



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



# LESSONS FOR DIALOGUE AMONG WILDLIFE AND COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT SECTORS IN ZAMBIA

Management of wildlife and forest resources in Zambia has largely remained centralized with the state, despite a series of programs and legislation since the late 1990s that aimed to devolve rights to communities. While pathways for recognizing and asserting local community rights exist, implementation has been somewhat limited. Local communities living adjacent to and alongside natural resources have attained the legal rights to co-manage these resources through local community governance structures, including Community Resources Boards (CRBs) and Community Forest Management Groups (CFMGs). The rationale for these policies is to reduce the government's resource protection burden and to incentivize local communities to manage resources and benefit from them. The devolution of rights to communities through community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) was enshrined in wildlife legislation initially through the Wildlife Act of 1998, and subsequently in the 2015 Wildlife Act. This vision is also clearly stated in the National Parks and Wildlife Policy of 2018 and is anticipated to be further enshrined in forthcoming wildlife legislation. A parallel process occurred in relation to the forest sector, initially focused on Joint Forest Management of forest reserves in the draft Forest Act of 1999, and subsequently through the creation of Community Forest Management (CFM) across any forested area in the country through the Forest Act of 2015 and associated regulations.

Forest and wildlife co-exist in the same landscapes across Zambia, and while the two sets of legislation each establish protections for community rights, the implementation mechanisms differ significantly. For example, CRBs are responsible for management of all wildlife resources within a predefined Game Management Area (GMA) for each chiefdom. In contrast, CFMGs can be established by any group of community members, who must define their own forest boundaries, and there can be multiple groups/community forests within a single chiefdom. With respect to benefit sharing, within the forest sector benefits are defined and negotiated individually within each CFMG, whereas animal trophy fees

from hunting under the wildlife sector are pre-defined and managed through government. The extent of rights devolution also varies significantly, with CFMGs responsible for establishing management plans, whereas CRBs (and the broader community) are relatively passive in making decisions over hunting. Law enforcement mandates also differ significantly between Honorary Forest Officers from communities which operate relatively independently, versus Community Scouts, who operate under the Department of National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW) Police supervision. These differences also manifest at the departmental level between the Forest Department (FD) within the Ministry of Green Economy and Environment and the DNPW within the Ministry of Tourism. The DNPW plays a very “hands on” role in the affairs of CRBs, while the FD is relatively “hands off” in relation to the CFMGs. With 88 CRBs across the country and 220 CFMGs, there is substantial overlap between these groups and the land they manage; the Forestry Act explicitly allows a CRB to also register and function as a CFMG.

This ambiguity in roles and functions is compounded by a broader disconnect in the relationship between state and customary institutions within rural chiefdoms. GMAs and CFMGs largely sit on customary land, which are administered by Zambia’s 288 chiefs. There is no ministry responsible for overseeing land allocations though when chiefs alienate land to leasehold tenure, they must sign a letter that demonstrates that consultations have occurred with local communities and in the case of alienation of over 500 hectares require the signature of the various government officials. Individual resource ministries engage with the chiefs over specific resource laws, but not on general land or land management best practices. Customary land administration follows tradition and occurs largely outside of any government visibility or influence, including outside of the District Local Authorities. There is a mandate for the District Local Authorities to develop integrated development plans, but these have largely not been integrated across sectors and in many cases have largely been focused on state land around district centers.

The siloing of government mandates across wildlife, forest and land resources has not allowed for effective convergence or coordination of management support despite the overlap of resource areas. The net effect is conflicted positions and plans across government agencies, the private sector, local communities, and natural resource management partners, as well as a general lack of funding for the sectors. The general lack of coordination between forest and wildlife departments has resulted in redundancies or duplication of forest and wildlife resource management and support to communities, in some cases stimulating conflicts and confusion. Individual departments are not particularly eager to collaborate (even if funded), as it may require them to acknowledge the power dynamics between the departments. This has extended to non-governmental organization (NGO) and civil society partners, which have established relationships through different community structures, government departments and chiefs.

Given these dynamics, there is an urgent need for dialogue between departments, most notably DNPW and FD (and potentially the House of Chiefs, which is a consultative body that is composed of chiefs but does not have authority over any individual chief’s decisions, including on land) both at the national level, as well as at individual district/chiefdom levels. Such dialogue is necessary to help clarify expectations and create a common understanding across partners, reduce potential for conflict, and promote synergy and efficiency in designing and implementing interventions to support natural resource management in Zambia.

In an effort to strengthen effective natural resource management in the country, since 2020 the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funded Integrated Land and Resource Governance (ILRG) program has offered to fund policy dialogues between the DNPW and FD on forest and wildlife management. These dialogues were pitched as a way to promote technical understanding in natural resource management and establish priorities for coordinated wildlife and forest resource management through CFMGs and CRBs. Though both DNPW and FD expressed interest, and ILRG offered flexible funding in support of this effort, a structured dialogue did not take place, despite a

number of opportunities and failed starts described below. This brief presents the approach taken and the prospects for future dialogue, which remains essential for Zambia to advance its CBNRM vision.

## **BACKGROUND**

Community involvement in natural resource management in Zambia dates to the 1990s, when CBNRM was adopted as a model for co-managing the country's protected areas with communities through CRBs. GMAs that border national parks cover over 20 percent of Zambia's surface and are found in almost 30 percent of Zambia's chiefdoms. While large portions of GMAs are not suitable for wildlife due to decades of agricultural expansion, they are still home to extensive forest habitat, and many have areas of abundant wildlife. In the 1990s, donor-funded programs, including NORAD-funded Luangwa Integrated Rural Development Program (LIRDIP) in Lupande GMA, aligned with DNPW (Department of National Parks and Wildlife Service (DNPWS) at the time) and subsequently Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) efforts to empower communities with hunting revenue and combat the poaching that had decimated Zambia's national parks and GMAs in the 1980s. This model of CBNRM was exclusively focused on wildlife resources in GMAs, with limited oversight of other resources such as forestry, leading to progressive degradation of customary managed forests, particularly those with limited wildlife populations and areas on the edge of agricultural communities.

While community awareness and resource security has improved in the wildlife sector since the 1990s, forest resources largely remained vulnerable as essentially open access resources without any incentive for local forest protection or management. Zambia's forest reserves cover approximately eight percent of the country, but forests are abundant across much of the remainder of the country. While the FD has management authority over these non-gazetted forests (but not the customary land that they sit on), they lack the human resources and financial capacity to actively manage forests outside of reserves. Therefore, involving local people in forest management has become increasingly necessary. In response to this growing need, the Zambian government introduced a CFM model to foster collective management of forest resources. Community involvement in forest management on customary land was first identified in the National Forestry Action Plan of 1997 as an approach to address the continuous deterioration of customary and gazetted forests. Since the 2015 Forests Act and subsequent Community Forest Management Regulations of 2018 were passed, over 200 communities have formed CFMGs and applied for forest management rights. In just five years, CFMGs now cover more than five million hectares. Importantly, CFM provides perhaps the only approach for self-defined communities to assert their community tenure over specific areas customary land and register these rights with government.

The 2015 Forests Act and the CFM Regulations of 2018 call for synergies between forest and wildlife management. This is further seen in the 2023 Community Based Natural Resource Management Policy, which was developed under the Ministry of Tourism. While the language identifies the need for management coordination, the practice to date has been lacking. The success of forest and wildlife management moving forward will largely depend on the interactions between the critical government agencies charged with separate legal responsibilities for managing forest and wildlife resources, and their approaches to supporting devolution of rights. The overlaps and gaps between wildlife and forest management are well understood in each department, as well as at the district level. The overlapping resources and local communities dictate constant engagement among field officials and there is natural coordination that occurs at the district level, albeit with little direction from the national level. However, a lack of institutional consensus on CFMG/CRB relationships regarding resource protection, revenue management, and community project support and development mechanisms using carbon and animal funds can spark antagonistic relationships between departments. This subsequently impacts their interactions with communities. There is furthermore a risk that devolution will be perceived as providing communities with responsibilities over management that they do not have the financial or technical capacity to implement. This underscores the importance of cross-department coordination.

## DIALOGUE OBJECTIVES

Since 2018, ILRG has established independent relationships with both the DNPW and the FD at national level through their respective ministries, and through ILRG's district-level implementing partners like Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS), Zambia Land Alliance (ZLA), Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO), and Zambia Community Resources Board Association (ZCRBA). ILRG has also built on its historical individual relationships with technical specialists in each department. ILRG recognized that effective coordination must come from within the departments themselves, and that a traditional workshop-style approach, called or convened by a USAID program, would not result in lasting coordination. ILRG assumed that if it were to convene a meeting, both departments would probably attend, but that it would be seen as an externally driven process with no need for follow-up. As a result, ILRG requested a joint proposal from the DNPW and FD to define their vision for a dialogue.

To kickstart the discussion, ILRG first approached DNPW and FD separately, agreeing on the key resource governance issues with each department and discussing the relevant areas of overlap. ILRG provided a funding invitation to both department directors, through the Permanent Secretary, to develop an agenda to start the dialogue. Upon expressed interest by both departments at the highest level, the matter was taken to the middle management level for detailed strategic engagement and dialogue preparation. ILRG insisted that the concept/agenda be submitted jointly by the departments, and that logistics would be jointly coordinated. ILRG identified four potential dialogue areas for discussion, though the program was open to other topics identified by the departments:

- 1. CFMG and CRB relationship in areas where they manage overlapping resources:** The conservation responsibilities of CRBs are focused on the GMA, but the CRBs represent the entire chiefdom, while CFMGs may cover part of the chiefdom as defined by its constitution and delimited forest boundaries. Within many GMAs, the CRB also acts as a CFMG, while in other wildlife-focused chiefdoms, CFMGs are established as independent entities from the CRB, oftentimes with multiple CFMGs in a single chiefdom. This has created tension in cases where two different groups are managing forest and wildlife resources on the same land. On the other hand, in areas where CRBs also act as CFMGs, issues emerge where group members largely represent wildlife interests over forest interests. To date this has largely been seen as CRBs attempt to take over responsibility for CFMGs, but without fully adapting their management and governance approaches. These will continue to cause tension as increasing carbon finance arrives. Clarifying CRB/CFMG relationships are essential to fostering resource conservation, promoting good governance, and ensuring equitable benefit sharing across the chiefdoms.
- 2. Financial management and oversight,** particularly as there are new and significant national forest carbon revenues emerging: CRBs have historically managed bank accounts for wildlife revenue, with DNPW overseeing the CRBs' performance and financial management. In contrast, there is little financial management guidance for CFMGs, and the FD does not have an interest in becoming involved in CFMG financial matters. The FD has largely taken the stance that the internal operations of the CFMG are outside of the Department's responsibility and their role is primarily in periodic auditing. This has resulted in the DNPW getting involved in forest carbon revenue management through CRBs, creating some tensions, as the CFMG would like to manage these funds independently. Financial issues remain sensitive, can breed mistrust in allocating funds to projects, and require coordination by the oversight institutions.
- 3. Resource monitoring and feedback to government departments:** Resource monitoring is a critical area requiring coordination between DNPW and FD. This has historically been an area of weakness for both departments, but is an area where opportunities for improvement exist, relying on digital tools as well as synergies between reporting structures. Monitoring and reporting in this context are critical for the community's capacity to co-manage resources and to justify the government's policy to devolve resource rights to the communities. Coordinating

resource monitoring between DNPW and FD can better support communities, reduce redundancies, create cost savings, and ensure that community resources are directed to areas with the most relevant and pressing needs. Joint planning by DNPW and FD departments to complement each other in terms of technical skills, equipment, and time management.

- 4. Law enforcement coordination between Honorary Forest Officers and Community Wildlife Scouts:** Natural resource management relies heavily on law enforcement in GMAs and community forests. CRBs registered as CFMGs continue to rely on Community Scouts to secure the jurisdiction of the CRBs. Community Scouts are full-time employees and enjoy expanded rights under the Wildlife Act, including the use of firearms. In addition, Community Scouts are recognized as law enforcement under the Forest Act. On the other hand, Honorary Forest Officers (HFOs) are empowered by the Forest Act to enforce the law in the community forests and, in most cases, work alongside the scouts. HFOs are usually unarmed volunteers, and as a result have very different training requirements than Community Scouts. Coordination by DNPW and FD is vital to ensure they balance the dual needs of effective law enforcement and sustained morale among Community Scouts and HFOs.

Despite indications of interest in holding a dialogue, no meeting took place. Each department was prepared to develop a dialogue concept (and indeed, they did draft a concept note), but when ILRG requested that the concept note be shared and submitted jointly by both Ministries (Tourism and Green Economy) with the engagement of the relevant departments, the process stalled. ILRG repeatedly organized cross-departmental meetings, only to find that one department or the other would not be available. This impasse persisted for three years, despite ILRG raising this as one of the three to four key areas of potential support in each departmental check-in meeting. While ILRG aimed to support a structured dialogue, other opportunities to advance coordination emerged along the way, which the program supported opportunistically and as described below.

## **CARBON FUNDS CONTROL DIALOGUE MEETING – NOVEMBER 2021**

In the past few years, new forest carbon activities have emerged, particularly through the voluntary market and two major programs with BioCarbon Partners and COMACO. These partnerships have brought significant funding, on the order of hundreds of thousands of dollars per year, to some CFMGs. This has raised questions of financial management and the appropriate level of government oversight that have not been addressed to date. This is particularly important in the numerous cases where CFMGs have been established on top of a CRB. Within the wildlife sector, DNPW officers are co-signatories of CRB accounts, a practice that, while designed for oversight purposes, has been criticized as an opportunity for collusion and corruption. Yet, to date, within the forest sector, the FD only requests the ability to audit CFMG accounts. Community groups generally favor the independence of the CFMG model, but supporting NGOs, as well as some government departments have expressed concerns about the possibility of mismanagement. A balance between the overly paternalistic approach under the wildlife sector, and the very limited oversight in the forest sector should be identified.

As a result, and at the request of the ZCRBA, ILRG supported a FD/DNPW discussion on carbon funds' supervision at the Golden Peacock Hotel in Lusaka in late 2021. The dialogue was intended to clarify the formal requirements for CRBs that were also recognized as CFMGs, including their duty to comply with the forest laws, reporting requirements on Management Plan implementation, forest monitoring, forest protection and revenue utilization. These issues were all the more urgent as ZCRBA was attempting to represent communities in their negotiations with forest carbon developers. During the meeting, it became clear that over recent years, some CRBs, together with DNPW, had been actively controlling carbon funds as part of traditional CRB revenues. This involvement of DNPW officers in forest-related carbon funds has caused tensions in the relationships with communities who would prefer to manage funds independently. Furthermore, the long-held view that DNPW had the authority to assume superior

oversight roles over all natural resources within the CRB jurisdiction continued to face opposition from the FD. These issues were raised during the discussion, but participants found no solutions or way forward to reconcile these differing views, and as a result the meeting closed without agreement on key issues.

### **CARBON FUNDS CONTROL DIALOGUE (SECOND) MEETING – JULY 2022**

By July 2022, the issues raised in the first meeting were surfacing in the day-to-day operations of both departments, with no path toward sustainable solutions. As a result, ILRG funded additional dialogue meetings between DNPW and FD at the request of ZCRBA at Ndozo Lodge in Chilanga. These meetings sought to re-engage the discussion and promote coordination across the two departments on resource protection, revenue management, and community project financing. Despite participation from both departments, meeting resolutions were vague and fell short of a specific roadmap. They did acknowledge the need for opening separate accounts for carbon revenues and designing improved mechanisms for community financial management. However, the technical staff interfacing with communities from the CBNRM unit of DNPW and the CFM team from FD provided limited follow up, and it is not clear that the action points that were committed to have been institutionalized.

### **CFM AND CBNRM 2022 ANNUAL CONFERENCES**

USAID has been instrumental in supporting national events on CBNRM since 2018. Through support to ZCRBA, the national CBNRM conference has convened hundreds of government, NGO, community, and traditional leadership representatives for two to three days to discuss the status of wildlife conservation in Zambia. These events have varied in the depth of engagement or policy dialogue that occurs. In addition to the national CBNRM conference, ILRG coordinated with FD and conservation partners to support the inaugural CFM conference in Zambia in November 2022. The CFM conference was the first platform for different CFM stakeholders, including government, communities, cooperating partners, the private sector, and NGOs, to take stock of CFM progress. With over 400 participants, the conference presented a perfect opportunity for renewed dialogue engagement between DNPW and FD.

This event brought forward many issues, with a workshop report that identified almost 50 action items to follow up on. However, the political decisions required to advance coordination between DNPW and FD did not occur and there was a reluctance to engage openly, despite interest from many. For example, the NGOs present at the conference continue to push the issues, but in one-off efforts. One month later in December 2022, ILRG coordinated with ZCRBA and NGOs to support the 2022 Annual CBNRM conference. While there was participation from FD in this meeting, DNPW was not permitted to attend the meeting due to ongoing conflicts over hunting concessions between DNPW and ZCRBA. Consequently, ZCRBA has lost its ability to drive change and dialogue between the DNPW and FD. Throughout 2023, ILRG was no longer able to collaborate with ZCRBA as a community advocacy voice to reach government on issues of CRB/CFMG overlap due to this poor relationship. There is no similar body that represents all CMFGs, though ZCRBA has been claiming in recent years that it will update its mandate to be more inclusive of both wildlife and forest sector community groups.

### **PROPOSED MUMBWA GMA PROTECTION DIALOGUE MEETING**

An opportunistic chance to advance forest and wildlife dialogue emerged in mid-2023 with a request from Chief Mulendema to address forest and wildlife concerns in his chiefdom in Mumbwa District. Chief Mulendema attempted to attract interdepartmental attention and invite interventions related to land, wildlife and forest challenges across the Mumbwa GMA. The rapid deterioration of the Mumbwa District is well-known across conservation actors. Primary concerns include encroachment, injudicious land allocation, unsustainable charcoal production, wildlife poaching and logging, among many other threats. Over the years, the damage has only escalated. It is widely understood that no single

government department or NGO could curb illegal activity and unsustainable practices on its own. While this area is a particular challenge, the request came from a traditional leader who has a conservation mandate. ILRG considered the request with the understanding that the DNPW and FD would mobilize national and field-level officials, including the Local Authority, to cement resource management coordination, invite conservation stakeholders and map out mechanisms for coordination. Specific objectives were proposed by the FD as follows:

- Develop a roadmap on how to deal with illegal charcoal production and trade; and
- Map out strategies to be employed in dealing with illegal charcoal production and trade.

The initial concept note had a selection of participants that was skewed towards FD, and ILRG's push for more balanced participation received pushback from the department. Further follow-ups and encouragement to collaborate did not yield positive results before ILRG closed operations in Zambia in July 2023. Meetings did occur with just the FD in an attempt to combat charcoal production, agricultural expansion and timber harvesting within the GMA, however, these conversations missed the opportunity to leverage DNPW wildlife protection capacities, particularly around law enforcement and monitoring.

## THE FUTURE OF FOREST AND WILDLIFE DIALOGUE

Wildlife and forest resources in Zambia are intricately linked, despite the current departmentalization of government systems. These critical resources occupy the same or adjacent geographic locations, face the same challenges, are influenced by the same local communities, and are supported by the same cooperating partners and NGOs. The effective management of resources and distribution of benefits will continue to be topical across communities, the government, and other stakeholders in the landscape. This strongly suggests the need for clarity and coordination to avoid duplicity of efforts to better protect resources and support benefit distribution. However, dialogue-focused interventions must be expanded beyond government departments and should include communities, private sector, and cooperating partners. Developing a culture of dialogue, and accountability for subsequent action, on natural resources can avoid redundancies and reduce costs of interventions while maximizing the benefits of conservation efforts.

ILRG undertook the following strategies to promote effective dialogue:

- **Avoided setting the agenda:** ILRG did not support an externally led dialogue series that could be seen as driven by USAID interests, which might limit government commitment for follow-through. ILRG encouraged mutual interest and equal representation from multiple ministries/departments, which represented a departure from the way activities are commonly carried out between government and development partners.
- **Established clear criteria for funding:** ILRG was clear that joint proposals were necessary to demonstrate joint commitment. While both departments shared their interests and identified opportunities, they were not able to bridge the gap between departmental priorities and so could not reach a compromise. Neither side was willing to support equal representation between departments in meetings; each side hosted meetings and events with attendance that favored their own organization.
- **Created opportunities when timing suited its partners:** ILRG remained open throughout the activity to capitalize on urgent issues as they arose. This occurred with respect to forest carbon revenue in a few instances, but unfortunately these dialogues were only able to identify the issues, as the champions who could move and agree on policy were not present.
- **Engaged consistently:** ILRG engaged with the DNPW and FD at multiple levels throughout the program, through formal presentations as well as periodic updates to each department.

While the departments were enthusiastic and committed during these meetings, there was very limited follow up, particularly between government departments. This indicates a lack of adequate interest to justify continued investment. This does not mean that these issues are any less pressing, but rather that the political will is currently not present for action. USAID and other partners should be ready to support resolution and dialogue when the issues inevitably become higher profile, or if these departments are eventually brought under the same ministry.

- **Identified decision makers and champions:** ILRG worked at community, district, department, and ministry levels. While the activity identified a number of champions who understood the issues and risks, none of these individuals were in decision-making roles, and many did not have a proposed solution to the challenges. A greater cohort of champions is certainly needed in order to move these issues forward. The engagement of Chief Mulendema presented a positive opportunity, though the issues in Mumbwa GMA were likely too contentious to push forward. Within government, ILRG did not identify a champion who could work across departments and bridge these challenges.

Despite the program's best efforts, there remains deep resistance to collaboration on natural resource management, due to the following issues:

- Departments sit within different ministries and as a result, there is no Minister or Permanent Secretary who currently holds the departments accountable for collaboration. At the ministerial level, there is no political will to reconcile the issues because while the status quo results in inefficient resource management, improving this efficiency is not seen as a high-level issue requiring urgent action. This could be achieved if it were a presidential priority, or Ministry of Finance, but given other priorities, it is not likely to rise to this level currently.
- Greater collaboration would require department staff to take on additional responsibilities, for example, enforcing the laws of the other department, while receiving no extra remuneration. Indeed, departments may be afraid that they will need to spend their resources mobilizing other departments/ministries if greater collaboration is mandated.
- The departments compete for resources with donors, private sector, and cooperating partners. There is a reluctance to bring multiple departments to the table, in part due to fear of showing that there are inefficiencies and inconsistencies across government implementation. For example, the increase in forest carbon revenues has shed light on concerns related to corruption/collusion in the management of CRB funds.
- There is a lack of urgency or willingness to proactively solve issues. This lack of interest in “rocking the boat” or identifying emergent challenges has led to persistent, low-lying tensions. This is also indicative of a government tendency to want to solve each issue in a case-by-case manner, as opposed to addressing the underlying policy challenges.
- Fear of public failure undoubtedly poses a challenge. There is not a simple, clear solution to most of the issues that affect natural resource management, and in the process of addressing the issues, current failure (including potential issues of corruption) may come to light. Departmental management within the ministries are reluctant to raise these issues in a public forum, even between ministries.
- Weak intra-departmental coordination stalls progress on tasks that require follow-up. The lack of information sharing between and within departments delays the accomplishment of tasks in a timely manner.
- Staff turnover delays and disrupts progress. Staff transfer or departure from the department affects task progress, particularly at the top and middle management levels. In recent years,



DNPW and FD were characterized by a high level of turnover. These disruptions cause a loss of time and pose a challenge to secure buy-in from new officers.

## **WAY FORWARD AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Dialogue can only be achieved by continuing to highlight areas of overlap and conflict to justify the necessity of greater collaboration. This needs to be carried out by clearly articulating potential for mutual gain, and consider stakeholders throughout government from field officers to leadership. Candid discussions are needed, as well as a willingness to address the discomfort and vulnerability that comes along with negotiation. Managing departmental power rivalries is a critical consideration when dealing with conservation matters at the inter-ministerial or departmental levels of government, and these engagements will call for dedication, skill, resilience, patience and a modest investment of time and budget for repetitive meetings and check-ins. This will also demand identification of model or trial areas and strategic rollout of successful coordination in the landscape. Different stakeholders have different priorities and interests in communities, and to date, there has been no management or localized coordination mechanism or plan to generate synergies and reduce overlaps and redundancies in forests and wildlife at national or field levels. This is somewhat surprising considering the increase in interest in forest carbon investments in Zambia. Unfortunately, the sectors may have simply decided to ignore one another, allowing the DNPW to focus on hunting revenue through CRBs, while the FD focuses on forest carbon through CFMGs. While these two departments may be able to carry out this bifurcated approach to CBNRM, it leaves gaps for both communities and underlying resources. The need for dialogue and broader CBNRM coordination in Zambia continues. The issues identified for dialogue will remain high priorities for the foreseeable future:

- Coordination around law enforcement and resource management for wildlife and forest resources, including the roles of Community Scouts and Honorary Forest Officers;
- Benefit-sharing for wildlife and carbon funds and implementation of management plans and financing of social projects;
- DNPW and FD oversight, supervision of CRBs/CFMGs, compliance and control of bank accounts;
- CRB/CFMG resource monitoring, performance reporting requirements, and feedback systems; and
- CRB/CFMG capacity building in good governance, leadership skills and gender inclusion.

Candid discussions across these and more themes could help the DNPW and FD better complement one another, leading to improved protection of resources and stronger community relationships. Given the reluctance of the departments to proactively address these concerns, there may be a need for cooperating partners to be prescriptive regarding inclusive approaches to resource management, for example through joint work planning and identifying other integrated ways to build relationships between departments. In the long run, reorganizing these departments under the same ministry is likely necessary to promote efficient resource management.