

**Community-based Natural Resource Management  
in Botswana and Namibia:  
an inventory and  
preliminary analysis of progress**

**Brian T B Jones**

**Report submitted to IIED in 1997 and published September 1999**



## POSTSCRIPT

Since this report was completed a number of developments in Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) have taken place in both Botswana and Namibia. There have been changes in both countries at national programme level as well as within individual projects and communities. Some of the communities have made progress and are increasing their income from wildlife and tourism, while others have struggled to develop appropriate institutions or proposed agreements with the private sector have fallen through. New projects have started and new donors, NGOs and communities have become part of the process. A brief update on new developments is provided below (the information is drawn from my own experience of both programmes and from a recent report completed in February 1999 by Tara Gujadur looking at CBNRM in Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe titled: Regional Inventory of Practical Strategies in Community Based Natural Resource Management. It is available from SNV Botswana and is a useful summary of CBNRM activities in the four countries):

In **Botswana** a number of policy advances have been made. A government community-based strategy for rural development has given additional impetus to community-based approaches to natural resource management by linking them to mainstream development strategies. A new CBNRM policy has been drafted for the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) which aims to consolidate the thinking implicit in previous policy and legislation and provide specific objectives for CBNRM and implementation guidelines. The policy will also include a section on relations between protected areas and neighbouring communities.

Under the National Development Plan 8 (NDP8) the government has made financial assistance available to local communities through a Community Conservation Fund (CCF). Communities can access funding for a variety of activities such as legal fees, training, proposal development, drafting a management plan and marketing. Finance is also available for conservation projects. The establishment of the CCF represents a significant commitment to CBNRM by the Government of Botswana.

The USAID-funded Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP), which provided technical assistance and financial support to Government, NGOs and communities, ended in mid 1999. IUCN and SNV Botswana have been supporting CBNRM stakeholders in mapping out the future post-NRMP and identifying best practices. They are also supporting the new Botswana Community-Based Organisation Network (BOCOBONET) which acts as an advocacy group and communication forum for community organisations involved in CBNRM activities.

According to Gujadur, CBNRM in Botswana is becoming more localised; environmental NGOs are offering communities a variety of services for employment and income generation, beyond tendering hunting concessions. The challenge for government, NGOs and communities is now to shape CBNRM themselves in a way that is less dependent on outside funding, as well as to develop internal capacity to support the fledgling community institutions.

In **Namibia** four communal area conservancies have been registered: Torra (Bergsig/De Riet) and #Khoadi //hoas (Grootberg) in Kunene Region, Nyae Nyae in eastern Otjozondjupa Region and Salambala in eastern Caprivi. Four more have been approved in principle by government pending clarification of some minor issues and several more communities are expected to apply for conservancy status within the next six months. A critical mass of communal area conservancies is beginning to be established which will strengthen the ability of individual communities to promote their CBNRM interests nationally.

The National Land Policy has been finalised and allows legally constituted groups such as conservancies to become land holders. The Communal Land Reform Bill, still before the National Assembly recognises conservancies, but is still unclear in many respects on how they will fit into the new land administration and allocation system. CBNRM stakeholders are carrying out more lobbying with government on issues such as exclusive group rights to land and resources. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) policy on Parks and Neighbours is still in draft form, but could be approved during 1999. A draft Tourism Policy also recognises conservancies as having tourism rights on their land, but the Tourism Bill which would entrench these rights has been held up by consultations on the policy. The bureaucratic process grinds on, and hopefully will produce before too many tourism assets of communities have been appropriated by the private sector or unco-ordinated development has led to tourism facilities outstripping demand.

The USAID-funded Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Project entered a second phase in mid 1999 and will run for another five years. It will continue to support Namibian NGOs and CBOs in implementing CBNRM and a particular emphasis will be on ensuring that national institutions are in place to take CBNRM into the next millennium. A new umbrella group of CBNRM stakeholders, the CBNRM Association of Namibia (CAN) has been established from the former collaborative group of Namibian implementors. New NGOs from the mainstream rural development sector have joined CAN giving it greater credibility in the development community.

MET has signalled its commitment to CBNRM through developing a special CBNRM unit and providing game for re-introduction to two established conservancies. CBNRM gained a political stamp of credibility in 1998 from an official launch of the communal areas conservancy programme by the Namibian President.

The existing conservancies and some emerging conservancies are concluding agreements with the private sector for hunting and tourism and beginning to generate sufficient income to cover their operating costs and provide benefits to community members.

By and large many of the key issues identified in 1997 in both Botswana and Namibia remain valid. In particular it still remains to be seen to what extent communities that receive income from wildlife and tourism really begin to manage these resources themselves or passively accept the benefits without the responsibility. Both countries face problems of capacity. They have small populations and CBNRM faces strong competition from other sectors for competent and experienced personnel. Resources available to conservation agencies remain generally meagre. The risk still remains that a number of communities enjoy five-star NGO and donor support while others struggle on their own. This is not so

much an issue of funding and infrastructure support, but of the need for persistent and consistent "light touch" facilitation of high quality to assist communities build robust, long enduring and accountable natural resource management institutions and to assist them develop successful business partnerships with the private sector.

Although there are still many risks and challenges, there is much positive about CBNRM in Botswana and Namibia.

Brian Jones  
Windhoek, August 1999

## **1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

---

The number, scope and scale of Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) activities in both Botswana and Namibia have grown considerably over the past five years to the extent that in each country there is now a clearly identifiable national programme. Within these national programmes, government provides an enabling framework for communities to manage their resources sustainably and provides certain extension and other services to communities. National and local level NGOs provide communities with funding support and management, institutional and organisational capacity building. Within each national programme, there is a central organisation or project which provides co-ordination of many CBNRM activities at national and local levels, and there are clearly identifiable partnerships between government, NGOs, communities, the private sector and donors.

An important feature of both national programmes is the diversification away from wildlife and wildlife-related tourism as income generating activities, and the focus on sustainable resource management. Although wildlife and tourism still form the basis of many of the CBNRM activities, the government, communities and other implementers have realised the interrelatedness of natural resource use and placed considerable emphasis on diversification, focusing also on veld products and forest products. This diversification is important for spreading risk in terms of income generation, but is also crucial to the ability of communities to make trade offs in their decision making on how to use their land. Because of the interrelatedness of different types of resource management and the extent to which individual projects in Botswana and Namibia combine management of different resources, this report will not investigate community-based wildlife activities alone, but will be inclusive and focus on community-based natural resource management in a broad sense.

Another important feature of CBNRM activities in Botswana and Namibia is the strength of the focus on rural development. A considerable amount of time is spent on carrying out socio-economic surveys, Participatory Rural Appraisals, developing community enterprises, facilitating community decision-making and institution building - all activities which would normally be associated with a rural development project rather than a wildlife conservation programme. Many of the CBNRM activities being carried out in Botswana and Namibia do not have traditional conservation objectives such as biodiversity conservation, or maintenance of ecosystems, as part of their goal or objectives. Indeed, the nature of the CBNRM activities in both countries begs the question whether they are in fact conservation or development programmes. It might be argued that if the primary focus were rural development, then this would lead to unsustainable use of resources as local people pursue maximum profit and benefits. Conservationists might ask why conservation authorities in the two countries are involved in a programme, which places so much emphasis on rural development at the possible expense of conservation.

To a large extent, however, the dichotomy between conservation and development in the case of CBNRM is a false one. Firstly, rural communities have always used natural

resources including wildlife to contribute to secure livelihoods and have had a number of mechanisms to regulate use of resources. Most rural African communities do not separate use from conservation.

Secondly, many of the activities in CBNRM programmes which appear to be concerned with rural development issues, are in fact focused on building local level community management institutions which can, on behalf of local people, manage natural resources sustainably. At the heart of most CBNRM activities in Botswana and Namibia is an attempt to help communities to develop institutions, which can manage common property resources successfully. Wildlife, forest products, veld foods and indeed tourism, are good examples of common property resources. In order to manage common property resources a number of conditions need to be met, which include:

- clearly defined boundaries of the area managed
- appropriate rules for exploiting the resource and for conserving it
- the people affected by the rules must be able to participate in changing them
- effective resource monitoring procedures must be in place and monitors of rules must be resource users or accountable to them
- conflict resolution mechanisms must be in place
- the right of resource users to devise their own institutions are recognised by external authorities
- resource users must have the right of exclusion of outsiders from using the resource

(adapted from IIED 1994)

Another set of important principles for common property resource management is the following:

- Effective management of natural resources is best achieved by giving the resource a focused value - to determine whether the benefit of managing a resource exceeds the cost, the resource must have a measurable value to the community
- Differential inputs must result in differential benefits - those communities living with the resource and thus bearing a higher cost should receive higher benefits than those who do not bear the cost
- There must be a positive correlation between the quality of management and the magnitude of derived benefits - an incentive for good management must reward greater investment in the resource with greater benefits

- The unit of proprietorship (i.e. who decides) should be the same as the unit of production, management and benefit - the group which manages the resource should also form the local management institution
- The unit of proprietorship should be as small as practicable - smaller social groups are better at managing themselves and the resource than large anonymous institutions

(Murphree 1993)

In Botswana and Namibia there is therefore considerable attention given to the formation of community institutions which represent a specific group of people and which have authority and responsibility over resources within defined areas. The attempt to develop institutions which, as far as possible, meet the principles of successful common property resource management is one of the most important foundations of both programmes.

Thirdly, there are strong reasons for believing that CBNRM projects with development objectives will in fact provide incentives for conservation. Murphree (1996) argues that the main objectives of projects, which seek to link conservation and development, should shift towards development rather than conservation. They should particularly focus on giving authority and responsibility over resources to local communities. Murphree does not believe that such a shift means abandoning conventional conservation objectives. "Paradoxically, however, the shift in the longer term can further conventional conservation objectives. Firstly, it provides an economic incentive to allocate appropriate land to wildlife production, thus expanding its range. Secondly (it) can create a better institutional context for 'parks-people' relationships... This is because it creates neighbours for state protected areas who have legally defined authority and responsibility, and mutual economic and managerial interests. Conflicts over priorities, boundary maintenance and cooperation in mutual interest can thus be negotiated between authorities of symmetrical status in an open and structured manner" (Murphree 1996, 10).

The focus of CBNRM activities on rural development and community 'empowerment' is an important consideration when trying to evaluate the success of these projects from a conservation perspective. Ultimately conservationists will judge them from the extent to which wild habitats and biodiversity have been maintained or improved. But before these results are reached, rural people need to be empowered to manage their resources and need to be able to reap the benefits of sustainable management. Particularly in the early stages, CBNRM projects must therefore be judged on the extent to which empowerment and the development of successful common property resource management institutions are achieved.

The terms of reference for this report required the consultant to investigate a number of key issues concerning CBNRM in Botswana and Namibia. These include: Forms of participation in wildlife management; community dynamics; institutional set up and indigenous community wildlife initiatives. It is impossible to provide any detailed data or analysis relating to these issues without having visited each individual project site to carry out a field investigation. This consultancy did not provide for field-based investigations



on this scale and thus the report does not deal with these issues at a local project level. They are dealt with rather at a national programme level.

There are in any case dangers in trying to categorise individual projects in a particular way at any given time. Community-based projects are dynamic and levels of participation and institutional relationships change over time. In the reality of field-based activities, projects do not always start with the level of full community participation desired by theory, but increased participation often develops as the project progresses, provided that outside agencies apply an adaptive management approach which is constantly aiming at promoting the fullest participation possible. Much the same is true in terms of community dynamics. It is part of the nature of many community-based projects that factions and groupings within communities gain temporary dominance of decision-making and benefit distribution at one particular time. The test of the success of the project lies more in the extent to which accountability and change is possible rather than which grouping is dominant at any given time. Many of the community-based projects in southern Africa now considered successful, might have been abandoned long ago, if strict criteria based on theory alone, concerning the level of participation, institutional relationships or community dynamics, had been applied.

Due to the nature of CBNRM activities in Botswana and Namibia, and the scope and number of activities taking place, this report will focus on the following: a brief country background covering socio-economic and environmental aspects; the policy and legal framework for CBNRM; national level activities; major implementing organisations; and short 'project profiles' detailing the location, activities, and implementing partners of individual local projects. The project profiles are followed by a section of analysis of progress, key issues, and constraints. The report concludes with a section on possible hypotheses for testing, and criteria and candidates for phase two case studies. Although the terms of reference call for policy recommendations, it is not possible to make strong recommendations, based on such a short study of the CBNRM activities, nor is it appropriate, given the 'outsider' status of the IIED investigation. Possible areas for policy recommendation can be identified from the issues raised in the analytical section.

## **2. COMMUNITY - BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN BOTSWANA**

---

### **2.1 Introduction**

As noted above there are a large number of CBNRM activities taking place in Botswana at both the national and local levels, and carried out by a number of different organisations. The Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) and its parent Ministry, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, have developed a policy framework which enables rural communities to gain user rights over wildlife and tourism on their land. In conjunction with a donor-funded team of technical assistants and local and international NGOs, the Department provides technical assistance, training, institution building and a number of other services to rural communities in the management of their wildlife and other natural resources.

At national level, the DWNP and the Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP) team, funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), provide policy direction and co-ordination with other Ministries and government agencies. The DWNP and NRMP teams provide a number of support services to NGOs and communities and individual projects at the local level. CBNRM activities have been taken up by local and international NGOs who see the income generation and community mobilisation potential of CBNRM approaches to rural development. At least 16 local community projects have been established based on generating income for local communities from sustainable natural resource management, and building appropriate community level institutions to manage these resources, manage the income generated, and represent the interests of the community in negotiations with government and the private sector.

### **2.2 Country Background**

#### **2.2.1 Socio-Economic context**

Botswana is a large land-locked country, with a total land area of 582 000 square kilometres (about the size of France). It is bordered by South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Zambia. Its population was estimated in 1991 at 1,3 million and it has an estimated population growth rate of 3,5%. With improved health facilities, declining infant mortality and increased life expectancy, official estimates are that the population will reach 2,5 million by the year 2001. More than 75% of the population lives in rural areas, but urban areas are growing at a rate of 10%. Most of the population lives in the higher rainfall and more fertile eastern part of the country. In most parts of the east, there are 30 people per square kilometre, while in places in the central and western areas there is one person per 30 square kilometres (USAID 1996).

Botswana's per capita GNP in 1993 was US \$1, 050. The country was one of the poorest in sub-Saharan Africa at independence in 1966 but largely due to the exploitation of diamonds

and other minerals such as gold, nickel, and soda ash, is now the second richest (ODA 1996). At independence, livestock, crops, hunting and gathering accounted for about 42% of GDP, but the direct and indirect contribution of the renewable natural resource sector is now estimated at about 11% of GDP and 5% of export earnings.

Although Botswana has a relatively strong economy, it has one of the biggest gaps between rich and poor in the world. In 1991 64% of the population were estimated to live below the poverty line, compared to 45% 15 years earlier. Most of the poor live in the rural areas and are highly dependent on renewable natural resources for their livelihoods. In recent years the country has been hit hard by drought, resulting in a decline of the national livestock herd by one third.

The Government of Botswana (GOB) has adopted a policy of economic diversification, and this is reflected in its National Development Plan 8 (NDP 8). The development plan places more emphasis on development based on the sustainable use of renewable natural resources such as wildlife and veld products than in the past, and views tourism as a potential 'engine of growth'.

Despite moves towards diversification, cattle remain an important part of the economy, to the extent that government policy in rural areas is geared towards favouring the livestock industry. Although 40% of farm households own no cattle and 60% of the national herd is owned by less than 10% of farm households, most Botswana depend on cattle in one way or another. This includes those who do not own any cattle (Mathuba 1992). There exists what is locally known as 'the cattle lobby', which exerts considerable influence over government policy. This lobby is made up of wealthy cattle owners and ranchers who include many politicians and civil servants.

### 2.2.2 Environmental context

Most of Botswana is classified semi-arid or arid. Mean annual rainfall ranges from 650 mm in the extreme northeast to less than 250 mm in the extreme southwest. Almost all rainfall occurs during the summer months, from October to April, and rainfall is highly variable temporally and spatially. Because of high summer temperatures, evaporation rates are high, ranging from 1,8 metres to 2,2 metres annually. In the northwest, is the large inland delta and permanent wetland of the Okavango Delta, while the central-north east consists of a large area of calcrete plains and salt pans. Most of the rest of the country, about two-thirds, is covered by deep Kalahari sands.

The Okavango delta is rich in biodiversity and is an international RAMSAR site. It provides water and food for people, livestock and wildlife, and supports a growing tourism industry. The delta is under threat from population growth, expansion of livestock, and the envious eyes of various sectors of the economy, which would like to abstract water for a variety of uses. Upstream of the delta, Namibia has plans to abstract water from the Okavango River because of its own water problems.

Water is one of the most important limiting factors for livestock, wildlife and economic growth and the GOB will increasingly be faced with trying to make a limited and variable resource meet the needs of all of these sectors.

There is evidence of increasing degradation of rangelands, and loss of wildlife and wild habitats. It is generally accepted that wildlife numbers have declined considerably over the past decade or more. The decline is attributed to a number of factors, including erection of veterinary fences, drought, poaching and over hunting, and loss of habitat to growing human and livestock populations.

In the southwestern part of the country, the districts of Kgalagadi, Ghanzi and Kwaneng, there have been dramatic declines in the populations of migratory species such as wildebeest and hartebeest. In 1979 the total wildebeest population for Kgalagadi and Ghanzi districts alone was estimated at more than 260 000 animals. The 1994 estimate for all three districts was 14 948. The 1979 population of hartebeest in Kgalagadi and Ghanzi districts was estimated at more than 270 000 animals and the estimate for 1994 in all three districts was 45, 692. The estimate for eland in 1979 in Kgalagadi and Ghanzi districts was 24 767, and the 1994 estimate for the three districts was 12 784 (Crowe 1995).

The decline in the numbers of these species is attributed to the cutting off of their seasonal breeding areas and access to dry season water sources by veterinary fences and increased human settlement.

In the north east of the country, buffalo numbers have declined significantly since 1987 when the population was estimated at 72 290. The 1994 estimate is 29 037. Zebra, another migratory species have declined from an estimated 64 808 in the north east in 1984 to an estimated 46 787 in 1994. Elephant by contrast have increased from an estimated 45 449 in the north east in 1987 to an estimated 78 304 in 1994 (Crowe 1995).

Again the decline in numbers of key species is attributed to increased human development including increased utilisation of range for livestock and veterinary fences.

Crowe (1995) concludes that in both the southwestern and northeastern parts of the country, the main wildlife areas, wildlife is increasingly becoming restricted to protected areas. At the same time, the need of seasonal movement means that protected areas are not sufficient in size and wealth of resources to maintain numbers of migratory species at present numbers, thus indicating that a further decline is likely. Crow suggests a number of actions, which could halt the decline in numbers of migratory species including the maintenance of corridors, which would again link remnant populations with their seasonal ranges. For this to happen there needs to be sufficient political will for the Government of Botswana to make major policy changes away from actions which promote and favour the livestock industry to those which support wildlife. If this change in policy is to occur, wildlife needs to be seen as a productive land use and there needs to be a constituency of rural people who believe that wildlife makes an essential contribution to their livelihoods.

## **2.3 Community-Based Natural Resource Management**

In response to environmental problems such as the decrease of natural habitat, land degradation, and decreasing wildlife numbers, several institutions and organisations in Botswana have begun to explore community-based approaches to natural resource management. These approaches have focused not only on wildlife, but also on a number of different resources, including mopane worms, marula fruit, cochineal and the grapple plant.

Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in Botswana focuses on providing incentives for communities to take responsibility for managing natural resources sustainably, and on actively building community capacity to do this. The incentives consist mainly of the right of communities to obtain from government leases to carry out hunting and tourism activities in specified areas, the right to sub lease these activities to safari operators, and the right to retain all income and other benefits derived from the hunting and tourism activities. These incentives are provided for in a number of government policies and laws, the most important of which are set out below.

### **2.3.1 Conservation policy and legislation affecting CBNRM**

#### ***Wildlife Conservation Policy***

The Botswana National Assembly approved this policy in July 1986. Its main aim is to "encourage the development of a commercial wildlife industry that is viable on a long-term basis. This will serve to create economic opportunities, jobs and incomes for the rural population in particular and the national economy in general" (GOB 1986: 1).

Specific objectives include the following:

- to realise the full potential of the wildlife resource
- To develop a commercial wildlife industry in order to create economic opportunities, jobs and incomes for the rural population and to enable more rural dwellers to enter the modern wage economy.
- To increase the supply of meat as a consequence of the further development of wildlife commercial utilisation. The increased supply of meat can be directed to commercial use or subsistence.

The policy rests on three important principles: that wildlife should contribute to rural development, that citizens should actively participate in wildlife utilisation and management, and that government should provide the necessary control of the wildlife industry.

Significantly, the policy has a section on the place of wildlife in land use planning, emphasising that wildlife must be viewed in terms of its potential contribution to the "wellbeing of the nation" as well as in terms of heritage and aesthetic values. The policy

states that "land use planning must accord the wildlife resource a position that is commensurate with its considerable potential economic significance" (GOB 1986: 1). The policy also makes it clear that use of wildlife must be sustainable and the continuity of wildlife as a resource must be ensured through protection measures where appropriate.

The policy further entrenched the system of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) which had been established under the Tribal Grazing Land Policy (TGLP) of 1975. This policy made provision for certain areas of communal land to be set aside as reserves for alternative land uses including wildlife utilisation. WMAs need to be approved by District Councils and District Land Boards before they can be officially declared in the Government Gazette. Once gazetted, regulations and a management plan should be developed for each WMA and a policy of sustained wildlife utilisation appropriate for each area should be implemented.

Wildlife utilisation plans in WMAs can include hunting, game ranching and farming, live capture, venison processing, and photographic safaris. Regulations should cover issues including the erection of buildings, grazing and keeping of livestock. The Wildlife Conservation Policy states that "existing settlements and livestock grazing will be accommodated by defining their physical extent. This will be done in consultation and agreement with the appropriate district authorities such as the council and Land Boards. These organisations will be involved in the management of the WMAs in their respective districts" (GOB 1986: 2).

The policy further states that wildlife utilisation and management should be the recognised primary form of land use in a WMA, and that other forms of land use should only be allowed if compatible with wildlife. WMAs should, however, only be established in areas marginal for livestock.

The Wildlife Conservation Policy discusses the relationship between WMAs and Controlled Hunting Areas (CHAs), emphasising that in controlled hunting areas there will be no control over other activities even if they are "detrimental to wildlife populations" The policy states that WMAs are a form of land use, but this is not the case of CHAs. Some CHAs may fall within WMAs while others might be outside.

The policy makes specific mention of the WMAs as being a tool for creating corridors which can keep open the migration routes of certain wildlife species and establishing buffer zones for protected areas, while at the same time providing economic opportunities for local people.

A number of WMAs have been established and gazetted and management plans developed. Others still need to be approved by the district authorities before they can be gazetted, and management plans developed. No regulations have yet been developed for WMAs.

### ***National Conservation Strategy***

The National Assembly adopted the National Conservation Strategy in December 1990. It provides an overall national policy on natural resources conservation and development. It covers a variety of sectors including approaches for dealing with water, rangeland, woody vegetation, veld products, industrial/urban pollution, wildlife and cultural/heritage resources.

The policy is based on the concept of sustainable development and provides an overall framework for establishing protection measures where necessary while utilising resources for the benefit of citizens. It contains a number of general references to promoting the greater involvement of rural people in conservation through education, but also incentives for managing resources sustainably.

The policy recognises the importance of maintaining a strong livestock industry, but "at the same time, in view of the overgrazing problem, it is considered that there is a strong case for diversification. This entails developing economies for resource uses additional to livestock and crop production" (GOB 1990a: 6-7).

### ***Tourism Policy***

The National Assembly approved the Botswana Tourism Policy in December 1990. Although it does not include hunting in any definition of tourism activities, the policy makes several references to hunting, particularly in its sections dealing with concessions and leases. It therefore appears to cover both wildlife viewing and hunting as part of tourism.

Among the objectives of the policy relevant for CBNRM are the following:

- to generate employment, mainly in rural areas
- to raise incomes in rural areas in order to reduce urban drift
- generally to promote rural development and to stimulate the provision of other services in remote areas of the country

In addition, the policy document states that the tourism policy will be designed "to provide local communities with direct and indirect benefits from tourism activities: it is only by doing so that the policy will encourage these communities to appreciate the value of wildlife and its conservation and the growing opportunities in rural areas for participation in wildlife-based industries, including tourism" (GOB 1990b: 4).

The policy states that tourist activities should also be carried out on an ecologically sustainable basis.

A number of provisions concerning concession leases are important for CBNRM activities. The policy makes provision for lessees of concessions to transfer, cede or sub-lease, subject to the approval of the lessor, which on tribal land is the Tribal Land Board. Further, the rights conferred on the lessee are exclusive except where local people or others have traditional or legal rights to use the land. Mobile safari operators and other tourism operators are not allowed to use the leased land except with the written agreement of the lessee.

The policy states that each concession should be advertised and the lessor should evaluate the applications according to a set of guidelines. The lessees are required to submit operating and development plans with their applications.

### ***Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act, 1992***

The Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act, 1992 (Act 28 of 1992) is the principal piece of legislation governing the protection and sustainable utilisation of wildlife, as well as making provision for protected areas.

Part III provides for the establishment of Wildlife Management Areas and Controlled Hunting Areas. The President may declare WMAs in the Government Gazette. The Minister may make regulations for WMAs concerning hunting and capture of wildlife by licence or permit, the erection of buildings and the size of settlements, the grazing of stock and conditions or limitations concerning the husbandry of stock, the cultivation of land, conditions governing the drilling and allocation of boreholes, and the culling of animals in accordance with an approved game utilisation plan.

CHAs do not need to be declared by the President, but by the Minister. They also have to be declared in the Government Gazette. No hunting or capture of game, except for certain designated purposes, may take place in a CHA without a licence, and without paying a licence fee. The Minister may direct that fees be paid to district councils.

The Act gives recognition in Section 53 to the role of tribal Land Boards in certain decisions concerning wildlife use. It states that where authority or permission of the owner or occupier of land is required for the carrying out of certain acts concerning wildlife, on tribal land this permission must be given by the Tribal Land Board.

Section 20 of the Act defines those persons who qualify for "landholder's privileges". This definition covers owners of private land and occupiers of land held under lease from the State or a Land Board for purposes other than hunting.

Landholder's privileges include the right to hunt a limited number of certain species without a licence or permit, and the right to let another person pay for hunting the landholder's quota. The Act does not define a Land Board as a landholder, although this seems to be implied in Section 53. A community holding a commercial lease from the Land Board could be regarded as a landholder under the Act if the lease was not for hunting purposes.

### ***SAVINGRAM directive***

An important document setting out the government's approach to giving rights over wildlife quotas and tourism and hunting concessions to communities is contained in a joint directive from the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing, dated 20th November, 1995. This document is titled "SAVINGRAM, Community tourism and hunting development activities". It sets out the minimum conditions that communities need to meet before they can be awarded a community wildlife offtake quota from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks or a resource use lease for any tourism or hunting development activity from a Land Board. If the community establishes a representative legal entity it can gain the quota or lease itself, but if it has not formed a legal representative entity, the community may, in terms of this directive, request that the quota or lease be given to an approved commercial partner after going through a tender process.



The conditions are as follows:

1. The community must have a representative and accountable management group or entity.
2. The community must demonstrate, where such exist, that the needs of Special Game Licence holders are being met in a way acceptable to the holders of such licences once a single and undifferentiated wildlife offtake quota is granted.
3. The District authorities must have observed and sanctioned the process by which a representative and accountable management group or entity has been developed or established.
4. The Joint Venture Guidelines published by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks are binding on those Districts that have adopted them in formal Land Board and Council Sessions, and particular attention must be paid to ensure that tendering procedures are followed to ensure compliance with the Tourism Policy (1990).
5. Land Boards may grant leases effective for 15 years based on three renewable 5 year periods to communities able to satisfy the above conditions, and which have formed appropriate legal entities for the management of their natural resources. Such leases shall contain a condition that a community wishing to enter into sub-leases with tourism operators shall grant these for one year at a time only where the grant is made during the first two years and for three years where made in the third year. Thereafter sub-leases may coincide with the periods of the head lease<sup>1</sup>. Where a community has not formed an appropriate legal entity for the management of its natural resources Land Boards may grant annually renewable resource leases to approved commercial partners identified as such by a community, provided that the community has satisfied the above conditions, until such time as the community forms an appropriate legal entity.
6. All activities proposed by communities, whether in conjunction with an approved partner or otherwise, must be in conformity with the prevailing Land Use Plan.
7. Where a community resides in a Wildlife Management Area the proposed activity must be in conformity with the published recommendations of the management plan, where such exists.

(GOB 1995)

The SAVINGRAM document states that these conditions have been established in support of the principles outlined in the Wildlife Conservation Policy (1986), the Tourism Policy (1990) and the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks <sup>1</sup>Act (1992). It is addressed to District, District Council and Land Board officials and Tribal Authorities.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original lease from the Land Board to the community.

### ***Joint Venture Guidelines***

Although not incorporated into legislation, the Joint Venture Guidelines of the DWNP form an important part of Botswana's policy on CBNRM, and as indicated above are deemed to be binding on Districts that have adopted them in formal district meetings. The main purpose of the guidelines is to provide a guide for communities to develop natural resource based business ventures with the private sector.

The guidelines explain that certain Controlled Hunting Areas have been designated for community utilisation so that "the wildlife and other natural resources occurring in a community utilisation CHA are to be sustainably used and managed by, and for the benefit of the resident community" (DWNP undated: ii).

The guidelines set out the roles that the community, private sector, DWNP, and Local Government bodies play in wildlife and tourism management at the local level:

#### *The community*

The role of the communities is to gain the wildlife utilisation quota from the DWNP after forming a legal management body. Thereafter they can look for an outside partner to "introduce, market and manage the different business enterprises they identify for their areas" (DWNP undated: 2). The community is also able to identify enterprises, which it wants to run itself, without private sector involvement. Communities select a private sector partner through a Review Committee, which is advised by a Technical Committee consisting of members of the District Rural Development Committee.

#### *Private sector*

The private sector is "expected to develop and manage each business as a joint venture with the community, and over time, train members of the community to manage parts of the venture and to develop their own ancillary enterprises" (DWNP undated: 3).

#### *DWNP*

According to the guidelines, the DWNP will act as a facilitator for the development of joint venture arrangements by helping to organise the consultation process and provide extension services to communities and the private sector on wildlife management. The DWNP also sits on the technical committee set up to assist communities evaluate joint venture proposals.

#### *District Development Committee*

The District Development Committee, along with the Tribal Land Board has to "endorse the joint venture concept as a viable means of supporting rural development whilst sustaining a community area's resource base. Once this decision has been taken, they should develop procedures to inform and consult rural people in each Community CHA" (DWNP undated, 4). The Development Committee is also assigned the role of ensuring that the community is briefed on possible joint venture options and develops a vision of what it wants from its private sector partners.

*District Councils*

The District Councils register the details of each potential joint venture partner and inform the private sector of each community's joint venture objectives. The Councils also manage private sector registration fees, which should be used to cover the costs of the review committee set up by the community to decide on its joint venture partner.

*Tribal Land Board*

The Tribal Land Board ensures that communities are informed of their land rights and allocates land to the community for hunting and tourism under a head lease. Land Boards are expected to allocate land only when they are satisfied that proposals are viable and that the community has consulted the appropriate technical authorities.

The Joint Venture Guidelines recommend the following procedure for selection of a joint venture partner:

- a) Members of the District Development Committee, Land Board and the DWNP explain the community CHA system, the opportunities for managing and benefiting from wildlife and other natural resources, and the procedures for the community to lease the area and sub-let to a safari operator. The community should be asked which resources they want to manage and what enterprises they want to develop.
- b) The community should be introduced to the idea of joint ventures, the advantages and disadvantages of such agreements.
- c) The community should choose its own joint venture objectives.
- d) The community should agree that taking on a private sector partner is in its best interests.
- e) The District Development Committee and DWNP should then explain the community's role in selecting a joint venture partner.
- f) The community form its Review Committee to consider proposals.
- g) The Technical Committee reviews the technical aspects of written joint venture proposals and makes recommendations to the community's Review Committee.
- h) The community Review Committee ranks each proposal by merit.
- i) The operators who have submitted proposals are interviewed by the Review Committee to explain their proposals and answer any questions.
- j) The Review Committee shortlists three prospective partners.
- k) With the support of the Technical Committee, District Development Committee members, District Council members and Land Board Representatives, the Review Committee presents the shortlisted proposals to the community. The community discusses the proposals.

- 1) Representatives of each shortlisted operator will then explain their proposals to the community, which then reaches a consensus or votes on the proposals. The guidelines make provision for communities who wish to take more time to discuss their final selection rather than deciding immediately after the presentations by the operators.

The Joint Venture Guidelines list a number of possible uses of both wildlife and other resources by joint ventures:

- **Consumptive Uses of Wildlife:** Safari hunting; citizen and resident hunting; game harvesting; game farming; intensive breeding of crocodile and ostrich; live capture and sale of game; processing of wildlife products.
- **Non-consumptive Uses of Wildlife:** Game viewing; mekoro (dug out canoe), boat, and pack animal safaris; protection and/or reintroduction of wildlife; breeding of endangered species.
- **Consumptive Uses of Other Resources:** Forestry; veld products for building, processing, sale; raw materials for handicraft production.
- **Non-consumptive Uses of Other Resources:** Photographic, cultural and adventure tourism (ecotourism).

### 2.3.2 Land policy and legislation affecting CBNRM

There are three basic land tenure systems in Botswana: Tribal (customary or communal land), State land and Freehold land.

Tribal land constitutes about 71% of the total land area of Botswana. Those who have been allocated land do not own it but have usufruct rights. Landholders have exclusive rights of use for residential, agricultural, commercial and industrial plots, which can be fenced. Communal grazing land and land not yet allocated is used collectively.

The main characteristics of tribal land are:

- Customary land rights are perpetual
- Land rights are inheritable
- Access to land is easy because there are no fees
- Tenure is secure
- Customary land is not a commodity

(Mathuba 1992)

#### ***Tribal Grazing Land Policy***

In 1975 the Government of Botswana introduced the Tribal Grazing Land Policy (TGLP), which aimed at controlling grazing lands and improving management and productivity, while safeguarding the interests of those who owned few or no cattle.

One of the results of the reform process under TGLP was the zoning of communal land into commercial farming areas, communal and reserved areas. The reserved areas would be set aside for the future as a safeguard for the poorest members of the population and for alternative uses such as wildlife (Mathuba 1992). These reserved areas for wildlife formed the basis of the Wildlife Management Areas.

### ***Tribal Land Act***

Introduced in 1968, the Tribal Land Act makes provision for the creation of Tribal Land Boards to take care of the allocation and administration of land. The Land Boards carry out their functions in terms of the customary land tenure system, common law and the national land policy. One of the most important aspects of the Act was the introduction of common law leases which meant land could be made available to individuals or groups for certain commercial purposes, including cattle ranching, wildlife utilisation and tourism. The lease outlines the rights and obligations of both the lessor (the Land Board) and the lessee (landholders).

Land Boards are composed of 12 members (subordinate Land Boards have 10 members) some of whom are elected at a meeting of the Kgotla (tribal court), while the Minister of Local Government, Lands and Housing nominates others. Each board has two ex officio members representing the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Commerce and Industry (the ministry responsible for wildlife and tourism).

### ***Policy on Controlled Hunting Areas***

Government approaches towards Controlled Hunting Areas form one of the key enabling policies for CBNRM activities related to wildlife and tourism in Botswana. It is through this policy that certain CHAs are zoned for community use. This zoning then guides the Land Boards in awarding head leases to communities instead of directly to the private sector. The policy approach is set out in a briefing document of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife, titled "Update on Controlled Hunting Areas and their Tendering" (DWNP 1997). According to this briefing note, in 1989 the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing began the rezoning of CHAs with the assistance of the District Land Use Planning Units and the DWNP. All CHAs were zoned for a particular form of resource management:

- Commercial multipurpose areas
  - Commercial photographic areas
  - Community managed wildlife utilisation in Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs)
  - Community photographic areas in WMAs
  - Community managed wildlife utilisation in livestock areas
  - Other CHAs
- (DWNP 1997)

According to the briefing note, the underlying assumption is that if one entity, company or community organisation, is responsible for the resource management in community and commercially managed CHAs, and has security of tenure through 15 year leases of resource management rights, this will result in better management and conservation of the resources.

"Another result will be the increase of the financial returns and other benefits from those areas, not only for the stakeholders involved in that management, but also the region and indeed the country as a whole" (DWNP 1997: 1).

The document further states that: "In particular, the introduction of community management of natural resources, and the allocation of the resulting benefits to those communities, is expected to increase people's appreciation of those natural resources and their perception of the use and value of such resources. Making the intended beneficiaries (rural communities) the managers of the resource, and the distribution of the benefits, is the instrument to ensure that wildlife and other natural resources do indeed become the engines of growth for the rural areas and provide the necessary diversification of rural incomes" (DWNP1997, 1).

As of February 1997, 27 CHAs were zoned for community managed wildlife utilisation, four CHAs were zoned as community photographic areas, two CHAs have had their zoning changed from commercial photographic to community photographic and there are nine CHAs zoned for community managed wildlife utilisation in livestock areas.

### 2.3.3 National level institutions and activities

#### *The Department of Wildlife and National Parks*

The Botswana Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) are the primary Government agency responsible for wildlife conservation and utilisation, and protected areas. It administers the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992. The DWNP falls under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and is run by a Director.

Through existing legislation and policy, the DWNP helps to ensure that there is a favourable enabling environment for CBNRM activities to take place. The Department houses the USAID-funded Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) which co-ordinates most CBNRM activities in Botswana and provides support to other organisations. The activities of the NRMP are detailed below.

The DWNP has suffered in the past from a shortage of funds and expertise and this is one of the reasons why the NRMP was set up with expatriate staff. The Department is committed to the CBNRM approach and gives full backing at the policy level. It is currently reorganising its staffing structure to include posts dedicated to CBNRM activities so that the Department can carry out functions currently carried out by the NRMP (Modise, pers. comm). The DWNP has already established a Community Extension Unit, which has led to a change of image for the department. "As opposed to being seen as only policemen, DWNP personnel are beginning to be seen as partners in the development of community-based enterprises and in controlling problem animals" (USAID 1996: 14). Department has appointed its own sociologist and plans to appoint resource economists, planners and liaison officers to work with communities in the field.

### ***The NRMP***

The Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) is the largest Community-based Wildlife Project in Botswana. Although it does not call itself a National Programme, it has most of the attributes of one rather than a project. It is housed within the government agency responsible for wildlife management and conservation, the Department of Wildlife and National Parks. The NRMP works at national level to mobilise communities to take up opportunities provided by government policy and legislation to use and benefit from wildlife and other natural resources. It assists communities to form appropriate institutions for managing wildlife quotas, and handling and distributing income derived from wildlife use. It provides technical assistance to communities on resource monitoring and on problem animal control, provides information on the value of wildlife as a resource, both to communities and to government, and it provides communities with advice on how to enter into joint ventures with the private sector.

At the same time, the project is involved in policy review and formulation and the drafting of new regulations for government, which will further entrench community rights over wildlife and other resources, and provide greater security of these rights. The project supports the activities of a number of NGOs and assists in building the capacity of Botswana NGOs to carry out community-based natural resource management activities. The NRMP is thus instrumental in further developing the policy and legislative framework within which CBNRM activities can take place and is working in parallel at the community level to establish locally based pilot projects. The programme is national in scope covering the whole country and is not limited to geographic target areas. It promotes the sustainable use of a number of resources apart from wildlife.

The NRMP is a project of the Government of Botswana, funded by the government and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The government contribution is US \$5 500 000 and the USAID contribution is US \$19 900 000 over a period from August 29, 1989 to August 31, 1997. The total funding level is thus US \$25 400 000 over eight years. There is the possibility that the project will be extended for another two years to August 1999. The project is part of a regional USAID-funded Natural Resources Management Project which supports sustainable natural resource management and community-based conservation activities within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region.

The NRMP has the following goal, purpose and objectives (USAID 1996):

**Goal:** Increase incomes and enhance capability to meet basic human needs through sustainable utilisation and conservation of natural resources, particularly wildlife.

**Subgoal:** Promote sustainable development of communities on lands that are marginally suitable for agriculture.

**Purposes:**

1. To demonstrate, through practical examples, the technical, social, economic, and ecological viability and replicability of community-based natural resources management

and utilisation programmes on marginal lands for increasing household and community income while sustaining natural resources.

2. To improve national and local capability to halt the decline in the wildlife resources base through training, education, protection, communication and technology transfer.

**Objectives:**

- 1) To demonstrate that sustainable natural resources utilisation is a profitable and viable development option for rural communities.
- 2) To increase local employment and incomes through diversifying employment opportunities in the sustainable utilisation of natural resources.
- 3) To strengthen local institutional decision-making and management units so as to empower them to become self-sufficient managers of their local resources.
- 4) To improve the participation and role of women in resources management programmes, thereby improving their incomes.
- 5) To strengthen staff training and career development for employees of the Department of Wildlife and National Parks.

The NRMP consists of six sets of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives (USAID 1996):

- A. Demonstration projects in community based wildlife utilisation predicated on defining the resource base as a community asset. Community-based projects are based on wildlife utilisation through tourism, hunting, processing and marketing of animal products, and the sustainable utilisation of veld and forest products.
- B. Planning and applied research to support the development of management plans for the northern national parks and reserves, and for the national network of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). The impact of project activities is also monitored under this component.
- C. Environmental Education activities to increase public awareness of environmental issues through curriculum development, teacher training, and non-formal education.
- D. Personnel planning and training activities to strengthen DWNP's institutional capacity. Outputs focus on establishing a Human Resource Development Unit and an effective training programme at the Botswana Wildlife Training Institute (BWTI).
- E. NGO and CBO support activities to develop their capacity so that communities themselves may implement CBNRM.
- F. Policy support to Government aimed at contributing to the enabling environment within the Botswana legal and regulatory structure affecting CBNRM.



In 1993 a mid-term evaluation was conducted for the NRMP, which led to the inclusion of an additional component in support of NGOs, with the following objectives:

1. Capacity building for non-governmental organisations to empower communities to manage their natural resources in a sustainable manner.
2. Development of a grant mechanism to support community-based natural resource management/utilisation projects.

The project is implemented jointly by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks and the NRMP Project Team. The team is led by the United States-based consulting firm, Chemonics, which supplies the Chief of Party or team leader. The other partners, Domestic Technology International and Conservation International (both US-based organisations) supply a number of other personnel.

The project has gone through several of changes since its inception, largely due to incorrect assumptions made during the design stage. These incorrect assumptions were that:

- CBNRM had been developed, tested and was ready for widespread demonstration
- Wildlife numbers were adequate to permit community subsistence utilisation on a sustainable basis
- There were sufficient NGOs within Botswana who were willing and able to work with communities and the project to start CBNRM initiatives.
- The process could take place within a five-seven year period.

The mid-term review carried out in 1993, concluded that when the project began, CBNRM had not been tested, wildlife numbers in most cases were not sufficient for subsistence harvesting even on a cost-recovery basis, and the existing NGOs had interests outside CBNRM and were not ready to take on major CBNRM activities (USAID 1996). The project also realised that its environmental education programme was not fully integrated with the rest of project activities and needed revising. The focus on formal environmental education and curriculum development in schools was not meeting any real CBNRM need and has now been changed to a 'conservation education approach'. The new conservation education activities are based on developing an awareness and understanding of CBNRM by decision-makers at national, district and community level (Winer, pers comm. 1997.).

It was also thought at the start of the project that it would be possible to build the capacity of one NGO which could be groomed to take over the activities of and house the NRMP. This has also turned out not to have been the case and the institutional home for the continuation of a number of project activities still remains an open question (Walz, pers. comm. 1997).

The NRMP is staffed by an expatriate team consisting of the following: Chief of Party; Administration Specialist, Human Resource Development Advisor; BWTI Advisor; BWTI

Instructor; Nonformal/Conservation Education Advisor; Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist; Sociologist; Senior Extension Officer; Resource Economist.

The NRMP as noted above, is involved in a wide variety of activities, spread across the country and across a number of individual projects. In some of these projects, the NRMP, working with the DWNP, has been the lead external agency working with a local community. In other instances the NRMP has assisted NGOs and communities by providing technical input in the form of assessment of resource utilisation potential and markets, sub-grants (through the IRCE component) and a number of other support activities. The following are the main national level activities of the NRMP:

*Policy development*

a) Community utilisation policy review

A number laws and policy documents contain statements of overall intent to enable rural people to benefit from wildlife management and be more involved in conservation. But there is no overall policy document for CBNRM in Botswana. Since 1991, the NRMP and the DWNP have used a number of existing policy and legal mechanisms to enable the development of legal, accountable, and representative community-based institutions with the rights to use and benefit from wildlife, wildlife-based tourism and other resources. The NRMP and DWNP have now identified the need to review the existing policy and legal documents and bring together the relevant sections to provide a single coherent CBNRM policy statement. A consultant has been employed to carry out this work and to prepare a paper for review by the Botswana Government during the first half of 1997.

b) Institutional reform for wildlife management

A conference of NGOs, government and private sector delegates met in 1995 near Gaborone to debate the status of wildlife in Botswana, and concluded that no single existing institution would be able to halt the severe decline in wildlife numbers. A group of NGOs formed a Task Force to approach the President of Botswana to ensure that concerns expressed at the meeting would be heard at the highest level.

The NRMP was asked to fund two consultants, a wildlife expert and a lawyer to make recommendations outlining technically and legally the institutional options for wildlife management in Botswana. The consultants' report has been presented to the President of Botswana, whose response is being awaited.

*Parks and WMA Planning*

The NRMP originally envisaged the development of management plans for the four northern parks (Chobe, Moremi, Makgadikgadi and Nxai Pans) and for twelve WMAs.

The project has completed the park plans and the park planning activities have been taken up by an European Union-funded project which employs two expatriate consultants, one to develop plans for the northern parks and the other to work on the southern parks.

The original aim of developing park management plans under the NRMP was to develop new approaches to park management which would focus on developing better relations with neighbours through improved communication and liaison and through activities such as sharing resources. It was recognised that protected areas could provide a number of development opportunities for neighbouring communities.

According to Winer (pers. comm. 1997), the park management planning process has suffered a number of problems and did not progress as well as expected. He believes it was not necessarily appropriate to begin the park planning process before being able to learn a number of lessons from the CBNRM approach being adopted outside protected areas. There was no clear vision at the start of the process as to what it should produce, and the practical results of CBNRM and the skills and experiences of staff which were developed, could not feed into the development of new approaches for park managers.

Winer also believes that the park planning process could have benefited from being more consultative and adaptive: "We need to revise the concept of management plans and instead of bulky documents with rigid prescriptions we should be developing a guide to good practice for the field person"

Furthermore, the planning activity suffered from a lack of clear links between the planning and implementation process which resulted in plans being developed without adequate knowledge of the implementation constraints (NRMP 1997).

Eight of the 12 WMA plans have been completed, one of which was produced by an independent consultant paid for with District funding. The State land WMAs will become hunting safari concession areas and the tender's have to produce their own management plans as part of the selection process. Two of the Districts have not yet requested management plans to be drawn up.

The planning officer in DWNP supported by the Dutch Development Organisation (SNV) is working with a policy consultant on developing regulations for the WMA's which can enforce the principle that wildlife utilisation is the priority form of land use in WMAs and strengthen community management rights.

#### *Personnel planning and training*

The development of the CBNRM approach as a national programme in Botswana requires that the personnel of the DWNP, both at national and field level, understand the philosophy behind the approach and are equipped to implement policy. CBNRM needs to be institutionalised so that it is seen as a mainstream DWNP activity. In order to achieve such an institutionalisation of the approach, staff needed to receive information and training. Furthermore, in order to implement the approach, the DWNP needs a core of well-trained, motivated personnel who can meet the needs of working with local communities, and who can efficiently deal with the administrative procedures such as quota setting, issuing of licences etc. which enable the system to work.

In 1991 the NRMP carried out an assessment of the Botswana Wildlife Training Institute (BWTI), the organisation which provides training for wildlife managers. The DWNP accepted the recommendations, which came from the assessment, and a new component was

added to the NRMP, which aimed at improving human resources development within the department and reorganising and strengthening the BWTI.

A number of activities have now been completed to strengthen human resources development within the DWNP:

- The current staff status has been reviewed in order to improve the understanding of how staff are deployed and where key vacancies still exist. A report was produced on the overall manpower needs of the Department
- A training needs analysis has been completed.
- The DWNP's personnel records have been computerised and new draft job descriptions completed.
- The department will establish a Human Resources Development Unit to support the new emphasis on personnel development.
- A recruitment standard has been set, requiring applicants to pass an interview and an Induction and Basic Training course at BWTI.

The DWNP has sent a number of staff on a variety of diploma, graduate, and post-graduate courses. Various other courses, including PRA have been provided. Seminars have been held for improving the supervisory capacity of middle managers. Training has been provided to the Community Escort Guides in the Chobe, Seronga and Sankuyo areas. The guides accompany all hunters to monitor hunting activities and wildlife movements.

Progress within the BWTI has included the following:

- Development of a new modular curriculum for the Certificate in Wildlife Management
- Development of a specialised stand alone module on Problem Animal Control (PAC) and the production of a field officer's manual on PAC for graduates of the PAC module
- 128 officers have gone through the Induction and Basic Training course
- The Institute has been refurbished, additional houses and offices constructed and teaching facilities and equipment upgraded.

An important contribution of the combined HRD and BWTI support is to create an increasing trend towards a transition of responsibilities from NRMP advisors to DWNP personnel. This shift is crucial for sustainability of the Botswana national CBNRM programme (USAID 1996).

#### *Community Action Plans and Participatory Rural Appraisal.*

The NRMP developed the use of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) as a tool for communities to develop their own action plans at the village level. The process started in the

Chobe Enclave (see project profile below) where three of the five villages making up the Chobe Enclave Community Trust developed their own action plans following PRAs carried out in 1994. The two remaining villages have requested that they go through the same process.

A modified format for PRA was employed in other areas, focusing more on natural resource management and institutional strengthening issues rather than the broad scope of issues normally uncovered by PRA methodologies. The modified format was first used at Sankuyo village (see project profile below), leading to detailed natural resource management plans and a community action plan. These led to the formation of a management trust, the acquisition of resource management rights and sub-lease arrangements for hunting and photographic safaris.

Twelve DWNP officers have been trained in PRA facilitation and four CBO representatives have been sent for PRA training in Kenya.

The Ministry of Finance has expressed interest in the PRA process developed by the NRMP as a means to use extension as a vehicle for incorporating village level input within the District and National level development planning process.

The project has worked to help a local organisation, the Botswana Orientation Centre create a Participatory Planning and Training Unit, in order to broaden the base of PRA expertise within the country and available to CBNRM communities. High turnover of personnel has weakened the centre's ability to provide the training expected of it.

#### *Environmental/Conservation education*

As noted above, the NRMP initially included an environmental education component, which has now changed emphasis and focus towards building awareness and understanding of CBNRM among key target groups with the aim of strategically supporting the activities of community organisations involved in CBNRM.

##### a) Environmental Education (EE):

Needs assessments were completed for all school levels in the formal education sector and for the non-formal sector. These assessments were provided to the Ministry of Education and other relevant organisations.

A number of teacher education workshops were held and the Ministry of Education set up a plan for in-service EE workshops for all teacher trainers and education officers. Teacher training colleges are continuing to carry out curriculum reviews in order to incorporate EE into curricula at various levels.

A teacher's resource handbook for Environmental Education was due to be published in early 1997 and a set of EE videos for teachers has been produced.

The NRMP funded a major national EE planning conference in 1991. The recommendations from the conference provided the foundation for the EE development plans in the Ministry of Education.

The project's environmental education advisor completed his contract in 1995. A number of consultancies were designed to support the Ministry of Education up to August 1997, but the Ministry has not taken advantage of these.

#### b) Conservation Education

The NRMP has worked with the Conservation Education Division of the DWNP and a private company to produce materials that DWNP staff can use at meetings with communities and District authorities. The materials include large-scale colour posters supplemented by a series of booklets, which explain wildlife quotas, Controlled Hunting Areas and Wildlife Management Areas. Nearly 60 DWNP officers have been trained in the use of these materials. NRMP has provided an advisor to the Conservation Education Division of the Department "in order to improve the department's capacity to reach a national audience with materials that will increase understanding of the department's policies and practices" (NRMP 1997: 7). A number of workshops have been held for NGO workers and community members on the DWNP's policy towards CBNRM.

The conservation education strategy has focused on awareness building and knowledge of policies first for DWNP staff followed by workshops with district leaders, teachers and NGO and CBO representatives.

The NRMP final evaluation report concludes that the conservation education component has been very successful, but requires more human and financial resources from DWNP to meet the demands being made upon the conservation education unit (USAID 1996).

#### *Monitoring and Evaluation*

The NRMP is working with DWNP to establish a socio-economic monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, which can be used as "a planning and diagnostic tool that DWNP can use to implement policies, programmes and projects consistent with CBNRM. The monitoring and evaluation system ... looks at how changes in the terms and conditions of resource access leads to changes in the patterns of resource use. It does this by monitoring changes in the organisation of productive activities, which reflects the conditions under which people have access to resources. The most basic level at which these changes are manifested is in the areas of gender, ethnicity and social class. Focusing on them allows the impacts of CBNRM to be assessed and compared in diverse socio economic and biophysical settings" (NRMP 1997).

Baseline socio economic studies have been completed in the village of Zutshwa, the Chobe Enclave and Sankuyo village.

Data collected includes:

- Data from other government agencies (e.g. the Central Statistics Office) and international donors (e.g. SNV).

- Qualitative and quantitative data gathered in villages where CBNRM is being implemented, using a combination of rapid assessment and Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques.
- Data collected through topical studies focusing on specific problems confronting wildlife management.
- Survey data collected from either a descriptive or probabilistic sample in selected areas at the outset of implementing CBNRM, and at intervals to be determined during and after implementation.

(NRMP 1997)

The DWNP has appointed a sociologist responsible for monitoring and evaluation. According to the NRMP final evaluation report, as the sociologist is only one person and relatively junior "DWNP does not yet have the capacity to respond to the need for socio-economic data collection and analysis that will accompany the snowballing of CBNRM projects throughout Botswana" (USAID 1996). The report concluded that the sustainability of the M&E system within DWNP would depend on the extent to which the department is able to increase the staffing of its sociology office.

The local level activities of the NRMP are described in the profiles of individual projects below.

### ***Institutional Reinforcement for Community Empowerment***

Institutional Reinforcement for Community Empowerment (IRCE) is a component of the Natural Resources Management Project. It is implemented by the US-based Private Voluntary Organisation (PVO), PACT, under a separate co-operative agreement with USAID. It was set up specifically to address the lack of NGO capacity in Botswana, to provide national level support to CBNRM and to develop the capability of NGOs to support communities in developing representative legal institutions for natural resource management.

IRCE has the following objectives:

- The empowerment of communities, through local NGO assistance, to manage their natural resources in a sustainable manner.
- To assist in NGO capacity building: to develop and carry out strategies for institutional capacity building so that by the end of the NRMP a number of PVOs and NGOs with nation-wide representation will be institutionally and technically competent to deliver and monitor services to communities as part of integrated natural resources utilisation and development strategies.
- To establish a grants making facility: to develop a flexible mechanism for making grants to implement community-based natural resource management activities, wildlife and veld product utilisation which directly complement on-going NRMP activities.

Two important specific objectives of the IRCE component are the development of a network of community-based organisations (CBOs) involved in natural resources management and the development of an umbrella NGO organisation which brings together those NGOs active in the CBNRM field.

The CBO network is aimed at facilitating information exchange between members and at carrying out advocacy on behalf of members. A workshop was held during mid March 1997 for members of CBOs to discuss how they wanted the network to function. Three sub committees were formed to cover marketing, legal issues such as sub leases with safari operators, and the structure of the network.

IRCE has developed a monitoring and evaluation tool for use by CBOs, called the Organisational Capacity Manual, which helps the CBOs measure progress against certain criteria.

The contribution of IRCE to local projects is provided in the local project profiles below.

### ***Thusano Lefatsheng***

Thusano Lefatsheng is a Botswana rural development NGO that works on agricultural research, extension and marketing. It has a particular focus on the sustainable use of veld products. Thusano carries out research into the potential use and marketing of products and purchases products such as grapple plant. It assists communities in institution building for resource management and assists communities to develop wildlife utilisation projects.

During 1994, the organisation went through a phase of community consultation, holding 38 community meetings around Botswana to discover how best it could serve local people. Communities requested Thusano Lefatsheng to work with them on developing community-based natural resource management projects, and as a result the organisation requested funding from the NRMP, which has been provided through sub-grants from IRCE.

The activities of Thusano Lefatsheng in local projects are described in the project profiles below.

### ***Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV)***

The Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV) is a Dutch Government funded organisation, which has been working on rural development in Botswana since the early 1970s. It has traditionally been a volunteer organisation, providing the Botswana Government with expert expatriate staff, particularly in the field of Land Use Planning at district level. During the late 1980s the organisation changed to a more process oriented approach based on providing support

To specific target groups in rural areas. SNV works particularly with Basarwa (San) people and poor rural women.

During 1994, SNV developed a new 5-year plan for its activities and decided to use community-based natural resource management as a focal set of activities for achieving its aims of mobilising communities. SNV now places personnel in the field to work in



conjunction with local NGOs and CBOs. It does not receive funds from the NRMP, but has a good working relationship. NRMP provides technical advice and backstopping to projects that SNV is involved in. SNV is assisting the DWNP to set up a land use planning unit and has provided the Department of Wildlife and National Parks with a planning officer who works on plans and utilisation issues for Wildlife Management Areas. This planning officer has a DWNP counterpart and works in close co-operation with NRMP staff. SNV plans to provide technical advisors to work with regional land use planning staff in DWNP whom are yet to be appointed. The aim is to develop the capacity of the DWNP to plan, develop, administer and manage the WMAs, and to assist local communities through planning and co-ordination to gain access to wildlife resources for sustainable utilisation.

SNV's activities in support of communities at the local level are described in the project profiles below.

#### 2.3.4 Local level CBNRM projects

The following section provides short project profiles for a number of CBNRM activities in different parts of Botswana. Typically several organisations are involved in these projects, although a specific institution might have the lead role in working with a community, with support and backstopping provided by others.

##### *The Chobe Enclave*

**Location:** An enclave of land on the northwestern edge of Chobe National Park between the park and the Chobe River, which forms the border with Namibia.

**Activities:** This is the first site at which the NRMP in conjunction with the DWNP tried to develop a community wildlife utilisation project based on decentralisation of management authority from government to the community. A Community Trust, the Chobe Enclave Community Trust (CECT), has been established composed of representatives of five villages, totalling about 5 000 people. Each village has its own trust committee. The CECT manages annually issued wildlife quotas which it receives from the DWNP. The Trust has a 'head lease' from the Tribal Land Board for carrying out wildlife and tourism activities within the area of land covered by the Trust. The Trust then sub-leases the wildlife and tourism utilisation rights to private operators. The mechanism used in the Chobe enclave for devolving rights to communities and the institutional arrangements pioneered there, have formed the model for implementing community-based natural resource management elsewhere in Botswana. The community only decided to form the Trust after at least two years of discussions and negotiations with the DWNP and NRMP personnel, who had to work hard to break down the hostility and suspicion of the community. This hostility and suspicion came from the problems people suffered from wildlife, particularly lions and elephants from the Chobe National Park and a poor relationship with park staff.

Income to the CECT has risen from P27 000 in 1993 to P332 000 in 1996.

The five villages have now developed a proposal to jointly manage salvageable timber from previous harvesting operations along the same basis as it manages its wildlife quota. The CECT is also developing a campsite for tourists.

IRCE provided a US \$235 000 grant to the Chobe Enclave Community Trust in 1995 over a two-year period. Part of the grant was for infrastructure and equipment such as an office for the Trust and a vehicle, part supports the salary of a community development advisor employed by the Trust, and part was for training and capacity building.

Thusano Lefatsheng is facilitating a crafts project, which has organised 300 women as craft producers in the village of Kachikau. The project aims to promote income generation, to assist the producers with quality control and marketing. and encourage children and the youth to acquire traditional handicraft skills.

### ***Sankuyo Village***

**Location:** Ngamiland east, adjacent to the Moremi Game Reserve.

**Activities:** This was the second area in which the NRMP assisted communities to set up a registered trust. The Sankuyo Tshwaragano Management Trust was established to manage wildlife and tourism on behalf of about 350 villagers. They have joint venture partnerships with the private sector for photographic as well as hunting safaris. Several trust members are being trained to develop their capacity to manage their resources. More than 20 residents are employed in the joint ventures and up to 30 others are employed on bird shooting safaris. The community is planning their own photographic safari operation and a tannery. In 1996, Sankuyo community earned P285 000 from their wildlife and tourism activities and in 1997 they expect to earn about P345 000.

A US \$80 000 grant was given to the Management Trust by IRCE for capacity building, including the employment by the trust of technical consultants and small business development including a community-run campsite for tourists.

### ***Beetsha/Seronga***

**Location:** To the north of the Okavango delta in Ngamiland

**Activities:** This was the first project to develop as a result of the impact of the successful implementation of the Chobe Enclave project. With the encouragement of the local Member of Parliament and a hunting safari company, the villages were encouraged to form a trust and apply for a community wildlife quota for two areas containing significant wildlife populations. The community earned P320 000 in 1996 and expects to make around P400 000 in 1997.

### ***Khwai village***

**Location:** On the northeastern edge of the Okavango Delta, near to the north entrance to Moremi Game Reserve.

**Activities:** Khwai village formed a Management Trust at the end of 1996 and has received a community wildlife quota. It is using this for local hunting purposes until it decides how else to use the quota. The NRMP provides advice when requested by the community. The village has funding from the Global Environment Facility, facilitated by a University of Botswana lecturer who worked in the area on a consultancy for the NRMP.

### *Mababe*

**Location:** Adjacent to the southwestern part of Chobe National Park and north east of Moremi Game Reserve.

**Activities:** A committee has been formed to take on the development of community wildlife and tourism management. There are divisions among villagers, with some viewing the committee as representing a lobby group set up to work towards regaining land which was gazetted as part of the Chobe National Park, and to maintaining their access to Special Game Licences (issued by the DWNP to people deemed to be dependent to a large extent on hunting for subsistence). Villagers dispute whether these should in fact be the aims of the committee or whether it should not rather concentrate on gaining advantages from the opportunities to utilise wildlife and tourism (NRMP 1997).

### *Gweta*

**Location:** Central Botswana, adjacent to the Makgadikgadi National Park

**Activities:** The community is developing a local land use plan which will voluntarily relocate some cattle posts to make land next to the Makgadikgadi National Park available for a community owned and managed photo safari business. The Community Trust has obtained a grant from non-NRMP sources for the construction of a 'traditional village' and is awaiting approval for a community lodge/camp site inside the adjacent national park.

A marketing consultancy carried out in the area for the NRMP identified spring water and the fruit of the marula tree as resources with considerable untapped potential for exploitation. With the help of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research in South Africa a site has been established for water extraction and water quality has been determined. The Community Trust has been granted permission to establish a bottling plant.

South African companies are interested in the production of marula fruit at Gweta and have talked of potential orders of up to 12 000 mt of fruit. The trust has developed a proposal to obtain the necessary machinery to produce puree. The machines will enable the trust to begin offering 200mt of puree for sale at 4.25 Pula/Kg in 1997. Alternative technology machines are being sought which will enable small producer groups to produce marula macerate and oil, thus increasing the value added remaining at the local level

### *Tswapong Hills*

**Location:** Eastern Botswana, between Gaborone and Francistown.

**Activities::** The Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS), a Botswana environmental NGO, is working with local community groups to develop sustainable use activities in order to

promote an improved conservation ethic. The KCS also plans to develop a local tourism industry based on the area's attractions and proximity to the Gaborone-Francistown national road. Following a marketing consultancy on veld products, the NRMP has provided support to local conservation-based development activities. Through proposals generated by KCS and the Women's Finance House (WFH), a Botswana NGO giving credit support to women, IRCE has funded a grant to WFH of US \$25 000 to set up a revolving loan fund and provide a vehicle, an office and a salaried liaison position. The project aims to help women in the utilisation of mopane caterpillars. Through organising themselves into a management group, the women are able to harvest up to twice the annual amount of these caterpillars for wholesale and retail trade. Groups of collectors are given credit to allow them to store their harvest for sale once the peak production season is past. Improved storage will be provided in the form of containers supplied to retailers on a twelve-month repayment scheme. There is also a savings component of the project to assist women to keep their earnings.

One informant believed the project carried some risks as he thought the strengthening of the women's' groups to improve their position in the mopane industry were challenging vested interests within the industry. He also thought the increased income earned by the women and relative economic independence they are gaining threatened to upset gender relations within the community, particularly between husband and wife. Socio-economic research is being carried out to monitor the situation. A representative of the KCS did not agree with this analysis, pointing out that women were not threatening existing markets and that their earnings were not a threat to relations between husband and wife, as the project was not changing existing relationships within the market, but assisting women to be more productive.

### ***Community-based Natural Resources Management Project, /Xai /Xai***

**Location:** In the Western Communal Remote Zone (WCRZ, Zone 6) of North West District, Ngamiland, west of the Okavango Delta, near the border with Namibia. The settlement is in Controlled Hunting Area NG4, which is proposed as a Wildlife Management Area.

**Activities:** Xai Xai is a mixed community of about 400 Ju/'hoansi (San) and Herero people with a mixed economy of cattle herding, hunting and gathering. A community wildlife quota was applied for in July 1996 and granted the next month. The DWNP, NRMP and SNV all provide support to the community in a co-operative approach. The project is being funded by SNV, which also provides a natural resources management advisor, who started in 1994. NRMP and the DWNP are providing technical assistance, while the NRMP through IRCE is providing funding for training of community members. The project aims at enhancing the sustainable use of natural resources to the benefit of local people and increasing their control over natural resources.

The CBNRM project started in 1994 and initial activities included the establishment of a Craft Production Committee and a Consumers Co-operative Committee. During 1996, the community established a Wildlife Quota Management Committee, which was expected to register itself as a legal trust in 1997. This will enable the community to enter into commercial agreements with hunting safari companies.

The community does not intend marketing its wildlife for hunting in 1997, but have begun to market photographic tourism themselves without the use of a joint venture partner.

### ***Kgalagadi District***

**Location:** Western Botswana

**Activities:** The District contains three WMAs and the district authorities wish to implement a community utilisation approach for the whole district. It has taken a considerable amount of time to reach agreement due to the presence of a powerful cattle lobby. However, at a meeting in September 1996, agreement was reached on options for implementing a community-based wildlife utilisation project. These options are due to be discussed at village and district level meetings in 1997.

### ***Community-based Natural Resources Management Project in Ukwhi***

**Location:** A Controlled Hunting Area, known as 'KD1', in the north west of the Kgalagadi District between the Namibian border and the Gemsbok Park. KD1 has been proposed as a Wildlife Management Area. It covers approx. 13 000 sq. km.

**Activities:** Attempts are being made to develop a model of community wildlife and veld products utilisation that can be sustainably carried out by the Basarwa (San) community living in the villages of Ukwhi, Ngwatle and Ncaang. These villages have a total population of between 500-700 people. The community is being supported by Thusano Lefatsheng and SNV. Thusano Lefatsheng aims to lessen the community's dependence on wild resources which are under pressure, diversify the crops grown, diversify food sources and increase the returns of arable agriculture.

The overall project goal of SNV is to enhance the inhabitants' effective access to and control over natural resources as well as over the benefits, which accrue from the utilisation of these resources. The three activities of the project are to build community institutional capacity for natural resource management, establish demonstration plots for domestication of veld products such as grapple plant and herbal teas, and wildlife utilisation.

IRCE have channelled a grant of US \$80 000 through Thusano Lefatsheng to fund 3 community liaison positions staffed by local people. SNV provides a community mobilisation officer. The NRMP provides technical backstopping on wildlife management issues.

The NRMP reports that this area has a greater level of opposition from cattle interests than in any other area that the project has worked in (NRMP 1997). Cattle interests from outside of the WMA appear to want to dominate wildlife interests in the WMA now that economic opportunities are available. A series of district meetings have been held to decide who should benefit from which resources. The district Council approved the community's wildlife utilisation plans in mid March 1997, and the next step was to obtain a quota from the DWNP.

Thusano Lefatsheng and SNV have been working with the community to set up a decision-making process based on village management committees in which each household is represented. These committees are then represented at an inter village management committee.

Communities in this area are also receiving ostrich eggshells distributed by an organisation called Ghanzi Craft, which buys up the crafts made with the shells.

***Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust, Zutshwa***

**Location:** Northern Kgalagadi District, 60 km west of Hukuntsi.

**Activities:** In 1989 Rural Industries Innovation Centre, a local NGO, and the community initiated a salt production project that uses the saline ground water in the vicinity of Zutshwa. In 1992 the Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust was formed to oversee the salt project and other activities on behalf of the community of more than 400 people. In 1993, SNV became involved in the project through employment of a co-ordinator and Production Advisor. Community-based natural resources management and craft production were added to the project's activities.

***Okwa WMA***

**Location:** Ghanzi District, western Botswana.

**Activities:** The district authorities have long approved community wildlife utilisation as a development tool. The Okwa WMA has been chosen as the first site for implementation. Exchange visits by community members and leaders with the Chobe Enclave helped facilitate this process.

The Kuru Development Trust has received a grant of US \$300 000 from USAID for work with local communities on the sustainable exploitation of veld products. The grant helps the trust to fund cochineal dye and veld products projects in nine settlements composed of 230 Nharo (San) families. Cochineal is an insect, which feeds off the prickly pear (*Opuntia sp.*) and is used in some instances as a biological control of prickly pear that is an alien species to Botswana. The insect is crushed and the dried body produces a natural food colourant. The multi-national business UNILEVER has expressed interest in purchasing cochineal from the project and providing technical support for the on-site production and processing. UNILEVER are considering offering around US \$70/kg, which will provide about US \$600 a month to each participating extended family. This is income unprecedented in a rural San community in Botswana and will provide a number of development problems in itself. Local people who have very little access to cash income will face very difficult choices about how to spend their income, and government and NGOs will need to help them with sound advice and facilitation without deciding for the people themselves.

The Klein Karoo Co-operative in South Africa in the past distributed whole ostrich eggs to craft marketing organisations working in the Ghanzi District, with the aim of developing a marketing arrangement where what they call "genuine Bushman crafts" could be sold in South Africa. The local craft organisations have more recently been able to find local supplies of commercial eggs. The distribution of eggs from commercial suppliers (and in the

past from South Africa) removes the need for communities to get permits for obtaining eggshells in the wild.

### ***Dqae Qare Bushman Game Farm Project***

**Location:** D'kar, Ghanzi District, western Botswana

**Activities:** In 1994, the Kuru Development Trust, requested financial assistance from the Dutch Government and SNV to purchase a freehold farm in the Ghanzi Block on behalf of a Basarwa community to provide them with land they can call their own. An amount of DFl 1.1. Million was made available by the Dutch Government to purchase the farm. The project aims to strengthen the economic position of the Basarwa, strengthen Basarwa cultural vitality and assist in identity building, strengthen social emancipation and political mobilisation of the Basarwa, and strengthen the capacity of women to increase their self-reliance in order to gain control over crucial resources. Project activities focus on income generation from wildlife and tourism, training of local people to manage the farm and tourist activities, building community level institutions such as a farm management committee, and the transfer of knowledge gained and skills developed by local people to other communities.

The development trust and SNV are assisting the community to develop game farming and a campsite for tourists on the farm. Reintroduction of game is being paid for with Dutch Government funding. SNV provides a community advisor and covers a number of project running costs. The community has elected a management committee of 25 people and the development trust intends to hand over the farm to be run by the management committee.

### ***Kwaneng District***

**Location:** Bordering southern boundary of Central Kalahari Game Reserve.

**Activities:** A grant of US \$30 000 has been given to Thusano Lefatsheng by IRCE to fund a revolving loan fund for grapple marketing by local Basarwa from about 3 000 households. About two thirds of the support goes to women. The main contribution of support to this community is the provision of a market outlet through Thusano at prices above those obtained through other markets (P5-6/Kg.).

### ***Molengwane***

**Location:** Kwaneng District, about 30 km south of Central Kalahari Game Reserve.

**Activities:** Thusano Lefatsheng is buying grapple from 34 families, who are growing veld products on 5 ha plots with water from two existing boreholes. The area is in a buffer zone to the Central Kalahari Game Reserve and the community is hoping to get rights to use wildlife. Financial support is being provided by the Kellogg Foundation, and has been used for an additional borehole, a diesel engine and fencing of the plots. Thusano supplies agriculture extension, community mobilisation, and marketing of the veld products. The community identifies the resources which are important to them and which they would like to see conserved, and Thusano helps them design experiments for production

### ***Community-based Management of Indigenous Forest, Kwaneng West***

**Location:** The villages of Motokwe, Khekhenye and Tshwaane, in western Kwaneng District, approx. 200 km west of the sub-district administrative seat, Letlhakeng.

**Activities:** SNV is working with a Botswana NGO, Veld Products Research, to assist about 1 800 people (mixed Basarwa and Bakgalagadi) in the three settlements to produce veld products for marketing. A Wildlife Management Area has been demarcated in the vicinity of these communities. During 1996, GTZ provided funding of P56 000 and the Forestry Sector Technical Co-ordination Unit of SADC-GTZ is expected to enter into a long-term agreement to provide financial support.

The project aims to improve the living standards of the local communities through sustainable and equitable utilisation of natural resources. Activities focus on sustainable management of indigenous veld products, integration of women in veld resources management, domestication of veld resources, development and application of techniques for processing and preserving veld resources, and developing and implementing strategies for marketing veld products.

## **2.4 Analysis Of Key CBNRM Issues In Botswana**

The following section focuses on a number of the issues identified in the terms of reference and other issues felt by the consultant to be of importance. It concludes with a summary of results of CBNRM activities in Botswana.

### **2.4.1 Enabling environment**

One of the accepted preconditions for successful CBNRM is an enabling policy and legislative framework which gives communities secure rights over resources and/or land, enables them to take decisions over the management of the resource and allows them to retain income derived from its use (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992).

From section 3.1 of this report, on policy and legislation, it can be seen that Botswana does not have a single policy or law, which gives local communities, secure rights over wildlife and tourism as resources, or rights over the land on which these resources are found.

What exists, however, is a number of different policy documents and laws that, together, provide opportunities for government to allow communities to gain rights over wildlife and tourism. The Botswana approach combines rights to obtain quotas and hunting licences from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks with rights to obtain leases over land for commercial purposes from Land Boards. Policy directives ensure that communities' interests are promoted.

The Policy on Wildlife Conservation of 1986, for example, calls for the greater involvement of local people in wildlife management and utilisation, and for rural people to gain greater benefits from wildlife use. It does not, however, spell out how this might be achieved. The



Wildlife, Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992 provides for the declaration of Wildlife Management Areas and Controlled Hunting Areas and provides for permission regarding wildlife use on communal land to be given by Tribal Land Boards. The Tribal Land Act of 1968 enables Tribal Land Boards to give out leases for commercial purposes. Policy directives such as the SAVINGRAM on community tourism and hunting development activities provide for leases over hunting and tourism to be given to communities who form a representative legal entity.

Rights are dependent upon designation of an area as a community CHA. Otherwise the lease is negotiated between the Land Board and the private sector directly. District level government agencies play a significant role in the process of a community negotiating its joint venture. According to the Joint Venture Guidelines, communities have to wait for endorsement of the joint venture approach by the District Development Committee. The District Council is assigned a role in negotiating with the private sector on behalf of the community e.g. informing operators of a community's objectives.

The Joint Venture Guidelines make it clear that: "Wildlife remains the property of the State, and although wildlife management is to be decentralised, wildlife utilisation and any form of off-take will be subject to the DWNP's decisions regarding the quota for each area. Close liaison with the DWNP is therefore important" (DWNP undated, 26).

The present framework for providing rural communities with rights over wildlife and tourism depends to a large extent on the goodwill of government at a number of different levels. The President can, for example, remove the WMA status, which protects wildlife as a land use. The Minister of Commerce and Industry can make regulations, which affect the WMA on a number of different issues such as grazing and keeping of livestock. Consultation on these issues is expected to take place at the district level. Controlled Hunting Area status can also be removed or changed by government according to whether the current policy approach is to favour communities or the private sector.

Indeed, much of the current enabling framework in Botswana can be reversed at the stroke of a pen. Although present Government policy is supportive of CBNRM approaches, the enabling framework remains vulnerable because it is not clearly entrenched legally. A number of possibilities exist to make community rights more secure. Wildlife legislation could extend to community trusts the same rights given to freehold farmers. Land Boards could give leases over land to community trusts, rather than just commercial leases for wildlife and tourism business activities.

The lack of legal and regulatory measures that define veld resources as common property rather than 'open access' has also been identified as a gap in the enabling framework for natural resource management (USAID 1996). If Land Boards were to give community trusts long term leases over land, this would go a long way towards creating a local level common property resource management regime. If necessary, security over land could be reinforced by the allocation to community trusts of resource ownership or user rights through sectoral legislation.

#### 2.4.2 Institutional relationships and capacity

The Botswana CBNRM programme has been based largely on the assumption that government would provide an enabling framework and certain limited services to communities, while NGOs would assist communities to form representative resource management institutions and provide other services such as assisting in gaining access to markets.

As noted in section 3.3, Botswana did not have the appropriate NGOs to provide the support envisaged to communities. This led to the NRMP staff becoming far more directly involved in field implementation than anticipated. It has also led to the development within DWNP of capacity to work directly with community level institutions, and assist in the development of these institutions. The NRMP is currently assisting the DWNP to build up its capacity to take over most of the NRMP functions. A significant shift away from the use of expatriate advisors to implementation by DWNP staff will considerably strengthen CBNRM activities in Botswana. However, the DWNP is hampered by its location in government as part of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the fact that it does not control its own budget. The DWNP remains weak in relationship to the 'cattle lobby'. Within the senior management of the DWNP there is good commitment to CBNRM as a conservation approach, which bodes well for the future of CBNRM activities in Botswana provided government supplies the department with sufficient resources to carry out its functions properly.

If the DWNP develops a strong extension capacity and can support communities in developing their representative natural resource management institutions, the need for NGO intervention is reduced. This would in turn free up resources, which could be used to directly build up the capacity of community-based organisations (CBOs) instead of first trying to focus on NGOs as conduits for resources to CBOs. There is also the danger that reliance on NGO support to communities can lead to a dependency relationship rather than community empowerment (USAID 1996). Where NGOs become 'gatekeepers' to communities it is often difficult for them to relinquish this role. On the other hand, the greater the institutional 'critical mass' involved in CBNRM, the stronger the approach becomes and the greater its legitimacy as a development process. If development NGOs begin to adopt CBNRM, this is an indicator of success. Flexibility is required so that where it might be appropriate for NGOs to support communities, the appropriate NGO institutions are able to respond. But where a direct relationship between government and the community is more appropriate, this should be pursued.

At the field level, CBNRM in Botswana relies heavily on the co-operation and capacity of district institutions: The District Administration as co-ordinating unit; the Land Board for the allocation of leases; the Tribal Administration; and the District Development Committee of the District Council. Co-ordination between these district level institutions and liaison between them and the emerging community level institutions is essential: "The District Land Use Planning Unit (DLUPU) appears to be a viable governmental institution for integrating community activities since it brings all relevant departments together. However, integration will not happen where DLUPUs are weak or where policies have not yet been defined, or decentralised, by home ministries" (USAID 1996).

The district level institutions will also have to adapt to the emergence of community-based institutions, which are developing their own economic and political power bases. If district level institutions feel that their own interests are being threatened, they might no longer follow the policy guidelines, which provide for devolution to community level. Entrenched legal rights for communities would help to prevent this situation from developing.

At community level the development of strong resource management institutions which are representative and accountable is essential for successful community-based natural resource management. The Botswana programme is going through the teething problems associated with institution building. The NRMP final evaluation report (USAID 1996) details some of these problems:

- At Sankuyo the chair of the board of the community trust was ignoring procedures stipulated in the trust constitution on how to deal with private operators.
- In the Chobe Enclave there was confusion about how the contract had been negotiated and about the roles of the trust members in negotiating a contract.
- In Chobe and at Gweta the trusts established cover more than one village. Methods of representation need to be developed and procedures for decision-making established which satisfy each village.

#### 2.4.3 Community dynamics/equity issues

With the time and resources available, the author was not able to visit individual project sites and investigate issues related to community dynamics and equity. However, from discussions with the informants consulted and the Botswana CBNRM literature, a number of issues can be identified.

Concern has been expressed about the position of San people in project areas where the San are not the dominant group numerically or politically. The experience in Botswana and neighbouring Namibia is that other groups usually economically and politically dominate the San. In Botswana, the San, along with others, have enjoyed hunting rights through the Special Licence system. When communities form their trusts and are allocated quotas, a new system of wildlife management is introduced which can lead to no Special Licences being issued. A group of Botswana San, who met the author in Namibia in 1996, explained how they were disadvantaged by the new system because they had lost their Special Licences because the community where they lived had been awarded a wildlife quota. They did not benefit from the new system because they were not represented on the community committee, which made decisions about wildlife use and benefit.

Conflicts have emerged in some project areas between wealthy livestock owners and poorer community members who see new economic opportunities in wildlife, tourism and other natural resources (c.f. Kgalagadi District and Ukwhi project profiles). In some instances cattle owners are resisting the development of other land uses, while in others they are trying to capture wildlife revenues themselves. These are issues, which will be part of a new dynamic at community level as rich, and poor compete over new sources of income and

status. At the local level, a test of government resolve and commitment to CBNRM will be whether District authorities side with the rich cattle owners or uphold the rights of the poor. The extent to which community trusts and other management institutions represent the different groups in communities, will also affect who benefits in the community. The Botswana policy and legal framework does not prescribe to communities how their management committee's should be elected or the composition of these committees. Neither does policy prescribe how benefits should be distributed. Government extension officers and NGO staff can facilitate communities addressing questions of equity and representation but cannot decide for them. The issue of the role of the San is a difficult one and begs the question whether some form of 'affirmative action' for the San and other marginalised groups needs to be built in to policy. The NRMP Final Evaluation Report (USAID 1996) suggests that Trusts should be assisted to develop procedures for the distribution and use of income. Such procedures could focus particularly on the equitable distribution of benefits within the community.

At the national level, conservationists in Botswana, especially many expatriates, like to blame the 'cattle lobby' for most of the problems facing wildlife and are ready to assign 'hidden cattle agendas' to most government activities, which affect communal land. While there clearly is a strong cattle lobby and some definite vested interests within government, cattle and the cattle industry still provide most Botswana with a means of making a living or some security in hard times. Cattle also have considerable cultural significance. Wildlife still needs to prove in practice the potential for economic development that its supporters claim for it. Although wildlife-based tourism and trophy hunting contribute significantly to the economy, they do not reach the same numbers of people as the livestock industry and rural Botswana are only just beginning to gain direct benefits from tourism and wildlife. It is therefore not surprising that cattle are often given priority over wildlife in government-decision-making. However, CBNRM approaches, through community empowerment and income generation, have the potential to stimulate the development of a new economic and political lobby, particularly amongst those who are currently the poorest in society. This lobby will increasingly be able to promote other land uses as part of securing rural livelihoods.

#### 2.4.4 From benefit to management

The success of CBNRM in Botswana, as elsewhere, will be measured in the long term by the extent to which communities are seen to be managing their land and resources sustainably. Some informants expressed concern that the Botswana programme was successful in beginning a flow of benefits to local communities, but these communities had yet to begin to actively manage resources.

Although the system of community management and benefit is new in most areas of Botswana, there is already some evidence that communities are moving towards sustainable management of their wildlife resources. In some cases, communities have decided not to use their full wildlife quota and "taken conservation conscious decisions concerning their wildlife" (Modise pers. comm. 1997). Some communities are beginning to make trade-offs between different land uses. At Gweta there has been discussion over moving cattle away

from an area bordering the neighbouring game reserve so that the land can be used for photographic safaris (Winer pers. comm. 1997).

According to the NRMP final evaluation report (USAID 1996): "As a partner with the GOB as well as the operator in the management of wildlife and habitats, the Trust must be a responsible steward of the habitats and animals. To date this seems to be the case, but there is still a need to monitor the management capacity of the Trusts."

Part of the extension approach of the NRMP is to assist communities to develop a responsible utilisation plan before requesting a wildlife quota from the DWNP. There are also plans to develop community capacity to monitor wildlife resources themselves.

#### 2.4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability is an issue, which permeates all levels of the CBNRM activities in Botswana. The DWNP and NRMP are for example, trying to promote institutional sustainability by building the capacity of the DWNP to implement activities themselves. The level of commitment by government to CBNRM should provide a good platform for sustainability. This commitment was seen by the author from officials in the DWNP and its parent Ministry, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. It was also noted from the Director of Lands in the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing. Furthermore, the Government has committed funds to CBNRM activities through the National Development Plan, NDP8. There is still a heavy reliance on donor funding for a wide range of activities and government will need to further reduce the level of donor support.

At the field level, the actual and potential income to a number of communities indicates that sustainability can be achieved, at least within resource rich communities or those with a variety of exploitable resources. In 1996, for example, the Chobe Enclave received P332 000 from its hunting safari operator; the Sankuyo community received P285 000 and the Beetsha/Seronga communities P320 000.

#### 2.4.6 Protected areas and neighbours

There is considerable potential for communities to develop income-generating activities based on wildlife and tourism in areas adjoining protected areas. Indeed, the first community trust to emerge, the Chobe Enclave Community Trust, was developed in an area adjoining the Chobe National Park. The DWNP is committed to changing its approach to protected area management and looking at ways in which parks and game reserves can contribute to local economies more directly (Modise pers. comm. 1997). The increased development of links between protected areas and neighbouring community wildlife and tourism management trusts is expected to receive more attention over the next few years as the DWNP develops the necessary policy vision and the park management plans to implement this vision.

Although the DWNP is keen to develop a progressive 'parks and neighbours' approach it has found itself in the middle of a controversy over the planned removal of a number of Basarwa

(San) families from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) and the adjoining Khutse Reserve. The CKGR was originally created in 1961 in order to provide sufficient wildlife resources for the Basarwa hunter gathers to live from, and in order to conserve the wildlife of the central Kalahari. However, more recently, the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing has developed plans to remove the Basarwa from the two reserves and resettle them at new locations in Ghanzi and Kwaneng districts. According to the newspaper, the Botswana Gazette, during March 1997 plans for the removal of the people were at an advanced stage and the Minister of Local Government, Lands and Housing, had asked Parliament for funds to develop the new settlements. The government is reported to want to move the Basarwa because it is too difficult to provide basic health and education services for them and because the government believes the presence of the people is incompatible with the needs of tourism development in the reserves.

It seems unfortunate that at a time when the DWNP is developing its ideas for new approaches to protected area management, that the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing is so determined to move the people. Increased tourism to the reserves could in fact provide development opportunities for the Basarwa on the land, which they view as their own. According to the Botswana Gazette a number of families do not wish to be relocated from the reserves.

#### 2.4.7 Results

A number of significant results have been achieved by the Botswana CBNRM programme and these are noted below:

- Representative community level natural resource management units being formed with certain user rights over wildlife and tourism. In some instances these units are taking responsibility for other resources even though user rights are not defined.
- Rural communities are gaining opportunities to diversify their economies through the use and management of wildlife, tourism, and veld products.
- Rural communities are beginning to realise a significant income from wildlife, tourism and some veld products.
- Rural communities are gaining new skills in negotiating with the private sector and developing their own enterprises.
- Rural communities are gaining new experience and skills in local level collective decision-making, representation and accountability.
- Some communities are moving from the receipt of benefits to active resource management.
- Government and development NGOs are beginning to accept CBNRM as a legitimate development process.

## **REFERENCES: BOTSWANA**

- Brown, M. and B Wyckoff-Baird. 1992. *Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects*. Biodiversity Support Programme. Washington.
- Crowe, D. 1995. Present Status of Wildlife. *In: The Present Status of Wildlife and its Future in Botswana*. The proceedings of a symposium/workshop organised by the Kalahari Conservation Society and the Chobe Wildlife Trust. Gaborone 1995.
- DWNP. Undated. *Joint Ventures: A guide to developing natural resource based business ventures in Community Areas*. Department of Wildlife and National Parks. Gaborone.
- DWNP. 1997. *Briefing Note: Update on Controlled Hunting Areas and their Tendering*. Department of Wildlife and National Parks. Gaborone.
- Government of Botswana. 1986. *Wildlife Conservation Policy*. Government of Botswana. Gaborone.
- Government of Botswana. 1990a. *National Conservation Strategy*. Government of Botswana. Gaborone.
- Government of Botswana. 1990b. *Tourism Policy*. Government of Botswana. Gaborone.
- Government of Botswana. 1995. *SAVINGRAM: Community tourism and hunting development activities*. Government of Botswana. Gaborone.
- IIED. 1994. *Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management*. International Institute for Environment and Development. London.
- Mathuba, B. M. 1992. *Land Policy in Botswana*. Paper prepared for the *Workshop on Land Policy in Eastern and Southern Africa*, February, 1992 Maputo.
- Murphree, M. 1993. *Communities as Resource Management Institutions*. Gatekeeper Series, No. 36, Sustainable Agriculture Programme. International Institute for Environment and Development. London.
- NRMP. 1997. *Project Summary Sheet*. Natural Resources Management Project. Gaborone.
- Overseas Development Administration. 1996. *ODA's Strategy of Assistance to Renewable Natural Resources in Botswana*. ODA. Pretoria.
- USAID. 1996. *Final Evaluation of the Botswana Natural Resources Management Project*. United States Agency for International Development. Gaborone

## **PERSONAL COMMUNICATION:**

- Matlhare J. Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife and National Parks. Gaborone. March 1997.

Modise, S. Director, Department of Wildlife and National Parks. Gaborone. March 1997.

Walz, D. J. Director, Pact/Institutional Reinforcement for Community Empowerment. Gaborone. March 1997.

Winer N. Chief of Party, NRMP. Gaborone. March 1997.

## **NEWSPAPER REPORTS**

"Plans to move San from Xade advanced". Botswana Gazette. 19 March 1997. Gaborone.

## **LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED: BOTSWANA**

- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Jan F. Broekhuis | Senior Wildlife Officer. Wildlife Management Areas. Department of National Parks and Wildlife. PO Box 131, Gaborone. Tel: 371405. Fax: 312354.   |
| Frank van Bussel | Programme Officer. Netherlands Development Organisation. PO Box 611, Gaborone. Tel: 3524 13. Fax: 314123.  |
| Paula Chalinder  | Renewable Natural Resources Field Manager. Overseas Development Administration. Private Bag 0023, Gaborone. Tel:35284. Fax: 356105.              |
| Richard Hartley  | Resource Economist. NRMP. PO Boz 131, Gaborone. Tel: 300978. Fax: 300978.  |
| Ruud Jansen      | IUCN. Country Representative. Private Bag 00300, Gaborone. Tel/Fax: 371584.  |
| Mark Johnstad    | Policy Advisor. NRMP. 10127 Stoneway. El Paso, Texas, 79925, USA. Tel: 915 594 8008.   |
| John Ludbrook    | Community Extension Specialist. NRMP. PO Box 131, Gaborone. Tel: 300978. Fax: 300978.  |
| Joseph Matlhare  | Deputy Director. Department of National Parks and Wildlife. PO Box 131, Gaborone. Tel: 371405. Fax: 312354.                                      |
| Sedia Modise     | Director: Department of National Parks and Wildlife. PO Box 131, Gaborone. Tel: 371405. Fax: 312354.   |
| Stevie C. Monna  | Principal Natural Resources Officer. National Conservation Strategy (coordinating) Agency. Private Bag 0068, Gaborone. Tel: 309952. Fax: 302051. |



Mushanana L. Nchunga	Executive Secretary. National Conservation Strategy (coordinating) Agency. Private Bag 0068, Gaborone. Tel: 302050. Fax: 302051.
G. Phorano	General Manager. Thusano Lefatsheng. Private Bag 00251, Gaborone. Tel: 372273. Fax: 305494.
Victor Rantshabeng	Director. Department of Lands. Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing. Private Bag 00128, Gaborone. Tel: 301402.
Vincent K. Selato	Deputy Permanent Secretary (Wildlife and Tourism). Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Private Bag 004, Gaborone. Tel: 351084. Fax: 371539.
Daniel J. Walz	Director. Pact. Private Bag 246, Gaborone. Tel: 314757. Fax: 314784.
Nicholas Winer	Chief of Party. NRMP. PO Box 131, Gaborone. Tel: 300978. Fax: 300978.

## **3. COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN NAMIBIA**

---

### **3.1 Introduction**

Most CBNRM activities in Namibia take place within the framework of a national CBNRM programme, which is implemented by a partnership of government, NGOs, the private sector and communities. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) has developed a policy and legal framework which give ownership of certain species of wildlife to local communities which form common property resource management units called 'conservancies'. Other species of game can be used by conservancies through a permit system and conservancies also gain concessionary rights over tourism activities. The MET and NGOs provide support to local communities in conservancy formation, wildlife management and enterprise development. Communities have negotiated income sharing agreements and joint ventures with the private sector.

The MET co-ordinates the national programme, which is supported in part by the USAID-funded Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme. The national programme at present focuses on the north eastern and northwestern communal lands of Namibia, where there are still substantial wildlife numbers. The programme has also diversified beyond wildlife to include other resources such as thatching grass and includes a crafts component.

### **3.2 Country Background**

#### **3.2.1 Socio-economic context.**

Namibia is a large country, situated in southwestern Africa, with a total land area of approximately 825 000 sq. km. It is bordered by Angola to the north, Zambia and Zimbabwe to the northeast, Botswana to the east and South Africa to the south. Namibia's population is estimated at 1,6 million with an annual growth rate of 3%. Almost two-thirds of the population live in the northern regions. In the arid areas of the west and south, population densities are extremely low.

Namibia's economy is almost entirely reliant on natural resources, both renewable and non-renewable. Two-thirds of the population lives in rural areas and are directly dependent upon the soil and living natural resources for their livelihoods (Brown 1997). By far the highest proportion of the workforce is involved in subsistence agriculture. In 1992, per capita GNP was US \$1 670, but income distribution is highly skewed between urban and rural households. The quarter richest households consume over 70% of total consumption (NPC undated).

Commercial agriculture, mining, fishing and fish processing, manufacturing and tourism are the important sectors of the economy. The sectors of the economy expected to show strongest growth are fishing and fish processing, tourism and manufacturing, while the share of agriculture in the economy is expected to fall, because of expected decline in unit prices of agricultural outputs, especially beef (Dewdney 1996).

Namibia gained independence from South Africa in 1990 and the legacy of apartheid and colonialism is still evident in the wide gap between rich and poor, unequal access to land and natural resources and poor education, health and housing for the rural majority.

### **3.2.2 Environmental context**

The most important environmental characteristic of Namibia is its aridity. Namibia is the most arid country south of the Sahara. The only perennial rivers are to be found on the country's borders. The shortage of water, in terms of both rainfall and permanent surface water, is the main limiting factor for the economy, and determines the way people try to secure their livelihoods. Rainfall is erratic both temporally and spatially and evaporation rates reach 3m annually. Drought is a regular occurrence. Crop growing is only possible in the wetter northeast (average rainfall of 600 mm), while the arid west (average rainfall 25 mm in parts of the Namib Desert) is mostly marginal for livestock farming.

Wildlife numbers have generally declined in most communal areas except where long-running community-based projects exist such as in Kunene Region in the northwest. A healthy and growing wildlife industry has developed on commercial (freehold) farmland since government gave commercial farmers rights over wildlife in 1968. Wildlife numbers have increased on commercial farms and species such as elephant, lion and rhino, which were shot out, have been reintroduced.

## **3.3 Community-Based Natural Resource Management**

### **3.3.1 Conservation policy and legislation affecting CBNRM**

Shortly after Namibian Independence in 1990, the newly formed Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, embarked on a major policy review aimed at updating existing conservation policies. This review process led to the development of new policies on biodiversity conservation and land use planning which make provision for increased community involvement in wildlife management. With the development from 1991 of a national CBNRM programme, the Ministry realised the need for a specific policy concerning wildlife and tourism in communal areas, and for a policy for the promotion of community-based tourism.

### ***Conservation of Biotic Diversity and Habitat Protection***

This policy aims specifically at the adequate protection of all species and subspecies, of ecosystems and of natural life support processes. In the guiding principles, which accompany the policy statement, provision is made for habitat protection through the acquisition of land by proclamation. However, the fourth guiding principle also makes provision for land acquisition for conservation in the non-formal sense. Among the strategies for achieving this are:

- The establishment of sustainable, co-operatively managed buffer areas surrounding proclaimed reserves (including proclaimed buffer zones)
- The creation of sound economic benefits from natural resources, particularly wildlife and forestry, being derived by local communities linked to their sound and responsible management of these resources.

(MET 1994a)

### ***Land-use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development***

This policy sets out the MET's approach to land use and management on communal state land, privately owned commercial farmland, proclaimed state land, urban areas and wetland systems including catchments.

The preamble to this policy states, among other things:

The Ministry recognises that the success of all development projects will rest on the extent to which local communities have participated in the planning of land use and have real decision-making power.

(MET 1994b)

The main policy statement concerning land use and management on communal land is as follows:

... it is the policy of this Ministry to encourage the rational and integrated planning of land use according to ecological principles in all rural areas within Namibia and to encourage the formation of suitable participatory structures so that local communities may participate in decisions and responsibilities concerning natural resources, and enjoy maximum sustainable benefit from these resources (including wildlife and forestry products) upon which they depend.

(MET 1994b)

The guiding principles for the implementation of this policy approach state that re-empowerment should be the key principle for community-based rural conservation. "Re-empowerment of local communities means involving them in conservation by restoring the power to make decisions about the use of land and associated natural resources. For re-empowerment to be achieved, appropriate institutions need to be identified or created for the community to be involved in decision-making and consultation with the authorities (MET 1994b: 3). These participatory structures should:

- a) be elected and non-political
- b) have legal status and powers
- c) attend to natural resource management and conflict resolution
- d) have regional flexibility

With regard to rights of access and responsibility, the guiding principles state that the appropriate institution for local decision-making and consultation should have jurisdiction within a geographically defined area and should decide on land and resource allocation and utilisation. Further, the principle of 'stewardship' rather than ownership of resources should apply, and rights of access and utilisation should be linked to individual responsibility, where individuals are accountable to the appropriate institution for collective decision-making.

The guiding principles state that individuals and communities should be able to determine the nature of benefits from resource use and should determine how the benefits are distributed or used.

Finally, the guidelines call for the drafting of appropriate legislation to give local community institutions decision-making power and the right to benefit from resource utilisation.

### ***The Establishment of Conservancies in Namibia***

In 1992, the MWCT approved a policy document which made provision for the establishment of wildlife management units called conservancies. Although the document was concerned essentially with the establishment of conservancies on commercial land it also provided for their establishment on communal land. The document defined conservancies as:

"...a group of farms and/or area of communal land on which neighbouring landowners/members have pooled their resources for the purpose of conserving and utilising wildlife on their combined properties and/or area of communal land "  
(MWCT 1992, 6).

It went on to state that the idea behind the establishment of a conservancy is that landowners practice their normal farming operations in combination with wildlife utilisation. The landowners would manage their combined land as a unit concerning wildlife, and would share in the benefits from their combined effort.

***Wildlife, Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas***

The Namibian Cabinet approved this policy document in March 1995. It sets out a system for implementing the key principles and guidelines set out in the policy on Land-use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development outlined above. It also builds upon conservancy policy. Although the conservancy policy made provision for conservancies to be established on communal land, there was little incentive for communal area residents to actually form a conservancy. While the Nature Conservation Ordinance, (No. 4. of 1975) gave commercial farmers conditional ownership of certain species of game and rights to use others, similar rights were not extended to communal farmers. The policy on Wildlife, Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas sets out an approach for giving communal area residents rights over wildlife and tourism, and it uses the concept of the conservancy as the mechanism to do this.

The objectives of the policy are as follows (MET 1995a):

- A. To establish ... an economically based system for the management and utilisation of wildlife and other renewable living resources on communal land so that rural communities can:
  - a) participate on a partnership basis with this (MET) and other Ministries in the management of, and benefits from, natural resources;
  - b) benefit from rural development based on wildlife, tourism and other natural resource management;
  - c) improve the conservation of natural resources by wise and sustainable resource management and the protection of ... biodiversity.
- B. To redress the past discriminatory policies and practices which gave substantial rights over wildlife to commercial farmers, but which ignored communal farmers.
- C. To amend the Nature Conservation Ordinance (4 of 1975) so that the same principles that govern rights to wildlife utilisation on commercial land are extended to communal land.
- D. To allow rural communities on state land to undertake tourism ventures, and to enter into co-operative agreements with commercial tourism organisations to develop tourism activities on state land.

Commercial farmers in Namibia are given ownership over huntable game (oryx, springbok, kudu, warthog, buffalo and bushpig) if they have a certain size farm and a certain type of fencing. They are able, as identified landowners, to use protected and specially protected species through a permit system. Legislation also allows trophy hunting to take place on commercial farms under certain conditions. Commercial farmers may buy and sell game on their land.

The policy on wildlife and tourism on communal land makes provision for rural communities which form a conservancy to be given the same rights over wildlife as a commercial farmer.

The policy states (MET 1995a):

1. The right to utilise and benefit from wildlife on communal land should be devolved to a rural community that forms a conservancy in terms of the Ministry's policy on conservancies.
2. Each conservancy should have the right to utilise wildlife within the bounds of the conservancy to the benefit of the community. Once a quota for each available species has been set, the conservancy members may decide how these animals may be utilised. They may decide to allow hunting by members of the conservancy, culling of game for meat, the sale of animals for trophy hunting, or the live sale of game.

The conservancy should be able to enter into a business arrangement with private companies to carry out some or all of these activities.

The conservancy would also have the right to establish tourism facilities within its boundaries or engage in a commercial arrangement with a registered tourism operator to act on its behalf.

In order to gain the above rights the policy states that the conservancy needs to be legally constituted, it must have clearly defined boundaries agreed by neighbouring communities or conservancies, a defined membership, and a committee representative of the conservancy members.

The policy makes provision for conservancies to receive income directly through its own business transactions, to retain all of this income (unless liable to existing taxes), and to decide how to use the income.

### ***Promotion of Community Based Tourism***

The MET policy on the Promotion of Community Based Tourism was approved in 1995. It provides a framework for ensuring that local communities have access to opportunities in tourism development and are able to share in the benefits of tourism activities that take place on their land. The policy recognises that where tourism is linked to wildlife and wild landscapes, the benefits to local communities can provide important incentives for conservation of these resources.

The policy recognises that in the past, local communities have had little control over tourism activities on their land and little access to direct benefits from tourism. In order to redress this a programme of action included in the policy document states that MET will give recognised communal area conservancies the concessionary rights to lodge development within the conservancy boundaries (MET 1995b).

### ***Nature Conservation Ordinance***

The Nature Conservation Ordinance (No. 4 of 1975) is the primary legislation providing for the proclamation of protected areas and the conservation and utilisation of wildlife in Namibia. Prior to an amendment in 1996, it gave conditional ownership over huntable game and limited use rights over other species to commercial farmers but did not extend these rights to communal farmers. In order to gain ownership of huntable game and the right to utilise other species through a permit system, farmers had to have farms of a certain size, which had to be enclosed by a certain type of fencing. In terms of the Ordinance, people in communal areas could benefit from wildlife use through a permit system if a hunting season was declared in their area. The Ordinance also enabled the Ministry to issue permits for the use of game species for traditional feasts or other special occasions. Under the Ordinance, trophy hunting could take place on communal land, but hunting rights were allocated by the state, which retained all revenue.

### ***Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996***

The Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996 (Act 5 of 1996) amends the Nature Conservation Ordinance so that residents of communal areas can gain the same rights over wildlife and tourism as commercial farmers. Instead of fencing and the size of the farm as conditions for gaining ownership over huntable game and the right to use other species, the Nature Conservation Amendment Act sets the formation of a conservancy as the condition upon which ownership and use rights over game are given to communal area residents. The Act puts into effect the MET's policy on Wildlife Management, Utilisation and Tourism on Communal land.

According to the Act any group of persons residing on communal land may apply to the Minister of Environment and Tourism to have the area they inhabit or part of that area declared a conservancy.

The Minister will declare a conservancy in the Government Gazette if:

- the community applying has elected a representative committee and supplied the names of the committee members
- the community has agreed upon a legal constitution, which provides for the sustainable management and utilisation of game in the conservancy
- the conservancy committee has the ability to manage funds
- the conservancy committee has an approved method for the equitable distribution to members of the community of benefits derived from the consumptive and non-consumptive use of game in the conservancy.
- the community has defined the boundaries of the geographic area of the conservancy
- the area concerned is not subject to any lease or is not a proclaimed game reserve or nature reserve.



Once a conservancy has been declared in the Government Gazette the Act gives the conservancy committee, on behalf of the community in the conservancy, "rights and duties" with regard to the consumptive and non-consumptive use and sustainable management of game "in order to enable the members of such community to derive benefits from such use and management" (GRN 1996: 6).

The Act then confers on a conservancy committee the same rights, privileges, duties and obligations that the Nature Conservation Ordinance confers on a commercial farmer. The Act makes it clear that provisions in the Ordinance concerning fencing and the size of the land will not apply to a conservancy.

The rights over wildlife conferred on a conservancy committee are for the ownership (and therefore use for own purposes) of huntable game (oryx, springbok, kudu, warthog, buffalo and bushpig), the capture and sale of game, hunting and culling, and the right to apply for permits for the use of protected and specially protected game. If a conservancy applies to become designated as a 'hunting farm', trophy hunting can be carried out within the conservancy.

The Nature Conservation Ordinance does not specifically deal with tourism. However, the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996 gives conservancies rights over non-consumptive utilisation of game. The definition of non-consumptive utilisation contained in the Act includes use for "recreational, educational, cultural, or aesthetic purposes". Conservancies thus acquire rights over non-consumptive uses normally associated with tourism. This is intended, as far as possible within the powers of the Nature Conservation Ordinance, to give conservancies a concessionary right over commercial tourism activities within the conservancy.

The Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996, also makes provision for communal area residents who do not form conservancies to benefit indirectly from wildlife, through the formation of Wildlife Councils. A Wildlife Council is established by the Minister after consulting with a local community or communities on communal land. The area covered by a Wildlife Council may not include any conservancy, any land subject to a lease or any proclaimed game park or nature reserve. A Wildlife Council will gain the same rights, and obligations concerning consumptive and non-consumptive use of wildlife as a conservancy (GRN 1996).

### ***Amendment of Regulations Relating to Nature Conservation, 1996***

In order to give more precise definition to certain issues relating to the formation of conservancies and Wildlife Councils, the MET introduced new Regulations to accompany the Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996.

The new regulations require a conservancy committee to provide a register containing the names, identification numbers and addresses of the members of the community to be represented by the committee.

The new regulations also specify certain issues, which must be covered by the Conservancy Constitution (GRN 1996b):

- the objectives of the conservancy, including the sustainable management and utilisation of game within the conservancy in accordance with a game management and utilisation plan, and the equitable distribution of the benefits derived therefrom
- the procedure for election and removal of members of the conservancy committee
- the powers and responsibilities of the conservancy committee, including powers to enter into agreements relating to consumptive and non-consumptive use of game
- provisions relating to the holding of meetings of the committee, annual and ordinary meetings of the conservancy and the recording of proceedings of these meetings
- the criteria and procedure for being recognised as a member of the conservancy, provided that no-one may be excluded on the grounds of ethnicity or gender
- the rights and obligations of members of the conservancy
- the procedure for members of the conservancy to decide on the policy to be followed by the conservancy committee in the equitable distribution of benefits
- provision for the management of the conservancy's finances, including the appointment of a suitably qualified person to act as treasurer, the keeping of proper accounts, and the opening of a bank account in the name of the conservancy
- a procedure for dispute resolution
- a procedure for the amendment of the constitution
- any other issues the conservancy may wish to include in its constitution

The regulations also provide more detail about the establishment of Wildlife Councils. In order to form a Wildlife Council, the Minister must hold a meeting in order to inform the community concerned and to consult the community about the functions and objectives of the proposed Wildlife Council. In order to hold such a meeting, the Minister must give notice of the meeting at the Office of the Regional Council, and in one newspaper circulating in the area in question.

The Minister may establish a Wildlife Council if he or she is satisfied that the community, together with a Wildlife Council, has the ability to manage and utilise in a sustainable manner the game in the area covered by the council.

Wildlife Councils will be composed of (GRN 1996b):

- a) the governor of the region in which the Wildlife Council has been established, or the governor's nominee
- b) two staff members in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism designated by the Minister
- c) five other members appointed by the Minister, of whom one shall be nominated by the traditional authority for the area in which the wildlife council has been established, and of whom four shall be persons nominated by members of the community for which the council has been established.

The regulations also provide for regular meetings of the council, and the procedure at these meetings. The regulations state that the Minister will determine how moneys received by a Wildlife Council will be spent, and that no funds of the council, except for operational costs, may be expended or distributed without the Minister's approval.

### ***Draft Tourism Act***

The MET is currently preparing a Tourism Act to provide for better co-ordination and regulation of the tourism industry in Namibia. This draft Act specifically provides for conservancies to be given concessionary rights over tourism activities. It states that upon declaration of the conservancy by the Minister, the conservancy committee will "acquire all rights to operate or lease tourism concessions within the conservancy, for the benefit of the members of the conservancy" (MET 1996, 11).

The draft Tourism Act is expected to be introduced in the Namibian Parliament during mid 1997.

### ***Forestry policy and legislation***

The Directorate of Forestry in the MET has drafted new policy and legislation which makes provision for the establishment of various types of protected forest area including a category of community forest. The approach is similar to that of communal area conservancies, although communities do not necessarily gain rights over the commercial exploitation of timber products in the way that conservancies do over wildlife and tourism. Within MET a policy decision has been taken that separate conservancy and community forest committees should not be created within one community, but the two approaches should be integrated.

### ***Policy proposals on Parks and Resident Peoples***

The MET recognises the need to update its policies and approaches to protected area management, bringing them in line with modern ideas which take into account the human and social aspects of protected area management. The MET is currently undergoing a process of policy review and development in this regard and has developed a number of policy proposals for further internal discussion before being submitted to Cabinet.

The proposals make provision for involving neighbours and people resident in protected areas in park planning and management, sharing resources and benefits with neighbours and residents, providing economic opportunities based on wildlife utilisation and tourism for local people and linking protected areas with local land uses and regional economies.

The Ministry proposes the following general policy for protected areas and resident people (people living inside parks as well as neighbours):

"It is the policy of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to manage protected areas in ways which are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of people living in or adjacent to these areas, giving particular attention to promoting their economic development, promoting communication and consultation and providing adequate forms of compensation to people removed from their land or denied access to key resources through the establishment of a protected area" (Jones in press., 30).

The MET proposes the following policy for protected areas, which have people living within their boundaries:

"It is the policy of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to manage protected areas in ways which are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of people living inside these areas, giving particular attention to recognising their rights, promoting their economic development, promoting communication and participation in decision-making and providing preferential opportunities to residents to benefit from the sustainable use of wildlife and from tourism activities within the protected area (Jones in press., 32)

The implementation of these policies will lead to the development of a number of new projects linking communal area residents with protected areas, particularly in northeastern Namibia. Conservancies neighbouring protected areas will gain additional opportunities for enterprise development and resource utilisation.

### 3.3.2 Land policy and legislation affecting CBNRM

At independence in 1990, ownership of all land previously set aside for the exclusive use of the various 'native' population groups was vested by the Constitution in the Government. This provided continuity from the situation, which existed since 1980 when ownership of communal lands was vested in the government of the Territory of South West Africa. The new Constitution vested ownership in a sovereign government rather than a colonial power.

Under the colonial administration, magistrates and superintendents were given control over the allocation of communal land. Traditional leaders were expected to carry out the instructions of magistrates, but regulations specified that headmen were not to make any allotments of land themselves. In practice, however, traditional leaders believe that communal land is owned by the chief or the king and have always been actively involved in land allocation in terms of customary law (Corbett and Daniels 1996). Communal area residents have usufruct rights over land and certain resources, such as grazing.

Government policy towards land issues is currently guided by the resolutions of the National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question, which was held in 1991 (Corbett and Daniels 1996). The resolution on access to communal land provides that:

- in accordance with the Constitution, all Namibians have the right to live wherever they choose within the national territory
- in seeking access to communal land, applicants should take account of the rights and customs of local communities living there
- in land distribution, priority should be given to the landless and those without adequate land for subsistence

However, a number of factors have combined to create a general situation of open access to communal land in Namibia, where there is little incentive for active sustainable management of land and resources to take place. The *de facto* allocation of land by traditional leaders has been eroded by government policy, which has tended to marginalise traditional leaders in terms of local power and authority. The provision in the Constitution that Namibians have the right to live anywhere in the country has been interpreted by many as the right to settle on any piece of land, regardless of who may already have customary rights of access and use. The lack of secure and exclusive group or individual tenure over communal land is a major disincentive for sustainable management. The fencing of large tracts of communal land by individuals and competition between communities over scarce resources has also contributed to the undermining of land allocation within communities on the basis of customary law (Dewdney 1996).

### ***Draft Communal Land Policy and Draft Communal Land Act***

Following the National Land Conference in 1991, a number of steps have been taken to institute land reform in Namibia. These include the drafting of a Communal Land Policy and a Communal Land Act. Both of these documents make provision for multiple forms of land rights and for the administration of communal land through a Land Board system based on the Botswana model. Land Boards would be responsible for the allocation and administration of communal land, acting on behalf of "land using communities". Provision is made for individuals and groups to lease land from the Land Board for commercial activities, which could include tourism and/or trophy hunting, a situation that is also similar to the Botswana model.

A White Paper on Land Policy dated 21 April, 1997, makes provision for community tenure as part of a system of multiple forms of land rights. It also contains a cross-reference to the Nature Conservation Amendment Act 1996, and conservancies. According to the document: "If they so choose, communities will be able to register as holders of rights to specific areas of land and will be authorised to manage the use of specified resources on that land, provided that they do so on a sustainable basis. Within community owned areas, subordinate title can be awarded to individuals or families for such purposes as residence or cultivation ... Communities which have constituted themselves conservancies under the Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996 may choose to apply for registration as owners of land on which their conservancies are located" (GRN 1997).

The White Paper makes provision for two pieces of legislation, a Land Bill which will establish Land Boards and deal with matters relating to customary grants and leasehold and a second Bill which will set out forms of family, group and community ownership and specify procedures for their operation.

### 3.3.3 National level institutions and activities

#### *National CBNRM Programme*

The National CBNRM Programme is both a partnership between several organisations involved in community-based natural resource management and a combination of activities at national and community level. Prior to Namibia's Independence in 1990, community-based conservation activities had been pioneered by the NGO, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC) working with individuals from the then Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreational Resorts. IRDNC worked in the northwest of the country in the former Damaraland and Kaokoland, now the Kunene Region. The main focus of IRDNC was community-based wildlife conservation.

In early 1990, just before independence, the Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreational Resorts, regained control of the Caprivi Game Park in the north-east of the country, which had been proclaimed in 1968, but taken over soon afterwards to be run as a military area by the occupying South African military forces. Between 3 000 and 4 000 people, mostly Khoe Bushman, remained in the park, where many of the men had been employed by the South African military. In order to decide how to run a park with about 4 000 people resident in it, the Directorate put together a multi-disciplinary team to carry out a socio-ecological survey of the area, which took place in April, 1990, one month after independence and under the auspices of the new Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism (MWCT). IRDNC assisted the Ministry in developing a methodology for the survey and in carrying it out. The survey was participatory and iterative in approach, having many similarities with Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques. It resulted in a series of recommendations that led to the development of a community-based conservation project in the Caprivi Game Park (Brown and Jones 1994).

The MWCT and IRDNC refined the socio-ecological survey methodology and carried out a series of surveys between 1991 and 1993 in eastern Caprivi, the Tsumkwe District, the lower Kuiseb valley in the Namib-Naukluft Park, the Huab catchment, and the Sesfontein area, either to develop new projects or to build on work already begun..

It was realised by the MWCT and IRDNC that in order for local communities to have sufficient incentives to manage their resources sustainably and for the local community-based conservation projects to reach their full potential, certain policy and legislative changes were necessary. In 1992, the Ministry began the process of developing new policy and legislation which culminated in the passing of the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, which makes provision for communal area conservancies. July 1993 saw the start of the US \$14 million Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme in support of national and local CBNRM activities. The national programme began to attract other

partners beyond the Ministry, IRDNC and the LIFE team, and the activities began to expand to include other resources than wildlife and tourism.

By May 1997, the programme consisted of:

- A policy and legislative framework for developing rights over wildlife and tourism to rural communities
- At least 12 active community projects focusing on conservancy formation and sustainable natural resource management in four of the country's 14 regions;
- Two NGOs (IRDNC and the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia) providing direct support to communities at field level;
- Social science research being carried out by the Social Science Division of the University of Namibia;
- Legal advice to communities on enterprise development, joint venture negotiation and conservancy formation provided by the Legal Assistance Centre;
- Further policy analysis and formulation carried out by MET
- Extension and support to communities on conservancy formation, resource economics, joint venture negotiations, enterprise development and wildlife management provided by MET;
- Support to communities on tourism enterprise development and national advocacy provided by the Namibian Community-based Tourism Association (NACOBTA);
- The development of a Community-based Tourism unit within MET;
- Considerable support many of these activities from the LIFE Programme;

The roles and activities of partner organisations within the National Programme which operate at a national level are set out below:

#### *Ministry of Environment and Tourism*

Through the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA), the Ministry of Environment and Tourism provides overall co-ordination of CBNRM activities and the national programme. The MET is responsible for providing the policy and legislative framework within which CBNRM activities take place. Since the legislative changes brought about by the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, the DEA has focused attention on assisting government and NGOs in the development of the White Paper on Land Reform in Communal Areas, paying particular attention to the relationship between tenure issues and sustainable resource management.

The DEA houses a resource economics programme which carries out research on resource values, the economics of alternative land uses, the viability of resource based enterprises and provides advice to communities on negotiating with the private sector. The DEA assists communities establishing conservancies to develop resource mapping and monitoring systems, which combine community level data gathering and knowledge with information generated by remote sensing and aerial censuses. The DEA houses an information and publicity officer who develops and provides information on conservancies, and generates publicity on behalf of the national programme and individual partner organisations.

Through the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM), the MET provides information to communities about conservancies and assistance to emerging conservancies in developing wildlife management strategies. Once conservancies are formed the DRM will provide extension on wildlife management and problem animal control.

The Directorate of Tourism (DOT) has a donor-funded community-based tourism (CBT) officer who is expected to be absorbed into the Ministry and who will head a CBT Unit within DOT. This unit will work on policy affecting community-based tourism, assist communities developing CBT enterprises, and liaise closely with the private sector.

The Directorate of Forestry (DOF) has signed an agreement with one community in northern Namibia for the establishment of a community forest. The area coincides with the same area the community wants to develop as a conservancy.

### ***LIFE Project***

The Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Project is a large CBNRM project which targets communities in the Caprivi and eastern Otjozondjupa Regions and supports a number of national level activities within the National CBNRM Programme. It is funded jointly between the Government of Namibia through the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Government of the United States through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

The project is administered by WWF-US, in partnership with the US PVOs Management Systems International and World Learning, and a Namibian development and training NGO, the Rossing Foundation. The major activities of the LIFE Project are the awarding of sub-grants to Namibian implementing organisations, sub-grants administration, technical support to implementing organisations, provision of training and capacity building, some limited direct implementation with communities and monitoring and evaluation.

The LIFE Project agreement was signed in September 1992 with USAID funding of US \$10,5 million up to August 31, 1997. Following a participatory mid-term assessment of the project from October 1994 to April 1995, the project was extended to August 18, 1999, with the injection of an additional US \$4, 356 000 from USAID.

The mid-term assessment aimed at dealing with a number of design faults in the original project and at reviewing the project Goal, Purpose, and Outputs. The revised Goal and Purpose and a set of result statements or objectives are set out below (USAID 1995):



**Goal:** Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable natural resource management.

**Purpose:** Communities derive increased benefits in an equitable manner by gaining control over and sustainably managing and utilising natural resources in target areas.

**Objectives/result statements:**

1. Social/ecological knowledge base improved for management of communal natural resources in Target Areas
2. Resource base of Target Areas developed and maintained
3. Increased community awareness and knowledge of natural resource management opportunities and constraints
4. Communities mobilised into legally recognised bodies that are capable of managing communal resources
5. Improved community skills in participatory and technical NRM and enterprise management
6. Improved capacity of Namibian organisations to sustainably assist communities in the establishment of sustainable CBNRM enterprises and management systems
7. Improved capacity of Namibian organisations to establish legal, regulatory and policy framework supportive of CBNRM
8. Analysis of CBNRM dynamics, experience, and lessons learned shared throughout Namibia and between LIFE and southern African colleagues

*LIFE Steering committee*

All project activities are co-ordinated and monitored by the LIFE Steering Committee, composed of representatives of MET, USAID, WWF, IRDNC, Nyae Nyae Farmers' Co-operative, NACOBTA, and the Director of the Namibian Legal Assistance Centre. The MET through the Directorate of Environmental Affairs, chairs the steering committee. Decision-making is by consensus, although USAID and MET retain final right to veto any activity which is contrary to their respective policies or regulations.

The tasks of the Steering Committee include:

- advise MET and USAID on all LIFE Project activities
- oversight of WWF support staff through reports at committee meetings and written semi-annual reports, annual workplans/budgets and evaluations

- review and approve sub-grant applications in accordance with criteria and priorities established by the committee
- monitor impact of government policies and legislation concerning community resource utilisation in the target area and make appropriate recommendations
- develop a plan during the life of the project for Namibian NGOs in conjunction with the MET to maintain key functions on a sustainable basis at the conclusion of the project

### *Staffing*

The LIFE Programme is staffed by a Chief of Party (expatriate), Programme Officer (Namibian), CBNRM Technical Assistant (expatriate), Community Development Officer (Namibian), Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist (expatriate), Financial Management Officer (expatriate), Accountant (Namibian), an Office Manager and Secretary (both Namibian). LIFE funds two positions, which are seconded to the MET. One is a resource economist (expatriate), who heads the resource economics programme within the DEA, and the other is a Community-based Tourism Officer (Namibian) in the Directorate of Tourism.

### *Current Sub-grants administered by the LIFE Project*

The LIFE Project is currently administering a number of sub-grants to Namibian NGOs for the implementation of various components of the project and the National CBNRM Programme. These sub-grants are as follows (WWF et al 1997):

#### *Community-Based Natural Resource Management in West Caprivi*

This grant supports implementation of an integrated natural resource management project by the NGO, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation, in the Caprivi Game Reserve. Key activities include support of a community game guard/resource monitor system, development and training of a community natural resource management structure, and promotion of natural resource enterprises (more detail about activities funded by this sub-grant are contained in the project profile on West Caprivi below). This grant ends on May 31, 1997. A new sub-grant to IRDNC will bring together the east and west Caprivi projects in an integrated project for the region, which will run to February 28, 1999.

#### *Community-Based Conservation programme in East Caprivi*

This grant assists IRDNC in their effort to promote community management of wildlife and other natural resources in areas neighbouring national parks or in other areas in East Caprivi. Major activities include a community-gameguard/resource monitor system, development of natural resource-based enterprises, assisting communities with conservancy formation, and environmental awareness and outreach (more detail about project activities are contained in the project profiles below). This grant ends on May 31, 1997, and the project will be amalgamated with the West Caprivi project.

**Monitoring and Managing the Natural Resource Base for East and West Caprivi for Increased Productivity and Sustainable Utilisation.**

This grant makes funds available to the MET for applied research on high value game species, monitoring of the wildlife resource base through aerial surveys and participatory land-based game censusing. Funding is also provided for aerial photography coverage of Caprivi, and development of GIS base maps for LIFE Target Areas. This grant ends in February 28, 1999.

*Institutional Support to the Social Science Division of the University of Namibia*

This grant was aimed at strengthening the capacity of the SSD to undertake applied social science research of Namibian CBNRM activities. It ended in February 1997.

**Communities Managing Natural Resources in Nyae Nyae: Community Ranger and Agriculture Programmes**

This grant provides institutional support to the Nyae Nyae Farmers' Co-operative to implement a Community Ranger system and a Sustainable Agriculture Programme. There is a considerable training component and provision for the Co-operative to hire consultants to assist them with a number of their activities. The grant was recently amended to assist the community in their efforts to establish a conservancy (more details are provided in the Nyae Nyae project profile below). It ends in February 1999.

**Promoting Sustainable Development Based on Sound Natural Resource Management Through the Development of Staff and Technical Infrastructure**

This grant is designed to strengthen the capacity of the Directorate of Environmental Affairs to support the National CBNRM Programme through the funding of a natural resource specialist, a media and information consultant and the procurement of strategic equipment and training. The grant ends on February 28 1999.

*Resource-based Enterprise Development Unit in East and West Caprivi*

This grant was designed to facilitate the establishment of natural resource-based enterprises in Caprivi, such as thatching grass sales, Lizauli Traditional Village, community-run camp sites, crafts production etc. This project ends on May 31, 1997, and its activities will be incorporated in IRDNC's integrated Caprivi CBNRM project.

*Crafts Production and Marketing in Caprivi*

This grant, to the Caprivi Arts and Cultural Association, supports increased production and marketing of crafts made from natural resources. Activities include assessment and monitoring of the resources used in craft production and the extension of more sustainable harvesting practices. The current grant ends on May 31 1997.

*Institutional Support to the Namibia Community-based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*

This grant provides funds to NACOBTA for a staff member and support equipment, training courses for a wide range of community-based tourism (CBT) enterprises, CBT networking, and representing the needs of the CBT sector at national level. The grant ends on February 28, 1999.

*Conservancy Formation in the Salambala Forest*

This grant provided funds and assistance for the Salambala management body in eastern Caprivi to mobilise community members in the establishment of a conservancy. The grant ended in January 1991. A new grant, which began in April 1997, will support the continuation of the conservancy establishment activities, and fund infrastructural developments required for the reintroduction of game and wildlife management (more details about activities in Salambala are provided in the project profiles below). The grant will end on February 28, 1999.

*Capacity Building Grant for the National CBNRM Programme*

This grant, to the Rossing Foundation, provides funds for four Namibians to study for Masters level degrees from southern African Universities. The objective is to enhance the knowledge and analytical skills of Namibians contributing to the implementation of the National Programme. The grant ends in February 1999.

*Institutional Support to Rossing Foundation Craft Development Programme*

This sub-grant began in February 1997 and will support the Rossing Foundation in the development of craft markets in the Caprivi, the development of crafts products and the improvement of the quality of crafts. It will run to February 28, 1999.

*New Sub-grants*

*Community-based Natural Resource Management in Caprivi*

Funding for this sub-grant will begin in June 1997 and will support an integrated CBNRM project in east and west Caprivi implemented by IRDNC. It will continue the activities under the West Caprivi and East Caprivi sub-grants to IRDNC noted above, and support new activities more focused on conservancy awareness, formation and operation.

*Social Science Division of the University of Namibia (SSD)*

The SSD is a research institute of the University of Namibia with a particular interest in issues such as rural poverty and natural resource management. It also carries out research on a consultancy basis for government and donor organisations. As noted above the LIFE Programme provided a grant to SSD to develop its capacity to research and analyse CBNRM issues in order to assist both implementation at the field level and the development of policy at the national level.

SSD has supported the national CBNRM programme by carrying out socio-economic research related to project activities in east and west Caprivi. It has also assisted in organising a national workshop for NGOs on CBNRM and has analysed the conservancy approach in relation to theory and practice of common property resource management. SSD has assisted the Ministry of lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation in developing its communal land policy and legislation, and has promoted the inclusion of secure communal group tenure. It had originally been hoped that SSD would play a similar role in the national programme to that played by the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) of the University of Zimbabwe in Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). CASS carries out socio-economic baseline research, analysis of programmatic issues and policy recommendations as part of its own research agenda. Although SSD staff were interested in carrying out CBNRM research, due to institutional problems within the University of Namibia, the SSD has been unable to develop a strong capacity for further support to the national CBNRM programme. It is likely that SSD will in future maintain less formal links with the programme and will carry out research and programmatic analysis on a contract basis, rather than by employing staff specifically tasked with such research.

#### ***Namibian Community-based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)***

NACOBTA is a non-profit Community-based Organisation (CBO) that was formed in 1995 following two workshops on community-based tourism development in Namibia. The workshops, organised and supported by the MET and the LIFE Programme, identified the need for an organisation to be established which could represent the needs of the more than 30 community-based tourism enterprises established in Namibia.

The primary objectives of NACOBTA are the following (NACOBTA 1995):

- to establish and develop partnerships between communities, government, NGOs and the private sector
- to promote the use of sound natural resources management practices by community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs)
- to increase profitability of CBTEs by facilitating training and technical assistance
- to document and share experiences of successful tourism
- to operate and maintain a CBTE network for a broad range of community-based enterprises involved in tourism, including cultural and environmental tourism.

NACOBTA is run by a programme manager based in Windhoek who works under the guidance of a Board composed of elected representatives of community-based tourism enterprises. A general meeting is held annually. Membership has grown from an original founding number of 16 CBTEs to 37 in late 1996. The association receives a grant from the LIFE Programme for the period December 1 1995 to February 28, 1999. The grant covers the salary of the programme manager, consultants' fees, training and workshops and equipment including a vehicle.

NACOBTA has also received funding from SIDA to enable it to provide small grants to communities. SIDA also provides a technical assistant to help NACOBTA in its provision of services to community run enterprises.

#### ***Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)***

The LAC is a not for profit NGO which provides free legal services to the poor and takes a particular interest in human rights issues. Its director has been a long-standing member of the LIFE Steering Committee. LAC has recently developed its own Land and Natural Resources programme with funding from the Ford Foundation. The LAC provides communities with advice on conservancy formation, particularly aspects such as drafting a constitution, forming Trusts, and negotiations with the private sector. The Centre has assisted MET in the drafting of the conservancy legislation and regulations. It has also played a prominent role in the debate on land Reform and has assisted the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation and the SSD in drafting policy and legislation which incorporates group tenure on communal lands.

#### ***Rossing Foundation***

The Rossing Foundation is a development and training NGO established by the Rossing Uranium Company. The Foundation is a member of the consortium of NGOs, which implements the LIFE Programme. Until recently, the Foundation has not played a big role in the implementation of CBNRM although it has provided support through its LIFE Steering Committee membership and indirectly through a separate USAID-funded Environmental Education Programme implemented by the Foundation. The Rossing Foundation receives a grant from LIFE to provide scholarships for Namibians to study for postgraduate degrees in CBNRM-related aspects of the social sciences. The Foundation has recently secured funding from WWF-UK to develop and implement a capacity building and training programme with a focus on enterprise development and management, for NGOs and CBOs involved in conservancy formation and implementation.

### **3.3.4 Local level CBNRM projects**

#### ***Caprivi***

About 80 000 people live in east and west Caprivi most of whom belong to one of six ethnic groups: the Mafwe, Subia, Mayei, Khoe (San), Vasekele (San) and Mbukushu. In west Caprivi there are tribal conflicts between the Khoe, who claim to be the authentic original inhabitants of the area, and the Mbukushu from west of the Okavango River who claim the whole of the Caprivi Strip. In east Caprivi, there are deep rooted differences between the Subia and the Mafwe and between the Mafwe and the Mayei, who in recent years have broken away from the Mafwe to form their own tribal court, now recognised by government.

The majority of people rely on subsistence livestock and crop farming, with some cash cropping, supplemented by the utilisation of wild fruits, fish, and water lilies. Where wildlife still exists, there is some illegal utilisation of game species largely for meat, with some illegal trade in ivory. Reeds, grasses and local timber are important for shelter, fuel and

farming implements. A growing number of people are becoming involved in the sale of crafts to tourists.

Rainfall, is high compared to the rest of the country - the annual average is around 650 mm - but this is still only marginal for rain-fed crop growing. Soils are poor, mostly Kalahari Sands, except in flood plain areas where agricultural potential is highest, but croplands are also susceptible to inundation in good rain years.

Rising human population growth, an increase in livestock numbers, and the slash and burn style of agriculture, have all contributed to a deteriorating natural resource base. Wildlife numbers have declined dramatically due to poaching by local people, government officials and the South African Defence force prior to Namibian Independence in 1990, and the continued conversion of wild habitat to livestock and croplands.

The decline in wildlife numbers was particularly striking in east Caprivi where for example red lechwe decreased from 12 928 in 1980 to 1 926 in 1989 (MET undated). Giraffe and wildebeest disappeared from eastern Caprivi during the mid 1980s, while there has been a significant decrease in wildebeest and roan numbers in west Caprivi. However, both elephant and buffalo have increased throughout the region, sable and giraffe appear to be increasing in west Caprivi and populations of impala, kudu and buffalo seem to be showing positive trends in the Mudumu National Park in eastern Caprivi (Rodwell et al. 1995).

CBNRM activities began in Caprivi in 1989 when the NGO, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC) developed a community-game guard programme in conjunction with local communities along the Kwando River and the Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreation Resorts.

The community game guard programme was developed in response to reports of significant declines in game numbers in the region and of hostility between local people and officials of the Directorate. IRDNC directors, Garth Owen Smith and Margaret Jacobsohn, held a series of community meetings to discuss the situation with local people. The tribal authority for the Mafwe Group, the Linyanti Khuta, agreed that something should be done about the decline in wildlife. The Khuta supported suggestions from IRDNC that the establishment of a community game guard system could help to curb poaching.

The game guards along the Kwando River were established in order to begin the process of giving back responsibility to local people for wildlife management, to provide liaison between local people and the government conservation authorities, and to monitor wildlife and provide information to local tribal leaders (indunas) about suspected poaching activities. The indunas would either deal with poaching incidents themselves, or in serious cases, ensure that these were reported to the conservation authority.

In early 1990, as described above in the section on Namibia's National CBNRM Programme, the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism (MWCT) carried out a socio-ecological survey of the Caprivi Game Reserve. The survey made a number of recommendations, which led to the formulation of a project proposal by the MWCT to WWF-US for funding to develop a community-based conservation project in the Caprivi Game Reserve. This project was implemented jointly by the Ministry and IRDNC. It aimed at appointing a

community liaison officer to work with local people, establishing a community game guard system, establishing a liaison committee between the inhabitants and park personnel, and the return of some benefits from tourism enterprises to local people (Brown and Jones 1994).

In late 1991, the Ministry and IRDNC, in conjunction with local leaders, carried out a socio-ecological survey of eastern Caprivi, along the Kwando River. The aim of the survey was to try to defuse some of the hostility between local people and MWCT personnel, which had developed because of problem animal incidents and an aggressive anti-poaching campaign. It also aimed to build on the work begun by IRDNC and the local community in developing a community game guard system. The survey identified a number of problems faced by people living close to two National Parks proclaimed by the South African Administration just prior to Independence and without final agreement with the local people. The survey made a number of recommendations for dealing with disputes over the park boundaries, dealing with problem animals, the channelling of benefits from wildlife and tourism to local communities and the roles of the community game guards (Brown 1991).

These recommendations formed the basis for ongoing MWCT and IRDNC co-operation in the area on working with local communities. They also led to the development of a project to monitor elephant movements and investigate the extent of elephant damage to crops and ways of dealing with problem elephants.

The Subia tribal Khuta also requested the extension of the community-game guard system to their area, which covers much of the eastern floodplains of East Caprivi, and is a region considerably depleted in wildlife. A number of game guards were appointed with the same functions as those along the Kwando River. In order to integrate women more fully into natural resource management issues, a number of women community resource monitors were appointed.

In tandem with the establishment of a game guard system, IRDNC worked with local communities to develop income generation activities that could demonstrate the potential for economic development of wildlife and tourism.

During 1995 and 1996 the focus of activities shifted towards assisting communities to form conservancies in anticipation of the legislation making provision for communal area conservancies. A number of communities are expected to apply for conservancy status during 1997.

The following project activities are being carried out:

*Community Game Guard system*

a) East Caprivi

A main focus of CGG activity in Caprivi east of the Kwando River has been problem animal control. Damage to crops by elephants, hippos and other animals, along with the killing of livestock by predators contributed in the past to a negative attitude towards western conservation approaches by local people. This was exacerbated by the failure in many cases of the conservation authorities to deal adequately with problem animals. The CGGs play an



important role in trying to minimise the damage caused by wildlife and increasing the likelihood that people will tolerate animals such as elephants and predators. Some of the game guards are armed and are able to shoot predators, which have killed livestock, which is permitted under Namibian legislation. Local people are not allowed to shoot an elephant or hippo without a permit, but game guards shoot over the heads of elephants if necessary to scare them away. The game guards advise community leaders and residents on improved livestock protection. Game guards from one community have also successfully maintained a locally designed 17 km electric fence, which prevents elephants entering the fields of villages just south of the Mudumu National Park. The aim is to build up a partnership between local communities, NGOs, and the conservation authority over problem animal issues. Lack of capacity has often prevented full involvement of the personnel from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

The CGGs along the Kwando River have had mixed success in their anti-poaching activities. In the early days of the game guard system, there was considerable hostility towards the conservation authority and local people tended to side with the poachers, withholding information about poaching activities. In 1995 one game guard was convicted for dealing in illegal ivory. As IRDNC has built up trust with the communities and a working relationship has developed between the communities, IRDNC and local game rangers, community members have begun to provide increasing support for the game guards in their anti-poaching efforts.

On the eastern flood plains in the Subia tribal area, the game guards also took responsibility for monitoring fishing activities on behalf of the tribal authority, and in addition to reporting suspected poaching cases, also reported use of illegal fishing methods.

#### b) West Caprivi

In West Caprivi the CGGs have been very successful in anti-poaching activities and the confiscation of illegal weapons. Their activities have led to a number of convictions for poaching and provide a conservation presence in the central part of the Caprivi Game Park where MET personnel patrol infrequently. Between June 1995 and December 1996, the unarmed game guards had confiscated more than 120 illegal weapons and over the 1996-97 Christmas and New Year period confiscated another 14.

The CGGs in West Caprivi enjoy good support from their headmen and communities, and are therefore able to take action against local people suspected of poaching as well as outsiders. While initially viewed with suspicion by many conservation personnel, the CGGs in both east and west Caprivi have more recently enjoyed increased support. During strikes by Ministry personnel during 1996 and in early 1997, the CGG network was the only conservation force operating in Caprivi.

#### *Community Resource monitors*

Early in the Caprivi project, IRDNC realised that although women were major users of natural resources, they were not represented in the nascent CBNRM structures being established by the project and communities. In addition, although women had the main responsibility for crop growing, and were therefore most affected by problem elephant

damage, their views were not being taken into account at community meetings to discuss problem animal control.

As a result, IRDNC began to establish a network of women community resource monitors (CRMs) in both east and west Caprivi. Their main role is to map and monitor, as a baseline record, natural resources in their area, particularly those resources most used by women. They also produce basic social maps, provide advice on sustainable methods of resource utilisation, disseminate information about CBNRM including conservancies, make sure women's voices are heard in community fora, and assist in resource-related enterprise development.

In east Caprivi appointments proceeded slowly given the shortage of capacity to train and provide support to the women. Six out of an envisaged 14 CRMs have been appointed in communities along the Kwando River.

In West Caprivi the community conservation management committee selected eight areas that needed community resource monitors, and requested that these half time posts be split in half in order to spread the benefit of the cash allowance paid by the project to the CRMs. As a result 16 women were appointed, despite concerns of project staff about lack of capacity to train and support this number of CRMs.

While there have been problems with the CRM programme, in both east and west Caprivi, the CRMs have produced social and environmental base line data which will assist conservancies in their future resource management. CRMs have also assisted in craft group development and in eastern Caprivi long-term resource monitoring of the use of thatching grass, water lilies and palm trees has been initiated.

Support to the training and capacity building of the CRMs has been provided by the LIFE Project. Problems (especially in translation) have been identified in past training approaches, and a new training programme is being developed by IRDNC and LIFE staff.

#### *Natural resource-based income generation activities*

Before the communal areas conservancy legislation was passed in 1996, IRDNC tried to find ways to facilitate the flow of benefits to communities from natural resource utilisation. "The aim was *not* merely financial income to local people, but, above all, to highlight the potential long-term value of communally owned natural resources, and the urgent need for their sustainable management *by communities*, as well as government" (IRDNC 1997: 7). A number of income-generation activities were initiated, covering a range of different resources.

#### *Thatching grass sales*

Eastern Caprivi has extensive areas of quality thatching grass, which have traditionally been utilised by local people for their own purposes and also for local sale. In conjunction with Lianshulu Lodge in the Mudumu National Park, IRDNC and LIFE staff facilitated the opening of an outside market for thatching grass. In 1994 buyers were put in contact with local women and in the first year of sales, US \$15 000 was earned from thatching grass sales

by women from two communities. A further three communities have become involved and total income is now in the region of US \$100 000. Women, as the harvesters of the grass, have been the main beneficiaries. Income is retained by individual producers with a small percentage of each thatching grass bundle going to a community-appointed representative who is the contact person with the buyer.

The community resource monitors have set up a long-term monitoring project to help ensure that utilisation is sustainable, but more work needs to be done on this aspect. The CRMs are also monitoring the socio-economic impacts of the grass sales, such as changes in access/ownership or control of the resources now that it has an increased monetary value.

#### *Bed-night levy*

The management of Lianshulu Lodge in Mudumu National Park collected a levy of US \$1,25 per tourist per night over a two year period between 1993 and 1995 for distribution to five communities neighbouring the park. IRDNC assisted in the distribution process by facilitating the identification by communities of beneficiaries, and consulting with the local and tribal khutas. "The main objective of the bed-night levy payout was not the relatively small cash benefit but to establish the *link* between the benefit and the resource, and to stress the communities' responsibility towards managing that resource" (IRDNC 1997: 8). A second payout reflecting a further two years collection of a levy by the lodge was expected in 1997.

One problem with the bed-night levy distribution was that some of the communities had not decided prior to receipt of the income how they would use the cash. The delay between receiving and using the cash could lessen the perceived link between the benefit and the resource.

#### *Lizauli Traditional Village*

Lianshulu Lodge provided the neighbouring village of Lizauli with capital to set up a traditional village which could be visited by tourists and where tourists could buy crafts. The aim was to make a link between direct local benefits from tourism and wildlife conservation and the National Park. The village was separate from people's actual living area so there would be no intrusion on daily subsistence activities and privacy. A committee was established by the village and it was decided to employ villagers to work in the traditional village. IRDNC played a limited role in the traditional village project and LIFE staff have also assisted in various training activities.

The project has run into problems over ownership of the traditional village as people believed that because Lianshulu Lodge provided the capital, it belonged to the Lodge. The Lodge management have, however, tried to convince the villagers that the project is theirs. There have also been problems of communication and accountability between the committee and the villagers. Nevertheless the project has contributed to the goal of linking benefits from tourism with wildlife conservation and to generating local support for the Mudumu National Park.

### *Bagani Campsite*

Following the 1990 socio-ecological survey in West Caprivi, it was decided by MET and IRDNC to try to get benefits from wildlife and tourism back to local people to demonstrate the income-generating potential of these activities. One of the main opportunities for generating income was the development of a community-run campsite opposite the Popa Falls on the east bank of the Okavango River at Bagani. IRDNC have supported the local community in developing the site. Progress was slow as there have also been problems with the community accepting ownership of the project, and debate over the level of capital investment and how the community should contribute. Towards the end of 1996, agreement was reached between IRDNC and the community on how to proceed and the camp was due to re-open in May 1997 with flush toilets, showers and lawned camping sites. The Bagani community have appointed a local man as camp manager. A percentage of the camp's income will go to community development.

### *Malengalenga Camp site*

Following the socio-ecological survey conducted along the Kwando River in 1991 the MET and IRDNC decided to assist the community of Malengalenga, bordering the Mamili National Park, to set up a community-run campsite to service tourists entering the park and as part of a buffer zone approach to managing conflicts between the park and local people. The venture failed because the Ministry subsequently developed competing facilities within the park and because the importance of providing a certain level of outside capital input for infrastructure was not realised at the time. The MET also failed to endorse the proposals for buffer zone development.

### *Mashi Craft Group*

Facilitated by the Enterprise Development Unit of IRDNC, women from the Choyi and Kongola communities on the east bank of the Kwando River have joined together as a group to market crafts. IRDNC have provided an A-frame structure next to the community conservation office at Kongola, a major junction and stopping point for tourists. In its first month of operation during 1996 the craft sales earned about US \$300. The project is expected to result in the growth of a major local industry. The Rossing Foundation craft unit have provided advice and training for the women. The project aims to enable the most marginalised sections of the community (women and the elderly) to earn a cash income from natural resource related activities. Crafts are made largely from local reeds, wood and grasses.

### *Salambala Joint Venture*

A joint venture agreement for the establishment of a tourist lodge has been signed between the proposed Salambala conservancy and a private tour operator. The conservancy will provide the land and the tourism and hunting rights to the area as well as game guards who help to monitor the wildlife and assist in anti-poaching activities. The private operator will provide the capital and expertise. The operator will pay an annual concession fee, and a percentage of turnover to the communities as well as provide preferential employment

opportunities to Salambala residents. The agreement will take effect upon registration of the conservancy. This is the second such community-private operator venture in Namibia.

Technical support was provided to the community by the Legal Assistance Centre, resource economists from the Directorate of Environmental Affairs, and facilitation has been provided by IRDNC and LIFE staff.

#### *Balelwa concession*

During 1996, the MET approved the award of a tourism concession in Mudumu National Park to the New Lianshulu community, which had been removed from the park prior to its proclamation. The concession was awarded in recognition of the need to compensate the people for being removed from their land, and the subsequent lack of access to resources once utilised by them. The Ministry is negotiating a contract with the community for the concession.

IRDNC, LIFE staff, and MET resource economists have been assisting the community, which has formed a committee to carry out the negotiations and later manage the concession. Possible developments include the establishment of a tented lodge in a joint venture with a private operator and a community-run campsite on the park border.

#### *Environmental awareness and outreach*

IRDNC appointed a Caprivian teacher as project manager in 1994 to build an environmental awareness programme in local schools and communities along the Kwando and Linyanti Rivers. Much of the work has focused on the development of environmental clubs in schools and visits to protected areas for teachers and community members. The project has also concentrated on exposing teachers and community leaders to conservation problems and the need for sustainable resource management. A monthly Enviro-Action newsletter is produced as a resource for local teachers. The project manager assisted in the bed-night levy distribution, by helping communities to plan distribution ceremonies.

With the aid of an assistant, the project manager has more recently concentrated on extending information to schools, teachers and community leaders, using the communications networks he has established over several years. The Environmental Awareness and Outreach unit is equipped with, a vehicle, audiovisual equipment and a generator. The unit works closely with MET personnel.

#### *Conservancies*

The passing of the communal areas conservancy legislation in 1996 enabled CBNRM activities in Caprivi to move into a new phase. While existing project activities have continued, IRDNC, LIFE and MET staff are also focusing on assisting communities to form conservancies and associated enterprises.

a) Mayuni Conservancy

This small, approximately 17 000 ha area abuts the Kwando river opposite the West Caprivi. It centres on the Choyi community and has an estimated population of 1 200 people. A management committee has been formed with representation from the Mashi Khuta (a sub-Khuta of the Mafwe Linyanti Khuta). The management committee has completed a register of members of the proposed conservancy and work is currently focused on establishing agreed boundaries and the development of a tourism plan. Sited opposite the Kwando flood plain and the game-rich west bank of the Kwando River, the conservancy has considerable potential for income generation from tourism enterprises, including joint venture lodge operations. A number of lodges already operate illegally in the area and it will be a challenge for the community and these private operators to begin to work together. Once the conservancy is registered, the community's negotiating position will be considerably strengthened as it will hold the commercial tourism rights for the area. The Mashi Conservancy is being assisted by IRDNC.

b) Sangwali

This proposed conservancy of about 24 000 ha lies between the Mudumu and Mamili National Parks with the Kwando river as the western boundary. It includes the Samudono, Sangwali and Nongozi communities with a joint population of 2 500 people. Project activities currently focus on information dissemination and election of a management committee. Work is also under way to establish agreed boundaries, but this has been complicated by the ethnic and tribal divisions. Sangwali conservancy is essentially a Mayei community, which broke away from the Mafwe tribal Khuta to form its own tribal Khuta. The proposed conservancy has good tourism and trophy hunting potential, and would provide an important corridor for wildlife movement between the Mudumu and Mamili national parks. IRDNC is supporting the development of the Sangwali conservancy.

c) Salambala Conservancy

The people of the Salambala Forest area in eastern Caprivi Region were the first community to submit a conservancy application to the MET. Their application for registration was made in May 1997, but at the time of writing there had been no decision from the Ministry. The conservancy covers about 80 000 ha and borders Botswana, with the Chobe River as its southern boundary. It has nearly 2 000 registered members. A 14 000 ha partially fenced core wildlife area is planned for building up wildlife numbers and tourism development. A joint venture for tourism and game bird shooting has been negotiated with a private operator pending approval of the conservancy by MET. So far the community has received no income from wildlife related activities. Conservancy formation has been supported by IRDNC, the LIFE Programme and the MET. A conservancy management committee has been established and a constitution accepted by the community. At the time of writing a small number of community members were disputing the use of the core area, which could potentially delay approval of the conservancy. Wildlife numbers are low and the LIFE Programme and MET will assist the conservancy in reintroducing species such as impala and zebra.

d) Mutjiku-Bwabwata

This area encompasses all land outside the core conservation areas of the West Caprivi and would be about 480 000 ha in size, involving about 7 000 inhabitants drawn from the Khoe and Vasekele San groups and the Mbukushu. The existing West Caprivi Community Conservation Steering Committee has been chosen as the conservancy management committee. Management and benefit distribution issues are currently being addressed.

The communities in West Caprivi have been subject to considerable uncertainty and confusion over their future as government has produced a number of plans for the area. The original proposal, emanating from the 1990 socio-ecological survey, was to retain proclamation of the area, proclaim the unproclaimed Kwando triangle, establish core conservation areas based on the Okavango and Kwando Rivers, and declare the remainder of the area, where people live, as a multiple use area. The MET then decided on deproclamation of the area in which people live, following recommendations from a project to develop park management plans for the north eastern protected areas. On the basis of this recommendation local people began preparing to form a conservancy. The Namibian President has subsequently favoured *not* deproclaiming any of the park. This has disappointed the local people, who preferred the conservancy option, but conservancies may not be established within a protected area. The MET has given a commitment that where people live within protected areas it will apply policies similar to the conservancy approach, based on a legally binding agreement between the Ministry and the local people. IRDNC and LIFE staff have been assisting the communities in West Caprivi in developing their conservancy.

e) Other emerging conservancies

A number of other communities in Caprivi have shown a keen interest in the conservancy concept. These include Lizauli on the northern border of Mudumu National Park, Singalamwe, on the Kwando river opposite West Caprivi, just south of the Zambian border, and Malengalenga, on the border of Mamili National Park. IRDNC activities concentrate on the first four areas due to capacity constraints and in order to ensure that effective working of conservancies are established which can serve as examples to other communities. The community along the Kwando River from Kongola to the Zambian border in the north have begun to form a conservancy and have requested assistance from IRDNC.

*New Activities*

IRDNC have secured funding from the LIFE Project to develop a new set of activities in the Mukwe area on the east bank of the Okavango River, near the Mahango National Park. A major flaw in the design of the West Caprivi Project is that activities do not extend eastward across the Okavango to include Mbukushu people living there. The Mbukushu impact on resources in West Caprivi, through legal and illegal activities. At the instruction of their chief many have begun illegally settling in parts of the Bagani area where the Khoe are living. Furthermore, the Mahango Game Reserve on the east bank of the river is adjacent to the Caprivi Game Park and part of the same system. For a number of reasons, the Mbukushu chief and his people are hostile towards the park and the MET. It therefore makes sense for the Mbukushu people to be included in CBNRM activities in and around the Bagani area. In

the past, neither the MET nor IRDNC have had the capacity to develop new activities with the Mbukushu, and no other organisation has been in a position to do so. IRDNC has recently taken on more staff and reorganised its operations and is now in a position to begin work with the Mbukushu in the Bagani/Mukwe area. IRDNC plan to open discussions with the Mbukushu leadership and explore options for developing CBNRM activities similar to those in other parts of Caprivi.

#### *North Eastern Park Management Plan Project*

The MET has initiated a programme of developing management plans for its north eastern protected areas, including, the Mahango and Caprivi game reserves, and the Mudumu and Mamili National Parks. As part of the management plan development process, the MET will be exploring ways in which the north eastern parks can include resident and neighbouring people in planning and decision-making, and in sharing resources and economic opportunities generated by the park. The Balelewa concession mentioned above, is an example of the options being explored. The north eastern park management plan project will be co-ordinated by a MET steering committee, carried out by consultants and funded by the German Development Bank, KFW.

The MET is also currently developing a new set of policies and approaches concerning protected areas and their relationship to people living inside or close to them. The new policy and approaches aim to ensure that the human and social dimension of protected area management are recognised and that protected areas can be integrated with local economies and land uses (Jones 1997).

The new policy directions for protected areas and the northeast park management plan project will have major implications for CBNRM activities in areas neighbouring the northeastern parks. The protected areas have considerable potential to provide income generating and resource sharing opportunities based on wildlife utilisation and tourism for neighbouring conservancies. The conservancies will provide appropriate institutions with which protected area managers can work, and will provide compatible forms of land use adjacent to protected areas.

#### ***Kunene Region***

The Kunene Region covers an area of approximately 70 000 sq. km and incorporates the former ethnic homelands of Damaraland and Kaokoland, as well as a portion of commercial farmland. It has a population of about 50 000 drawn from Himba, Herero, Damara, Riemvasmaker and Nama ethnic groups. The region is semi-arid to hyper arid with rainfall ranging from an average of 350 mm in the east to less than 50 mm in the far west. As a result, people are dispersed in small settlements and cattle posts. Farming activity consists mostly of semi-nomadic pastoralism with some sedentary livestock farming and small-scale dryland and irrigated agriculture.

The present CBNRM activities in Kunene Region have their roots in Namibia's oldest community-based conservation programme. In 1982, Garth Owen-Smith of the Namibia Wildlife Trust and Chris Eyre of the then Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreational Resorts, began working with local headmen to combat the results of a



devastating drought and heavy poaching. The headmen agreed that the decline in wildlife numbers since the early 1970's should be brought to a halt. From these early discussions with the headmen, a community-game guard system evolved in which the headmen appointed members of their community to act as guardians of the wildlife. The game guards were responsible to the headmen and their communities and did not work for government. They were paid with donor funding for spending part of their time on patrol in the remote areas around their settlements.

Since the start of the community-game guard programme there has been an impressive build up of game numbers on communal land in Kunene Region. Between 1982 and 1995, elephant increased from 250 to 415 and black rhino increased from 65 to more than 100. Between 1982 and 1992 giraffe increased from 220 to 300, mountain zebra from 450 to 2 200, oryx from 400 to 1 800 and springbok from 650 to 7 500 (Durbin et al. 1997). The Kunene Region is the only area in Africa where black rhino are *increasing* on tribal land outside game reserves.

A number of factors have contributed to this increase, but there is consensus in Namibian conservation circles that the game guard programme was particularly important. The early anti-poaching work of Owen-Smith and Eyre and the activities of the community game guards assisted wildlife to build up numbers during the critical recovery period at the end of the drought in 1981. The game guard system was important because it:

- restored to rural communities some of the responsibility over wildlife which had been taken over by the State during the colonial period;
- involved local people in conservation under existing legislation;
- benefited rural people through the game guards' wages and rations
- provided local communities with a mechanism for expressing the sense of 'ownership' they felt over wildlife

(Durbin et al. 1997)

During the late 1980s Owen-Smith teamed up with anthropologist Margaret Jacobsohn to form a non-governmental organisation, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC). They built upon the success of the community game guards by developing projects aimed at returning to local people some of the benefits from wildlife-based tourism. From 1995, the focus of the organisation shifted to working with local communities on conservancy formation in anticipation of the legal changes on wildlife use being planned by government.

#### *IRDNC Kunene Project*

The current activities of IRDNC in Kunene Region are funded by World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) International at a level of CHF (Swiss Francs) 2 794 550 between 1996 and 2001.

The following are the project goal, purpose and outputs (Durbin et al. 1997):

**Project goal:** Contribute to the enhancement of the quality of life for rural Namibians through improved natural resource management.

**Project purpose:** Linkages between social and economic development and conservation and sustainable utilisation of natural resources in northwest Namibia established.

**Project outputs:**

1. Natural resource base increased and/or maintained and managed in the project region
2. Capacity of communities to jointly manage and benefit from natural resource use improved
3. Generation of social and economic benefits for local communities from natural resource use facilitated
4. Community-based natural resource management advocated nationally and internationally
5. Project management, monitoring and evaluation in function.

The following are project activities:

a) Community game guards

There are now 50 CGGs throughout Kunene Region and they have continued to play an important role in creating the necessary conditions for wildlife to maintain its positive trend. They provide monthly reports on game observations. With support from the MET, a mapping and monitoring system is being developed which will enable the information provided by the CGGs to be captured in a data base which can be used by both MET and local communities for their wildlife management. The CGGs continue to monitor poaching and provide information to their headmen and MET on suspicious activities. The game guards are becoming more involved in dealing with problem animals as the increase in elephant numbers has brought an increase in conflict between people and wildlife. Elephants are beginning to raid crops in areas where there were previously few problems and elephants are drawn to artificial water points created for people and their stock. Many of these water points are close to homesteads. The CGGs play an important role as extension agents within the community, providing advice on problem animal control and information about natural resource management issues.

b) Etendeka bed night levy

Prior to Namibia's independence in 1990, the former government of the Damaraland ethnic homeland awarded a number of tourism and hunting concessions with the aim of gaining revenue from wildlife based activities. Although the Damaraland government received income from the concessions, little financial benefit went back to local communities on

whose land the concessions had been established. after Namibia's Independence in 1990, the new government honoured the existing concessions and continued to award hunting and tourism concessions in Kunene Region.

The concessions are only for the exclusive right to carry out commercial tourism activities on the land held under concession. Local people are still able to use the land for their farming activities and self-drive tourists are able to camp on the concession land. this leads to conflict between the needs of the concessionaire and the local people, as the tourism operators do not want livestock on the land they are using for up market wilderness tours. Neither do they want self-drive tourists using their concession land.

In order to deal with some of the problems caused by the concession system, IRDNC negotiated the collection of a bed-night levy from one of the concessionaires, Etendeka Mountain Lodge, for payment to neighbouring communities. The aim was to show that local people could benefit from tourism in the region as well as to provide communities with some compensation for agreeing not to take their livestock on to the Etendeka concession except for emergency grazing in times of drought.

In November, 1996, Etendeka paid out N\$40 000 (approx. US \$8 000) to 370 households representing about 4 500 people from five neighbouring communities. Although a relatively small amount, the money was the first significant cash benefit from wildlife-related tourism received by communities in the Sesfontein District. Furthermore, the process used by IRDNC and the communities to decide how the money should be used, has been an important foundation for communities forming conservancies as similar decisions have to be made. In the months leading up to the payout, IRDNC staff facilitated a community consultative process stressing the link between the cash and wildlife. Communities chose teams to conduct household surveys so that all community members were given the opportunity to decide how their money should be spent and which community structure should receive it on their behalf (IRDNC1996).

### c) Community wildlife cropping

With the gradual increase in wildlife numbers on communal land in Kunene Region during the late 1980s, the Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreational Resorts decided that certain species could be cropped so that the meat would be available for local residents. Oryx and springbok were cropped in the Sesfontein and Bergsig areas by the Damara ethnic government in 1987, while in 1988 and 1991, the cropping was done by conservation personnel.

After 1991, the Ministry of Wildlife, conservation and tourism informed the communities that due to the high costs of the cropping operation, the Ministry could no longer carry out the cropping on their behalf. In 1993 the Ministry decided that communities wishing to hunt the game themselves could apply to the MWCT for a quota for the declared hunting season and permits would be issued to headmen, who could appoint hunters from the community.

IRDNC staff played a major role in supporting the community during the 1993 community hunt. They assisted in the transport of meat, the purchase of ammunition and the training of some hunters. IRDNC were repaid for the ammunition it purchased from income generated

from the sale of skins. The quota awarded by the Ministry for the whole area was: 81 mountain zebra, 170 oryx, 181 springbok, 20 kudu, 4 giraffe, and 44 ostrich. IRDNC estimated that the total value of the meat produced was N\$150 000 (approx. US \$30 000) or N\$50 per person. The communities raised N\$18 250 from the sale of skins, N\$6 000 of which was paid to IRDNC for the purchase of ammunition, while IRDNC's transport costs amounted to just over N\$10 000 (Nott et al. 1993).

According to Nott et al. (1993), the community hunt helped to develop a stronger link between the communities' involvement in conservation and the potential benefits that can be derived from wildlife. The cropping also helped to defuse a growing conflict between stockowners and wildlife as competition between livestock and wildlife for grazing increased with the increased wildlife numbers.

In 1995, the communities of the Sesfontein District and Bergsig area were again allocated a wildlife-cropping quota by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. A total of 843 animals were allocated for the same species as in 1993 except for giraffe. Hunters were again chosen by headmen. IRDNC again assisted communities with vehicles, staff drivers and ammunition. The communities raised nearly N\$13 000 from the sale of skins, while the total cost to IRDNC was nearly N\$23 000 (Odendaal 1995). No figure is available for the value of the meat produced, but due to the increase in number of animals cropped, is likely to be more than the 1993 figure of N\$150 000.

#### d) Conservancies

IRDNC is assisting four communities in the Kunene region which are exploring the option of establishing a communal area conservancy. Each of the four communities are at different stages of conservancy development. The profiles of the conservancies provided below are partly based on data compiled by Durbin et al. 1997.

##### *Sesfontein*

The Sesfontein conservancy covers an area of about 6 500 sq. km in the northern part of the Khorixas District. It includes the communities of Khovarib, Warmquelle, Sesfontein and Otjindakwe, with a total of about 300 households. The community has elected a Veld Committee, which is being transformed into the conservancy committee. The conservancy boundaries need to be finalised and depend upon a decision by the Puros community to the north on whether it wishes to be part of the Sesfontein conservancy or form its own conservancy. Membership registration has been completed for all adults except those in outlying settlements and Puros. A constitution is being drafted. Members of the Sesfontein area have benefited from the Etendeka bed-night levy and the community hunts in 1993 and 1995. There is considerable potential for the proposed conservancy to negotiate levies and other agreements with a number of existing tourism ventures, as well as to develop new enterprises. Trophy hunting, game bird hunting and sport hunting provide opportunities for further income generation.

*Ward 11 (Bergsig/De Riet)*

The Ward 11 conservancy covers the area south of the veterinary control fence, eastwards to the Grootberg mountain range, and south to the Huab River. It includes about 80 households living in the settlements of De Riet and Bergsig and people living on outlying farms and cattle posts. The proposed conservancy covers an area of about 5 000 sq. km. A conservancy committee has been elected, a constitution drafted and most residents have been registered as members of the proposed conservancy. A boundary dispute with the neighbouring Grootberg (Ward 10) community (see Grootberg Conservancy below) needs to be resolved. Bergsig have benefited from the Etendeka bed-night levy, and the 1993 and 1995 community hunts. With considerable assistance from IRDNC Bergsig have entered into a joint venture agreement with a private company, Wilderness Safaris, for the running of a tented lodge. Another joint venture lodge is being negotiated, and there is potential for trophy hunting, game bird hunting, sport hunting, and black rhino tracking.

*Puros*

About 40 households live within the proposed Puros conservancy, which covers an area of approx. 5 000 sq. km. and the two main settlements of Puros and Ganamub. It is situated in the southern part of Opuwo District. The community still has to decide whether to join with Sesfontein in a larger conservancy and/or another community at Otjikandavirongo. A Development Committee has been selected through customary procedures and could evolve into a conservancy committee. Since the late 1980s the Puros community has been receiving a tourism levy, facilitated by IRDNC, from private tour operators who use the area. A community-run campsite has been in operation for 18-months and community guides take tourists elephant viewing and black rhino tracking. Residents have benefited from the 1993 and 1995 community hunts. A number of community members sell crafts to tourists. There is potential for some sport and trophy hunting and small tourism related enterprises.

*Omuramba*

This is the least advanced community in terms of conservancy formation. The potential conservancy includes about 100 households in an area of approx. 2 000 sq. km. The community is involved in a boundary dispute with the neighbouring Otjokovares community. No proto-conservancy committee has been formed yet. The community has received income from the Etendeka bed night levy and has benefited from the 1993 and 1995 community hunts. There is potential for hunting concessions, wilderness trails and some campsite or lodge development.

*Grootberg Conservancy (Ward 10)*

The proposed Grootberg conservancy area lies between the Grootberg range of mountains in the west and the commercial farmland to the east, in eastern Khorixas District. It includes a number of small settlements such as Anker and Erwee and scattered settlements on farms and cattle posts. The Grootberg Farmers Association Management Committee has been spearheading conservancy formation and a new committee specifically for the conservancy is due to be elected. Conservancy members are being registered. A constitution has been

drafted and discussions are taking place with Ward 11 over boundaries. The two communities dispute the 'ownership' of three farms. The community has nominated five men and two women to serve as community game guards. Grootberg has not yet received any income from wildlife related activities or enterprises, but there is potential for sport and trophy hunting and some tourism development. The Grootberg Farmers Association is developing the conservancy as part of an integrated approach to resource utilisation, which includes sustainable range and water management. The Association receives support from a coalition of government and non-government agencies, which include the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development and the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia.

### *Eastern Tsumkwe district*

Eastern Tsumkwe District in north-eastern Namibia is part of the Kalahari sandveld system, which covers much of eastern Namibia and western Botswana. However, the area is characterised by a series of seasonal pans, which serve as a focal point for people and wildlife alike. The region is inhabited by about 3 000 Ju/'hoan San people. Over the past decade, supported by the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDNF), the Ju/'hoansi have tried to diversify their hunting and gathering economy by embracing subsistence cattle farming and dryland cultivation. They still derive a large part of their diet from wild plants and many older men continue to hunt traditionally. The Ju/'hoansi live in small groups in about 35 settlements scattered around the area, which is known to them as Nyae Nyae. Land and natural resources are managed and allocated according to the n!ore, or territory, system. A n!ore in the past was an area of land providing enough game, bushfoods and water to support a band of 30-50 people. The system has been adapted to modern circumstances and a n!ore owner and his people have clear rights to the land and resources within a particular n!ore. The people have established their own representative organisation, the Nyae Nyae Farmers' Co-operative (NNFC).

When the pans of the eastern Tsumkwe District are flooded in years of good rain, they attract large numbers of pelicans, flamingos and a wide variety of small waders. Many Palearctic migrant birds spend the European winter in the area. There is a wide variety of wildlife, including elephant, wild dog, lion, and leopard. Antelope species, including the rare roan antelope, exist in low numbers only, having decreased since 1980 (Jones 1996).

In 1991, a socio-ecological survey was carried out in the area which led to the development of a CBNRM project funded by WWF-US and the Biodiversity Support Programme and managed by the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism. This project has moved through several phases, which have gradually seen ownership and control shift to the NNFC.

The current project, the Integrated Natural Resource Management Project of the NNFC is funded by the LIFE Programme, which also provides technical assistance. The NNDNF provides the NNFC with an agricultural advisor and project manager. Control of the project lies with the NNFC management committee and board. The LIFE Project funding makes provision for the NNFC to hire its own consultants for a number of activities including, wildlife management, institutional development and range management.

The Integrated Natural Resource Management Programme has the following goal and objectives (NNFC 1996):

**Goal:** To increase food production and income, which will result in an improved quality of life for the communities in Nyae Nyae, through sustainable management of natural resources.

**Objectives:**

1. restoring and maintaining wildlife and other resources for use by the people of Nyae Nyae;
2. assisting community members to increase their knowledge of land use management systems that enhance the natural resource base, including wildlife, veld foods, livestock and food crops;
3. increasing the capacity of the community to manage natural resources in a sustainable manner by strengthening the NNFC and increasing the community's access to information for decision-making, and;
4. facilitating the return of economic and social benefits derived from sustainable natural resources management to the community.

The project integrates wildlife management, veld food production and agricultural production. A major activity of the NNFC, which is supported by the LIFE Project and MET, is the formation of a conservancy. The NNFC has met all the conditions set by the conservancy legislation and is ready to submit its application to MET. It is being delayed by the Governor of the region, who has not yet endorsed the application.

***Uukwaluudhi***

Uukwaluudhi is a tribal area of the former Owambo homeland in the far north of Namibia. Its western extremity is located in the new Kunene Region, while the largest part of the tribal area is incorporated into the new Omusati Region. The western part is a zone of mingling between Herero and Owambo people, and cuts across territory disputed by Herero leaders and King Taapopi of the Uukwaluudhi tribal group.

Several years ago, the king proposed to the MET that a game reserve be created based on Okaholo Pan in the west. The MET never had the resources to respond to this request and suggested to the king that a conservancy might be more appropriate. The King established an Uukwaluudhi Wildlife Area Committee in 1994 to develop the conservancy proposals. The plan is for an area of about 18 000 ha to be fenced off as a core area for wildlife reintroduction. Wildlife numbers are extremely low in the region due to past poaching and the use of part of the area as a military training ground. Habitat is good and the human population low, providing the possibility for wildlife to be re-established. A conservancy would be based around the core area, and would probably include all the people under the king's leadership. The LIFE programme has carried out some initial work with local

communities to see who would be affected by fencing of the core area and the loss of access to water and grazing. MET would provide game from Etosha for reintroduction.

The project has been dogged by controversy over complaints by cattle owners from a neighbouring tribal area that they will lose their grazing rights in the core wildlife area. The king maintains that because he gave permission for these people to graze in the area, they should leave at his request. Although this issue seems to have been resolved, a further delay has been caused by Herero leaders who have linked the project to the disputed tribal boundary between the old Owamboland and the old (Herero-dominated) Kaokoland. There is considerable political interest in the project as it is in the heartland of the governing party in Namibia and the President has intervened to resolve the grazing dispute. There are concerns that the conservancy formation process remains top down, driven by the king and his councillors, and that much more local involvement is required if the conservancy approach is to succeed.

The area is on the seasonal migration route of elephants from the Etosha National Park to the south, and, particularly if linked to a tourism route from Etosha, has some tourism potential. One of the main reasons given, however, by the king and his council for reintroducing game is for cultural and educational value rather than for cash benefits.



## **4. ANALYSIS OF KEY CBNRM ISSUES IN NAMIBIA**

---

### **4.1 Enabling environment**

Namibia's policy and legislative environment goes further than any other in southern Africa in giving secure rights over wildlife and tourism directly to local communities. The rights are given by law to community institutions, thus avoiding regional government structures, and the need for these structures to devolve authority down further. Communities have to define themselves, enabling the development of cohesive social management units with incentives for individuals to co-operate together, rather than artificial administrative units which potentially force together people who would not normally co-operate. The rights given to communities are relatively strong and are exclusive. In the case of huntable game, communities gain conditional ownership of wildlife. In the case of tourism, concessionary rights automatically go to a conservancy on registration by the MET.

The conservancy policy and legislation is flexible enough to make provision for the variety of socio-cultural and ecological conditions, which exist in Namibia. The legislation does not prescribe the size of the conservancy nor does it prescribe how a conservancy committee should be appointed. It leaves communities to decide for themselves who should represent them on the conservancy committee. In the wetter north east of Namibia, where people are concentrated into main villages with satellite settlements, the self definition of community could be a relatively large number of people within a small geographic area. However, in the arid north-west, a conservancy might have a fairly small number of people, spread across a large geographical area. A conservancy committee might consist of people elected by majority vote, or by consensus in the traditional manner. The committee might consist of traditional leaders, an existing community committee such as the management committee of a farmers' association, or might be made up of individuals the community believes are the most competent for the job. Communities are therefore able to shape their conservancy according to the social and ecological conditions of their own areas and choose their committees in a manner consistent with their own cultural norms. Because communities are dynamic, and change over time, the flexibility of the legislation enables communities to change and adapt the way in which they choose their committee.

Although the policy and legislation give strong and exclusive resource rights over wildlife and tourism, they clearly do not give secure and exclusive land tenure. If communities are not able to control access to their land, even with state backing, it will be difficult for them to control access to their resources. The current system of 'open access' to communal land in Namibia provides a threat to the opportunities for sustainable resource management provided by the conservancy approach. Without exclusive group land rights, other people can move into a conservancy area and settle on the land, using resources being conserved by the existing residents. The current version of the White Paper on Land Reform addresses this issue by providing for communal area residents to gain exclusive group tenure and by specifically enabling conservancies to apply for 'ownership of their land.

Coupled with secure land tenure, the conservancy approach provides the opportunity for local communities to form strong common property resource management institutions not only for wildlife and tourism, but most other communal resources on their land. If control over the land and a suite of resources is vested in one representative management body by the state and the community, then there is a strong foundation for sustainable resource management. Communities will also be able to make trade-offs between different forms of land use, within a defined land and resource management unit.

Although the conservancy approach is still young and untried, it is still possible to assess the concept against the theory and practice of common property resource management. Turner (1996) has tried to test the approach based on an analysis of proto-conservancy development in three communities in north-eastern Namibia, west Caprivi, Salambala and Nyae Nyae, and one in the north, Uukwaluudhi. Although his analysis does not include cases from the north west, it still raises some important issues. Turner (1996:38) points out that "principle and practice suggest that a successful conservancy, as a successful venture in common property resource management, would have a strong natural resource base (in which wildlife is prominently represented), and form a compact geographical and social unit, with a large enough population to sustain robust social institutions - including a strong and respected leadership and a localised system of justice."

However, he sees conservancies developing with different degrees to which this 'perfect' match is achieved. One pattern is socially stronger conservancies in relatively compact areas developing on weak natural resource bases, and with relatively large human populations. Another pattern is a stronger natural resource base spread over large areas with very sparse human populations, among whom leadership is less strongly developed and poverty levels high. Turner identifies a third pattern (more common to Kunene Region) where distances are great, the resource base promising and the population small, but social and institutional cohesion stronger. In the arid western areas, the opportunistic movement of wildlife over large areas in search of water and grazing creates issues of ownership between neighbouring conservancies and/or conservancies and non-conservancy communities. It suggests that some species might have to be managed on a more regional basis with conservancies co-operating on conservation and utilisation strategies, and deciding how benefits will be shared.

The challenge for conservancies in Namibia, is therefore to find the right match between the size of the human population, units of proprietorship which provide sufficient social cohesion for co-operation and decision-making, and areas of land large enough to contain economically viable resources. In some areas, conservancies with relatively small and socially cohesive human populations might form the building blocks for co-operative management and benefit across larger resource management units.

A number of practical problems have begun to emerge as communities form their conservancies and apply to the MET for registration. Several communities are involved in boundary disputes with their neighbours. This is a result of the approach of letting communities define themselves, rather than basing conservancies on existing administrative units. A number of issues affect boundary definition, such as old colonial ethnic boundaries, new regional administrative boundaries, colonial allocation of areas to headmen, conflict over resources etc. It remains to be seen whether the boundary disputes can be quickly resolved and conservancy registration can go ahead, or whether boundary definition

becomes a constraint to the conservancy approach. The MET has assigned Regional Governors the role of endorsing conservancy applications if they are satisfied that there are no reasons why the conservancy should not go ahead. A reason for not endorsing an application would be knowledge of an existing boundary dispute. Regional Governors are elected from the body of elected regional councillors and are therefore political figures rather than appointed, and supposedly impartial, administrators. There is the suspicion among CBNRM partner organisations in Namibia that in some cases Governors are delaying endorsement of conservancy applications due to their own political agendas.

Another important issue is the inclusion in the Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996, of provision for the establishment of Wildlife Councils. The Wildlife Councils are to be established by the MET with local leaders and the Regional Governor. They do not provide rights or benefits directly to local communities, and meet few of the criteria for successful common property resource management. It is questionable whether they will provide incentives for sustainable resource management. They also run the risk of repeating the problems created by the devolution of appropriate authority over wildlife to Rural District Councils within the Zimbabwean CAMPFIRE Project. Many Rural District Councils are reluctant to devolve authority down further to more local levels of management which are closer to community level. This goes against CAMPFIRE policy and undermines many of the incentives for sustainable resource management contained in the CAMPFIRE approach.

There is the danger in Namibia that Wildlife Councils will not want to give up the authority over wildlife and benefits that they enjoy when conservancies emerge in the same area as that covered by the council. MET policy is that the area covered by Wildlife Councils should shrink as conservancies are established. However, it is likely that the councils will want to hold on to the authority they have and the patronage they enjoy in the use of income for regional development. Local politicians and traditional leaders are unlikely to naturally give up a potentially powerful instrument of local influence and status. There is also the danger that some MET staff, unwilling to let go of authority over wildlife to local communities, will use the Wildlife Council as an excuse to hold on to power themselves. There will always be reasons for arguing that the community is not ready to take over from the MET and the Wildlife Council. The extent to which Wildlife Councils become a stumbling block to conservancy formation and the promotion of sustainable resource management will depend largely upon the determination of MET to enforce the policy that Wildlife Councils should shrink as conservancies develop.

## **4.2 Institutional relationships and capacity**

The Namibian national CBNRM programme provides a good framework for the development of strong institutional relationships and partnerships for implementing CBNRM. The MET and the LIFE Programme provide platforms for co-ordination and information sharing among implementing organisations. Within the programme, the MET provides the enabling policy and legislative environment within which representative community resource management institutions can develop, and provides a number of resource management related services to the communities. NGOs provide facilitation and capacity building to communities in the establishment of their institutions, and related enterprises. The national programme has helped to weld together a team of government and

non-government personnel and organisations, working towards a common goal and providing mutual support, each contributing different perspectives, skills and expertise. The umbrella organisation for NGOs, the Namibian Non Governmental Organisation Forum (NANGOF), has taken an increased interest in CBNRM and Oxfam in Namibia has also been exploring its potential.

A number of capacity issues can be identified, however. MET has only a small number of staff members directly involved with the CBNRM programme, one co-ordinator based in Windhoek in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs and one community-based tourism officer, who has yet to be absorbed into a Ministry post. The other CBNRM posts within the DEA are donor funded and the staff seconded from NGOs. The Directorate of Resource Management has no personnel specifically dedicated to CBNRM and many of the staff designated to work with communities have to deal with a wide range of other issues. Within the DRM, there has been a reluctance to fully embrace the CBNRM and conservancy approach as a conservation tool. There are many reasons for this, some relating to the need for institutional reform within DRM and some relating to the need to fully embrace the principles and approaches of an independent, post colonial, post apartheid Namibia. With the passing of the Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, there has, however, been an increasing involvement by DRM staff in the conservancy approach. More information and training for staff at the field level is required to develop adequate capacity to promote the concept and assist communities.

While Namibia is fortunate to have an NGO, which has pioneered CBNRM approaches in the form of IRDNC, generally the number of NGOs involved in CBNRM is limited. In order to meet demands for conservation formation across the country, a larger number of NGOs need to be interested and involved in natural resource management issues at community level. There is a danger that 'elite' conservancies will be formed in the north east and north west, receiving the full support treatment form NGOs and MET, while others elsewhere in the country have to struggle largely on their own. The interest and involvement in CBNRM and land policy debate of NANGOF has been a positive development, but more capacity is required at field level. The development of the Rossing Foundation training, enterprise and capacity building project within the national programme should help to address this issue.

### **4.3 Community dynamics/equity issues**

Each community has its own set of dynamics and relationships between different groups and individuals within that community. It is not possible to provide much detail about community dynamics without extensive field work. However, a number of issues can be identified from the literature about various projects.

In many project areas there seems to be a recognition of the role of women as resource managers who need to be involved at community level decision-making over the use of natural resources and distribution of benefits. This is seen in Kunene Region where women community activators were appointed to focus on issues of particular importance to women, but with "the priority given to the creation of conservancies they became part of the team that undertook household surveys and provided a vector for the integration of women into the entire process of CBNRM" (Durbin et al. 1997). In Ward 11, about half the conservancy

committee are women and women are represented on the Sesfontein conservancy committee.

Durbin et al (1996) also highlight the role of youth. In Ward 11 and at Puros youth had expressed different opinions to other groups in the communities, which had created problems in the process of conservancy formation. In other areas, young people tend to focus on the need to create job opportunities and generate income, while older members of communities tend to focus as much or more on the social and cultural benefits that wildlife can bring.

In some communities such as Uukwaluudhi, Salambala, and the proposed Mayuni conservancy traditional authorities still have considerable influence and are strongly in favour of forming conservancies in their areas. While it can be an advantage to have strong support from the traditional leadership, it can also be a disadvantage when traditional leaders want to drive the process from the top without full participation of community members. In the Sesfontein area in particular, headmen played a crucial role in the establishment of the game guard system, and their continued commitment to wildlife conservation has been a significant feature of the community-based conservation success in Kunene Region. However, the headmen, who never received any financial benefits themselves, are seeing younger members of the community gaining employment in various jobs either with IRDNC or with new community institutions. The headmen are now asking for some form of financial recognition from money being made from wildlife and tourism. Game guards have in the past reported first to headmen and to some extent have helped to reinforce the status of traditional leaders. With the shift in emphasis to conservancies, game guards will in all probability work for the conservancy and be accountable to the conservancy committee rather than the headmen. The headmen and their communities will need to find ways of dealing with this transition in a sensitive way (Durbin et al 1997).

Ethnic issues have also surfaced. In Ward 11, there was concern that Damara speaking residents had been left out of the conservancy formation process and the appointment of workers in the Ward 11 tourism joint venture. The Ward 11 committee was responsive to this criticism and has made a point of involving Damara speakers, who form a minority, in all processes as much as possible.

The government regulations, which accompany the conservancy legislation expressly, forbid the exclusion of people from membership of a conservancy on the grounds of ethnicity or gender, a provision that is based on principles contained in the Namibian constitution. The legislation and regulations also call for conservancies to have a plan for the "equitable" distribution of benefits. When the MET receives applications from communities to have conservancies registered, the Ministry will check the application as far as possible to make sure that people have not been excluded on the grounds of ethnicity or gender and that equitable distribution plans have been developed.

#### 4.4 From benefit to management

An important aspect of the Namibian approach to CBNRM, developed particularly by IRDNC, is that "people must take responsibility for the resource - and therefore be accountable - *before* benefits flow (IRDNC 1997:14). Considerable emphasis has been placed on social empowerment. According to Durbin et al. (1997), fundamental to the initiation of IRDNC's Kunene programme was the insight that local cultures contained an ethic of conservation and sustainable use, which could be enhanced under existing conditions with appropriate facilitation. The community game guard system developed in Kunene Region was far more than an attempt to halt poaching. It was aimed at empowering communities by giving back to them some of the responsibility over wildlife which the state had systematically removed, and involving them directly in managing the wildlife resource, within the existing policy and legal framework.

In Kunene Region communities conserved wildlife, allowing numbers to build up to an extent that game species were competing with livestock for grazing and browse. This was done without significant cash benefits. In parts of east Caprivi, there has been less success in using game guards as a vehicle for social empowerment and encouraging communities to take responsibility for wildlife conservation. In some communities, poaching has continued despite the game guard programme and the receipt of some benefits from the Lianshulu Lodge bed night levy. In west Caprivi the game guards have been very effective in dealing with local and outsider poaching and again appear to be a real expression of people's sense of ownership over the wildlife and commitment to its conservation. There are several possible reasons for these differences, and some personnel involved in the national programme have always felt that economic benefits might be a strong stimulus in areas of east Caprivi. The Namibian programme promotes a combination of incentives leading to sustainable management. These are social empowerment, control over the resource, and economic benefit. It is significant that in both Uukwaluudhi and Salambala, particularly among older community members, the reason for starting a conservancy is simply so that people can enjoy having wildlife around them again. They recognise that cash benefits might only come in four or five years time once wildlife has been re-established.

#### 4.5 Sustainability

The issue of sustainability needs to be addressed within the Namibian national CBNRM programme at two main levels, implementing partners and communities.

Much of the funding for the activities of implementing partners comes from donors, and there is a heavy reliance on two donors, WWF and USAID. The programme needs to diversify its funding base and seek ways in which security of funding can be obtained. One way for this to be achieved is for funding to be generated within Namibia. The MET is currently pursuing the establishment of an Environmental Investment Fund, which would receive endowment type funds from donors, but then raise additional funds from a tourism levy. As CBNRM gains credibility within government, it should also be possible to provide more government funding to support CBNRM activities. However, if people in the developed countries who love wildlife are willing to pay for its existence value in a far off

continent, there is no reason why developing countries should not continue to seek donor funding for viable conservation approaches.

Sustainability will not only be assured through the continued availability of financial resources, but also through the continued and increased commitment of government to CBNRM. Within MET, there needs to be a greater commitment from the Directorate of Resource Management, so that its staff view CBNRM as a priority and human and financial resources are directed towards working with communities. There is some evidence of change in this direction, but the pace of change needs to be accelerated. Greater priority needs to be given to developing a core group of staff who have the skills and expertise to work with rural people and assist them in their natural resource management.

At community level, the potential earnings from wildlife and tourism that could accrue to conservancies have been well demonstrated (Ashley and Barnes 1996). This is particularly important in view of some of the expenses that conservancies are likely to incur in their resource management and community mobilisation activities. It has always been made clear to communities, for example that payment of community game guards and resource monitors would ultimately have to be taken over by the conservancies themselves.

## **4.6 Results**

A number of significant results have been achieved by the Namibian national CBNRM programme and these are noted below:

- introduction of new policy and legislation which gives rural communities ownership over certain species of wildlife, exclusive use rights to other species, and exclusive concessionary rights over tourism;
- rural communities are forming representative community resource management institutions to manage wildlife and tourism. Some communities are beginning to integrate wildlife and tourism in local level land use planning;
- rural communities have received limited benefits from tourism levies, game cropping, and game guard wages;
- two communities have negotiated joint venture tourism agreements. One is already receiving benefits in the form of a concession fee, a monthly percentage of gross revenue, and preferential employment;
- communities have received social benefits and empowerment through the community game guard and resource monitor programmes;
- rural communities are gaining opportunities to diversify their economies through the use and management of wildlife, tourism and a limited number of other resources such as thatching grass;

- rural communities are gaining new skills in negotiating with the private sector and developing their own enterprises;
- rural communities are gaining new experience and skills in local level collective decision-making, representation and accountability;
- a beginning has been made in gaining credibility for CBNRM as a development approach among government agencies and NGOs.
- some communities have responsibly managed the wildlife resource before receiving significant financial benefits
- the national programme has promoted the development of a team of government and non-government personnel and organisations working towards a common goal and providing mutual support;
- the policy debate on national communal land reform has been positively influenced towards government providing secure and exclusive group land tenure to rural communities;



## REFERENCES: NAMIBIA

- Ashley C. and J. Barnes. 1996. Wildlife Use for Economic Gain. The potential for wildlife to contribute to development in Namibia. Research Discussion Paper No. 12. Directorate of Environmental Affairs. Windhoek.
- Brown, C. J. 1991. Socio-ecological survey of parts of east Caprivi-interim report. Internal report. Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism. Windhoek.
- Brown, C. J. 1996. The Outlook for the Future. *In: Namibia Environment. Vol.1.* Directorate of Environmental Affairs. Windhoek.
- Brown, C. J. and B. T. B. Jones (Eds). 1994. Results of a socio-ecological survey of the West Caprivi Strip, Namibia: a strategic community-based environment and development plan. Directorate of Environmental Affairs. Windhoek.
- Corbett A. and C. Daniels. 1996. Legislation and Policy Affecting Community-based Natural Resource Management in Namibia. Social Science division, University of Namibia. Windhoek.
- Dewdney, R. 1996. Policy factors and desertification - analysis and proposals. Namibian Programme to Combat Desertification Steering Committee. Windhoek.
- Durbin, J., B. T. B. Jones and M. W. Murphree. 1997. Namibian Community-Based Natural Resource Management Programme. Project Evaluation. World Wide Fund for Nature. Gland.
- GRN. 1996a. Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996. Government Gazette No. 1333. Government of the Republic of Namibia. Windhoek.
- GRN. 1996b. Amendment of Regulations Relating to Nature Conservation. Government Gazette No. 1446. Government of the Republic of Namibia. Windhoek.
- GRN. 1997. Republic of Namibia, National Land Policy. "White Paper". Government of the Republic of Namibia. Windhoek.
- IRDNC. 1996. Namibia: WWFNA0004 Technical Report to BMZ. Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation. Windhoek.
- IRDNC. 1997. Community-based Natural Resource Management in Caprivi. A 21-month Grant. Proposal to the LIFE Project. Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation. Windhoek.
- Jones, B. T. B. in press. Parks and Resident Peoples: Linking Namibian protected areas with local communities. Research Discussion Paper. Directorate of Environmental Affairs. Windhoek.

- MET. 1994a. Conservation of Biotic Diversity and Habitat Protection. Policy Document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek.
- MET. 1994b. Land-use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development. Policy Document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek.
- MET. 1995a. Wildlife Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas. Policy document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek.
- MET. 1995b. Promotion of Community-based Tourism. Policy Document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek.
- MET. 1996. Tourism Act. Consolidated Draft. Internal document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek
- MET. Undated. East Caprivi Census Record. Internal report. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Windhoek.
- NACOBTA. 1995. Institutional Support to the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA). Project proposal to the LIFE Programme. Namibia Community-based Tourism Association. Windhoek.
- Nott, C., G. Owen-Smith and M. Jacobsohn. 1993. Report on the 1993 Hunting Season, Sesfontein District and Bergsig area. Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation. Windhoek.
- NPC. Undated. First National Development Plan (NDP1). Vol. 1. National Planning Commission. Windhoek.
- Odendaal, N. 1995. Community Hunting in the Kunene Region. Project completed as part of the National Diploma in Nature Conservation. Polytechnic of Namibia. Windhoek.
- Rodwell, T. C., J. Tagg and M. Grobler. 1995. Wildlife Resources in the Caprivi, Namibia: The Results of an Aerial Census in 1994 and Comparisons with Past Surveys. Research Discussion Paper No. 9. Directorate of Environmental Affairs. Windhoek.
- Turner, S. 1996. Conservancies in Namibia: a model for successful common property resource management? Social Sciences Division, Multi-disciplinary Research Centre, University of Namibia. Windhoek.
- USAID. 1995. Natural Resource Management Project Namibian Component: 690-0251.73 Living in a Finite Environment, Project Paper Supplement (Amended). United States Agency for International Development. Windhoek.
- World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning, Management Systems International. 1997. Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme (Project No. 690-0251), Semi Annual Report for the period October 1, 1996 - March 31, 1997. LIFE Programme. Windhoek.

**LIST OF PERSONS INVOLVED IN CBNRM RESEARCH AND/ OR IMPLEMENTATION IN NAMIBIA**

Karl Aribeb	Programme Officer, LIFE Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 239945. Fax: 239799.
Caroline Ashley	Co-ordinator, Namibian Alternative Land Use Project. 4 Penton Place, Alberta Estate, London, S.E. 17 3JT. Tel/fax: 171 7357500
Linda Baker	Media and Publicity Officer. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Phoebe Barnard	Biodiversity Programme Co-ordinator. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Jon Barnes	Co-ordinator, Natural Resource Economics Programme. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Dhyani Berger	CBNRM Technical Assistant, LIFE Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 239945. Fax: 239799.
Rob Blackie	Natural Resource Economist. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Andrew Corbett	Director, Legal Assistance Centre. PO Box 604, Windhoek. Tel: 223356. Fax: 234 953.
Ben Fuller	Deputy Director, Social Sciences Division. University of Namibia. Private Bag 13301. Tel: 206 3698. Fax: 2063050.
Manfred Hinz	Director, Centre for Applied Social Sciences. University of Namibia, Private Bag 13301, Windhoek. Tel: 206 3810. Fax: 206 3703.
Margaret Jacobsohn	Director, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 228506. Fax: 228530.
Brian Jones	CBNRM Programme Co-ordinator. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.

*List of Persons Involved in CBNRM Research and/or Implementation in Namibia*

---

Maxi Luis	Programme Manager. Namibian Community-based Tourism Association. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 250558.
Immanuel Nghishoongele	Natural Resource Economist. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Colin Nott	Co-ordinator, IRDNC Kunene Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 228506. Fax: 228530.
Mark Renzi	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, LIFE Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 239945. Fax: 239799.
Matthew Rice	Co-ordinator, IRDNC Caprivi Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 228506. Fax: 228530.
Len le Roux	Deputy Director. Rossing Foundation. Private Bag 13214, Windhoek. Tel: 211721. Fax: 211273.
Patricia Skyer	Community Development Officer, LIFE Project. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 239945. Fax: 239799.
Garth Owen-Smith	Director, IRDNC. PO Box 9681, Windhoek. Tel: 228506. Fax: 228530.
Jo Tagg	Natural Resource Planner (Community-based resource mapping and monitoring). Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Peter Tarr	Co-ordinator, North East Parks Management Plans Project. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek. Tel: 249 015. Fax: 240 339.
Wendy Viall	Project officer. Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia. PO Box 9026, Windhoek. Tel: 236327. Fax: 225997.
Chris Weaver	Chief of Party, LIFE Project. PO Box 9681. Windhoek. Tel: 239945. Fax: 239799.