

Strategic Vision

Increasing Community Participation in the Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project in the Maswa-Makao Area, Tanzania

Tamar Rachelle Losleben
November 21, 2002

Strategic Vision:

Increasing Community Participation in the Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project in the Maswa-Makao Area, Tanzania

Introduction

My interest in wildlife conservation arises from a monumental move my family made when I was twelve from the lush, expansive suburbs of Nairobi, Kenya to a seventh-floor apartment in Cairo, Egypt, a brown polluted megapolis of more than 18 million people. I left a conservation-minded society that showed their regard for wildlife by establishing national parks and arrived in a society that was overusing their natural resources. I witnessed effects of rapid population growth; asphalt and cement skyscrapers suffocating fertile agricultural lands, garbage and rubble littering the ground, and the development and sculpting of *wadis* that had once been the home of desert foxes and city campers. I saw humans abusing their natural resources and I wanted to act.

With Leadership Rice, I worked at the Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project (CHCWP) in Tanzania, to develop communities' initiatives to conserve and plan the use of their natural resources in and around the Robin Hurt Safaris (RHS) Ltd. hunting blocks. Allow me to explain the peculiar relationship between professional hunting and conservation that I became aware of after working with CHCWP. You may refer to the flowchart on How CHCWP Works (Appendix 4) for a visual aid.

Robin Hurt Safaris Ltd. is a luxury hunting safari company based in Tanzania. The Tanzanian government rents hunting areas to RHS Ltd. for four-year cycles. At the end of four years, the hunting companies go through a bidding process to secure their areas. RHS clients must hunt with Tanzanian-trained and licensed professional hunters and purchase permits for the expected trophies from the Tanzanian Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (See Appendix 5 for a list of government hunting permits fees.) Six out of eight RHS Ltd. hunting blocks are open areas, which means that individuals are free to live in and around the wildlife areas.

The project began in 1989, when Mr. Robin Hurt and Mr. Joseph Cullman III formed CHCWP because they were concerned about the future of Tanzanian game and hunting as a recreational sport - increasing rural populations and poaching were putting a strain on wildlife populations and their habitats. Thus, their primary goal was of a practical nature: to reduce poaching so that there would be game for clients to hunt. While the coexistence of communities in hunting blocks added stress on natural resources and wildlife, it also created an opportunity to encourage communities to see how the use of resources could be mutually beneficial for communities and RHS Ltd.

Initially, CHCWP focused on the conviction that “communities living adjacent to wildlife areas should be entitled to benefit from conserving their resources as well as to take an active part in its protection” because if villagers benefit from wildlife they are more likely to value and conserve it (CHCWP). In the short-term, CHCWP has relied more on anti-poaching patrols to decrease poaching but this has created hostility toward the program in some villages. Meanwhile, CHCWP’s long-term goal is to further community respect and conservation of wildlife and their habits, and the management of their sustainable usage.

CHCWP has two parts that work on securing a future for wildlife: community benefits and anti-poaching operations. Community benefits entails CHCWP villages receiving a voluntary fee of 20 % over and above the Government Game License RHS clients pay. Villages do not receive the community benefits in money, but rather, decide to put the money toward providing a community service. (See Appendix 6 for examples of village benefits projects.) Then, CHCWP uses the money to provide the necessary supplies. Not only do villagers directly profit from community projects, but they also earn money, employment, and food if they work with the anti-poaching team. The project director meets at least biannually with village leaders to discuss wildlife issues, their needs, select a development project, and jointly plan and implement the chosen project. At the same time, the project director manages the second component of CHCWP, the anti-poaching team. Each anti-poaching team consists of a CHCWP field officer, government Game Scout, driver, and four part-time trained villagers. Patrolling involves searching for signs of poachers, poachers’ camps, and snares. In addition, anti-poaching teams are expected show Swahili conservation videos to local students, meet with village leaders, turn poachers over to the local village officials and to follow-up with poaching cases, bearing witness when necessary.

With regards to anti-poaching, it is important to understand the history of natural resource management and ownership in Tanzania. In 1961, after the Tanzanian people won their freedom from decades of colonial rule, President Julius K. Nyerere founded the *ujumaa*, socialist movement concerned with family and community spirit. Present day Tanzania, has inherited Nyerere’s socialist idea of the government ultimately owning and managing the land and resources. Translating this concept to hunting, rural Tanzanians become poachers if they hunt in the RHS hunting blocks because the Tanzanian government owns the wildlife and sells permits authorizing only permit-holders to hunt. Such a philosophy is well expressed in Nyerere’s Arusha Manifesto (Appendix 3).

CHCWP has shown positive results in anti-poaching initially. However, as the fruits of the community benefits scheme (e.g. dispensaries, clinics, schools, and water pumps) entice more people to immigrate to wildlife areas, more pressure will be placed on the land by agricultural expansion in nutrient-poor area and on wildlife as more villagers hunt to provide meat to their families or to sell commercially. This, together with the fact that providing fuel for the anti-patrols is so costly, indicates more effective means of minimizing poaching must be developed if the future of Tanzanian game hunting is to be secured and wildlife species preserved.

Vision

Historically, African conservationists have simply implemented the plans of the white, European and American specialists, or, perhaps, Westerner-trained Africans. My dream is to increase the effectiveness of present CHCWP projects by creating a sense of project-ownership and more fully involving the community in discussing, planning, and implementing conservation plans. Specifically, I hope to employ this tactic in the Maswa-Makao RHS Ltd. hunting block in northwestern Tanzania, however, many of the ideas may be transferable to other RHS Ltd. areas.

A number of changes will need to be made to realize this dream. In the short-term, I envision CHCWP villages adopting anti-poaching values because of the direct economic incentive they see in safeguarding wildlife and its habitat. In the long-term, by internalizing anti-poaching ethics, communities will pass their values on to the youth. As a byproduct, CHCWP will be able to depend more on the villages to control poaching from within, would be able to reduce the number of patrols, and therefore save more money to go towards community benefits. Increased involvement of communities is essential for these goals to be accomplished. I propose that conducting more village meetings and developing a more open relationship with the villages are realistic means to do so.

Modeled after the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project (LIRD) in Zambia and the Communal Areas Management Program For Indigenous Peoples (CAMPFIRE) project in Zimbabwe, I believe that conducting separate meetings for men and women followed by a joint meeting will nurture a sense of project-ownership. In the case of natural resource management, communities could greatly benefit from the listening to women because “women not only have information that needs to be part of the development process, but research shows that much positive social change is correlated with the education and involvement of women” (Myers 190). This would not only open pathways for better communication and understanding but would also spur women to utilize their different methodical bias to living life and pursuing change in conservation matters.

Eventually, my vision through this project is to gradually replace most anti-poaching patrols with more sustainable examinations of poaching activities that enable patrols to proactively target poachers instead of reacting to poaching after *nyama* (game) has been killed. Research of LIRD projects show that “anti-poaching patrols are less effective at controlling poaching than more basic, and considerably less expensive investigative techniques” (Adams and McShane 130). The success of such a change would be based on the level of community willingness, participation, and trust the CHCWP staff members are able foster in the community. Furthermore, because of the emphasis of the role of community in conservation, CHCWP field officers and the project director will have to modify their job description, receive new training, and adjust their schedule.

This blue print is bold in the changes it recommends especially in decreasing the number anti-poaching patrols. I recognize how “war on poaching may soon resemble the war in Vietnam: a massive, well-armed force struggling in vain against a poor but unyielding foe” unless changes are made to better understand and use different weapons against the foe, weapons such as the community (Adams and McShane 130).

Assessment of the Current CHCWP

Project Structure

Before getting into the details of the proposal, allow me to describe how CHCWP functions. The project director of CHCWP balances time between the Arusha base and visiting CHCWP villages scattered in RHS’s seven hunting areas around Tanzania: Burko, Rungwa South, Rungwa Inyanga, Piti, Mlele, Niensi, and Maswa-Makao. Three experienced project field officers each lead anti-poaching patrols and train villagers with assistance from a Government Game Scout. The anti-poaching team is paid a salary and rewards as an incentive to arrest illegal hunters, destroy wire and sisal snares, catch unlicensed tree-cutters, confiscate illegal firearms, and to protect the environment from degradation. The teams travel from hunting block to hunting block using three Toyota land cruisers and gallons of gas.

The most prized animals hunted in these areas are lion, leopard, sable, roan, buffalo, gerenuk, lesser kudu, Oryx, and Sitatunga. To support the village benefits, clients hunting with RHS pay a mandatory 20% Community Conservation Fee (not including the Government Game Fee), to supply enough funds for 23 village to receive benefits in the form of development projects. The most common projects are primary schools, secondary schools, dispensaries, clinics, hospitals, water pumps, dams, and other services. Clients also make donations, which generally pay for salaries, supplies, and fuel. Like many non-profit organizations, one of CHCWP’s challenges is to collect enough donations to finance the whole year. The budget is carefully managed and donors are cherished.

Current Programs

Previously, I mentioned two successful community wildlife programs, LIRD in Zambia and CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe. Allow me to expand on their successes.

Unlike CHCWP, LIRD is government-managed under the Zambian National Parks and Wildlife Service and annually funded by \$1 million from the Norwegian aid agency. Similar to CHCWP, its efforts are focused on certain wildlife areas, South Luangwa National Park and the Lupande Game Management Area. The projects aims to teach people how to manage and profit from wildlife by making wildlife conservation a profitable venture and attaching an economic incentive to conserve. Yet, one report from LIRD illustrates how receiving monetary resources is not enough to motivate communities to protect wildlife. They found that project money was not reaching the households where poaching activities originated:

“Previously, communities received 40% of wildlife revenues, but this was administered in a top-down manner. Assessments showed that people did not fully participate in the program. They did not learn the value of wildlife. Poaching continued. And because people were not participating in management of their wildlife and projects they were not learning about it” (LIRD).

From my experience in Makao, CHCWP seemed to be working with solely the village leaders. People did not participate. One of the main similarities between LIRD and my vision is that they also emphasize that the whole community must gather to discuss the use and management of the money.

A second example is the CAMPFIRE program designed and managed by Africans where the Zimbabwean government encourages people to take responsibility for preserving wildlife by granting them the right of proprietorship. Essentially, CAMPFIRE utilizes economic incentives to spur rural Zimbabweans to take meaningful action to protect natural resources from overuse. Like land in Maswa-Makao, many “communal lands have too little or unreliable rainfall for agriculture but they provide excellent wildlife habitat” (CAMPFIRE). Because this program permits families to choose how they would like to use the land, they have the possibility of profiting greatly from wise land use. The important point is that CAMPFIRE has created a reason for rural Zimbabweans to want to involve themselves in wildlife conservation.

The Basics of Community

Implementation of my strategic plan incorporates many steps so that ultimately women may have more of a voice in natural resource management and the CHCWP’s focus may be redirected from anti-poaching to communities: sociological studies and model development, seeking support, structural adjustments, raising the benefit stakes, dialogue in village meetings, community leadership and training, funding, and progress reports.

Model

At its root, this proposal tapers down to one main idea: putting the focus on the whole community. Inclusion of the full community means both men and women must be involved. More women will be involved in village discussions, decision-making, and carrying out ideas with field officers because until now their needs and thoughts have generally been unheard. This is a logical change because most development projects CHCWP villages have chosen have been within African women’s traditional, domestic sphere of influence as housekeeper, child-bearer, cook, provider of nourishment, agriculturalist, and collector of water and firewood. More importantly, women are responsible for nourishing their families, deciding where meat will be found, and either encouraging or discouraging their husbands to poach. Though their influence in wildlife conservation is not immediately obvious, they have potential to impact the environment through agricultural area expansion, firewood collection, and the values they teach their

children. Of course, first a study of the role of women should be conducted where villagers are asked how women could be more involved. For the longevity and applicability of CHCWP, it is essential CHCWP's vision concurs with the community's.

Secondly, gradually strengthening the relationship between CHCWP and the community will allow CHCWP to pursue long-term resolutions. Improving communication between CHCWP and the CHCWP villages would make the investigative process more successful than anti-poaching patrols because the latter can be expensive to conduct due to the fuel required to take multiple trips from the bush to the police station. Meanwhile, the former offers the potential of finding source of poaching activities, where the demand originates, and better understanding communities' needs.

Seeking Support

For this blueprint to be put into action, I must consult and gain the support of the Sally Capper (CHCWP director), Robin Hurt, and Joseph Cullman 3rd. In the presentation to them, I would highlight the effectiveness of the CAMPFIRE and LIRDP programs, show them CHCWP's past anti-poaching records, and describe what future of CHCWP would look like with and without implementing the strategic proposal. Most of all, I would emphasize the cost and manpower effectiveness of altering CHCWP's focus from anti-poaching to community empowerment and sociological studies to better understand local communities' political structures, resource use, and motivation for poaching or not poaching.

Structural Adjustments

Field officers' job descriptions will change slightly. They will retain their responsibility as head of the anti-poaching patrols and will facilitate separate community meetings for men and women. Such meetings will help create the necessary dialogue and trust between CHCWP and communities so field officers are viewed positively, as people assisting the community in satisfying their needs and securing wildlife's future.

In a meeting involving the village leaders, village council, the CHCWP project director, field officers, community members, the new CHCWP expectations and the village will accept or reject invitation to participate in the CHCWP project.

Raising the Benefit Stakes

For conservation, one of the most important qualities of a community is their unity, cooperation, and ability to work with others. CHCWP will only work with villages willing to involve the whole community in conservation and education. Together the village leaders and CHCWP director will decide how to gauge and monitor this willingness. One possibility is stipulating a certain number of men and women must attend CHCWP meetings. Furthermore, people must honor the decisions made in village meetings and approved by the village council, *mwana kiti* (village appointed leader), and *mtandaji* (government appointed village leader). Failure to do so will result in suspension of the village from CHCWP. CHCWP is a serious commitment. If some want the village to be involved, they may create some healthy peer pressure to induce others to join.

Villages not willing to comply with CHCWP parameters may reapply to be a CHCWP village when there is a mutual agreement between them, two out of three field officers and the project director that they are prepared to conserve wildlife. After strictly enforcing these parameters, there is the risk that more people will poach from that village because they are no longer receiving CHCWP village benefits. Such reactions could be monitored using the anti-poaching database.

Dialogue in Village Meetings

CHCWP field officers will facilitate discussion in the separate and joint women and men conservation meetings to allow them to share their sense of what wildlife means to them spiritually, economically, aesthetically, traditionally, etc. Whatever goal the village decides to work toward, it is imperative that they are unified in their goal. Subsequently, discussions of wildlife, the hunting business, committee projects, clinics, digging wells, and their village benefits account may be more fruitful because a common understanding has been established and CHCWP employees are more educated on local culture. The main incentive for women and men to attend meeting will be the village benefits villages receive from CHCWP. Village meeting with a CHCWP field officer must happen at least once every two months. Meeting minutes must be kept, role taken, and a copy of such records sent to the CHCWP project director to be kept on file.

Poaching surveys may occur informally in any of the four meeting settings, village meetings, men and women meetings, small groups, or individual interviews, depending on the field officer's preference and how villagers work with the field officer. Such a process might be more successful if the community displays accountable, transparent, and effective characteristics. However, to develop an effective approach to dialogue, CHCWP must gain an understanding of how the village society operates.

Community Leadership and Training

Mirroring CAMPFIRE's methods of gathering in the community toward a common goal, I believe that field officers can be trained by the CHCWP project director and MWEKA College of Wildlife to help convey information through lectures, role plays, charts, drama groups. Education of this type naturally brings forward community leaders. I think it would be ideal but unrealistic to expect full community involvement. What is more realistic is to expect a few individuals to be very involved, conscientious leaders while others attend to watch and simply listen for social reasons.

Progress Reports

Every six months, field officers will complete progress reports describing and evaluating the progress or challenges the communities have faced in taking responsibility for conservation as a community, village meetings, and poaching. It is the field officer's responsibility to present and explain the report to the CHCWP project director.

Funding

From CHCWP's financial point of view, one of the main incentives behind gradually changing from anti-poaching patrols to investigations is the fuel money the could be saved from not having to driving in search of poachers, transporting arrested poachers to the villages, and returning driving to the regional or district court to testify for the case. What is not known is how long it will take for the results of community work to be apparent and the need for anti-poaching patrols to decrease. If money is saved, it could go toward hiring one or two more field officers so that there is a greater ratio of field officers to villages and more time can be spent developing the skills and capacity of the communities.

In the mean time, CHCWP will need funding to pay for costs associated with improving CHCWP-village dialogue. These costs should be minimal because field officers and the anti-poaching team already visit CHCWP villages, spend the majority of their time in RHS hunting areas, and have downtime between patrols when they could work with the communities. If costs do start to rise, CHCWP could apply for a grant from an aid donor agency or conservation organization such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), or the World Wildlife Federation (WWF)

As a community wildlife project in Tanzania, empowering the community to develop, implement, and manage their own wildlife conservation strategy should be a Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project priority. If this vision were realized, I feel that both CHCWP and communities would gain a better understanding of the causes of poaching and the challenges in the wise-use of natural resources. Through such avenues of communication, perhaps CHCWP can work with other NGOs and organizations to combat the some of the sources of poaching activities and the demand for the *nyama*. Only then will tradition of Tanzanian game hunting survive to support game management and wildlife species survival.

References:

1. Adams, Jonathan S. and Thomas O. McShane. *The Myth of Wild Africa, Conservation without Illusion*. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California.
2. Bloody Africa - film
3. Civile, John R. and William R. Duggan. *Tanzania and Nyerere, A Study of Ujamaa and Nationalism*. 1976. Orbis Books. Maryknoll, New York, USA.
4. Communal Areas Management Program For Indigenous Peoples (CAMPFIRE) <http://www.campfire-zimbabwe.org/>
5. Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project (CHCWP) <http://www.cullmanandhurt.org/introduction.html>
6. International Resources Group, Ltd. 2000. Community Based Conservation Experience in Tanzania: An Assessment of Lessons Learned. Washington, DC.
7. Leopold, Alfred. *Game Management*. 1986. The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin, USA.
8. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. 1974. The Wildlife Conservation Act of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam; 55-97.
9. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam. Tanzania.
10. Myers, Bryant L. *Walking with the Poor, Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*. P.99. Orbis Books. Maryknoll, New York, USA. 1999.
11. *The Field Afar, Msange, Tanzania*. Episode 3. Narrated by Steve Allen. Maryknoll World Productions.
12. *The Field Afar, Shinyanga, Tanzania*. Episode 8. Narrated by Steve Allen. Maryknoll World Productions.
13. The Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project. Oct 16. <http://www.zambiatourism.com/travel/General/lirdp.htm>
14. United Nations Environment Programme. Nov 20. <http://www.unep.org/>

Appendix 1.

Interview List:

1. Sally Capper, Project Director (CHCWP)
2. John Ngalesoni, Field Officer (CHCWP)
3. Andre de Kock, Professional Hunter (Robin Hurt Safaris Ltd.)
4. Raoul Ramoni, Owner and Manager (Tanzania Big Game Safaris)
5. Fred Nelson, Field Officer (Sand County Foundation)
6. Susan Row, Executive Director (Flathead Land Trust)
7. Connie J. Johnson, Foreign Service Officer (USAID El Salvador)
8. Jim Blackburn, Environmental Lawyer (Blackburn & Carter Law Firm)
9. Dr. Kairn Klieman, African History Professor (University of Houston)
10. Fr. Jerry Kelly, Missionary Priest (Maryknoll, Chile)
11. Fr. Ed Schoellmann, Missionary Priest (Maryknoll, Tanzania)

Appendix 2.

Key Movers and Shakers in the Field –

CHCWP – Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project, Tanzania

LIRD – Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project, Zambia

FZS - Frankfurt Zoological Society

CAMPFIRE - Communal Areas Management Program For Indigenous Peoples

USAID – United States Agency for International Development

UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme

Mweka School of Wildlife – base community education on MWEKA curriculum –
African flavored (116)

AWF – African Wildlife Foundation

CRS - Catholic Relief Services

Appendix 3.

Arusha Declaration of Wildlife Protection

Julius Nyerere

The survival of our wildlife is a matter of grave concern to all of us in Africa. These wild creatures amid the wild places they inhabit are not only important as a source of wonder and inspiration but are an integral part of our national resources and our future livelihood and well being.

In accepting the trusteeship of our wildlife we solemnly declare that we will do everything in our power to make sure that our children's grandchildren will be able to enjoy this rich and precious inheritance.

The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower, and money, and we look to other nations to co-operate with us in this important task the success or failure of which not only affects the continent of Africa but the rest of the world as well (Adams and McShane 113).

Appendix 5.

Tanzania Government Fees for Hunting Permits

Animals	Government Fees (\$)
Baboon	90
Buffalo	600
Bushbuck	340
Bushpig	190
Crocodile	840
Civet	140
Duiker	180
Eland	840
Elephant	4000
Hartebest	370
Hippo	840
Hyaena	190
Honey Badger	70
Impala	240
Jackal	120
Klipspringer	720
Lesser Kudu	1300
Greater Kudu	1170
Dik Dik	170
Grants Gazelle	220
Thompson Gazelle	190
Leopard	2000
Lion	2000
Oribi	120
Oryx	870
Ostrich	740
Reedbuck	290
Roan	870
Sable	1200
Steinbuck	150
Serval Cat	180
Topi	350
Warthog	320
Waterbuck	440
Wildbeest	320
Zebra	590
Porcupine	70
Fox	180

Appendix 6.

Makao Village Benefits Projects 1991-2001

Village-District		Earnings to Date	Village Benefits
Makao-Meatu	1991-2001	\$82,712	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Maize Mill and Mill House (1991) *Tractor & Trailer (1992-3) *Repair Tractor & Maize Mill (1996) *Two Wells/water pumps (1995) *New Primary School (1994-) *Dispensary/Desks (1997) *Maize donation/tractor repair (1998) *Primary School Supplies (1999) *Maize Donation (1999) *Doctor's housing (2000) *Primary School Latrines (2001) *Contribution Kimali Secondary (2001)
Iramba Ndogo-Meatu	1994-2001	\$41,913	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *New Primary School (1994-) *Maize Donation (1998-9) *Teacher's house/toilets *2 Primary School Classrooms to Lentil *Contribution Kimali Secondary (2001)
Mwangudo-Meatu	1998-2001	\$17,640	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Renovate Primary School (1998-) *Clinic (1999-2000) to Village Office *School Toilets *Finishing of Primary School (2001) *Contribution Kimali Secondary (2001)
Sungu-Meatu	1997-2001	\$17,640	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Maize donation (1998-9) *Primary School Construction (1999-) *Maize donation *Teacher's house (2001) *School toilets (2001) *Contribution Kimali Secondary (2001)

Points of that could be Developed Further

Community-based conservation is a complex model to implement successfully because of the different cultural perspectives, assumptions, and expectations. As I presented the drafts of my strategic vision paper to reviewers, I found they wrestled with similar issues: cultural discrepancies, who really benefits from CHCWP, the distinction between poaching and hunting, and the odd relationship between Robin Hurt Safaris, Ltd. (RHS) and the Cullman and Hurt Community Wildlife Project (CHCWP). I will briefly address these dilemmas, their role in wildlife conservation, and how they can be addressed.

Africa has a long history of colonialism and, more recently, Euro-centric development projects. Designing an African community conservation project using Western philosophies would probably be unsuccessful because communities' true needs and desires aren't considered. Successful, sustainable projects take into account local culture and communities' needs. To better understand communities, how people relate to wildlife and benefit from it, village structure, local political systems, and the history of natural resource management at the grassroots level, sociological studies must be done in RHS, Ltd. hunting areas. CHCWP cannot know what villagers would benefit from unless they ask and listen. Only then can the impact of CHCWP and RHS, Ltd. on communities and communities' impact on wildlife be understood and managed.

Secondly, many pinpoint a conflict of interest between RHS, Ltd. and CHCWP because CHCWP works with communities to conserve game and decrease poaching while RHS clients hunt the game. People are upset by the fact that when local Tanzanians hunt game to provide meat for their family or to sell, it is considered poaching. Meanwhile, wealthy RHS client hunt and it is trophy hunting. What is poaching? Who owns the wildlife? Who is truly benefiting from CHCWP, the villagers or the client? Are anti-poaching agendas valuable or even appropriate? The integrity of CHCWP village benefit projects also needs to be analyzed to determine their impact on the village, whether it is positive or negative. Who does CHCWP benefit, the communities, wildlife, or hunting company? Ultimately, it would be best for CHCWP to separate from the tourist hunting company's policies because its attachment complicates motives and requires CHCWP to place RHS, Ltd. needs above those of villagers and wildlife.

These points lead me to conclude that the most beneficial step CHCWP could take would be to conduct sociological studies to better understand the impact CHCWP has on villagers, and village roles and dynamics. To train villagers to communicate openly and honestly, CHCWP employees must first be willing to educate themselves.