

PD ABM-204
15N 97282

ADD 12A-1, Cnd 12, HB 3
(TM 3:43) 9-30-82

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol

1. PROJECT TITLE Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Project			2. PROJECT NUMBER 690-0251.73	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Namibia
4. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting office, Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 02	B. Final Completion Expected FY 96	C. Final Input Delivery FY 00	5. REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/>	
5. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ 14.356			From (month/yr.) July 1992	
a. U.S. \$ 14.356			To (month/yr.) September 1995	
			Date of Evaluation Review Oct 2-3, 1995	

6. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. LIST DECISIONS AND/OR UNRESOLVED ISSUES; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which involve AID/W or regional office action include activity type of document, i.e., program, SPAR, PIC, which will prompt detailed review)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
A. Facilitation and Documentation Support for LIFE Program		
1. USAID/Namibia amend the PP and WWF CA.	B/Belding GDO	9/29/95
2. Incorporate the revised LIFE Project Logical framework in a PP, ProAg and WWF CA Amendment.	C Culler Prg Mgr	12/15/95
3. Remove formal EE output from LIFE Project Logical framework by PP amendment.	"	12/15/95
4. Adopt revised Logframe indicators of project impact	"	9/29/95
5. Amend PP to conform with more limited long-term training component of the WWF CA.	"	3/31/95
6. Extended LIFE PACD to coincide SARP regional NRM project PACD of August 18, 1999.	"	9/29/95
B. Report of the Field Assessment Team Phase III of the Mid-Term Assessment of the LIFE Project.		
1. Build on the Conservancy policy and use Conservancies as a central focus of future work. It should be stressed, however, that the time that legislation may take should not prevent this work from going ahead.	WWF/MET	Work will continue; conservancies expected 2mths after legislation is passed
2. Focus greater attention specifically on communities and community-based organizations (CBOs).	WWF	Starting immediately
3. Concentrate on getting economic and conservation benefits to people, help to diversify their sources of income, and assist in providing advice on both community-based and joint ventures.	WWF	Starting immediately
4. Improve coordination at all levels, but especially at the field level in the target areas.	WWF	Starting immediately

8. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIC/P	

9. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Scope and/or
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

10. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY CONTACTS AND BANKING PARTICIPANTS

AS APPROPRIATE (Name and title)
 Barbara Belding, GDO, info
 Ed Spriggs, AIDREP, info
 Joan Johnson, PROG, info
 Chris Brown, Head, info

11. MISSIONARY CODE SIGNATURE APPROVAL

Signature: *[Signature]*
 Print Name: EDWARD SPRIGGS

Project Evaluation Summary Part 11

13. SUMMARY

The Living In a Finite Environment (LIFE) Project is the Namibia component of the Regional Natural Resource Management (NRM) program. The LIFE Project Paper Supplement (690-0251.73) was authorized September 3, 1992 as five year US\$ 10.5 million amendment (number 3), to the Southern Africa Regional NRM Project.

The LIFE Project is implemented through a Cooperative Agreement between USAID and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) with WWF having as partners, World Learning, Inc. (WLI), Rössing Foundation (RF), and Management Systems International (MSI). This group is referred to as the LIFE Program Team. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) of the Government of the Republic of Namibia is responsible for interpreting the National policy, establishing policy and guidance for the LIFE Project, and assuring that all Project activities fit within the GRN national policy framework. All project activities are monitored and coordinated by a Steering Committee (SC), which is also responsible for overall project management and oversight.

The LIFE project activities are all supportive of community-based natural resource management and include:

- Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) activities;
- Applied Research;
- Training;
- Regional Programs and exchange of information.

The project activities support the core concept of the sustainable management of Namibia's natural resources by rural communities. The first component provides support to specific community-based pilot activities in three main Target Areas: West Caprivi, East Caprivi, and Eastern Bushmanland. The second component supports the planning and applied research that is relevant to CBNRM activities in these three regions. The third component builds on lessons learned and is aimed at disseminating information locally, nationally, and regionally and forming linkages among communities, organizations, and institutions involved in CBNRM activities.

There have been positive developments at the national program context level. These developments include:

(i) Cabinet approval of the Conservancy Policy was granted in March, 1995, and the new Minister of MET has requested the acceleration of the legislative schedule, with draft Conservancy Legislation to be placed before Parliament in October, 1995;

(ii) the Tourism White Paper, which presented elements of concern to the Project in March, 1995, is being revisited and revisions with more accommodation of CBNRM perspectives is anticipated;

(iii) the inauguration of the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA) has taken place and should have positive impacts on the Project;

(iv) other community-based tourism initiatives are gaining momentum;

(v) there is an improved level of concurrence and synergy between the LIFE partners and USAID. Greater concurrence and cooperation is also taking place within the divisions of MET, where efforts are being made to more closely integrate the activities and resources of Directorate of Resource Management into CBNRM.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The LIFE project is part of the MET's nation-wide CBNRM program. Therefore, the LIFE Project supports the broader MET Program and provides lessons learned for their nation-wide efforts. Early on, LIFE underwent an extensive internal review process which included examination and refinement of the Project Goal, Purposes, Outputs, Outcome indicators and Targets and the further refinement and/or modification of implementation approaches to achieve the Project Goal.

The LIFE Project has recently completed a seven month Mid-Term Assessment exercise which recommended a further two year extension of the current Project Agreement Completion Date (PACD) in line with the Southern Africa Regional Program (SARP)'s PACD of August 18, 1999 and increased funding. The purpose of this Assessment was to refine the project so that Mid-Term course adjustments could be made which would take into account lessons learned since project design. A "Rolling Assessment" process was followed, which included use of an internal assessment team (IAT) under Phase I and an external assessment team (EAT) under Phase II. Phase III of the Assessment covered field visitations and a review of sub-grantee performance to date. Recommendations adopted from Phase I, II and III were used for Phase IV harmonization of the LIFE project documentation. The evaluation was completed with the integration of all four phases.

An assessment process of this kind assisted project implementation in the following manner:

- (i) allowed for more detailed examination of various project issues and components;
- (ii) supported effective mid-course adjustments;
- (iii) helped to avoid the tendency in many evaluations for the special interest of the evaluators' to dominate project directions;

- (iv) allowed selected issues, new opportunities and potential interventions to be assessed in depth, before deciding to alter project documentation;
- (v) provided an on-going review and revision process leading to a shared vision among all Project Partners of CBNRM philosophy and approaches.

Internal and External assessment teams were used in this mid-term assessment process. The rolling assessment process was meant to incorporate new approaches and activities based on knowledge acquired during the first year of project implementation. The assessment also included identification and validation of modifications required in USAID project documentation.

In terms of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan in the Project Paper, the project must undergo a Mid-Term and a Final evaluation to assess the achievement of planned outputs. This, Mid-Term Assessment in the third year of implementation was aimed at assessing the validity of Project design and progress to date. This was also used as a tool for planning the remainder of the Project implementation plan and emphasized steps that needed to be taken to ensure sustainability.

The Mid-Term Assessment was a joint exercise by all LIFE Project partners, including MET, WWF, USAID and our immediate customers i.e. sub-grantees (NGO's and CBO) in the LIFE Program. The process was divided into various phases in which both Internal Assessment Team (IAT) and External Assessment Team (EAT) participated. Phase I was completed by the IAT, and Phase II by the EAT.

The role of the external assessment team (EAT) in the overall assessment process was to supplement the beginning efforts of the internal assessment team (IAT) by facilitating agreements by all parties as to direction and focus, and to document group findings and recommendations so that mid-course adjustments can be made to improve project implementation. The EAT assisted in the process of mid-project adjustment and adaptation.

There were two External Teams used for the assessment. The first EAT consisted of Weston Fisher and Marshall Murphree and they produced the External Assessment Team Report. The second team consisted of Robert Hitchcock and Marshall Murphree and they constituted the Field Validation Team, which also produced the Field Validation Report.

The external assessment team consisted of:

1. **Weston A. Fisher:** A Natural Resource Specialist with 14 years experience with USAID evaluations in 13 African countries. Former Regional Energy/Natural Resource Advisor for the Regional USAID office for East and Southern Africa (REDSO/ESA) and USAID Energy/Natural Resource Advisor for USAID's Bureau for Africa.

2. **Marshall W. Murphree, Ph.D.:** Director of the Center for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) at the University of Zimbabwe. A Community Based Natural Resource Management Institution Specialist. Has extensive working knowledge of CBNRM approaches and institutional contexts in Eastern and Southern Africa, particularly the CAMPFIRE program in Zimbabwe. He has a 37 years experience in anthropology, much of it focussed on intergroup relations and responses to ecological change and development issues, with emphasis on micro-scale community-based research methodologies.
3. **Robert Hitchcock, Ph.D.:** An anthropologist with extensive experience in Community-Based Natural Resource Management practices in Southern Africa. Several years of experience with USAID supported projects in Botswana, Swaziland, Zimbabwe and Namibia.

(For methodology on the EAT Scope of Work, itinerary, list of literature consulted and list of people interviewed, see ANNEXES A - D)

The Internal Assessment Team (IAT) consisted of USAID, WWF and partners. The role of the IAT was to resolve relevant issues pertaining to the LIFE project, such as design flaws, the Project previews efforts to correct implementation strategies and current conditions that require a new look at project implementation.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS.

The Project Paper Supplement has been amended based on the recommendations of both Assessment reports, and through the discussions generated by the assessment exercise and reports. The recommended changes reflect the strong consensus between the LIFE partners, arrived at through a lengthy participatory process. The original CBNRM focus of the project is not being altered and the project still fits squarely within the Regional NRMP objectives. The amendments attempt to sharpen the project in response to the realities in the field, such as the lack of appropriate NGO's involved in CBNRM activities, and to strengthen the results to bestow more lasting sustainable skills to communities managing and using their natural resources.

There are various other factors that necessitated this Mid-Term Assessment. One of these is the lack of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) with extensive experience in community-based natural resource management in the LIFE Project target areas. The lack of NGO's involved in CBNRM activities puts the sustainability of this program at stake after the Life of the Project, hence, the request for an extension to August 19, 1999. As a result of lack of NGO's in the target areas, the LIFE Project might be forced to make use of peripheral NGO's to

implement specific aspect of the project.

A number of incorrect design assumptions became apparent early in the project implementation process:

- assumptions concerning the policy and legislative environment;
- assumptions about the number and capacity of NGO's;
- assumptions about levels of CBO organization and capacity;
- assumptions about DEA capacity and broad MET support (especially for support, development and monitoring of the resource base).

The assessment process served as a means for examining these assumptions and proposing appropriate design and implementation modifications.

The positive factors that prevail in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism could also be cited as external factors that have contributed to the Mid-Term Assessment. The newly appointed Minister, the Deputy-Minister and the Permanent Secretary of MET are all supportive of the primary objective of the LIFE Project. These include issues such as the acceleration of the Conservancy Legislation, that will enable communities to retain income from better management of natural resources in the target areas.

The Government of the Republic of Namibia's (GRN) National Development Strategy 1 (NDP 1) put emphasis on the sustainable development of all aspects of the economy, including environmental issues. This policy commits the GRN to pay very serious attention to environmental management and sustainability in the design of development projects. The other objectives of NDP 1 include:

- promoting sustainable development within all sectors and that all Namibians gain optimal benefit from the equitable and sustainable utilization of Namibia's renewable resources;
- protect biotic diversity and maintain ecological life-support systems;
- promoting the training of Namibians and institutional strengthening in the field of environmental management and integrating planning and management of land and other natural resources.

Although the LIFE Project was originally design to work at the national level, it was determined that the project would have greater impact if it focused its efforts on a limited number of target areas. The project resolved to work in three target areas, East Caprivi, West Caprivi, and Eastern Bushmanland , with possible extension in the part of Uukwaluudhi. The new PP refers to eight (8) target communities: two communities in West Caprivi, three communities in East Caprivi along the Kwando river, one in

eastern part of East Caprivi at Salambala, one north of Etosha Pan in Uukwaluudhi, and one in Eastern Bushmanland.

Implementation of the LIFE Project commenced in July, 1993 when LIFE Program Team field staff took up residence in Namibia. The Project under the leadership of WWF is currently in the 27th month of implementation. Early on the LIFE team encountered a number of flaws in design assumptions leading to a readjustment by all partners of the project's Logical Framework and anticipated outcomes. These in turn lead to changes in LIFE Project implementation strategy and operational procedures. In August, 1994, it was decided to undertake an assessment exercise in order to make recommendations for the incorporation of changes into the LIFE PP. The resulting internal and external rolling assessment has yielded both (i) a more focussed set of EOPS and outcomes, (ii) a

revised implementation strategy, and (iii) recommendations for additional strategic interventions which, if applied, could significantly enhance achievement of program benefits and outcomes.

16. INPUTS

On September 3, 1992 USAID/Namibia authorized a \$10.5 million five year natural resource management project called Living In a Finite Environment (LIFE) as Amendment 3 to the SARP Regional NRM Project. The initial obligation was US\$ 3 million. An additional US\$ 1 million was obligated May 14, 1993; US\$ 532,000 on September 30, 1993; US\$ 3 million on March 23, 1994; US\$ 2,968,000 on June 29, 1995. The Mid-Term Assessment increased an additional US\$ 3,856,000 on September 29, 1995. This brought the total LIFE Project funding to US\$ 14,356.

Although the first authorization was made September 3, 1992, the actual implementation started in July, 1993 when the LIFE Project Team field-staff took up residence in Namibia.

The LIFE Project inputs include technical assistance, training and funding of grants. USAID provides US\$ 14,356,000 for the LIFE Project. The USAID/Namibia Project Manager provides backstopping to the LIFE Project, does reporting, and coordinates evaluation activities for USAID. In accordance with AID requirements, USAID/Namibia has ultimate responsibility for LIFE Project management, monitoring, financial accountability, and assessment of the Project's impact.

WWF plays the leading role in the implementation of the LIFE Project. Its leading role is also to support LIFE Project participants (AID, GRN, NGO's, CBO's) in identifying and testing innovative approaches to link conservation and human needs. WWF's specific role is to provide leadership and technical assistance in natural resource management and the ways in which

improved management approaches can better meet human needs and contribute to social and economic development.

The LIFE Project support several NGO's and CBO's working in CBNRM field in the project target areas. These include:

- Institutional support to Namibia Nature Foundation;
- Institutional support to the Social Science Division of University of Namibia (UNAM) to undertake applied research of Namibian CBNRM activities in Caprivi.
- Institutional support to the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to provide institutional support and development through the funding of staff members including technical assistance for Natural Resource Specialist and other staff. This sub-grant also provide procurement of strategic equipment and training.
- Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation for support of community Game Guards and Resource monitor system, development and training of community management structure, promotion of natural resource enterprises, and eventually formation of one or more conservancies in East and WEST Caprivi. It also include development of Resource-Based Enterprise Unit in both East and West Caprivi.
- Nyae-Nyae Farmers Cooperative for integrated natural resource management program in Eastern Bushmanland.
- Support to the Caprivi Arts and Cultural Association for staff support, equipment, and training of artisans of the Association.

The LIFE Project has also recognized the fact that if the project wants to realize its goal of enhancing improved relation between MET and the various rural communities, it needs to assist in the capacity building of MET. This is because the LIFE Project is reliant on the effective functioning of MET, therefore MET capacity and ability to effectively coordinate is of crucial importance. Capacity building and technical assistance efforts have been carried out by the LIFE Project with MET, NGO's and CBO's through participatory approaches and empowerment.

17. OUTPUTS/RESULTS

The LIFE Project progress have generally been impressive and on target in most cases, except that there were some inconsistencies identified with the first Project Status Review in 1993. Through

various sessions of all Project Partners, it was agreed to revised the Project documents to be in line with the Regional NRMP goal. This was also meant to further focussed the project purpose, outcomes and target.

The establishment of clear indicators and targets is useful only to the degree that the LIFE Partners apply them to gauge Project progress. The Logical Framework indicators and targets are the primary measurements of program achievements and progress and therefore need to be monitored with care. Consult the attached table for current project progress indicators.
(See ANNEX E for revised LIFE Project Logical Framework)

18. PURPOSE

At the Purpose level, the three original purposes were deemed to be unfocused and not at the Purpose level but at the Output level. Therefore, one new Project Purpose was selected as noted in the table below:

Old Life Purpose(s)	New Purpose
1. Increase social and economic well-being in poor rural communities and/or in buffer zones to protected areas, through community-based natural resource management. 2. Improve community-based groups capabilities to manage natural resources in sustainable fashion, through strengthening local, regional and national institutions which provide services to communities. 3. Develop strategies and methodologies for community management of natural resources.	Communities derive increased benefits in an equitable manner by gaining control over and sustainably managing natural resources in target areas.

Changes in Project Logical Framework

LIFE fits into the MET's nation-wide CBNRM Program. Therefore, the LIFE Project supports the broader MET program and provides lessons learned for their nation-wide efforts. LIFE Project underwent an extensive internal review process which included an examination and refinement of the Project Goal, Purposes, Outputs, Outcome indicators and Targets and to further refinement and/or modification of implementation approaches to achievement

of the Project Goal. These changes are reflected in the revised Project objective tree and Logical Framework which were jointly developed by the participating LIFE partners. These revisions have been vigorously supported by MET and the Steering Committee, but required review by the external assessment team prior to incorporating into LIFE PP.

The LIFE Project EOPS were refined during the Assessment process and modified as new funds and an extended PACD were added. The revised EOPS indicators of the LIFE Project are listed below:

Purpose Level Indicators:

- Four conservancies established and maintain;
- Number of enterprises that produce positive net economic benefits to resource users in Target Areas (Target: 20);
- Total net community income per year from program-supported NRM practices (Target: N \$520,000/yr);
- Total national net financial benefit from program-supported NRM practices (Target: N \$750,000/yr);
- Number of Households in Target Areas that benefit from program-supported NRM practices (Target: 70%).

There are one or two objectively verifiable indicators associated with each of the eight Results outlined in the logframe. In order to maintain a direct and accurate relationship between the Results and the indicators, USAID and its partners will review and revise the indicators by March 31, 1996. Work will also be carried out by the implementation team to further identify and explicate the "equitable distribution" and to incorporate this into the revisions.

The LIFE Project Results

The LIFE Project has eight (8) Results statements which contribute to accomplish the LIFE Project Purpose. These are listed below:

1. Social/economic/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 NRM opportunities and constraints;
4. Communities mobilized into legally-recognized 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 organization to sustainably assist communities in the establishment of sustainable CBNRM enterprises and management systems;
7. Improved capacity of Namibian organizations to establish legal, regulatory, and policy framework supportive of CBNRM;

8. Analysis of CBNRM dynamics and experience, and lessons learned and shared throughout Namibia and between LIFE and Southern African colleagues.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

The LIFE Project newly approved Goal reads as follows:
 "Improved quality of life to rural Namibians through sustainable natural resource management."

The rationale for changing the Goal and Purpose was to focus the project to ensure that benefits to its customers will be obtained during the LOP and to confirm that all partners agreed on the changes to the original LIFE PP. The new Goal specifies more directly where the project is headed.

The project will attempt not only to enhance capabilities of people, but to improve the quality of life. The old and new goals are listed in the table below:

Old LIFE Goal	New LIFE Goal
Enhance capabilities to meet the basic human needs through sustainable management of natural resources.	Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable natural resource management.

20. BENEFICIARIES

The direct beneficiaries of the LIFE Project are the eight target communities where the Project is operational. The communities derive increased benefits in an equitable manner by gaining control over and sustainably managing natural resources in target areas. The Project aims to enable communities to create opportunities that would increase their income from better management of natural resources. This would reduce unemployment amongst rural communities and encourage self-employment. The project will attempt not only to enhance capabilities of people, but to improve the quality of life. (See attached list of data on community benefits, Annex B).

The LIFE Project is increasingly striving towards supporting developmental activities that provides communities with direct economic benefits. The realization is that the Project will be able to intensify its already existing programmes within the various communities, such as employing community members as Community Game Guards (CGGs) and Community Resource Monitors (RMs). This will ensure that communities develop and maintain their interest in the Project as well as undertaking sustainable natural resource management practices. In order to realized these, the Project puts emphasis on achieving economic

diversification and to develop alternative sources of income for the target communities.

-There are several LIFE Project supported-enterprises operative in 3 Target Areas and include:

- * Thatching grass
- * Traditional village
- * Bed-night levy (5 communities)
- * Craft production
- * Community campsites
- * Safari hunting
- * Film-making crews paying the Nyae-Nyae Farmers Cooperative (NNFC) for the rights to work in the region.

There are also several other potential activities envisaged in these areas:

- * Mopane worm collection
- * Herbal medicine collection and production
- * Cochineal production
- * Collection of cocoons (e.g. Gonimbrasie belina) for manufacturing of silk
- * Game farming.

Both Assessment Reports (EAT Report and the Field Validation Report) list significant results from the first two years of LIFE activities. By project component, these include:

Component 1: CBNRM Activities

- * generated increased policy support; Conservancy policy was passed by Cabinet in March, 1995; Draft Conservancy Legislation is being prepared for October, 1995 Parliamentary session.
- * support to community based tourism activities has resulted in the formation of NACOBTA and government support for community-based tourism have established baseline and methods for continued collection of information on the natural resource base.
- * increased public awareness of CBNRM activities.
- * 4 NGOs/CBOs have strengthened their organization's capacity to plan, implement and manage CBNRM activities.
- * supported first land-use planning workshop involving residence of Bushmanland and other Ministries
- * thatching grass and reeds yield US \$24,000/year for 160 women; bed-night levy of US \$3,600/yr to 746 households in five communities: Lizauli village yields US \$4,000 for 14 staff and community members; Lizauli crafts yields US \$2,000 for 60 some individuals.

Component 2: Applied Research

- * provided economic research and data to support MET CBNRM focus and for development of community-based tourism activities.
- * provided economic models for NRM benefits projections

2 staff from SSD receiving on-the-job training including MA degrees.

-Component 3: Training

- * NGOs and CBOs received participatory rural appraisal training.
- * NGOs/CBOs received training in project monitoring and evaluation.
- * carried out first training needs assessment in the MET.

Component 4: National/Regional Networking

- * participated in Project Coordinated Committee
- * participation of a 14 member delegation in the Regional Kasane Workshop
- * sent participants to the Regional Gender Workshop.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

The Project was initially designed to be implemented by two entities. WWF was selected as the U.S. PVO to implement the major part of the LIFE Project under an US\$ 8.027 million Cooperative Agreement; and the Zoological Society of San Diego (ZSSD) was awarded a US\$ 1.1 million Grant to conduct research in cooperation with the Etosha Ecological Institute (EEI). ZSSD abruptly and unilaterally ended the Grant on June 22, 1993, after only eight months of implementation. ZSSD, USAID, MET and EEI were fully aware of implementation problems that were being encountered by ZSSD and had set a meeting for June 21, 1993 to discuss these concerns. The meeting was held, but instead of discussing the resolution of issues, ZSSD discussed how to close out the Grant. It was decided that remaining \$800,000 of the ZSSD Grant will be assigned to the Sub-grant line item under of the Project budget to support field activities.

At the time of its initial conceptualization, the LIFE project was to provide broad-based capacity building to a variety of different Namibian NGOs involved with environmental issues. It was assumed that a sufficient number of Namibian NGOs possessed the institutional capacity and knowledge to provide assistance to communities in CBNRM. During the course of LIFE Project implementation, it was discovered that there were relatively few NGOs with the necessary human resources capacity and experience in natural resource issues. The LIFE Team determined that there was a widespread need for intensive assistance in the organizational development of Namibian NGOs. As a result, LIFE Project staff invested time and energy in institutional strengthening and in more direct involvement in program implementation at the field level. This situation meant that there were increased workloads and expanded operating cost.

The increased integration of LIFE staff in implementation efforts

brought about a merging of NGO and LIFE Team technical skills and perspective on community facilitation processes. Extensive contacts between the LIFE project team and NGO staff working in the field in partnership fashion has resulted in a strong team approach and a fertile sharing of knowledge and experience. In addition, the increased involvement of LIFE staff at the field level has and will continue to benefit the program monitoring process, thereby facilitating documentation of the effectiveness of different approaches and improving learning opportunities.

As it has worked out, the LIFE Project currently is working with two NGOs in Caprivi, the NNF and IRDNC. It has begun to work more intensively with two CBOs, the Nyae-Nyae Farmers Cooperative in Eastern Bushmanland and the Caprivi Arts and Cultural Association in Caprivi. Capacity building and technical assistance efforts have been carried out by the LIFE Project with both NGOs and CBOs. The recently completed LIFE Project amendment is aimed at better achieving development needs and the USAID Mission's strategic objectives by building the capacity of NGOs and especially CBO's through participatory approaches and empowerment.

In order to become effective, NGOs and CBOs must improve their institutional capacity in a variety of organizational spheres. The LIFE Project has identified a number of measures to track institutional development and community management of NGOs and CBOs working with the Project. These include (a) the capacity to plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate development activities; (b) the establishment of sound, transparent, and clear financial management and reporting procedures; (c) the setting up and running of participatory and effective management structures; (d) the ability to assess impacts and analyze data which are then integrated into decision-making.

It is possible to divide the NGOs with which the LIFE Project works into two categories: core NGOs and peripheral NGOs. The core NGO are those that are involved directly in carrying out broad-based CBNRM and community capacity building work in the target areas. The peripheral NGOs are those which could be brought into the LIFE Program for specific purposes such as conducting training, doing workshops, or assisting in a short-term project activity. The LIFE Project can assist peripheral NGOs in number of ways: (1) giving of strategic grants to NGOs to support a specific activity that is in support of LIFE Project objectives (such as community-based tourism); (2) carrying out awareness creation workshops in the broader NGO community on the conservancy policy and CBNRM issues; (3) providing cross-cutting training events for interested NGO; and (4) promoting networking among participating NGOs and CBOs. At the national level, the LIFE Project can provide technical consultation on common property resource management to the NGO Land Forum and relevant government bodies. It can also enhance knowledge of CBNRM through carefully orchestrated networking and information dissemination efforts.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

The LIFE Project is a pilot effort to test various models of community based natural resource management in communal areas. Eventually it is planned to duplicate lessons learned in other parts of the country.

One of the major outcomes of the LIFE Project is the sharing of information on the lessons learned from CBNRM activities in Namibia. Key issues have already been identified concerning the need to integrate wildlife with other kinds of natural resource activities, the importance of land tenure, and jurisdictional factors, the need for equity in resource management systems and enterprise promotions, and the significance of traditional leadership in local resource management regimes. The experiences and knowledge gained in Namibian CBNRM activities have already had impacts on the kinds of approaches being employed elsewhere in the region.

The models of resource utilization and management vary significantly both within Namibia and in Southern Africa generally. Through the applied research, monitoring, and evaluation process, and through comparing results, these models will undoubtedly provide significant opportunities for the formulation of hypotheses concerning the kinds of conditions necessary for successful natural resource management. An important part of this process is the opportunity for people from across the region to participate in conferences and to take part in exchange visits.

23 SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

The LIFE Project regards Conservancies as the cornerstone of the MET's CBNRM program, as it is noted in the MET Policy Document on Wildlife Management, Utilization, and Tourism in Communal Areas. The generic purpose of MET's policy and the LIFE Project, along with other CBNRM projects in the Southern African region, is the establishment of communal proprietorial regimes of natural resource management, i.e. communities with secure tenure and rights of ownership over their natural resources and their economic potential. Currently in Namibia's communal lands, including the LIFE Project Target Areas, Eastern Bushmanland, West Caprivi, and East Caprivi communities do not have this secure tenure and ownership over their natural resources, a condition which severely militates against the establishment of incentive structures required for the achievement of the Project Goal and Project Purpose. Lack of an appropriate legislation that guides the jurisdictional and proprietary rights and responsibilities is the root cause of many of the problems that rural communities continue to face.

The proposed Conservancy legislation will confer on communities in communal lands (a) the right to utilize wildlife on the designated conservancy land and retain revenues from such usage; (b) the right to the tourism resources on conservancy land; (c) the right to negotiate with the private sector as legal proprietors for any lease or contractual arrangements for the use of wildlife and other tourism resources; and (d) the responsibilities of representative, effective and sustainable natural resources use and management.

The draft Communal Land Bill is also being revised to be compatible with the proposed Conservancy Legislation. Although emphasis for the two bills is for communities to control and benefit from all resources (including land) under their management, the Communal Land Bill is far more complex and raises many issues that could impact upon sustainable natural resources management in the communal areas. While the politically - charged communal land issue is not and was never conceived as being within the scope of the LIFE Project, it is clear that both USAID and its partners in the project have a major stake in the harmonisation of the Communal Land Bill with CBNRM principles and approaches. Fortunately, the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) has appealed to everybody concerned to give as much input as possible to enable GRN to pass a legislation that satisfy the broader Namibian population, in particular the people in the communal areas.

The LIFE project will play an active role in community training and awareness raising in terms of assisting the MET in redressing these issues of concerned to the communities. Currently the LIFE Project is facilitating initiatives from communities to raise their concerns to most of these proposed bills.

ANNEX A

SCOPE OF WORK AMENDMENT NO. 1
FOR THE
FIELD ASSESSMENT
PHASES IV OF THE MID-TERM ASSESSMENT
OF THE
LIFE PROJECT, USAID/NAMIBIA COMPONENT
NUMBER 690-0251.73

A. Justification:

The purpose of this amendment is to extend the services of Dr. Robert Hitchcock to complete the Field Assessment Report and to add a further assignment. The reason further time is needed to finish the Field Assessment Report is because one of the consultants was sick in bed for almost a week and could not finish his part of the report. This delayed the report being submitted to the key members of the LIFE program and for the reviews to be held. It also delayed the finalization and review of the Project Description which was based on the Assessment findings and recommendations.

In addition, the AID Representative requested that the team leader of the Field Assessment, prepare additional scenarios for the project extension. Based on the work in the field and the fact that the consultant had read background documents, it was deemed cost effective to extend the same consultant to complete this assignment. This extra "deliverable" will require additional time and funds.

B. Adjusted Time Table:

July 28 Last day of consultation by team leader under current PO (25+4 travel days)

July 29 through August 11 - 12 days of amended contract (6 day work week authorized)

July 29-August 2	- Finalize the Field Assessment Report
August 3 - 7	- Finalize the summary Project Description
August 8-11	- Finalize a Project Description scenario to include an project extension

ANNEX B

B

ANNEX 2

Itinerary and Schedule of Visits

Friday, June 30, 1995, Windhoek

arrival of team members Robert Hitchcock, Marshall Murphree
meeting with Ministry of Environment and Tourism
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Saturday, July 1, 1995, Windhoek

meeting with Gideon Shilongo, MET
meeting with LIFE team, LIFE offices
evening get-together, C. Culler
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Sunday, July 2, 1995, Windhoek

meeting with Gideon Shilongo
meeting with Axel Thoma, Magdalena Brormann
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Monday, July 3, 1995, Windhoek - Bushmanland - Lianshulu

depart Eros Airport 6:30 a.m.
meeting with M. Biesele, S. Barclay, Tjum!kui, East Bushmanland
meeting with NNFC and NNDFN representatives, Baraka, E. Bushmanland
flight to Lianshulu
meeting with IRDNC staff members, Lianshulu
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Tuesday, July 4, 1995, East Caprivi

meeting of Labuta community representatives (N=17)
meeting with Environmental Awareness personnel, Sangwali
meeting with CRM supervisor, IRDNC Field Officer, Hupula
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Wednesday, July 5, 1995, East Caprivi

meeting with Caprivi Arts and Cultural Association, Kutima Mulilo
meeting with DRM/MET staff, Kutima Mulilo
night at Zambezi Lodge, Kutima Mulilo

Thursday, July 6, 1995, West Caprivi

meeting with IRDNC Project Manager and EDU Community Facilitator,
Susuwe, West Caprivi
discussions with IRDNC Co-Director
meeting with Community Members, //Xham//Xhao, West Caprivi
meeting with Community Members and West Caprivi Steering Committee
representatives, Omega, West Caprivi
night at Ndhovu Lodge, Okavango River, West Caprivi

Friday, July 7, 1995, West Caprivi

meeting with Chief Kippi George
meeting with Bagani Community Members, West Caprivi Campground
Committee and Western Caprivi Arts and Crafts Committee
representatives, Bagani, West Caprivi

discussions at Bagani Campsite, IRDNC staff
meeting at Chetto, IRDNC/CGG issues, West Caprivi
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Saturday, July 8, 1995, East Caprivi
meeting with Community Members, Lizauli, East Caprivi
meeting with elephant researchers, Lianshulu
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Sunday, July 9, 1995, East Caprivi
meeting with Lianshulu personnel
analysis and write-up of data and recommendations
flight over Caprivi to see locations of communities, boundaries
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Monday, July 10, 1995, East Caprivi
analysis and write-up
presentation to LIFE Project decision summit
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Tuesday, July 11, 1995, East Caprivi
field trip to Bhukalo and Salambala
meeting with members of Salambala Wildlife Management Committee,
tour of Salambala, visit to Maseziyane Village
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Wednesday, July 12, 1995, East Caprivi
analysis and write-up
presentation to Steering Committee
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Thursday, July 13, 1995, East Caprivi
analysis and write-up
meetings with SSD representative, other SC members
night at Lianshulu Lodge

Friday, July 14, 1995, East Caprivi
attend wrap-up session of Steering Committee
return to Windhoek via commercial Air Namibia flight, Kutima
night at Thuringerhof Hotel, Windhoek

Saturday, July 15, 1995, Windhoek
analysis and write-up
meeting with Nyae Nyae consultant, researcher
night at Thuringerhof Hotel, Windhoek

Sunday, July 16, 1995, Windhoek
Marshall Murphree departs for Harare
analysis and write-up
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Monday, July 17, 1995, Windhoek
analysis and write-up of results
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Tuesday, July 18, 1995, Windhoek
meeting at USAID with USAID, LIFE team and management team
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Wednesday, July 19, 1995, Windhoek
write-up of report at AID/Namibia
meeting with Ulla Kann, Ministry of Basic Education and Culture
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Thursday, July 20, 1995, Windhoek
write-up of report at AID/Namibia
meeting with LIFE COP
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Friday, July 21, 1995, Windhoek
meetings with NNDNFN, WIMSA
write-up of report at AID/Namibia
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Saturday, July 22, 1995, Windhoek
write-up of report at AID/Namibia
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Sunday, July 23, 1995, Windhoek
discussions and report printout at WWF/LIFE
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Monday, July 24, 1995, Windhoek
meeting with USAID/Namibia
PCC meeting at Sundown Game Ranch
meeting with Botswana NRMP representatives
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Tuesday, July 25, 1995, Windhoek
meeting with Manfred Hinz, CASS, on customary law issues
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Wednesday, July 26, 1995, Windhoek
meeting with Mark Renzi, C. Culler, B. Belding on M & E issues
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Thursday, July 27, 1995, Windhoek
meeting with LIFE team, MET, USAID
work on field assessment
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Friday, July 28, 1995
completion of draft field assessment report
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Saturday, July 29, 1995
discussions on Eastern Bushmanland section of assessment
revising of draft field assessment report
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Monday, July 31, 1995

re-cast LIFE Project Paper work
Project Coordinating Committee meeting, Sundown Lodge
discussions with PCC members
night at Thuringerhof Hotel

Tuesday, August 1, 1995

meeting at WWF/LIFE regarding LIFE Project
work at USAID on re-cast LIFE Project description
meeting with I. Tlhase, NEPRU

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

work at USAID on re-cast LIFE Project description

Thursday, August 3, 1995

work at USAID on re-cast LIFE Project description
meetings with personnel of National Museum, Namibia Archaeological
Trust

Friday, August 4, 1995

meeting with Steve Turner, SSD
finalization of draft LIFE Project Description
incorporation of changes in field assessment report

Saturday, August 5, 1995

revisions of draft re-cast LIFE Project description
finalization of field assessment report

Monday, August 7, 1995

distribution of draft re-cast LIFE Project description
meeting with S. Lawry, Ford Foundation, L. Garvin, SSD

Tuesday, August 8, 1995

USAID and LIFE partners meeting on field assessment report
meeting at WWF/LIFE on PP and field assessment
meeting at USAID on LIFE policy issues

Wednesday, August 9, 1995

meeting with USAID, LIFE, and MET on LIFE Project description
work on revisions of re-cast LIFE Project description

Thursday, August 10, 1995

meeting at LIFE office with permanent secretary, MET
meeting with MET Division of Resource Management (DRM)
finalization of changes in field assessment report

Friday, August 11, 1995

meeting with representative of National Monuments Council
incorporation of changes in re-cast LIFE Project description
final printing of field assessment report

Saturday, August 12, 1995

finalization of re-cast LIFE Project description

ANNEX C

ANNEX 3:

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Ulitala Hiveluah, Permanent Secretary, MET
Brian Jones, Principal Planning Officer, DEA
Jon Barnes, LIFE Natural Resource Economist, DEA
Caroline Ashley, Natural Resource Economist, DEA
Jo Tagg, Natural Resource Planner, DEA
Gideon Martin Shilongo, LIFE Tourism Officer, MET
Manie Le Roux, Acting Chief Conservation Officer, DRM, Caprivi
Shedrick Siloka, Principal Ranger, Caprivi, DRM
Nad Brain, Veterinarian, Etosha, MET
Lou Scheepers, Principal Game Researcher, MET, Caprivi
Patrick Kazwela, Conservation Officer, West Caprivi
Ben Beytel, Division of Resource Management, Windhoek
Leon Van Rooyen, Division of Resource Management, Windhoek
Chris Grobeler, Division of Resource Management, Windhoek

WWF Programme Team

Chris Weaver, Chief of Party
Karl Aribeb, LIFE Program Officer
Barbara Wyckoff-Baird, LIFE Community-based Natural Resource
Management Technical Advisor (CBNRM/TA)
Mark Renzi, LIFE Monitoring and Evaluation/Institutional
Development Specialist (MSI)
Estelle Brumskine, LIFE Financial Management Specialist (WLI)

USAID/Namibia

Edward Spriggs, AID Representative
Joan Johnson, Program Officer
Barbara Belding, General Development Officer
Carol Culler, LIFE/READ Project Manager
Mathew /Goagoseb, LIFE Project Assistant
Tom Hand, Executive Officer

Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation

Garth Owen-Smith, Co-Director
Simon Mayes, Project Manager, West Caprivi
George Hess, Project Manager, East Caprivi
Annie Symonds, Field Manager, Enterprise Development Unit
Allen Sameja, Community Enterprise Promoter
Bernard Mushitu, Field Officer, East Caprivi
Manius Ishimwe, CGG Field Officer, East Caprivi

24

Beaven Munali, CGG Field Officer, East Caprivi
Oena Dihaku, Field Officer, West Caprivi
Ronnie Mahindi, Field Officer, West Caprivi
Janet Matota, Supervisor, Resource Monitors, East Caprivi
Loveness Shitaa, CRM, East Caprivi
Linus Mukueda, Environmental Awareness Program, East Caprivi
Patrick Mutelo, Lizauli Traditional Village Committee
Joyce Setakatu, CRM, Libuta, East Caprivi

Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative and NNDFN

Hugh Hogan, Natural Resources Advisor, NNFC
Kxao Moses /Oma, Manager, NNFC
Tsamkxao Moses G/ao, Assistant Manager, NNFC
/'angn!ao /'Un (Kiewit), Chairman, NNFC
/Ailae /Aice (Benjamin), Senior Field Officer, CBNRM, NNFC
Kaqece /Kaece, RADA, Central District, NNFC
Megan Biesele, Consultant, Village Schools Program, Nyae Nyae
Steve Barclay, Researcher, Nyae Nyae
Shebby Mate, Agricultural Advisor and Field Manager, NNDFN

Persons Met in the Field

Moses Nasilele, Director, CACA
Solvent Yambwa, Bookkeeper, CACA
Grant Burton, Lianshulu Lodge
Marie Burton, Lianshulu Lodge
Pam Emmett, Lianshulu Lodge
Colin Emmett, Lianshulu Lodge
Tim Rodwell, Caprivi Elephant Conservation Researcher
Caitlin O'Connell, Human/Elephant Conflict Researcher
Ruth Norris, Management Systems International (Washington)
Cynthia Jensen, World Wildlife Fund (Washington)
Stephen Turner, SSD, Programme Leader, CBNRM
Len le Roux, Deputy Director, Rossing Foundation
Andrew Corbett, Legal Assistance Center
Ian Johnson, Student, Port Elizabeth Technicon
S. Siango, Councillor, Lizauli
B.S. Lilungwe, District Forestry Officer, Katima Mulilo
Community Members, Libutha, East Caprivi (N=17)
Community Members, Omega, West Caprivi (N=15)
Western Caprivi Steering Committee representatives
Jack Gowagwe, Chairperson, West Caprivi Steering Committee
Community Members, //Xam//Xao, West Caprivi
Volf, Headman, //Xam//Xao, West Caprivi
Chief Kippie George, leader, Barakwena people, Bagani, West Caprivi
Community Members, Bagani, West Caprivi (N=25)
Bagani, West Caprivi Campground Committee representatives (5)
Western Caprivi Arts and Crafts Committee representatives (6)

25

Community Members, Lizauli, East Caprivi (N=48)
George Mutwa, prince, Bhukalo, member of Salambala Wildlife Management Committee
Emil Liswaniso, Chairman, Wildlife Management Committee, Salambala
Rosarius Shambwe, Carver, Bukhalo, East Caprivi
Bernard Sezuni, CGG, Ngoma, East Caprivi

Persons Met in Windhoek

Wendy Viall, Nyae Nyae Development Foundation
Murray Dawson-Smith, NNFC
Axel Thoma, Work Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa
Magdalena Brormann, former Village Schools Program Coordinator, NNDFN
Jim Baird, Consultant (WWF, Rossing, IRDNC)
Beth Terry, Consultant (WWF, CACA)
Bill and Tara Lindique, Researchers, University of Massachusetts Lowell
Ulla Kann, Ministry of Education and Culture
John Kinahan, Namibia National Museum
Jill Kinahan, Namibia National Museum
David Cownie, SIAPAC
Beatrice Sandelowsky, National Monuments Council
Satoko Yoshimura, Researcher, Kaokoland
Manfred Hinz, Center for Applied Social Sciences, University of Namibia
Maj-Britt Ohlson, Representative, Africa Groups of Sweden
Irene Tlhasse, Economist, Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit
Richard Moorsom, Associate, SSD
Thomas Dowson, Researcher, University of Southampton
Steve Lawry, Representative, Ford Foundation, Windhoek
Lori Garvin, Associate, SSD
Hilda Sinkonde, Trainer, READ Project

ANNEX D

Selected References

Ashley, C., J. Barnes, and T. Healy (1994) Profits, Equity, Growth, and Sustainability: The Potential Role of Wildlife Enterprises in Caprivi and Other Communal Areas of Namibia. Research Discussion Paper Number 2. Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Ashley, Caroline and Elizabeth Garland (1994) Promoting Community-Based Tourism Development: Why, What, and How? Research Discussion Paper Number 4. Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Associates in Rural Development (1992) Decentralization and Local Autonomy: Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Resource Management. 2 Volumes. Burlington, Vermont: Associates in Rural Development and Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development.

Associates in Rural Development (1995) Facilitation and Documentation Support for The Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Program Assessment Exercise for the LIFE Project in Community-Based Natural Resource Management, USAID/Namibia Component (690-0251.73). Burlington, Vermont: Associates in Rural Development and Windhoek, Namibia: USAID/Namibia.

Barnes, Jon I. (1995) A Note on the Potential for Generation of Natural Resource Use Values in LIFE Programme Target Areas. Unpublished Paper, Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek, Namibia.

Bieseke, Megan (1994) Human Rights and Democratization in Namibia: Some Grassroots Political Perspectives. Paper presented at the 93rd annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Bieseke, Megan, John Ford, and Dianne Hubbard (1991) Land Issues in Nyae Nyae: A Communal Areas Example. In National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question, Windhoek, 25 June - 1 July 1991, Volume 1: Research Papers, Addresses, and Concensus Document, pp. 517-544. Windhoek, Namibia: Government of the Republic of Namibia, Office of the Prime Minister.

Bieseke, Megan, David Green, and Robert Hitchcock (1992) Decentralization and Natural Resource Management: Namibia Field Report. In Decentralization and Local Autonomy: Conditions for Achieving Sustainable Resource Management. Volume II: Appendices. Burlington, Vermont: Associates in Rural Development, Inc. and Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development, Research and Development Bureau.

Botelle, Andy, Rick Rohde, and Ireve Van Rhyn (1994) Those Who Live on the Land: Land Use Planning in the Communal Areas of Eastern Otjondjupa: A Socio-economic Baseline Survey. Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation and the Social Science Division, University of Namibia.

Brown, C.J. and B.T.B. Jones, eds. (1994) Results of a Socio-ecological Survey of the West Caprivi Strip, Namibia: A Strategic and Community-Based Environment and Development Plan. Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Brown, Michael and Barbara Wyckoff-Baird (1992) Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects. Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program.

Child, Brian and John H. Peterson, Jr., eds. (1991) CAMPFIRE in Rural Development: The Beitbridge Experience. Paper 1/91. Harare, Zimbabwe: Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPWLM) and Center for Applied Social Sciences (CASS), University of Zimbabwe.

Garland, Elizabeth (1994) Tourism Development in Eastern Bushmanland: Final Report. Windhoek, Namibia: Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1992) Communities and Consensus: An Evaluation of the Activities of the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation and the Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative in Northeastern Namibia. Windhoek, Namibia: Nyae Nyae Development Foundation and New York, New York: Ford Foundation.

Jansen, Ruud, Neville Pradhan, and John Spencer (1994) Bushmen Ex-Servicemen and Dependents Rehabilitation and Resettlement Programme, West Bushmanland and Western Caprivi, Evaluation (Final Report, April 1994). Windhoek, Namibia: The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia and the Royal Norwegian Embassy/NORAD.

Kasita, Maria and Japeni Nujoma (1995) Resettlement and Rehabilitation of the Ex-Servicemen and their Dependents in West Caprivi and West Bushmanland: Evaluation Report. Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation.

Kiss, Agnes (ed.) (1990) Living with Wildlife: Wildlife Resource Management with Local Participation in Africa. World Bank Technical paper Number 130. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Legal Assistance Center (1991) Communal Lands in Namibia: The Legal Framework, Its Application, and Existing Practices. In National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question, Windhoek, 25 June - 1 July 1991, Volume 1: Research Papers, Addresses, and Consensus Document, pp. 99-141. Windhoek, Namibia: Government of the Republic of Namibia, Office of the Prime Minister.

Mehra, Rekha (1993) Gender in Community Development and Resource Management: An Overview. Washington, D.C.: International Center for Research on Women and World Wildlife Fund.

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1994a) Policy Document:

Conservation of Biotic Diversity and Habitat Protection.
Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1994b) Policy Document: Land-Use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development. Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1995a) Policy Document: Wildlife Management, Utilization, and Tourism in Communal Areas: Benefits to Communities and Improved Resource Management. Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1995b) Policy Document: Promotion of Community-Based Tourism Development. Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing (1993) Regional Conference on Development Programmes for Africa's San/Basarwa Populations, Gaborone, Botswana, 11th-13th October, 1993. Gaborone, Botswana: Government Printer.

Murphree, Marshall W. (1994) Integrating Applied Social Science Research with Community-Based Natural Resource Management in Namibia. Report to USAID/Namibia and the LIFE Project, Windhoek, Namibia.

Murphree, Marshall W. (1995) Optimal Principles and Pragmatic Strategies: Creating an Enabling Politico-Legal Environment for Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). Paper presented at the Conference of the Regional Natural Resources Management Program, Kasane, Botswana.

Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative (1989) = 'Hanu a N!an!a'an: N//oaq!'ae Farmaskxoasi //Koa//Kae (Statutes of the Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative). /Aotcha, Namibia: NNFC.

Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative (1995) Integrated Natural Resource Management Program in Nyae Nyae (Eastern Bushmanland). Grant Proposal to the LIFE Program. Windhoek and Nyae Nyae: Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative.

Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative (n.d.) Application for Right of Occupation in Eastern Bushmanland: Proposal for the Registration of the Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative as a Charitable Corporation. Windhoek and Baraka, Namibia: Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative.

Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (1992) Proposed Reorganization of NNFC. Windhoek and Baraka, Namibia: NNDFN.

Powell, N.S. (1994) Participatory Land Use Planning: Methods Development Incorporating the Needs and Aspirations of Indigenous Peoples in Natural Resource Management. A Case from Eastern Bushmanland, Namibia. Windhoek, Namibia: WWF/LIFE.

Republic of Namibia (1991) National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question, Windhoek, 25 June - 1 July 1991, Volume 1: Research Papers, Addresses, and Concensus Document. Windhoek, Namibia: Government of the Republic of Namibia, Office of the

Prime Minister.

Republic of Namibia (1992) Regional Conference on Development Program's for Africa's San Populations, Windhoek, Namibia, 16-18 June, 1992. Windhoek, Namibia: Government of the Republic of Namibia, Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation.

Republic of Namibia (1995) Sectoral & Cross-Sectoral Chapters for Namibia Development Plan 1 (Draft). Windhoek, Namibia: Government of the Republic of Namibia.

United States Agency for International Development (1989) Regional Natural Resources Management Project (690-0251). Washington, D.C.: USAID, Department of State.

USAID/Namibia (1992) Natural Resources Management Project Paper, Namibia, Entitled Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) (690-0251.73). Windhoek, Namibia: USAID/Namibia.

WWF/Namibia (1995) Namibia (LIFE) Living in a Finite Environment Programme, Semi-Annual Progress Report for the Period October 1, 1994 - March 31, 1995. Windhoek, Namibia: WWF/Namibia.

ANNEX E

Life Project Logical Framework

(Amended September, 1995)

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>GOAL:</p> <p>Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable natural resource management</p>	<p>Standard quality of life measures such as household incomes, birth rates, mortality rates</p> <p>Increased % of rural Namibians receive benefits from managing their natural resources</p>	<p>National Statistics</p> <p>USAID, WWF, NGO/CBO project documentation</p>	<p>(From Purpose to Goal)</p> <p>Internal and External political environment permit effective project implementation</p> <p>Public and private structures allow for participation</p> <p>Positive GNP growth</p> <p>Government maintains its commitment to CBNRM and sustainable NRM</p>
<p>PURPOSE:</p> <p>Communities derive increased benefits in an equitable manner by gaining control over and sustainably managing natural resources in target areas¹</p> <p>(1) Additional indicators which define "equitable" aspects and achievement of project purpose will be added by March 31, 1996.</p>	<p>a. Number of conservancies established and maintained in Target Areas (<i>Target: 4 conservancies</i>)</p> <p>b. Number of programme-supported enterprises that produce positive net economic benefits to resource users (<i>Target: 20</i>)</p> <p>c. Total <i>net community income/year</i> from programme-supported NRM practices (<i>target \$N 520,000/yr.</i>)</p> <p>d. Total <i>national net financial benefit</i> from programme-supported NRM practices (<i>Target: \$N 750,000/yr.</i>)</p> <p>e. Number of households in Target Areas that benefit from programme-supported NRM practices (<i>Target: 70%</i>)</p>	<p>a. Records of conservancy establishment, likely to be located in MET</p> <p>Minutes of management body meetings</p> <p>b. Cost/benefit analysis performed for each practice</p> <p>Activity Management Profiles</p> <p>c. DEA/NRE analysis</p> <p>d. Activity Management Profiles and field interviews.</p> <p>e. Summary of AMPs and field interviews</p>	<p>(From Results to Purpose)</p> <p>Activities promoted by project are capable of increasing resource user welfare.</p> <p>Resource users perceive adequate economic benefits and other incentives to adopt sustainable NRM practices.</p> <p>If resource users gain greater control over natural resources, they will utilize them more sustainably.</p> <p>Government will approve, and effectively implement, conservancy legislation.</p>

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>RESULTS:</p> <p>Result #1: Social/Economic/Ecological knowledge base improved for management of communal natural resources in Target Areas</p> <p>Result #2: Resource base of Target Areas developed and maintained</p> <p>Result #3: Increased community awareness and knowledge of NRM opportunities and constraints</p> <p>Result #4: Communities mobilized into legally-recognized bodies that are capable of managing communal resources</p> <p>Result #5: Improved community skills in participatory and technical NRM and enterprise management</p> <p>Result #6: Improved capacity of Namibian organizations to sustainably assist communities in the establishment of sustainable CBNRM enterprises and management systems</p>	<p>1. Number of relevant studies and reports produced and disseminated (<i>Target: 40</i>)</p> <p>2. Resource base developed and improved (<i>Target: TDB</i>)</p> <p>3. Number of community workshops, meetings, and training events held on opportunities and constraints to NRM (<i>target: 60</i>)</p> <p>4a. Number of officially-recognized management bodies which assume new responsibility for management of a resource (<i>Target: 1-2 community in each of 3 TAs + 1 in Ukwaluudhi</i>)</p> <p>4b. Number of assisted management bodies which show a composite 50% improvement in community/management body relations, natural resources management skills, and management body operations, as measured by the Community Management Profile (CMP) (<i>Target: 4 management bodies</i>)</p> <p>5. Number of community members trained in participatory and technical NRM and enterprise management (<i>Target: 350</i>)</p> <p>6. Number of Namibian organizations that show a 50% improvement in management capacity, as measured by the Institutional Development Profile (IDP) (<i>Target: 4 organizations</i>)</p>	<p>1. LIFE bibliography</p> <p>2. Monitoring reported from game guards, resource monitors, and MET</p> <p>3a. Quarterly sub-grantee reports</p> <p>3b. LIFE semi-annual reports</p> <p>4a. Meeting logs</p> <p>4b. Management body reports</p> <p>4c. Statement of rules (Constitutions)</p> <p>4d. Community Management Profiles</p> <p>5. Workshop records; sub-grantee quarterly reports</p> <p>6. Institutional Development Profile</p>	<p>(From Inputs to Results)</p> <p>Adequate capacity exists in the government and NGO sectors to be the chief implementation agents of LIFE.</p>

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Result #7:</p> <p>Improve capacity of Namibian organizations to establish legal regulatory and policy framework supportive of CBNRM</p> <p>Result #8:</p> <p>Analysis of CBNRM dynamics, experience, and lessons learned shared throughout Namibia and between LIFE and Southern African colleagues</p>	<p>7a. Number of LIFE-funded activities that have assisted Namibian organizations to establish a legal, regulatory and policy framework supportive of CBNRM <i>(Target: 15 activities)</i></p> <p>7b. Number of MET staff trained in CBNRM under LIFE Project funded workshops, short-courses and classes. <i>(Target: 50)</i></p> <p>8. Total number of conferences, classes and exchange visits attended; publications produced; and conferences and exchange visits sponsored <i>(Target: attend 35 regional events; 5 publications; sponsor 10 conferences; and conduct 8 exchange visits)</i></p>	<p>7. CBNRM policy log</p> <p>8. LIFE Dissemination Records</p>	
<p>INPUTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Cooperative Agreement with World Wildlife to manage the project, provide TA and training, and to administer subgrants to Namibian NGOs and CBOs. - Steering Committee to oversee the project activities, advise WWF of management concerns and approve subgrants, annual workplans and budget submissions. - USAID project personnel, technical assistance and commodities. - USAID funding of \$ 14,356,000; MET in-kind of \$5,000,000; WWF match to be negotiated. 	<p>USAID funds allocated and disbursed</p> <p>WWF cooperative agreement funds disbursed</p> <p>NGO/CBO grants allocated and disbursed</p> <p>Commodities maintained and in use</p> <p>Steering Committee meets regularly</p>	<p>USAID audits</p> <p>Project reports, evaluation records and other records</p> <p>Semi-annual reports of participating NGOs/CBOs</p> <p>Steering Committee minutes</p>	<p>NGOs/CBOs develop acceptable proposals to obtain grants</p> <p>Funds from USAID are made on a timely basis</p> <p>NGOs/CBOs are able to effectively and efficiently use the additional resources</p>