JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEES ON ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE, AND ENVIRONMENT

AND

AFRICA

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 9, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

77-751 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U. S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044105-6

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEES ON
ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE, AND ENVIRONMENT

AND

AFRICA

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 9, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

77-751 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044105-6

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
TOM LANTOS, California
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
HARRY JOHNSTON, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY, Georgia
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida
ERIC FINGERHUT, Ohio
PETER DEUTSCH, Florida
ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN, Maryland
DON EDWARDS, California
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
(Vacancy)

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JAN MEYERS, Kansas
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DAVID A. LEVY, New York
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, Florida
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California

MICHAEL H. VAN DUSEN, *Chief of Staff*
RICHARD J. GARON, *Minority Chief of Staff*
ANNE GREY, *Staff Associate*
DEBORAH HICKEY, *Staff Associate*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE, AND ENVIRONMENT

SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut, *Chairman*

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY, Georgia
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ERIC FINGERHUT, Ohio
ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN, Maryland
HARRY JOHNSTON, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York

TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska
JAN MEYERS, Kansas
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
DANA ROHRABACHER, California

JOHN SCHEIBEL, *Staff Director*
EDMUND B. RICE, *Republican Professional Staff Member*
KATHLEEN BERTELSEN, *Professional Staff Member*
DONNA LA TORRE, *Professional Staff Member*
PETER YEO, *Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA

HARRY L. JOHNSTON, Florida, *Chairman*

DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
DON EDWARDS, California
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York

DAN BURTON, Indiana
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, Florida
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
(Vacancy)

CLIFFORD KUPCHAN, *Staff Director*
GILEAD KAPEN, *Republican Professional Staff Member*
ANNE-MAREA GRIFFIN, *Professional Staff Member*
BERT D. HAMMOND, *Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

AFRICA AND THE ENVIRONMENT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE
AND ENVIRONMENT, AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:29 p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Sam Gejdenson (chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment) presiding.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Please come to order. Our thinking on the environment has come a long way in the last 10 years. Instead of being expressed only as an interest in the preservation of exotic species, concern for the environment these days is likely to take on a more comprehensive and developmental focus.

In fact, practically all of the major environmental organizations are talking about the environment in terms of entire ecosystems and in broad development goals.

Why? The simple reason is that is the way it works. When environmental plans take into account the role of people within ecosystems, their need for sustenance and employment, and the pressures on countries to earn hard currencies through exports, the plans work. If we ignore these plans, we are confronted with failure. Plans that are in the best interest of the environment and of the people who must live and work in that environment are plans that have a chance of making a difference. Simply outlawing the cutting of trees will never stop deforestation. Providing economic incentives to keep trees intact will. Prohibiting wildlife in preserves will not stop poachers. Fostering a tourist industry around one might.

Just as environmental preservation and development are intertwined, so are environment preservation and sustainable agriculture. So many issues in agriculture such as soil erosion, water conservation, decertification, are at the heart of environmental concerns.

Environmentalists have been arguing for years that everything in this world is interconnected. Nowhere is that more true than in Africa where the economic development must mean increased agricultural production, but it can also mean further environmental degradation. That is the bad news. The good news is that if the path to economic development can be found that is good for the environment, farmers will increase their crop yields, biodiversity will be maintained for the source of genetic materials needed to make

mprovements in food crops and livestock, global climate change hat wreaks havoc on weather patterns will be reduced and the denuded lands can be recovered for productive uses.

These are the highlights of today's hearing and a critical review. We have held hearings in the past where we found that World Bank loans ended up increasing production of cotton in countries, but the cost of the increased chemicals was equal to the increase in the production value. And then, we ended up poisoning their water system with hazardous chemicals. And we walked away from that obviously a net loss, an increase of product only equal to the increased cost of production and a loss of a drinkable water system.

Today, we have two panels of witnesses. The first is Robert Pringle, from the Department of State and Richard Cobb, for the Agency for International Development. Mr. Pringle.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. PRINGLE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECOLOGY AND TERRESTRIAL CONSERVATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. PRINGLE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would like to begin with an anecdote, but I think it is illustrative. When I was Ambassador to Mali, I discovered to my surprise that there were about 500 elephants in the northern part of the country. In fact, it is the northern-most remaining herd of elephants in Africa. At the time very few people among the foreign community knew anything about them, and they tended to laugh at you if you said there really are elephants in Mali and you can actually go see them.

They were publicized by a Malian, Dr. Noumoy Diakité who was looking after them as a labor of love. Dr. Diakité had a job working for a World Bank cattle project, and he used his tank trucks to haul water to them during the great draught of 1984, and saved a lot of them from dying. And he kept up with it and now there is more international attention being paid to them.

And it is important because they are in a wonderful geographic triangle between the ancient city of Timbuktu on one side; the inner delta of the Niger River on another side; and the Dogon country on a third side; and in the middle, some spectular Monument Valley-type rock formations, all of which make it an area of great potential touristic importance. And on top of that, these are elephants that have survived because of a rather interesting traditional relationship with the local people, who are nounadic uaregs—who believe that the elephants symbolize that everything is going well with nature, and do not harm them. And on top of that, they also have very small tusks. No one is sure why because the animals, themselves, are very big. Perhaps it is because of the perodic. So, they have not been poached for their ivory and that has certainly helped preserve them up to now.

And, yet, as development has taken place, there has been an introduction of irrigated agriculture around the water holes where these elephants go, and now they are beginning to come into conflict with people in a way that needs to be resolved. But at the end of the day, when it does get resolved, it will be good for the country. It will certainly enhance the touristic attraction of the area, not to mention its biodiversity. It is a kind of a parable, I think,

for the importance of developmental conservation in Africa generally.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to testify because I have been working at the State Department in a new job with the Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science helping design an environmental policy framework for Africa that will embody the goals and objectives which have been posted by the new administration. Because when it was said that environment would be a major policy objective, people at our Embassiessort of looked around and said, "Oh, that is very interesting, but what do we do next? Where's the beef?"

And in fact, what I am discovering is that although this is a difficult time to get new money for anything, first of all, there is a lot that is going on out already. There is a wealth of activities by the private sector, private voluntary organizations. And if you put it all together, it already adds to important U.S. presence, in addition to our mainstream aid programs.

Something that tends to get overlooked is that there are dedicated Africans all over the continent, sometimes working under conditions of extraordinary hardship, who really believe in promoting sound environmental policy, I do not think it is something that the North is imposing on the South. I think it is something that is perceived as a good and a necessary thing to be doing by people like Dr. Diakité and there are thousands more like them in Africa.

Later today, Amy Vedder from Wildlife Conservation International is going to be testifying about some of the work they have been doing with people in Zaire, a country which has almost ceased to exist from a governmental point of view, and where AID has had to pull out because of the economic and political situation; and, yet, were people are carrying on with projects in eastern Zaire in a way that demonstrates total dedication on their part. And certainly, one of the things we need to do in all of our activities is to try to identify these people and support them.

I have some written testimony here. I certainly do not want to read all of it. The main thrust of it Mr. Chairman, is very similar to what you have said in your opening statement.

I begin by saying the African continent is simply to vast, and its proportion of the world's population, area and biological resources is too great for it to be left in the margins of our environmental concerns. I go on to say, again what you said, that nowhere else is there such an immediate and compelling overlap between environmental progress and economic development.

Better management and sustainable development of land and forest is going to lead directly to improved living conditions for Africa's often impoverished rural majority. The conservation of wildlife is already a major source of ecotourism income in some countries, and certainly has the potential elsewhere.

Protecting forests and forest elephants in northern Congo, as AID is doing, will help the Republic of Congo—which unfortunately is going through another political crisis as we speak—to develop a new tourist industry and avoid the rapid depletion of an otherwise irreplaceable timber resource.

The same thing holds true in Mali where I was. Helping villagers to manage their forests and practice family planning will, by reduc-

ing pressure on fragile soils, help to arrest the advance of the desert. And so it goes. One could cite many other such examples.

Our priority in Africa is to promote sound environmental practices, which are also developmentally sound. In 9 times out of 10 they are. There may be short-term pressures to do wasteful environmentally destructive things, and that is a real problem everywhere. But in the end, the two things come together: development and sound environmental practice.

The African environment relates to our global concerns in many ways. Central Africa has the world's second largest expanse of moist tropical forest, after the Amazon. Deforestation linked with brush fires from slash-and-burn agriculture is a significant and probably growing source of CO_2 emissions. And Africa's magnificent and often threatened fauna are priceless assets, partof our global heritage. From rhinos to microorganisms, these species represent a significant component of the earth's biological diversity.

Our policy also has a strong multilateral component. We regularly and repeatedly encourage the multilateral development banks to assist borrowing countries to adopt environmentally sound policies. At U.S. insistence, for example, the World Bank and the African Development Bank have adopted policies on environmental impact assessment. In recent months, we have had increasing support from other donors for quality reforms in specific loans to African countries.

Unfortunately, continued effective U.S. leadership in this area is limited by U.S. arrearages to the banks. And, of course, we are going to need to address this question soon and find a balance between our support for these institutions, and their ability and willingness to respond to our calls for efficient management, quality control and portfolio improvements.

We are also sensitive to the implications for Africa of a range of environmental agreements and conventions flowing from the Rio Earth Summit, including Agenda 21, the Convention on Global Climate Change, the Convention on Biodiversity and the Convention on Combatting Desertification.

We are, in fact, supporting climate change studies in half a dozen African countries, helping Africans to inventory their greenhouse gas emissions, to evaluate their vulnerability to climate change, and to begin thinking about remedial strategies; with, of course, the long-term objective of helping them develop their own planning and implementation capability on climate change and its consequences.

By signing the Convention on Biodiversity, we have signalled our support for sustainable use of the biosphere, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits deriving from that use. In Africa, as well as around the globe, countries will have new incentives and resources for conservation of their unique biological gifts.

The desertification convention, which is still under negotiation and to which I have been leading our delegation, gives priority to Africa because it is the area that is the most heavily impacted by desertification. And we think it will accomplish two things. On one level, it will encourage the kind of high-tech cooperation exemplified by early drought warning systems and satellite data. And on another level, we think it will encourage Africans to use existing

antidesertification aid more creatively and efficiently by, for example, promoting better planning, involvement of local communities and regional cooperation. And it will require donors to do a better job of coordination than has sometimes been the case in the past.

Of course, we know that preserving the endangered species of Africa is a matter of the utmost urgency. Secretary Babbit's certification of China and Taiwan under the Pelly Amendment for their trade in rhino horn, as well as Asian tiger parts, reflects this administration's determination to act before it is too late.

Under the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service, which plays a very important role in all of this, provides significant assistance to range states involved in the often desperate war against poaching. There is similar legislation, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, under which one of these days we hopefully will have some funding to do some projects in Africa on that front, similar to what we are doing in Latin America.

On a bilateral basis, we have just in the last year enabled several U.S. technical agencies to support basic science research on environmental issues. This is through the appropriation provided to the Oceans, Environment and Science Bureau that I work for, OES. These include a cooperative fisheries study in Senegal, a collaborative study and survey of the biota in Madagascar, and a mineral potential study in the Horn of Africa.

I would not want to suggest that our current environmental policy is perfect. It needs strengthening in a number of areas and, of course, it has, as all intended good things do, to cope with the problem of budgetary resources. I think we need to do more to effectively support U.S. NGO's working on environmental issues, and to keep embassies informed about the depth and complexity of U.S. NGO involvement, and at the same time to encourage linkages between American NGO's and their African counterparts. This is something that embassies (including AID Missions and the invaluable Peace Corps) can do because they are there on the ground.

We badly need a small project fund, within existing resources, to replace the defunct Biodiversity Fund, which you may recall was financed in 1991 and 1993 through the Security Assistance Account. A fund like this would enable U.S. Ambassadors to support new biodiversity initiatives that they spot in the field, and would not necessarily, as the old fund was, require that this money be channeled through the local military, which the Biodiversity Fund did because it was out of FMF funding. I personally never quite understood how that happened, but it did.

We also need to make greater use of regional funding capabilities to support our global environmental concerns in those African countries which do not have on which are losing AID missions. And I would underline that this is very important because there are a lot of countries out there that are extremely important from an environmental point of view. They are not in the developmental mainstream and we need to be able to take care of them consonant with our own interests. We are planning a regional program focused on the Central African rain forest with that in mind, which will look at the whole range of biodiversity issues and which will have as a hallmark support of NGO's who are already working in the area.

We realize that sound and sustainable environmental policy depends on participation of dedicated individuals as I mentioned earlier. And we are encouraging our Ambassadors to identify them to help them through things like the International Visitor Program and other means at their disposal.

In closing, let me say, although I am not sure this is necessary, why a vigorous environmental partnership seems to us to serve American as well as African interests. Africa's long-term economic well-being is surely linked with sustainable development of its natural resource base. Without progress in this area, the prospects for even more civil unrest and the requirements for extremely expensive emergency aid are going to escalate. African countries faced with massive economic problems need help in order to work with us on issues of global concern, such as biodiversity and global climate change. And that is why our investment in helping Africans to sustain Africa's environmental health is so important to our own environmental health.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask that the full statement be entered into the record.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Without objection.

[The satement of Mr. Pringle appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Cobb.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD COBB, DEPUTY ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU FOR AFRICA, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss USAID's environmental programs in Africa.

I wish to make three points which will supplement the written statement: first, a word about our approach in Africa; second, a comment on efforts to bring some cohesion to the process of identifying issues and planning programs; and third, a comment on the role of NGO's in our work.

First, our approach. USAID's environmental programs are working on two levels: on one level, toward progressive national policies that protect the environment, and at the same time focusing on local capacity to understand and implement environmentally sound programs. For USAID, the critical environmental questions in Africa relate to the underlying productivity of the continent's natural resource base. For that reason, we have focused on programs that support three areas: first, sustainability of agriculture; second, maintaining tropical forests; and third, the conservation and preservation of biodiversity.

For the past 5 years, USAID has been implementing the Development Fund for Africa (DFA). Within the DFA, environmental sustainability has been closely linked to development; specifically, to the objectives of increasing incomes and growth. This approach is fully supportive of the overall environmental strategy of the administration, with its focus on the environment as an element of economic development.

USAID's environmental programs have helped both governments, as well as farmers, by supporting changes that lead to sustainable development. For example, in Mali, USAID programs are simultaneously promoting positive national land use and marketing poli-

cies, and at the same time, helping farmers to increase yields and the diversity of their economic activities.

Second, on the issue of more cohesion in identifying problems and in the planning process, we have invested a major effort, including staff resources, in trying to create a realistic and sound environmental policy and planning framework throughout Africa, a framework that Africans, scientists, bureaucrats, donors and NGO's can all use. The principle vehicle for this has been the National Environmental Action Plan. We support this process. In countries like Rwanda, Madagascar and Uganda, the National Action Plans have been the vehicle for organizing and focusing major donor support in the environment and natural resource sectors. Our USAID missions have provided advice and knowledge to international teams, and conversely, the National Action Plan process has helped link USAID programs more closely with those of other donors.

Finally, the role of NGO's. In preparing our environmental strategies for Africa and in carrying out our programs, USAID relies heavily on NGO's and private voluntary organizations, international, United States and local. We have a strong partnership with such groups as World Wildlife Fund, African Wildlife Foundation, Conservation International, CARE, AFRICARE and the Wildlife Conservation Society. For the past several years, these organizations have had an influential role in the formulation of strategies for the Africa Bureau, as well as specific country strategies related to sustainable agriculture, and the conservation and preservation of biodiversity.

In addition, NGO's are the primary instrument through which local groups are empowered to participate in the programs we support. This partnership between USAID and the NGO's is a model which we should use in building similar close relationships with NGO's working in other sectors. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Cobb appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Mr. Johnston, do you have an opening statement you want to put in the record?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will just put it in the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Johnston appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Let me ask a couple of quick questions and maybe we can get through the questioning before we have to go vote.

In Massachusetts, if you want to build a factory or a generating facility you have two options: you can try to get rid of 100 percent of the pollution that is coming out of the smokestack, you know, usually two-tenths of a percent or 2 percent is where 90 percent of the money goes; or you can then find worldwide someplace for the same amount of money to get more bang for your buck. So, if you are building a power-generating facility that burns fuel oil and you can get 98 percent of the pollutants out of it, and then you provide financing either for setting up a preserve somewhere, or buying a piece of the rain forest and protecting it, the associated clean-up that occurs worldwide, if it is enough, will get you off the hook on the last 2 percent.

And so, one of the things it seems to me that maybe we ought to look at is a worldwide approach where industrial nations will make some rational decisions on capital investment, and maybe we can do a lot more good investing some of those cleanup dollars in Africa and developing countries, rather than necessarily always taking that last two-tenths of a percent of cleanup.

Not that I am against that last bit of cleanup, but maybe we can get a lot more cleanup and a lot more preservation for the same dollars. You should not let the companies get off the hook for the cheapest proposal, but take the same amount of dollars and get a lot more environmental benefit from it. In that sense, there is always the great talk that we should have a carbon tax, the wealthy polluting nations end up paying for what is happening in other nations. But, it is a great idea. I do not think we are going to do that right away, especially in the present economic atmosphere where the country is still in turmoil over our 4½ cent gas tax. They are not going to see new taxes passed in Western democratic government.

So that maybe getting the international corporate community committed to a more rational utilization of their resources may be one place to get money. Is that an option?

Mr. PRINGLE. It certainly sounds like a good idea to me from where I sit. I could not speak authoritatively.

Mr. GEJDENSON. You know, maybe what you ought to do is meet with the folks that deal with the utilities up in Massachusetts, I would be happy to get you together with them, and we can look at having some kind of international commitment that will do some of this.

The other thing is my question—and I think I know the answer, but it is kind of instinctive. Is Africa a place that is facing population pressure that is creating some of this? Is it a rapidly expanding population that is growing drastically across Africa?

Mr. PRINGLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is true, there is not absolute population pressure in the sense that there are a lot of vacant areas. But, in fact, the growth of—the population growth rate is, I believe—Dick, stop me if I am wrong—the highest of any underdeveloped area. The actual day-to-day impact on resources is, I would say, more severe probably than almost anywhere else.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So, my correct staff tells me the population will double in the next quarter of a century.

Mr. PRINGLE. Right.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So if that is the case, should we be directing some of our effort at population programs, and are the governments generally interested in participating in population programs?

Mr. COBB. There is enormous population pressure in Africa. The density of the population is a direct cause of cutting down the trees and depleting the fertility of soils. USAID is putting as much money into population programs as we are in natural resources. I do not think that finding resources are a major problem.

Mr. GEJDENSON. OK. Let me ask one last question, and then turn to Mr. Johnston the short time that we have.

How do we get the governments to see this as a priority? And how do our feeding programs impact agriculture in that country?

Do governments see this as a general priority? This is some fancy concept for wealthy nations to be engaged in, but we are in a survival battle and do not talk to us about long-term sustainable development. Our children are dying. The other question is what happens to rural communities as we bring in food shipments to some of these countries? Does that disrupt the local agricultural?

Mr. COBB. Let me take the first part of your question. We are trying to make the link in dealing with governments. Specifically, the link between environment and growth. The argument that we are making is that the rural population, which constitutes the vast majority of people in Africa, are not going to have any change in its welfare and income without some attention to these issues of agricultural sustainability and preserving the natural resource base.

There has been multinational, multidonor efforts directed at this issue of trying to link development with natural resource and environmental issues. And, in a number of countries, I think we are succeeding in getting policymakers to focus on this.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Can you get us a list of countries that you think generally see this as an issue they care about and are willing to make some commitment to, and countries that do not care?

Mr. COBB. Sure.

Mr. GEJDENSON. The last question I have, and then we are going to recess until we get to the next panel: is there a relationship between the debt burden these countries face and their commitment to environmental programs? Does that show up when they do not have the resources, when they have too much foreign debt?

Mr. COBB. Yes, there is a relationship. A lot of these countries are under extraordinary debt and have very limited revenues. There is pressure across the board on their development programs. And, it affects what they can do in the environment, what they can do with population, what they can do with agricultural development.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And what portion of our assistance to Africa goes to population programs and to environmental programs?

Mr. COBB. Well, we are putting up 10 percent of the Development Fund for Africa roughly into population and another 10 percent into the environment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Twenty percent go into those two categories?

Mr. COBB. Yes, that is right.

Mr. GEJDENSON. What does the bulk of the other money go to?

Mr. COBB. Other areas in which we work include agriculture, health and child survival, and basic education. But, a substantial portion is going into population and environment natural resources. We can give you a breakdown if you are interested.

[The material has been sumitted for the record.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. OK. I would like to see that. I want to thank both of you. We will submit to you some additional questions for the record. The committee will stand in recess for approximately 10 minutes.

[Recess.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. On the next panel, we have Henri Nsanjama of the World Wildlife Federation, Diane McMeekin of the African Wildlife Foundation and Amy Vedder of the Wildlife Conservation

Society. Your entire statements will be placed in the record. Please proceed with what is most comfortable, and we will start with Mr. Nsanjama.

STATEMENT OF HENRI NSANJAMA, VICE PRESIDENT, AFRICA AND MADAGASCAR PROGRAM, WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

Mr. NSANJAMA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Chairman Gejdenson of the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment and Chairman Johnston of the Africa Subcommittee, as well as other committee members for inviting me to participate in this important hearing. I am Henri Nsanjama, a native of Malawi in southern Africa. Currently, I serve as vice president of the Africa and Madagascar Program of the World Wildlife Fund-U.S.

This hearing is taking place at an opportune time. Opportune because, on the one hand, Africa is currently going through a process of political reform to more democratic forms of government. On the other hand, the U.S. Government is considering cutting back developing assistance funding to Africa. If adequate external financial resources are not available for Africa now, the environment will inevitably suffer through unsustainable exploitation of natural resources to satisfy immediate short-term needs. Aid to Africa from the United States during this critical period will draw a line between a rotting and degraded African environment and a better future for the citizens of Africa.

Mr. Chairman, Africa is a continent of great cultural and biological wealth with over 500 million people of hundreds of ethnic groups and languages. Ecosystems and species richness may be unsurpassed by any other continent. However, today, Africa is going through a conservation crisis. The viability of Africa's ecosystems is increasingly, and in some cases, highly threatened. The human population of many African countries will double within the next 25 years. Pressure for land is increasing steadily, making a "hands off" conservation approach less and less viable, and integrated conservation and development increasingly necessary. In short, Mr. Chairman, conservation should not compromise viable and ecologically sustainable rural economic development.

What should we be doing? Mr. Chairman, nobody can claim to know with certainty how best to save the African environment, but we all know that humans are the sole source of the continent's crisis without any question. It is, therefore, logical to expect that the solution to the crisis lies in the hands of humans.

The loss of Africa's resources has complex dimensions with multiple and often interdependent causes, many of which are not of African making or over which Africans have no control. Because of this, Africa must be distinguished from other regions of the world. These following characteristics make Africa's context for conservation unique: 1) severe economic underdevelopment; 2) basic human needs are unmet for many; 3) population growth is out-pacing increases in agricultural production; 4) most land is agriculturally unproductive; 5) there are unpredictable and widespread droughts through the continent; 6) until recently, undemocratic governments prevented the normal growth of nongovernmental organizations; and finally, Africa has the lowest human resources development of

any continent. Therefore, although African participation is critical, Africans cannot afford to undertake unilateral mitigation of environmental degradation.

What is the World Wildlife Fund doing? The World Wildlife Fund's commitment to conservation of biological diversity and development of sound natural resource management practices in Africa and Madagascar has resulted in support for conservation efforts in more than 40 countries since 1962. The Fund has developed strategies that guide and integrate program effort. These strategies include: 1) creating and protecting protected areas; 2) linking conservation and human needs; 3) building conservation infrastructure; and 4) protecting species of special concern.

What role can the U.S. Government play? Africa's economic growth rate is the lowest in the world. Per capita food production between 1962 and 1983 is about 30 percent. According to the United Nations' annual development index, 32 of the 40 countries with the lowest economic development are in Africa. Such hard facts have extremely negative impacts on the environment of Africa as people fight to acquire the barest requirements for survival. Despite all this, Africa gets the least development aid.

Conservation of natural resources is a long-term endeavor that requires long-term investment. Such investment requires a solid base for funding. Africa cannot do it alone. The U.S. Government has been a world leader in the stewardship of the global environment and is a source of inspiration for many Africans. Now, more than at any other period during the last two decades, Africa needs the United States to stand by its side.

Experience shows that finding new money for environmental activities is very hard these days. That, coupled with this era of budget reductions would render a proposition for additional funding unlikely. It is crucial, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that existing funds be utilized very effectively. New ways must be explored that will leverage funds from different sources. Innovative approaches include the establishment of trust funds and debt reduction mechanisms. Congress has played a key role by passing laws allowing these innovatives.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that now is not the time to abandon Africa. I have spent the last 18 years working on the environmental issues in Africa, and I know that the political and economic reforms currently taking place in Africa will be meaningful if the environment is afforded the highest priority. The United States can and should endeavor to make that possible. Today, Mr. Chairman, we are presented with the opportunity to reverse a conservation crisis in Africa, and if we do not do something about it, future generations will never pardon us. I thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Nsanjama appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Ms. McMeekin.

STATEMENT OF DIANA McMEEKIN, ACTING PRESIDENT, AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Before I begin, I would like to thank Mr. Gejdenson, and Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Roth and Mr. Burton for inviting me here to testify along with my colleagues. I am Diana E.

McMeekin, acting president and CEO of the African Wildlife Foundation. Having lived and traveled in Africa for more than 25 years, or worked on African issues from Washington during that time, I particularly appreciate the increased interest in the African environment that this hearing represents. I applaud the subcommittees' efforts.

The African Wildlife Foundation has worked in Africa for 32 years. We have had projects on the ground in all regions of sub-Saharan Africa, though we currently specialize in East Africa. In particular, our major ongoing projects are in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania and eastern Zaire. Since the late 1980's, the Foundation has been a leader in work that we coin "community conservation"—that is, taking a step beyond traditional, park-related conservation to work with communities surrounding natural areas, trying to smooth the relationship between growing human and shrinking animal populations so that they co-exist to the greater benefit of both. It is this specialty of our program portfolio that I want to address today.

It has been written and said many times that if people are to conserve their natural resources, they must value them as sources of wealth. No one who has worked in the field in Africa seriously argues with this mantra of self-interest. And yet, implementing it has never been simple. Like rural resources users anywhere, including in the United States, Africans take a comprehensive view of their self-interest, a view which values stability in their resource-use arrangements, as well as the immediate generation of economic benefits, whenever possible. If conservation authorities in Africa expect resource users to harvest from their environment sustainably, then they must provide, in return, a reasonable expectation that the relationship between themselves and the resource users will also be stable. In short, our self-interest solution depends on the institutions involved achieving a certain level of development. Community conservation arrangements must be dependable, and clearly supported by governments, to work. This is precisely the direction that AWF is taking in much of its work.

We call our community conservation program "Neighbors as Partners". Unlike the worthy work of some of the other conservation organizations, we concentrate only on communities surrounding protected areas, because a very large percentage of the remaining wildlife in East Africa is concentrated in parks and reserves, from which it spills out into the communities that surround them. In Kenya, our experience in the field has led to a current project called COBRA, Conservation of Biodiverse Rich Areas, which is wholly funded by USAID. The case history of community conservation in Kenya is a good lesson for those interested in putting scarce conservation resources where they are most needed.

Since Tsavo West National Park in Kenya was first gazetted, the Maasai livestock herders surrounding it have not always been able or willing to observe the restrictions against grazing in the park. These restrictions came at a time when much land previously devoted to grazing was coming under more intense agriculture. As a result, the Maasai were forced to look farther afield for land for their herds. In dry seasons especially, the park became an inviting solution, and no amount of force could prevent those resource users

from entering the park. We had a classic example of environmental stress, in this case a growing human population and inadequate space or resources for dry-season grazing, forcing people, people who were living on the edge of survival anyway, into critical wildlife habitat. A good percentage of the locally available graze for wildlife species was instead consumed by domestic animals. If I could combine all of the environmental problems of Africa into one case, this would come very close.

We initially addressed the problem by appointing a Maasai project officer to identify, along with the Kenyan Wildlife Conservation and Management Department, exactly who was grazing in the park and how to encourage them to go elsewhere. Far from grand schemes to share park receipts or the like, the first few years of this involved sitting under a lot of trees and attending a lot of community meetings. We knew that without this gradual building of a solid foundation, without gaining credibility and the confidence of the Maasai, and showing them that the Kenyan Government was committed to finding solutions, we had no hope of accomplishing this program. We found, of course, as you always do that the problem centered around much deeper issues, like the lack of access to markets for Maasai sheep and goats, and government land-use policies that threatened the traditional, community-oriented ownership pattern.

After establishing stable links with the community, through Community Conservation Committees and key leaders, solutions became easier to implement. It became possible to talk about tourism in the area and to share the benefits. It became easier to find markets for the livestock and to develop them. In the end, herders in the park made a decision based on their own interest to move their livestock. With the exception of an extremely dry season in 1991 and this past dry season, there have been no further problems with livestock in the park.

Now this was all before the current COBRA project began. These simple, but profound, changes made it possible to think about broader, policy-level issues and about how we could integrate them into the Kenyan Government. With money from USAID, AWF, and several other organizations, the Kenya Wildlife Service began a 5-year push to create a community wildlife program. This came into existence with the promise to share revenues with the neighboring people to parks. How to accomplish this goal within a stable infrastructure, with competing claims and rivalries between communities, were among the many hurdles that had to be met. Merely distributing cash made little sense, since it would have been prohibitively expensive to administer, and would have raised false and conflicting hopes. In the end, with the assistance of a Maasai project officer employed by AWF, all sides agreed to put the money into community-suggested projects. Basic community development work became tied to the success of the park.

Now, with the new Community Wildlife Service, known as Cobra,institutionalized within the Kenya Wildlife Service, we are free to think about better revenue-sharing arrangements. We can address the human issues behind wildlife decline as a matter of routine business now. This is where we hoped we would be when we started.

If we are looking for continued success, the first recommendation I would make is to fund projects that work, as this one does, on a variety of levels. The Neighbors as Partners program has always emphasized vertical integration: grassroots activities, including community development, meshed with regional planning and national policy work. Rural people have some control over their day-to-day use of the resources. But it is naive and counterproductive to assume that merely satisfying a few material needs, handing out a bit of cash here and there, will free these people to become sustainable users, even if they wanted to. A great many policies, laws, and economic conditions affect the decisions of resource users. These larger forces can negate any progress made at the grassroots level.

Next, there is a dire need for greater capacity among conservation personnel in many countries. Community conservation personnel require specialized skills for which they rarely receive training. The small training budgets of most states are insufficient in this regard.

Finally, I would urge the U.S. funding strategy to seek self-sufficiency in community conservation projects. AWF has placed great emphasis on promoting the idea of community conservation as a necessary component of park management. In Tanzania, we have also succeeded in integrating community conservation into the government and the Tanzanian national park system; not just as a desirable add-on, but as a necessity. The costs associated with such projects must be built-in, institutionalized within the framework of park management and, therefore, stable.

What we need from the U.S. Government and other donors is a long-term commitment. We need stability in funding and a willingness to keep support coming for many years. If the committee can address this need, it can do an immeasurable service to the people in Africa.

Africa now has some of the foundation on which to build a permanent place for conservation in society, to create conservation institutions and capacity. But it needs a reliable, long-term commitment on the part of the donors to finish the job. The African Wildlife Foundation looks forward to working with this committee to see it happen in the years ahead. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McMeekin appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Ms. Vedder.

STATEMENT OF AMY VEDDER, DIRECTOR OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY

Ms. VEDDER. Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting me to testify, despite the fact that I am from New York.

I come from the Wildlife Conservation Society. This Society was founded in 1898 as the New York Zoological Society. We are a field-driven program that promotes better understanding and protection of wildlife and wilderness resources internationally. We have been active in Africa since the 1920's. Currently, we have a wide-ranging program that includes 80 projects in 20 different countries in Africa. This is in addition to our other global programs. Having worked many years in Africa myself, I now direct the Africa program and

I am based in New York. I have been personally involved with seven different countries in which we have helped set up USAID programs in biodiversity.

I would like to mention just one thing in terms of considering a context of biodiversity conservation in Africa, since much has been said on this already today. Africa represents an area where there is tremendous underdevelopment and, yet, great biological richness, which has been referred to. But one of the consequences of this is that there is a strong dependence on the part of the local people on biological resources. This means that their biological resources are vital to them on a subsistence basis: for both biological products, as well as ecological services. This means that this is a set of issues that is very dear to local and national African hearts. It also means that these resources are under tremendous pressure, which has been mentioned as well: both local pressure, as well as national pressure to derive foreign exchange from those biological resources.

I would like to say one other thing before talking specifically about biological conservation. I do not believe that such conservation can begin to succeed if we do not have sustainable development outside of the biologically rich areas. Virtually all of the richest areas left in Africa have very little potential for development. They are unproductive places in general. So, you have quite an interesting irony here. They are not areas that can be engines for development. And, yet, the greatest pressures on those wilderness areas occur when development does not take place soundly outside of those areas. And so, the context in which biological conservation is found, is extremely important to success of conservation in Africa. And that should be one of the primary goals of any assistance program to the continent: dealing with the macro level of the problem.

What should be done? The issues of biological conservation in Africa are very complex and demand complex approaches. I think we have to remember that these are experimental approaches that we are taking right now. These ecological systems are not very well understood. We cannot yet predict the impacts of human use on these systems. We do not know how resilient the natural systems are to human use and disturbance. And we are just beginning to establish mechanisms of local participation, which are so far untested.

Given the experimental nature of what we are doing and the challenges, we face, one challenge of which is the very strong conflict between short-term economic interests and benefits that could come from these resources, and long-term benefits through conservation, as well as the conflicts between national regional, global and local benefits, which are frequently not congruent, I think this requires that we take complex approaches; multifaceted approaches to biological conservation.

This can be seen in a number of different areas. We need to deal with mosaics of different levels of protection. We very much need purely protected areas if we want conservation of biological diversity. There is an if there. If we are committed to the protection of biological diversity, we need some purely protected areas and there needs to be support for that.

We also need to work very strongly, as I said, outside of biologically rich areas on general development: intensive development to relieve pressures on those wild areas. And we need to look at the challenging matrix in between, which are those patches of multiple use of natural systems where we might achieve some benefits of conversation, as well as some benefits of development. This is where quite a bit of our challenge lies. But we can't forget: we need all three pieces. We cannot concentrate on just one, and any program should consider all three pieces.

Also, in terms of multifaceted approaches, we need action, as has been said, on both policy level as well as on the ground. We need both policy and practice, or neither will succeed. We need to work simultaneously on both levels. We also need to look at both biological systems and socioeconomics. And finally, we need to collect integrated information and put it into wise planning.

Next we also must work on the basis of sound information. As I said, we do not fully understand these systems: some have not even been surveyed. We need initial information and we desperately need to monitor the situation, given the extent and nature of what we are trying to do. We need to take the pulse of the system, both biologically and socioeconomically. This will allow for adaptive management and wise tolling designs of projects that are appropriate reactions to the information that is rolling in. And we have to be patient as we wait for the results—as we work for the results.

Continued information collection can be considered monitoring. This monitoring will also allow us to learn lessons from the activities we are undertaking, and I do not think we have done a very good job of that so far. This kind of information is important. Project people and funders often do not consider research a high priority—this information collection is vital to any wise project design and/or implementation.

Further, we absolutely have to increase active participation at all levels. This has been mentioned today. We need local voices raised. This is not easy. This would parallel some of our efforts in democratization,— looking for mechanisms for effective, local decision-making, local voices in the national arena. We need to help foster networks for indigenous and adaptive knowledge of good conservation or management practice, and get that practice transmitted and extended to other areas. In other words, foster exchanges among local peoples and among African nations.

Furthermore, we desperately need technical training in Africa—everything from barefoot biologists out in the field to people with university and Masters degrees. It is very difficult to find qualified or motivated people, and we need to flood the market so we end up with people out in the field doing what needs to be done. This education has to be practically based and linked to real problems, and can range from on-the-job to very formal training.

I think it's also important to maintain a small grants program for Africans—This would have to be a risky, innovative program, with small amounts of money available; much of which may not produce tremendous results, but will be, in fact, an important mechanism for training and professional development.

In addition, we need to foster NGO's. There are many NGO's in Latin America, quite a few developing in Asia, yet Africa stands out prominently as having few nongovernmental environmental organizations. So, we need to encourage their establishment.

As a general point, we also need to look at sustainable systems. Not just biological and socioeconomic, but also sustainable financial mechanisms for long-term conservation effort. This means dealing with small, low-scale recoverable costs or external contributory mechanisms, trust funds, endowments.

Finally, several points more specifically on what could be done by us angcies. One, you want lower administrative costs—to decrease the cost yet maintain programs overseas. I do think you can do it by partnering with PVO's who have long experience in the field. There are a handful who have been present on a long-term basis with strong expertise. If this is to follow, there should be subsequent meetings to discuss mechanisms for collaboration. We have been developing a possible model for collaborative implementation particular interest, but need to work out the "wrinkles" in our system.

Two, I would suggest you not farm out overseas project designs or work to technical experts who do not know Africa. In other words, do not just shift the burden of some of this responsibility to other U.S. technical agencies that specialize in U.S. matters. Make sure that those people have experience in Africa.

Three, there needs to be a longer-term commitment for projects and programs. We cannot have funding faucets turned on and off. We need more like 8 to 15-year commitments, rather than 3 to 5 years as currently exists in these programs. And we need to try to avoid the political vicissitudes that are present and real in Africa.

Four, when that funding faucet is on, do not turn it on full blast. You will drown the institutions and the systems. Smaller amounts of money over a longer term will be far more useful. Five, we need help in networking and sharing our lessons in Africa, especially among African nations. Six, we need more regional programs to allow for this networking, as well as cross-boundary planning and action. Seven, like I said, we desperately need training on all levels. Eight, please fund conservation, resource use mosaics; do not stick with one piece of the puzzle. You will not do biological conservation without protecting; you will not do development without sound resource management.

And finally, if you really want a chance for biological conservation to work, you have to concentrate as well on problems at the macroeconomic and macrosocial scale, and deal with those other pillars that have been mentioned in AID discussions having to do with democratization, population issues and economic development. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Vedder appears in the appendix.]

Mr. GEJDENSON. Thank you. Do the people from the administration, as a general rule, reach out to you to have meetings with folks at AID, and the State Department?

Ms. MCMEEKIN. I expect we all three have the same answer, Mr. Chairman. It is considerably better than it was 5 or 6 years ago. We still, all of us, have a long way to go on that. There are too many times when an environmental issue is seen as something iso-

lated and, therefore, a lower priority or less importance than a political issue or economic issue. Whereas, the point we are all trying to get across here is that it's a seamless piece of cloth. And I think that when we do get the administration, and the Bank and USAID, all three, to see that it is all one issue with many facets, I will be more satisfied with our progress.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Ms. Vedder, you indicated that there is—I think it was you—there is still not a lot of NGO's doing environmental work in Africa. We sit here sometimes and think there is nothing but NGO's out there—tripping over one another, and fighting to deal with the ability to be concerned. Is the real story here that we're not calculating these agencies?

Ms. VEDDER. Yes. What actually I was referring to were African NGO's. I am sorry, it may not have been clear. There are extremely few African NGO's with a conservation emphasis.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So the assumption is that national activities are there?

Ms. VEDDER. I think we can certainly use more. There are a lot of areas unattended to right now. We do tend to trip up each other once in awhile in the field, however.

Mr. GEJDENSON. The kinds of participation, is everybody now focused on, and where there is a function there, others are there?

Ms. VEDDER. Yes. Well, we hear about it before it hits the papers. But I think that there could be more collaboration among NGO's—international NGO's that are working out there. And I do think that there should be meetings that will bring NGO's together with U.S. agencies to begin this kind of roundtable discussion.

Mr. GEJDENSON. But there are no kinds of conferences or all NGO's doing development activity in Africa that come together with the State Department folks, with U.N. folks, with the French, the English, Germans and the Japanese?

Ms. VEDDER. There are bits and pieces that take place at different levels. Often in a country, you will find different donor agencies or NGO's getting together. What resembles that to some extent here in the States is the Biodiversity Support Program, which has actually taken very big strides in trying to coordinate some NGO activity. But it is not done on a consistent, programmatic basis and it is not done with other branches of other agencies.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Nsanjama, you are from where?

Mr. NSANJAMA. Malawi.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Where?

Mr. NSANJAMA. Malawi.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And what is the response in Africa to these international NGO's? Are they generally well-received? What is their sense?

Mr. NSANJAMA. In Africa, subject to instability, you know, because they brought their particular lots toward Africa. In the last 5 years, we have seen tremendous change, where we are all on the ground, meaning from point zero and saying yes, there is a crisis here. Let's find solutions to this crisis. We far believe those solutions are African-based. During the past few years, these committed people are giving better attention.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And is there a sense in the population that this challenge is an important thing to do?

Mr. NSANJAMA. There is, again, a particular view in the past few years where we are seeing a—presentation of our democratic process passing through, where the local peasant has worked a bit—one works there, ourselves. But, again, before that, it was difficult.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And you think it is better now. Is there a correlation between democratic developments and concern for these issues?

Mr. NSANJAMA. No particular order. Mr. Chairman, a probably quick example in Botswana, which is, as you know, one of the most highly democratic countries in Africa, local people—it was—but the local community stopped the draining of Okavango. Democratic process allows people to make representations of government and governments are able to listen. If they desire to listen.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Does it make sense to ask the State Department or AID to have an African meeting on sustainable development environmental issues or do we first need an agenda first?

Mr. NSANJAMA. Yes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Is somebody working on that in your organizations? What kind of things ought to be invested in Africa—looking toward coordination afterwards?

Ms. VEDDER. Again, there are some attempts at this taking place. But it is not done on an overall basis. No one is coordinating all the agencies at this point. For Central Africa, there has been an initiative on the part of the Biodiversity Support Program and the State Department to bring a number of partners together to discuss where one might go and how one might coordinate in Central Africa.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. I think again, as we have all three said, there is hope, and people are trying. There are some positive signs, and bits and pieces of things are being done. Ms. Vedder and I were at a meeting this morning with the World Bank to discuss the second phase of the Global Environmental Facility Funding. That is a very promising step. There was not any such meeting for the first phase. There are lots of things that are happening here and there.

But, I think that we still have a mentality of the kind of "flavor of the month" funding or hit-or-miss funding that is one of the reasons for what you refer to as stepping over each other in the field. The funding is still so cryptic and so limited that everyone rushes to the same sources when money is available. And when we get to the point of understanding that on the African continent, more than 95 percent of the people depend entirely on the food they grow, then we will begin to understand that all of these other issues are absolutely beside the point, unless we find a way to maintain the biodiversity and the natural resource base.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Ms. Vedder.

Ms. VEDDER. I think there are a couple of opportunities coming up. One is in the development of biodiversity strategy for Africa, which is possibly being planned both by the State Department and by AID: possibly separately, possibly together. The World Bank and GEF may be doing separate strategies, though it looks like they may join to do it together. So, there are some possibilities of strategies coming together and including various agencies, as well as NGO's.

But, I think it would also be important if people are talking about a stronger or expended partnership between international NGO's and U.S. agencies as a model, which has been mentioned, that we should try to follow-up on the idea given that there are glitches in the system, we will have to work through some of the mechanisms. We have been at this now for 5 years and we have learned some lessons; what might work from what we know.

Mr. GEJDENSON. One of the incidents here, and since I am always correct, is that tourism will solve problems. Tourism is an economic rational for preserving various environments and natural states; it blends in economic confidence of the community that are readily visible. We are not just talking about Africa: in my own district people see tourism as employing people. Is that realistic for Africa as well? Will it be able to develop an adequate interest, so that the main matters of environmentally important areas then have economic benefits as well?

Mr. NSANJAMA. Yes, I think tourism could be a possible solution, providing most of the money we ask remain in Africa. In most of the cases that I know, tourism comes from outside Africa and the bulk of the money does not, say, talk of the government, but even getting down to the local communities——

Mr. GEJDENSON. It is all flown in if I remember.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Well, that does not—Mr. Chairman, I would say that does not have to be the case.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Fine.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. But, as Mr. Nsanjama said, that is often the case. But this is something entirely within the control of a sovereign state to regulate against that sort of——

Mr. GEJDENSON. To make sure that these are important——

Ms. MCMEEKIN. That is right.

Mr. GEJDENSON [continuing]. —and local services.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. That is right. And although I must confess having heard it and used it myself several dozen million times, I still do not know exactly what ecotourism is. But tourism——

Mr. GEJDENSON. Probably some place——

Ms. MCMKEEN. That is right. So, you do not have a toilet. But there is a——

Mr. GEJDENSON. But it is not so popular.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Absolutely. Absolutely. But in any case, the fundamental—the premise behind all of this is that multiple uses of the natural resources can bring in revenues. Some types lend themselves to tourism; others don't. East Africa has a very user-friendly kind of atmosphere and charismatic megafauna—and all the services that make it very easy to go and pay a few thousand dollars, and come back and be able to go. West Africa is far more subtle and it has entirely different charms which will meet the needs for a different type of player. Southern Africa, again, has its own specialties.

So, it is something that can be developed for each country in a certain way. But, there is not one template we can lay down and say, OK, that is it. But it is certainly being developed.

Mr. GEJDENSON. And your group generally find local participants in adequate number? Or is that still a big challenge?

Ms. MCMEEKIN. I think you can find employees in contradiction activities quite easily.

Mr. GEJDENSON. But not——

Ms. VEDDER. It is more difficult to find people at other levels. Most of my work has been in Central Africa, and there, we have a stronger lack of higher-level trained personnel. The layer of trained people is extremely thin. And as soon as one goes out of the system, you have a significant void.

Mr. NSANJAMA. That is right. We at the region, we agree with—we at the region could—the possibility, especially training, of people who might be resourceful is only one of the areas, at least for the next 5 years, that is a well-defined base. There is quite a need for that.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Mr. Chairman, if I could just say one thing. I think Henri Nsanjama is the ideal person to answer your question about this availability of training, manpower and womanpower. I am sure, and perhaps I am pressing our friendship a bit, but I am sure that during the course of Henri's professional development and education, there must have been a large number of people who questioned his wisdom in going into a soft field like wildlife and natural resource conservation, when the same energy could have gotten him an education that would provide for another job where he did not have to work and he could take advantage of all of the prestige. Is that correct, Henri?

Mr. NSANJAMA. Right.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Not everyone is as dedicated as he. So, we do find a man power shortage.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Most assured. We look at Africa and worry about the shortages. But within the minds of children, we are trying to develop some sensitivity to the environment. Having this corridor that any people that have access to lakes and streams and trails—and frankly, we do not have a lot of that talent in our organization. We have to deal with the organization in the state of Connecticut that is equivalent to provide support for area's corridor. We are dealing with people whose early industrial development, water uses, etc. that most of us are ignorant on.

So, I think, you know, when you look at Africa as a challenge I think we should try ecotourism or anything else in virtually any place in this country. You are at the same time challenged by local groups that are designed to deal with these issues, even in a very outgoing country, because there are so many evolutions along the way. This kind of waking up to this is in the United States as well.

I want to commend all of you. I hope that at some point, the committee can take a look at some of the things that you are doing, and maybe even help facilitate some dialogue to propose specific ideas among the Federal agencies. Even if you do not take the same roads, at least know where everybody is going.

Thank you, very much.

Ms. MCMEEKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEJDENSON. The meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:04 p.m., the subcommittees were adjourned.]

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF HON. SAM GEJDENSON

Our thinking on the environment has come a long way in the last 10 years. Instead of being expressed only as an interest in the preservation of exotic species, concern for the environment these days is likely to take on a more developmental focus.

In fact, practically all the major environmental organizations are talking about the environment in terms of whole ecosystems and broader development goals.

Why? The simple reason is that it works. When environmental plans take into account the role of people within ecosystems, their need for sustenance and employment, and the pressure on countries to earn hard currencies through exports, the plan works. Plans that are in the best interest of the environment and of the people who must live and work in that environment are plans that have a chance of making a difference. Simply outlawing the cutting down of trees will never stop deforestation. Providing economic incentives to keep intact will. Prohibiting hunting in wildlife preserves won't stop poachers. Fostering a tourist industry around preserve might.

Just as environmental preservation and development are intertwined, so too are environmental preservation and substainable agriculture. So many issues in agriculture such as soil erosion, water conservation and desertification are, at heart, environmental concerns.

Evironmentalists have been arguing for years that everything in this world is interconnected. Nowhere is that more than in Africa where economic development must mean increased agricultural production but it can also mean further environmental degradation. That's the bad news. The good news is that if a path to economic development can be found that is good for the environment, farmers will increase their crop yields, biodiversity will be maintained for sources of genetic material needed to make improvements in food crops and livestock, global climate change that wreaks havoc on weather patterns will be reduced and denuded lands can be recovered for productive use.

OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HON. HARRY JOHNSTON

Today we meet to discuss the very important topic of the environment in Africa. I am pleased that the Africa Subcommittee and the Economic Policy, Trade and Environment Subcommittee are working together on this topic. In our pressing day-to-day efforts to address the immediate crises that we are facing in Africa, it is not always possible to step back and look at the larger issues that will have to be addressed in Africa is to achieve faster progress toward sustainable development.

Few of these issues are more important than the environment. Indeed the nexus between the environment and development will have to be more aggressively and creatively addressed by the United States if we are to play a more effective role in ensuring a sustainable future for Africa. I am pleased that the Clinton administration has expressed its commitment to just such a new approach.

I want to stress at the outset that when I think of environment issues in Africa I don't think primarily about saving animals. In the end, if we can't provide an improved livelihood for Africa's people, especially its rural people, then nothing will be able to save Africa's majestic animals and spectacular vistas. So our strategy for addressing environmental concerns in Africa must have at its center responding to the needs of Africa's poor. Nor can outsiders be the leading force in addressing environmental concerns in Africa. Unless African governments and non governmental organizations take full ownership of these issues, we will not be able to achieve real progress.

When Congress created the Development Fund for Africa in 1987, we recognized the central role that effective management or natural resources played in ensuring long-term increases in productivity. The Congress has asked AID to meet a target of 10 percent of all DFA funds to be used, for natural resource activities.

Today, we hope to learn more about how these funds have been used, about what the lessons are that AID has learned in its environmental-related work in Africa, and about where the Clinton administration sees environment issues fitting in to its overall Africa policy.

We should also learn more, from our private panelists, about how Africa nongovernmental organizations view the environmentally-sensitive development in Africa.

Testimony of
Ambassador Robert M. Pringle
Director, Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation
Department of State
Before the House Subcommittees on Africa
and on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment

November 6, 1993

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to testify on the Administration's environmental policies in sub-Saharan Africa. Let me begin by emphasizing our awareness that a serious global environmental policy would be impossible without a major African component. The African continent is too vast, and its proportion of the world's population, area, and biological resources too great, for it to be left in the margins of our environmental concerns.

But there is another and even more compelling reason for keeping environmental issues front and center in our Africa policy. Perhaps nowhere else is there such an immediate and compelling overlap between environmental progress and economic development.

Better management and sustainable development of land and forests will lead directly to improved living conditions for Africa's often impoverished rural majority. The conservation of African wildlife is already a major source of ecotourism income for countries such as Kenya and Botswana, and has great potential elsewhere. To cite some other examples:

-- Protecting forests and forest elephants in northern Congo, as AID is doing, will help the Republic of Congo develop a new tourist industry and avoid the rapid depletion of an irreplaceable timber resource;

-- Helping Malian villagers manage their forests and practice family planning will, by reducing pressure on fragile soils, help arrest desertification;

-- Stopping soil erosion in Madagascar will improve rural income by preventing the permanent loss of farmland at the same time that it stops the destruction of coral reefs offshore.

Thus our priority in Africa is, wherever possible, to promote sound environmental practices which are also developmentally sound. This is practical policy because, as I have indicated, what is environmentally sound coincides with what is productive over the long term.

The African environment relates to our global concerns in many ways. Central Africa has the world's second largest expanse of moist tropical forest, after the Amazon. Deforestation linked with brush fires from slash and burn agriculture is a significant and growing source of CO_2 emissions. Africa's magnificent and often threatened fauna are priceless assets of our global heritage. From rhinos to microorganisms, African species represent a significant component of the earth's biological diversity.

Our policy has a strong multilateral component:

-- The USG has regularly, consistently, and repeatedly encouraged the multilateral development banks (MDBs) to assist borrowing countries to adopt environmentally sound policies. At U.S. insistence, for example, the World Bank and the African Development Bank have adopted policies on environmental impact assessment. In recent months, we have had increasing support from other donors for quality reforms in specific loans to African countries.

- Our pressure has also fostered new forestry, energy, and water resource management strategies in the World Bank, and the African Development Bank is currently drafting new forestry and energy sector policies. This Administration is paying close attention to these policies, and will continue to press for reforms and improvements regarding transparency, information disclosure, and public participation in project design.

- Again with the encouragement of the U.S. Government, MDBs are funding environmental projects in Africa. For example, the World Bank has eleven loans now in the implementation stage, covering forestry in Gabon, environmental resource management in Ghana, drainage and sanitation in Nigeria, among others.

- Parallel financing and AID cooperative projects in the pilot phase of the GEF (Global Environmental Facility) have addressed specific issues in Africa. For example, AID's "Action Program for the Environment" in Uganda will provide resources for local and international NGOs to work with communities in and around protected areas on natural resource planning and management.

Continued effective U.S. leadership in this area is limited by U.S. arrearages to the Banks. We will need to address this question soon, and find a balance between our support for these institutions and their ability and willingness to respond to our calls for efficient management, quality control, and portfolio improvements.

-- We are sensitive to the implications for Africa of a range of environmental agreements and conventions flowing from the Rio Earth Summit, including Agenda 21, the Convention on Global Climate Change, the Convention on Biodiversity, and the Convention on Combatting Desertification.

- We are supporting climate change studies in half a dozen African countries, helping them to inventory their greenhouse gas emissions, to evaluate their vulnerability to climate change, and to begin considering remedial strategies. Our long-term objective is to help the Africans develop their own planning and implementation capability on climate change and its consequences.

- By signing the Convention on Biodiversity, the U.S. has signalled its support for sustainable use of the biosphere and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits deriving from that use. In Africa, as well as around the globe, countries will have new incentives and resources for conservation of their unique biological gifts.

- The desertification convention, still under negotiation, gives priority to Africa as the area most heavily affected by dertification. It will stimulate international cooperation against a world-wide scourge, drawing on the latest technological developments, such as drought early warning systems. At the same time it will encourage African nations to use existing anti-desertification aid more creatively and efficiently -- by, for example, promoting better planning, involvement of local communities, and regional cooperation.

-- We know that preserving Africa's endangered species is a matter of the utmost urgency requiring vigorous multilateral and bilateral action. Secretary Babbit's certification of China and Taiwan under the Pelly Amendment for their trade in rhino horn and (Asian) tiger parts reflects this Administration's determination to act before it is too late.

- We expect our friends and fellow members of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered species (CITES) to help us in this effort. We are also offering technical assistance to China and Taiwan to enable them to act more effectively.

- Under the African Elephant Conservation Act the Fish and Wildlife Service provides signicant assistance ($1.2 million yearly) to range states involved in the often desperate war against poaching. Unfortunately, there is no funding available under the Wild Bird Conservation Act to conduct bird projects in Africa similar to those underway in Latin America.

And on a bilateral basis, using State Department (OES) special funds, we have, just in the last year, enabled several U.S. technical agencies to support basic science research on environmental issues. Examples include a cooperative fisheries study in Senegal by NOAA, a collaborative study and survey of biota in Madagascar by the Smithsonian, and a mineral potential study in the Horn of Africa.

I am not suggesting that our current environmental policy is perfect. It needs strengthening in a number of areas. Let me mention three of them:

-- We need a system to support more effectively U.S. NGOs working on environmental issues, to keep U.S. embassies better informed about the scope and significance of NGO efforts, and to encourage linkages between U.S. NGOs and their African NGO counterparts;

-- We need a small project fund, within existing resources, to replace the defunct Biodiversity Fund, which was financed in FYs 91 and 93 through military assistance. Such a fund would to enable U.S. ambassadors to support biodiversity initiatives in foreign countries. (The new fund should not require that this assistance be channelled through the local military, as the Biodiversity Fund did.)

-- We need to make greater use of regional funding capabilities to support our global environmental concerns in those African countries which do not have AID missions. We are already planning a regional program focussed on the Central African rainforests.

We realize that sound and sustainable environmental policy depends on vigorous local participation by individuals, communities and NGOs. American ambassadors from Praia to Pretoria are being encouraged to identify and support, through the entire range of our aid and exchange programs, individuals and organizations who are leaders in the struggle for a healthier environment. We know that Africans increasingly share our concern about the environment and hope for a growing degree of cooperation with us on environmental issues.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me explain why a vigorous environmental partnership in Africa serves American as well as African interests. Africa's long-term economic well-being is, we know, linked with sustainable development of its natural resource base. Without progress in this area, the prospects for civil unrest and requirements for emergency aid will continue to escalate. African countries faced with massive economic problems need help in order to work with us on issues of global concern, such as biodiversity and global climate change. That is why our investment in helping Africans to sustain Africa's environmental health is so important to our own.

Thank you.

BUREAU FOR AFRICA
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523-1515

STATEMENT

OF
RICHARD A. COBB
DEPUTY ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR
BUREAU FOR AFRICA

at a Hearing on

AFRICA AND THE ENVIRONMENT

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY, TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 9, 1993

I. WRITTEN TESTIMONY: **The environment and sustainable development - The challenge and prospects for Africa**

I am pleased to have been given this opportunity to discuss with the Committee the prospects for sustainable development in Africa, and the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) role in ensuring that this development is environmentally sound.

There are two stories to tell about the rural economy in much of sub-Saharan Africa. On the one hand, there is the composite, macro-level view of a continent in decline with per capita production stagnant, and natural resources degradation accelerating. On the other hand, there are thousands of cases where farmers, herders, and woodcutters are increasing their productivity, reducing their risks, and are beginning to improve their lives through better natural resources management practices. For example, in Niger, community-based natural resource management, pioneered by USAID in the 1980's, under the Forest Land-Use Planning (FLUP) Project, has expanded from 500 hectares in 1987 to 55,000 in 1992.

The question is whether Africa's future is necessarily preordained to follow the pattern of the negative trend, or does the other more promising story represent a

plausible future for Africa? Also, are the more promising cases dependent on special endowments of soil, capital or education and are they therefore limited to a restricted portion of the population? Or have they occurred because of enabling conditions that could be established on a broad scale?

USAID is optimistic about the future of Africa. With political liberalization and the reform of economic systems, the African entrepreneurial spirit will respond. USAID's environmental programs are working toward progressive national policies that protect the environment; and, at the same time, focusing on local capacity to understand and implement environmentally sound programs.

For USAID, the critical environmental questions for Africa relate to the underlying productivity of the continent's resource base, a critical element of long term development. For that reason, USAID has focused on programs which support the sustainability of agriculture, tropical forests and the conservation and preservation of biodiversity.

For the last five years, USAID has been implementing the Development Fund for Africa (DFA). The DFA has given USAID significant flexibility in initiating long-term economic growth programs in Africa. Within the vision of the DFA, environmental sustainability is inextricably linked to development. This approach is fully supportive of

the overall environmental strategy of the Administration, with its focus on the environment as an element of economic development.

We are well aware that emphasis on only short-term results, without identifying and supporting improvements in the underlying conditions, is bound to fail. The DFA encourages an emphasis on the longer-term approach and USAID programs, which will lead to sustainable growth for Africa's future.

During the last five years, USAID has committed over $300 million to major natural resource and environmental programs in 16 African countries, countries where the political commitment exists for economic development. Also funds have been allocated in support of specific environmental problems, such as global climate change initiatives in the Congo Basin, integrated pest management in the Sahel and protection of elephant habitats in lowland savannas in Africa.

The level of funding provided by USAID over this period means that the U.S. Government is one of the largest donors supporting natural resources management programs in Africa.

In previous years, USAID (like other donors) funded discrete projects that were directed at helping individual farmers to improve their livelihood, for example, the

Small Farming Systems Research Project in Burundi. While many of these initiatives were well meant, the problems afflicting Africa have proved to be more systemic. Accordingly, USAID has shifted focus away from single projects toward broader issues. For example, our environmental programs address such problems as the lack of effective management at local levels, prices that promote short-term use over long-term management, and other policy and market failures.

USAID's environmental programs have helped farmers and herders by supporting the institutional, technical, economic, and political changes that lead to sustainable development. For example, in Mali, the Development of the Haute Vallee Project (DHV-five years and $170 million), the PVO C0-financing Project (five years and $16 million) and the Farming Systems Project (seven years and $19.7 million) are simultaneously promoting positive national land use and marketing policies, and at the same time helping farmers to increase yields and diversify their economic activities using environmentally sustainable practices.

Another major initiative aimed at creating a sound policy and planning framework has been USAID support the National Environmental Action Plans (NEAP). In several countries, such as Uganda, Madagascar, Gambia, Rwanda, and Guinea, USAID has become the lead bilateral donor in this process, providing financial support and intellectual leadership. USAID also is working closely with the World Bank and

other donors to support the Multi-Donor Secretariat for NEAPs. In addition, USAID is actively supporting environmental planning in several other countries, including Mali, Senegal, Kenya, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Ghana. The NEAPs, especially in Rwanda, Madagascar, and Uganda have been instrumental in organizing and focusing major donor support in the environmental and natural resources sectors. USAID Missions have provided advice and knowledge to the international teams preparing the NEAPs. Conversely, NEAPs have helped USAID link its country efforts more closely with those of other donors.

In all instances, USAID's support of the national environmental planning process has emphasized local control and empowerment of the people. We have been trying to ensure that these plans reflect the concerns and interests of resource users, including the rural poor. To help ensure broad participation at the local level, USAID also has supported international and local private voluntary and non-governmental organizations (PVOs and NGOs), such as the World Wildlife Fund, African Wildlife Foundation, Conservation International, CARE, AFRICARE and the Wildlife Conservation Society. These organizations play a key partnership role in the planning and implementation of USAID-funded natural resource management (NRM) programs in Africa.

NGOs have actively participated in strategy analyses and program planning related to sustainable agriculture and the conservation and preservation of biodiversity

throughout the continent. With financial resources provided by USAID, international PVO/NGO consortia have designed and administered debt-for-nature swaps. These swaps in turn have in turn provided the incentive for the empowerment of local NGOs and grass roots organizations. For example, in Madagascar a trust fund was established by the World Wildlife Fund under the USAID natural resource program. In addition an endowment now being designed with USAID funding will support local educational and research institutions which require long term financial security that is not provided by annual project funding.

Agenda 21, an outgrowth of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) presents a major challenge to implement the general concept of sustainable development in practical, on-the-ground terms. This is a difficult task especially as environmental quality in many African countries is closely linked to poverty, demographics, national and international policies, institutional arrangements, and technology. This condition is further complicated by the fact that environmental degradation constrains and undermines development goals such as poverty reduction and improved public health. USAID has confirmed that, in Africa, environmental stewardship and economic and social development can be mutually reinforcing, and the countries involved can directly affect some of the factors that mediate the relationship between environment and development.

USAID believes its approach to dealing with environmental problems in Africa is consistent with the development objectives called for in at the Earth Summit Conference in Rio. We believe that this is a productive and dynamic strategy for the Africa to follow in promoting sustainable development throughout the continent.

In summary:

1. There is reason for hope. Evidence is emerging that Africans are beginning to improve their lives through better natural resources management practices.

2. USAID has a leadership role in sustainable development in Africa because of the approach mandated by the Development Fund for Africa.

3. The strategy now used by USAID in Africa requires a multi-faceted approach including: strong participation from NGOs/PVOs; policy reform; the provision of technical assistance, and coordination between bilateral and multilateral donors.

INTRODUCTION

I would like to thank Chairman Gejdenson of the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment and Chairman Johnston of the Africa Subcommittee, as well as other committee members for inviting me to participate in this important hearing. I am Henri Nsanjama, a native of Malawi in southern Africa. Currently, I serve as Vice President of the Africa and Madagascar Program of the World Wildlife Fund -US.

This hearing is taking place at an opportune time. Opportune because, on the one hand, Africa is currently going through a process of political reform to more democratic forms of government. On the other hand, the United States government is considering cutting back developing assistance funding to Africa. The new democratic Africa requires immediate assistance in the form of financial resources to reverse the more than thirty years of tyranny and mismanagement of governments. If adequate external financial resources are not available for Africa now, the environment will inevitably suffer through unsustainable exploitation of natural resources to satisfy immediate short term needs. Aid to Africa from the United States during this critical period will draw a line between a rotting and degraded African environment and a better future for the citizens of Africa.

CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Africa is a continent of great cultural and biological wealth with over 500 million people of hundreds of ethnic groups and languages. Ecosystems and species richness may be unsurpassed by any other continent - from the remote Kalahari sands to the crystal clear waters of Lake Malawi and Great Rift Valley lakes; from the majestic snow capped Kilimanjaro mountain to the arid Sahel; from the complex and beautiful coral reefs of Madagascar to the dry savannas of eastern and southern Africa. The dense tropical rain forest stretching from Guinea on the west coast to Zaire in central Africa is the second largest in the world. As a result of these rich biological ecosystems, Africa boasts a wide variety of wild animals, including: the African elephant, (the largest land mammal), the okapi, the highly endangered black rhinoceros, a wide variety of duikers and antelope, down to the dik-dik, (the smallest antelope in the world). However, today, Africa is going through a conservation crisis. The viability of Africa's ecosystems is increasingly, and in some cases highly, threatened. The human population of many African countries will double within the next 25 years. Pressure for land is increasing steadily, making a "hands off" conservation approach less and less viable and integrated conservation and development increasingly necessary. Given that over 65% of Africans are rural dwellers and depend on an agrarian economy, the challenge to conserve Africa's natural resources in the coming decade lies in ensuring that conservation is culturally and politically acceptable by the parties directly affected, the rural dwellers. In short, conservation should not compromise viable and ecologically sustainable rural economic development.

STATEMENT OF HENRI NSANJAMA

VICE PRESIDENT - AFRICA AND MADAGASCAR PROGRAM,

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND-US

AT A HEARING ON AFRICA AND THE ENVIRONMENT

BEFORE THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEES ON ECONOMIC POLICY,

TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT AND ON AFRICA

November 9, 1993

CONSERVATION STRATEGIES

Nobody can claim to know with certainty how best to save the African environment but, we all know that humans are the sole source of the continent's crisis without question. It is therefore logical to expect that the solution to the crisis lies in the hands of humans. While the solution includes limiting the size of Africa's population to sustainable levels; it also depends on what people's attitudes towards the environment will be; and what lifestyles will they choose to live. In essence, conservation should not be merely a matter of science and technology but increasingly a matter of humanistic concern. Conservation without a human face is doomed to failure.

The loss of Africa's resources has complex dimensions with multiple and often interdependent causes, many of which are not of African making or over which Africans have no control. Because of this, Africa must be distinguished from other regions of the world. These challenging characteristics which make Africa's context for conservation unique include:

1. Severe economic underdevelopment.
2. Basic human needs are unmet for many, including basic healthcare, access to potable water, sanitation, nutrition and education.
3. Population growth is out-pacing increases in agricultural production.
4. Most land is agriculturally unproductive and therefore creating a tendency to cultivate marginal lands.
5. There are unpredictable and widespread droughts throughout the continent.

6. Until recently, undemocratic governments prevented the normal growth of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) reinforcing social, economic and gender inequities.

7. Africa has the lowest human resources development of any continent. Institutions in all sectors, particularly in the environmental sector, are critically underdeveloped.

Although African participation is critical, Africans cannot afford to undertake unilateral mitigation of environmental degradation. The international community must have a major role in this process.

Five basic principles should guide conservation of nature and ecological processes:

1. Ensure that use is sensitive to ecological processes;

2. Promote ethics for sustainable living;

3. Reduce the poverty level of rural communities by ensuring that they benefit in equitable shares of resources;

4. Balance human numbers with available resources by promoting population and development policies that bring population growth into stable balance with the resources that can support them.

5. Involve women in the conservation process, for they act as natural resource managers across the continent.

WWF's commitment to conservation of biological diversity and development of sound natural resource management practices in Africa and Madagascar has resulted in support for conservation efforts in more than 40 countries since 1962. We are uniquely positioned to address the threats to Africa's environment and the associated biological diversity. We have developed "strategies" that guide and integrate our program effort. Our interventions in the

field define our roles and capability to shape the policies and actions of larger institutions and collaborating partners in the region.

The following are WWF's priority strategies:

1. **Creating and Sustaining Protected Areas:** Assuring that critical habitats, both terrestrial and marine, are preserved in effective and sustainable systems of protected areas.

   Establishing parks has been one of the hallmarks of WWF's conservation efforts. Creating effective and sustainable systems of protected areas continues to be a central element of our efforts to conserve biological diversity in Africa. There continues to be a need for our help in creating protected areas, developing management plans and training staff.

   In the coming years, WWF will focus particular effort on employing more sophisticated methodologies for designing systems and identifying gaps in existing systems. We will be working to assure that protected areas are economically and socially sustainable in the long-term by working to integrate them into broader economic development and promoting community participation in management. We will be working to assure that protected areas are ecologically sustainable by promoting a landscape approach to

management, and addressing use of adjacent lands. And, we will be working to devise and secure sustained funding.

2. **Linking Conservation and Human Needs:** Developing and demonstrating more effective models to reconcile human needs with the conservation of nature, and working to integrate conservation into actions, programs and policies of government agencies, major development institutions and the private sector.

Linking conservation and human needs underlies everything that WWF does. WWF invests heavily in integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs), like the ADMADE project in Zambia and the Dzanga-Sangha project in the Central African Republic. Our focus is on designing ICDPs that can demonstrate approaches that are ecologically, socially and economically sustainable, with an aim to draw and disseminate lessons that can help shape the programs of larger actors, such as development and finance ministries and aid agencies.

This strategy is also central to our growing involvement in the international policy arena. Drawing on our field experience, we give high priority to integrating conservation into international trade regimes and development assistance, addressing population, and promoting international instruments that

can foster more sustainable management of forests, oceans and other important resources.

3. **Building Conservation Infrastructure:** Building strong and effective institutions and policies that can sustain conservation efforts for the long-term and developing creative financial mechanisms to assure a funding base for those institutions. As opportunities for debt swaps recede, WWF will continue to work to develop new mechanisms that can provide permanent, self-generating, in-country funding sources for conservation -- such as levies, credit facilities, and micro-enterprises. We will continue to work with the U.S. Congress.

Building conservation infrastructure, or capacity building, is the core of WWF's philosophy. The highest priority for WWF's Africa and Madagascar Program over the next five years is to build the capacities of government ministries/departments and NGOs to meet the increasing need, and in some cases increasing opportunity for conservation. We will work to support training to develop natural resource management expertise. We will also invest in environmental education to foster public awareness and reforms to increase public participation in conservation efforts. Education is an important component of many ICDPs.

4. **Protecting Species of Special Concern:** Protecting critical wildlife populations that are threatened by over-harvest or by habitat destruction and degradation. Ultimately, WWF's work is concerned with the conservation of species. In the Africa and Madagascar Program, species of special concern are most often addressed through working to establish protected areas that preserve critical habitats for the species. Some projects focus on high-profile species, such as elephant or rhino, that serve as flagships for broader conservation efforts.

ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Africa's economic growth rate is the lowest in the world. Per capita food production between 1962 and 1983 decreased by 20%, (Smuckler and Berg, 1988). Most increases recorded are primarily due to increases in area under cultivation rather than intensification. According to the UN annual development index, 32 of the 40 countries with the lowest economic development are in Africa. Such hard facts have extremely negative impacts on the environment of Africa as people fight to acquire the barest requirements for survival. Despite all this, Africa gets the least development aid. For example, in 1986, total bilateral aid to sub-Sahara Africa was 8% compared to 18% for Asia and 16% for Latin America and the Caribbean, (Smuckler and Berg, 1988). In the U.S., private foundation support to biodiversity conservation in 1989 was: Asia 3%, Africa 4% and Latin America and Caribbean 88%.

Conservation of natural resources is a long-term endeavor that requires long-term investment Such investment requires a solid base for funding. Africa cannot do it alone. The United States government has been a world leader in the stewardship of the global environment and is a source of inspiration for many Africans. Now, more than at any other period during the last two decades, Africa needs the United States to stand by its side with reforms that will make governments responsible to their citizens through the protection of the natural resource base which, directly or indirectly, is the basis for their well-being

Experience shows that finding new money for environmental activities is very hard these days. That, coupled with this era of budget reductions would render a proposition for additional funding unlikely. It is crucial, therefore, that existing funds be utilized very effectively. New ways must be explored that will leverage funds from different sources. Innovative approaches include the establishment of trust funds and debt reduction mechanisms. Congress has played a key role by passing laws allowing these innovative developments.

CONCLUSION

Now is not the time to abandon Africa. I have spent the last 18 years working on the environmental issues in Africa and I know that the political and economic reforms currently taking place in Africa will only be meaningful if the environment is afforded a high priority The United States can and should endeavor to make that possible. Today, we are presented with the opportunity to reverse a conservation crisis in Africa, and if we do not do something about it, future generations will never pardon us.

Even as we speak, the impetus for change in environmental attitudes is being manifested in Africa. We are witnessing a number of indigenous environmental NGOs developing throughout the continent. Only five years ago, this was not the case. With assistance, they will mature, and as experience has shown on other continents, they have the potential of ushering in effective natural resource management.

AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION
1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington DC 20036
Telephone (202) 265-8394 Facsimile (202) 265-2361

People and Wildlife in Africa

Testimony Prepared by: Diana E. McMeekin
Executive Vice-President
African Wildlife Foundation

Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade, and Environment
Subcommittee on Africa
Committee on Foreign Affairs

November 9, 1993

Before I begin, I would like to thank Mr. Gejdenson and Mr. Johnston, chairmen of the subcommittees, as well as Mr. Roth and Mr. Burton, ranking minority members of the subcommittees, for inviting me here to testify. Having lived in Africa, or worked on African issues from Washington, for more than twenty-five years, I appreciate the increased interest in the African environment this hearing represents, and applaud the subcommittee's efforts.

The African Wildlife Foundation has worked in Africa for thirty-two years. We have had projects on the ground in all regions of sub-Saharan Africa, though we currently specialize in East Africa. In particular, our major ongoing projects are in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, and eastern Zaire. Since the late 1980's, the Foundation has been a leader in work that we coin "community conservation": that is, taking a step beyond traditional, park-related conservation to work with communities surrounding natural areas, trying to smooth the relationship between growing human -- and shrinking animal -- populations so that they co-exist, to the greater benefit of both. It is this specialty of our program portfolio that I want to address today.

Before I do, I want to make it clear that AWF is a wildlife organization. Our projects -- and the vast percentage of our resources go directly into the field -- have as their goal the long-term survival of threatened natural resources and ecosystems. But anytime you work for thirty years in one place you get a feeling for the complexity of the environment. Both Africa's wildlife and its people live in the same natural setting, and are connected in vital ways. Therefore, though AWF rarely addresses issues like water quality, soil erosion, and the like, which seem to be purely human related environmental problems, they are all born of the same parent-issues as wildlife decline: poverty, immature institutions, and insufficient mechanisms to resolve conflicts. We define environmental degradation to include all of these things. But it does little good to pick these problems off, as if teasing them out of the tangle of environmental decline

was our primary challenge. We prefer to think of all these issues as one: unsustainability of resource use. Though it has many causes, and the African Wildlife Foundation does not approach it from all its many angles, our work addresses the whole issue.

When the founders of the Foundation began their work in the early 1960's, "conservation", as its practitioners currently describe it, didn't exist. But many of the basic needs of then pre-independence Africa were similar in nature to those we encounter today: namely, institutional development, capacity-building among conservation professionals, and smoother resolution of the inevitable conflict between people and wild animals. It is mostly the extent of these problems that have multiplied since then, with the emergence of industrial-scale poaching, population growth, and a continent-wide economy that refuses to strengthen. Certainly we can say that conservation institutions and professionals have made great strides since the 60's, in a great many different countries. But I would argue that the conservation community in the 1990's is trying to repair many of the same parts that were broken twenty or thirty years ago. Our progress has been in diagnosing the problems, and, to some extent, putting the initial work into fixing them. Needless to say, we have a long way to go.

It has been written and said many times that if people are to conserve their natural resources, they must value them as sources of wealth. No one who has worked in the field in Africa seriously argues with this mantra of self-interest. And yet, implementing it has never been simple. Like rural resources users anywhere, including in the United States, Africans take a comprehensive view of their self-interest, a view which values stability in their resource-use arrangements as much as the immediate generation of economic benefits, whenever possible. If conservation authorities in Africa expect resource users to harvest from their environment sustainably, then they must provide, in return, a reasonable expectation that the relationship between themselves and the resource users will also be stable. In short, our self-interest solution depends on the institutions involved achieving a certain level of development. Community conservation arrangements must be dependable, and clearly supported by governments, to work. This is precisely the direction AWF takes in much of its work.

We call our community conservation program "Neighbors as Partners". Unlike the worthy work of some other conservation organizations, we concentrate on communities surrounding protected areas, because a very large percentage of the remaining wildlife in East Africa is concentrated in parks and reserves, and it spills out frequently. In Kenya, our experience in the field has led to a current project, called COBRA (Conservation of Biodiverse Rich Areas), which is wholly funded by USAID. The case history of community conservation in Kenya is a good lesson for those interested in putting scarce conservation resources where they are most needed.

Since Tsavo West National Park was first gazetted, the Maasai livestock herders surrounding it have not always been able to observe restrictions put on grazing in the park. These restrictions came at a time when much land previously devoted to grazing was coming under more intense agriculture; as a result the Maasai were forced to look farther afield for land for their herds. In dry seasons especially, the Park became an inviting solution, and no amount of force could prevent these resource users from entering. We had a classic example of environmental stress,

in this case a growing human population and inadequate space or resources for dry-season grazing, forcing people (people who were living on the edge of survival anyway) into critical wildlife habitat. A good percentage of the locally available graze for wildlife species was instead consumed by domestic animals, threatening a serious decline. If I could combine all the environmental problems of Africa into one case, this would be very close.

AWF initially addressed the problem by appointing a Maasai project officer to identify, along with the Kenyan Wildlife Conservation and Management Department, exactly who was grazing in the park, and how to encourage them to go elsewhere. Far from grand schemes to share park receipts or the like, the first few years of Kenyan community conservation involved attending community meetings. We tried to tease out the fundamental issues behind the problem, and at the same time build a certain amount of credibility among the Maasai. We knew that, without this gradual building of a solid foundation, without the confidence of the Maasai that the Kenyan government was committed to finding solutions, that the project was doomed. We found that the problem centered around deeper issues, like the lack of access to markets for Maasai sheep and goats, and government land-use policies that threatened the traditional, community-oriented ownership pattern.

After establishing stable links with the community, through Community Conservation Committees and key leaders in all project areas, solutions became easier to implement. It became possible to talk about increased tourism in the Maasai area, to share the benefits. It became easier to find markets, and to develop them. In the end, herders in the Park made a decision based on their own interest to remove their livestock. That situation prevails today, though the herders once asked for and received permission to graze in the Park during a particularly dry stretch, and there have been a few problems with enforcement.

This was all before the current COBRA project began. The simple but profound changes brought about by the original project made it possible to think about broader, policy-level issues, questions about the way the Kenyan government dealt with rural resource use. With money from USAID, AWF, several other organizations, and the Kenya Wildlife Service began a five year push to create a community wildlife program. The Wildlife Service came into existence with the promise to share revenues from protected areas with neighboring peoples. But how to accomplish this goal within a stable infrastructure, with competing claims and rivalries between communities among many other hurdles, was and is a true challenge. Merely distributing cash made little sense, since it would have been prohibitively expensive to administer. In the end, with the assistance of a Maasai project officer employed by AWF, all sides agreed to put the money into community-suggested projects. Basic community development work became tied to the success of the park. It was a simple idea decades old, but so hard to express in real terms, in real settings, that it took years of building just to produce a foundation. Now, with the new Community Wildlife Service institutionalized within the Kenya Wildlife Service, we are free to think about better revenue-sharing arrangements. We can address the human issues behind wildlife decline as a matter of routine business. This is where we hoped we'd be when we started.

And Kenya is not the only country in which this kind of work is progressing. In Tanzania, USAID supports another policy-level project, called PAWM (Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management), which the Tanzanian government uses to develop sustainable resource use policies. AWF also works in Uganda, at Lake Mburo, and in Rwanda, with communities surrounding the gorillas of the Virunga Mountains. Southern African nations, including Zimbabwe and Zambia, oversee similar projects. The point I want to make is that Africa has begun to build its conservation foundation, but is very short of financial resources to finish its task. Revenue-sharing in theory may pay for itself, particularly if the revenue base is well managed and intensively harvested. But in reality, it takes a great deal of investment to make it stable, to build an insutution around it. **What we need from the U.S. government and other donors is a long-term commitment. We need stability in funding and a willingness to keep support coming for many years. If the committee can address this need it could do an immeasurable service to the people of Africa.**

If I may, I would like to conclude by going a little deeper into the kinds of things the U.S. government can do in the name of wildlife conservation in Africa. Again, I am concentrating on community-based wildlife conservation rather than some of the other projects AWF operates, because it is particularly important to nourish this seed until it can grow on its own. As one of our founders once said, the goal of our organization is to work ourselves out of a job. Only when we have done that can Africa's resources be considered conserved.

The first recommendation I would make is to fund projects that work on a variety of levels. The "Neighbors as Partners" program has always emphasized vertical integration: grass-roots activities, including community development, meshed with regional planning and national policy work. Rural people have some control over their day-to-day resource use. But it is naive and counter-productive to assume that merely satisfying a few material needs of these people will free them to become sustainable users, even if they wanted to. A great many policies, laws, and economic conditions affect the decisions of resource users; these larger forces can negate any progress made on the grass-roots. What we are trying to do is shift the fundamental relationship between people and natural resources, the essence of rural life, in a certain direction. This involves, first, unlocking the possibilities, and second convincing people to embrace them.

Next, there is a dire need for greater capacity among conservation personnel in many countries. Community conservation personnel require specialized skills for which they rarely receive training. The small training budgets of most states are insufficient in this regard.

Finally, I would urge the U.S. funding strategy to seek self-sufficiency in community conservation projects. AWF has placed great emphasis on promoting the idea of community conservation as a necessary component of park management, rather than a desirable add-on. The costs associated with such projects must be built-in, institutionalized within the framework of park management and therefore stable. Donors interested in supporting parks and neighboring communities must therefore commit to longer term assistance if their aid is to be meaningful. Since most donors commit funds only for medium terms (5 year), and require outputs that may

be inappropriate for the funding period, we need a different kind of mechanism altogether. I would submit that a reasonable time frame for committing funds to community conservation may be as long as 15-20 years.

Mr. Chairman, as the new Director of USAID has said repeatedly, our foreign aid strategy must change to meet the needs of the developing world. Not only must we think differently about the purpose of our assistance programs, but also the ways in which they are administered. Though as a continent Africa is abundantly rich in natural resources, it is squandering them, for a variety of reasons. It has reached the point in the conservation of these resources where hit-and-run, temporary solutions no longer even preserve the status quo.

Africa now has some of the foundation on which to build a permanent place for conservation in society, to create conservation institutions and capacity. But it needs a reliable, long-term commitment on the part of donors to finish the job.

I look forward to working with this committee to see that happen in the years ahead.

AFRICA AND THE ENVIRONMENT: BIOLOGICAL CONSERVATION

Principles and Practices

Testimony for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and the Environment
and
Subcommittee on Africa

prepared by
Amy Vedder and William Weber
NYZS/The Wildlife Conservation Society
New York

11/9/1993

The continent of Africa is tremendously diverse -- with respect to ecological habitats, social systems, economics and politics -- and therefore does not lend itself to simple description or summary. However, it is clearly a region facing great development challenges: high levels of poverty, large proportions of people living on subsistence levels, inadequate health and educational services, the highest population growth rates in the world, and insecure political structures. At the same time, Africa harbors spectacular biological diversity, unparalleled populations of large terrestrial mammals, the most extensive wetlands in the world, and large tracts of wilderness -- including rainforest second only in size to the Amazon. The juxtaposition of these factors creates an acute challenge: to promote conservation of globally-significant biological diversity in the context of tremendous human need.

Before considering the practice of biological conservation in Africa, and the roles which can be most effectively played by US agencies and US-based NGOs, it is therefore worthwhile to summarize principles which provide a foundation for such strategies.

The Development Context for Conservation

Sound development is essential to effective conservation

On-going conservation efforts are ultimately doomed to fail if the basic needs and aspirations of the majority of people cannot be met. These needs are great in Africa, and strong emphasis must be placed on the alleviation of poverty and progress in health, education, and family planning services. In order to meet these needs and yet not compromise biological conservation, development processes must divert pressures from remnant wild, biologically-rich areas.

The primary role of a development agency should be to promote economic, social and political development

US development assistance should support activities which have the objective of improving the long-term well-being of human populations and societies. In Africa, this requires substantial investment in human resource development and appropriate production spheres, including the basics of food and fuel. The maintenance of an adequate representation of undeveloped wildlands and diverse lifeforms should also be recognized as an important part of the development process. This is particularly true in Africa, where wildlands and wildlife are in fact a major economic resource, valuable for local consumptive use, international tourism and safari hunting.

Development should be sustainable

The concept of sustainable development emphasizes a continuous flow of economic benefits with minimal social and environmental costs. As such, it is a radical departure from current approaches which generally place the accent on short-term economic benefits and fail to account for environmental and social costs in economic analyses. However, in those African regions where land tenure, political tenure, or economic outlooks are insecure, short-term strategies will continue to be followed.

Sustainable development should be promoted first on already-modified lands

Major development should focus on changing current land use practices in the existing agricultural, industrial, and urban zones which have already been converted from a wild state. This is due to several factors: the potential for remnant natural ecosystems to serve as "engines for development" is extremely limited by their scale, fragility, inaccessibility, and increasing scarcity. In addition, given that much of

development remains experimental, it is best to try new approaches -- and risk failure -- on lands that have already lost much of their conservation value.

Environmental impacts of development can be mitigated, but not eliminated

There are environmental impacts associated with all development activities. Attempts to eliminate these impacts altogether through environmental purism will kill development. Careful mitigation of these impacts is the key to optimal strategies for sustainable development, along with balancing more intensive production zones with comparable protection zones, through long-term land use planning.

Democratization should benefit nations' social, economic and conservation systems in the long run, but the transition period may place tremendous pressure on each

The process of democratization in many African countries is producing significant disturbance in social and economic spheres. Where the process is interpreted as "open access" to wild areas, public and/or communal lands -- which is already occurring -- then significant negative impacts on biological systems are likely to result. As northern countries encourage democratization, therefore, there must be a simultaneous strengthening of conservation systems and measures. Without this, one priority (sound politics) will undermine another (conservation).

Sound natural resource management is fundamental to sound development

Natural resources comprise the basic building blocks of all development. Sustainable development, with maintenance of options for future benefits, therefore requires careful planning and use of these resources. Appropriate distinctions in management strategies should be related to qualitatively different kinds of resources, especially those which are non-renewable (coal, petroleum, metals), semi-renewable (water, soil), and renewable (many, but not all, biological species and some communities).

Conservation of biological diversity is an important component of natural resource management

Not all environments are biologically diverse. Naturally-occurring ecosystems tend to be far more diverse than human-modified systems, with tropical rain forests and coral reefs among the richest of all. Functional examples of major ecosystems must be maintained at both the global and national scales. Reasons for this include local subsistence use

values, ecological services provided (e.g. watershed protection), the potential for discovery of medically or commercially important species, the carbon source-sink role of many natural systems in global warming, and the uncertainty associated with the unprecedented loss of species and ecosystems with which human life has evolved. Natural systems also serve as our "canary in the mineshaft", warning us of imminent human ill-health when over-exploitation leads to degradation and extinction.

The Practice of Biological Conservation in Africa

Despite increasing international and national recognition of the importance of the principles described above, African nations are currently able to attend to little more than short-term human needs. Inadequate human and financial resources and institutional capabilities, combined with the intensity of basic human needs, overwhelm nations' capacities to deal with issues of longer term development and conservation. Technical and financial assistance from other sources is required -- and welcomed -- in Africa more than in any other part of the world today. What form should this assistance take?

Approaches to be undertaken must be multi-faceted to address the complexity of conservation in Africa

Conservation must be addressed at multiple levels. High level reform of conservation policy, legal and regulatory statutes, and institutional structures must be enacted, providing a requisite framework for conservation action. Existing regulations in many African countries are leftover from colonial rule, and are now irrelevant or actually discouraging of sound conservation practice. At the same time, on-the-ground implementation of site-specific projects should take place, demonstrating approaches which yield success.

Land-use and conservation planning should allow for a mosaic of land and resource use options. Sufficiently large, naturally-occurring systems are able to maintain biodiversity on their own, if human impacts are minimized as in many traditional use systems. However, impacts of moderate intensity use of natural resources are little understood. Faced with this situation, a multi-faceted strategy is required for biodiversity conservation. The primary emphasis of this approach should be on the protection of core areas with high biodiversity values. Where local populations already exist in or around such reserves, traditional use zones also need to be identified. This, however, raises ever

more complex questions: What is traditional? Can Mbuti net-hunters switch to guns? Sell to markets? Start farming? Who decides? Based on whose interests? All questions which are extremely difficult to answer.

Approaches to biodiversity conservation must focus on both biological and socio-economic issues. Biological components, both species and systems, must be at the heart of conservation efforts, and success should be judged by biological measures. Yet conservation must be compatible with socio-economic needs and aspirations, should provide substitutes for resources rendered off- limits to local people, and whenever possible should provide additional social and economic benefits. Questions of degree of comptability remain to be worked out, in particular with respect to the degree to which conservation actors should compensate people or governments for opportunity costs.

Conservation programs should examine both short and long-term impacts of action, as well as assess impacts at global, national and local levels. Frequently, costs or benefits will not be congruent at different time or geographical scales. Relative impacts must be recognized, weighed, and evaluated before conservation strategies are derived.

Biological conservation should be based on sound initial information, combined with regular monitoring

Because the natural systems of Africa are still little-understood (many have not even been inventoried), and because conservation approaches are relatively new and untested, all actions taken for conservation should be considered experimental to some degree. This means that there should be a strong emphasis on information collection, from the initial stages of program design through implementation. This allows for program management to continually assess trends, impacts and progress. In this way effective approaches to conservation can be identified and evaluated, and subsequently promoted.

Continued monitoring and assessment of biological and socio-economic indicators also provide the basis for adaptive program management. Flexible programs will result, and therefore the capacity for innovation and problem-solving.

Reliance on information means that project or program designs cannot be based on short missions conducted by outside consultants, and initial project designs cannot be required to proscribe all activities for the subsequent series of years. The best initial information will come instead from experts in country, who know country-specific issues best. Conservation programs can benefit significantly from the long-term presence

and expertise found in some of the international PVOs. These groups provide information, assist governments and communities in project implementation, and frequently help develop plans and policies.

Finally, this also indicates that results may not come quickly. Conservation success will be measured over decades, and eventually over generations. Those funding and implementing conservation programs must not succomb to "quick-fix" approaches, but instead must recognize the need to design sustained efforts over longer durations. Aid programs will have to change current 2-5 year project windows to 8-15 year periods.

African participation in conservation must increase at all levels

This is the greatest challenge, and the only long-term solution, to biological conservation in Africa.

Currently, local people are only beginning to be given an official voice in managing their natural resources or participating in conservation planning -- and this is taking place only in innovative projects in a small number of countries. Many problems have arisen: governments suspicious of empowering their own citizens, existence of multiple ethnic groups or diverse communities with conflicting interests in a single region, ethnic groups that have no traditional means for decision-making at the scale that conservation often requires. However, progress in some projects is being made, and some national policies on local participation are already changing.

Local and/or national people using promising natural resource management techniques, whether traditional or not, should be encouraged, and their practices promoted. Indigenous knowledge systems are being lost, yet when carefully conducted many of these activities can produce significant sustainable values from natural systems. The people themselves are the best extension agents for promotion of such practices, and should be given the option and means to do so.

As mentioned earlier, there are very few trained, skilled African natural resource managers or conservationists. One of the most urgent needs, therefore, is to provide technical training in conservation planning and implementation. This need extends from the "barefoot biologists" -- local people who may know the natural systems extremely well but need literacy training or or other technical skills -- to on-site protected area managers and community liaison officers, who have some theoretical background but little idea of how to apply it to field problems or make decisions; and on to high-level planners and policy makers, who may have been recruited

from other very different ministries or have had no in-service training in the last 20 years. Technical training can take many forms, from low-cost field-based on-the-job training to university or post-graduate education. Efforts made to promote training at any of these levels will certainly produce conservation results.

Participation can also be enhanced by fostering the development and strengthening of conservation-oriented non-governmental organizations. Although religious and cooperative organizations have a richer history, in most African countries environmental NGOs are only recently-organized and few in number. To provide an alternative vehicle for popular participation in conservation, encouragement should be provided for such nascent NGOs, as well as the adoption of conservation issues by non-environmental groups.

Finally, all natural resource management and conservation programs should aim toward biological, socio-economic, and programmatic sustainability

Clearly, conservation practices should lead to sustainable natural systems, able to maintain biological diversity and/or ecological/biological productivity or services. Such systems should also be acceptable to local people and national governments, and help if possible to meet social and economic needs.

Conservation programs themselves must also be sustainable: they must have the support of an informed and enfranchised public; they must be staffed by trained and motivated personnel, with systems for continued training; and they must be designed to be affordable. This latter point requires that costs of conservation programs be recovered or compensated for by benefits derived from the activities themselves, or that external contributory mechanisms be designed (endowments, trust funds, taxes). This implies that unless external inputs are guaranteed throughout the indefinite future, then on-going program systems should be designed to be low-cost, practical, and self-sustaining. Assistance should be administered with this in mind.

The Role of the United States Government

Recently, efforts of the Wildlife Conservation Society have involved frequent collaboration with USAID, through grants and cooperative agreements, in African projects addressing conservation and its interface with local and national development. Having worked directly on these projects over the years, I would like to

emphasize the importance of these joint ventures. We have seen clear and significant progress result from these efforts: the establishment of new protected areas, more careful use of natural resources, better understanding and recognition of the dynamics and importance of resource conservation, strengthening of local and national capabilities, and improved national policies. This progress is intended to lead toward more sustainable forms of biological conservation and ecologically sound local/national development. The projects are producing important long-term benefits to host country people as well as to globally-important aspects of conservation.

We at WCS feel that is it vital that US agencies remain strongly involved in this arena, and that support for field operations not be reduced. Among multi-lateral and bilateral donor agencies, USAID was the first to recognize the importance of these efforts and provide support to them. It continues to promote a diversity of "cutting-edge" approaches, and thereby provides models that are now demonstrating results. US efforts are frequently more site-appropriate, integrative, and participatory than other donor-sponsored efforts -- all of which contribute to their effectiveness. Although we are all in the process of learning how to most effectively reduce conflicts between conservation and development, and how to realize the potential of positive feedback from the two processes, USAID efforts are in general far more advanced and more productive than other donor initiatives -- and therefore should be encouraged. Local, national and global development urgently depend on success in this realm.

The WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY

The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) has pursued the dual objective of better understanding and protecting wildlife and wilderness resources since it was established, as the New York Zoological Society, in 1898. Over the past century, WCS scientists have greatly expanded our knowledge of key species and ecosystems through pioneering, long-term field studies; effectively promoted the cause of conservation through their direct role in the establishment of over 70 national parks and reserves; trained innumerable conservationists and wildlife managers in developing countries; helped to nurture the institutions in which the latter must work; and contributed key ideas to the on-going debate over tropical resource management and conservation.

WCS has been active in Africa since the 1920s and began working in African rain forests in 1959. Over the past twenty years, its collective experience in more than twenty African countries has established WCS as a primary source of scientific and conservation expertise in both spectacular savannas and the critically important rain forest biome.

WCS's current program in Africa is characterized by broad geographical and ecological coverage across most of the sub-saharan region. Its projects extend from the coastal mangroves of West Africa to Kenya's coral reefs; from the Ethiopian highlands to the deserts of Namibia. In between, WCS field staff have accumulated unmatched expertise in the rich and varied forests of the continental interior: Uganda, Rwanda, Zaire, Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Congo and Nigeria; and in the mammal-rich grasslands of east and southern Africa: Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Backing up the field program, WCS's New York staff have extensive experience in African forest ecology and conservation, and played a key role in elaborating USAID's focus on the Afromontane forest zone as a priority area for biodiversity conservation. They have also designed and administered numerous projects integrating conservation and development interests in cooperation with USAID and other international agencies over the past several years.

Richard Cobb
November 9, 1993
Page 26
Line 549

ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA BY SECTOR [a]
FY 1993 ESTIMATE
($ Millions)

Ag/Nat Res/Env/Energy [b]	188.8
(Agriculture)	(124.9)
(Natural Resources)	(67.3)
(Environment)	(66.6)
(Energy)	(3.3)
(Biodiversity)	(21.8)
(Elephant Conservation)	(7.2)
Total Health	136.2
(Child Survival)	(52.4)
(AIDS)	(37.3)
(Other Health)	(46.5)
Population	76.3
Education	163.1
(Basic Education)	(93.4)
Infrastructure	26.1
Democracy/Governance/Human Rts	52.6
Business/Finance/Trade Dev	100.3
Public Sector Admin/Mgt	15.4
Other [c]	63.1
Total	821.9

[a] Includes DFA and DA funds allocated to the Africa Bureau, whether obligated by the Africa Bureau or transferred to other Bureaus for obligation for Africa. Excludes central bureau funds obligated for Africa. Includes $23 million from the African Disaster Assistance account.
[b] Based on earmark/target definitions; funding for subsectors in this group overlaps.
[c] Includes $15.3 million for emergency assistance.

Sources: Data were obtained from A.I.D. mainframe, supplied by USAID missions in Africa.

Ranking of African Countries - linkage of environmental and natural resource management issues to development.

Scoring based on active process in country of policy reform in the environmental sector, and active pursuit of environmentally-sound development principles. (10 = best; 1 = worst)Source: World Bank & USAID.

Country	Rank	Country	Rank
Madagascar	10	Rwanda	7
Uganda	10	Chad	7
Cameroon	10	Zambia	7
Gambia	10	Coted'Ivoire	7
Niger	10	Swaziland	7
Botswana	10	Kenya	6
Ghana	9	Ethiopia	6
Mali	9	Guinea-Bissau	6
Senegal	9	Burkina Faso	5
Tanzania	9	Centr. Afric. Republic	5
Malawi	9	Congo	5
Nigeria	9	Zaire	5
Namibia	9	Burundi	5
Zimbabwe	8	Togo	4
Cape Verde	8	Benin	3
Lesotho	7	Mauritania	2
Guinea	7	Sudan	1
Mozambique	7	Somalia	1

ISBN 0-16-044105-6

9 780160 441059 90000