REPUBLIC OF KENYA
MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND WILDLIFE

REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT ON THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT (ACCESS AND CONSERVATION) (FEES) REGULATIONS, 2025

FOR

KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE

APRIL 2025

This Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) statement has been prepared by The Ministry Tourism and Wildlife pursuant to Sections 6 and 7 of the Statutory Instruments Act, Cap 2A

Table of content

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Wildlife Conservation and Management (Access and Conservation) (Fees) Regulations, 2025, represent a strategic and policy-driven reform aimed at securing the long-term financial sustainability of wildlife conservation in Kenya. Developed by the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife pursuant to the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act Cap. 376, these regulations propose a comprehensive revision of conservation fees to enable the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) to fulfill its statutory mandate effectively.

For over a decade, the existing fee structure has remained static, even as operational costs have surged, conservation demands have grown, and visitor expectations have evolved. With over 90% of KWS's internal revenue derived from conservation-related tourism, the Service faces an unsustainable fiscal gap currently estimated at **KSh. 10 billion** annually. This threatens not only the protection of Kenya's iconic biodiversity but also the livelihoods, economic sectors, and communities that depend on wildlife economy.

The proposed regulations pursue three key policy outcomes:

1. **Enhancing Financial Sustainability**

Aligned with National Treasury Circular No. 02/2023, the regulations will support KWS's transition toward financial self-reliance as a semi-autonomous government agency. Adjusted fees will stabilize revenue streams, reduce reliance on exchequer funding and donor grants and ensure uninterrupted delivery of conservation services.

2. **Delivering Tangible Conservation and Visitor Outcomes**

The revised fees will be directly reinvested into core conservation programs, human-wildlife conflict mitigation, habitat restoration, anti-poaching efforts, infrastructure modernization, and educational experiences. This linkage between pricing and service delivery is essential to restore public trust, elevate visitor satisfaction, and ensure that tourism remains a tool for conservation advocacy and sustainable development.

3. **Promoting Equity, Competitiveness and Strategic Growth**

The pricing model adopts a segmented and tiered approach, balancing affordability for Kenyan citizens with the revenue potential of international tourism. It reflects regional benchmarking, cost recovery needs, and elasticity-based revenue optimization. The model also supports broader government agendas, including Vision 2030, the Bottom-Up Economic Transformation Agenda (BETA), and Medium Term Plan IV.

Through extensive national consultations, benchmarking, and predictive modeling, the proposed fees have been adjusted to optimize both revenue and access. Notably, 75% of surveyed stakeholders including visitors, tour operators, and local communities expressed willingness to pay higher fees if accompanied by visible conservation outcomes and improved park services.

The regulations are anchored on a robust legal and policy framework including the Constitution of Kenya, 2010, the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap. 376, Kenya Vision 2030, and various national and multilateral environmental agreements. They also align with emerging global best practices on payment for ecosystem services, climate-resilient tourism, and biodiversity protection financing.

Recommendation

Three options were evaluated. Among all assessed options which were a) status quo, b) visa-based conservation levy an c) conservation fee adjustments, reviewing conservation fees is the most direct, implementable, and impactful strategy. It offers immediate revenue gains, requires no new legislation, and provides the flexibility to address both domestic and international market segments without compromising equity or inclusivity.

Conclusion

Kenya's global leadership in conservation is underpinned by strong institutions, iconic wildlife, and a thriving tourism economy. The 2025 Conservation Fees Regulations options offer an urgent and overdue recalibration of the financial model that sustains this legacy. By adopting this regulatory reform, Kenya affirms its commitment to a future where wildlife conservation is not only a national duty, but a strategic investment in economic growth, community empowerment, and ecological integrity.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) is mandated under section 7 (a) of the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap. 376 (The Act) to conserve and manage national parks, wildlife conservation areas and sanctuaries. In order to effectively perform this function, the Cabinet Secretary Tourism and Wildlife on recommendation by KWS is empowered under section 116 (1) and (2) of the Act to make regulations on imposition of fees payable under the Act or in particular cases.

The current regulations imposing fees have been in force for 18 years and it has become challenging for the KWS to effectively perform its mandate. Over this period of 10 years, the cost of operations for the service has tremendously escalated given the change in conservation models and tourism sector.

The proposed regulations seek to sustain wildlife conservation for posterity, enhance KWS financial sustainability, and address the emerging socio-economic and environmental issues such as inflation, environmental protection, emerging government policies, revenue volatility among others.

2.0 A STATEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION AND THE REASONS FOR THEM

2.1 General Objective

The overall objective of The Wildlife Conservation and Management (Access and Conservation) (Fees) Regulations, 2025 (hereinafter referred as ***"The Statutory Instrument"*** is to review conservation fees to facilitate effective execution of KWS mandate to conserve and manage wildlife. The regulations shall therefore provide for fees payable for access and conservation of national parks, national reserves, national marine parks, national marine reserves and national sanctuaries.

2.2 Specific Objectives

(i) Support the growth of wildlife population
(ii) Promote co-existence between people and Wildlife
(iii) Enhance resilient ecosystems with rich biodiversity
(iv) Strengthen community and stakeholder participation
(v) Promote access and benefit sharing
(vi) Enhance wildlife economy
(vii) Support a high performing organisation

2.3 Specific purpose

The purpose of the proposed regulations is to provide conservation fees chargeable for access to and utilisation for National Park, Reserves, and Sanctuaries

3.0 EFFECT OF IMPLEMENTING THIS STATUTORY INSTRUMENT

This Statutory Instrument will upon Implementation, revoke The Wildlife Conservation and Management (National Parks) (Fees) Regulations, 2013.

The adjustment of these fees through the Wildlife Conservation and Management (Access and Conservation) (Fees) Regulations, 2025 has been **necessitated** by the following key factors:

(a) Financial Sustainability

In order to successfully carry out its conservation mandate and decrease dependency on exchequer funding, Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) must achieve financial sustainability, in alignment with **National Treasury Circular No. 02/2023**. The circular requires **Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs)** like KWS to transition toward full financial self-sufficiency, particularly those with internal revenue-generating capabilities.

Currently, KWS funds its activities through three main revenue sources: (I) **internal revenue from tourism-based activities (Appropriations-in-Aid)** including park entry fees, leases, event venues, and accommodation facilities; (II) **Government of Kenya (GoK) subventions**; and (III) **donor grants**. Of these, internal revenue contributes **90%,** primarily derived from tourism, a sector highly vulnerable to external shocks such as pandemics, terrorism, global conflicts, natural disasters and travel advisories. These vulnerabilities have previously led to severe operational cutbacks and austerity measures, which in turn negatively affect core conservation activities and staff welfare.

Despite these challenges, KWS currently **generates at least 80% of the income required to fund its annual budget**, a proportion expected to grow toward **100% self-financing**, in line with national policy.

The financial structure however, remains constrained: **78 percent** of the operating budget is allocated to security operations, leaving only **22 percent** for essential recurrent operations such as human wildlife conflict, wildlife monitoring, and vehicle maintenance.

KWS operates with an annual funding gap of approximately KSh 10 billion, highlighting the urgency of implementing robust financial reforms. Increasing conservation fees, coupled with revenue diversification and reinvestment in operations and infrastructure, will be critical in ensuring that KWS can sustainably protect Kenya's rich biodiversity and deliver on its conservation mandate.

(b) Revenue Diversification

In order to improve long-term financial stability and lessen an excessive dependence on tourism-related income, KWS is considering pursuing a deliberate and strategic approach to revenue diversification.

One promising avenue is the monetization of biodiversity and ecosystem services. KWS is exploring income generation through participation in carbon credit markets, particularly programs or voluntary schemes linked to forested areas and rangelands. Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) can also be formalized with downstream water utilities, agribusinesses, and urban municipalities that benefit from clean water, pollination, and climate regulation originating from KWS-managed parks and reserves such as Chyullu Hills, Aberdares and Mt. Kenya. Additionally, biodiversity offset programs, bioprospecting partnerships, and licensing arrangements with scientific institutions offer untapped potential.

KWS will consider the development of digital products—including virtual safaris, wildlife livestreams, adopt-a-species initiatives, merchandised shops, wildlife farming, aquarium tourism, and an integrated KWS mobile app that can tap into a global audience of conservation supporters and generate recurring revenue while enhancing engagement. This multifaceted revenue diversification strategy will not only improve financial resilience but also elevate KWS's role as a conservation engine that sustains ecological integrity, supports community livelihoods, and drives inclusive green growth for Kenya.

(c) Economic Alignment

Wildlife Tourism in Kenya is a significant driver of sustainable development as it contributes to the economic, social and environmental facets of development. The Bottom-Up Economic Transformation Agenda (BETA) aligns strongly with wildlife tourism in Kenya as a key driver of inclusive economic growth, job creation, and environmental sustainability. Through its focus on job creation, BETA supports the over one million Kenyans directly and indirectly employed in the wildlife tourism value chain, including those in hospitality, guiding, and crafts. It empowers Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), many of which thrive around national parks and reserves through community conservancies, eco-lodges, and tour operations. Wildlife tourism is also a top foreign exchange earner, generating over USD 1 billion annually, aligning with BETA's goal of increasing national revenue and foreign investment. This reform will also unlock greater reinvestment into infrastructure, conservation services, and community benefit-sharing, fueling **local enterprise growth** and **job creation**, especially in rural and marginalized regions. Furthermore, the regulations aim to support the broader goals of **Kenya Vision 2030**, the **BETA**, and the **Fourth Medium Term Plan**, by enabling sustainable use of natural resources, fostering eco-tourism innovation, and positioning Kenya as a premier green economy and global conservation leader.

Moreover, BETA's emphasis on environmental stewardship and climate resilience reinforces the protection of Kenya's biodiversity, which is central to sustainable tourism. Additionally, BETA prioritizes infrastructure development—roads, airstrips, and digital access—that enhance tourist access and satisfaction, positioning Kenya as a globally competitive destination.

(d) Environmental Conservation and Protection

This entails using pricing strategies to manage visitor numbers and mitigate over-tourism, thereby protecting the ecological integrity of parks and at the same time generating resources for restoration.
Strategic pricing is an essential tool for KWS to protect the ecological integrity of Kenya's national parks while managing the growing pressure of tourism. High-traffic parks such as Nairobi, Amboseli, and Lake Nakuru face risks from over-tourism, including habitat degradation, wildlife stress, and infrastructure strain.
These pricing strategies align with the **Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap. 376**, and provide KWS with an opportunity to both generate revenue and fulfill its conservation mandate. Funds collected through adjusted fees will be reinvested into critical initiatives like **habitat restoration, anti-poaching efforts, and climate resilience**. Ultimately, pricing for environmental protection allows KWS to uphold its conservation mandate while delivering a high-quality, low-impact visitor experience. It ensures that Kenya's parks remain resilient, biodiverse, and vibrant for future generations.

(e) Enhanced Visitor Experiences

Reinvesting revenue from adjusted conservation fees presents a critical opportunity for KWS to enhance the overall visitor experience across Kenya's national parks.

As international and domestic tourists seek more meaningful, comfortable, and informative encounters with wildlife, improved services and infrastructure are essential to meet evolving expectations. Increased revenue will support upgrades such as **modern visitor centers, well-maintained roads and trails, clean amenities, signage,**

digital guides, and efficient entry systems. These improvements not only elevate comfort and accessibility but also encourage longer stays, higher visitor satisfaction, and positive word-of-mouth—all of which contribute to the sector's long-term growth.

Beyond physical infrastructure, reinvested funds can expand **educational and interpretive programs** that deepen visitor understanding of Kenya’s biodiversity and conservation challenges. This includes guided tours, interactive exhibitions, citizen science initiatives, and youth-focused conservation education.

High-quality experiences enrich the value of each visit, fostering emotional connections to wildlife and greater public support for conservation efforts. Strategically linking entry fee adjustments to visible service improvements builds trust among visitors and stakeholders, reinforcing the message that **every shilling spent supports both enjoyment and environmental protection**. This approach ensures that tourism remains not only a revenue stream but a tool for advocacy, education, and deeper appreciation of Kenya’s natural heritage.

4.0. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Wildlife in Kenya is a significant driver of sustainable development as it contributes to the economic, social and environmental facets of development. It is a cornerstone of Kenya's economy, contributing approximately 10% to the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and generating over USD 1 billion annually in direct revenue through tourism. Iconic parks and reserves like the Maasai Mara, Amboseli, and Tsavo attract hundreds of thousands of international visitors annually, making tourism one of Kenya’s top foreign exchange earners alongside agriculture and remittances.

The multiplier effect of wildlife conservation in Kenya is substantial, as every dollar generated from the sector circulates through multiple layers of the economy, creating far-reaching benefits. Wildlife conservation contributes directly and indirectly to various industries including tourism, agriculture, manufacturing, trade, banking, insurance, and research. Communities are also reliant on this sector for livelihoods and as a form of their heritage.

The proposed regulations provide for a sustainable pricing model that will ensure funding for critical conservation efforts that protect Kenya’s biodiversity while ensuring the wildlife value chain and communities benefit from the wildlife economy.

5.0 POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

5.1 The Constitution of Kenya, 2010

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 is the supreme law of the country, providing the framework for governance, the protection of fundamental rights, and the distribution of powers among various institutions.
The Constitution of Kenya 2010 recognizes natural resources in several ways. It establishes principles and provisions related to wildlife conservation and management as follows:

1. Article 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64; Land; stipulates Principles of land policy, classification of land, public, community and private land respectively.
2. Article 69; Obligations in respect of the environment; This article stipulates state and public roles to ensure sustainable exploitation, utilization, management, protection and conservation of the environment and natural resources, and ensure the equitable sharing of the accruing benefits;
3. Fourth Schedule; distribution of functions between the national government and the county governments
    - (a) National government is mandated to carry out the following function in relation to wildlife
        - (i) Protection of the environment and natural resources with a view to establishing a durable and sustainable system of development, including, in particular—
            - a. protection of animals and wildlife
            - b. fishing, hunting and gathering
        - (ii) Disaster management
        - (iii) Tourism policy and development

5.2 The Kenya Vision 2030, Bottom-Up Economic Transformation Agenda and Fourth Medium Term Plan (MTP IV)

The Kenya Vision 2030 is the national development blueprint that seeks to make Kenya a middle-income economy by 2030. It is anchored on three key pillars namely; economic, social and political pillar. The wildlife sector falls under the social pillar which aims to build a just and cohesive society that enjoys equitable social development in a clean and secure environment.

Currently, the Government of Kenya is implementing Bottom-Up Economic Transformation Agenda (BETA) that is operationalized through the Fourth Medium Term

Plan 2023-2027 (MTP IV). BETA is anchored on five key pillars of Agriculture, MSMEs, Housing and Settlement, Health Care and Digital Superhighway and Creative Economy. The key outcomes envisaged under BETA include improved livelihoods, job creation, food security, revenue generation, reduced cost of living reduced inequality and increased foreign exchange earnings.

The Medium-Term Plan IV is implemented through five sectors, namely: Finance and Production; Infrastructure; Social; Environment and Natural Resources; and Governance and Public Administration. KWS falls under the Environment and Natural Resources sector. KWS priority areas and targets in MTP IV include;

Wildlife conservation and management, Management of rangeland, diversification of Wildlife (Safari) products, enhancement of wildlife revenue, Digitalization of revenue collection in all parks; rehabilitation of guest houses and *bandas,* creation of green and blue jobs initiatives, Tourism and wildlife training and research, Legal Reforms- Review of Wildlife Conservation Management Act, 2013.

5.3 Other Sector Policies and Laws

(a) Sessional paper No. 01 of 2020 on Wildlife Policy; The Kenya National Wildlife Strategy, 2030; The Wildlife Conservation and Management Act Cap 376 of the Laws of Kenya; National Human Wildlife Compensation Strategy and Action Plan 2024-2033; National Tourism Blueprint 2030; and various wildlife –related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) that the country has signed and ratified and that in accordance with Article 2 of the Constitution , are part of the national laws. These provide the policy and legal framework in the management of wildlife in Kenya. They also provide strategies and action plans for sustainable utilization of wildlife resources for the betterment of the Country.

(b) The Environmental Management and Coordination Act, Cap.387; The Forest Conservation and Management Act, Cap.387; and The Water Act, 372 Cap. These legislations provide for the protection of the natural environment that forms the habitats for wildlife. The proposed regulations have aligned themselves to the provisions and aspirations of these laws. For example, majority of the water towers and forests are within the protected areas and as such KWS has a responsibility in protecting them.

(c) State Corporations Act Cap 446; Public Financial Management (PFM) Act Cap.412A and attendant regulations; Mwongozo Code of conduct 2015; The Public Procurements and Asset Disposal Act, Cap.412C (PPADA) and attendant regulations; Public Private Partnership (PPP) Act, Cap.430. These legislations and regulations guide on how public institutions should ensure prudence and accountability in management and utilization of resources.

(d) East Africa Community (EAC) Vision 2050; The East African Community (EAC) Vision 2050 is a long-term development framework that aim to provide a catalyst to enhance regional growth and development and transform the community to an upper – middle income region within a secure and politically united East Africa based on the principles of inclusiveness and accountability. The vision is anchored on five key pillars namely: infrastructure development, Agriculture, Food Security and Rural Development, Industrialization, Environment and Natural Resource Management and Tourism, Trade and other Services Development. By promoting conservation, KWS not only generates revenue but also creates employment opportunities, contributing to the EAC Vision 2050's pillar of tourism and economic growth and development. Specifically, EAC Vision 2050 emphasizes sustainable land management, particularly its contribution to biodiversity and addressing climate change, regional tourism and wildlife conference which will be held annually and on rotational basis and need for conservation of the natural and cultural heritage.

6.0 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

6.1 Regional Context

Compared to Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) and South Africa National Parks (SANPARKS), KWS offers moderately priced experiences for non-residents—USD 60 at premium parks versus TANAPA's USD 70–100. SANParks charge USD 24–30 for flagship parks while offering superior infrastructure and interpretation services. However, visitors pay for different services within the parks making the overall expenditure higher. For citizens and residents SANParks charges South African citizens USD 3–7, and TANAPA offers rates from USD 1.50 for locals and EAC.

KWS citizen fees (USD 2–8) are higher than most peer countries and may exclude low-income or educational users. Comparatively, the costs to the consumer are lower considering the quality of infrastructure available in Kenya including connectivity (road, rail and air), quality of the road network, internet and mobile phone penetration as well as unique events such as the safari rally.

KWS's lack of value bundling—such as SANParks' Wild Card or TANAPA's community-linked offerings—limits its appeal. In contrast, private conservancies in Kenya like Ol Pejeta and Lewa offer curated, high-service experiences that justify higher rates (USD 90–140). Maasai Mara's high pricing is offset by brand equity and high wildlife density.

KWS is largely self-sufficient with almost 80% of its revenue derived from internal sources.

6.2 Domestic Context

In addition to the protected areas managed by KWS, Kenya hosts a wide range of county-managed national reserves and privately/community-managed conservancies. These include world-renowned sites such as Maasai Mara National Reserve, Ol Pejeta Conservancy, and several community conservancies in Samburu and Laikipia counties.

While KWS offers uniform, nationally regulated pricing, other conservation entities apply independent, often premium pricing strategies. These rates are influenced by market demand, exclusivity, management models, and direct benefit-sharing mechanisms with local communities.

A comparison between these conservation areas and KWS parks reveals price disparities, unique experiences, and targeted service offerings, making them valuable benchmarks for improving KWS pricing strategies.

Reserves/ Conservancies vs. KWS Parks

Visitor Categories	**Conservation Area Versus Charges**			
	Maasai Mara NR (Narok County)	**Samburu / Buffalo Springs**	**Kalama / Namunyak / West Gate (Community Conservancies)**	**Ol Pejeta Conservancy**
Non-Resident (USD)	200 (High Season), 100 (Low)	70	80–120 (seasonal)	110
Regional (USD)	38.63 (High), 19.32 (Low)	7.73	7.73–15.46	15.46
Citizens (USD)	23.18 (High), 11.59 (Low)	3.87	7.73–15.46	15.46
Residents (USD)	38.63 (High),	7.73	7.73–15.46	27.05

	19.32 (Low)			

6.3 KWS Current Pricing Regime

To ensure pricing reflects both conservation value and visitor experience, KWS has adopted a segmentation model that categorizes parks based on ecological importance, tourism demand, and infrastructure development. This classification serves as the foundation for setting differentiated pricing tiers, ensuring that entry fees are aligned with the uniqueness and operational needs of each park. The segmentation also enables KWS to balance conservation priorities, accessibility and revenue optimization across its diverse portfolio of protected areas.

KWS has classified parks into distinct categories that reflect visitor demand, conservation importance, and level of infrastructure. These categories determine baseline entry pricing:

1. Premium Parks (e.g., Amboseli, Lake Nakuru)
2. Wilderness Parks A & B (e.g., Tsavo East/West, Meru, Aberdare, Mt. Kenya)
3. Urban Safari (e.g., Nairobi National Park)
4. Sanctuaries & Special Interest Parks (e.g., Nairobi Safari Walk, Kisumu Impala)
5. Marine Parks (e.g., Mombasa,Watamu, Kisite Mpunguti, Malindi, Kiunga)
6. Scenic and special interest (Mt Longonot, Ruma, Oldonyo Sabuk)
7. Mountain Parks (Mt Kenya and Mt Elgon)

Each category has a price point tailored to perceived value, demand, and maintenance costs.

To enhance accessibility and equity in park access, KWS employs a visitor segmentation strategy that differentiates pricing based on nationality and residency status. This approach allows for tiered fees that reflect differing capacities to pay while promoting inclusivity for local populations. The segmentation includes East Africa citizens, foreign residents, international tourists (non-residents), and children or students who often benefit from substantial discounts. By structuring fees this way, KWS aims to balance domestic affordability with the potential for higher revenue from global tourism markets.

KWS applies differentiated pricing for:

- East Africa Citizens
- Residents (Foreign nationals with legal Kenyan residence)
- Non-Residents (International tourists)
- Children/Students (often discounted at 50% or more)

Other pricing regimes for products and services include Activity-Based Pricing; Vehicle, Aircraft, and Boat Fees; and Annual Passes & Commercial Access.

Discounts and Group Incentives are offered to encourage bulk visitation and support group-based tourism. KWS offers structured discounts for organized groups such as schools, conferences, and corporate outings. These discounts typically range between 5% and 30%, depending on the size of the group. This approach enhances affordability, especially for educational and community-based programs, and incentivizes higher visitor volumes during both peak and off-peak seasons.

KWS has also adopted a fully cashless payment system, primarily facilitated through the eCitizen platform. This digital approach streamlines park entry transactions, improves transparency, and enhances revenue accountability. The cashless system also reduces logistical challenges associated with cash handling and aligns with broader government efforts to digitize public services. However, accessibility and user experience of the platform remain a critical factor influencing visitor satisfaction.

7.0 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

In January 2025, KWS commissioned a study *Titled Sustaining Wildlife Conservation in Kenya: Pricing for Posterity.* The study involved all key stakeholders in the wildlife sector across the country as well as benchmarking in the region.

7.1 Objective of the Study

The objective of the study was to assess stakeholder perceptions, feedback, suggestions and regional competitiveness of the current pricing model deployed by KWS. The aim was to inform a tiered, responsive pricing framework that balances revenue generation with affordability and competitiveness.

7.2 Legal requirement relating to consultation and public participation

The process of stakeholder consultation in preparation of draft Regulations in line with Article 10 of Constitution of Kenya, 2010 and Section 5 of the Statutory Instrument, Act Cap. 2A

7.3 Stakeholders Consulted

Several key stakeholders were consulted. These included:

- **Visitors (Domestic & International Tourists**
- **KWS Staff with Direct Contact with Visitors**
- **Operators of Lodges within Game Parks**
- **Boat Operators**
- **Tour Guides & Porters**
- **Tour Operators & Travel Agents**
- **Learning Institutions**
- **Local Communities & Conservation Groups**
- **Private Conservancies & Competitor Parks**
- **Government Agencies & Tourism Organizations**

7.4 Methodology and Approach

The stakeholder consultation adopted a participatory and triangulatory approach to ensure a comprehensive and inclusive assessment of pricing structures within KWS parks. By engaging multiple stakeholders, including visitors, tourism operators, conservation entities, government officials, and local communities, the study integrated diverse perspectives to inform data-driven decision-making.

This was achieved through structured surveys, focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs), and benchmarking analysis, ensuring that insights from all relevant actors are captured and contextualized. Structured questionnaires generated numerical data on pricing perceptions, visitor behaviors, and economic impacts, while qualitative methods such as FGDs and KIIs provided deeper insights into the rationale behind stakeholder responses. Benchmarking analysis further contextualized findings by comparing KWS pricing structures with those of similar conservation entities.

As a result of integrating multiple data sources and analytical techniques, the methodology ensured that the study results were both empirically sound and contextually relevant, facilitating well-informed policy recommendations for KWS's pricing strategy.

7.5 Phased Approach in the Methodology

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative techniques, with a strong emphasis on triangulation to enhance the validity and reliability of findings.

The phases were as follows:

(i) **Inception Phase** – Establishing the study framework, refining the methodology, and aligning stakeholders.

(ii) **Document Review Phase** – Reviewing existing pricing models, revenue structures, and benchmarking against global and regional practices.

(iii) **Data Collection Phase** – Gathering insights from visitors, KWS staff, conservation stakeholders, and key industry players through surveys, FGDs, and interviews.

(iv) **Data Analysis Phase** – Processing and interpreting quantitative and qualitative data to derive key findings.

(v) **Draft** Report **Writing** – Structuring findings into a coherent draft report, including visual representation of data.

(vi) Validation **Phase** – Engaging stakeholders to review and refine the draft report.

(vii) **Final Report Submission & Presentation** – Delivering the final report with actionable recommendations to KWS.

7.6 Key Findings

7.6.1 Perceptions on KWS Mandate and Achievements

Since its inception, KWS has significantly contributed to wildlife conservation. It has implemented specialized security units to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade while strengthening anti-trafficking measures. Over the years, KWS has undergone major transformations, aligning with the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap. 376 and the Constitution of Kenya, 2010. Other key developments include the establishment of 205 registered conservancies, and efforts to recover endangered species and their habitats among other initiatives.

Challenges faced by KWS centered around the increasing human population and settlement encroachment in wildlife habitats. These have intensified human-wildlife conflicts, leading to habitat loss, climate change impact, and illegal wildlife trade, which remain critical issues threatening conservation efforts.

7.6.2 Perceptions of Service Quality

While wildlife and scenery scored highly, 77% of visitors were satisfied with the wildlife experience and 71% with cleanliness—ratings dropped sharply in areas like infrastructure, signage, staff service, and entry systems. Marine parks recorded the lowest level of satisfaction, largely due to weak amenities and staff visibility. The top service gaps included poor roads, inadequate toilets, insufficient signage, and long gate delays. In total, 76% of respondents prioritized infrastructure as the area most needing improvement, while 19% pointed to service delivery. Tour drivers and hotel owners echoed these concerns, with over 40% citing road quality as the leading complaint. The eCitizen payment system was also criticized for inflexibility and delays, especially for groups or last-minute bookings.

7.6.3 Pricing and Perceived Value

KWS's current tiered pricing (citizens, residents, EAC, and non-residents) is well understood but perceived as mismatched with service quality. Many visitors, especially domestic and regional—felt current fees were not justified by the amenities offered, particularly in wilderness and urban parks.

Feedback from tourism operators showed that 43% of guests complain about inadequate value, especially when compared to more immersive experiences in private conservancies or high-service regional parks. Tour drivers flagged persistent issues with park entry systems, customer care, and lack of clear service differentiation between high- and low-fee parks.

Net Promoter Score (NPS) results illustrate this gap: visitors gave KWS parks a modest +5.9, while tour operators rated them higher at +27.4. This suggests that informed users appreciate KWS's natural offerings, but casual or first-time users see room for improvement. Domestic users were the most price-sensitive, while international tourists showed willingness to pay more—provided the experience delivered. Without clear service improvements and communication on how fees support conservation, price increases risk being poorly received.

7.6.4 Willingness to Pay (WTP)

The pricing study found that a large majority of KWS visitors and stakeholders are willing to pay higher park entry fees—provided these increases are linked to visible improvements in services, infrastructure, and conservation outcomes. About 75% of all respondents indicated willingness to pay up to 50% more, while 13% would accept increases between 51% and 100%. Only 9% were unwilling to pay more, signaling strong potential for modest, service-linked fee adjustments.

Scenario testing further confirmed that most respondents would accept price increases if tied directly to service improvements, highlighting the importance of transparency, value communication, and reinvestment. The study supports the adoption of a tiered, phased pricing strategy. WTP is highest among non-residents and premium park users, moderate among citizens and residents, and lowest among EAC nationals and schools. However, the common condition across all groups is clear: any increase must come with tangible, measurable upgrades in the overall visitor experience.

The study reveals strong foundations for a revised KWS pricing strategy that balances revenue growth with value delivery and equity. With demonstrated willingness to pay, but a clear demand for service enhancements, KWS can pursue a phased, segmented fee adjustment—anchored on park category, season, and visitor type—while prioritizing reinvestment in quality, transparency, and engagement. This will not only improve financial sustainability but elevate KWS parks to globally competitive standards.

8.0 RECOMMENDED REGULATORY AND NON-REGULATORY INTERVENTIONS

In assessing alternatives to park entry fee adjustments as a means to strengthen the financial sustainability of Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), three key options have been evaluated, encompassing both **regulatory** and **non-regulatory** interventions. Each presents distinct trade-offs in terms of feasibility, revenue potential, stakeholder impact, and implementation complexity.

8.1 Option 1: No Increase in Park Fees – Focus on Marketing and Optimizing Visitation (Non-Regulatory Option)

This approach focuses on maintaining current fee structures while enhancing revenue through **non-regulatory strategies** such as aggressive marketing, infrastructure upgrades, product diversification, and improved service delivery. It emphasizes tapping into the **untapped domestic market** and **underperforming parks** through campaigns, loyalty programs, and community engagement. Although inclusive and supportive of long-term tourism development, this option requires **significant upfront investment**, has a **slower revenue realization timeline**, and remains vulnerable to external disruptions such as pandemics and geopolitical shifts. It is best suited for **medium- to long-term application** in parallel with other strategies.

8.2 Option 2: Introduce a Conservation Fee on Foreign Tourist Visas (Regulatory Option)

This **regulatory intervention** proposes a **conservation levy** on foreign tourist visas, ring-fenced to support park operations, infrastructure, and conservation. It has the potential to raise funds to fill KWS's funding gap without raising entry fees. The option has multiple benefits including **stability, inclusivity**, and **international precedent**. However, it requires **multi-agency coordination**, **policy and legislative reforms**, and robust oversight mechanisms to prevent revenue diversion. Despite its promise, the administrative and political complexity may delay implementation.

8.3 Option 3: Increase Park Entry Fees (Regulatory Option – Recommended)

This regulatory option involves a structured increase in park entry fees to enhance KWS's internal revenue generation capacity. As a **semi-autonomous government agency (SAGA)** with a legal mandate to collect and utilize Appropriations-in-Aid (A-in-A), KWS can directly adjust user fees as a policy lever to reduce over-reliance on exchequer funding and donor grants. This option is grounded in **existing regulatory authority** and aligns with National Treasury Circular No. 02/2023, which calls on SAGAs to attain greater financial self-sufficiency.

Incremental park fee adjustments provide a **direct and manageable approach** to addressing KWS's annual **KSh 10 billion funding gap**, without requiring major legislative amendments or third-party coordination. It offers flexibility in design—allowing for **tiered pricing**, **differentiation by park category**, and **protection of domestic affordability** through localized discounts and exemptions. Moreover, by reinvesting the additional revenue into conservation operations, visitor infrastructure and community benefit-sharing, this approach directly strengthens KWS's operational capacity and enhances public trust. Among the available options, increasing park entry fees stands out as the most **practical, immediate, and scalable regulatory mechanism** to advance KWS's dual goals of financial sustainability and ecosystem protection.

8.4 Recommendation

Among the three alternatives, **Option 3—adjusting park entry fees—offers the most direct, implementable, and impactful solution** for KWS's financial sustainability and conservation mandate. It requires **no new laws or external coordination**, offers high potential for **internal revenue generation**, and provides the flexibility needed to protect domestic users and optimize revenue from international visitors. While Options 1 and 2 offer long-term value, their dependency on broader reforms or prolonged implementation timelines makes them less appropriate for addressing the **urgent funding shortfalls** KWS currently faces. Option 3 allows for **immediate action**, supports national policy direction, and strengthens the fiscal foundation for delivering effective, inclusive, and sustainable wildlife conservation in Kenya.

9.0 PRACTICABLE MEANS OF ACHIEVING THIS OBJECTIVE

9.1 Current Conservation Funding For KWS

Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) funds its conservation activities through three main income sources:

(i) Internally generated income (revenue from tourism activities) (Appropriations-in-Aid - A-in-A)

(ii) Government of Kenya (GoK) subventions

(iii) Grants

Tourism, which accounts for 90% of KWS's internal revenue, is a highly volatile sector. Fluctuations in the industry significantly impact KWS operations, often necessitating stringent austerity measures that negatively affect staff welfare and overall operations. This can also be seen in the changes in the foreign policies like the withdrawal of funding to African Countries.

Kenya's conservation funding model requires KWS to generate at least 78% of the financial resources necessary for its conservation efforts in operations leaving just 22% for recurrent operations across the country. This creates considerable pressure to strike a balance between investing in tourism the main source of internal revenue, and fulfilling the conservation mandate hence experiencing funding challenges. In some years, the security budget has risen to as high as 85%, reducing the recurrent budget to only 15%. The distribution of KWS budget activities is in the Table 1 provided below:

Table 1: KWS Recurrent Budget Distribution (2024/2025 FY)

#	Budget Item	% Distribution (2024/25 FY)
1.	Security Operations	78%
2.	HWC Response and Awareness	2%
3.	Tourism product development, marketing and customer service	1%
4.	Parks and Sanctuary/ Orphanage Management	2%
5.	Species and Habitat Management, and Translocations	1%
6.	Technical Services Support (ICT, Buildings, Roads, Air-wing)	3%

#	Budget Item	% Distribution (2024/25 FY)
7.	Other Support Services (Headquarters Departments)	2%
8.	Legal expenses and court awards	4%
9.	Service Contracts (Cleaning, Internet, Software)	1%
10.	Corporate Budget lines (BOT, Insurance, Bank Charges, Tax, Training, Audit Fees)	4%
11.	Capital expenditure (computers, internet connectivity and vehicles	2%
12.	**Total**	**100%**

From the above table, security operations are allocated as a first charge consuming 78 percent of the total recurrent budget. Parks management and HWC response and awareness creation takes 6 percent, of the total operations budget. The above allocations represent the minimum operating budget, as per available resources thus not indicative of the optimum funding.

The wildlife sector is experiencing adverse effects from human wildlife conflict, intense human activities leading to habitat fragmentation and degradation, impacts of climate change and poaching, all of which demand specific interventions and sufficient resources to ensure wildlife exists for posterity.

9.2 Revenue Generation from Parks

KWS oversees 20% (8.2% constitutes parks and reserves and 11.8% conservancies) of Kenya's land mass, out of which 33 are revenue-generating national parks, reserves, and sanctuaries. Five top-performing parks contribute 78% of the total annual revenue, effectively subsidizing the remaining parks, most of which do not generate sufficient income to cover their operational costs. However, these non-revenue-generating parks are critical for biodiversity and ecosystem conservation. This financial imbalance underscores a vulnerability within the current revenue model, where underperforming parks depend on the continued success of a few high-traffic parks.

In addition to park operations, KWS manages 154 human-wildlife conflict stations and 8 veterinary units situated outside protected areas—essential conservation and response functions that do not generate revenue. These units are vital for safeguarding communities, livestock, and biodiversity, but their continued operation is wholly reliant on revenue from parks and sanctuaries. Similarly, the organization's devolved administrative structure, consisting of eight conservation area headquarters, ensures localized park governance and coordination, yet these hubs also function as cost centers without revenue generation.

This financial structure highlights the importance of strategic conservation fee adjustments as a means to stabilize and broaden the revenue base. By optimizing pricing, particularly in high-performing parks with strong international demand, KWS can generate additional income not only to sustain flagship destinations but also to cross-subsidize underperforming parks, fund essential non-revenue conservation functions, and maintain national coverage through its extensive station and administrative networks. These adjustments are therefore pivotal to ensuring the equitable, efficient, and sustainable delivery of KWS's conservation mandate across the country (Table 2 on distribution of revenue by the park).

Table 2: Distribution of Revenue Generation by Source

	Park	**Percentage**
1	Amboseli National Park	25%
2	Lake Nakuru National Park	16%
3	Nairobi National Park	16%
4	Tsavo East National Park	15%
5	Tsavo West National Park	6%
6	Sanctuaries/Orphanages - 4	3%
7	Other parks -25	12%
8	Other income (leases, licenses, permits, bank interest)	8%
	TOTAL	**100%**

Therefore, Conservation fees constitute 90% of the total internal revenue generated by KWS as opposed to Government subvention and Donor funds hence the need to revise the same so as to achieve the Service objectives of conserving and managing wildlife as well as its habitat for posterity.

9.3 Recommended Means of Achieving the Objectives

The pricing study recommends that KWS implement a tiered, service-linked price adjustment strategy, anchored in stakeholder support and guided by market realities. Key actions include: Improve Park Infrastructure and Services; Enhance Customer

Experience; Modernize Digital Services; Tiered and Flexible Pricing; Stakeholder Engagement; and, Visible Reinvestment and Communication.

9.4 Predictive Model for Pricing Strategy

Informed by elasticity modelling and marginal revenue analysis, the KWS has developed a pricing strategy aimed at enhancing internal revenue generation while maintaining accessibility, competitiveness, and alignment with its conservation mandate. The analysis applied differentiated elasticity assumptions for non-residents and citizens/residents, reflecting their distinct sensitivities to price changes.

For non-resident visitors, a price elasticity of -0.1 was used, indicating that every 10% increase in park fees results in an estimated 1% decline in visitation. The predictive model revealed a consistent rise in total revenue across all pricing scenarios. However, the rate of marginal revenue gain diminishes beyond certain thresholds, with the most significant increases occurring between 10% and 30%. The curve begins to flatten between 50% and 60%, marking the point of diminishing returns. Therefore, it is recommended that KWS adopts a price adjustment of between 50% and 60% for non-residents. While increases beyond this range may yield additional revenue, the gains are increasingly marginal and could present reputational or accessibility risks if not coupled with improvements in service quality and visitor experience.

For citizens and residents, a higher elasticity of -0.5 was applied to account for their greater price sensitivity. The model shows that revenue increases steadily up to a 50% price adjustment, after which total earnings begin to decline. The most notable marginal revenue gain occurs at a 15% increase, with diminishing returns observed in subsequent increments. At 60%, revenue falls below the 50% mark, signaling the peak has been passed. Therefore, it is recommended that KWS caps price increases for citizens and residents at 50%. Beyond this threshold, further increments are unlikely to yield net revenue gains and may compromise access for schools, families, and other key domestic segments.

Assuming the recommended pricing adjustments are implemented, the projected total park fee revenue for KWS is expected to grow from KSh 7.41 billion in 2024 to KSh 16.58 billion by 2028. These projections are based solely on park entry fees and reflect anticipated trends in visitation and spending behavior under the proposed pricing framework.

This predictive pricing strategy offers KWS a pragmatic and evidence-based approach to achieving financial sustainability while upholding its commitment to inclusive conservation

tourism. It enables the institution to balance revenue generation with public value, ensuring the long-term protection and accessibility of Kenya's natural heritage.
The Model is discussed hereunder.

Non Residents

Assumptions:

- **Elasticity = -0.1** (i.e., every 10% price increase → 1% visitor decline).
- **Base Visitors (2024)**: 853,511
- **Base Avg Spend (2024)**: KSh. 6,943

Table 3: Price Elasticity Model for Non-Residents

Price Change	Visitor Drop (%)	Projected Visitors	Avg Revenue per Visitor (KSh)	Projected Revenue (KSh)	Marginal Increase (KSh)	% Revenue Change
0%	-0.0%	853,511	6,943.00	5,925,926,873	0	0%
+10%	-1.0%	844,975	7,637.30	6,453,334,365	527,407,492	8.9%
+20%	-2.0%	836,440	8,331.60	6,968,890,003	515,555,638	7.99%
+30%	-3.0%	827,905	9,025.90	7,472,593,787	503,703,784	7.23%
+40%	-4.0%	819,370	9,720.20	7,964,445,717	491,851,930	6.58%
+50%	-5.0%	810,835	10,414.50	8,444,445,794	480,000,077	6.03%
+60%	-6.0%	802,300	11,108.80	8,912,594,017	468,148,223	5.54%
+70%	-7.0%	793,765	11,803.10	9,368,890,386	456,296,369	5.12%
+80%	-8.0%	785,230	12,497.40	9,813,334,902	444,444,516	4.74%
+90%	-9.0%	776,695	13,191.70	10,245,927,563	432,592,661	4.41%
+100%	-10.0%	768,159	13,886.00	10,666,668,371	420,740,808	4.11%

Thus, +50% to +60% strikes a balance between optimal revenue, visitor retention, and competitive pricing, while +70% to +80% could be considered if accompanied by visible service improvements and strong communication.

Citizens and Residents

Assumptions

- **Base Year**: 2024
- **Visitors (2024)**: 2,347,591
- **Baseline Average Spend**: KSh 631.11
- **Elasticity**: -0.5

- **Average Spend per Visitor increases proportionally with price**
- **Price Scenarios**: +15% to +60%

Table 4: Price Elasticity Model for Residents

Scenario	Price Change	Visitor Drop (%)	Projected Citizens / Residents	Avg Revenue per Visitor (KSh)	Projected Revenue (KSh)
Baseline (2024)	0%	0%	2,347,591	631.11	1,481,579,643
15% Increase	+15%	7.5%	2,171,016	725.78	1,575,557,275
20% Increase	+20%	10.0%	2,112,832	757.33	1,599,822,952
25% Increase	+25%	12.5%	2,054,642	788.89	1,620,450,494
30% Increase	+30%	15.0%	1,996,452	820.44	1,637,438,900
40% Increase	+40%	20.0%	1,878,073	883.55	1,660,642,847
50% Increase	+50%	25.0%	1,760,693	946.67	1,665,967,640
60% Increase	+60%	30.0%	1,643,314	1,009.78	1,658,413,369

9.5 Impact on revenues

Optimal implementation of the pricing model will result in KWS realizing revenue potentials without compromising on visitations. This is summarized in table 5.

Table 5: Overall Impact on Revenues

Category	Item	2024 - Base	YR1	YR2	YR3	Y4
Non residents	Projected Visitors	853,511	811,085	1,042,735	1,196,146	1,349,557
	Average Revenue	6,943	10,415	10,415	10,415	10,415
	Projected Revenues	**5,926,318,572**	**8,448,712,272**	**10,860,083,984**	**12,457,859,549**	**14,055,635,114**
Citizens / Residents	Projected Visitors	2,347,591	1,760,693	1,936,763	2,227,277	2,672,732
	Average Revenue	631	947	947	947	947
	Projected Revenues	**1,481,579,643**	**1,666,496,161**	**1,833,145,777**	**2,108,117,644**	**2,529,741,173**

Total Projected Revenues	**7,407,898,215**	**10,928,804,580**	**12,693,229,761**	**14,565,977,192**	**16,585,376,286**

Revenues are expected to reach KES 10 billion on year one of implementation of the revised fees. With re-investment of the revenues towards conservation and product development, the revenues are expected to reach KES 16 Billion by the end of year 4 of implementation.

9.6 Recommended Revised Fees

The recommended fees and charges for KWS products and services are attached in the First Schedule of the draft Regulations. The development of the revised fees took into consideration the following key factors:

(i) The output of the elasticity model;

(ii) Adjustments for undervaluation of the prices in the 2013 Regulations that had grossly undervalued some of the products and services;

(iii) Adjustments due to product improvement and value addition;

(iv) Adjustments due to declined value of the Kenya Shilling against the major currencies;

(v) Adjustments due to the increased value of the species (both flora and fauna) and attendant conservation costs; and

(vi) Adjustments due to the increased cost of living.

10.0 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

10.1 Introduction

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is a tool used by regulatory decision makers, in our case, the Regulation Making Authority (RMA) to identify the costs and benefits, in financial terms, of a proposed regulation to society as a whole. In preparing the CBA, the RMA makes an attempt to assign a monetary value to all the predicted costs and benefits of a proposed regulation. These include not only the direct costs and benefits, but any tangential effects a proposed regulation may impose on society. In evaluating the effects on society, CBA includes costs and benefits to industry, Government, individual citizens, communities, the environment, and the economy at large. Cost-benefit analysis helps alleviate democratic concerns by making the development of statutory instruments more transparent, accessible and open to both the public, stakeholders, experts and Parliament, who can exercise influence over the RMA. Cost benefit analysis requires an RMA to attempt to quantify its reasoning process-revealing which aspects of a problem the RMA has taken into account. It allows the public, stakeholders, experts and Parliament to understand and challenge the RMA's calculations or even its choices about which factors count in the decision- making process.

Section 7(1) of SIA provides that a regulatory impact statement shall include an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed statutory rule and of any other practicable means of achieving the same objectives in clear and precise language.

10.2 Anticipated Costs of the Regulations on Conservation Fees

The implementation will entail several administrative and compliance requirements to ensure effective rollout, enforcement, and stakeholder acceptance. While the overall burden is expected to be moderate, KWS will invest in the necessary systems, capacity, and communication to support the transition and sustain public confidence.

(i) System and infrastructure upgrades will be required to integrate the new fee structures into existing digital revenue collection platforms such as eCitizen and the Smart Parks system. These upgrades will support real-time reporting, reduce revenue leakage, and ensure user-friendly visitor experiences. Additionally, physical infrastructure such as, access roads, signage at entry points and park information boards will need to be updated to reflect the new tariffs.

(ii) There will be a need for staff training and capacity building across all parks and conservation areas. Frontline staff, including park wardens, customer service teams, and ticketing personnel, must be oriented on the new fee structure, enforcement procedures, and handling visitor inquiries. Internal finance and audit teams will also require refresher training to ensure accurate revenue reporting and compliance monitoring.

(iii) Proactive stakeholder engagement and public communication will be crucial in minimizing resistance to conservation fee adjustments. KWS will need to engage with tour operators, travel agencies, local community representatives, conservation partners, and media stakeholders to explain the rationale behind the changes. Public awareness campaigns—emphasizing the link between fee adjustments, conservation outcomes and improved services —will be essential in building support and managing expectations.

(iv) Additional compliance and monitoring efforts will be necessary to ensure proper enforcement of the new pricing framework. This will include enhanced audit processes, field inspections, and reporting mechanisms to track visitor numbers, revenue performance, and adherence to differentiated pricing rules. Monitoring will also help assess the effects of pricing on visitation trends and ensure that any emerging challenges are addressed in real time.

(v) KWS will need to realign its internal resource allocation systems to ensure that additional revenue generated from conservation fees is effectively reinvested in conservation operations, infrastructure improvements, and benefit-sharing with communities. This may involve establishing or strengthening park-level budget frameworks and local oversight mechanisms to promote accountability and ensure that the benefits of increased fees are widely felt and transparently managed.

(vi) Basing on the price elasticity on increase in conservation fees there is likely to be a drop of 5% visitors due to increase in conservation fees. To cushion stakeholders in the industry from this impact, KWS will enhance marketing initiatives, improved products and incentives to the sector.

10.3 Benefits of the Regulations on Conservation Fees

The adjustment of this Conservation fee through the Wildlife Conservation and Management (Access and Conservation) (Fees) Regulations, 2023 shall avail the necessary sustainable financial resources to enable KWS achieve its mandate as follows:-

i. Support the growth of wildlife population

The conservation fee will be reinvested into translocation, restocking, introduction and reintroduction of wildlife to designated protected areas across the country. Further KWS will work with local communities in management of endangered threatened and rare species. Active management of wildlife species by developing protocols and standards in wildlife management. Undertaking periodic wildlife census will be crucial to guide management in interventions to wildlife risks and threats.

ii. Promote co-existence between people and Wildlife

The conservation fees will support KWS in increasing and securing wildlife corridors and dispersal areas, as well as promoting the creation of wildlife conservancies, sanctuaries, creation of conservation marine areas-locally managed marine areas, enhance Human-Wildlife Conflict prevention and Mitigation.

iii. Enhance resilient ecosystems with rich biodiversity

Strategic engagement with stakeholders including county governments, enhance community education and awareness, promote alternative livelihood through Community Social Investment (CSI), protect wildlife terrestrial and marine habitats, promote alternative energy sources, enhance response to climate impact on wildlife, enhance tree cover , enhance disaster preparedness and management mechanism, promote use of green energy and control of invasive species.

iv. Strengthen community and stakeholder participation

Through increased community and stakeholder education and awareness on wildlife conservation, strengthen governance among communities, stakeholders and partners, enhanced collaboration with communities, honorary wardens and stakeholders, improve youth engagement, collaboration of development partners, other agencies at both National and County Government levels, Administration and Implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

v. Promote access and benefit sharing

Improve legal framework and promote community livelihood.

vi. Expand the wildlife economy

Awareness creation on consumptive utilization, develop regulatory framework on wildlife economy, promote consumptive wildlife-based enterprises, enhance wildlife utilization among communities and enhance product development.

vii. Support a high performing organisation

Prudent financial management, strengthening corporate planning improved service delivery, technology, efficiency in A-in-A collection, improve cost management, diversification, development and optimization of revenue streams, resource mobilisation programmes, establish platforms for financial sustainability.

11.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed adjustment in conservation fees will support wildlife conservation in Kenya which in turn will create a multiplier effect in various sectors of the economy including tourism, agriculture, manufacturing, trade, banking, insurance, and research. Communities will benefit from this sector through improved livelihoods created in the various industries.

The proposed regulations provide a comprehensive and strategic approach to enhance the financial sustainability of the organization, promote conservation, and address environmental, economic, and social considerations. This Regulatory Impact Statement outlines the rationale, objectives, and methodology for assessing the impact of the proposed fee adjustments, emphasizing the commitment to transparency and consultation.