable development enterprises in areas bordering the commons.

Fabricius et al (2007) identified three broad categories of adaptive communities. First, "powerless spectator" communities that have a low adaptive capacity and weak capacity to govern, lack financial, technological options, and lack natural resources, skills, institutions, and networks. Second, "coping actor" communities that can adapt but are unable to manage social-ecological systems. They lack the capacity for governance because they lack leadership, vision, and motivation, and exhibit reliance on typically short term responses. Third, "adaptive manager" communities have both adaptive capacity and governance capacity to sustain and internalize this adaptation. They invest in the long-term management of ecosystem services. Such communities are not only aware of the threats, but also take appropriate action for long-term sustainability. My research findings did not fit this kind of rigid categorization. The highly contested nature of the forest resource in Kenya and the prevailing danger to its very existence has heightened the awareness of the need for improved governance mechanisms at all stakeholder levels. The aforementioned characteristics were observed in all the communities to varying degrees. Nevertheless the communities, without exception, remained largely powerless in their attempts to effect meaningful change to prevailing skewed relationships with the state despite the enactment of a new co-management law. I attributed this inability to counter state forest management hegemony mainly to the disparate and disconnected efforts of the small local level community institutions of management and social organization. More collaborative efforts and linkages at the horizontal level within and between the various Community Forest Associations, forest user groups, and local level development cooperatives at regional and national levels will be critical in reversing the power imbalances observed during the early implementation process of new participatory policies and laws.

9.3.4 Knowledge, Power and Resource Flows

Questions of agency and power over existing natural resource governance regimes remain pertinent in developing countries like Kenya. Many experts recognize that governance occurs in a decentralized
manner, through interactions of loosely tied networks of multiple actors, states, functional state agencies, and non-state actors (Haas 2002). Environmental protection outcomes are not only influenced by practices and institutions rooted in the space of place, but are also embedded in the space of flows and in the global networks that 'govern' these flows (Mol and Van Den Berg 2004). The impact of these global networks and flows was illustrated in Kenya by the strategic manipulation of a disputed and broad definition of sustainability during the early stages of implementation of the new co-management paradigm of forest resources in Kenya. This critical transition period provided evidence that more resource endowed and powerful state and international actors willfully perpetuated structural regimes and programs that conflicted with the new policies that they appeared to support at face value.

The state no longer has a monopoly on knowledge and resources needed for sustainable forest management in Kenya. INGOs and NGOs such as IUCN, WWF, FAN, Nature Kenya and ICIPE harbour significant knowledge on the state of forest resources in Kenya. The Kenya Forest Service is highly dependent on these non-state institutions for technical and management resources. But these organizations harbour their own agendas and are consequently able to unduly influence forest governance programs at the state level. For example, organizations that promote extreme protectionist forest policies are likely to resist any local livelihood programs that portend even minimal forest ecosystem changes. Nevertheless non-state organizations played an important function in supporting resource-poor government agencies and local communities during the critical implementation stage that promised quicker stabilization during an uncertain time of policy change in Kenya. These non state resources were crucial during the interpretation stage of the framework law and any allocations should be deliberately aimed at supporting local level institutions to counter the skewed power relations in arenas of debate and negotiations. I showed that many external organizations covertly preferred restrictive forest policies that repelled any seeming intensive use. Local organizations should, thus actively seek out new external partnerships at global, national and local levels with parallel beliefs in indigenous and local rights to forest use and that

recognize that compromises and change in the forest ecosystem state are unavoidable factors in achieving a mutually beneficial outcome of conservation and social wellbeing. Local communities cannot depend on a majority of the current major external actors in achieving this aim.

The essence of sustainability can be more appropriately defined by metaphors of novelty, memory and instability rather than capitalistic notions of growth, equilibrium and stability (Adger et al 2003; Berkes, Colding & Folke 2003; Berkes & Folke 1998). Interpretations that utilize neoliberal ideas often lead to unsatisfactory results. This was exemplified by the Kenyan case where international and national level conservation institutions were unwilling to consider alternatives to market capitalism despite consistently unsatisfactory outcomes of ICDPs. Kenya could choose to view forest governance challenges simply as a need for refining the processes of engagement and negotiation within a transition management framework for its natural forests. However, this would mean that necessary fundamental re-conceptualizations of how structural change originates and proceeds, for example, via class-based or counter-hegemonic perspectives in political economy are ignored. The arena of forest management should continuously develop a capacity for positioning itself favourably within the shifting political process in order to mobilize support, influence agendas, and redirect investments and other commitments away from incremental repair work and toward more radical transition goals (Smith and Stirling 2010). The multilevel interactions observed in Kenya conformed largely to negotiated outcomes of power relations that reaffirmed hierarchies of institutions and actors. The key goal for local community groups and institutions is to extricate themselves from this position of disadvantage and to begin to shift the process to a more equal footing.

The second element in the political economy of how cross-scale interactions occur is the cost of knowledge since this is a key element in the calculus of power. Some transaction costs are related to interactions between regulators and resource users. In cases where these linkages involve contracts and

exchanges, transaction costs can be significant and can limit the positive outcomes (Falconer 2000). Available platforms for negotiations in Kenya – however nascent at present – offer avenues for resolving conflicts over resource allocation between local and more powerful state and international interests. But the perceived high transaction costs in setting up the necessary PFM contracts with the Kenya Forest Service was already a significant hurdle and a major source of frustration for a majority of CFAs. A negotiated and distinctive policy mechanism through the CFAs that allows for compensation for time and expert hire cannot be avoided early in the process. The proposed and fledgling national CFA association discussed in Chapter 8 should take the lead in this process and promote horizontal linkages that coalesce the disparate efforts of individual CFAs into a more powerful voice on the national stage. This might enable them to bypass existing disadvantageous structures of multilevel interaction.

The establishment of minimum requirements of efficiency agreed upon by stakeholders is a necessary first step towards more equitable forest governance. This requires clear, quantifiable minimums of forest resource and use. And yet this required element remains surprisingly unarticulated within forest governance discourse in Kenya. This uncertainty has served the purpose of the competing actors at higher levels of governance to varying degrees. Greater clarity and access to forest condition data accessible to actors at all levels should be a major priority of the governance system. Rigid demands by some forest stakeholders for the retention of a perceived pristine forest are likely to be forcefully resisted by local communities and such inflexible stances are likely to further exacerbate forest destruction. Reasons for change for change can allow for flexible governance mechanisms and arenas of negotiation that adapt to the needs for change. Interpretations of the new co-management policies should recognize these requirements as a matter of urgency and devote required resources to set up such mechanisms of information exchange and negotiation. Moreover, emergent social networks that connect institutions and organizations across levels and scales should facilitate information flows, identify knowledge gaps, and create significant nodes of expertise for ecosystem management (Olsson et al 2006).

9.3.5 Re-envisioning Local Development Strategies within ICDPs

The findings of my study were in agreement with others that have shown that, to enable local participatory forest management, the Kenyan government should transfer tangible decision-making powers to local authorities and other local decision-makers (see for example Ribot 2002). The highly contested and threatened forest ecosystem in Kenya requires a strategy that provides local users the opportunity to make and enforce rules within a defined scope of authority for a specified geographical area. Folke et al (2003) termed this arrangement "framed creativity". Such a strategy is appropriate in the short-term (about a decade) since the differences at community level require more time to be resolved in order to take account of local factors such as gender and class differences that may impact on access for individual community members.

Adaptive co-management usually emerges from existing resource management systems (McCay 2002). But in the Kenyan situation, apart from the rare but still small scale Kaya system of management along the Kenyan coastline, local management systems have in most cases disappeared as the hegemonic topdown system of management gradually and systematically eliminated all forms local forest management. Nevertheless, systems of development and social organization can be clearly discerned from the harambee collectives (see Chapter 6). Necessary conditions that support communal local cultural and social development characteristics should be created to facilitate the emergence or re-emergence of adaptive comanagement in Kenya forest governance. The strong cross-scale dynamics of adaptive comanagement will necessarily be reflected in these conditions that will define the role of key individuals and trustbuilding throughout the process as proposed by Olsson et al (2006). This includes support that enables local ecosystem management and concerns the flow of information and knowledge. The initial widespread attempts to involve local resource users in monitoring through joint patrols that were observed in this study could encourage improved knowledge of local ecosystem dynamics and improve local

capacity for managing their particularly unique forest ecosystems. This would counter the tendency of the state to implement uniform management strategies in all forest areas simply because it lacks the resources to design the needed place-specific management practices.

In my research, I found there was sufficient knowledge among the communities regarding the need for forest preservation; this contradicts the common assumption that a broader knowledge of environmental issues would automatically lead to higher conservation priorities for the local communities (Olsson et al 2004). The strategy of granting communities the crumbs of conservation practice in the form of small groups targeted for alternative livelihoods has failed. Greater focus should be placed on actual needs of the local communities instead. For example, despite the best efforts of the project planners, the demand for basic needs - particularly through farming - and overall social and cultural needs superseded the Western notion of conservation for forest-adjacent communities. Forest communities are highly dependent on the forests for their daily livelihoods. Farming is the major livelihood activity in all areas and strategies that ignore it are unlikely to succeed in forest-adjacent areas. A major goal of ICDPs and other similar strategies should be clearly linked to local farming practices and requirements. The critical connections between local needs with conservation requirements means that the widespread default template of ICDPs (that prioritizes conservation above local community basic needs) is unlikely to succeed. My recommendation is that all ICDPs give local livelihood requirements at least as much weight as conservation needs during project conceptualization and implementation. The alternative school must refocus on or reemphasize agricultural improvements if success in forest governance is to be achieved. This can begin to reverse the rigid practice of working in reverse whereby project borderlines are defined by conservation needs while local development needs are fitted into an already rigid structure to the maximum allowable capacity.

9.3.6 Global Networks and Local Policy Transformation

The existing and emergent policy networks in Kenya are unlikely to result in sustainable and equitable transformations in the forestry sector. Transformations that lead to adaptive governance are characteristically accompanied by efforts toward facilitation of information flows, identification of the necessary information and the creation of nodes of expertise for ecosystem management to be consulted at crucial times (Olsson et al 2006). These conditions have not yet emerged in Kenya. My study found that it is within such networks that the dominance of the state and international organizations in policymaking can be loosened in order to benefit from the renewing and enriching impact of external resources. These is because members of such networks are under reduced scrutiny from their agencies or constituencies, and thus are freer to develop alternative policies, learn from each other, and think creatively about how to resolve resource problems (Olsson et al 2006).

Although the small size of the ICDPs and pilot policy studies I examined may appear insignificant in comparison to the paradigm-shifting intentions of new forest policies, they should not be dismissed because they offer important vessels for learning and insights which often require decades for the full effects to emerge. The uniqueness of the Kenyan situation is that the resource is highly threatened and yet this has not led to rapid change or acceptance of alternatives modes of management. I found that forest management discourse and governance was unduly influenced by powerful networks consisting of organizations like WWF and IUCN that in practice served to create additional layers of bureaucracy that served to further alienate local community priorities in forest-adjacent zones. The continued preference for top-down forest management at state level has created an alliance of convenience that propagates a protective agenda in forest governance often in direct opposition to local community needs. My research showed that despite the importation of potentially useful development resources, global-level involvement in project design and management often disrupted local level adaptive capacities through the support of

restrictive rules and boundaries of operation. External actors often failed to recognize the local community assimilative and adaptive capacities because they underappreciated the effects of unique local development factors. External interventions made "big" development assumptions on what was good for local development. For example, they promoted neoliberal informed projects and individual-propelled mechanisms – as opposed to "small" community-oriented strategies – as major vessels for alleviating specific area management conflicts.

Olsson et al (2004) argued that knowledge and associated management practices of local resource users and communities require social networks and an institutional framework to be effective. This study found that the state and local institutions had long and resilient institutional capacities in a complex mix of advantages and disadvantages in the process of implementing collaborative management strategies. Dependence on the attributes of one side is likely to result in the failure of collaborative management efforts. Recognition that the higher scales of interest also operate in a political sphere, often shielded in a veneer of 'science' that hides particular ideologies, can help to devise local level adaptive strategies that counter such hidden external agendas.

Opportunities that could most benefit local communities in relation to international treaties and policies have surprisingly been underexplored. This study attributed the failure to properly utilize these potential benefits to the weakly developed global - to - local networks of actors who believe in more equitable utilization of the commons. For example, articles that support the transfer of benefits to communities from the Convention on Biological Diversity would require linkages with international organizations that espouse similar beliefs and are willing to support their implementation in practical ways. But this has not occurred and instead project ideas have been dominated by a few hegemonic organizations that support the environmental and economic status quo (see Chapters 5, 7 and 8). An active political approach that strives to create new networks with more like-minded organizations in the global-national-local level

spectrum is necessary in order to better take advantage of supportive international treaties and policies that benefit local communities.

The coastal regions institutional linkages and coalitions were more structured and complex than their counterparts in the western region. These more complex and intensified institutional networks at the coast were the result of a global level perception of a highly threatened forest resource categorized as a global biodiversity hotspot of the coastal forests. This in essence gave rise to communities of place – stakeholders who have staked a claim in the resource through processes of globalization that have redefine the ownership of the forest resource. The emergent vertical and horizontal institutional networks led to asymmetrical power balances that disadvantaged local communities in forest governance.

9.4 Study Contributions to Knowledge and Further Research Implications

Management strategies, philosophies, and methodologies of commons management in Kenya have been rapidly impacted by multiscalar factors in an era of globalization. This creates difficulties in determining the impacts of such factors on governance outcomes for areas such as forests bordered by resource-poor local communities. I attempted to contribute to a much needed body of knowledge through empirical research on multilevel co-management arrangements in the governance of the commons (Berkes 2002; Dietz et al 2003). My research focused particularly on the mechanisms that contribute to the alleviation of degradation of the commons by identifying mismatches in scale, and lack of attention to cross-scale linkages. I showed how local level institutions are in a constant state of interaction with external institutions and other factors, contrary to many studies that assume little or no external impact in local-level institutional analysis (e. g., Steins et al., 2000).

9.4.1 Contributions of my Research

I believe that my research specifically contributed to Kenyan development process in the following areas:

- The impacts of external institutions on local-level institutions and the impacts of cross-scale interactions, particularly by considering the historical and cultural contexts in tracing multilevel governance
- 2. The constantly evolving processes, networks, coalitions and partnerships that impact on the outcomes of governance and policymaking are unlikely to succeed if rigid management structures and policies continue to dominate the sector. A particularly important insight was the tendency to create networks dominated by existing actors dominated by prevailing internationally active conservation institutions instead of seeking to create advantageous networks with actors outside the prevailing governance spheres.
- 3. The kinds and scales of networks are crucial in enabling more equitable outcomes of strategies emanating from global level treaties and development initiatives. The strategy of my research to trace the financial and resource flows and the consequent emergent networks fills a gap in understanding how multilevel resource flows influence local development (Bebbington & Kothari (2006).
- 4. Complexity paradigms that emphasize notions of resiliency and flexibility, particularly in times of rapid change and uncertainty, offer normative notions that can be utilized to better understand the political ecology of socio-ecological systems such as forest areas. This study contributed to this larger theoretical enterprise by focusing on how global level factors impact on the resilience of adaptive co-management. The focus on resilience revealed the hidden political considerations that are often clothed in the language of 'science' in order to ensure that higher level interests are ranked higher than the needs of local communities in the management of socio-ecological

systems. My study confirmed others' findings regarding a need to shift toward the normative goal of enhancing the resilience of resource systems to allow for flexibility and perseverance of a socio-ecological system while providing resources and services to users (Carpenter et al. 2001).

5. Declining public resources in Kenya provided an opportunity to analyze how social capital offers an alternative pathway to sustainable community development. My research contributes to better understanding of social capital that has been hypothesized as a possible pillar of development policy (Bridger & Luloff 2001). I found national horizontal level organizations to be integral to local level development initiatives in cases where co-management strategies were utilized since they showed a tendency to build a social capital that impacted both the local and international level particularly in terms of trust. Furthermore, my research demonstrated the importance of utilizing local organizations as boundary organizations instead of INGOs that often assumed this role but often ended up promoting their own organizational agendas.

9.4.2 Further Research Implications

- The use of project case studies to examine the impact of global networks on development necessarily entailed a focus on financial flows rather on the specific institutional or individual beliefs. Limited research resources and time meant that potentially insightful interrogation of global level institutional beliefs and motivations could not be undertaken. Any future studies could aid in better understanding how these flows impact local level development.
- 2. I found evidence of attempts by international stakeholders to resist, rework and assume the spread of beliefs. But it was not always easy to determine the extent to which transnational flows of resources affected local development processes. It is possible that a comparative study of geographically similar cases influenced by transnational resources advocating radically different

beliefs may serve to better elucidate the impact on local level beliefs and consequently the outcomes of the projects.

- 3. Environmental factors like climate and soil types play an important role on the productivity of specific income-generating activities such as sericulture and apiculture. Enterprise production levels are integral to wider community acceptance and adoption of integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs). These more specific environmental impacts were outside the scope of this study. Comparative studies targeted at particular environmental factor impacts on project outcomes would serve to further identify opportunities to re-organize ICDPs for the benefit of all interested actors.
- 4. Dual social and entrepreneurial collectives like the harambee groups studied in this study deserve further analyses in order to identify transferable organizational advantages that make them successful. Such collective advantages could then be channeled towards meeting the conservation aspirations of ICDPs and improved environmental management in general.

References

- Adams, W.M. (1995). Green Development Theory? Environmentalism and sustainable development, In: Crush J (ed.) Power of Development, pp.87-99 Routledge, New York
- Adams, W. M., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliot, J., Hutton, J., Roe, D., Vira, B. &
 Wolmer, W. (2004). Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty. *Science*, 306(5699), 1146-1149.
- Adams, W.M. & Hulme, D. (2001). If community conservation is the answer in Africa, what is the question? *Oryx* 35(3), 193-200
- Adger W.N., Benjaminsen T.A., Brown K. & Svarstad H (2001). Advancing a political ecology of global environmental discourses, *Development and Change*, 32(xx), 681-715.
- Adger, W.N., Brown K., Fairbrass J., Jordan A., Paavola J., Rosendo S., and Seyfang G. (2003)
 Governance for Sustainability: towards a `thick' analysis of environmental decision-making, *Environment and Planning A*, 35(xx), 1095-1110.

Adger, W.N. (2006). Vulnerability, Global Environmental Change, 16(xx), 268–281.

- Agrawal, A. & Gibson, C.C. (1999). Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation, *World Development*, 27(4), 629-649.
- Agrawal, A. & Ostrom, E. (2001). Collective action, property rights, and decentralization in resource use in India and Nepal. *Politics & Society*, 29(4), 485-514.
- Agrawal, A. (2001). Common Property Institutions and Sustainable Governance of Resources, *World Development*, 29(10), 1649-1672.
- Agrawal, A. (2002) Common resources and institutional sustainability, In: Ostrom, E., Dietz, T., Dolsak,
 N., Stern, P.C., Stonich, S., Weber, E. (eds.), The Drama of the Commons, National Research
 Council, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change. National Academies Press,
 Washington, DC, 41–85

- Agrawal, A. (2005). Environmentality: technologies of government and the making of subjects, Duke University Press.
- Agrawal, A., & Ribot, J. C. (1999). Accountability in decentralization: a framework with South Asian and West African cases, *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 33(4), 473–502.
- Akama, J.S. (1996) Western environmental values and nature-based tourim in Kenya, Tourism Management 17(8): 567-574
- Akotsi, E.F.N., Gachanja, M. & Ndirangu, J.K. (2006). Changes in forest cover in Kenya's five "Water Towers" 2003-2005, Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing (DRSRS) and Kenya Forests Working Group C (KFWG) p.44
- Andersson, K. P. & Ostrom, E. (2008). Analyzing decentralized resource regimes from a polycentric perspective. *Policy Sciences*, 41(1), 71–93.
- Andersson, K. P., Gibson, C. C. & Lehoucq, F. (2006). Municipal politics and forest governance: comparative analysis of decentralization in Bolivia and Guatemala. *World Development*, 34(3), 576–595.
- Armitage, D., Berkes, F. & Doubleday, N. (eds.) (2007) Adaptive co-management: collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance, UBC Press Vancouver and Toronto Canada.
- Ashley, C. (2000). Applying livelihood approaches to natural resource management initiatives: experiences in Namibia and Kenya, Working Paper 134 Overseas Development Institute, London UK.
- Attwell, C.A.M. & Cotterill, F.P.D. (2000). Postmodernism and African conservation science, *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 9(xx), 559-577.
- Balint, P.J. & Mashinya, J. (2006). The Decline of a model community-based conservation project: governance, capacity, and devolution in Mahenye, Zimbabwe, *Geoforum*, 37(xx) 805–815.
- Balint, P.J. (2006). Improving community-based conservation near protected areas: The importance of development variables, *Environmental Management*, 38(1), 137-148.

- Balmford ,A., Moore, J. L., Brooks, T., Burgess, N., Hansen, L.A., Williams, P. & Rahbek, C. (2001). Conservation conflicts across Africa, *Science* 291, 2616-2619.
- Barkan, J.D & Holmquist, F. (1989). Peasant-state relations and the social base of self-help in Kenya, World Politics, 41(3), 359-380.
- Bebbington, A. & Kothari, U. (2006). Transnational development networks, *Environment and Planning* A, 38(5), 849-866.
- Bebbington, A. (2003). Global networks and local developments: Agendas for development geography, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geographie*, 94(3), 297-309.
- Behnke, R. & Scoones, I. (1993). Rethinking range ecology: implications for rangeland management in Africa: In: Behnke et al (eds). Range Ecology at disequilibrium, Overseas Development Institute, London
- Bennett, C.J. & Howlett, M. (1992). The lessons of learning: reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change, *Policy Sciences*, 25(3), 275-294.
- Berkes, F. & Folke, C. (eds) (1998). Linking social and ecological systems: Management practices and social mechanisms for building resilience, Cambridge University Press.
- Berkes, F. (2002). Cross-scale institutional linkages: Perspectives from the bottom up, In: Ostrom, E. et al. (eds.) *Drama of the commons*, Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press.

Berkes, F. (2007). Community-based conservation in a globalized world, PNAS, 104(39), 15188-15193.

- Berkes, F. (2009). Evolution of co-management: role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90(5), 1692–1702.
- Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C (eds.) (2003). Navigating social-ecological systems: Building resilience for complexity and change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, p393+xxi.
- Berkes, F.J. (1999). Are East African pastoralists truly conservationists? Comment, *Current Anthropology*, 40(62), 637-638.

- Biermann, F. (2007). Earth system governance as a crosscutting theme of global change research, *Global Environmental Change: Human and Policy Dimensions* 17: 326–337.
- Biggs, R. et al (2004). Nature supporting people, The Southern African Millennium Assessment,
 Integrated Report A contribution to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, Prepared by the
 Southern African Millennium Team, Pretoria: Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.
- Blaikie, P. & Brookfield, H. (1987). Land degradation and society, London.
- Blim, M. (2000). Capitalisms in late modernity, Annual Reviews Anthropology, 29, 25-38.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Johnston, J. & Pansky, D. (2006). Governance of protected areas, In: Lockwood, M., Worboys, G.L. and Kothari, A. (eds.) *Managing protected areas: A global guide*, IUCN, Earthscan, London UK and Sterling VA. Pp. 116-145.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Pimbert, M., Farvar, M. T., Kothari, A. & Renard Y., (2004). *Sharing power: Learning by doing in co-management of natural resources throughout the world*, Cenesta, Tehran: IIED and IUCN/ CEESP/ CMWG.
- Brandon, K., Redford, K.H. & Sanderson, S.E. (eds.) (1998). Parks in peril: People, politics, and protected areas, The Nature Conservancy, Island Press, Washington, D.C. and Covelo, California pp519+xv.
- Brechin, S.R. Wilshusen, P.R., Fortwangler, C.L. & West, P.C. (2002). Beyond the square wheel: toward a more comprehensive understanding of biodiversity conservation as social and political process, *Society and Natural Resources*, 15(1), 41- 64.
- Bridger, J.C. & Luloff, A. E. (2001). Building the sustainable community: Is social capital the answer? Sociological Inquiry, 71(4), 458-72.
- Brinkerhoff, J. M., (2002). Government-non-profit partnership: a defining framework. *Public Administration and Development*, 22(1) 19–30.
- Brugere, C. (2006). Can integrated coastal management solve agriculture-fisheries-aquaculture conflicts at the land-water interface? In C.T. Hoanh, T.P. Tuong, J.W. Gowing & B. Hardy (Eds.),

Environment and Livelihoods in Tropical Coastal Zones, (pp. 258–273). Oxon, UK: CAB International.

- Bruner, A.G., Gullison, E. & Balmford, A. (2004). Financial cost and shortfalls of managing and expanding protected-area systems in developing countries, *BioScience*, 54(12), 1119-1126.
- Byron, H. & Treweek, J. (2005). Guest editorial: Strategic environmental assessment great potential for biodiversity? *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*, 7(2), v-xiii.
- Caldecott, J. (1996). Designing conservation projects, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK and New York, NY pp312+xxii.
- Camberlin P. & Planchon, O. (1997) Coastal Precipitation Regimes in Kenya, *Geografiska Annaler*, Series A, Physical Geography, Vol. 79, No. 1/2, (1997), pp. 109- 119
- Campbell, L.M. & Vainio-Mattila, A. (2003) Participatory development and community-based conservation: opportunities missed for lessons learned? Human Ecology 31(3), 417-437
- Carlsson, L. & Berkes, F. (2005). Co-management: concepts and methodological implications, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 75, 65-76.
- Carney, D. (ed.) (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: What contribution can we make? Department of International Development, Nottingham: Russell Press Ltd.
- Carpenter, S.R., DeFries, F., .Dietz, T, Mooney, H.A., Polasky, S., Reid, W.V., & Scholes, R.J. (2006). Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Research Needs, *Science* 314, 257-258.
- Cash, D.W. & Moser, S.C (2000). Linking global and local scales: designing dynamic assessment and management processes, *Global Environmental Change* 10, 109-120.
- Cash, D.W., Adger, W.N., Berkes, F., Garden, P., Lebel, L., Olsson, P., Pritchard, L. & Young, O.
 (2006). Scale and Cross-Scale Dynamics: Governance and Information in a Multilevel World.
 Ecology and Society 11(2):8 [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/art8
- CBS (2006). Kenya facts and figures, Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), Ministry of Planning and National Development, Online at http://www.cbs.go.ke/downloads/pdf/kenyafacts2006.pdf

- CEPF (2009). CEPF Final Assessment Workshop for the Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya, 25th-26th February 2009, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, pp86
- CEPF (2009b). Community biodiversity conservation micro-grants in the Eastern Arc and coastal forests of Kenya and Tanzania – CEPF Final Project Completion Report: Kenya, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
- Clement, F. (2010). Analyzing decentralized natural resource governance: proposition for a "politicized" institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Sciences*, 43(2) 129-156.
- Coleman, W.D. & Perl A. (1999). Internationalized Policy Environments and Policy Network Analysis, Political Studies, XLVII, 691-709
- Colfer, C. J. P. & Capistrano, D. (Eds.) (2005). The politics of decentralization: Forests, power and people, Bogor Indonesia: Center for International Forestry Research & London: Earthscan.
- Convention on Biological Diversity (2000). Decision V/6: The Ecosystem Approach CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Canada.
- Craig, D. & Porter, D. (2006). Development beyond neoliberalism? Governance, poverty reduction and political economy, Routledge, New York, NY 340pp.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Crofts, R. (2004). Linking protected areas to the wider world: A review of approaches, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 6(2), 143-156.
- Cruz, W. & Repetto, R. (1992). *The environmental effects of stabilization and structural programs: The Philippines case*, Washington DC: World Resources Institute.
- Daniels, R. & Bassett, T.J. (2002). The spaces of conservation and development around Lake Nakuru National Park, Kenya, *The Professional Geographer* 54(4), 481-490.

- De Haan, L. & Zoomers, A. (2003). Development geography at the crossroads of livelihood and globalization, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 94(3), 350-362.
- Dearden, P., Bennett, M. & Johnston, J. (2005). Trends in global protected area governance, 1992-2002, *Environmental Management*, 36(1), 89-100.
- DFID (2001). Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets, Department for International Development, London, UK.
- Dietz, T., Ostrom, E. & Stern, P.C. (2003). The struggle to govern the commons, *Science*, 302(5652), 1907-1912.
- Dobbin, F., Simmons, B., & Garrett, G. (2007). The global diffusion of public policies: Social construction, coercion, competition, or learning? *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 2007. 33, 449-472.
- Dobuzinskis, L. (1992). Modernist and postmodernist metaphors of the policy process: Control and stability vs. chaos and reflexive understanding, *Policy Sciences*, 25(4), 355-380.
- Doherty, T. L. & Horne, T. (2002). Managing public services: Implementing changes A thoughtful approach to the practice of management, London & New York: Routledge.

Easton, D. (1965). A Systems analysis of political life, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

- Edwards, V.M. & Steins, N.A. (1999). A Framework for analyzing contextual factors in common pool resource research, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 1(xx), 205-221.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research, *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Emerton, L. (1992). Summary of findings on forest utilisation in Kakamega Forest, Kenya Indigenous Forest Conservation Programme, Forest Dept., Nairobi.
- Emerton, L. Karanja, F. & Gichere, S. (2001). Environment, poverty and economic growth in Kenya: What are the links, and why do they matter? IUCN - The World Conservation Union, Eastern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi 8pp

- Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering development: The Making and unmaking of the Third World, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar, A. (2000) Beyond the Search for a Paradigm? Post-Development and Beyond. *Development* 43(4), 11-14.
- ETC (2006). Kenya Country Environment Profile Final Report, EU Kenya Country Environmental Profile - to inform the EU Country Strategy Paper – *Final report – April 2006*, ETC East Africa Ltd., Nairobi, Kenya
- Fabricius, C., Folke, C., Cundill, G. & Schultz, L. (2007). Powerless spectators, coping actors, and adaptive co-managers: a synthesis of the role of communities in ecosystem management, *Ecology* and Society 12(1):29.
- Fabricius, C., Koch, E., Turner, S. & Magome, H., (Eds.) (2004). Rights, resources and rural development: Community-based natural resource management in Southern Africa. London: Earthscan.
- Falconer, K. (2000). Farm level constraints on agri-environmental scheme participation: a transactional perspective, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16(3), 379-394
- FAN (2006). Report on EMPAFORM Baseline Survey Kenya 23rd April to 9th May 2006, Forest Action Network, EMPAFORM Programme, Nairobi Kenya
- FAO (2003). The Forest Revenue System and Government Expenditure on Forestry in Kenya A paper prepared for the FAO work - Programme component on financing sustainable forest management working paper: FSFM/WP/11Forestry Policy and Planning Division, Rome Regional Office for Africa, Accra. Rome Italy
- Fischer, A., Petersen, L., Feldkotter C. & Huppert, W. (2007). Sustainable Governance of Natural Resources and Institutional Change–An Analytical Framework, *Public Administration and Development* 27: 123–137

- Fischer, F. Miller, G.J & Sidney, M.S (eds.) (2007). Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods, CRC Press
- Fisher R.J., Maginnis, S., Jackson, W.J, Barrow, E & Jeanrenaud, S. (2005). Poverty and Conservation: Landscapes, People and Power, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK xvi + 148 pp.
- Fisher, R.J., Maginnis, S., Jackson, W.J., Barrow E., & Jeanrenaud, S. (2005). Poverty and Conservation: Landscapes, People and Power, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK xvi + 148pp
- Fletcher, R. (2012). Using the Master's Tools? Neoliberal Conservation and the Evasion of Inequality, *Development and Change* 43 (1): 295-317
- Folke, C., Colding, J. & Berkes, F. (2003). Building resilience for adaptive capacity in social-ecological systems, In: Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C. (Eds.), *Navigating social-ecological systems: Building resilience for complexity and change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality, in Burchell G., Gordon C., and Miller P. (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf
- Franks, P., & Blomley, T. (2004). Fitting ICD into a project framework: a CARE perspective, pp. 77-97 in T. O. McShane and M. P. Wells, editors, *Getting biodiversity projects to work: towards better conservation and development*. Columbia University Press, New York, New York, USA
- GEF (2004). Developing incentives for community participation in forest conservation through the use of commercial insects in Kenya: Project Summary Final Commercial Insects Medium-Sized Project (MSP) Brief. Washington, DC: Global Environment Facility.
- GEF (2006). The Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs, Evaluation Report No. 30Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office,Washington
- Gerring J. (2004). What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *American Political Science Review* Vol. 98, No. 2: 341-354

Gibson, C.C., Ostrom, E. & McKean, M.A. (2000). Forest, people, and governance: Some initial theoretical lessons, In: Gibson C.C., McKean M.A. & Ostrom E. (eds.) People and forests: Communities, institutions, and governance, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Giddens, A. (1987). Social Theory and Modern Sociology, Cambridge: Polity Press

- Githitho, A. (2004). *The Coastal terrestrial forest of Kenya: A report on resources, threats and investments*. Nairobi: WWF Eastern African Coastal Forest Programme.
- Global Forest Resources Assessment (2005). Progress towards Sustainable Development, FAO, Rome Italy
- Gordon, I. & Ayiemba W. (2003) Harnessing Butterfly Biodiversity for Improving Livelihoods and
 Forest Conservation: The Kipepeo Project, Journal of Environment & Development, Vol. XX, No.
 X, 1-17
- Gore, C. (2000). The Rise and Fall of the Washington Consensus as a Paradigm for Developing Countries, *World Development*, Vol. 28, No. 5:789-804
- Gorenflo, L.J. & Brandon, K. (2006). Key Human Dimensions of Gaps in Global Biodiversity Conservation *BioScience*, 56(9), 723-731.
- Government of Kenya (2005). *The Forests Act*, Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 88 (Act No. 7). Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Greig, A., Hulme, D. & Turner M. (2007). Challenging global inequality: development theory and practice in the 21st Century, Palgrave McMillan, New York
- Gunderson, L.H. (2003). Adaptive Dancing: Interactions between Social Resilience and Ecological Crises, In: Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C (eds.) (2003)
- Gupta, M. D. Grandvoinnet, H. & Romani, M. (2004). State-community synergies in community-driven development. Journal of Development Studies, 40(3), 27-58

Guthiga P.M., Mburu J., Holm-Mueller K. (2008). Factors Influencing Local Communities' Satisfaction Levels with Different Forest Management Approaches of Kakamega Forest, Kenya, *Environmental Management*, 41:696–706

Haas P.M. (2002). UN Conferences and Constructivist Governance, Global Governance 8: 73-91

Hajer, M.A. & Wagenaar, H. (Eds.) (2003). Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, pp307+xv

Hardin G. (1968) The tragedy of the commons, Science 162:1243-48.

- Harremoes, P. & Turner, R.K. (2001). Methods for integrated assessment, *Regional Environmental Change* 2:57-65
- Harrison, G. (2005). Economic Faith, Social Project and a Misreading of Africa Society: the Travails of Neoliberalism in Africa, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No 8:1303-1320
- Heclo, H. (1978). Issue Networks and the executive establishment, In: King A. (ed.) The new American political System, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, DC
- Hempel, L.C. (1996). Environmental Governance, Island Press
- Hettne, B. (1990). Development Theory and the Three Worlds, Longman, pp 232-251
- Hettne, B. (1990b). "Reorientations in development Theory", in *Development Theory and the Three Worlds*, Longman, pp 232-251
- Hill, M. & Hupe, P. (2009). Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance. London: Sage Publications (2nd edition).
- Hill, MJ.D. (1991). The Harambee Movementf in Kenya: Self-Help, Development and education among the Kamba of Kitui District, London School of Economics Monographs on social Anthropology No 64, The Athlone Press, London & Atlantic Highlands, NJ
- Hinchley, D., Turyomurugyendo, L. & Stonewall, K. (2000). Review of collaborative management arrangements for Mt Elgon National Park, IUCN Eastern Africa Program, Nairobi pp. vi+35

Holdgate, M. (1999). The Green Web, Earthscan, London 308pp.

- Hyde, W.F., Amacher G.S. & McGrath W. (1996). Deforestation and Forest Land Use: Theory, Evidence and Policy Implication, *World Bank Research Observer* 11 (2): 223-248
- ICLEI & IDRC (1996). The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide: An Introduction to Sustainable Development Planning, The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), Toronto, ON, The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi Kenya
- IUCN (2005.) Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP) Programme Document, Prepared by: IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Eastern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi, Kenya, Version: May 2005
- IUCN (2006). World Database on Protected Areas, World Conservation Union (IUCN), UNEP/World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP/WCMC), Cambridge, UK
- IUCN (2009). MERECP The Final Technical Programme Report for 2005-2009, Report Submitted by: Regional Office of IUCN for Eastern and Southern Africa, Nairobi
- IUCN, UNEP, WWF (1980). World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development, IUCN, UNEP, WWF, Gland, Switzerland
- IUCN, UNEP, WWF (1991). Caring for the Earth A Strategy for Sustainable Living, the World Conservation Union (IUCN), United Nations Environment Program, and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Gland, Switzerland
- Jaetzold R. & Schmidt H. (1982). Farm Management Handbook of Kenya Natural Conditions and Farm Management Information, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya; German Agricultural Team, Nairobi
- Jann W. & Wegrich (2007). Theories of the Policy Cycle, In: Fischer at al. (eds.) (2007)
- Janssen, M.A., Anderies, J.M. & Ostrom, E. (2007). Robustness of Social-Ecological Systems to Spatial and Temporal Variability, *Society and Natural Resources*, 20:307–322

- Jordan, A. & Greenaway, J. (1998). Shifting Agendas, Changing Regulatory Structures and The 'New' Politics Of Environmental Pollution: British Coastal Water Policy, 1955–1995, *Public Administration*, 76(4), 669-694.
- Juma, C. & Ojwang, J.B. (Eds) (1996). In Land We Trust: Environment, Property and Constitutional Change, African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) Environmental Policy Series-7, Initiatives Publishers, Nairobi, Kenya and Zed Books, London. Pp 462
- Kagombe J.K. and Gitonga J. (2005) Plantation Establishment in Kenya: A Case Study on Shamba System, Kenya Forestry Research Institute and Forest Department, Nairobi pp42+vii
- Kaimowitz, D. & Sheil, D. (2007). Conserving What and for Whom? Why Conservation Should Help Meet Basic Human Needs in the Tropics, *Biotropica* 39(5): 567–574
- Kaul, I., Grunberg, I. & Stern M.A. (1999). Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st
 Century, The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Oxford University Press, New
 York and Oxford pp.546+xxxviii
- Keely J. & Scoones I. (1999). Understanding Environmental Processes: A Review, *IDS Working Papers* 89, Environment Group, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, pp.50
- KEFRI/KFS (2007). Framework for Establishing Monitoring Plots for Natural Forest Rehabilitation in Green Zones Development Support Project (GZDSP) Intervention Areas, Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) and Kenya Forestry Service (KFS), Nairobi
- Kellert, S.R., Mehta, J.N., Ebbin, S.A. & Lichtenfeld L.L. (2000). Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, Rhetoric, and Reality, *Society and Natural Resources*, 13:705–715
- Kenis, P. & Schneider, V. (1991). Policy Networks and Policy Analysis: Scrutinizing a New Analytical Toolbox. In: Marin and Mayntz (eds.) Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt

- Kenya Ministry of Environment (2002). Study on Kenya's energy demand, supply and policy strategy for households, small scale industries and service establishments - Final report. Nairobi: Ministry of Energy & Nairobi: Kamfor Company Limited
- KFMP (1994). (Kenya Forestry Master Plan) Kenya forestry master plan: Development programs.Nairobi: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR) & Nairobi: Forest Department.
- KFS & KFWG (2009). *Manual on forming and registering Community Forest Associations (CFAs)* Nairobi: Kenya Forest Service (KFS), & Nairobi: Kenya Forests Working Group (KFWG)

KFWG (2000). Mount Elgon - Forest Status, Kenya Forests Working Group, Nairobi

- Kibet S. & Nyamweru, C. (2008) Cultural and Biological Heritage at Risk; The Case of the Rabai Kaya Forests in Coastal Kenya, Journal of Human Ecology 24(4): 287-295
- Kiely, R. (1999). The Last Refuge of the Noble Savage? A Critical Assessment of Post-Development Theory. *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol.11 No.1, pp 30-55
- KIFCON (1994). A National Profile of Kenya's Indigenous Forests, Kenya Indigenous Forest Conservation Programme – KIFCON, Nairobi Kenya
- KIFCON (1994). Map: Major areas of closed canopy indigenous forest cover and associated vegetation units. Nairobi: Forest Department – Kenya Indigenous Forest Conservation Program (KIFCON).
- Kigomo, N.B. (2001). State of Forest genetic Resources in Kenya, Sub-Regional Workshop FAO/IPGRI/ICRAF on the conservation, management, sustainable utilisation and enhancement of forest genetic resources in Sahelian and North-Sudanian Africa (Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 22-24 September 1998), Forest Genetic Resources Working Papers, Working Paper FGR/18E. Forestry Department, FAO, Rome, Italy
- Kimenyi, M.S. (2002). Agriculture, Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction, *KIPPRA Occasional Paper No. 3*, Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis, Nairobi Kenya pp29
- Kiringe J.W., Okello M.M. & Ekajul S.W. (2007). Managers' perceptions of threats to the protected areas of Kenya: prioritization for effective management, *Oryx*, 41(3), 314–321

- Kituyi, E., Marufu, L., Huber, B., Wandiga, S. O., Jumba, I. O., Andreae, M. O. & Helas, G. (2001a).Biofuel Consumption Rates and patterns in Kenya, *Biomass & Bioenergy* 20(2): 83-99
- Kituyi, E., Marufu, L., Wandiga, S., Jumba, I. O., Andreae, M. O. & Helas, G. (2001b). Biofuel Availability and Domestic Use Patterns in Kenya, *Biomass & Bioenergy* 20(2): 71-82
- Klein, J.T.R, Schipper, E.L.F. & Dessai, S. (2005). Integrating Mitigation and Adaptation into climate and development policy: three research questions. Environmental Science & Policy 8: 579-588
- Knocke, D. (1990). Political networks: The structural perspective, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK
- Knox, A., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2000). Collective action, property rights, and devolution of natural resource management: Exchange of knowledge and implications for policy—A workshop summary paper, CAPRi Working Paper 11. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- KWS (2012). Conservation and Management Strategy for the Elephant in Kenya 2012-2021, Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Nairobi Kenya
- Lambin, E.F. et al (2001). The Causes of Land-Use and Land-Cover Change: Moving beyond the Myths, *Global Environmental Change* 11: 261–269
- Larson, A. M. & Ribot, J. C. (2007). The Poverty of forestry policy: double standards on an uneven playing field. *Sustainability Science*, 2(2), 189–204.
- Larson, A. M., Pacheco, P., & Toni, F. (2007). The Effects of Forestry Decentralization on Access to Livelihood Assets. *The Journal of Environment & Development*, 16(3), 251-268.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1951). The policy orientation, In: Lerner D. and Lasswell H.D. (eds.) The Policy Sciences, Palo Alto, CA, Stanford University Press
- Lasswell, H.D. (1971). A preview of policy sciences, New York, American Elsevier
- Laswell, H.D. (1956). The Decision Process, University of Maryland Bureau of Governmental Research, College Park, Maryland.

- Lemos, M.C. & Agrawal, A. (2006). Environmental Governance, Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 31:297– 325
- Lennon, M.C. & Corbett, T. (Eds.) (2003). Policy into Action: Implementation Research and Welfare Reform, The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C. pp. 332+ix
- Lockwood, M., Worboys, G.L. & Kothari, A. (eds.) (2006). Managing Protected Areas: A Global Guide, Earthscan, London and Sterling VA pp802+xxx
- Logan, B.I. & Moseley, W.G. (2002). The Political Ecology of Poverty Alleviation in Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE), *Geoforum* 33: 1-14
- Luke, Q. & Maunder, M. (2007). The Shimba Hills, Kenya: a plant conservation priority for East Africa, Oryx, 41(4), 432–432
- Luke, Q. (2005). Annotated checklist of the plants of the Shimba Hills, Kwale District, Kenya, *Journal of East African Natural History* 94(1): 5–120
- Lurie, I. (2003). Field network Studies, In: Lennon M.C. & Corbett T. (eds.) Policy into Action: Implementation Research and Welfare Reform, The Urban Institute Press, Washington DC
- Mackenzie, A.F.D. (2003). Land Tenure and Biodiversity: An Exploration of the Political Ecology of Murang'a District, Kenya, *Human Organization* Vol. 62(3): 255-266
- Manek, M. (2001). The Implementation of Biodiversity-related Conventions: A Kenyan case study, UNEP-BPSP Project/FIELD
- March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1996). Institutional perspectives on political institutions. *Governance*, 9(3), 248-264.
- Matiru, V. (2000). Forest cover and forest reserves in Kenya: Policy and practice, *Forest and social perspectives in conservation*, Working Paper No.5. Nairobi: IUCN Eastern Africa Program.
- Matthews, S. (2004) Post-Development Theory and the Question of Alternatives: A View from Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(2), 373-384.

- Maxim, L. & Spangenberg, J.H. (2006). Bridging the gap between two analytical frameworks, Paper presented at the *Ninth Biennial Conference of the International Society for Ecological Economics* "Ecological Sustainability and Human Well-Being", December 15-18, New Delhi, India, pp 20
- Mbuvi, M. T. E., Maua, J. O., Ongugo, P. O., Koech, C. K., Othim, R. A. & Musyoki, J. K. (2009).
 Perceptions on Participatory Forest Management impacts on poverty for selected forest adjacent communities in Kenya. Nairobi: The Action Research into Poverty Impact of Participatory Forest Management (ARPIP) & Nairobi: the Kenya Forestry research Institute (KEFRI).
- McCay, B.J. (20020. Emergence of institutions for the commons:Contexts, situations, and events, In: Ostrom, E, Dietz, T.,Dolsak, N., Stern, P, Stonich, P., Stonich, S., Weber, E.V. (Eds.), *The drama of the commons*, Nation Research Council 2002, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., pp361–402.
- McShane, T.O. & Wells, M.P. (Eds.), Getting biodiversity projects to work: towards better conservation and development, Columbia University Press, New York, New York, USA
- McShane, T.O. (2005). Protected Areas and Development Assistance Agencies: At the Intersection of Conservation and Development, In: McNeely J.A.(ed.) *Friends for Life New Partners in Support of Protected Areas*, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK p.91-100
- Meinzen-Dick R., Di Gregorio, M. & McCarthy, N. (2004). Methods for studying collective action in rural development, *Agricultural Systems* 82, 197-214.
- MENR (2000). A Summary of the Kenya National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Nairobi
- MENR (2005). Sessional Paper No. 9 of 2005 on Forest Policy, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR), Government of Kenya, Nairobi

- MERECP (2009). Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP) Redesigned
 Programme Strategy, Lake Victoria Basin Commission Secretariat, East African Community,
 (MERECP strategy final version 070709- Project Document)
- Mintrom, M. & Vergari S., (1996). Advocacy coalitions, policy entrepreneurs, and policy change, Policy Studies Journal, 24, 3: 420-434
- Mitchell, J.K. (2006). The primacy of partnerships: scoping a new national disaster recovery policy, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social science 604:228-55
- Mitchell, R. & Bernauer, T. (1998). Empirical Research on International Environmental Policy: Designing Qualitative Case Studies, *The Journal of Environment & Development* 7(1): 4-31
- Mitchell, R.B. (2006). Problem Structure, Institutional Design, and the Relative Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements, *Global Environmental Politics* 6(3): 72-89
- Mitchell, R.B., Clark, W.C., Cash, D.W. & Dickson, N.M (eds.) (2006). Global Environmental Assessments: Information and Influence, The MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts
- Mitlin, D.,Hickey, S. & Bebbington, A. (2007). Reclaiming Development? NGOs and the Challenge of Alternatives, World Development 1699-1720
- MoE (2002). Study on Kenya's Energy Demand, Supply and Policy Strategy for Households, Small Scale Industries and Service Establishments, Final Report, Ministry of Energy (MoE) and Kamfor Company Limited, Nairobi
- Mogaka, H., Simons, G., Turpie, J., Emerton, L. & Karanja, F. (2001). Economic Aspects of Community Involvement in Sustainable Forest Management in Eastern and Southern Africa, IUCN Nairobi Kenya, pp.iv+151
- Mol, A.P.J. & Van Den Burg, S. (2004). Local Governance of Environmental Flows in Global Modernity, *Local Environment*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 317–324

- Morrissey, O. & Rai, Y. (1995). The GATT agreement on trade related investment measures: Implications for developing countries and their relationship with transnational corporations, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 31(5), 702-724.
- Mukabana J.R. and Pielke R.A. (1996) Investigating the influence of Synoptic-Scale Monsoonal Winds and Mesoscale Circulations on Diurnal Weather Patterns over Kenya Using a Mesoscale Numerical Model, *Monthly Weather Review*, Vol. 124: 224-242
- Muriithi, S. & Kenyon, W. (2002). Conservation of biodiversity in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Kenya, Biodiversity and Conservation 11: 1437-1450
- Mwabu, G. & Thorbecke, E. (2004) Rural Development, Growth and Poverty in Africa, *Journal of African Economies* 13: 16-65
- Myers, N., R.A., C.G. Mittermeier, G.A.B. Mittermeier da Fonseca, & J. Kent (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities, Nature 403 (6772): 853-858
- Nakamura, R.T. (1987). The Textbook Policy Process and Implementation Research. In: *Policy Studies Review* 7(1) 142-154
- Naughton-Treves, L., Holland, M.B & Brandon, K. (2005). The Role of Protected Areas in Conserving Biodiversity and Sustaining Local livelihoods, *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 30:219–52
- NES (2000). (National Environmental Secretariat) *A summary of the Kenya National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*, Nairobi: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, the National Environmental Secretariat
- Netting, R. (1993). Smallholder householders: farm families and the ecology of intensive, sustainable agriculture, Stanford University Press
- Neumann R.P. (1997) Primitive ideas: protected area buffer zones and the politics of land in Africa, Development and Change 28:559-82

- Newell, B, Crumley, C.L., Hassan, N., Lambin, E.F., Pahl-Wostl, C., Underdal, A., & Wasson R. (2005).
 A Conceptual Template for Integrative Human–Environment Research, *Global Environmental Change* 15: 299–307
- Ngau, P.M. (1987). Tensions in Empowerment: The Experience of the "Harambee" (Self-Help) Movement in Kenya, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, (35)3: 523-538
- Ngugi, R. K. & Nyariki, D. M. (2005). Rural Livelihoods in the Arid and Semi-Arid Environments of Kenya: Sustainable Alternatives and Challenges, *Agriculture and Human Values* 22(1): 65-71
- Nieuwolt, S. (1979). The East African Monsoons and their Effects on Agriculture, *GeoJournal* 3.2 193-200
- Norton-Griffiths, M. & Southey, C. (1995). The opportunity costs of biodiversity conservation in Kenya. *Ecological Economics*, 12, 125-139
- O'Riordan T. (1981). Environmentalism (2nd eds) Routledge
- Odera J.A. (2001) Progress in Implementation of C & I for Assessing Progress Towards Sustainable Forest Management within the Dry-zone Africa Process, A Paper Presented to a Country-led initiative in Support of the United Nations Forum on Forests International Expert Meeting on Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on the Progress Toward Sustainable Forest Management. Held in Yokohama Japan from 5-8 November, 2001
- Ogweno, D. O., Opanga, P. S. & Obara, A. O. (Eds.) (2009). Forest Landscape and Kenya's, Vision 2030 – Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Forestry Society of Kenya (FSK) Conference and Annual General Meeting held at the Sunset Hotel, Kisumu. 30th September - 3rd October, 2008. Nairobi: Forestry Society of Kenya.
- Ogweno, D. O., Opanga, P. S. & Obara, A. O. (Eds.) (2009). Forest Landscape and Kenya's, Vision 2030 – Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Forestry Society of Kenya (FSK) Conference and Annual General Meeting held at the Sunset Hotel, Kisumu. 30th September - 3rd October, 2008. Nairobi: Forestry Society of Kenya.

- Okidi, C. O., Kameri-Mbote, P. & Akech, M. (eds.) (2008). *Environmental governance in Kenya: Implementing the framework law.* Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Olsson, P., Folke C, & Berkes F. (2004). Adaptive Comanagement for Building Resilience in Social– Ecological Systems, *Environmental Management* Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 75–90
- Olsson, P., Folke C., & Hahn T. (2004). Social-ecological transformation for ecosystem management: the development of adaptive co-management of a wetland landscape in southern Sweden. *Ecology and Society* 9(4): 2. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss4/art2/.
- Olsson, P., L. H., Gunderson, S. R. Carpenter, P. Ryan, L. Lebel, Folke C. & Holling, C. S. (2006).
 Shooting the rapids: navigating transitions to adaptive governance of social-ecological systems.
 Ecology and Society 11(1): 18. [online] <u>URL:http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art18/</u>
- Ongugo, P.O., Kagombe, J.K., Wandago, B.O., Gachanja, M. & Mbuvi, M.T. (eds.) (2007). Proceedings of the 1st National Participatory Forest Management Conference: Better Managed Forests and Improved Livelihood – June 6-8, 2007, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Muguga, Kenya
- Ongugo, P.O., Mogoi, J.N., Obonyo, E. & Oeba, V.O. (2008). Examining the roles of community forest associations (CFAs) in the decentralization process of Kenyan forests, Paper presented to the IASC Conference 11th-19th July 2008 England UK
- Orlov, e B. (1980). Ecological anthropology, Annual Review of Anthropology, 9:235-73

Ostrom E. (2000) Collective action and the evolution of social norms, J. Econ. Perspectives 14(3):137-58

- Ostrom, E. (1990) Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Ostrom, E. (2007). A Diagnostic Approach for Going Beyond Panaceas, PNAS, 15181-15187
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Analyzing collective action, Agricultural Economics, Vol 41 pp:155 -166
- Ostrom, E., Gardner, R. & Walker, J. (1994). Rules, games and common pool resources. Univ. Mich. Press, Ann Arbor

- Ostrom, E., Janssen, M. A. & Anderies, J. M. (2007). Going beyond panaceas, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104(39), 15176-15178.
- Parfitt, T. (2002). The end of development: modernity, post-modernity and development, London: Pluto Press, pp. 232
- Parsons, W. (1995). Public Policy: An Introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis. Edward Elgar, Brookfield, USA
- Paulson, S. & Gezon, L.L. (eds.) (2005). Political ecology across spaces, scales, and social groups, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick
- Pepper, D. (1984). The roots of modern environmentalism, Croom Helm: Routledge, London; Dover, N.H.
- Perz, S.G. (2007). Reformulating Modernization-Based Environmental Social Theories: Challenges on the Road to an Interdisciplinary Environmental Science, *Society and Natural Resources*, 20:415-430
- Pinillos, M..J. & Reyes L. (2011). Relationship between individualist–collectivist culture and entrepreneurial activity: evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data, *Small Business Economics* 37:23–37
- Plummer, R. & FitzGibbon, J. (2004). Some observations on the terminology in co-operative environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 70(1), 63-72.
- Porter, D. (1995). "Scenes from Childhood: The homesickness of development discourses" in Crush, J. ed., Power of Development, pp 63-86
- Poteete, A. R. & Ribot, J. C. (2011). Repertoires of domination: Decentralization as process in Botswana and Senegal. *World Development*, 39(3), 439-449.
- Poteete, A.R., & Ostrom, E. (2004). In pursuit of comparable concepts and data about collective action, *Agricultural Systems*, 82:215–232

- Pressey, R.L., Watts, M.E. & Barrett, T.W. (2004). Is maximizing protection the same as minimizing loss? Efficiency and Retention as Alternative Measures of the Effectiveness of Proposed Reserves *Ecology Letters* 7: 1035–1046
- Preston, P.W. (1999). Development Theory: Learning the Lessons and Moving On, the European Journal of Development Research, Vol 11 No. 1:1-29
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modem Italy. Princeton, NJ: The Princeton University Press.
- Raab J. and Kenis P. (2007) Taking Sock of Policy Networks: Do they matter? In: Fischer et al (eds.) (2007)
- Raina, S.K, Kioko, E.N, Gordon, I., Nyandiga C. (2009). Improving Forest Conservation and Community Livelihoods through Income Generation from Commercial Insects in Three Kenyan Forests. Nairobi, Kenya: Icipe Sci. Press. 87 pp.
- Redpath, S.M., Young, J., Evely, A, et al (2013). Understanding and managing conservation conflicts, *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* Vol. 28, No. 2: 100-109
- Republic of Kenya (2001). Kenya National Guidelines on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), National Environmental Management Authority, Nairobi, Kenya
- Rhodes R.A.W. (1990). Policy Networks: A British perspective, Journal of theoretical politics, 2:293-317

Ribot J.C. & Peluso N.L. (2003). A Theory of Access, Rural Sociology, 68(2): 153-181

- Ribot J.C., J. Lund J.F., & Treue T. (2010). Democratic decentralization in sub-Saharan Africa: its contribution to forest management, livelihoods, and enfranchisement, *Environmental Conservation* 37 (1): 35–44
- Ribot, J. C. & Larson, A. (eds.) (2005). Democratic decentralization through a natural resource lens: Experience from Africa, Asia and Latin America, London: Routledge
- Ribot, J. C. (1995). From exclusion to participation: turning Senegal's forestry policy around. World Development, 23(9), 1587-1599.

- Ribot, J. C. (2002). Democratic decentralization of natural resources: institutionalizing popular participation, Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
- Ribot, J. C., Agrawal, A., & Larson, A. M. (2006). Recentralizing while decentralizing: how national governments reappropriate forest resources. *World Development*, 34(11), 1864-1886.
- Ribot, J. C., Lund, J. F. and Treue, T. (2010). Democratic decentralization in sub-Saharan Africa: Its contribution to forest management, livelihoods, and enfranchisement. *Environmental Conservation*, 37(1), 35-44
- Robbins P. (2004) Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction, Blackwell Publishing, Victoria Australia, pp. 242+xxi
- Roe E. & van Eeten M.J.G (2004) Three—Not Two—Major Environmental Counternarratives to Globalization, *Global Environmental Politics*, Vol.4 No.4: 36-53
- Rostow, W. W. (1960). The Stages of Economic Growth: A Noncommunist Manifesto. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Sabatier P.A. & Jenkins-Smith H. (1988). An advocacy coalition model of policy change and the role of policy oriented learning therein, *Policy Sciences*, 21: 129-168
- Sabatier, P.A. & Jenkins-Smith (eds.) (1993). Policy change and learning: an advocacy coalition approach, Boulder, CO: Westview

Sabatier, P.A. (ed.) (1999). Theories of the Policy Process, Westview Press, Oxford UK, pp. 289+viii

- Sachs W. (Ed.) (1992). The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books
- Sandler, T. (2004). Global Collective Action, Cambridge University Press, West Nyack, NY, USA
- Sawyer R.K. (2004) The Mechanisms of Emergence, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 34 No. 2: 260-282
- Sayer, J., & Campbell, B (2004). The science of sustainable development: local livelihoods and the global environment, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK and New York, NY pp.268+xix

- Sayer, J., Campbell, B., Petheram, L., Aldrich, M. Perez, M.R., Endamana, D., Dongmo, Z.N.L, Defo L., Mariki S., Doggart N. & Burgess N. (2007). Assessing environment and development outcomes in conservation landscapes, *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 16:2677–2694
- Schuurman, F.J. (2000). Paradigms lost, paradigms regained? Development studies in the twenty-first century, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No 1: 7-20
- Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis, *IDS Working Paper No.* 72, IDS, Brighton
- Sen, A. (1993). Capability and well being, In: Nussbaum M. and Sen A. K. (eds) *The Quality of Life*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 30–53
- Shackleton, C. M., Willis, T. J., Brown, K. & Polunin, N. V. C. (2010). Editorial: Reflecting on the next generation of models for community-based natural resources management. *Environmental Conservation*, 37(1), 1-4.
- Sherwood, D. (2002). Seeing the Forest for the Trees: A Manager's Guide to Applying Systems Thinking, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London UK and Yarmouth, Maine pp.346+xviii

Simon, H.A. (1969). The Sciences of the Artificial, MIT Press, Cambridge MA

- Simon, H.A. (2000). Public Administration in Today's World and Markets, *PS-Political Science and Politics* Vol. 33(4): 749-756
- Sindiga, I. (1999). Alternative tourism and sustainable development in Kenya, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7(2): 108-127
- Skyttner, L. (2005). General Systems Theory: Problems, Perspectives, Practice, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., pp.524, 2nd Edn.
- Smith, A. (2000). Policy networks and advocacy coalitions: explaining policy change and stability in UK industrial pollution policy? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, volume 18, pages 95-114
Smith, A., and Stirling, A. (2010). The politics of social-ecological resilience and sustainable sociotechnical transitions. *Ecology and Society* 15(1): 11. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss1/art11/

Smith, M .J. (1993). Pressure, Power and Policy, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead, Herts

- Soini, E. (2006). Past and present land tenure and incentives for land management in the five districts surrounding Mount Elgon, Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Program (MERECP), IUCN
- Soini, E. (2007). Land tenure and land management in the districts around Mount Elgon: An assessment presented to Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP). ICRAF Working Paper no. 49, Nairobi, Kenya: World Agroforestry Centre
- Sombroek, W.G., Braun, H.M.H. & van der Pouw, B.J.A. (1982). Exploratory Soil Map and Agro-climatic Zone Map of Kenya, 1980, Scale: 1:1'000'000, Exploratory Soil Survey Report No. E1, Kenya Soil Survey Ministry of Agriculture - National Agricultural Laboratories, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Southgate, C.R.J. (2006). Ecotourism in Kenya: the vulnerability of communities, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 5(1-2): 80-96
- Southworth J., Nagendra H. & Munroe D.K. (2006). Introduction to the Special Issue: Are Parks Working? Exploring Human–Environment Trade-offs in Protected Area Conservation, *Applied Geography*, 26: 87–95
- Spangenberg, J.H., Pfahl, S. & Deller, K., (2002). Towards indicators for institutional sustainability: lessons from an analysis of Agenda 21, *Ecological Indicators* 2:61-77
- Stake, R. (1995). The art of case study research, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Steiner A., Kimball, L.A. & Scanlon, J. (2003). Global Governance for the Environment and the Role of Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Conservation, *Oryx* 37, No 2

- Stern, P.C. (2005). Deliberative Methods for Understanding Environmental Systems. BioScience 55(11): 976-982
- Steward, J.H. (2006). The concept of method of cultural ecology, In Moore H.L. and Sanders T. (eds.) Theory of Culture Change: The methodology of multilinear evolution, Wiley Blackwell
- Sunderlin, W. D., Angelsen, A., Belcher, B., Burgers, P., Nasi, R., Santoso, L. & Wunder, S. (2005). Livelihoods, forests, and conservation in developing countries: an overview. *World Development*, 33(9), 1383-1402.
- Thenya, T., Wandago, B. O.B., Nahama, E. T. & Gachanja, M. (Eds.) (2008). Participatory Forest Management experiences in Kenya (1996-2007). Nairobi: Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG).
- Thomas, B.P. (1985). Politics, Participation, and Poverty: Development through self-help in Kenya, Westview Press, Boulder and London
- Thomas, B.P. (1987). Development Through Harambee: Who Wins and Who Loses? Rural Self-help Projects in Kenya, *World Development*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. *46S481*, *1987*
- Thomas, D.S.G. & Twyman, C. (2005). Equity and Justice in Climate Change Adaptation amongst Natural-Resource-Dependent Societies, *Global Environmental Change*, 15: 115–124
- Thouless, C., King J., Omondi, P., Kahumbu, P., Douglas-Hamilton, I. (2008). The status of Kenya's elephants 1990–2002, Kenya Wildlife Service and Save the Elephants, Nairobi Kenya
- Tiffen, M., Mortimore, M. & Gichuki, F. (1994). More People, Less Erosion: Environmental Recovery in Kenya, *Overseas Development Institute*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, England
- Tole, L. (2010). Reforms from the ground up: a review of community-based forest management in tropical developing countries. *Environmental Management*, 45(6), 1312-1331.
- Toner, A. & Franks, T. (2006). Putting livelihoods thinking into practice: implications for development management, *Public Administration and Development*, 26, 81–92
- Trimbur, T.J. & Watts, M. (1976). Are cultural ecologists well adapted? A review of the concept of adaptation, *Proceedings of the Association of American Geographers* 8: 179-83

- Trosper, R.L. (2003). Policy transformations in the US forest sector, 1970-2000: implications for sustainable use and resilience, In Berkes F., Colding J. and Folke C. (eds.) Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change pp. 328-351. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Tucker, C.M. (2008). Changing Forests: Collective Action, Common Property, and Coffee in Honduras, Springer
- Turner, W.R., Brandon, K., Thomas, M. Brooks, T.M., Gascon, C., Gibbs, H.K., Lawrence, K.S., Mittermeier, R.A. & Selig E.R. (2012). Global Biodiversity Conservation and the Alleviation of Poverty, *BioScience*, 62(1):85-92
- UNDP (2007). Improved Conservation and Governance for Kenya Coastal Forest Protected Area System, UNDP Project Document, UNDP-GEF Medium-Size Project (MSP), Government of Kenya and United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Nairobi
- UNESCO (1996). Biosphere Reserves: The Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework of the World Network, UNESCO, Paris
- Vayda, A. (1983). Progressive Contextualization: Methods for Research in Human Ecology, *Human Ecology* 11 (3): 265-281
- Villamor, G.B. (2006). The rise of protected area policy in the Philippine forest policy: An analysis from the perspective of Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), Forest Policy and Economics 9: 162–178
- Walby, S. (2009). *Globalization and inequalities: complexity and contested modernities*. Los AngelesCA: Sage Publications.
- Watts, M. (2000). Political ecology, In: Sheppard, E. & Barnes, T.J. (Eds.) A companion to economic geography, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 257-274
- Watts, W. (1995) A New Deal in Emotions: Theory and practice and the crisis of development, In: Crush,J. ed., Power of Development, pp 44-62

- WCED (1987). Our Common Future, Oxford University Press, World Commission on Environment and Development – WCED, New York NY
- Weible, C.M. & Sabatier P.A. (2007). A Guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework, In: Fischer et al (2007) (eds).
- Wells, M.P. & Brandon, K.E. (1993). The Principles and Practice of Buffer Zones and Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation, *Ambio*, Vol. 22, No. 2/3, pp.157-162
- Wells, M.P. & McShane T.O. (2004). Integrating protected area management with local needs and aspirations, Ambio 33(8): 513-519
- West, P., Igoe, J. & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and peoples: The social impact of protected areas. *The Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35, 251-277.
- Western, D., Wright R. M., & Strum, S. C. (Eds.) (1994). Natural connections: perspectives in community-based conservation. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Wilkinson, K.P. (1991). The Community in Rural America. Westport, CT: Greenwich Press.

- Williamson, J. (1989). What Washington means by policy reform, In: Williamson, J. (ed.) Latin American Readjustment: How Much has Happened, Washington: Institute for International Economics
- Williamson, J. (1993). Democracy and the "Washington Consensus", *World Development* 21 (8): 1329-1336
- Windhoff-Heritier, A. (1993). Policy Network Analysis, In: Kenman (ed.) *Comparative Politics: New directions in theory and method*, Amsterdam University press, pp. 143-160
- Winterbach, H.E.K, Winterbach, C.W., Somers, M.J. & Hayward, M.W. (2012). Key factors and related principles in the conservation of large African carnivores, *Mammal Review* 43 89–110
- Witcomb, M. & Dorward, P. (2009). An assessment of the benefits and limitations of the shamba agroforestry system in Kenya and of management and policy requirements for its successful and sustainable reintroduction. *Agroforestry Systems*, 75(3), 261-274.

- World Bank (1994). Making Development sustainable The World Bank Group and the Environment, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- World Bank (2007). Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Kenya Forests Act 2005, The World Bank, Washington DC
- WRI (2007). (World Resources Institute) Nature's benefits in Kenya: An atlas of ecosystems and human well-being. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute (WRI); Nairobi: Government of Kenya; & Nairobi: International Livestock Research Institute.
- WWF (2006). The Eastern Africa Coastal Forests Ecoregion: Strategic Framework for Conservation 2005-2025, WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office (EARPO), Nairobi, Kenya
- WWF (2012). http://worldwildlife.org/about/history (downloaded December 22, 2012)
- WWF (2012b). <u>http://wwf.panda.org/who_we_are/history/wwf_conservation_1961_2006/</u> (downloaded December 22, 2012)
- WWF-EARPO (2007). Water towers of eastern Africa: Policy, issues and vision for community-based protection and management of montane forests, WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office, Nairobi Kenya
- Young, O.R. (2002). Institutional Interplay: The Environmental Consequences of Cross-Scale
 Interactions, In: National Research Council (2002) *The Drama of the Commons*. Committee on the
 Human Dimensions of Global Change, E. Ostrom, E. Dietz T., Dolsak N., Stern P.C., Stovich S.,
 & Weber E.U., (Eds.) Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC:
 National Academy Press
- Young, O.R., Berkhout, F., Gallopin, G.C., Janssen, M.A., Ostrom, E., & van der Leeuw, S. (2006). The globalization of socio-ecological systems: An agenda for scientific research, *Global Environmental Change* 16: 304–316
- Young, O.R., Lambin, E.F. et al (2006). A Portfolio Approach to Analyzing Complex Human-Environment Interactions: Institutions and Land Change, *Ecology and Society* 11(2): 31

- Zettelmeyer, W., Rozemeijer, N. & Woodhill, J. (2008). External Review of IUCN 2007: Report on Linking Conservation to Livelihoods in Africa (Objective 2); Annex 1 of Volume; Wageningen UR/ Mestor Associates
- Zimmerer, K. & Young, K (Eds.) (1998). Nature's geography: new lessons for conservation in developing countries University of Wisconsin Press, Madison
- Zimmerer, K. S. (2006). Cultural ecology: at the interface with political ecology the new geographies of environmental conservation and globalization, *Progress in Human Geography* 30, 1: 63-78
- Zimmerer, K.S. (2007). Cultural ecology (and political ecology) in the 'environmental borderlands': exploring the expanded connectivities within geography, *Progress in Human Geography* 31(2): 227–244
- Zimmerer, K.S. (ed.) (2006a). Globalization and New Geographies of Conservation of Conservation, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. x+357

Appendices



Main study communities in Arabuko-Sokoke Source: Adapted from GEF (2004)

Appendix 1: Map of Arabuko-Sokoke Forest



Main study communities in Kakamega Forest Source: Adapted from GEF (2004)

Appendix 2: Map of Kakamega Forest



Main study communities in Shimba Hills Forest Source: Adapted from Luke (2005)

Appendix 3: Map of Shimba Hills Forest



Main study communities in Mount Elgon Source: Adapted from Soini (2006)

Appendix 4: Map of Mount Elgon Forest

Actor Categories	Organizations	Vision and Mission	Main Beliefs	Mechanisms of Influence (programs/projects)
State	KFS	Conserve, develop and sustainably manage forestry resources Enhance conservation and sustainable management of forests for environmental stability and social-economic development	Sustainable utilization, market forces	Sustainably manage natural forests for social, economic and environmental benefits Increase productivity of industrial forest plantations and enhance efficiency in wood utilization Promote farm forestry and commercial tree farming Promote efficient utilization and marketing of forest products
	KWS	Save the last great species and places on earth for humanity Sustainably conserve, manage, and enhance Kenya's wildlife, its habitats in collaboration with stakeholders for posterity Conserve and manage Kenya's wildlife scientifically, responsively and professionally.	Sustainable utilization, market forces, ecological conservation	Stewardship of National Parks and Reserves Oversight of wildlife conservation and management outside protected areas Conservation education and training Wildlife research Input into national wildlife-related law and policy including international conventions and protocols
	NMK	Global leader in heritage, research and management Promote the conservation and sustainable utilization of national heritage through generation, documentation and dissemination of research and collection management knowledge, information and innovations	Ecological conservation, cultural preservation, indigenous knowledge, aesthetic	Heritage promotion, collection and documentation Undertake research on cultural, natural history, biomedical and bio- conservation Preservation and Conservation by in-situ and ex-situ means Information Dissemination
	KEFRI	Centre of excellence in forest science through technology development, deployment and dissemination of scientific information Conduct research and provide information and technologies for sustainable development of forests	Sustainable utilization, technological solutions and capacity building	Generate knowledge and technologies for forest development, conservation, management and utilization Improve seed production, distribution and marketing Strengthen linkages and partnerships

Appendix 5 Main Actors and Beliefs in the Forest Policy Subsystem in the Kenyan Coastal Region

NGOs	Nature Kenya FAN	Connecting nature and people to take action for biodiversity conservation influence the enactment of sustainable forest policies by engaging with the state and like-minded organizations	Ecological conservation, sustainable utilization, sustainable livelihoods Equitable development, community action, sustainable	Enhance knowledge of biodiversity Promote conservation of species, sites, and habitats Encourage community participation in conservation through promotion of sustainable benefits Advocate policies favorable to biodiversity conservation Enhancing knowledge of Kenya's biodiversity Networking and publication of articles in newspapers and magazines and books
	ICIPE	Help alleviate poverty, ensure food security and improve the overall health status of peoples of the tropics by developing and extending management tools and strategies for harmful and useful arthropods Develop, introduce and adapt new tools and strategies for arthropod management that are environmentally safe, affordable, appropriate, socially acceptable and applicable by the target end-users, with full community participation	Ivelihoods Sustainable utilization, technological solutions and capacity building	Build capacity of individual researchers and institutions Develop partnerships at all levels to influence policymaking Reduce poverty as an ultimate goal by creating sustainable livelihoods for rural communities and entrepreneurs through agro-based food, fibre and health products enterprise development; and promote use of beneficial insects Build technological capacity of individuals and institutions in the tropics
	KFWG	Improve the status of Kenya's forests and increase the benefits from them through sound management and conservation practices	Ecological conservation, aesthetic, sustainable utilization	Supporting participatory forest management initiatives Policy and legislation advocacy for improved forest governance Partnership and development by developing collaborative engagement with government, other civil society organizations, international organizations and the private sector
INGOs	IUCN	A just world that values and conserves nature Influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable Believes that global production and	Ecological preservation, sustainable livelihoods, market forces, globalization, equity of global resources	Valuing and conserving nature emphasizing both tangible and intangible values of nature Effective and equitable governance of nature's use to improve people-nature relations, rights and responsibilities, and the political economy of nature Deploying nature-based solutions to tackle problems of sustainable development, particularly in climate change, food security and social and economic development

		consumption nottame and destroying		
		life support system _ nature _ at persistent		
		and dangerously high rates		
	Birdlife	Birds are beautiful inspirational and	Ecological	prevent the extinction of any hird species
	International	international excellent flagships and vital	preservation	maintain and where possible improve the conservation status
	international	environmental indicators	sustainable	of all hird species
		By focusing on birds and the sites and	livelihoods market	conserve and where appropriate improve and enlarge sites and
		habitats on which they depend, improve	forces, aesthetics	habitats important for birds
		the quality of life for birds, for other		help, through birds, to conserve biodiversity and to improve
		biodiversity, and for people		the quality of people's lives
		r i i i i i j j i i i i r i r i r		integrate bird conservation into sustaining people's livelihoods
	WWF	Conserve nature and reduce the most	Ecological	By 2020, working in partnership with others to:
		pressing threats to the diversity of life on	preservation,	Protect and restore species and their habitats
		Earth	sustainable	Strengthen local communities' ability to conserve the natural
		Build a future where people live in	livelihoods, market	resources they depend upon
		harmony with nature	forces,	Transform markets and policies to reduce the impact of the
			globalization,	production and consumption of commodities
			equity of global	Ensure that the value of nature is reflected in decisions made
			resources	by individuals, communities, governments and businesses
				Mobilize hundreds of millions of people to support
				conservation
	Conservation	A healthy, prosperous world in which	Ecological	working to secure a stable global climate
	International	societies are forever committed to caring	preservation,	understanding and protecting the sources and flows of fresh
		for and valuing nature, for the long-term	sustainable	water
		benefit of people and all life on Earth	livelinoods, market	ensuring nature's ability to provide food for numan needs
			forces,	minimizing environmental pressures on numan nearth
			giobalization,	valuing the fole of flature in numan cultures
			resources	values that nature provides
Ri- and multi-	WB	Galvanize international and national	Market forces	Fighting hunger and malnutrition particularly through better
lateral	110	support around two goals: to virtually end	sustainable	agricultural productivity
organizations		extreme poverty in a generation and to	livelihoods.	Encouraging regional integration and helping develop
organizations		push for greater equity	globalization	infrastructure: power, water, transport, and information and
			0	communications technologies
				To produce faster results, IDA undertakes joint programs with
				International Finance Corporation (IFC), the World Bank
				Group's lead agency for private sector development, as well as
				with other nonprofit organizations

	UNEP	Provide leadership and encourage	Ecological	Functional Programs:
		partnership in caring for the environment	preservation	Early warning and assessment
		by inspiring informing and enabling	globalization	Environmental policy implementation
		nations and peoples to improve their	technological	Technology industry and economics
		quality of life without compromising that	solutions and	Regional cooperation
		of future generations	solutions and	Environmental law and conventions
		of future generations	capacity-building	Clabel Environmental Environmental Environmental
				Global Environmental Facility Coordination
	INDD			Communication and public information
	UNDP	Help countries build and share solutions to	Globalization,	Poverty reduction and achieving the Millennium Development
		achieve poverty reduction and the	equitable	Goals (MDGs); democratic governance; crisis prevention and
		Millennium Development Goals,	development,	recovery; environment and sustainable development
		democratic governance, crisis prevention	sustainable	
		and recovery, environment and energy for	livelihoods	
		sustainable development		
		Help developing countries attract and use		
		aid effectively		
		Encourage the protection of human rights,		
		capacity development and the		
		empowerment of women in all activities		
	USAID	Carries out U.S. foreign policy by	Ideological	Promote broadly shared economic prosperity
		promoting broad-scale human progress at	promotion of free	Strengthen democracy and good governance
		the same time it expands stable, free	markets and	Protect human rights
		societies, creates markets and trade	democracy,	Improve global health
		partners for the United States, and fosters	globalization,	Advance food security and agriculture
		good will abroad	distribution of aid	Improve environmental sustainability
	EU	EuropeAid is the Directorate-General	Distribution of aid.	Sustainable growth and development:
		responsible for formulating EU	market forces,	Rural Development, Food Security, Nutrition
		development policy and defining sectoral	sustainable	Climate Change, Environment, Natural Resources, Water
		policies in the field of external aid, to	livelihoods.	Private Sector Development, Trade, Regional Integration
		reduce poverty in the world, ensure	globalization	
		sustainable development and promote	Broomingation	
		democracy peace and security		
Local	ASFADA	Participate in conservation and	Community action	protect conserve and manage forest under Forest Act and
community		management of a state forest or local	equitable	provisions of the management plan for the forest
organizations		authority forest in accordance with legal	development	formulate and implement forest programs consistent with
(CROs)		provisions	indigenous	traditional forest user rights in accordance with sustainable
(CDO3)		provisions	knowledge	use criteria:
			sustainable	use enterna,
			sustamable	protect sacred groves and protected trees

		livelihoods	assist the Forest Service in enforcing rules and regulations
			enter into partnerships with other persons to ensure efficient
			and sustainable conservation and management of forest
DIFAFA	Participate in conservation and	Community action,	protect, conserve and manage forest under Forest Act and
	management of a state forest or local	equitable	provisions of the management plan for the forest
	authority forest in accordance with legal	development,	formulate and implement forest programs consistent with
	provisions	indigenous	traditional forest user rights in accordance with sustainable
		knowledge,	use criteria;
		sustainable	protect sacred groves and protected trees
		livelihoods	assist the Forest Service in enforcing rules and regulations
			enter into partnerships with other persons to ensure efficient
			and sustainable conservation and management of forest

Source: research data