UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area: Community Benefits and Challenges (2002-2020)

By

Prudence Nkomo

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree: Master of Arts in International Relations (MA, International Relations) in the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, South Africa,

December 2021

Supervisor: Professor Yolanda Sadie

DECLARATION

I, Prudence Nkomo, declare that:

I. The research reported in this dissertation/thesis except where otherwise indicated, is my original research.

II. This dissertation/thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

III. This dissertation or thesis does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs, or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons

IV. This dissertation/thesis does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the internet unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the dissertation/thesis and in the reference's sections.

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The attainment of this degree has truly taken a village. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the individuals and institutions that have affirmed my academic skills in one way or another.

Ekuqaleni, ngibonga uNkulunkulu nezinyanya zami. Camagu!

To my supervisor, Prof Sadie - words are not enough. Thank you for guiding and affirming me, thank you for your wholesome supervision. I reach this milestone, running on empty on numerous fronts but you have cheered and believed in me the whole way. Thank you, Prof for fighting for me and never giving up on me. May you do for others as you have done for me.

To my parents who have invested in my education and made it possible for me to make it this far, ngiyabonga bazali. Mine is to always make you proud. To my sisters, thank you for always cheering me on and believing in me.

To Dr Robin Bourgeois, thank you for tirelessly availing yourself to help. You introduced me to people who work at CIRAD and CASS UZ which opened an entirely new world of possibilities for me. Thank you for believing in my research.

To Dr Onwu, thank you for the hours you spent trying to help me to refine my ideas. Thank you for always affirming me, as a chemistry professor your deposits to my research are what has helped me finish this degree. I can never thank you enough.

To Heather Thuynsma, you have been my safe landing space since undergraduate. There has not been a tear you haven't seen, no demotivation you haven't witnessed and no frustration you have not listened to. Thank you for all you have done and still do for me and the many many many hugs. Thank you for fighting with and for me.

To Prof Harris and Dr Ncube, thank you for your support. You gave me an amazing opportunity that allowed me to grow as a researcher. Prof Harris, thank you for reminding me that care can be found in these lonely academic institutions. Thank you for being so empathetic and warm.

My masters was funded by the Andrew W Mellon Foundation's Inequality grant. This scholarship helped ease the financial burdens involved with pursuing this qualification. I am so grateful for the scholarship.

To my community, my friends, extended family, and many other people I journeyed with; I am because you are. Bongani Dube, Ruramai Zvirevo, Tanaka Maimba, Mmakeng Pheko, Oniccah Maenetja, Zuzile Hlathswayo, Dr Mellissa Mlambo, Nomathamsanqa Veremu, Michael Chavinda, Tinotenda Mpofu, Kundai Mtasa, Amanda Moyo, Zaphesheya Dlamini, Jabulile Madonsela, Nhlanhla Khumalo, Dr Toyin Ajao, Stanley Nyoni, Oripa Chipfumbu, Dr Nomzamo Malindisa, Lutho Bobe, Cathy Moroke, Gontse Letsapa, Ncumisa Pendu, Tawika Nyathi, Tengetile Zwane, Zinyusile Khumbula, Benjamin Oyebode, Dr Sean Maliehe and many others that I might not have mentioned.

To my favourite mtomdala - ngiyabonga Dewa, Sayi, Vumabalanda. Thank you for the roles you all played on this journey.

Most importantly, I would have not managed without the bottomless and premium support that I received from Dr Banda. Some days I dreaded your calls, but you made sure this milestone is reached. There was nothing too big and out of reach for you. Zikomo, Banda.

Peba, you were my unofficial supervisor. You are the one person that has grown with me and this topic. For the numerous hugs and countless calls trying to put out the many fires I encountered - Raleboga. Truly, you were my saving grace during this pursuit. I hope you see the fruits of your support and persistence.

To my therapist, thank you for the emotional support throughout this pursuit. I have fallen so many times, but I always got back up after a few visits to your offices. Thank you for being my favourite safe space.

Truly, umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu.

Lastly, in the wise words of Snoop Dogg - “Last but not least, I wanna thank me. I wanna thank me for believing in me. I wanna thank me for doing all of this hard work. I wanna thank me for never quitting.”

Mimi, here’s another one for us.

ABSTRACT

The past two decades have seen the proliferation of transfrontier conservation areas (TFCAs) in the southern African region, of which the second, the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (the GLTFCA), which is the focus of this study, was established in 2002. It is made up of national parks in Mozambique, Zimbabwe and South Africa. The aim of the transfrontier conservation areas is not only to improve biodiversity conservation, but to also enhance socio-economic development in rural areas and to contribute to reducing poverty in local communities.

The aim of this study was to trace the nature of the benefits to local communities living within and near the GLTFCA since its establishment in 2002. How have communities benefitted and what challenges have they faced over the years? This study focused on two communities, the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe and the Kruger National Park in South Africa. The major findings of this study revolve around the three major aspects addressed in this study namely: the nature of the benefits to local communities because of the GLTFCA initiative; the nature of the challenges they face and lastly, their involvement in the decision-making processes. The major benefits to the Makuleke community in the Kruger National Park and the communities in the Gonarezhou National Park are summarised under the following themes: benefits from tourism, benefits from the enhancement of livelihoods, benefits arising from access to resources in the parks and benefits from cross-border access and trade. These are also the broad categories of potential benefits from TFCAs highlighted in numerous SADC and GLTFCA official documents.

Tourism has been a major drive of economic income and the sustainment of livelihoods of local communities, particularly in the Kruger National Park. Tourism has also led to a market for arts and crafts through the Kruger Park's arts and crafts outlets. Such opportunities also exist in the Gonarezhou National Park. The transfer of knowledge (also envisaged as a potential benefit to communities) has manifested in different ways for communities in the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks. Over the years rangers and community members have also been trained to work at lodges or as rangers in the conservation and anti-poaching units by SANParks in the Pafuri

area. In the Gonarezhou Park, most of the employees are from local communities while community members are also hired for the construction and maintenance of camps in the park. Communities also benefit from access to resources such as medicinal plants and the cutting of grass for livestock during droughts, that are found inside the national parks. These benefits are both tangible and intangible.

Although communities have benefitted in several ways through the establishment of the GLTFCA, several challenges have also been experienced. Despite the income-generating projects that have resulted from the GLTFCA initiative, these have not had a tangible effect on the alleviation of poverty in the communities. A further challenge over the years has been human-wildlife conflict and the lack of compensation for losses incurred by local communities which result in a lack of trust in the management of the parks.

Scholarly contributions on the benefits to communities are scant and those that have focused on communities have addressed a particular issue. It is therefore difficult to establish a holistic picture of the nature of community benefits and the challenges communities in the GLTFCA face.

LIST OF ABBREVIATONS AND ACRONYMS

ANAC	National Administration of Conservation Areas
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
CBC	Community-Based Conservation
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CWM	Community Wildlife Management
FLS	Front Line States
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GLTFCA	Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area
GTZ	German Development Agency
ICDP	Integrated and Conservation Development Projects
ITCZ	Inter-Tropical Convergence Zone
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JMB	Joint Management Body
KfW	German Development Bank
NGO	Non-Government Organization
PPF	Peace Parks Foundation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADC RISDP	Southern African Development Community Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
SADC RIDMP	Southern African Development Community Regional Infrastructure Development Master Plan
SANPARKS	South African National Parks
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

TBPA	Transboundary Protected Area
TFCA	Transfrontier Conservation Areas
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WWF	World-Wide Fund for Nature
ZIMPARKS	Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, AIM AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 Introduction

The greater part of the post-independence era in Southern Africa has seen a proliferation of transboundary/transfrontier conservation areas (TFCAs). A transboundary protected area is defined by the International Union for Conservation (IUCN) as:

"An area of land and/or sea that straddles one or more boundaries between states, sub-national units such as provinces and regions, autonomous areas and/or areas beyond the limits of national sovereignty or jurisdiction, whose constituent parts are especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed cooperatively through legal or other effective means" (IUCN, 2004).

A transboundary protected area is therefore a generic term that covers several types of transfrontier areas that are set aside for conservation. The Southern African Development Community (SADC) views these transfrontier conservation areas as important since they are regarded as a means of an enabling environment for local/community participation in decision-making processes. In addition, they are regarded as increasing opportunities for investment in income-generating activities for communities to improve local economies, which could result in poverty reduction (SADC, Information document).

The first TFCA established in the SADC region was the Kgalagadi TFCA in 2000. The Kgalagadi straddles South Africa and Botswana. The GLTFCA[1] was the second in 2002 and it is made up of national parks in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and South Africa

[1] The Great Limpopo Park (GLTP) was established in 2002 when the Presidents of Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe signed an international treaty in Xai-Xai, Mozambique (GLTP, 2014). Two years prior to this international treaty, ministers representing the same countries signed the Skukuza Agreement in Skukuza, South Africa (GLTFCA, 2016: 2). The Agreement finalised the three states' intent to establish and develop a Transfrontier Park (GLTP, 2014: 2).

(SANParks, 2004). Since 2002, 18 TFCAs at different levels of implementation, are in existence in Southern Africa. The purpose of the parks is to employ conservation as a land-use option to the benefit of the local people. The rapid growth of the transfrontier areas, which straddle geo-political colonial boundaries of state sovereignty, presents the fulfilment of a vision of a "boundless" and "borderless" Southern Africa (Muzeza, 2013: 1).

The GLTFCA is a space (as mentioned above) where political borders are theoretically blurred, and ecological borders are prioritised. With colonialism, the three above mentioned countries were divided politically and borders were created so that their sovereignty could be defined. No regard was given to ecological systems (Bhatasara, et al., 2013) (Ramutsindela, 2007). To 'revive' wildlife ecosystems, the Great Limpopo's mission is to "remove all human barriers …connect ecological systems … so that animals can roam freely within the local ecosystem" (GLTP, 2014). Furthermore, the purpose of the GLTFCA is to benefit local people through "the establishment of cross border tourism and socioeconomic development programs" and promoting "peace and stability in the region" (GLTP, 2014). As a result, both local people and wildlife are catered for.

However, after nearly two decades in existence, the extent and way in which communities have benefitted from the GLTFCA initiative is not clear. Some scholars such as Muzeza (2013), argue that most of the benefits go to government entities and the private companies that invested in tourism and not to the communities. Zanamwe et al. (2018) also found that the inclusion of local communities, particularly on the Zimbabwean side, in ecotourism and conservation-related enterprises chains has not yet materialised. This is due to the absence of appropriate academic and professional skills as well as the lack of knowledge on the ongoing ecotourism and conservation related projects. Furthermore, the institutions that have been created for the ecotourism and conservation related developments are weak and lack capacity (Zanamwe et al., 2018: 10). In contrast, Harmon (2006) asserts that the Makuleke community in South Africa, as owners of a lodge within the Kruger, own and profit from all concessions from the park since they also own the land. A holistic overview of the achievements and failures have not been undertaken by scholars. As will be shown below, scholars have focused on a specific area of interest.

1.2 Aim of the study

Given the above brief background, the study aims to trace the benefits to local communities living within and near the GLTFCA over the 18-year period since the formal establishment of the GLTFCAin 2002 until 2020. In doing so, the study also seeks to establish the challenges local communities face within this transboundary initiative. In other words, how have communities benefitted, in what way have these benefits affected their livelihoods and what challenges have they faced over the years? The specific questions that this study attempts to answer are:

- What is the nature of the resources that have been distributed to communities and in what way did the communities acquire these?
- In what way have the livelihoods of communities changed?
- What is the perceived relationship between the local communities and the park management?
- Do local communities participate in decision-making processes and in what way do they participate?

The study will focus on communities living in the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe and the Kruger National Park in South Africa. The Zimbabwean Park is administered by Zimparks whilst the South African park is regulated by South African National Parks (SANParks). The two countries were chosen not as a means of comparison, but to develop a more nuanced understanding of the lived experiences of their communities. Moreover, both the Gonarezhou National Park and the Kruger National Park have been in existence before the TFCA initiative. The local communities have therefore been living in these areas long before the TFCA initiative. Changes in their lives after formally becoming part of the TFCA would therefore be noticeably visible.

1.3 Literature review

In this study, the scholarly contributions on the topic of transboundary conservation in Southern Africa are divided into three sections. The first section contains information

on the historical background of the Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) concept and the motivations for its establishment. This is followed by scholarly contributions on the implementation of TFCAs in Southern Africa, with a particular focus on the years between 2000 to 2010 when the first TFCAs were established in the region. The third section highlights the scholarly work on the lived experiences of communities living within and adjacent to the GLTFCA, particularly in the period 2010 to 2020.

The history of the TFCA concept and the motivations for their establishment

Whilst the first TFCA in the world was established between the United States of America and Canada in 1932, the first TFCA in Southern Africa, as mentioned above, was only established in 2000. Mavhunga and Spierenburg (2009) postulate that TFCA proposals including Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa date back to 1927. These proposals were debated from 1925 to 1940. The existence of these debates almost seven decades before the establishment of the first TFCA in Southern Africa, highlights how this concept might not be as new as it sounds.

The first national parks such as the Yellowstone in the USA (1872), Sydney in Australia (1879), Banff in Canada ((1885) and Tongariro in New Zealand (1887) were created by the British settler societies. Berglund (2015: 9) explains how these national parks became the blueprint "for modern states to civilise nature, an ideal of protecting and managing pure nature for conservation, tourism and identity politics". Thereafter, the idea spread worldwide and scholars such as Jones (2012: 31) argue that "national parks are one of the most important and successful institutions in global environmentalism" though Berglund (2015) disagrees with this argument because of the legacy of national parks and local communities in Africa. A case in point is the creation of the Kruger National Park where black people were removed from the land to make way for the national park. Similar processes of exclusion were implemented when the Gonarezhou and Limpopo national parks were established.

Furthermore, Carruthers (1989, 1995) points to the fact that black people were pushed into wage labour through the control over access to land and the systemic undermining of their land and resource rights. Whande (2007) also concludes that these protected areas did not occur overnight, but they mirrored the ways in which the colonial state

was being institutionalised and this affected the local people's use and access to natural resources. Similarly, scholars such as King (2010) also argue that colonial authorities created national parks mainly for hunting and tourism purposes whilst forcibly removing indigenous people. This was all done under the banner of wilderness protection. As a result, the history of national parks is imbued with dispossession and restricted use of resources (for black people) that is paramount and still feeds into the negative perceptions of black people who are afraid of losing their land rights and [access] to natural resources (Brechin et al., 2003).

Cognisant of this colonial history of national parks, some of the literature in the early 2000s questioned the post-colonial state of nature conservation in Southern Africa. The literature particularly focused on the possibility of this TFCA initiative being a port-manteaux concept of a form of neo-liberalisation, a reignition of the Cape to Cairo[2] narrative or the renaissance of the African dream (see Brockington and Duffy (2011); Draper and Wels (2002); Ramutsindela (2007) and Hughes (2015)). Brockington and Duffy (2011) postulate that the neo-liberalisation of nature through TFCAs is fuelled by the way the marketing of conservation areas as tourist locations is directly linked to the idea that consumption is a prerequisite for sustainable development. For Draper and Wels (2002) the peace parks idea was born on the ideals of colonialism. Additionally, the authors identified the paradoxical way the Peace Parks Foundation[3] (PPF) was attempting to focus on community participation and development whilst "presenting the African landscape with noble savage mythology" (Draper and Wels, 2002). Ramutsindela (2007) explains that the transborder tourism offered by the TFCA initiative, likened the TFCA initiative to the 'Cape to Cairo' idea. In addition, the work by Ramutsindela (2007) shows that through initiatives such as the TFCAs, the imperial motives behind ideas such as 'Cape to Cairo' were being reinterpreted in the 21st

[2] The Cape to Cairo narrative refers to the railway line that was supposed to run from the South (Cape Town) to the North (Cairo) of Africa to serve the British empire and their interests. The initial idea was created during the Western colonial period under the guidance of Cecil John Rhodes. This railway line would be a channel for the colonisers to transport goods, weapons and have an undisturbed transport system through the African continent.

[3] The Peace Parks Foundation was initiated in February 1997 by HRH Prince Bernard of the Netherlands, Nelson Mandela, and Anton Rupert to assist in the establishment of peace parks or TFCAs in southern Africa. The aim of the foundation was to assist in the delivery of peace parks that are functional and managed harmoniously with their surrounding communities to create sustainable local, national, and regional benefit flows (PPF, 2002).

century to promote tourism in Africa. Simultaneously, the African dream initiative was meant to connect "the splendours of Africa through a network of Afrikatourism routes from Cape to Cairo" (Ramutsindela, 2007: 132). The initiative was developed alongside the cross-border parks idea however, Addison (cited in Ramutsindela, 2007) argues that Anton Rupert (of the Peace Parks Foundation), through his promotion of the peace parks, gave the African Dream initiative a geographical expression. Likewise, Hughes (2005) argues that the "planning of the GLTP exacerbates and reinforces structural racism and that the current conservation discourse is strikingly similar to imperial colonial legacies" (Berglund, 2015: 51).

A group of scholars such as Hulme and Murphree (2001); Barrow & Murphree (2001); Duffy (2001) and DeMotts (2017) examine the concept of community-based conservation and the promises it would fulfil. The TFCA model was marketed as an initiative that would use a community-based model of conservation, which emerged as a response to top-down fortress conservation models that excluded people from protected areas (Hulme & Murphree (2001) and Buscher (2013)). The tenets of community-based conservation place communities as an integral part of conservation. Referring to the views of Barrow & Murphree (2001), community-based conservation allows for people to manage their own resources, encourages multiple ways of development, ensures sustainable and equitable accrual of benefits amongst other things. In addition, the TFCA initiative was marketed as something that would fulfil economic, social and conservation elements whilst also providing benefits through the same avenues (Duffy, 2001). Economically, the TFCA model would promote ecotourism and the development of local communities. Socially, it was postulated that TFCAs would re-establish historical links between communities DeMotts (2017).

Juxtaposed with the history of conservation in Southern Africa and the promise of community-based conservation, scholars such as Berglund (2015), Hughes (2002) and Wolmer (2003) examine the international financial support for the development of the GLTFCA. The GLTFCA received financial support from donor agencies such as the German Development Bank, the French and Italian development agencies, and the World Bank among others (Schoon, 2008). Berglund (2015) explains the importance of the funds received from donors as they compensated for the limited financial abilities of the three countries and how they supported the PPF as a Non-

Government Organization (NGO) that was involved in the fundamental stages of the peace park initiative in Southern Africa. However, the work done by Hughes (2002) raised concerns over the link between the increased support and attention on transboundary initiatives and the possible Western influence on these initiatives. Similarly, Wolmer (2003) highlights the hesitancy from the Zimbabwean government because they saw the involvement of these donors as an interference and pushing of an 'external agenda'.

Although the TFCA concept was presented as an ideal package for the region because it would allow for a redressing of past injustices and an exploration of regional integration, Wolmer (2003) argued that the existence of a TFCA could interfere with informal transborder livelihood strategies that are paramount for local livelihoods. Furthermore, the author explained how not all local communities make a living through natural resources, thus, ecotourism and entrepreneurship might not be a one size fits all solution. In addition, Schoon (2008) warned against viewing the TFCA initiative as a panacea.

The research on the colonial history of national parks has been prominent since the 1990s, however, the emergence of the TFCA initiative inspired a further inquiry into the motivations behind the growing popularity of transboundary conservation initiatives. The sections below will highlight scholarly debates on the implementation of the TFCA concept in Southern Africa and the lived experiences of communities in the GLTFCA.

The implementation of the TFCAs in Southern Africa (2000-2010)

Most of the literature between 2000 to 2010 focused on the implementation of the TFCAs in Southern Africa, the role of the NGOs such as the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) and the initial impacts of the TFCAs on communities, especially the resettlement of communities. These will be discussed below.

As mentioned above, the first TFCA established in the region was the Kgalagadi TFCA in 2000. The Kgalagadi straddles South Africa and Botswana. The GLTFCA was the second in 2002 and it is made up of national parks in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and

South Africa. As mentioned above, 18 TFCAs at different levels of implementation, are in existence in Southern Africa. NGOs such as the PPF, Conservation International, the African Wildlife Foundation and the World-Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) have been instrumental in the establishment of the TFCAs in Southern Africa (see Duffy (2001); King (2004); Spierenburg, Steenkamp and Wels (2008)). Duffy (2001) explains the involvement of the PPF in lobbying governments for transfrontier conservation and the critiques lodged against the Foundation for overlooking consultation with local communities. Schoon (2008) also illustrates the prominence of, the PPF, particularly the Foundation's involvement in the signing of the international treaty to establish the GLTFCA.

According to Duffy (2001), communities had chances of enhanced bargaining power through their relations with international NGOs but there was a possibility that the needs of communities could be undermined if they participated in TFCA initiatives that include powerful actors. For King (2004), the support for disenfranchised communities placed the NGOs at a favourable and powerful position with regards to influencing the conservation agendas. However, Spierenburg, Steenkamp & Wels (2008: 148) argued that "the NGO sector is not homogenous and its involvement in TFCA development is likely to have contradictory effects on the position of communities – which are not homogenous either – and therefore further complicates the issue". For Khan (2009) one of the functions of the NGOs is also to be the link between the growing economic needs of the local communities and the need to preserve the 'natural wealth' of the location.

A second group of scholars focus on the resettlement of communities because of human wildlife conflict and/or making way for the establishment of a park. These include Cernea (2006); Lunstrum (2010); Milgroom and Spierenburg (2008); Tavuyanago (2017) and Ramutsindela (2002). According to Cernea (2006), forced displacements or evictions place conservation goals in peril and fuel conflicts between the park management and local people living near a protected area (see also Pimbert and Pretty, 1995). For Lunstrum (2010), the reinvention and transformation of spaces (such as the hunting concession to a national park) highlights a power dynamic between who can reap the benefits of the transformations and who must sacrifice for the transformation to be manifested. Furthermore, Milgroom (2012) illustrates how the

local communities in Mozambique through resettlements, sacrificed their livelihoods, land, and homes to make way for the national park. In addition, with the translocation of more wild animals, the incidences of human wildlife conflict escalated and led to the further displacement of local communities (Milgroom & Spierenburg, 2008). Similarly, Tavuyanago (2017) shows that with the establishment of the Gonarezhou National Park, local communities were also evicted. In addition, Ramutsindela (2002) uses the Makuleke as an example of eviction and resettlement in South Africa. The aforementioned illustrate the prominence of resettlements and evictions of local people within national parks and the sacrifices that were made for the creation of the Limpopo National Park.

The lived experience of communities in the GLTFCA (2010-2020)

Most of the literature on the GLTFCA in the period 2010-2020 focus on the lived experience of the local communities, in particular, benefit sharing through ecotourism, the involvement of local communities in decision-making and the actualisation of the promises of the GLTFCA initiative (see for example Chirozva (2015); Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017); Zanamwe et al. (2018) and Hoogendoorn et al. (2019). Firstly, for Chirozva (2015) the tangibility of local community benefits was as important as the intangible benefits. He illustrates how community involvement in the planning of ecotourism ventures was both a practical expression of the communities' agency but also a means of benefitting. For Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017) factors such as poor resource and administrative governance primarily lead to minimal community involvement in tourism and subsequently benefits could not be actualised. In addition, Zanamwe et al. (2018) argue that for communities in Zimbabwe, economic benefits were not trickling down to individual households and that the chances of benefitting were directly proportional to involvement in ecotourism initiatives. On the other hand, Hoogendoorn et al. (2019: 8) show how effective benefit sharing requires "good corporate governance, transparency, consultation, communication, education and trust for all stakeholders emerged as important in effective benefit transfer".

The involvement and participation of local communities in the GLTFCA decision-making processes is a theme that has been explored by Thondhlana and Cundill (2017); Ntuli et al. (2019); DeMotts (2017) and Maluleke (2018). For Thondhlana and

Cundill (2017) local people would be more supportive and involved in protected areas if they have access to the protected areas, have access to benefits, and if clear lines of communication, especially with park management authorities, exist. Ntuli et al. (2019) emphasise the importance of the perceptions of local communities on conservation and the associated initiatives since these influence their level of involvement. In her work DeMotts (2017) highlights the fact that community participation in the Kruger National Park was more pacification than open conversation. She further highlights the lack of information dissemination from the park management to the local communities. Moreover, she argues that there was no commitment from the government's end to involve local communities in a manner that will result in the envisaged outcomes of the GLTFCA. Maluleke (2013) details the way the co-management agreement between the Makuleke community and SANParks could benefit from a different governance structure to promote an equal contribution from both parties.

A further group of scholars examine the impact of 'blurring' political borders on local communities and wildlife. Milgroom (2012) explains how local communities have suffered invisible losses through resettlements and displacements. In contrast, Bhatasara et al (2013) argues that the 'blurring; of borders could be beneficial to wildlife ecosystems and possibly increase wildlife numbers. DeMotts (2017) refutes the premise that the existence of the GLTFCA has reconnected local communities.

From the above overview it is evident that scholars hold different views on the achievements and challenges that local communities within the GLTFCA face. Each of the scholarly contributions also focus on a specific issue or theme with some focusing on the shortcomings while others highlight the success of the GLTFCA in terms of the development of communities in these areas. None of the contributions provide a holistic analysis of the challenges and achievements that local communities in Zimbabwe and South Africa have faced since the establishment of the GLTFCA. This study hopes to fill this gap.

1.4 Method of Research

Qualitative research refers to “the meanings, concepts, definitions and characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of things” (Berg, 1989: 3) Likewise, this study was a quest to primarily find the meaning, definitions, symbols, and characteristics of the benefits accrued or promised to local communities. A qualitative method of inquiry was the most fitting for the questions this study seeks to answer because it allows for deep comprehension of the particular (Domholdt, 1993). The ‘particular’ in this study are the local communities residing inside and surrounding the GLTFCA. A case study refers to an in-depth presentation and analysis of a single unit with an aim to generalize across a larger number of cases or units (Creswell, 2007). In this study, the local communities in the GLTFCA are explored as the case or unit of analysis. Furthermore, a case study design allows the researcher to answer ‘how’ and ‘why’ a specific phenomenon or programme functions the way it does in a specific context (Polkinghorne (2005) and Baxter & Jack (2008)). This study seeks to understand ‘how’ the communities have benefitted and the way the GLTFCA (as a TFCA) functions. Thus, a case study design was the most appropriate design for this study because the study area is bounded by time and place (Creswell, 2003) and context (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The study is based on the analysis of both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include the Treaty signed with the establishment of the GLTFCA, government publications, newspapers, and annual reports. These were useful in providing information on the historical context of the GLTFCA and TFCAs in Southern Africa. Secondary sources on the other hand, were important in establishing whether communities in Zimbabwe and South Africa have been acquiring the perceived benefits foreseen in the establishment of the TFCAs and in this study, the GLTFCA. Although the study focuses on communities in or neighboring the national parks in South Africa and Zimbabwe forming part of the GLTFCA, this is not a comparative study of the lived experiences of the different communities. Instead, the aim is to bring forth a deeper understanding of the lived experience of communities in different locations in the larger trans frontier conservation area of which they form part.

An analytical framework (see chapter 3) for this study is drawn from the SADC TFCA programme, IUCN transboundary conservation guidelines and the GLTFCA treaty, which, among other things, set out the perceived benefits and commitments to

communities. These documents were chosen because some contain information related to the functioning of TFCAs in general while others relate to the GLTFCA. The information collected from the primary and secondary sources are analysed in line with the mentioned analytical framework.

1.5 Structure of the study

This first chapter provides the background and aim of the study. It also provides a literature review of the scholarly contributions on the topic as well as the method of research. Chapter 2 is devoted to the historical background of the TFCAs, their establishment and in particular, the establishment of the GLTFCA and its functioning. The analytical framework that guides the study is developed in chapter 3. The framework is developed from among other things, regional treaties and protocols and documents from the respective state conservation management agencies, SANParks in South Africa and Zimparks in Zimbabwe. Chapter 4 analyses the benefits to communities within the GLTFCA and their role in decision-making in the management of the GLTFCA. It also discusses the shortcomings of the GLTFCA initiative, specifically regarding the benefits to communities and the improvement of their livelihoods. Chapter 5 concludes the study by providing a summary of the main findings.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSFRONTIER CONSERVATION AREAS AND THE GLTFCA

2.1 Introduction

Transfrontier conservation areas (TFCAs) as noted in the previous chapter, refer to protected areas that stretch across two or more countries with the aim of conserving wildlife whilst generating socioeconomic benefits for surrounding local communities. These areas, of which there are now 18 at different levels of implementation in southern Africa, are not a recent conception. Although the first one in southern Africa, the Kgalagadi TFCA was established in 2000, the idea of such parks is intertwined with the colonial origin of national parks in Africa. The TFCA concept is also not unique to Africa because, as mentioned in the previous chapter, there was a TFCA that was established between Canada and the United States of America (USA) in 1932.

The development of TFCA's in southern Africa has been underscored by several protocols and frameworks, ranging from the SADC Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement of 1999 to the SADC TFCA Programme of 2013. Furthermore, in establishing the TFCAs in southern Africa, several actors played a significant role. The Peace Parks Foundation in particular, spearheaded the establishment of a majority of the regional TFCAs, especially the GLTFCA in 2002. However, despite the acclaimed benefits of the establishment of the GLTFCA, it did not take place without the eviction and resettlement of local communities.

This chapter provides a historic overview of the development of the TFCA's and in particular, the GLTFCA. The first section shows the colonial origin of the idea of wildlife conservation, the post-colonial development of the concept and the introduction of the TFCAs in southern Africa. In the second section an overview of the protocols and frameworks that have underscored the idea and management of TFCAs, over the years, is provided. The last sections are specifically devoted to the GLFTCA. The role of the PPF in the establishment of the GLTFCA will be explored as well as the

establishment of the GLTFCA and the initial consequences the establishment had on communities. Lastly, an overview of the structure and functioning of the GLFTCA is presented.

2.2 The road to establishing the GLTFCA: colonial and postcolonial conservation and the introduction of TFCAs in southern Africa

The colonial context of wildlife conservation in southern Africa is significant in understanding how transboundary conservation has evolved because these events have had a bearing on public, political and community attitudes towards wildlife conservation and, by extension, transboundary conservation. The colonial background particularly influenced the policies and agendas at national level, which in turn, also laid the foundation for transboundary conservation policies in the 21st century. In the following brief historical overview of conservation practises during the colonialism and the period after decolonisation, the focus is specifically on the way colonialism affected and/or influenced the current state of conservation in the region.

2.2.1 Colonial and postcolonial conservation in southern Africa

Colonial conservation

Colonial constructions of nature were influenced by the creation of Yellowstone National Park, the first national park in the USA (Berglund, 2005). The model of conservation used at Yellowstone was imitated and recreated in several locations, including southern Africa.

Yellowstone National Park was established in 1872 and is in Wyoming, parts of Idaho and in Montana too. A series of expeditions to explore the Yellowstone area took place from the early 1800s to 1870 (Augustin and Kubena, 2010). The first expedition, by Lewis and Clark, took place in 1804 to 1806. In this expedition 50 miles of the Yellowstone Park was explored (Augustin and Kubena, 2010). The next expedition took place in 1860 but it failed to explore the Yellowstone Plateau. The Folsom-Cook-Petterson expedition of 1869 was successful. Two additional successful expeditions were conducted in 1870 and 1871 (Augustin and Kubena, 2010). These expeditions

provided insights that led to the lobbying and creation of the Yellowstone National Park Protection Act. The Yellowstone Park Protection Act states that “the headwaters of the Yellowstone River … is hereby reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or sale … and dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people” (NPS, 2021). To make way for the national park, the native Americans were removed and banned from the park. The removal of these tribes, among other reasons, resulted in an increase in the wildlife population. Consequently, this decision “changed the environmental balance between humans and the animals living there” (Agustin and Kubena, 2010:71). Since this was the first national park, managing the park posed some challenges - there were no preceding examples on how the park should be managed (Augustin and Kubena (2010).

The national parks initiative in southern Africa was implemented using the blue print of the Yellowstone National Park. However, the striking difference was that Yellowstone was depopulated yet most ‘national parks’ in southern Africa had residents. Thus, the social issues that have been encountered in southern Africa, were not present in Yellowstone (Berglund, 2005).

The models of conservation used during the colonial and postcolonial era in Southern Africa were either a by-product of the Yellowstone model, or an effort to rework and re-establish a form of conservation different from the initial one at Yellowstone. The discussion below will describe the events that shaped conservation areas in Southern Africa.

Whilst the first TFCA in Southern Africa was established in the early 2000s, the road that led to the evolution of protected areas is believed to have started around the 1880s to 1890s, when the first game reserves were created in South Africa. The first was the Pongola game reserve and it was established in 1889, but was officially proclaimed in 1894, in the then Transvaal province of South Africa (Carruthers, 1995). The Sabi game reserve, located in the South African lowveld, followed in 1898 (Carruthers, 1995). The creation of these two game reserves was to primary preserve and promoted an increase in the number of game animals. This was with the hopes that the excess would be culled by paying sport hunters, in the future. In addition, the game reserves were also created to exclude Africans from accessing wildlife. The

Pongola game reserve was made up of seven farms situated at the poort where the Pongola River cuts through the Lebombo mountains whilst also surrounded by the Transvaal, the New Republic, Swaziland, and parts of Zululand (Carruthers, 1995: 22). The area between the Sabie and Crocodile rivers was turned into a game sanctuary and restricted hunting zone. It was initially named the Government Game Reserve, then it was renamed to the Sabi Game Reserve in 1898 by President Kruger of South Africa. In 1903, the area between the Sabie and Olifants rivers was added to the reserve.

At the end of 1903, in the face of strong opposition from landowners and hunters, Kruger also proclaimed a second reserve, the Shingwedzi Game Reserve which, covered the area between the Letaba and Levuvhu rivers (Africa Geographic, 2018). (These original reserves formed the core of what is the Kruger Park today). Although hunting was still forbidden in the game reserve, wildlife was still scattered, and the numbers were fluctuating.

The first park warden, James Stevenson-Hamilton was appointed head ranger of both reserves, together with a small number of other rangers, who assisted him. Establishing the reserve as a national park under the South African Union Government was the only way to secure the future of wildlife in the reserve. However, World War I broke out in 1914, many reserve staff left to serve in the army and they could not be replaced. As a result, the reserve experienced extensive poaching and only started recovering in 1919 (Africa Geographic, 2018).

The national park discussions were restarted after the recovery. One of Hamilton's visions was to create a national park that would be sustained by tourism. This vision came into fruition in 1926. The Shingwedzi and Sabie Reserves were merged and the 70 privately owned farms between them were purchased by the government to form a consolidated area. The National Parks Act was drawn up and passed and the Kruger National Park was established. A year later (1927) the park was opened to tourists[4].

[4] Only three cars entered the Park in 1927 but it soon became a popular destination. Within a decade, 3 600 km of roads had been built and several camps established (Kruger National Park: undated).

Across southern Africa, a number of other parks were also established. In 1907, one of the biggest national parks in Africa, the Etosha National Park was proclaimed. The Etosha National Park in Namibia covers an area of 22,270 square km. It has an abundance of wildlife, with most of the lions, elephant, rhinos, and other large animals of Namibia living within the park. The Park was also home to the Hai//om people who are hunters and gatherers - normally classified under the bushman or San group of people in Namibia (Dieckmann, 2001). The Hai//om were still accepted as residents of the game reserve; however, they are currently left without a legal title to any land in Namibia (Dieckmann, 2001: 127).

Likewise, the start of protected areas in Zimbabwe (then Southern Rhodesia) was the proclamation of the Wankie Game Reserve in the 1930s (Andersson and Cumming, 2013). The Wankie Game Reserve situated in what is known today as Hwange, was proclaimed as a national park in 1950.

According to Neumann (1995), the proposals to preserve nature in national parks, in East Africa began in the early years of the 20th century. In the 1920s, local game officials brought forward the possibility of establishing a national parks system. The Serengeti National Park in Tanzania was established in the 1940s.

In Zambia, the Kafue National Park is the oldest and largest national park, covering around 22 400 square km. It is located within the Kafue Basin, in the south-central part of Zambia and was first proclaimed as a game reserve in the early 1920s to aid in controlling the “progressive attrition of wildlife populations” (Mwima, 2001: 58).

In 1948, proposals for the establishment of a national park that included the area covered by the Kafue Game Reserve and the Cordon Controlled Area were brought under discussion. (Mwima, 2001). In 1950, the Kafue National Park was established. Similar to most of the national parks mentioned above, there were human settlements in the Kafue Game Reserve before it was declared a national park. However, in 1945, some of the people from the Kasonso and Busanga villages had to move out of the game reserve to an area in the north to make way for the national park.

According to MacKenzie (1988; 1991: 22), the game reserve initiative was based on several assumptions such as: that humans and animals were incompatible and that hunting by Africans was inadmissible because it was perceived as regressive. Furthermore, the methods adopted by Africans were unacceptable. Similarly, Child (1995) interpreted the creation of game reserves as a potential solution for wildlife preservation and an extension of European tradition of royal hunting grounds. Carruthers (1995: 92) explained how these game reserves were white inventions that elevated wildlife over humanity and were used as instruments to dispossess and subjugate local people. Berglund (2015: 9), postulates that the national parks concept became a prototype used by modern states to 'civilise' and protect the purity of nature for conservation, tourism, and identity politics. Moreover, the western perceptions of Africa's landscape as the 'lost Eden', the ultimate icon of a natural aesthetic were fundamental in the creation of game reserves and national parks (Adams and McShane, 1992: 5-7; Draper et al., 2004: 346). Through these game reserves and national parks, Africa would provide a wild and natural environment for Europeans to experience (Anderson and Grove, 1987). In addition, the Edenic perceptions could accommodate Africans as 'the noble savage' where being closer to nature than civilisation was beneficial (Neumann, 1998: 18; Draper et al, 2004: 346). Thus, Africans could be kept in these spaces if they fit the 'pure' and/or 'uncivilised aesthetic'.

Postcolonial conservation

The attainment of independence for most countries in southern Africa ushered in a period of asserting sovereignty from colonial rulers. Murombedzi (2006), postulates that the post/neo-colonial governments in southern Africa have continued and possibly strengthened the colonial conservation practises. In addition, there have been numerous new protected areas that have been established in the same locations as previous colonial protected areas. These new protected areas have had little to no regard for the conservation and livelihood practises of local people. Thus, "conservation continues to be imposed, alien and arbitrary, barring people from their lands and denying their understanding of non-human nature" in the post/neo-colonial era (Adams, 2003:9). However, since most of the postcolonial conservation practises are built on Western conservation influences of colonial remnants, the preservationist conservation ideology fosters a separation between humans and nature plus nature

and culture. Therefore, poor countries face moral and practical dilemmas because oftentimes human needs are sometimes dependent on access to nature.

When Zimbabwe became independent in 1980, the new government inherited a skewed land distribution, national parks and the problems that rose because of the intersection of these two entities (land distribution and national parks) (Wolmer et al., 2004). By 1994, wildlife ranching had become one of the fastest growing uses for commercial farm land in Zimbabwe. However, in South Africa where white rule existed since independence from Britain in 1934/1961, colonial conservation policies were still being upheld. It was only in 1994 with the end of apartheid rule that the incoming government sought to establish new conservation policies such as the Land Restitution Act 22 of 1994 and the National Environmental Management Act of 1998.

Part of the apartheid government's mission was to separate black South Africans from their rights in national parks. As a result, parks such as the Kruger National Park were seen as protected areas that reflect "power and privilege which have shaped South African society" (Cock and Fig, 2000: 23). The apartheid government ensured the exclusion of black people as consumers of national park' recreational offerings but also as decision makers. Cock and Fig (2000), argue that the exclusion also manifested through requirements such as an entry fee and the need for motorised transportation to access the park. As a result, these protected areas were inaccessible for black people since they had neither the money for the entry fee nor the motorised transportation. The apartheid system caused black people to be at the bottom of the food chain, what they had and could afford was the minimum (Cock and Fig, 2000).

Additionally, part of the apartheid government history of protected areas in South Africa was the forced removal of local people. These forced removals excluded the low wage labourers because they were to be exploited by the whites in the Kruger National Park. Therefore, protected areas in South Africa, particularly the Kruger National Park were administered and maintained in a manner that enforced white minority privileges, which were against the ethos of nation building (Carruthers, 1995).

For Singh and van Houtum (2002) fortress conservation made way for post-colonial or new conservation in southern Africa in the 1980s. Hulme and Murphree assert that

post-colonial conservation ideals were founded on three premises. These premises, according to Hulme and Murphree (1999), start with challenging the state centric nature of conservation. Conservation would be practised and implemented at a local level in society. The local level would be seen as a community therefore, resulting in community-based conservation or community conservation. Secondly, postcolonial conservation shifted from preservationist conservation models to sustainable development models. Sustainable development models allow for both conservation and development goals to be satiated. Lastly, postcolonial conservation is influenced by neoliberal economic thinking. This neoliberal thinking seeks to remove and/or reduce the inequities that resulted from fortress conservation (Singh and van Houtum, 2002).

Postcolonial conservation in Zimbabwe

The colonial conservation practises in Zimbabwe existed until the attainment of independence in 1980. These colonial conservation practises included the removal of local people to make way for the establishment of national parks and banning the use of wildlife for commercial and traditional hunting (Child, 1996). According to Child (1996), separating the local people from their resources, rendered the resources valueless. In addition, wildlife symbolised oppression for the local people therefore, its destruction was encouraging. Poachers were subsequently considered heroes. As a result, local people started to keep domestic animals and planting crops because this benefitted them as opposed to the wildlife. This led to a disappearance of wildlife.

Project WINDFALL was the first formal attempt at linking communal people and wildlife management (Child,1996). Project WINDFALL was in existence from 1978 to 1989. Through project WINDFALL the money collected from culling in the national parks and safari hunting in the communal areas was given to the rural district councils. The state, through the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management, still managed the conservation areas. Project WINDFALL was not successful because the money stayed with the councils, so the local people received few benefits (Child, 1996). Moreover, the local people were not involved in the management and thus developed no interest. From 1989 to 1993, the Communal Areas Management Programme (CAMPFIRE) was established and implemented (Child, 1996). CAMPFIRE was a

community-based natural resource management programme. CAMPFIRE came into being after the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Act of 1975 was revised and extended legal provisions to the rural district councils. Therefore, in CAMPFIRE, unlike in project WINDFALL, rural district councils had authority and they were accountable to the landholders they represent (Child, 1996). Communities, as opposed to the rural district councils, were to manage and benefit from wildlife. In addition, CAMPFIRE guidelines insisted that decision-making should be devolved and that most of the revenue collected from the wildlife is given to the 'producer' community. So, the rural district councils had authority to manage the wildlife, only if the benefits and management would be devolved to the community.

Postcolonial conservation in South Africa

As briefly explained above, in South Africa, the apartheid government's conservation policies were centred on racial exclusion. So, when the democratic government took over in 1994, they sought to create a democratic system that was inclusive in all processes and structures. This resulted in the Constitution of 1996, which includes a commitment to protecting the environment whilst improving the livelihoods of the local people (RSA Government, 1996: Section 24). The inclusion and involvement of black people in conservation was an integral part of the post-apartheid conservation efforts by the South African government. Therefore, there were numerous attempts to integrate black people into conservation through offering financial assistance and skills development (Musavengane and Leonard, 2019). However, most NGOs involved in conservation were still headed by whites, which could present problems if effective transformation should take place. The hegemonic ideals of conservation that were held by colonial and racialised mindsets could still be transferred through education and other means (Musavengane and Leonard, 2019). Thus, programmes such as the Youth Environmental Services Programme funded by the Department of Environmental Affairs in the Western Cape that were meant to expand the environmental knowledge and participation in conservation of young people had to be examined (Musavengane and Leonard, 2019).

In addition, collaborative management was established between local people and conservation NGOs to aid in expanding the skills and knowledge transfers to young

black people in communities. SANParks as the state conservation agency, also conducted environmental education programmes for previously excluded communities and created Park forums as a consultative platform between communities and other stakeholders for the management and development of national parks (SANParks, 2004).

SANParks also promoted social equity by including black people in high level leadership positions in its organisational structure. The first black woman (Dr Yvonne Dladla) was appointed as the director of the SANParks social programme in 1995. The social programme led to the creation of the SANParks directorate of People and Conservation, which aims to improve the parks' relationship with their community neighbours (SANParks, 2004). The National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998, NEMA: Protected Areas Act of 2004 and the White Paper on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of South Africa's Biological Diversity (July 1997) were policies that promoted equitable access to natural resources and the rights of all people to participate in conservation related activities (Musavengane and Leonard, 2019).

Although the post-colonial conservation era began at different times for Zimbabwe and South Africa, the centrality of local people involvement and benefits to local people in the respective post-independence and post-apartheid policies, align with the premises of post-colonial conservation that were suggested by Hume and Murphree (1999), mentioned above. The efforts to redress inequities were evident in the CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe and in the People and Conservation programme in South Africa. The post-colonial conservation efforts in both countries paved the way for the models of conservation that were pursued in the region, thereafter.

Community based conservation

"Community-based conservation (CBC) emerged in the 1970s and 1980s as a response to colonial top-down fortress-conservation models that excluded people from protected areas" (Büscher, 2013: 11; Hulme and Murphree, 2001). CBC is a community-oriented approach toward conservation. The term is an umbrella term for policies, ideas, practises, and behaviours that seek to give those residing within rural

environments a greater involvement in managing natural resources and/or greater access to the benefits produced by these resources that are within the same geographical location as them (Hulme and Murphree, 2001).

Hulme and Murphee propose that whilst “community conservation represents a shift of authority (and management and benefits) to local residents”, they still function as part of a bigger regional, national, and international arena that has multiple institutions and organisations playing a role (2001: 5).

According to Barrow and Murphree (2001: 34), community-based conservation has four objectives to:

- create an enabling legal and policy context for local people to manage their own resources sustainably
- encourage the development of wildlife offtake, safari hunting and tourism in communal lands
- establish institutions for the effective local management of natural resources, and
- ensure that benefits accrue on a sustainable and equitable basis.

Adams and Hulme (2001: 18) suggest that community conservation has “diffused particularly fast across Africa and has become more solidly entrenched there than in many other regions”. They further posit that one of the main reasons that expedited the speed at which community conservation was accepted is the aid-dependency within sub-Saharan Africa. This was evident in the manner in which international non-governmental organisations (NGO, hereafter) and aid donors applied community conservation which would then be developed and implemented by certain “champions”. Moreover, Barrow and Murphree (2001: 29) asserted that:

“the institutionalisation of community conservation in Africa today is largely a product of initiatives by international conservation agencies (endorsed by state governments), shaped by conservation professionals and funded by international environmental grant sources”.

On defining community-based conservation and its adaption in Southern Africa, Barrow and Murphree (2001: 24) postulate that:

"'Community' is a noun that has consistently defied precise definition while 'conservation' is often given a meaning at odds with the cultural perspectives of the 'communities' that are expected to practise it. In spite of, or perhaps because of, this ambiguity the term has gained a prominent place in the international lexicon of environmental policy and practise embracing a broad spectrum of approaches and programmes. "

The 'broad spectrum of approaches and programmes' include community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), community wildlife management (CWM), community-based conservation (CBC) and Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) amongst others. This propagates the idea that there was possibly an initial and intentional ambiguity when choosing CBC in Southern Africa to make space that allows for multiple manifestations of the other affixes of 'community'. Additionally, Büscher argues that this type of conservation was built on "ideals of respect for indigenous knowledge, awareness of historical injustices, and the compatibility of human development and conservation of nature" (Barrow and Murphree, 2013: 11).

2.2.2 The introduction of TFCAs in southern Africa

Mavhunga and Spierenburg (2009), provide evidence of aspirations to create a transborder park similar to the GLTFCA, seven decades before the establishment of the GLTFCA. In 1933, Gilchrist (then Minister of Commerce in Rhodesia) announced plans to transform the Kruger, Gonarezhou and Coutada 16 (now Limpopo National Park) into "the greatest game sanctuary in the world" (2009). Gilchrist emphasized the need for collective transborder cooperation as this project was too big to be worked on single-handedly (Mavhunga and Spierenburg, 2009). There were further talks about TFCAs between 1936 and 1937. AOG Mogg, who worked for the South Africa Wildlife Protection Services, tabled a motion for the creation of a national park or game reserve in Southern Rhodesia that could be similar or possibly linked to the Kruger (Mavhunga and Spierenburg 2009). Mogg suggested that this reserve could adjoin the

Limpopo River and maybe stretch as far as the Birchenough Bridge and Beitbridge, but they had reservations as the "existing reserve [the Gonarezhou] did not [physically] link up with the Kruger" (Mavhunga and Spierenburg 2009: 730). However, during a talk on a trip to Salisbury[5], there was a suggestion on the possibility of creating a corridor that would link these countries. This suggestion was a precursor of the Sengwe corridor that joins the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks (Mavhunga and Spierenburg 2009).

The changes in Africa's political landscape and by implication also in the political landscape of southern Africa since 1989, provided and enabling environment for the establishment of TFCAs in the region. In most African states, political liberalisation and reform have unfolded. Bitter civil wars ended in, for example Angola and Mozambique, creating political stability and establishing more pluralistic systems of government offering opportunities for economic development. Also, Namibia, after 24 years of revolt and warfare, gaining independence from South Africa in 1989, held its first democratic elections[6]. Furthermore, the demise of apartheid rule in South Africa in 1994 and the orderly transition to democracy were not only seen as likely to result in the improvement of the economic situation of much of the people in the country, but also creating improved economic prospects in the southern African region (Rasheed, 1996: 6-7)). There was also a renewed emphasis on regional integration, peace building and peace making after the political and economic shifts that came about as a result of the end of the cold war, attainment of democracy and independence for most countries in southern Africa.

Various arguments are put forward on why southern Africa was regarded as an appropriate region for the TFCA initiative. According to Swatuk (2005) there are four

[5] After independence the name of the capital Salisbury was changed to Harare.

[6] During the 1960s most of Africa's countries had gained independence except for Namibia. The independence era ushered in democratically elected regimes in the former colonies, though one-party rule subsequently took over and became the dominant norm. The degeneration of single party rule into corrupt, unrepresentative and in many cases, a repressive system of government fuelled continuing struggles and demand for democratic change (despite being ruthlessly put down by the autocratic regimes). An upsurge of democratic change engulfed the continent since 1989 and by the middle of 1994 multi-party elections have taken place in an overwhelming majority of African states including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Angola and Malawi (see for example, Rasheed, 1996; Bratton and van de Walle,1996).

factors that played a role. Firstly, the way the colonisers or imperialists built their 'states and empires' was heavily influenced by politics. In other words, they built their states and empires in places that were suitable for their political aspirations and locations that could showcase their sovereignty. As a result, the region was divided politically, with no cognisance of natural conservation pathways such as areas of transitions where for example, there was a semi-arid climate transitioning to a sub humid climate or from dry to moist savanna. Other pathways include locations through which large mammals, including humans, migrated seasonally, depending on the movement of the inter-tropical convergence zone (ITCZ) (Swatuk, 2005: 2). Therefore, conservation groups believed that "reconnecting extensive but fragmented protected areas will … correct a wide variety of environmental ills … and achieve regional commitments to multilateral environmental agreements and the UN millennium development goals" (Swatuk, 2005: 2). A second factor was the region's formal interstate commitment to regional peace and economic development (Swatuk, 2005). These interstate commitments were done through the Frontline States alliance (FLS) and SADC. The FLS was a coalition of African countries that was in existence from the 1960s to the 1990s. The coalition's mandate was to put an end to apartheid and white minority rule in South Africa and Rhodesia. Thus, the existence of cooperation and deep alliances as a result of these agencies was important. Most importantly, the work done by SADC such as the regional protocols, policy guidelines, laws and regulatory frameworks was considered crucial for long term regional economic growth and sustainable development (Swatuk, 2005).

Thirdly, some of the SADC states were, at the time, transitioning from conflict to peace and from authoritarian rule to political liberalisation (mentioned above). Therefore, nature was considered an important aspect in peace building considering the role forests, mountains and national parks played in providing hideouts for rebel movements and the military (Swatuk, 2005). In addition, Duffy (2007) and Berglund (2015) explain how the end of the civil war in Mozambique and apartheid in South Africa led to new means of cooperation and focus on regional integration, thus, conservation was the most fitting area where possible collaborations could be established. These TFCAs would be parks for peace as they would be paramount in regional peace-making and building. As shown above, TFCA initiatives were

presented with expansive ambitions for nature conservation, economic development, and peace building (Berglund, 2015).

The political, social, and economic climate of southern Africa between the end of apartheid in South Africa and the creation of the first TFCA in the region, was a perfect landing ground for the TFCA initiative. With South Africa's peaceful transformation to democracy, the air was filled with optimism, excitement, and expectation to the role it could play in the region. Although the new government had inherited many problems from the apartheid government, there was a commitment to redressing past injustices, in particular, land distribution. The need to resolve past injustices deeply embroiled by skewed land distribution policies led to the eagerness of South Africa's involvement in TFCAs. However, a new democracy like South Africa, a sanctioned Zimbabwe, and a Mozambique recent from a civil war, were in no position to financially support the TFCA ambitions. Donor funding though (as discussed below), made the whole idea of the TFCAs a reality.

2.3 The role of the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) and the donor community in the establishment of TFCAs

The PPF is recognised as the organisation that primarily lobbied for and facilitated the TFCAs in southern Africa. The foundation, as previously mentioned, was founded in 1997 by Dr Anton Rupert, President Nelson Mandela, and Prince Bernhard of the Netherland. The aim of the PPF was to re-establish, renew and conserve large ecosystems in Africa, transcending humanmade boundaries by creating regionally integrated sustainably managed networks of TFCAs (PPF, 2005). The PPF dream is to "reconnect Africa's wild spaces to create a future for man in harmony with nature" (PPF, 2005). In addition, the Foundation believed that conquering political boundaries will allow them to re-establish, renew and preserve functional ecosystems (PPF, 2005).

The Foundation not only assists the TFCA partner countries in identifying key projects and designing project plans, but also assists in securing the necessary funding required for the projects (PPF, 2005).

As of 2019, eight TFCAs have been established with the assistance of the PPF, four are in the emerging stages and six are in the planning stages. The PPF has also facilitated other African transfrontier conservation areas in countries further north such as Zambia, Malawi, and Angola.

Because of the critical importance of skills and people in the success of the peace parks, the Peace Park Foundation also runs the Southern African Wildlife College and the SA College for Tourism.

The origins of the PPF

In May 1990, the then President of the World-Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Anton Rupert, held a meeting with Mozambican President Joaquim Chissano to discuss the possibility of linking protected areas in southern Mozambique and other adjacent protected areas in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Swaziland (Hanks, 1997: 12). This meeting has been cited as the first effort by Anton Rupert to establish TFCAs in the region. Thereafter, a feasibility study was carried out by the WWF SA and submitted to the Mozambican government. As a result, the Mozambican government requested financial assistance from the World Bank's Global Environment Facility (GEF) and by 1996, the World Bank through the GEF produced a report that suggested a shift from protected areas to a concept that emphasised multiple resource use by local communities (Hanks, 1997). The suggestion for a shift sparked the TFCA idea. For the TFCA initiative to be implemented, the WWF SA executive committee suggested that a separate body that would coordinate and drive the TFCA process, had to be established. This separate body that was established was the PPF. It was established with a starting fund of R1,2 million from Anton Rupert (Hanks, 1997). After establishing the PPF, a discussion about potential TFCAs, was held with South African and neighbouring country conservation agencies. Seven potential TFCAs were identified and the GLTFCA was the largest of them (Hanks, 1997).

Although the efforts of the PPF are widely acclaimed by the region's leaders, private sector entities and individuals, some scholars such as Draper, et al. (2004), regarded the PPF as nurturing solidarity between the old (mostly white), new business and

political elites through creating a 'super African' identity that is formed through bonding with nature. In addition, they argue that through community-based conservation, old elites can feign concern for the previously disadvantaged. Most importantly, the bonding of the old and new elites over nature, is still based on an Edenic perspective. In this instance, local communities are divided into good and bad. The good being the communities that are closest to nature and less 'civilised' whilst the seemingly modernised communities pose a threat for the 'pure nature-Edenic' aesthetic (Neumann, 2000: 227; Draper et al., 2004: 349). Since the TFCAs are to benefit and develop local communities, the motivations of the involvement of the PPF in TFCAs are regarded as questionable since the local communities and the super elite are polar opposites but are both beneficiaries of nature (Draper et al., 2004).

The donor community and the establishment of the TFCAs

The successful implementation of the TFCA initiative in southern Africa required significant donor support, as mentioned above, so NGOs such as the WWF, the GEF and PPF provided the financial support needed. The GEF urged other donors to participate in the TFCA initiative. The donors were, among others, the German development Bank (KfW), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Ford Foundation. The WWF and GEF were specifically instrumental in the creation of the GLTFCA (see discussion below). Additionally, donors such as the German development agency (GTZ), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and USAID worked closely with the PPF towards the realisation of the TFCA initiative in southern Africa. Kokwe (1997) suggested that all these actors had varied motivations for their involvement, sometimes their collective interest and beliefs overlapped. Büscher (2013: 3), asserts that whilst it is true that conservation and capitalism share a history, neoliberalism is and has reconstituted conservation "as a tool for the expansion of capital" that reconfigures the practises, ideals, and representations of conservation. As established by Büscher (2013: 7) in his interview with the PPF's chief executive, politicians love the peace parks concept as it was a melting pot for all their interests such as conservation development and the fact that it is green. Büscher further details one of his interactions at a Dutch embassy, with the same PPF executive who explained how "the peace parks concept works well with politicians due to its "feel good' character" (Büscher 2013: 71). The

same executive shared how politicians “love to shake hands when the peace parks are being opened thus attracting good publicity [and] that tourism was a practical strategy to market the peace parks” (Büscher 2013: 71). The funding from the NGOs and international aid agencies therefore exhibits the relationship between conservation and capitalism.

2.4 The TFCA initiative: SADC protocols and frameworks

Since TFCAs are a global phenomenon, their foundational guidelines are provided for by the IUCN’s Transboundary Protected Areas (TBPA) guidelines. In southern Africa the concept of TFCAs is being incorporated into the national legislation and policies of most SADC countries, as well as their conservation agencies. The concept of TFCAs is formally supported by SADC members states and forms part of the official development strategy of SADC. The SADC protocols and strategies acknowledges that TFCAS can enhance socio-economic development in rural areas through the sustainable use of shared natural and cultural resources in addition to being effective vehicles for fostering regional cooperation and integration.

In addition to the SADC documentation specifically related to TFCAs which is highlighted below, a number of protocols and strategies provide an enabling environment for the establishment and development of TFCAs in the SADC region. Moreover, the SADC documents provides a framework and mutual goals to be worked towards by all member states. This propels regional integration and collaboration since the member states will be pursuing similar goals. The protocols and strategies include the SADC Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement (1999), which comprises of a common framework for conservation and sustainable use of wildlife in the region. Furthermore, the SADC Protocol on Forestry (2002) gives guidelines on the undertaking of national forest assessments and national forest policies, programmes, and laws (SADC, 2012). The aim of the SADC Protocol on Shared Water Courses (2002) on the other hand, is to foster closer relations among member states for the protection, management, and use of shared watercourses in the region. The SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy (2006) as the name indicates, provides a framework for cooperation and implementation of provisions aimed at sustaining

biodiversity in the region (SADC, 2012). Furthermore, the revised SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) emphasises that sustainable development and the conservation of wildlife and transboundary natural resources are key priorities of SADC.

Although, the above-mentioned protocols have sections dedicated to the TFCA initiative, the SADC also developed documentation specifically related to TFCAs. The first is the SADC TFCA programme in 2013. The SADC TFCA programme was developed as an extension of the SADC structures' support for TFCA planning and development processes (SADC, 2012). The document also includes the overarching SADC vision and mission statements for TFCAs that were adopted by SADC member states at a meeting in March 2011. The programme has seven key components with specific objectives, activities, and outputs to be carried out at the regional, sub-regional and national levels.

Furthermore, in 2014, the SADC developed three more documents. These are the SADC TFCA establishment and development guidelines, the SADC TFCA network structure, and the SADC TFCAs tourism concession guidelines. The SADC TFCA establishment and development guidelines provide among other things, the principles of sustainability as their point of departure (SADC, 2012). The guidelines are divided into three parts, the first part covers background, contextual definitions, and a summary of the legal and policy frameworks that support the establishment and development of TFCAs (SADC, 2012). The second part covers the procedures that are important for the initiation of the TFCA process, the feasibility assessments, and the requirements for an implementation process. The last part focuses on providing guidance on the procedures associated with the establishment and development of TFCAs.

The SADC TFCA Network was created in 2013, as a response to the needs of SADC TFCA practitioners, the call was for a network that will facilitate information exchange, learning and innovation. Its purpose is to improve information exchange; joint learning and knowledge management; resource mobilisation and collaboration and relationships (SADC, TFCA Network). Lastly, the SADC TFCA tourism concession guidelines provide guidance for tourism concessioning in TFCAs within the SADC

region. It ensures that both the conservation and development objectives of regional TFCAs are met, in particular, rural development and community participation.

In 2017, the SADC TFCA monitoring, and evaluation framework was published. The necessity of the framework was shared as one of the strategic objectives of the SADC TFCA programme. In addition, the framework contains guidelines that were agreed upon by the SADC member states, the steering committee of the SADC TFCA network and the SADC TFCA unit.

From the above, the extent of involvement and commitment of the SADC to the development and sustainment of TFCAs in the Southern African region is evident.

2.5 The establishment and functioning of the GLTFCA

The GLTFCA, which is the largest TFCA was, as mentioned above, already an aspiration in the 1930s of ecologist Gomes de Sousa (Mavhunga and Spierenburg, 2009). However, this vision was eventually realised, though in a different political and regional context in 2002 when as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the presidents of South Africa, Zimbabwe and Mozambique signed a treaty in 2002 to establish the GLTFCA, after years of facilitation by Anton Rupert and President Chissano.

In 2000, two years before the GLTFCA international treaty was signed, ministers representing the above-mentioned countries signed the Skukuza Agreement in Skukuza, South Africa (GLTFCA, 2016: 2). The Skukuza Trilateral Agreement finalised the intent of the three countries to develop and establish a transfrontier park (GLTP, 2014: 2).

The establishment of the GLTFCA as set out in the Treaty is “for the purpose of conservation, socio-economic development and for public enjoyment” (article 2). The Park integrates the following areas: the Limpopo National Park in Mozambique; the Kruger National Park and the Makuleke region in South Africa; and the areas known as the Gonarezhou National Park, the Malipati Safari area, and the Manjinji Pan

Sanctuary in Zimbabwe. It also includes community areas which constitute the biodiversity corridor linking Gonarezhou to the Kruger National Park (article 3).

The management of the GLTFCA is overseen by a Ministerial Committee, the Joint Management Body (JMB), the Coordinating Party and other bodies which may be established if needed (article 9). The Ministerial Committee is made up of the Ministers mandated by the respective countries of the GLTFCA. The Ministerial Committee provides the overall policy guidance for the management of the park and should meet at least once a year. Additionally, the Ministerial Committee monitors the implementation of the joint management plan and should be chaired on a rotational basis (article 10). The JMB is made up of two representatives from the National Implementing Agencies of the countries, one from the national institutions responsible for borderline control of the countries and one representative appointed as deemed fit by each of the countries. The JMB focuses on the revision and implementation of the Joint Management Plan, provides methods of distributing GLTFCA funds, identifies and secures funds for financial needs for the effective implementation of the joint management plan. In addition, the JMB also acts as: “a convener or facilitator between diverse actors, a support function for empowering actors and lastly a coordinator that encourages information sharing” (article 11).

Lastly, the JMB is required to provide reports to the Ministerial Committee, meet quarterly and be chaired on a rotational basis between. The decisions made by both the Ministerial Committee and the JMB should be taken by consensus. One of the countries is designated as a coordinating party to promote accountability and ensure sustained momentum in the management of the park. It also oversees the existence of an effective JMB and achievements of the GLTFCA objectives as set out in the establishment treaty. This is a position based on a two-year rotation basis (articles 10-11).

Since the GLTFCA is a transboundary conservation initiative established through the signing of a treaty, it primarily functions according to the requirements set out in the establishment treaty of 2002 (discussed above), the GLTFCA Integrated Livelihoods Diversification Strategy of 2016 (hereafter, GLTFCA Livelihoods strategy) and the SADC protocols concerned with TFCAs that were mentioned above. In addition, the

individual country conservation policies also provide important guidelines for the functioning of the GLTFCA.

However, since the GLTFCA is situated in southern Africa and is made up of countries that are SADC member states, some of its basic functioning principles are provided for by the SADC's policies and frameworks. As mentioned above, there are nine SADC policies and frameworks that feed into the overall functioning of the GLTFCA. These are the SADC Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement of 1999, the SADC Protocol on Forestry of 2002, the SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy of 2006, the SADC Regional Indicative Strategy Development Plan, the SADC TFCA Programme of 2013, the SADC TFCA Network Structure of 2013, and the SADC TFCA Tourism Concession Guidelines of 2014. The SADC TFCA guidelines and the SADC TFCA monitoring, and evaluation framework of 2017 complete the range of documents that pertain to TFCAs and in this instance, the GLTFCA.

Additionally, the GLTFCA Livelihoods strategy details the way the GLTFCA will function with regards to enhancing livelihoods in the period 2016 to 2030. The GLTFCA Livelihoods strategy was developed by the JMB to establish ways of supporting the livelihoods of communities. The strategy provides elaborate objectives on the involvement of communities. The strategy feeds into the general functioning of the GLTFCA, building on the fundamentals set out in the GLTFCA Treaty of 2002. Outside of the legal documents that provide guidelines on how transboundary conservation areas should function, there are state conservation agencies like the South African National Parks (SANParks), Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (Zimparks) and the National Administration of Conservation Areas (ANAC) (Mozambique) that oversee the management and maintenance of their relevant national parks. As a result, the daily functioning of the Kruger, Gonarezhou and Limpopo National Parks are overseen by SANParks and Zimparks and ANAC respectively. The work done by SANParks is informed by the Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003, Zimparks is guided by the Parks and Wildlife Act of 1975 and ANAC is guided by the National Environmental Policy 5/95 and the Environmental Law Act 20/97. All these acts are instituted by the governments of South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique respectively.

2.6 The movement of communities in establishing the GLTFCA

Berglund (2015: 10) asserts that at the core of the creation of national parks was the image of a wilderness that was untouched by humans, therefore, national parks and people have historically been perceived as incompatible. As a result, the local communities that exist in and around the GLTFCA are no strangers to displacement because of conservation initiatives. Although their displacement and marginalisation occurred at different times, there is a striking resemblance in the way they are all negatively impacted by the existence or creation of a conservation initiative. Below are brief descriptions of the displacement and marginalisation that the Makuleke in the Kruger National Park, the Makavene in the Limpopo National Park and the Sengwe and Chisa in the Gonarezhou National Park in the GLTFCA have experienced.

Resettlement in the Kruger National Park

The Makuleke community have a history that can be traced back to the intersection of the Limpopo and Olifants rivers in Mozambique. As a result of the Mfecane war that happened between the 1820s and 1830s, they were moved to the most Northern corner of South Africa and eventually settled at the Pafuri Triangle during the 1830s. The Pafuri Triangle is an area near the confluence of the Limpopo and Luvuvhu rivers. The Pafuri Triangle's location within the Kruger National Park inadvertently led to the community being viewed as a hindrance to the plans that numerous actors had for the Kruger National Park (Carruthers, 1995). In 1933, the Transvaal Provincial Authority proclaimed the Pafuri Triangle as a game reserve that would be incorporated into the Kruger National Park (Ramutsindela, 2002: 17). However, the community's unwillingness to move led to their hunters being classified as poachers and their unfortunate removal from their land in 1969 (Ramutsindela, 2002: 17). The Makuleke were resettled from the Pafuri Triangle in the Kruger National Park to an area outside of the Kruger called Nthlaveni (Tapela, 2001). To discourage them from returning they were, according to Collins (2003: 1), "forced at gunpoint to set fire to their huts and livestock kraals". They were then "dumped" in three areas, placed under a Venda chief, and told to rebuild their lives.

Resettlement in the Limpopo National Park

For the GLTFCA to be established and the TFCA to materialise, the Limpopo National Park had to be created so that it could be joined with the Kruger and Gonarezhou national parks. The Limpopo National Park was created in 2001 (PPF, 2005). Since there were low wildlife populations in the Limpopo National Park because of the war that took place in 1992 in Mozambique, animals had to be translocated to the Limpopo National Park from the Kruger National Park (Massé, 2016). A further way to increase the wildlife population in the Limpopo National Park was to drop a portion of the fence between the Limpopo and Kruger National Parks to encourage the movement of animals between the two countries (Massé, 2016).

The creation of the park resulted in a myriad of problems for the local people. Firstly, the local people faced possible relocation as they needed to make way for the park. Secondly, the presence of animals enhanced the probability of more human-wildlife conflict. Thirdly, the commitment to the actualisation of the park attracted donor funding that aided in the procurement of rangers and more rules around the protection of wildlife (Massé, 2016). Previously, the Park was a hunting concession with a few rangers without much training or weaponry. Presented with these possibilities, the Makavene community was one of the communities that agreed to be resettled for the creation of the Limpopo (Garcia, et al. 2016). They were resettled to an area outside of the Limpopo National Park in the Massingir district near the Giriyondo border post between South Africa and Mozambique. They were promised better houses, infrastructure, and farmlands (Garcia, et al., 2016). However, three years after the resettlement (in 2011), the Mozambican state still had not fulfilled any of its promises to the community. The presence of animals such as elephants increased the incidents of human-wildlife conflict within the park. The presence of animals such as hippos at the Olifants river resulted in local people moving away from their homelands as the hippos would attack part of their crops and this would impact their food security. Additionally, the new rules being enforced by the rangers meant the local people could no longer trap or kill animals when they attacked them or their livestock because, if found guilty, could be fined or face jail. Therefore, the resettlement of local communities in the Limpopo National Park was motivated by the different ways in which the translocation of the animals impacted their lives (see Milgroom & Spierenburg, 2008; Witter, 2013 and Witter & Satterfield, 2014).

Resettlement in the Gonarezhou National Park

When the Gonarezhou was established as a game reserve in 1934 and thereafter efforts to remove all people residing in the park designated area were activated. These efforts gained momentum from the mid 1950s and was only successful in 1968 (Tavuyanago, 2017: 46). The Gonarezhou was the land of the Shangaan people, also known as the Tonga and Hlengwe. The removals of people in the Gonarezhou National Park gained momentum when the Chitsa community was earmarked for eviction. Thereafter certain areas from Nuanetsi to the Limpopo River were re-designated as the Sengwe Special Native Area that would accommodate the evicted people from the park. Between 1950 and 1968, the colonial government intensified efforts to remove all the Shangaan people that were still living in the Gonarezhou National Park (Tavuyanago, 2017:55). The Chisa, Ngwenyeni and Xilotlela communities were also targeted for eviction. Although the Chisa put up strong resistance to eviction, they were eventually evicted from the Gotosa area to the Chingoji. Soon after their arrival in Chingoji, they were moved again to an area at the periphery of the park called the Seven Jack area. They were given 50-day notices to vacate their Gotosa homes and those that resisted had their huts burned, bundled into trucks, and dumped at the new sites that were not in a habitable state. In 1962, the community was moved yet again from the Seven Jack area to Ndali near the Sangwe Tribal Trust Land (Tavuyanago, 2017: 58). When the Gonarezhou game reserve was upgraded to a national park in 1975, the Seven Jack area was added to the Gonarezhou National Park. The Sengwe community resides in the Sengwe Communal Land in the Gonarezhou National Park. The Sengwe communal land is situated where the corridor connecting the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks' is to be created. The creation of the corridor would result in about 5,600-15,500 people being relocated (Andersson and Cumming, 2013 and NewsDay, 2020)

From the above it is clear that the establishment of the TFCAs, and in this case the GLFTCA had (and still have) consequences for the communities. As Ramutsindela (2007: 112) puts it, the process of community marginalisation is embedded into the "conception, design and practises of TFCAs in the region". During the conception of the TFCAs, the initial maps were classified documents therefore, communities had

neither access to them, nor an idea that the areas they reside in, would form part of the TFCAs. Similarly, Tavuyanago (2016: 4) affirms that "the establishment of modern parks was largely influenced by the fortress conservation mentality that sought to protect nature from human beings by advocating for a people-out approach". Thus, both Ramutsindela and Tavuyanago agree that the exclusion and/or marginalisation of local people is entrenched in conservation practises being implemented in southern Africa. Moreover, "fortress conservation celebrates the timely coming of good conservationists (whites) to save game against extermination by irresponsible exploiters (blacks)" (Carruthers 1995: 2). As such, the exclusion of local people and distribution of land were guided by racially biased principles under the colonial government's policies in Zimbabwe and Mozambique and the apartheid government's policies in South Africa.

2.7 Conclusions

This chapter started with a brief overview of the development of TFCAs in southern Africa. Thereafter, conservation in the colonial and postcolonial conservation periods of southern Africa were explained. The colonial history of conservation was shared and contextualised with the events that were taking place in the world like the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in the USA in 1932. A brief overview of the establishment of game reserves in the SADC region, from the 1930s to the 1950s, was also provided. This brief historical overview of these game reserves highlighted the racially exclusionary policies and motivations that led to their creation. The establishment of national parks such as the Kruger National Park in South Africa, the Etosha in Namibia, the Serengeti in Tanzania, and the Kafue in Zambia developed from game reserves that were already in existence.

Fortress conservation that characterised conservation in southern Africa, made way for post-colonial or new conservation in the region in the 1980s. This new form of conservation is characterised by a move away from state centric conservation to community-based conservation; a shift from a preservationist conservation model to a sustainable development model, which allows for both conservation and development

goals to be satisfied, and lastly, the removal and/or reduction of the inequities that have resulted from fortress conservation.

It was then argued that the changes in Africa's political landscape since 1989, provided and enabling environment for the establishment of TFCAs in the region. Most countries were becoming democratic states after years of authoritarian one-party rule. The renewed emphasis on regional integration, peace building and peace making aided in the pursuit of TFCAs in the region because the TFCAs were the most suitable initiative that would help the region attain all three prospects. The need to redress past injustices that were by products of the colonial and immediate post-colonial era was also a pertinent vision of the TFCA pursuit by the region.

Since the TFCA initiative was enticing for the region, the PPF was established in 1997, as an organization that would facilitate the development and implementation of TFCAs in the region. It is still instrumental in the development of TFCAs. The KfW, USAID, the Ford Foundation, SIDA and GTZ are some of the donors that have been involved in the TFCA initiative.

With the financial backing from the donors and the implementation taken care of by the PPF, the TFCA initiative in the region was then supported by the SADC through the introduction of a number of protocols and frameworks pertaining to the functioning of the TFCAs.

The chapter then turned to the establishment of the GLTFCA, the second TFCA in the region, which spans across national parks in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa. Since the GLTFCA is a transboundary conservation initiative established through the signing of a treaty by the presidents of the three countries, it primarily functions according to the requirements set out in the establishment treaty of 2002, the GLTFCA Livelihoods strategy of 2016 and the SADC protocols concerned with TFCAs. In addition, the individual country conservation policies also provide important guidelines for the functioning of the GLTFCA.

However, despite the potential advantages envisaged with the establishment of the GLTFCA it was not without negative consequences for communities in the three areas

which comprise the GLTFCA. Four communities in particular, experienced displacement because of the establishment of the GLTFCA – these are the Makuleke community in the Kruger National Park, the Makavene in the Limpopo National Park and the Sengwe and Chisa in the Gonarezhou National Park.

In the next chapter an analytical framework is developed from the official documents (both regional and local) pertaining to, among other things, the vision, requirements and functioning of the GLTFCA.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK GUIDING THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction

The TFCAs that have already been established in the region such as the Kgalagadi, the Greater Mapungubwe and the Maloti-Drakensberg were not only established for the sole purpose of natural resource conservation. They were also established as sites that would generate socio-economic benefits for the local communities in and around these geographic locations. In chapter 1, the prominence of local communities in such initiatives was presented and the potential benefit accrual and involvement of local communities in the TFCAs were highlighted as important elements of the TFCA initiative.

The aim of this study, as noted in chapter 1, is to establish whether local communities have indeed benefitted and whether they have been incorporated in the decision-making processes, specifically in the GLTFCA, since its establishment in 2002. To establish whether local communities have benefitted from the establishment of the GLTFCA, this chapter develops an analytical framework, which will guide the analysis. This framework is developed from the protocols, frameworks, and legal documents such as the IUCN TBPA guidelines, which underlies the establishment of TFCAs across the world. In addition, the SADC programme for TFCAs and SADC TFCA guidelines contain the regional guidelines and aims for TFCAs. The SADC TFCA guidelines highlight the perceived benefits to communities as well as the importance of community involvement in the decision-making processes at all levels in the TFCAs. Of particular importance for this framework, is also the GLTFCA Treaty, which was signed at its establishment. This Treaty outlines the guiding principles for the functioning of the GLTFCA.

This chapter consists of three broad sections; the first section provides brief descriptions of benefits and their accrual. The section also contextualises and defines the concept of livelihoods. The second section discusses the potential benefits of the

TFCAs to communities as highlighted in the various official documents mentioned above. These include enhancement of livelihoods, cross-border access, tourism, and access to the park. The last section explores the importance of good governance and community involvement in decision-making processes in the GLTFCA. The improvement of the TFCA governance framework is highlighted as a key strategic area by the SADC Regional Biodiversity Action Plan (SADC, 2012). The SADC TFCA guidelines also highlight the importance of governance in different aspects of the TFCA initiative such as benefit flow, skills and knowledge sharing and ensuring sustainability. Moreover, the SADC TFCA guidelines elucidate on the existing governance models, structures, and instruments. The SADC TFCA guidelines also emphasise the involvement of local communities in the decision-making processes of managing natural resources (Zunckel, 2014). The prevalence of good governance and the involvement of local communities in decision-making processes will be analysed in Chapter 4.

3.2 Understanding the benefits, their accrual, and livelihoods

As set out in the GLTFCA Treaty, the benefits to local communities are a fundamental part of the TFCA initiative and its existence. The Treaty also highlights the socioeconomic development aspirations of the TFCA initiative. Thus, some of the many avenues that will yield benefits for the local communities are nestled in the socioeconomic development work that the GLTFCA and partners will be involved in. Consequently, the benefits for local communities from TFCAs are a crucial theme recurring in the protocols, frameworks, and legal documents, referred to in this study.

This section provides an overview of the perceived benefits to communities that are highlighted in the above-mentioned documents. It also elaborates (where applicable) on the requirements set out in scholarly contributions for the successful achievement of the benefits.

According to Cundill et al. (2013: 174), benefit accrual in conservation takes numerous forms such as regulated access to natural resources, which include fuelwood, building material, medicinal plants, wild foods, bushmeat, grazing resources, a share of

reserve profits and revenue sharing from tourism and other commercial activities. It can also include employment opportunities on the reserve or through public works programmes. As emphasised by Kideghesho et al. (2007: 2227), a benefits-based approach can be a motivational factor in securing local support for conservation. However, for its success, the benefits provided should firstly, be uniform across different villages. It would be illogical to anticipate success from just changing the attitudes of a fraction of a community. Secondly, "the benefits should be sufficient enough to offset the direct costs resulting from conservation and indirect costs of forgoing the ecologically destructive activities that local people perceive to be economically profitable" (Kideghesho et al., 2007: 2228). Thirdly, the benefits should be distributed equitably, and their future access should be guaranteed. For Kideghesho (2007: 2228), the long-term success of conservation depends on whether the living standards of the local people can be improved through the provision of benefits to the people and thereby alleviating poverty. Similarly, Cundill et al. (2013: 174) postulate that "the promise of benefits, realistic or otherwise, has been one of the fundamental forces that have aligned actors in the pursuit of co-management during land claim processes. Additionally, they affirm that "more importantly the benefits are almost never quantified but remain vague promises". If the benefits do not meet the resource demands of the people for survival, illegal activities by the people will continue.

The SADC programme for TFCAs acknowledges that the primary beneficiaries of TFCAs must be the rural communities that live in and around these areas and whose livelihoods are intrinsically linked to the integrity of ecosystems that these TFCAs conserve (SADC, 2012). An important component of the SADC programme for TFCAs is therefore the enhancement of local livelihoods. It identifies several strategies, which can benefit communities. These strategies will be discussed below. Furthermore, the SADC programme specifically emphasises that the vulnerable segments of the population, for example women and the youth, require special attention within these programmes.

Before discussing the various strategies that are put forward in the SADC programme for TFCAs which can enhance the livelihoods of communities, a brief overview of the meaning of the term 'livelihood' is provided. For Carney (1998: 2), a livelihood

comprises of “the capabilities, activities, assets that are both material and social that are required as a means of living”. Additionally, a livelihood is considered as being sustainable if it can cope and recover from stresses and shocks and manage or enhance its capabilities and assets for the present and future - all this whilst not undermining the natural resource base. Thus, the available assets constitute a stock of capital that can be stored, accumulated, exchanged, depleted, and put to work so they can be used to generate a flow of income or other benefits in a household, community, and at societal level.

Rutten and Leliveld (2008), mentions five types of resources that constitute sustainable livelihoods namely: natural capital, human capital, physical capital, financial capital, and social capital. Natural capital consists of the renewable and non-renewable natural resource that can be used to provide benefits to people. These natural resource flows are those things that the rural poor depend on most (Rutten and Leliveld, 2008). Human capital refers to knowledge, expertise, ability, and skills, which make humans an asset (Gaol, 2014: 696). Physical capital refers to equipment that can be used to improve peoples’ lives or work (Ellis, 1999). Financial capital are those assets obtained through the financial system in the form of salaries, income, subsidies, and deposits (Gorda et al., 2018), while social capital denotes “the rules, norms, obligations, reciprocity and trust embedded in social relations, social structures, and society’s institutional arrangements” (Narayan, 1997: 50). These enable community members to achieve their individual and community objectives.

Part of the vision of the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy aims to have flourishing communities. A community is flourishing if they are empowered and involved in improving their livelihoods through initiatives that better their wellbeing, increase their resilience and self-sustainability. Therefore, it is essential that the potential benefits can better the wellbeing of the people and increase their resilience and self-sustainability. As mentioned above, the SADC programme for TFCAs identifies several ways which can potentially benefit communities. These include increasing the opportunities of investment in income generating activities for local communities, reducing the levels of vulnerability caused by climate change and empowering women to participate in decision-making (SADC, 2002). The GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy highlights that finding alternative, more sustainable livelihood options and finding ways

for communities to maximise their benefits through existing and new livelihoods, will be beneficial to local communities (GLTFCA, 2006).

The SADC programme and GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy identify the availability of cross-border access as a potential benefit for local communities (SADC, 2002; GLTFCA, 2006). Tourism is considered a viable strategy to provide benefits for local communities. The GLTFCA Treaty seeks to develop transborder ecotourism to encourage socioeconomic development (GLTP, 2014). The SADC programme advocates for the marketing of TFCAs as regional tourist packages to increase tourist traffic and the flow of benefits to communities (SADC, 2002). In addition, the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy suggests that the enhancement of cultural tourism can have a positive impact on overall tourist activities in the area (GLTFCA, 2016).

Lastly, one of the principles of the SADC TFCA guidelines is that access to resources must always be respected while the SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy postulates that access is a way to ensure that the people of the region benefit from the region's biological heritage (Zunckel, 2014; SADC, 2012).

Below follows a discussion of the above-mentioned potential benefits to communities in and around TFCAs.

3.3 The potential benefits to the GLTFCA local communities

The four potential benefits to the GLTFCA communities are: the enhancement of livelihoods; cross-border access, trade and events; benefits from access to resources in parks and tourism. These potential benefits form the core of the analytical framework according to which the functioning of the GLTFCA in terms of community benefits will be analysed. The analytical framework seeks to create a checklist against which the functioning of the GLTFCA will be juxtaposed.

Enhancement of livelihoods

The enhancement of livelihoods, through the different strategies contained in both the SADC programme for TFCAs and the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy is a prominent benefit for the local communities.

The SADC programme for TFCAs suggests that an increase in investments towards activities that generate income for local communities can result in an increase in benefit flows to these communities (SADC, 2012). Further investments in cross-border infrastructure and tourism, from both the public and private sector, can contribute to improving local economies. According to the SADC programme for TFCAs, the investment of both the public and private sectors into trans boundary infrastructure, tourism and trade will be beneficial for local economies. In addition, the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy stresses the importance of building effective partnerships and institutions that are founded on trust and collaboration. The SADC programme for TFCAs aims for these partnerships, especially between the private sector and local communities, to be more equitable, to be improved and to be increased.

In the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy, the GLTFCA is divided into smaller nodes for better management. As a result, the establishment of effective partnerships and institutions will be based on the context of the location. Node one covers the Sengwe, Tshipise and Malipati communities in Zimbabwe and the Pafuri triangle in South Africa. This node covers all the communities relevant to this study. To support greater collaboration and coordination, a new joint park management committee is envisaged (though no timeline is provided.) The SADC programme for TFCAs plans to develop guidelines that will be used to facilitate equitable joint partnerships between local communities and the private sector.

The ongoing climate crisis has an impact on the biodiversity, tourism, agriculture, water, and the well-being of the local communities (SADC, 2012). These factors all have an impact on the TFCAs and their contribution to poverty alleviation in the region. Thus, the SADC programme for TFCAs aims to teach the local communities and TFCA managers about climate change and to assist in developing measures to help mitigate and adapt to consequences of climate change on livelihoods and biodiversity (SADC, 2012).

The GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy (2016: 11-12) aims to empower the choices of the local communities by integrating a wider range of livelihood options that focus on human, social, productive, and financial capital. The strategy also encourages and supports initiatives that are not land based as this will reduce land and unsustainable resource dependency. In addition, the reduction in land dependency will be through human capital development, where local communities receive access to education and skills that are not solely focused on conservation and ecotourism, but support other alternative livelihoods (GLTFCA, 2016: 12,17). In the case of the communities near the Pafuri triangle, this will be through the SAWC satellite that will be in Tshikondeni.

Lastly, the GLTFCA strategy aims to help communities maximise their benefits, either in new and already existing livelihoods, through promoting ownership, employment, and access to supply chains.

Cross-border access and trade.

The SADC programme asserts that the provision of cross-border access for local and regional markets can have a positive impact on income at a household level (SADC, 2012). For the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy, cross-border access could enhance tourism to the region and promote more viability on the route that involves the Sengwe Tshipise Wilderness corridor between Zimbabwe and South Africa (2016:18). Furthermore, deeper cross border linkages should be supported because administrative borders do not constrain nor define social ecologies (GLTFCA, 2016: 9).

The provision of cross-border access will allow for cross-border adventure activities to take place and in the GLTFCA, the annual Shangaan festival is one such activity that takes place at the border of South Africa and Zimbabwe near the Pafuri Triangle. In addition, the transboundary nature of the GLTFCA is anticipated to reconnect local communities that might have been divided by political borders (DeMotts, 2017)[7].

[7] No plans have been provided on how the flow of people crossing the political border are to be managed.

Access to resources in the park

One of the principles of the SADC TFCA guidelines asserts that "land rights and access to resources, both natural and cultural, must be respected at all times" (Zunckel, 2014). Similarly, the SADC Regional Biodiversity Strategy emphasises the need for appropriate access and benefit sharing arrangements as they are essential in making sure that people from southern Africa and the world can attain mutual benefits from the biological heritage in the region (SADC, 2012). The SADC Protocol on Forestry (2012: Article 16) states that state parties should "recognise, respect and protect the rights of individuals and communities over their traditional forest related knowledge and their right to benefit from the utilization of this knowledge".

For Ribot and Peluso (2003: 153), access is "the ability to benefit from things". They identify key mechanisms that could influence and facilitate access. These mechanisms might be based on rights that are defined by law, custom and convention. However, the state or customary governing body will execute a legal claim or oppose an illegal action. Ribot and Peluso (2013) argue that structural and relational mechanisms work in parallel to mechanisms based on rights. These include political, economic, and cultural factors that allow or restrain a person's ability to benefit from a resource. Access could be impinged in the resettlement process, as many communities face the risk of losing access to common property resources and the risk of landlessness (Cernea, 1997; Kibreab, 2000; Koenig and Diarra, 2000). Most importantly, access is based on who can benefit from what and from which resources. (Ribot and Peluso, 2003; Milgroom et al., 2014).

Access to the park and resources can positively impact on the livelihoods of the local communities because of the existence of biodiversity and other resources that are available for trading and nutrition amongst other things. In cases where local people have been relocated to make way for the park, access to the park is most importance because the park is likely to house things such as ancestral burial sites, medicinal plants, and other sacred places that provide them with spiritual, symbolic, and cultural services (Cundill et al., 2017; DeMotts, 2017).

Tourism

As mentioned above, tourism is considered as one of the biggest income generators in the TFCA initiative. However, tourism manifests in different ways and in the TFCA initiative, eco-tourism, cultural and photographic tourism are some of the ways in which local communities can participate and benefit in the TFCA initiative.

The SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) and the SADC Regional Infrastructure Development Master Plan (RIDMP) consider TFCAs as instruments for encouraging cooperative tourism and rural development (SADC, 2012). The SADC Protocol (2012: Article 2(4)) on Tourism will "ensure the involvement of small scale and micro enterprises, local communities, women and youth in the development of tourism throughout the region". The SADC Protocol on Tourism (2012: Article 3) is emphatic on state parties formulating and pursuing "policies and strategies that promote the involvement of local communities and local authorities in the planning and development of tourism" Since numerous prominent tourist destinations in the region are already located in some parts of the TFCAs, promoting tourism at a TFCA level has great employment potential for the people residing in the rural and marginalised areas where the TFCAs are located. This is expected to contribute to poverty reduction (SADC, 2012). The SADC programme for TFCAs' goal is to increase equitable partnerships between the communities and the private sector in the tourism industry (SADC, 2012). The SADC programme for TFCAs also emphasises the development and marketing of regional cross-border tourism products. Moreover, the marketing of TFCAs as regional tourist products will also increase the tourist numbers and this will result in a further increase in benefit flow to the local communities (SADC, 2012).

Article 4(e) of the Treaty dictates that one of the objectives of the GLTFCA is the development of transborder ecotourism as a means of fostering regional socioeconomic development (GLTP, 2014). The GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy states (mentioned above), that both cultural and photographic tourism are already existing livelihood strategies. Cultural tourism is when people travel to cultural attractions with the aim to attain some cultural experiences and gain knowledge about the cultural values (Petroman et al., 2013: 385). Photographic tourism on the other hand, is when

a tourist travels to a place with the primary goal of taking photographs (Gogoi, 2014: 109). In the Pafuri Triangle, cultural tourism can be enriched in order to grow. Cultural tourism is proposed as one of the economic activities that could take place in the Sengwe-Tshipise corridor because of the traditional lifestyles of the Hlengwe communities (GLTFCA, 2016: 17).

Eco-tourism is a further leg of tourism. The International Ecotourism Society defines it as “responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment, sustains the well-being of the local people, and involves interpretation and education” (TIES, 2015). Ecotourism is considered a crucial component towards income generation, environmental sustainability, improved standards of living, the political enablement of local communities and for educational purposes (Osman, Shaw and Kenawy, 2018; Mnini and Ramoroka, 2020). Scholars such as Manwa and Manwa (2018) postulate that in certain countries, for the call for ecotourism to be considered as an effective means to reduce poverty it should be brought about by both government and international donors (2014). Additionally, Santarem et al. (2019) argue that community members ought to be included in the ecotourism decision-making processes that affect their lives. Moreover, eco-tourism should respect the beliefs and livelihoods of the different community members (Santarem et al., 2019).

Those who implement and participate in ecotourism activities ought to follow the six principles of ecotourism. These comprise of minimizing impact; providing direct financial benefits for conservation; giving a positive experience for the visitors and host, empowering local people and providing financial benefits and respect; creating environmental and cultural awareness and sensitivity to the political, environmental, and social climate of the host country (TIES, 2015).

From the above, it is evident, that ecotourism can be considered successful when communities are part of equitable ecotourism partnerships and when the communities have full and important knowledge of the initiatives. Furthermore, communities must be involved in the decision-making processes of the ecotourism initiatives that affect their lives. Most importantly, cultural, and photographic tourism have the potential to grow and to be beneficial to the local communities.

3.4 Good governance and community participation in decision-making

The SADC RISDP highlights that "good political, economic and corporate governance are prerequisites for sustainable socio-economic development" (SADC, 2002). Good governance refers to the transparency, capability, responsiveness, and inclusivity of governing systems. For Hossain (1995), good governance upholds the rule of law and efficiency in all aspects of decision-making. In addition, the presence of good governance encourages the competent management of human, natural, economic, and financial resources. The inclusion of more people and their opinions in decisions that pertain to their lives is suggested to improve governance. Thus, the participation of the public in decision-making processes not only strengthens governance as mentioned above, but also influences the opinions of the participants in the final decision or policy. Therefore, the participants have a stake in the decisions that are made.

This section discusses the emphasis on good governance in the official documents of the functioning of GLTFCA and the importance of community participation in the decision-making processes of the GLTFCA.

3.4.1 Good governance within TFCAs

The GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy emphasises the devolvement of governance and accountability to the lowest level possible. This should be done by finding ways to empower a range of local stakeholders through involving them in the designing, planning, scheduling, and budgeting of activities (GLTFCA, 2016: 36). Therefore, communities should be involved in the identification of projects, their design, implementation, and monitoring. This will ensure that the projects implemented will be supported by communities and that the benefits accrued to the communities will be shared and used in fair and transparent ways (GLTFCA, 2016: 36).

Good governance is essential in the realisation of community benefits. Without good governance, guidelines to ensure community level involvement at all levels, in all projects and at the different stages of the project's existence, will not necessarily be

adhered to. Furthermore, good governance requires accountability from parties for not adhering to regulations stipulated in, for example, the GLTFCA Treaty.

3.4.2 Participation of local communities in decision-making processes

The SADC programme for TFCAs stipulates that TFCA activity plans ought to be created through a participatory process (SADC, 2012). In addition, the SADC is emphatic on the necessity of involving vulnerable members of society such as women, youth and people living with HIV in these (income generating) programmes. The SADC Protocol on Forestry (2012: Article 3) stipulates that the state parties will cooperate through "promoting respect for the rights of communities and facilitating their participation in forestry policy development, planning and management … develop adequate mechanisms to ensure the equitable sharing of benefits derived …". Article 4(b) of the Treaty states that the GLTFCA aims to "promote alliances in the management in the management of biological natural resources by encouraging social, economic and other partnerships among the Parties, including the private sector, local communities, and non-governmental organisations" (GLTP, 8). Lastly, the SADC also emphasises the incorporation of the local communities in the in the planning and decision-making processes of natural resource management (Zunckel, 2014: 14).

The GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy also asserts that "decision making should be devolved to community level to ensure greatest likelihood of success" (GLTFCA, 2016: 5). In addition, the Strategy requires the empowering of communities to actively participate in resource management decisions (GLTFCA, 2016: 4). Similarly, the SADC programme for TFCAs, aims to "empower communities, especially women, to participate in TFCA decision making processes" (SADC, 2012). It is important for the environment to enable participation because since local communities are the primary beneficiaries of TFCAs, they have an intrinsic right to be involved in the decision-making (SADC, 2012). In line with this, the SADC programme for TFCAs aims to review and improve policies that pertain to the participation of local communities in decision making. The SADC TFCA guidelines states that governance instruments, mechanisms or structures should "maintain open channels of communication above

and beyond the governance mechanisms" (Zunckel, 2014). The objectives of the GLTFCA include the promotion "of alliances in the management of biological nature resources by encouraging social, economic, and other partnerships among the parties, including the private sector, local communities and non-governmental organisations" (GLTP, 2004: 7).

In addition to community participation in decision-making processes in the TFCAs, the Joint Management Plan of the GLTFCA also emphasises the importance of communication between the conservation authorities and the communities (Joint Management Plan, 2002). The Plan also states: "communication between neighbouring communities and the conservation authorities – by definition a two-way process – is fundamental to the success of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park" (2002). In addition, the Joint Management Plan (2002) emphasises that the communication must be ongoing and done in the most appropriate manner so as to ensure that communities understand and support the park.

The plea for good communication is common in collaborative or multi-participant projects because poor communication induces frustration (Huxham and Vangen 1996: 10). For Huxham and Vangen, there are three channels of communication (1996). These are: communication between people in the core group; communication between the core group and the organisations concerned and lastly, communication between the collaboration and wider community. Therefore, communication is an important aspect of community involvement in the decision-making processes.

Scholars such as Adams and McShane (1996: 139), also emphasise that the cooperation, understanding and engagement of local people is critical to the future of conservation (1996: 139). Additionally, Metcalfe and Kepe (2003) suggest that it is important to practically incentivise the local communities for their involvement. Most importantly, at the core of local peoples' participation is devolution. This allows for a shared understanding of problems and ways of solving them (Ribot et al., 2010). Brockington (2003) posits, that even though conservation can succeed without the participation of local people, it is fitting that from an ethical perspective, conservation should reflect moral norms especially in locations that have had a history of physical

and economic displacement (Holmes-Watts and Watts, 2008; Thondhlana and Muchapondwa, 2014).

Like good governance, the involvement of local communities is very crucial in the benefit accrual processes within TFCAs. The overall involvement and/or participation of local communities in the decision-making processes and livelihood strategies is a recurring theme in the SADC programme for TFCAs, the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy and the SADC TFCA guidelines. The participation of local communities in decision-making processes can be considered successful if there is evidence of devolution in the TFCA. Without effective devolution, the involvement of local communities is not tangible. Ultimately, at the core of any functional relationship is good and clear communication. Without communication, most, if not all the above-mentioned potential benefits will not be realised. Cyril et al. (2017), also emphasise that the inclusion of participation and consent in decision-making is an indication of functional governance arrangements.

3.5 Conclusions

This chapter serves as the analytical framework for evaluating whether communities in and around the GLTFCA have benefitted from this TFCA. Official documents such as the GLTFCA livelihoods strategy, the SADC programme for TFCAs, the SADC RISDP, the SADC RIDMP, the SADC TFCA guidelines and the GLTFCA Treaty have elaborated on several benefits envisaged in the establishment of TFCAs and, for the purpose of this study, the GLTFCA. These potential benefits will serve as indicators to establish if communities in the GLTFCA have indeed benefitted from these activities.

The activities that are emphasised in the above-mentioned documents are: the enhancement of livelihoods through partnership and investment, trade benefits by means of cross-border access; access to resources in the park; and tourism, which includes regional tourism, eco-tourism, cultural tourism, and photographic tourism.

Local livelihoods can be enhanced through investment and partnership that result in benefit flows and better local economies. Cross-border access and trade benefit the

communities, if they have access to other markets that could increase their income. Also, the allowance for cross-border adventure activities and the maintenance of social ecologies would be benefits accrued if cross-border access actualises. In addition, cross-border tourism activities would benefit local communities via cultural tourism.

Access to resources in the parks is essential for communities because without access communities cease to benefit. In addition, access to the park could give the communities spiritual and cultural fulfilment through access to cultural medicines, ancestral sites amongst other such things.

Tourism can benefit the communities in various ways. Firstly, through ecotourism. Communities can generate income through participating in ecotourism however, the six ecotourism principles, would have to be upheld, which are minimizing impact; providing direct financial benefits for conservation; giving a positive experience for the visitors and host, empowering local people and providing financial benefits and respect; creating environmental and cultural awareness and sensitivity to the political, environmental, and social climate of the host country (TIES, 2015). Secondly, marketing TFCAs as regional tourism products will generate income through increased tourist numbers, and this could increase benefit the income flow to local communities. Lastly, cultural, and photographic tourism, if enhanced could also benefit communities through benefit flows.

Throughout the TFCA documentation (including the GLTFCA Treaty) emphasis is placed on good governance within the TFCAs, communication between park management and local people and community participation in decision-making. It has been argued that the benefits to communities are compromised in the absence of the above mentioned. In other words, without good governance, and active participation in decision-making (of which communication is a central requirement), benefits to local communities cannot be actualised. See table 1 below for a summary of the indicators discussed above.

Table 1 Summary of Indicators

Benefit	Indicator
Enhancement of livelihoods	• "the livelihoods of the millions of people that live in and around TFCAs are intricately linked to the integrity of ecosystems and biodiversity these TFCAs conserve" (SADC, 2012) • "increased private and public investments in cross border infrastructure and tourism projects in these TFCAs can also contribute significantly to improving local economies" (SADC, 2012) • "…active participation of local communities in the management and equitable sharing of benefits derived from natural resources" (SADC 2012)
Cross border access and trade	• "Facilitating cross border access to local and regional markets can further increase at the household level" (SADC, 2012)
Access to resources in the park	• "Apart from using land to raise livestock, grow food and cultivate cash crops, rural communities also harvest natural resources such as firewood, wild herbs, wild fruit and game meat for subsistence and commercial purposes" (SADC, 2012) • "… establishing equitable and efficient ways to facilitating public access to

	forests and benefits to local communities”
Tourism	• “inculcate more equitable partnerships between private sector and communities in tourism industry” (SADC, 2012) • “ensure the involvement of small scale and micro enterprises, local communities, women and youth in the development of tourism of tourism throughout the region” (SADC Protocol on Tourism, 2012: Article 2(4)) • “[pursuing] policies and strategies that promote the involvement of local communities and local authorities in the planning and development of tourism” (SADC protocol on Tourism, 2012: Article 3) • “develop trans-border eco-tourism as a means of fostering regional socio-economic development …” (GLTP, 2014: Article 4(e)) • “cross border and cultural tourism products can be enhancing to grow tourism to the region …” (GLTFCA, 2016: 17) •

The following chapter presents an evaluation of the benefits that communities have accrued in the GLTFCA since 2002 and whether they have formed part of the decision-making processes in the GLTFCA.

CHAPTER 4

COMMUNITY BENEFITS RESULTING FROM THE GLTFCA INITIATIVE

4.1 Introduction

The benefits to communities in the establishment of transfrontier parks in southern Africa have, (as shown in previous chapters) been one of the primary aims. One can also argue that the envisaged benefits to local communities in the areas, made the TFCA concept attractive to governments in the region as well as to regional organisations such as the SADC. As mentioned in chapter 2, the concept of TFCAs is being incorporated into the national legislation and policies of most SADC countries, as well as their conservation agencies. It also forms part of the official development strategy of the SADC.

The nature of the potential benefits to communities have been highlighted in a number of regional documents and treaties. The potential benefits were identified in the previous chapter and serves as the analytical framework guiding the discussion in this chapter. These potential benefits are the enhancement of livelihoods by means of cross border access and trade, access to the park and tourism. Each potential benefit has a set of indicators, which were derived from different official documents from SADC, the GLTFCA and the GLTFCA Treaty (see Table 1, chapter 3).

An important requirement for the successful functioning of the TFCAs and in this instance, the GLTFCA, which has a direct bearing on community benefits or gains, as well as their acceptance of the whole concept of TFCAs, is the involvement of communities in the decision-making processes of the GLTFCA, and in particular those decisions that affect the communities (see chapter 3). A further important requirement highlighted, is the prevalence of good governance in the management of the parks. The absence of good governance it is argued, will compromise not only the functioning of the TFCAs (thus also the GLTFCA), but also the benefits to the communities.

The analysis in this chapter (as stated in chapter 1) will focus on communities in both the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks. The potential benefits and their indicators will be juxtaposed against the documented experiences of the local people from the aforementioned national parks. The analysis will focus on the experiences of the communities from the time the GLTFCA was established in 2002 until 2020. The information on the lived experiences of the local communities is derived from annual reports from SANParks and the PPF, newspaper articles and other sources such as the GLTFCA website. Additional information was collected from different scholars that have conducted research on the GLTFCA. As mentioned in chapter one, the study aims to establish whether and in what way communities have benefited and how these benefits have impacted their lives. Equally important are the challenges that the communities have encountered or still encounter in improving their living standards in general. In short, what are the benefits that communities have gained and what challenges have they experienced, or do they still experience?

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides an overview of the nature of the successes in the benefit accrual process of communities in both the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks. The second section focuses on the problems experienced and the challenges communities face in the benefit accrual process in the two parks. The third section will discuss the overview presented in sections one and two.

4.2 Community benefits

In this section, the successes attained in relation to the potential benefits in the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks are presented. These achievements are mostly collected from annual reports from the state conservation agency in South Africa – SANParks and the GLTFCA implementing agency the PPF. Scholarly contributions and newspaper reports have also been sources of information. Only one annual report (dated 2019) was available from the state conservation agency in Zimbabwe – Zimparks. The unavailability of the rest of the annual reports made it difficult to assess the successes attained in relation to the potential benefits in Zimbabwe.

4.2.1 The enhancement of livelihoods

The first part of this discussion focuses on the Makuleke community (South Africa) while the second part discusses the benefits to communities in the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe as a result of the GLTFCA.

The land owned by the Makuleke community in the Pafuri Triangle was turned into a contractual park and is now part of the GLTFCA and managed by SANParks. In the period 2000 – 2003, the Makuleke community used trophy hunting to generate more revenue whilst tourist lodges and camps were being built (Wyllie, 2014:168). The trophy hunting generated approximately US$ 230,000 over a three-year period. The community also benefitted from the venison. The Makuleke community entered into two agreements with the private sector in 2002 and 2003. In 2002, the community established a partnership with Matswani Safaris. Matswani Safaris funded the building of a luxury 24 bed lodge that would have a low environmental impact but offer upmarket tourism accommodation. The agreement between the community and Matswani Safaris had the following financial obligations; eight percent of all earnings would be transferred to the Makuleke Communal Property Association (CPA), a percentage of all the game drive revenue would be negotiated and that two percent of all gross earnings would be transferred to a social development fund that will be used to create youth education facilities (Zeppel, 2006). Spenceley (2005) estimated that with the lodge at 60 percent occupancy, the community should receive approximately US$75,000 and 30 local community employees would receive US$150,000 in collective wages.

In 2003, the Makuleke community entered into a concessionary agreement with another private sector organisation. The organisation is Wilderness Safaris, which would fund the building of three low impact, luxury tented lodges and lease the land for 45 years. Zeppel (2006) explains that Wilderness Safaris had in 2006 already built 20 tented rooms that overlook the Luvuvhu River. The financial obligations of this agreement include transferring a percent of the revenue to the community on a monthly basis, the training of local people and the creation of more than 200 jobs (Spenceley, 2005). However, as part of this agreement, the local community could no

longer partake in hunting activities because the contractual park was officially recognised as a conservation area, making hunting illegal.

As a result of the above financial gains, the Makuleke community developed a trust where all the funds received, were administered. Some of the money has been used to electrify and build classrooms in Ntlhaveni – the area where they were resettled. In 2003, more than 100 community members were to be trained to work at the lodges or as rangers in the conservation and anti-poaching units by SANParks in the Pafuri area of the Kruger National Park (*Financial Mail*, 2003: 74).

As highlighted in the previous chapter, knowledge transfer was also envisaged as a potential benefit to communities. In terms of knowledge transfer in the Kruger National Park, the Lillydale Environmental Education Centre was established that is run by the community but is supported by the Sabi Sabi reserve (Loon et al., 2007: 274). "The centre serves as a multifunctional environmental education centre, promotes Shangaan knowledge and rural development tourism to the area and encourages local environmental conservation practises through training workshops" (Loon et al., 2007: 274). The SANParks 2008/2009 annual report recorded that SANParks had conducted a "socio-economic benefit" analysis for the communities (SANParks, 2004). According to the report, there were 73 community-based socio-economic initiatives listed on the database. In the SANParks 2009/2010 annual report, three community socio-economic projects were implemented (SANParks, 2004). These were the 5th Art, Crafts and Retails outlet at the Phabeni Gate, the Community Hop-On-Guide and the KNP Car Wash. These generated a collective income of R325 348 with Phalaborwa Hlanganani Curio Outlet earning R250 000 and Phabeni R7 587 of the income. For the period 2010/2011, the projects contributed more than half a million rand to local communities and more than R300 000[8] (approximately $20 000) through the art and craft outlets and car wash projects (PPF, 2004).

In 2015, a scoping report was done in the GLTFCA, and it was noted that communities in all three countries were to receive telecommunications network/mobile network coverage (as mentioned in chapter 1 Mozambique forms part of the GLTFCA but is

[8] Dollar to Rand exchange rate on 22/3/2022 – 1 USD to ZAR = 14.9255

not covered in this study). This would be a start in accessing technologies through the availability of the internet using mobile networks (GLTFCA Scoping Report, 2015). It would also have a socio-economic impact on the lives of community members because the mobile networks would open up access to information, communication, and in some instances to health, education, and finance (GLTFCA Scoping Report, 2015). The same report notes that households could then also access benefits easier from agricultural and livestock projects and investments in human capital through education (GLTFCA Scoping Report, 2015)). Some of the successfully established livelihood strategies that were in the report include (but are not limited to) agriculture – both irrigation and conservation- for subsistence and small-scale trade and intensive rotational grazing

Turning now to the Gonarezhou National Park, it should be mentioned that the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust is a partnership between the Frankfurt Zoological Society and Zimparks that was formed in 2017 and now oversees the management of the Gonarezhou National Park (Musakwa et al., 2020: 1). Through the Trust, Mpfhuka was established. Mpfhuka is a project that provides a platform for sharing information, engaging, empowering, and educating communities (Musakwa et al., 2020: 7). As part of Mpfhuka, there is an education project that enables local people and schoolchildren to be part of education tours in the Gonarezhou National Park since 2012. These education and awareness campaigns are considered a means of transferring climate change, conservation, and tree planting knowledge across generations. Eighty percent of the Trust's employees are from the local communities and other community members are also hired for construction and maintenance of camps used for tourist accommodation such as the Mananga camps. The employment provides an income for local communities and reduces their dependence on unsustainable protected area resources. The Trust interacts with communities, especially the disadvantaged women, to ensure that economic empowerment is taking place and that communities receive benefits from tourism revenues (Musakwa et al., 2020: 7).

The women from the Chitsa community, in the Gonarezhou National Park, also process grass (for thatching) that they have cut themselves or that is donated to them by a grass cutting project in the park. The women, who are called the Tiyeselani

Woman's Group, sell the finished products to tour operators and contractors for cash income (GCT, 2021).

In 2020, the PPF implemented the Peace & Changemaker Generation project in the Gonarezhou and Limpopo National Park (PPF, 2005). The project was a joint initiative between the World's Children's Prize Foundation and the PPF. The project aims to empower 100 000 children as changemakers who stand against wildlife crimes and advocate for girls' rights in their communities (PPF, 2005). Initially, 2000 children will be trained as the Peace and Changemaker Generation ambassadors with 700 teachers and school leaders (WCP, 2020). Thereafter, these ambassadors and teachers will educate the 100 000 children and 350 schools about children's rights, global sustainable development goals, the consequences of wildlife crime and climate change on their communities (WCP, 2020).

4.2.2 Cross border access, trade, and events

According to the 2013 PPF annual report, a Shangaan festival was hosted in Chiredzi, Zimbabwe in July 2013. The communities from the three countries (Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa) participated in this annual event. This event was an example of support of cross-border linkages between communities in the GLTFCA.

In addition to the annual cultural festival, generating some income, wilderness trials in the GLTFCA have also been established. Not only have these resulted in tangible benefits, but they have also increased collaboration between communities in South Africa and Zimbabwe. These trials are the cultural wilderness trail that crossed the Pafuri-Sengwe part of the GLTFCA. Alongside this was the Trans-Limpopo walking trail from the Makuleke area in the Kruger to the Sengwe area in Zimbabwe. The PPF report described these events as "resulting in the flow of tangible benefits to two of the Great Limpopo's community areas" (PPF, 2005).

The presence of Chief Maluleke of the Makuleke clan (in South Africa) during the 2015 Pafuri Wilderness Trail was symbolic and seen as enforcing the cross border cultural linkages between the Makuleke clan and the Sengwe community in Zimbabwe (PPF,

2005). In 2017, the GLTFCA Mountain-bike Trail also took place. This was a four-day event that covers the 240km between South Africa and Zimbabwe. The main aim of this event was to raise funds towards the social investment of the Sengwe-Tshipise corridor in Zimbabwe (TFCA Portal, 2014).

From the above, it is evident that the envisaged ideal of cross-border income initiatives, which incorporate an awareness of conservation since it occurred in a conservation area, has become a reality with tangible monetary benefits for the communities. In addition, these cross-border income initiatives facilitate the realisation of the regional integration and cooperative tourism (SADC, 2012).

4.2.3 Access to resources in the park

As discussed in the previous chapter, an important provision in the SADC documentation is that local communities are allowed access to biological resources found within the parks as a means to sustain their livelihoods. Furthermore, that includes visits to ancestral burial sites sacred places within the parks that provide them with spiritual and cultural services.

SANParks developed a sustainable resource use programme in 2004. The programme facilitates access to national parks for local communities, as long the activities do not interfere with the integrity of the resources. Communities participated in the pilot mopani worm harvest[9] in the Kruger National Park in 2011 (SANParks Annual Report, 2011/2012). In the same year, a pepper bark propagation and harvesting project was created. This allowed communities to harvest the pepper bark and propagate the plant for planting in the community nursery (SANParks Annual Report, 2011/2012). In 2012, nine nursery and/or propagation projects were registered. These allowed local communities access to medicinal plants and vegetables. In addition, local communities propagated plants for rehabilitation use and for resale to the public.

[9] Mopani worms are edible caterpillars (a delicacy for many people) that primarily feed on Mopane tree leaves. As part of the SANParks policy to encourage sustainable natural resource utilization, harvesters from surrounding communities are escorted and guided by the KNP rangers to the locations where they can harvest these (Siyabonga Africa, 2011).

In the Gonarezhou National Park, under the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust, local people are allowed to collect fruit and medicinal plants from the protected area under the supervision of the Trust's officials (Musakwa et al., 2020: 8). The Trust also gives the local people permission to cut grass in the park for their livestock during droughts. Since 2012, supervised grass cutting has been taking place in the north-western sector of the park (GCT, 2021). The communities can also harvest vegetables and fish biannually (Musakwa et al., 2020: 9). In addition, through the Trust's Mpfhuka project, the local communities that were displaced to make way for the park have been given access to the Gonarezhou National Park so they could visit their traditional and cultural sites to perform their traditional rituals such as the rain making ceremonies (Musakwa et al., 2020:7). The access is guided by the terms of reference that were agreed upon by both the local communities and the Trust.

4.2.4 Photographic and Ecotourism

In addition to the benefits of general tourism discussed above, the perceived benefits that the TFCAs can generate from specifically photographic and ecotourism, have also been highlighted in the previous chapter. In this regard, a 2015 report of the GLTFCA, highlighted the investments made in photographic tourism and the fact that 29% of the projects in the livelihoods database of the Kruger2Canyon Biosphere Reserve, were in photographic tourism (GLTFCA Scoping Report, 2015). The funds from these community run tourism projects are channelled through community structures.

In the Gonarezhou National Park, the Mpfhuka project aids in the management and protection of the communities' ecotourism sites such as the bird watching site in the Sengwe community area at the Manjinji pan (Musakwa et al., 2020: 7).

4.2.5 Community involvement in the decision-making processes

Community involvement in decision-making in the parks are, as highlighted above, important for the success of the TFCAs. As stated previously, the SADC programme

for TFCAs aims to “empower local communities, especially women, to participate in the TFCA decision making processes” (SADC, 2012).

In 2002, a consultation process on the creation of the Sengwe-Tshipise corridor is recorded to have involved the local communities (Wyllie, 2014: 174). The 2004/2005 report reflected on how SANParks had appointed managers for community-based conservation and cultural research management among others. The activities that were seen as aiding in strengthening these relations included “overseeing the public consultation and participation facts in our conservation” (SANParks, 2004). This report also introduced the concept of park forums. Fourteen Park forums were in the process of being established. These forums were considered to be important platforms to enable community and stakeholder participation.

In the SANParks 2005/2006 report, the cultural heritage resources management implemented an initiative that surveyed San Rock Art in the Kruger Park. Other highlights included the consultation with communities on the elephant management strategies (SANParks, 2004). The 2008/2009 report provided a clear account of the community engagements taking place within the Kruger. They accounted for a total of 36 meetings that took place. These meetings were outside of the already existing regular park forum meetings. These 36 meetings were also used as a platform to educate and add more understanding of the functioning of the Kruger Park (SANParks, 2004). In the 2012 PPF annual report, it was reported that “the parks have also increased cooperation at executive management level … joint meetings were held, and field trips undertaken to improve inter-park communications” (PPF, 2005). Additionally, the report suggested that there were efforts towards the “harmonisation and integration of various policies to improve the cooperative management of the [Great Limpopo] park” (PPF, 2005).

In the Gonarezhou National Park, the Trust sought a community liaison officer in 2017 to function as a mediator between the park management and the communities. The liaison officer is employed by the Trust. The officer assists in establishing communication channels between the communities and the park management. In 2019, SANParks entered into a cooperative management agreement with 12 community associations and representative bodies and two provincial agencies. This

agreement was created to facilitate co-management in the Kruger National Park. This agreement allows communities to participate in the decision-making process through active involvement in the decisions and activities that take place in the Kruger National Park. The agreement can be interpreted as a tool that enforces governance between the park management and local communities. The annual monitoring reports and biennial external audits are some of the strategies that are used to monitor and evaluate the implementation of and compliance with the management plan. The agreement will be reviewed after three years from its establishment (therefore in 2022), thereafter, it will be evaluated every five years.

4.3 The challenges experienced by communities in the benefit accrual process

This section focuses on the challenges encountered by local communities in their pursuit of the four potential benefits. The information discussed below was collected from studies undertaken by scholars who had conducted fieldwork in the GLTFCA and in certain instances, the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks.

4.3.1 The enhancement of livelihoods

One of the major problems communities in the GLTFCA have been experiencing, and in particular the Kruger National Park, is according to Anthony (2006), the cost local communities have to bear through the loss of life, crops, and livestock, from damage caused by animals as well as the psychological damage caused by these experiences. Therefore, all the economic empowerment strategies used in the Kruger National Park, can also be regarded as a source of disempowerment. (Anthony, 2006: 264). The communities are not compensated by the park for all these losses. Considering the importance of livestock and crops in the livelihoods of local people and not being compensated for the losses, results in the entrenchment of poverty and lack of trust in the Kruger National Park. It is argued by Anthony (2006: 264-265), that the local people cannot trust the Kruger National Park that it will provide economic benefits that better their lives if they cannot be, for starters, compensated for their losses.

In the Sengwe area of the Gonarezhou National Park, 86 percent of the households depend on agro-pastoral activities as major livelihood strategies and the integration of these strategies into the GLTFCA's wildlife and tourism sector seems to be a challenge. There were proposals that included the resuscitation and increase of irrigation schemes as compensation for livelihood losses in 2006. However, only two of the 13 irrigation schemes were fully functional, with others at different stages of resuscitation. The area covering the proposed Sengwe-Tshipise corridor, has an unemployment rate of 92,5 percent due to the political and socio-economic challenges in Zimbabwe. In addition, migrant labour contributes to 55 percent of the livelihoods with an increase in informal cross border trading by low-income people such as women who travel to South Africa to buy goods for resale in Zimbabwe. The limited opportunities in the corridor area have resulted in local people migrating to neighbouring countries for work. The study by Sibanda (2010) highlights the impact of the unfulfilled GLTFCA promises on migration and livelihoods in Zimbabwe. Sibanda (2010) asserts that the unfulfilled promises have resulted in a lack of socioeconomic and employment opportunities for the local communities. Consequently, there has been an increase in the number of community members migrating to nearby countries for work and a reliance on remittances for those left behind (Sibanda, 2010). This has resulted in communities that are vulnerable to conservation initiatives that do not deliver on their promises. The already existing livelihood strategies in the Sengwe area are land based and "wildlife does not combine well with other land uses- particularly those that involve presence of people" (Wolmer, 2003: 97). Sibanda (2010) asserts that the GLTFCA has increased the prevalence of conservation refugees in the Sengwe area as local people are not deriving any benefits.

4.3.2 Cross border access and trade

To reflect, kinship ties are present between inhabitants of Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe; meetings between the three chiefs of the communities around the Pafuri Triangle have been a regular occurrence (Bocchino, 2008). However, more frequent meetings took place between the Chief of Dumela in South Africa and the Chief of Sengwe in Zimbabwe. These meetings took place at least once a semester (Bocchino, 2008: 215). Bocchino (2008: 215) found that 82 percent of the villagers

have relatives either in Zimbabwe, South Africa, or in both countries. Most people do not own any form of identification, which is needed when travelling across the border and crossing illegally is too risky for most (Bocchino, 2008: 215). Ferreira (2004) also alludes to the access limitations for Zimbabweans, brought about by the need to have a passport and visa in order to travel to South Africa. In addition, it is indicated that travel documents are not easy to obtain in Zimbabwe and this excludes most people from travelling.

Bocchino (2008) explains that in the Pafuri area, a soft and permeable border exists. The softness refers to the existence of uncontrolled movements between the three countries and the permeability is showcased by the illegal and legal trading and migrations towards South Africa (Bocchino, 2008: 166). Bocchino (2008) explains that although there are police at Mozambique and South African entry ports, the uncontrolled movements still take place because of a shared understanding that these local people are travelling for cultural purposes, friendship, and economic needs. The informal movement of local people and goods are mostly in pursuit for better livelihoods such as the selling of agricultural produce (Bocchino, 2008). The same border conditions exist at the Madimbo corridor, where “common heritage transcends borders” (Bocchino, 2008:166). Whilst there is a permanent army patrolling along the Limpopo River, Zimbabweans still make their way into the Madimbo area. These examples are used to illustrate the political and socioeconomic impact of borders on the lives and livelihoods of such border communities. Bocchino (2008) explains how most of these cross-border activities happen in places where police (from either Mozambique, or South Africa) are present. This illustrates an implicit understanding or cognisance of that most of the local people crossing are doing so for cultural, friendship and economic reasons. The Giriyondo and Pafuri border posts were created to facilitate the movement of tourists from one country to another, within the park. In order to cross the Pafuri or Giriyondo border posts, proof of accommodation in either the Kruger or Limpopo National Parks are required. With these conditions, local people will be unable to make use of these facilities. Although there is uncertainty on how the border posts within the GLTFCA have impacted local communities, the condition of use already excludes the local communities.

4.3.3 Access to resources in the park

Although efforts such as grass collection had been put in place to extend access to the local communities in the Kruger National Park, veterinary constraints and safety concerns have become hurdles towards the implementation of these access extensions. Anthony (2006: 267) states that such scenarios further fragment local people's hope and fuel negative perceptions towards the Kruger National Park. The local people are likely to perceive the Kruger National Park as being dishonest for promising access and then restricting it again.

Local people in the Madimbo area, which is near the Pafuri Triangle and Limpopo River, have suggested that the presence of the military, the veterinary's caution on not mixing cattle and wildlife and informal resource use controls by the informal Makuleke rangers is all part of a coalition put together to deny them access to land and natural resources (Whande, 2007: 31). The military was given a portion of the Madimbo land that is considered the most fertile and since a large population of the Madimbo community have livestock that need grazing pastures, this portion of land is very important to them (Whande, 2007: 29). The presence of the military impedes their ability to graze their livestock, which then affects their livelihoods. (Livestock is the largest contributor to their livelihoods) (Whande, 2007). Lastly, the livelihood insecurities that were experienced by the local people along the Madimbo corridor threaten nature-based tourism and conservation driven tourism because land uses are contested. For example, the presence of the military along the corridors poses a threat for the communities and their access to resources such as a grazing land. The grazing land is important for the communities' livestock rearing. This threat fuels insecurities for the communities and results in the rise of contestations over land use in the area. (Whande, 2007: 47).

The Mahenye community in the Gonarezhou National Park are not allowed to use wildlife to support themselves. This meant that they can no longer hunt, and hunting was an important livelihood strategy for them - in addition, they had developed sustainable hunting practises (Murphree, 2001; Petterson, 2014: 16). The access restriction meant the community has to rely on agriculture as a livelihood strategy (Petterson, 2014: 16). Zibanai (2019: 74) postulates that local people experienced

social and economic exclusion because they can no longer access the abundant natural resources which were the base of their social and economic livelihoods. These natural resources include manure, harvesting wild fruits, firewood, picking mopane worms, thatching grass, grazing land, and sand mining. Some of these were sold to generate income for the local communities.

4.3.4 Tourism

Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017) interviewed 180 heads or the most senior members of households of the Sengwe and Chiredzi communities in the Gonarezhou National Park on their views on community engagement and the benefits of the GLTFCA to them. Their results show that communities were concerned about "inequitable distribution of tourism benefits and lack of clear guidelines for community participation in transfrontier tourism enterprises" (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 265). Due to the lack of awareness, 96 percent of the interviewees perceived that craft tourism was the main opportunity for local communities to be involved in tourism activities in the GLTFCA (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017:265). In addition, only about four percent viewed "employment creation and cash transfers from the transfrontier tourism proceeds" as the main opportunity for local communities in the tourism industry (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 266).

According to nearly half of the interviewees (46 percent) they have never received any benefits from transboundary tourism, and as a result, they continue with their household activities like livestock rearing and crop farming as these give them direct benefits (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 268). Furthermore, communities had no legitimate access to land rights thus, they cannot pursue their tourism entrepreneurship possibilities because without this legitimate access, the communities are excluded from possible joint venture partnerships (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 269). Most people indicated that their livelihoods are sustained by livestock rearing and crop farming. This is a clear indication of the importance of access to land, however, since most of this land is communal it cannot be used for "valuable tourism development such as game ranches, communal conservancies and community-based ecotourism" (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 269). They also noted that the minimal

distribution of information and poor governance make it difficult for local people to break into the tourism sector.

Most importantly, Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017:267) concluded that corruption, lack of transparency on the income generated from tourism initiatives, and the inequitable distribution of benefits, were major sources of discontent for the communities. This had a negative effect on people's interest in the tourism projects that were supposedly run-on behalf of the local communities in Sengwe (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 267).

In the south-eastern lowveld of Zimbabwe, Zanamwe et al. (2018: 8) found that although there were community-based institutions in the area, they were not purposely contributing to ecotourism and wildlife conservation enterprise development. This was as a result of the lack of financial support from the government - either through grants or loans. In addition, the lack of financial support meant there was no renumeration, therefore only the passionate were still working. All these factors compromised the governance levels of community owned ecotourism and wildlife conservation related enterprises (Baret et al., 2013; Zanamwe et al., 2018: 8). Zanamwe et al. (2018: 10) allude to the fact that 15 year later, the development of cross border ecotourism has not been realised and that the institutions that were created to facilitate ecotourism and wildlife conservation related enterprises development remain "weak and lack capacity". In addition, the majority of the policies and places that were created to guide ecotourism and wildlife conservation related ventures, when the GLTFCA was established, have not been executed at community level (Dhliwayo et al., 2009).

For Mbaiwa (2005), the infrastructure, services and goods created for tourism are altered to suit the tourist demand and not what the local communities want or can afford. For example, in Bennde Mutale, one of the cattle farmers was allocated a piece of land where a communal borehole existed. Since water is a scarce resource in this area, access to water is paramount. However, the area that the cattle farmer was allocated was eventually fenced off and people must pay for access to water (Whande, 2007: 37) Lastly, Whande (2007) explains that tourism is dependent on political and social stability. The absence of these two factors repels investors, and as was witnessed during political instability in Zimbabwe.

4.3.5 Good governance and community involvement in decision-making processes

In the Gonarezhou National Park, the headmen were the main sources of information on the functioning of the GLTFCA. Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017: 266) argue that although this is a good sign of information distribution, it is not effective in carrying out the community engagement mandate of TFCA programmes and activities. This is because most headmen have low literacy levels. They, therefore, may not be "conversant with the intricacies of transboundary governance" (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 266). A large percentage of the interviewees (42 percent) felt that they were excluded from key transfrontier area decision-making processes (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 267). Approximately 55 percent of the interviewees asserted that the structures put in place to facilitate community engagement, community participation and coordinate the development programmes in the TFCA process were not functional and transparent enough (Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017: 267). Although, the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust has a relationship with the local communities, community members are unhappy about the inability of the Trust to compensate them for losses incurred from human wildlife conflicts (Musakwa et al., 2019: 7). The exclusionary practises that were implemented at the establishment of the Gonarezhou National Park and the lack of compensation are some of the factors that lead to a deficit of trust from the local communities. This affects their perceptions and willingness to participate in park initiatives. As a result, the Trust struggles to develop a common vision (Musakwa et al., 2019: 7).

On Park Forums, Shikolokolo (2010: 38) found that 73 percent of the local people interviewed did not consider them a helpful platform. The local people felt there was no need for the forum to exist because it was used as a rubber stamp by the Kruger National Park. They asserted that the Forum was not a part of the decision-making process concerned with the Park's development or that of the community (Shikolokolo, 2010: 38). 64 percent of the local people interviewed indicated that there was no consultation by the park with the community (Shikolokolo, 2010: 40).

DeMotts (2017: 2) explains that the absence of the local people from Zimbabwe, Mozambique and along the edge of South Africa at the international level of the policy

process was conspicuous. This reflected the marginalization of local interests and the effort to avoid addressing local concerns. The GLTFCA planning meetings took place in South Africa, which for many reasons, seemed to put South African communities at an advantage. They did not have to account for travel expenses amongst many other things. This places the communities from the other two countries on an unequal footing as they had to limit numbers when travelling because of expenses and accommodation, among other things (DeMotts, 2017).

4.4 Discussion of findings

This section will discuss and contextualise the findings in line with the various indicators of the potential benefits. From the above discussion, it is evident that on the one hand communities have benefitted from the GLTFCA initiative, but on the other, they have faced several challenges.

In the enhancement of livelihoods, the employment and training in the Pafuri area have greatly increased the prospects for the local people and in particular, the generation of income. In addition, the partnerships between the Makuleke community and the two private sector organisations (Wilderness Safaris and Matswani Safaris) fulfil SADC's vision that investments towards activities that generate income for local communities can increase benefit flows to the communities. The Makuleke CPA received eight percent of the revenue and two percent is kept for youth development. Other strategies mentioned above that contribute towards better lives of the local people, is the existence of centres such as Lilydale, which is a multi-functional education centre. This centre contributes to human development, one of the goals of the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy. The existence of socioeconomic projects from 2008 to 2011, as reflected in the SANParks reports, shows the feasibility of functional community run projects that yield benefits. The mobile network provisions also signify a commitment to empower communities in varied ways and serve as an introduction to technology. The work done by the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust through the project Mpfhuka is an example of a partnership that is effective and beneficial to local economies. The numerous ways in which the Trust is engaging with the local people have brought income generating activities, education, and empowerment. The involvement of

school children in the work done by the Trust and the Peace and Changemaker project ensures that knowledge is shared across generations which is important for local communities that have had multiple generations living in the parks.

Livelihood strategies such as irrigation and conservation agriculture and rotational grazing can be considered climate conscious strategies. These strategies reflect the SADC programme for TFCAs' aim of developing ways and measures to mitigate the effects of climate change on biodiversity and livelihoods. The collaboration between the PPF and the World Children's Prize Foundation not only aims to empower the children in local communities, but also provides some knowledge transfer on human rights and wildlife conservation. However, for the communities along the Madimbo corridor, efforts to establish non-agricultural livelihoods are stifled by factors such as the availability of cash to pay for products instantly, crowded markets and a possible surge in HIV and AIDS infections.

Therefore, whilst there have been some recorded successes in enhancing livelihoods, there have been very few clearly recorded financial benefits that have efficiently reached the communities. Most communities are still land dependent and there are no tangible efforts seen towards poverty alleviation strategies. Very few non land based alternative livelihoods have been recorded in both the Kruger and Gonarezhou National Parks. The argument that the Kruger National Park can be a source of disempowerment because of the lack of compensation for human wildlife conflicts, is important in understanding the different affects an activity can have on local communities. In addition, the prevalence of conservation refugees because of the absence of socioeconomic benefit attainment in the Sengwe community has brought a different perspective on the challenges of the benefit accrual process and its impact on livelihoods and migration.

The implementation of the cross-border wilderness trail and Shangaan festivals since 2013 has been some of the repeated successes of the GLTFCA pertaining to cross border activities. Although the economic benefits of these were not shared, the involvement of the Shangaan communities from Makuleke and Sengwe was seen as an ode to their cultural linkages. This is significant as the promotion of social ecologies is an important part of cross-border access. The work done by Bocchino (2008), and

Ferreira (2004) explains the complexity that border facilities present for local people. These include the need for national identification, which most local people do not have and also customs regulations and restrictions at the border. These impede the cross-border trade aspirations of most local people. So, whilst the Shangaan festival and Pafuri wilderness trail for example, showcased the potential benefits of cross border access, the studies undertaken by Bocchino (2008), and Ferreira (2004) explains the complexities of border facilities to local people. These challenges include the exclusionary nature of border facilities within the GLTFCA because they are created to facilitate tourist transborder movement, thus local people do not benefit from these structures. In addition, the stricter border facilities are likely to have a negative impact on the livelihoods of border communities.

A further positive feature of SANParks and Gonarezhou Conservation Trust's Mpfhuka programme is that it allows local people access into the park for among other things, resource use, medicinal plants, and cultural rituals. This is in line with SADC's requirement that people from southern Africa can reap benefits from the biological heritage of the region (SADC, 2012). The allowance for local people to take some of the plants for resale or replanting is a benefit as it creates income and allows local people to have some of the plants in their gardens which is closer than the park. For communities along the Madimbo corridor, access is obstructed by the presence of the military on their most fertile grazing land, which have a bearing on their livestock and livelihoods.

Lastly, the Makuleke are always cited as a great example of successful tourism initiatives that include and benefit the local people. Also, the support of the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust to the local people's ecotourism activities is a great illustration of communities and the private sector working together in ecotourism initiatives. However, other communities in the GLTFCA have not had the same opportunities and experiences. The lack of information, access to land, financial support from the government and efficient institutions are some of the hurdles that local people in Zimbabwe in particular, face when attempting to be involved in the tourism initiatives of the GLTFCA. The centrality of tourism as a benefit generating activity in the TFCA model has not been shared by most communities. As shown above, most local communities have barely benefited from tourism in the GLTFCA.

The involvement of local communities in decision-making processes has not been uniform. SANParks seems to have more structures and opportunities for participation than their Zimbabwean counterparts. The SANParks structures include the Park Forums and the GLTFCA cooperative agreement. The Park Forums are a platform that facilitates better community and stake holder relations. The GLTFCA cooperative agreement facilitates co-management between local communities in the Kruger National Park and SANParks. The GLTFCA facilitates joint meetings for park management teams from Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa. These three initiatives enforce some of the principles of good governance such as inclusivity, competent co-management, and accountability. As seen above, Zimbabwean local communities perceive the community engagement structures as dysfunctional and not transparent.

4.5 Conclusions

This chapter presented an overview of the nature of the successful initiatives as well as the challenges associated with the establishment of the GLTFCA. The governments of South Africa and Zimbabwe, through their respective conservation management bodies, SANParks and Zimparks the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust have been implementing some of the goals of the TFCAs and in particular those agreed upon in the GLTFCA Treaty and other documentation discussed in the previous chapters. These are facilitating the benefit flows to local communities by promoting the enhancement of livelihoods, cross border access and trade, access to the parks and tourism.

As emphasised in various SADC and GLTFCA documents such as the SADC programme for TFCAs, the SADC protocol on forestry and the GLTFCA livelihoods strategy, community involvement in decision-making processes in the Parks which are situated in the TFCAs is regarded as an important element in the eventual success of the TFCAs. In addition, the involvement of local communities in the decision-making processes, as the primary beneficiaries of TFCAs, enables the communities to hold the park management accountable and empowers them.

From the discussion it is evident that the GLTFCA initiative has since its establishment in 2002, have had some positive results when it comes to community benefits, which include income generation through employment, selling of plants accessed in the Parks and selling thatch grass. The benefit flows from partnerships such as the Makuleke agreements with Wilderness Safaris and Matswani Safaris have resulted in better livelihoods for local communities. Communities have benefitted from human development programmes that take place at the Lillydale centre.

The network provisions for local communities and the Peace and Changemaker programme in the Gonarezhou National Park, showcase a commitment to their empowerment through introduction to technology and knowledge.

The socio-economic projects recorded in the SANParks annual reports from 2008 to 2012 signifies the feasibility of community run projects that are functional and yield benefits. The use of irrigation schemes and conservation agriculture as livelihood strategies can be considered climate change conscious strategies which exemplify the local communities' ability to adapt to climate change and alternative livelihood strategies.

The access to national parks provided by SANParks and the Gonarezhou Conservation Trust allows local communities to medicinal plants, fruit and most importantly ancestral burial sites and cultural places that are essential for their spiritual and cultural beliefs. The cross-border tourism activities have generated income whilst the cultural festival has been a symbol of acknowledging the cross border cultural linkages between local communities.

The challenges to communities on the other hand, can however not be ignored. These include the lack of tangible efforts towards poverty alleviation and the existence of land dependent livelihood strategies. The lack of compensation to local communities for damage caused by animals results in a lack of trust in the park management's ability to provide economic benefits. The impact of TFCA initiatives such as wildlife corridors have resulted in livelihood insecurities that encourage migration for better livelihoods that allow remittances to be sent back to families still living in the park. The inequitable

distribution of tourism benefits, corruption and lack of transparency has led to communities being hesitant to participate in tourism initiatives in the park because the prospect of benefit does not seem feasible and is not as direct as the benefits, they receive from crop farming.

The lack of functional governance structures and community involvement in decision-making processes, particularly in Zimbabwe, impede the benefit accrual process for local communities. Lastly, since tourism is impacted by social and political stability, the political instability in Zimbabwe has deterred tourists and this affects the tourism benefit flows to local communities.

From the scholarly literature and the various reports by SANParks, the PPF and newspaper reports, it seems that communities in South Africa have so far benefitted more than the communities in the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe. This may be ascribed to the fact that Zimbabwe has experienced numerous events that have affected the social, political, and economic situation. As a result, the political and socio-economic climate in Zimbabwe is less favourable for development strategies to be established and implemented successfully. The political and economic climate in South Africa is more favourable for development.

With regard to the incorporation of communities in decision-making, it is evident that SANParks has put more effort into adhering to this important requirement. The establishment of agreements such as the GLTFCA cooperative agreement and park forums illustrate community involvement in platforms where decisions are made. There is also evidence to community involvement in cultural heritage initiatives such as the rock art survey and consultation on the elephant management strategies in the Kruger National Park. Apart from the community consultations about Sengwe-Tshipise corridor, the incorporation of communities in decision-making is lacking in Zimbabwe.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The past two decades have seen the proliferation of transfrontier conservation areas (TFCAs) in the southern African region, of which the second, the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (the GLTFCA), which is the focus of this study, was established in 2002. It is made up of national parks in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and South Africa. The main aim of the TFCAs is to conserve wildlife (and promote the sustainability of ecosystems) through the removal of all human barriers within the transfrontier park so that animals can roam freely. These areas straddle the boundaries of two or more countries. However, the aim is not only to improve biodiversity conservation, but to also enhance socio-economic development in rural areas and to contribute to reducing poverty in local communities.

The aim of this study was to trace the nature of the benefits to local communities living within and near the GLTFCA since its establishment in 2002. How have communities benefitted and what challenges have they faced over the years? Specific questions that the study attempted to answer was:

- What is the nature of the resources that have been distributed to communities?
- In what way have the livelihoods of communities changed?
- What is the relationship between the local communities and the park management?
- Do local communities participate in decision-making processes?

Scholarly contributions on the benefits to communities are scant and those that have focused on communities have addressed a particular issue. It is therefore difficult to establish a holistic picture of the nature of community benefits and the challenges communities in the GLTFCA face. This study focused on two communities, the Gonarezhou Park in Zimbabwe and the Kruger National Park in South Africa.

This is a qualitative study based on both primary and secondary literature. The ideal would have been to conduct fieldwork in the areas, but this was not possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In southern Africa the concept of TFCAs is formally supported by the SADC member states and form part of the official development strategy of SADC. The numerous SADC protocols and strategies acknowledge that TFCAs can enhance socio-economic development. Moreover, the SADC documents provide a framework and mutual goals to be achieved by member states in relation to TFCAs.

To establish whether local communities have benefitted from the establishment of the GLTFCA, an analytical framework was developed from the above-mentioned SADC protocols and frameworks as well as the GLTFCA Livelihoods Strategy to guide the study.

5.2 Findings

The major findings of this study revolve around the three major aspects addressed in this study namely: the nature of the benefits to local communities because of the GLTFCA initiative, the nature of the challenges they face and lastly, their involvement in the decision-making processes.

The major benefits to the Makuleke community in the Kruger National Park and the communities in the Gonarezhou National Park are summarised under the following themes: benefits from tourism, benefits from the enhancement of livelihoods, benefits arising from access to resources in the parks and benefits from cross-border access and trade. These are also the broad categories of potential benefits from TFCAs highlighted in the above-mentioned documents.

5.2.1 Community benefits

Tourism has been a major drive of economic income and the sustainment of livelihoods of local communities particularly in the Kruger National Park. This has been

clearly seen from the revenue gained through tourist lodges and camps and the partnerships between for example, the Makuleke community and safari companies. Tourism has also led to a market for arts and crafts through the Kruger Park's arts and crafts outlets. Such opportunities also exist in the Gonarezhou National Park.

Through partnerships between the Makuleke community and the two private sector organisations (Wilderness Safaris and Matswani Safaris), the Makuleke CPA received eight percent of the revenue of which two percent is used for youth development and projects such as the building and electrification of classrooms.

The transfer of knowledge (also envisaged as a potential benefit to communities) has manifested in the Kruger Park through the establishment of, for example, the Lilydale Environmental Education Centre which is run by the community while in the Gonarezhou Park there are for example, education projects which enable local people and school children to be part of education tours in the park.

Over the years rangers and community members have also been trained to work at lodges or as rangers in the conservation and anti-poaching units by SANParks in the Pafuri area. In the Gonarezhou Park most of the employees are from local communities while community members are also hired for the construction and maintenance of camps in the park.

Communities also benefit from access to the national parks as envisaged in the SADC TFCA guidelines, SADC protocol on Forestry and SADC RISDP. These benefits are both tangible and intangible. Communities are allowed access to resources such as the use of medicinal plants and the cutting of grass for livestock during droughts (in for example the Gonarezhou Park). SANParks have developed a sustainable resource use programme as far back as 2004, which over the years have for example, included numerous community nursery projects. Communities are also allowed to preform cultural rituals, which is a significant intangible benefit to the communities.

Several cross-border activities which generate income have also been initiated over the years. These include cross-border wilderness trails and Shangaan festivals that have been some of the repeated successes of cross border activities since 2013. The

Shangaan festival for example, draws large crowds every year from people from Zimbabwe and Mozambique, which contributes significantly to cross-border tourism.

Although communities have benefitted in several ways through the establishment of the GLTFCA, several challenges have also been experienced.

5.2.2 Community challenges

Despite the income generating projects that have resulted from the GLTFCA initiative, these have not had a tangible effect on the alleviation of poverty in the communities. The absence of socioeconomic benefit attainment in the Sengwe community (Zimbabwe) for example, has impacted livelihoods and increased the prevalence of conservation refugees and emigrants.

Although tourism is the major source of income and job creation, local communities on the Zimbabwean side, experience numerous challenges. The biggest challenge for these communities is the lack of clear guidance for community participation in transfrontier tourism enterprises. The government and the institutions in Zimbabwe lack transparency and there is little to no dialogue between parties on the situation concerning the parks. Access to land, financial support from the government and efficient institutions are the hurdles they encounter when attempting to get involved in GLTFCA tourism initiatives. The centrality of tourism as a benefit generating activity has therefore not been shared by all communities, particularly those on the Zimbabwean side.

Cross border facilities also present difficulties for local people such as the need for national identification, which most people do not have. This causes problems with custom regulations and restrictions at the border as people living in these communities, commute regularly between towns and villages within the border area. These impede the cross-border trade aspirations of most local people, and it has a negative impact on the livelihoods of border communities.

A further challenge over the years have been human wildlife conflict and the lack of compensation for losses incurred by local communities which result in a lack of trust in the management of the parks.

As highlighted in the previous chapter, it seems that communities in South Africa adjacent to the Kruger Park have benefitted more from the establishment of the GLTFCA than the communities in the Gonarezhou Park in Zimbabwe. This may be attributed to the political and economic situation which is less favourable to development than is the case in South Africa.

5.3 Participation in decision-making

Community involvement in decision-making in the parks is important for the success of the TFCAs. Besides the fact that it is regarded as a means of empowering local communities (SADC, 2012), it is also important for local 'buy-in' to the notion of conservation.

The involvement of local communities in decision-making processes has not been uniform. SANParks has more structures and opportunities for community participation than their Zimbabwean counterparts. Structures such as the Park Forums established by SANParks are functional while Zimbabwean local communities perceive the community engagement structures as dysfunctional and not transparent.

5.4 Conclusion

This study has shown that tourism in the GLTFCA, is a major driver of employment and growth. One cannot conclude this study without considering the socio-economic shockwaves of the COVID-19 pandemic that have left communities devastated since its first outbreak at the beginning of 2020. Numerous job losses (in the tourism and hospitality sectors) have occurred because of the travelling restrictions within countries and within the southern African region. Declining visitors to parks are affecting revenue, operations, and community beneficiation. The overall impact of

border closures and lockdowns have also resulted in the loss of additional income opportunities such as selling produce and crafts to international and local visitors.

The pandemic, as acknowledged by the Peace Parks Foundation (2020), threatens to reverse decades of work by governments and NGOs to bring about equitable benefits to communities while the repercussions of COVID-19 are anticipated to be felt by the conservation industry for years to come.

How governments and NGOs will mitigate the impacts of COVID-19 in Southern Africa in the years to come to keep the protection of natural resources in place, while at the same time assisting vulnerable communities remains to be seen. In the meantime, the Peace Parks Foundation has intervened by implementing measures to protect the lives of people. Among other things, they have distributed more than 240 000 personal protective equipment (worth $100 000) to vulnerable communities and healthcare services in areas where they have an operational footprint. The Foundation is also assisting in mitigating the economic consequences of the pandemic by preserving the livelihoods of communities. Together with various governments and partners they have been coordinating and implementing programmes that aid communities through-cash-for-work interventions in the GLTFCA and other conservation areas. Funding to the amount of 6 million Euro provided by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development has subsidised thousands of jobs, cash-for-work, and food-for-work programmes. Funding is also used to compensate for park revenue losses that have occurred (PPF, 2020).

The intervention of governments and NGOs in preserving the livelihoods of local communities in the GLTFCA and other conservation areas is a topic for future study.

5.5 Suggestions for further study

The aim of this dissertation was to use the available literature to answer the research questions set out above (and in chapter 2). From the literature, as discussed, it is evident that communities have been benefitting or could benefit from TFCA initiatives. Despite the existence of some of the benefits, the financial statistics on the income

generated or the direct monetary benefits to the local communities have not been made available. In addition, the lack of documented evidence from the Zimbabwean state conservation agency – Zimparks - over the past 20 years, have resulted in the unavailability of sufficient information to comprehensively analyse the benefits to communities in the Gonarezhou National Park and the challenges they are faced with.

Therefore, it is suggested that future research on the GLTFCA should particularly focus on the lived experience of the communities in the Gonarezhou National Park. On the other hand, research (in the form of interviews) should also be conducted with officials from Zimparks to obtain the views of the government on the achievements and the limitations of the GLTFCA initiative. Scholarly contributions on Zimbabwe have since 2017 also been scant.

Lastly, as suggested above, the devastating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on communities as well as the intervention of governments and NGOs in preserving the livelihoods of local communities in the GLTFCA and other conservation areas is also a topic for future research.

Bibliography

Adams, J.S. and McShane, T.O. 1992. *The myth of wild Africa: conservation without illusion*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Adams, W.B. and Mulligan, M. 2012. *Decolonizing nature: strategies for conservation in a post-colonial era*. Routledge.

Africa Geographic. 2018. *The Kruger History & Future*. Available at: https://africageographic.com/stories/history-and-future-of-the-kruger/ [Accessed: 10 November 2021].

Andersson, J.A. and Cumming, D.H. 2017. Defining the edge: boundary formation and TFCAs in Southern Africa. In Andersson, J., de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., Cumming, D., Dzingirai, V. and Giller, K (eds), *Transfrontier Conservation Areas: people living on the edge,* London and New York: Routledge.

Anderson, D. and Grove, R. 1987. The scramble for Eden: past, present and future in African conservation. In Anderson, D and Grove, R (eds), *Conservation in Africa. People, policies and practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anthony, B.P. 2006. *A view from the other side of the fence: Tsonga communities and the Kruger National Park, South Africa.* Central European University.

Augustin, B.; Kubena, J. 2010. *Yellowstone National Park (Nature's Wonders)*. New York: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark.

Balint, P.J. 2006. Improving community-based conservation near protected areas: the importance of development variables. *Environmental management*, 38(1): 137 - 148.

Baret, S., Sandford, N., Hid, E., Vazirani, J. and Hatfeld, S. 2013. *Developing an effective governance operating model: A guide for financial services boards and management teams*. Hermitage: Deloitte Development LLC.

Barrow, E. and Murphree, M. 2001. Community conservation: from concept to practice. *African wildlife and livelihoods: The promise and performance of community conservation,* edited by D. Hulme and M. Murphree. James Currey Ltd

Baxter, P. and Jack, S. 2008. Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report,* 13(4): 544 - 559.

Berg, B.L. and Lune, H. 2007. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* 6th edition. London: Pearson.

Berglund, K. 2015. *Framing Transfrontier Nature Conservation: The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park and the Vision of peace Parks' in Southern Africa*.

Bhatasara, S., Nyamwanza, A.M. and Kujinga, K. 2013. Transfrontier parks and development in southern Africa: The case of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. *Development Southern Africa*, 30(4-5): 629 - 639.

Bocchino, C. 2008. *Is Mozambique the new South African frontier? The socio-economic impact of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier conservation area on the livelihood strategies of border communities in the Pafuri administrative post*. Bologna: Alma Mater Studiorum- Universita di Bologna.

Bratton, M. and van de Walle, N. 1996. Popular Protest and Reform in Africa in Nyang'oro, J.E. (ed.) *Discourses on Democracy*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.

Büscher, B. 2013. *Transforming the frontier: peace parks and the politics of neoliberal conservation in Southern Africa*. London: Duke University Press.

Brechin, S.R., Wilshusen, P.R. and Fortwangler, C.L. 2012. *Contested nature: promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century.* Albany: Suny Press.

Brockington, D. and Duffy, R. 2011. *Capitalism and conservation*, Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brockington, D., Igoe, J. and Schmidt-Soltau, K.A.I. 2006. Conservation, human rights, and poverty reduction. *Conservation Biology*, 20: 1250 - 1252.

Carney, D. 1998. *Sustainable rural livelihoods: What contribution can we make?.* London: Department for International Development.

Carruthers, J., 1989. Creating a national park, 1910 to 1926. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 15 (2): 188 - 216.

Carruthers, J. 1995. *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History.* Scottsville: Natal University Press.

Cernea, M. M. 1997. The risks and reconstruction model for resettling displaced populations*. World Development*, 25(10): 1569 - 1587.

Child, G. 1995. *Wildlife and people: the Zimbabwean success. How the conflict between animals and people became progress for both*. Harare and New York: Wisdom Foundation.

Child, B. 1996. CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe: Assessing the Sustainability of Uses of Wild Species*. IUCN/SSC Occasional Paper*, 12: 59 - 78.

Chirozva, C. 2015. Community agency and entrepreneurship in ecotourism planning and development in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. *Journal of Ecotourism,* 14(2-3): 185 - 203.

Chiutsi, S. and Saarinen, J. 2017. Local participation in transfrontier tourism: Case of Sengwe community in Great Limpopo transfrontier conservation area, Zimbabwe*. Development Southern Africa,* 34(3): 260 - 275.

Cock, J. and Fig, D. 2000. From colonial to community-based conservation: environmental justice and the national parks of South Africa. *Society in transition*, 31(1): 22 - 35.

Collins, S. 2003. Optimising community benefits from conservation: Visual tourism versus hunting in the Makuleke Contractual Park in South Africa's Kruger National Park. Tourism Investment in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area: Scoping report, Report to the Transboundary Protected Areas Research Initiative, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Connor, T. 2005. Place, belonging and population displacement: New ecological reserves in Mozambique and South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, *22*(3): 365 - 382.

Creswell, J.W. 2003. A framework for design. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 9 - 11.

Creswell, J.W. and Tashakkori, A. 2007. Differing perspectives on mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods*, 1(4): 303-308.

Cundill, G., Thondhlana, G., Sisitka, L., Shackleton, S. and Blore, M. 2013. Land claims and the pursuit of co-management on four protected areas in South Africa. *Land use policy*, *35*: 171-178.

DeMotts, R. 2017. *The challenges of transfrntier conservation in Southern Africa: the park came after us.* Maryland : Lextington Books.

Dhliwayo, M., Breen, C. and Nyambe, N. 2009. Legal, policy, and institutional provisions for community participation and empowerment in transfrontier conservation in Southern Africa. *Journal of international wildlife law & policy*, 12(1-2): 60 - 107.

Dieckmann, U. 2001. 'The vast white place': a history of the Etosha national park in Namibia and the Hai//om. *Nomadic Peoples*, 5(2): 125 - 153.

Domholdt, E. (1993). Physical Therapy Research: Principles and Applications. W B Saunders, Philadelphia. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People,* 7(1): 23 - 48.

Draper, M. and Wels, H. 2002. Super African dreams: the mythology of community development in transfrontier conservation areas in Southern Africa. *Séminaire Ecotourism and Nature Parks in East and Southern Africa*. African Studies Centre: Leiden.

Draper, M., Spierenburg, M. and Wels, H. 2004. African dreams of cohesion: Elite pacting and community development in transfrontier conservation areas in Southern Africa. *Culture and Organization,* 10(4): 341 - 353.

Dudley, N. 2008. *Guidelines for applying protected area management categories.* IUCN.

Duffy, R. 2001. Peace parks: the paradox of globalisation. *Geopolitics*, *6*(2)1-26.

Ferreira, S. 2004. Problems associated with tourism development in Southern Africa: The case of Transfrontier Conservation Areas. *GeoJournal,* 60(3): 301 - 310.

Duffy, R. 2007. Peace parks and global politics: the paradoxes and challenges of global governance. In S. Ali (ed) *Peace parks: conservation and conflict resolution*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Erg, B. Groves, C., McKinney, M., Michel, T.R., Phillips, A., Schoon, M.L., Vasilijevic, M. and Zunckel, K. 2015. *Transboundary conservation: a systematic and integrated approach.* Best practice protected area guidelines series, (23).

Ferreira, S. 2004. Problems associated with tourism development in Southern Africa: The case of Transfrontier Conservation Areas. *GeoJournal,* 60(3): 301-310.

GCT. 2021. *Gonarezhou: A conservation Partnership.* Available at: https://gonarezhou.org

Gaol, C.J.L. 2014. *A to Z Human Capital Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

Garcia, A. K., Wijnhoud, D., Otsuki, K. & Acha, D. 2016. *Food & Business Knowledge Platform*. Available at: http://knowledge4food.net/wpcontent/uploads/2016/12/arf12b_mozambique_policybrief02.pdf

Giampiccoli, A. 2015. Community-based tourism: Origins and present trends. African Journal for Physical Health Education*, Recreation and Dance,* 21(2): 675 - 687.

GLTFCA, 2016. Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area: Integrated Livelihoods Diversification Strategy 2016-2030, South Africa: USAID Southern Africa and Peace Parks Foundation.

GLTP, 2014. Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. Available at: https://www.greatlimpopo.org

GLTFCA Scoping Report. 2015. The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area Livelihoods Diversification Strategy: Scoping Report. Available at: https://maps.ppf.org.za/arcgis/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=6a4ecb43005247b1a8adb88d7b79a917

Gogoi, D. 2014. A conceptual framework of photographic tourism. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences* (IMPACT: IJRANSS), 2(8): 109 - 114.

Gorda, A.O.S., Romayanti, K.N. and Anggreswari, N.P.Y. 2018. Social capital, spiritual capital, human capital, and financial capital in the management of child welfare institutions*. International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities,* 2(3): 12 - 20.

Hanks, J. 1997. Protected areas during and after conflict: the objectives and activities of the Peace Parks Foundation. *Parks,* 7(3): 11 - 24.

Harmon, D. 2006. People, Places, and Parks: Proceedings of the 2005 George Wright Society'. *In Conference on Parks, Protected Areas, and Cultural Sites, Hancock, Michigan, USA*.

Holmes-Watts, T. and Watts, S. 2008. Legal frameworks for and the practice of participatory natural resources management in South Africa. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 10(7-8): 435 - 443.

Hoogendoorn, G., Kelso, C. and Sinthumule, I. 2019. Tourism in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park: a review. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 8(5): 1 - 15.

Hossain, K. 1995. Evolving principles of sustainable development and good governance. In Erik M.G. Denters, Konrad Ginther, and de Waart (ed.), *Sustainable Development and Good Governance*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Hughes, D.M. 2002. Going transboundary: Scale-making and exclusion in southern African conservation. *Unpublished paper*.

Hughes, D.M., 2005. Third nature: making space and time in the Great Limpopo Conservation Area. *Cultural Anthropology*, 20(2): 157 - 184.

Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. 2001. *African wildlife and livelihoods: The promise and performance of community conservation*. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. 1999. Communities, wildlife and the 'new conservation' in Africa. Journal of International Development: *The Journal of the Development Studies Association*, 11(2): 277 - 285.

Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. 1996. Working together key themes in the management of relationships between public and non-profit organisations. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management,* 9(7): 5 - 17.

Joint Management Plan. 2002. Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park Joint Management Plan: Joint Policy and Management Guidelines. Available at: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadd273.pdf

Katerere, Y., Hill, R. and Moyo, S. 2001. *A critique of transboundary natural resource management in Southern Africa*. Harare: IUCN, Regional Office for Southern Africa.

Kideghesho, J.R., Røskaft, E. and Kaltenborn, B.P. 2007. Factors influencing conservation attitudes of local people in Western Serengeti, Tanzania. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 16(7): 2213 – 2230.

King, B. 2010. Conservation geographies in Sub-Saharan Africa: The politics of national parks, community conservation and peace parks. *Geography Compass*, 4(1): 14 - 27.

King, B.H. 2004. The state of NGOs in post-apartheid South Africa: Changing roles in conservation and development. *African Geographical Review*, 23(1): 65 - 84.

Koenig, D. and Diarra, T. 2000. The effects of resettlement on access to common property resources. In Cernea, M. M. and McDowell, C. (eds), *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees, Washington*, D.C.: World Bank Publications.

Kokwe, M. 1997. *"Biodiversity and Transfrontier Protected Area Management and Research,"* an issues paper presented at the SADC Joint Environment and Land Management, Forestry, Wildlife, Community Building Workshop, 14 - 18 April, Mbabane, Swaziland.

Loon, R., Harper, I. and Shorten, P. 2007. Sabi Sabi: A model for effective ecotourism, conservation and community involvement. In Bushell, R and Eagles, P.F.J. (eds)

Tourism and Protected Areas: Benefits Beyond Boundaries: the Vth IUCN World Parks Congress. Wallingford: CABI.

Lunstrum, E. 2010. Reconstructing history, grounding claims to space: history, memory, and displacement in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. *South African Geographical Journal= Suid-Afrikaanse Geografiese Tydskrif*, 92(2): 129 - 143.

MacKenzie, J.M. 1988. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting. Conservation and British Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Maluleke, G. 2018. *Rethinking protected area co-management in the Makuleke Region, South Africa (SA)*(Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University).

Manwa, H. and Manwa, F. 2014. Poverty alleviation through pro-poor tourism: the role of Botswana forest reserves*. Journal of Sustainability*. 6(9): 5697 - 5713.

Massé, F. 2016. The political ecology of human-wildlife conflict: producing wilderness, insecurity, and displacement in the Limpopo National Park. *Conservation and society*, 14(2): 100 - 111.

Mavhunga, C. & Spierenburg, M., 2009. Transfrontier Talk, Cordon Politics: The early history of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park in Southern Africa, 1925-1940. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 35(3): 715 - 735.

Mbaiwa, J. E. 2005. Enclave Tourism and its Socio-Economic Impacts in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Tourism Management,* 26(2): 157 - 172.

Metcalfe, S. and Kepe, T. 2003. Your Elephant on our Land": The struggle to manage wildlife mobility on Zambian communal land in the Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area. *The Journal of Environment and Development*, 17(2): 99 - 117.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M., 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London: Sage.

Milgroom, J. 2012. *Elephants of democracy: An unfolding process of resettlement in the Limpopo National Park*. Wageningen: Wageningen University

Milgroom, J. and Spierenburg, M. 2008. Induced volition: Resettlement from the Limpopo National Park, Mozambique. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 26(4): 435 - 448.

Milgroom, J., Giller, K.E. and Leeuwis, C. 2014. Three interwoven dimensions of natural resource use: Quantity, quality and access in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. *Human Ecology*, 42(2): 199 - 215.

Mnini, P. and Ramoroka, T. 2020. Challenges Of Ecotourism and Poverty Alleviation in South Africa. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 12(2): 321 - 334.

Mosammam, H.M., Sarrafi, M., Nia, J.T. and Heidari, S. 2018. Typology of the ecotourism development approach and evaluation from the sustainability view: the case of Mazandaran Province, Iran. *Journal of Tourism Management Perspective*, 18: 168 - 178.

Murombedzi, J. 2003. *Pre-colonial and colonial conservation practices in southern Africa and their legacy today*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Murphree, M. 2001. Community, council & client: a case study in ecotourism development from Mahenye, Zimbabwe. In Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. (eds) *African wildlife and livelihoods: The promise and performance of community conservation*. Oxford: James Currey.

Musakwa, W., Gumbo, T., Paradza, G., Mpofu, E., Nyathi, N.A. and Selamolela, N.B. 2020. Partnerships and stakeholder participation in the management of national parks: Experiences of the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe. *Land*, *9*(11): 1-17.

Musavengane, R. and Leonard, L. 2019. When race and social equity matters in nature conservation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Conservation & Society*, 17(2): 135 - 146.

Mwima, H. 2001. A brief history of Kafue National Park, Zambia. *Koedoe*, 44(1): 57-72.

Neumann, Roderick P. 1998. *Imposing wilderness. Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa*. London, Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

NPS. 2021. *National Parks Service.* Available at: https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/historyculture/timeline.htm [Accessed 10 November 2021].

Ntuli, H., Jagers, S.C., Linell, A., Sjöstedt, M. and Muchapondwa, E. 2019. Factors influencing local communities' perceptions towards conservation of transboundary wildlife resources: the case of the Great Limpopo Trans-frontier Conservation Area. *Biodiversity and Conservation,* 28(11): 2977 - 3003.

Osman, T., Shaw, D. and Kenawy, E. 2018. Examining the extent to which stakeholder collaboration during ecotourism planning processes could be applied within an Egyptian context. *Land use policy*, 78: 126 - 137.

Pettersson, R. 2014. *Conservation for development: a literature study of the socioeconomic effects of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Petroman, I., Petroman, C., Marin, D., Ciolac, R., Vaduva, L., Pandur, I. 2013. Types of cultural tourism. *Scientific Papers Animal Science and Biotechnologies*, 46(1): 385 - 388.

Phiri, P. and Okeyo, D.O. 2015. In search of potential eco-tourism and eco-femini-tourism artifacts from rural Eastern Cape Province of South Africa: a case of Binfield,

Hopefield and Mazotsho village communities of Nkonkobe Municipality. African Journal for Physical Health Education, *Recreation and Dance*, 21(2.2): 426 - 440.

Polkinghorne, D.E., 2005. Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of counselling psychology*, 52(2):137.

PPF. 2005. *Peace Parks Foundation*. Available at: https://www.peaceparks.org

Prinsloo G., Marokane C.K, Street R.A 2018. Anti-HIV activity of southern African plants: Current developments, photochemistry and future research. *Journal of Ethnopharmacol,* 210: 133 – 155.

Ramutsindela, M.F. 2002. The perfect way to ending a painful past? Makuleke land deal in South Africa. *Geoforum*, 33(1): 15 - 24.

Ramutsindela, M. 2007. The renaissance of the bush: the reinvention of the Cape to Cairo route in contemporary Africa. *Transfrontier conservation in Africa: at the confluence of capital, politics and nature*, pp.123 - 139.

Ramutsindela, M. 2007. *Transfrontier conservation in Africa: At the confluence of capital, politics and nature*. Wallingford :CABI.

Rasheed, S. 1996. *Development, Participation and Democracy in Africa*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Ribot, J., Treue, T. & Lund, J. 2010. Democratic decentralisation in Sub Saharan: Its contribution to forest management, livelihoods, and enfranchisement. *Environ Conserv*, 37: 35 - 44.

Ribot, J.C. and Peluso, N.L. 2003. A theory of access. *Rural sociology*, 68(2): 153 - 181.

Rodgers, G. 2009. The faint footprint of man: Representing race, place and conservation on the Mozambique–South Africa borderland. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22(3): 392 - 412.

Rutten, M., Leliveld, A. and Foeken, D. 2008. *Inside Poverty and Development in Africa: Critical reflections on pro-poor policies*. Leiden: Brill.

SADC. 2012. *Southern African Development Community*. Available at: https://www.sadc.int/themes/natural-resources/transfrontier-conservation-areas/ [Accessed 10 November 2021].

SANParks. 2004. *South African National Parks*. Available at: https://www.sanparks.org [Accessed 5 May 2021].

SANParks. 2004. *South African National Parks: Annual Reports*. Available at: https://www.sanparks.org/assets/docs/general/2009.pdf
SANParks. 2004. *South African National Parks: Annual Reports*. Available at: https://www.sanparks.org/assets/docs/general/annual-report-2010.pdf

Santarém, F., Campos, J.C., Pereira, P., Hamidou, D., Saarinen, J. and Brito, J.C., 2018. Using multivariate statistics to assess ecotourism potential of waterbodies: A case-study in Mauritania. *Tourism Management*, 67: 34 - 46.

Schoon, M.L. 2008. *Building robustness to disturbance: Governance in southern African peace parks*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Shikolokolo, H.P. 2010. *An evaluation of the impact of Kruger National Park's development programme on the Hlanganani community in Limpopo*. Limpopo : University of Limpopo.

Sibanda, M. 2010. The urban and rural spaces: consequences of nature conservation and the rural to urban migration: a case of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area, Zimbabwe Sector. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 1(1-2): 23-32.

Singh, J. and Van Houtum, H. 2002. Post-colonial nature conservation in Southern Africa: same emperors, new clothes? *GeoJournal*, 58(4): 253 - 263.

Siyabonga Africa. 2011. Mopane Worm Harvest. Available at: https://www.krugerpark.co.za/krugerpark-times-6-2-mopani-worm-harvest-25325.html

Spenceley, A. 2005. Tourism investment in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area Scoping report. *Wits Rural Facility: University of the Witwatersrand*.

Spierenburg, M., Steenkamp, C. and Wels, H. 2008. Promises Of Economic Development In The Great Limpopo, Southern Africa: Networks And Partnerships In transfrontier Conservation. *In Inside poverty and development in Africa* (pp. 144 - 168). Brill.

Spierenburg, M. and Wels, H., 2006. "Securing Space" Mapping and Fencing in Transfrontier Conservation in Southern Africa. *Space and Culture*, 9(3): 294 - 312.

Swatuk, L.A. 2005. *Peace parks in southern Africa*. Available at: https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/parks-for-peace-or-peace-for-parks-issues-practice-and-policy

Tapela, B. N. 2001. *Community Participation In Natural Resource Management: The Case of The Makuleke Community Based Natural Resource Management*. University of Pretoria.

Tavuyanago, B. 2016. *Living on the fringes of a protected area: Gonarezhou National Park (GNP) and the indigenous communities of South East Zimbabwe, 1934 - 2008*. University of Pretoria.

Thondhlana, G. and Cundill, G. 2017. Local people and conservation officials' perceptions on relationships and conflicts in South African protected

areas. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management,* 13(1): 204 - 215.

Thondhlana, G. and Muchapondwa, E. 2014. Dependence on environmental resources and implications for household welfare: Evidence from the Kalahari drylands, South Africa. *Ecological Economics*, 108: 59 - 67.

TIES. 2015. *The International Ecotourism Society*. Available at: https://ecotourism.org/what-is-ecotourism/.

Vancouver Kibreab, G. 2000. Common property resources and resettlement. In Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees, edited by Cernea, M. M. and McDowell, C. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Publications

WCP. 2020. *The World's Children Prize.* Available at: https://worldschildrensprize.org/aboutpcg

Whande, W. 2007. Trans-boundary natural resources management in southern Africa: local historical and livelihood realities within the Great Limpopo Trans-frontier Conservation Area. Bellvile: PLAAS.

Whande, W. 2007. Transfrontier conservation areas: Historical and livelihoods considerations within the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. Bellville: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies Research Report.

Witter, R. 2013. Elephant-induced displacement and the power of choice: moral narratives about resettlement in Mozambique's Limpopo National Park. *Conservation and Society*, 11(4): 406 - 419.

Witter, R. and Satterfield, T. 2014. Invisible losses and the logics of resettlement compensation. *Conservation Biology*, 28(5): 1394 - 1402.

Wolmer, W. 2003. Transboundary conservation: the politics of ecological integrity in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29(1): 261 - 278.

Wolmer, W. Chaumba, J. and Scoones, I. 2004. Wildlife management and land reform in south-eastern Zimbabwe: a compatible pairing or a contradiction in terms? *Geoforum*, 35(1): 87 - 98.

Wyllie, R. 2014. Benefits beyond boundaries: cross-border tourism collaboration in southern African transfrontier conservation areas. University of Pretoria.

Zanamwe, C., Gandiwa, E., Muboko, N., Kupika, O.L. and Mukamuri, B.B. 2018. Ecotourism and wildlife conservation-related enterprise development by local communities within Southern Africa: Perspectives from the greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation, South-Eastern Lowveld, Zimbabwe. *Cogent Environmental Science*, 4(1): 1-13.

Zeppel, H. 2006. *Indigenous ecotourism: Sustainable development and management*. CABI.

Zibanai, Z. 2019. Trans-Frontier Parks: Tourism Development and Poverty Alleviation Vehicles-Lessons from Southern Africa. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Systems*, 12(2): 67 - 81.

Zunckel, K. 2014. Southern African development community transfrontier conservation guidelines: The establishment and development of TFCA initiatives between SADC Member States. Zunckel Ecological and Environmental Services, Hilton.