

**Support to the National CBNRM Programme beyond the  
current LIFE Programme**

**Concept Paper for USAID**

Roy Hagen

Brian T.B. Jones

Barbara Wyckoff-Baird

**April 1998**

# CONCEPT PAPER FOR USAID SUPPORT TO THE NATIONAL CBNRM PROGRAMME BEYOND THE CURRENT LIFE PROGRAM

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### List of Acronyms

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>i-iii</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 Results of the CBNRM Sector Assessment</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.0 Summary of LIFE Program Evaluation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.0 Proposed Goal Statement and Results Indicators</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.0 Opportunities and Options for Support</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6.0 Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>22</b>

---

---

### Appendices

---

**Appendix 1** Observations on the Proposed EIF - Tim Resch

**Appendix 2** National Programme for CBNRM, 1994:2

---

## List of Acronyms

CARMS	Communal Area Resource Management Support
CBNFM	Community-Based Natural Forest Management
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resources Management
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CBRM	Community-Based Range Management
CBTE	Community-Based Tourism Enterprises
CBWM	Community-Based Wildlife Management
DCWM	Division of Community Wildlife Management
DEA	Directorate of Environmental Affairs
DIFID	Division for International Development (ODA)
DOF	Directorate of Forestry
DPW	Directorate of Parks and Wildlife
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
DRM	Directorate of Resource Management
DSS	Division: Scientific Services
EIF	Einvironmental Investment Fund
EU	European Union
FENATA	Federation of Namibian Tourism Association
GRN	Government of Namibia
HRDU	Human Resource Development Unit
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation
LAC	Legal Assistance Centre
LEAD	Land, Environment and Development Unit (LAC)
LIFE	Living in a Finite Environment
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MSI	Management Systems International
NACOBTA	Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association
NANGOF	Namibia Non-Governmental Forum
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
NNFC	Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PAC	Problem Animal Control
PSF	Private Sector Foundation
PTO	Permission To Occupy
RCSA	Regional Centre for Southern Africa
RF	Rossing Foundation
RISE	Rural Institute for Social Empowerment in Namibia
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
UNAM	University of Namibia
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WL	World Learning
WWF	World Wildlife Fund US

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For the past five years, USAID has been supporting the GRN National Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Programme through the Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme. LIFE is currently planned to end in August 1999. GRN, USAID and the recently completed evaluation of LIFE all consider the LIFE Programme to be an exceptionally successful project. All parties see a clear need for continued assistance to the National CBNRM Programme from USAID.

This concept paper lays out design options for follow-on assistance to the GRN beyond the current LIFE Programme. The concept paper has been prepared as the third step in a four-step design process. The process began with a "big-picture" evaluation of the LIFE programme with emphasis on identifying what worked well and why, what were the constraints and why, and what were the key lessons-learned that would be valuable for designing a follow-on.

The second step was an assessment of the CBNRM sector in Namibia looking at 1) the present status and plans of the National CBNRM Programme; 2) the status of sectoral and cross-sectoral policies affecting CBNRM); 3) the importance of CBNRM for the economy and for local governance; 4) the potential for expansion of the current programme into new natural resources technical areas and new geographic areas; 5) the core components of community-level CBNRM development; 6) the community-assistance needs and institutional support mechanisms for servicing such needs; and 7) suggested priority actions for the development of the National CBNRM Programme over the next 5-10 years.

The evaluation, sector assessment and concept paper have all been done by teams with the same core members. The concept paper will be shared widely for comment in preparation for the final design phase in June for which the core members will be brought back together.

Chapter 2 presents a summary of the Sector Assessment. The current CBNRM programme is a coalition of governmental and non-governmental partner organizations implementing CBNRM at community and national levels. These partner organizations have formed a National CBNRM Collaborative group that provides philosophical direction and coordination to the whole programme. The general policy environment for CBNRM is supportive but incomplete in its present form. Much more needs to be done to strengthen sectoral policies.

CBNRM is considered vital to the democratic and economic processes underway in Namibia. It is a critical strategy for the economic development and the empowerment of peoples in communal areas. The Assessment team proposed the following 10-year vision for the National CBNRM Programme:

*"By the year 2008, all communities in all communal lands of Namibia should have the legal right to organize themselves, should they choose,*

*into legally constituted bodies recognized by the GRN, and thus obtain the right to control and manage all of the renewable natural resources on the lands within clearly defined boundaries over which they have been granted resource tenure. Furthermore, there will be a range of governmental and non-governmental support services available to the communities as needed to help them develop into independently sustainable management bodies."*

The Assessment identified priorities areas over the next 5-10 years that include the following:

- Most importantly, further strengthening of the policy framework for CBNRM and of interministerial coordination;
- New pilot activities at community sites that develop new systems for integrating natural forest management and range management into CBNRM.
- Strengthening and broadening the governmental and NGO institutional base for providing support services to communities;
- Expanding the membership in the National CBNRM Collaborative Group and the development of a secretariat with grants-making capabilities to be housed in a new or existing NGO.

Chapter three presents a summary of the LIFE evaluation including the following points:

- A key strength of LIFE has been its flexible, process oriented approach to the support of a well-conceived nationally driven programme for CBNRM;
- LIFE has been very successful in increasing the capacity of Namibian NGOs to provide services to communities, but the number of NGOs that LIFE has been able to actively involve is small. The DRM had not yet become actively involved in CBNRM as of the time of the evaluation (but this will change drastically under the recently announced restructuring of MET).
- The very first conservancies supported by LIFE are just now being registered. Some of them show very promising signs of empowerment, enterprise development, anti-poaching and problem animal control activities and general development of their community-based organizational capacity. However, they are just beginning to develop capacity to manage their natural resources and to operate the conservancies as businesses. It is critical that support to these emerging conservancies be continued well beyond the current project.

The overall strategy proposed for the USAID SO#3 Results Package could, depending on funding and priorities established by the SO Team and partners have five components as follows:

- Support for continued policy reform and inter-ministerial coordination for integrated CBNRM, including policy analysis, support to fora for information dissemination and

consultation, and networking among ministries, regional councils and the relevant standing committees of the National Assembly;

- Technical assistance and training for MET/DPW, including full-time advisors in the DCWM and DSS for CBNRM and "people-centred biology", respectively;
- Institutional strengthening of Namibian CBNRM organizations to work in communal areas, including facilitating NGOs, training institutions and partnerships with groups that are sector specific. Priority would be on conservancy "core skills";
- Support to a national-level NGO to act as secretariat to the National Collaborative Group and as a grants-making facility for CBNRM, including, as possible, a fund for small grants and technical assistance for NGOs/CBOs. May be through an endowment.
- Expansion into community-based natural forest management and additional technical areas.

The Team found that the present wording of SO#3 accurately reflects the objective of the proposed follow-on activities. Intermediate results and their indicators are also still appropriate, overall, but will have to be reviewed more closely during the design based on the actual choice/mix of options selected for the follow-on.

The ultimate clients of the present LIFE Programme and of the follow-on will be historically disadvantaged Namibians living in rural communal areas who organize themselves through conservancies to improve their livelihoods through sustainable management of natural resources. The intermediate clients are the governmental and non-governmental organizations and personnel which provide support and services to the communities forming conservancies. In the follow-on, the client base will be broadened into new geographic areas beyond the present target areas and to new governmental and non-governmental organizations not presently receiving any significant assistance from the current project.

The options of support to a new or existing NGO to develop capacity to serve as a secretariat to the Collaborative Group and to manage grants for CBOs and NGOs presents one of the greater risks on the sustainability of the different options proposed. The Team believes that the risks of such sustainability should be moderated by a long term perspective. If CBNRM is going to succeed, it will have to grow into a self-sustaining socio-economic and political force in Namibia. If this does not occur within the next 15 years, then CBNRM may very well fail. If CBNRM succeeds, it will both generate its own resources and will be able to use its political influence to direct government resources to its support, as do economic interest groups in developed countries.

## 1.0 Introduction

In most of Africa, non-agricultural communal lands and resources outside of protected areas, belong to the State. The State almost invariably lacks the means and the motivation to manage them properly. The communities that depend on these resources have no legal control over them. The resources are exploited by all but are effectively managed and cared for by no one. As demographic pressures increase, these common resources can very quickly be transformed into an alarming state of degradation or destruction.

Namibia probably has the strongest programme in southern Africa, if not all of Africa, of devolving rights over state-owned lands and resources to local communities. All of these communities benefitting from the programme are historically disadvantaged Namibians that were discriminated against under apartheid.

USAID has been the principal donor supporting the Namibian National Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Programme over the past five years through the LIFE Programme. Great progress has been made during these five years. Key enabling legislation was passed in 1996 giving communities the right to organize themselves into legal bodies called conservancies recognized by the GRN to have management and use rights over wildlife resources. Similar pending legislation would allow communities to obtain similar rights over forests and water points.

At least 18 conservancies are in various stages of development, mostly in the wildlife-rich communal areas. One has just been registered in January and three more have submitted their applications. There are clear signs that these emerging conservancies are feeling a growing sense of empowerment and are using this new status to make demands on government. They are also clearly pressing for broader rights over resources other than just wildlife.

LIFE has been very successful in the development of natural resource-based enterprises, in anti-poaching and problem animal control through community game guards and, critically, in facilitating the institutional development of the community-based organizations in the emerging conservancies they are supporting. However, the most advanced conservancies are only now gaining the legal status that puts them in the position to seriously develop their capacity to manage their wildlife and other natural resources and to develop their capacity to manage their conservancies as businesses.

Conservancy development and the National CBNRM Programme are at critical stages of development. The LIFE Evaluation that was just completed strongly recommended that USAID fund a follow-on to the present LIFE programme. The GRN has requested that USAID continue to support the National Programme beyond LIFE. USAID has indicated that they wish to do this and has put together a team to prepare a concept paper to lay out strategic options for follow-on USAID support to the National Programme for another five years beyond the current project.

The core team for the development of the concept paper were also core members of the LIFE Evaluation and of the CBNRM Sector Assessment. It is planned that they will also participate in the actual design of the follow-on in June. This rather unique approach to project design was expressly planned to best benefit from the lessons learned from the LIFE Evaluation and from the results of the sector assessment in the identification of options for the follow-on. The Concept Paper Team believes that this is a very sound approach because it allows the Concept Team to make recommendations based on the conviction of their own analysis of the current project and of the sector.

Although summaries of the Sector Assessment and of the LIFE Evaluation are presented in Chapters 2 and 3, respectively, the readers of this concept paper are strongly encouraged to read the complete versions of these two papers. The options identified in this concept paper are presented in a fairly succinct format. One can only fully appreciate the context and justification of the options in relation to the other two documents.

MET and USAID plan to share this concept paper widely amongst the different partners in the National CBNRM programme. Their comments and criticisms on the strengths and weaknesses of the different options will be invaluable in designing the follow-on.

## **2.0 Results of the CBNRM Sector Assessment**

An assessment of the CBNRM sector in Namibia was conducted immediately prior to the preparation of this concept paper. The reader is encouraged to read the full document. A summary of the results, however, is presented here.

The Namibian National CBNRM Programme is both a coalition of partner organisations implementing CBNRM and a set of CBNRM activities at national and local levels. The partner organisations form a Collaborative Group which gives philosophical direction to the programme and which was intended to provide coordination of the programme. The Collaborative Group includes members of government departments as well as members of NGOs and CBOs. The group has developed a 'manifesto' which sets out the goal of the national programme, its aims and objectives and membership.

The CBNRM Sector Assessment Team concludes that CBNRM is vital to the democratic and economic processes underway in Namibia. CBNRM offers a viable alternative in communal areas to the prevailing situation under which there is no empowered management body responsible for and capable of planning and controlling the use of common resources. CBNRM promotes economic growth in the present, without compromising the natural resource capital for future generations.

The evolving policy environment is supportive of CBNRM but incomplete in its present form. The 1996 amendment to the Nature Conservation Act allows for communities to gain the rights and responsibilities for the management and benefit from wildlife by establishing conservancies. However, many of the sectoral policies must now be

amended to allow for the management of other resources within the conservancy or other similar structure.

The CBNRM sector in Namibia is at a critical stage in its development. It needs to receive significant levels of support by the Government of Namibia (GRN), donors, and local communities. This support will enable the current pilot activities to evolve into a sustainable national programme.

The Assessment Team went on to explore the potential expansion of the National CBNRM Programme over the next decade. A 10-year vision statement proposed by the team states:

*"By the year 2008, all communities in all communal lands of Namibia should have the legal right to organize themselves, should they so choose, into legally constituted bodies recognized by the GRN, and thus obtain the right to control and manage all of the renewable natural resources on the lands within clearly defined boundaries over which they have been granted resource tenure. Furthermore, there will be a range of governmental and non-governmental CBNRM support services available to these communities as needed to help them develop into independently sustainable management bodies."*

This "vision" presents the big picture, within which individual stakeholders can identify the components in which they are involved and wish to support. The vision sets the framework within which future activities can be designed. It provides an opportunity to ensure that they are consistent and strategic.

Given the integrated nature of resource use and management, the assessment team envisions that the National CBNRM Programme must expand from wildlife management and tourism to all renewable natural resources, including grazing resources, forests, water, and fresh water fisheries, if it is going to reach its goal of "sustainably managed resources". The Assessment examines the potential for expansion into these additional resource sectors and implications for the geographical distribution of activities in communal areas.

The Assessment Team concludes that the National CBNRM Programme must expand not only in terms of the natural resource sectors it engages (e.g.: the scope), but also the geographic area where activities are viable (e.g.: the scale). The scope of the CBNRM programme over the next 10 years should encompass the integration of all resource management issues in a given area, including wildlife management, tourism, forest management and range management. Freshwater fisheries, while presenting selected opportunities for investment, is primarily a cross-boarder management issue and requires further development in international, joint-management regimes before it is really feasible. Although it is difficult to predict the future demand for CBNRM, the Assessment Team believes it will increase incrementally as communities are informed and policies change and promote the development of common property regimes in areas where game is not a significant land use option.

The Assessment outlines some of the specific components, and thus support needs, for CBNRM and conservancy development. It examines institutional mechanisms for servicing these support needs, including both: 1) a review of key institutions involved in the CBNRM sector; and 2) the potential for expanding the institutional base and service delivery mechanisms. By building support institutions, sustainability of the CBNRM effort will be increased.

The expansion of the national CBNRM programme at two levels - both scope and scale - raises two "red flags". First, there is concern that the national programme is trying to do too much, and that the organizations supporting CBNRM are too few. The assessment team believes this might be true, but argues that it is more likely that demand and supply of services to community institutions will grow in concert. As communities place demands on the organizations working with them, they will respond and new ones will be developed. What is important is to allow for an evolutionary process leading to a comprehensive national programme.

Second, there is recognition that inter-ministerial support is necessary for integrated resource management, however, it is notoriously difficult. Why and how will other ministries engage in the national CBNRM programme? The Assessment Team believes that, at the field level, communities themselves can provide the framework for coordination. Experience has demonstrated that, as communities establish conservancies and gain rights over their resources, they may plan for the use and management of these resources in an integrated way. This framework can then guide government inputs into an area. Ministries can continue to respond to their primary client - communities - without losing their sectoral focus.

Inter-ministerial coordination at the national level is more problematic. Strategies to address this challenge include the development of inter-ministerial Memoranda (similar to the one drafted for support of the Grootberg Conservancy), expansion of the National CBNRM Collaborative Group, and increased efforts to build a supportive network throughout the concerned ministries.

The LIFE Programme activities make up a large proportion of the National Programme and to some extent have come to dominate it, with the LIFE Steering Committee taking on most of the functions of the Collaborative Group. Mindful of this and the need to 'Namibianise' most of the LIFE activities, the Collaborative Group has been developing ideas for the establishment of a national level organisation to support it and promote the concept of CBNRM. The ideas centre around the creation of a new NGO, to be known as the Communal Areas Resource Management Support organisation (CARMS). These proposals are under review by the Collaborative Group.

The Assessment goes on to propose development priorities necessary for the sustainability of the national programme over the next 5- 10 years. At its heart is further strengthening of the policy framework within which CBNRM operates. The focus is on ensuring that the Communal Lands Bill recognizes and accepts conservancies as a viable unit for holding rights over land and other resources. Equally important is the focus on sector-specific policies, including tourism, forestry, range management, and

other resources (e.g.: the Parks and Wildlife Management Bill). Activities could include policy analysis and networking with other ministries, regional councils, and appropriate National Assembly committees. In addition, inter-ministerial coordination will be an important aspect of the enabling environment.

Strengthening the organizational base to respond to increasing community support needs is essential to ensure sustainability of CBNRM in Namibia. This can be done by working with existing organizations, by expanding the involvement of new organizations, and by using community-level facilitators and interns. As part of this process, the MET should receive support to: 1) promote policy reform; 2) better disseminate information regarding CBNRM; and 3) respond to technical assistance requests in natural resource management. National level institutions should also be strengthened to ensure development and continuity of the CBNRM programme. As policy evolves and other ministries engage, there will be even more resources available to the communities.

Additional priorities include 4-5 new pilot CBNRM activities promoting integrated resource management at sites in communal areas that are especially suited for: 1) community-based natural forest management, focusing on fuelwood; and 2) community-based range management components. Where possible, the use of all natural resources should be addressed through an integrated natural resource management plan stemming from the community itself. Implementation grants to support community initiatives are also needed.

The Assessment Team concluded that the national CBNRM programme will evolve over time, responding to challenges, opportunities and lessons learned. While there must be a vision for the future, the programme must remain flexible and adaptive. The authors hope that this sector assessment successfully lays out the quilt of CBNRM vision in such a way that individual stakeholders can sew their own squares.

### **3.0 Summary of LIFE Programme Evaluation**

The LIFE Programme, a joint programme between the governments of the United States and Namibia, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and its management partners, and Namibian NGOs, was initiated in 1993 and has since been extended to August 1999. The level of USAID funding is \$15 million, with in-kind contributions from MET valued at \$3,910,000 and a match contribution from WWF valued at \$3 million.

LIFE provides support to a Namibian initiative to develop a national programme for Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM). The purpose of the LIFE programme is:

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

---

\* All figures in US\$

The LIFE Programme has several objectives, including: support to the CBNRM policy framework; institution strengthening; increased ecological, social, and economic knowledge for management of communal resources; increased community awareness; development of community institutions for NRM; improved community skills in enterprise management linked to natural resources; developing and maintaining the resource base; and analysis and dissemination of experiences and lessons learned.

The Team has used an analogy that compares CBNRM to a three-legged stool standing on a legal and policy floor. The CBNRM approach can be considered to be the seat of the stool, providing the framework and structure for the integration of the three legs. CBNRM depends on a legal and policy base that insures that communities have tenure or clear, long-term control and access rights over their resources. The three legs of the stool are (1) a representative, capable, community-based organization and, (2) a sustainable natural resources management system for the community's resources that (3) generates revenues and other benefits from natural resources in a fashion that provides incentives for sustainable management and that covers management costs and provides benefits for the community as a whole.

Design strengths included the fact that the programme was designed to support a well-conceived Namibian initiative in a flexible, process-oriented approach supported by an in-house grants making capability. Design weaknesses included the assumptions that the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM) in the MET would become actively involved in supporting CBNRM and, secondly, that there were a number of qualified and/or motivated NGOs that could be supported to work in developing CBNRM in the target areas. At the time of the evaluation, the DRM had not yet become actively engaged in the National CBNRM Programme and the number of Namibian NGOs involved was still low.

Programme implementation has been strongly conditioned by passage of the enabling legislation that created the policy floor for the CBNRM stool. This legislation was not passed until 1996. It allows communities to organize themselves into legal bodies called conservancies. It is probably the most progressive legislation of its type in southern Africa. Even so, it does not grant rights to natural resources in general, but rather rights over wildlife resources. Prior to 1996, Programme support of CBOs development was limited. Natural resources management activities consisted mostly of the establishment of community game guard-programmes, anti-poaching, problem animal control and data gathering. Revenue generation focused on the development of natural resources-based crafts and other enterprises that did not require collective management of natural resources.

After passage of the enabling legislation in 1996, LIFE has added a major focus on the support for conservancy management committee institutional development and for assistance in the process of becoming registered as conservancies. This is a

critical institutional building process that cannot be rushed too quickly. The first conservancy was registered in January 1998, three others should be registered in the near future and 14 more are in various stages of development. It is only now that CBNRM development is reaching its most interesting and challenging stage of development with legally-empowered CBOs in a position to really begin developing and exercising their natural resources management and business management skills. LIFE is actively working with the more advanced conservancies to develop these capacities. Recent developments provide strong indications of a significant sense of empowerment on the part of emerging conservancies.

Achievements and constraints by programme objective are summarized as follows:

- LIFE support for policy and legislative reforms have been highly successful. Staff limitations in MET/DEA have been a constraint to even greater achievements in the policy arena.
- LIFE has resulted in very significant increases in Namibian NGO capacity to support CBNRM development, but capacity has been built over a rather narrow range of NGOs. Institutional capacity building in MET has been much more limited.
- The knowledge base for management of natural resources in target areas has improved, particularly regarding economic and social data, and less so for ecological and marketing information. As conservancies now begin to develop management plans, the linkage between information gathered and information needed for management will need to be made more explicit.
- LIFE partners are effectively disseminating information regarding the conservancy concept and its legal framework. They have been less effective in disseminating information from surveys, trends, inventories and applied research.
- LIFE has been successful in facilitating the mobilization of communities through the process of qualifying for registration as legally recognized bodies. The development of the capacity of these bodies to manage communal resources is still in its early stages of development.
- LIFE has been quite successful in promoting natural resource-based enterprise development by local craftsmen and user groups. Anti-poaching and problem animal control through community game guards has been very successful in some areas. Community/conservancy level NRM and enterprise/business management are in their very early stages because the first conservancies are only now being registered.
- Successful anti-poaching has led to significant recovery of game populations in some areas, although systems to quantify the recovery are not in place. Infrastructure development to improve the resource base is just beginning. Habitat management should begin.
- With the exception of progress in natural resources economics, written analysis and documentation of the dynamics and of lessons learned from the Namibian experience in CBNRM development has been somewhat limited.

Overall progress towards the USAID Strategic Objective, towards the LIFE programme purpose and towards the National CBNRM programme objectives has been very good.

LIFE Programme management has diplomatically and effectively coordinated, and balanced, the diverse interests of the Steering Committee, USAID, and MET. Implementation has been flexible, while not losing sight of the ultimate purpose of the programme. Workplans, budgets, and reports are comprehensive and delivered on time. At times, however, the programme could be more strategic in its planning and better managed for results.

The principal successes/impacts of the LIFE Programme have been:

- Establishment of a sound policy/legal base for community control and management of game resources;
- Very promising institutional development of community-based organizations/conservancy management committees;
- Clear indicators of a growing sense of empowerment of local communities over their resources and over their ability to influence government decision-making;
- Significant growth in natural resource based enterprises, employment and revenue generation, especially in community-based tourism.

Numerous recommendations were made for the remaining 16 month of the LIFE Programme. They focus on the following areas:

- Immediate and close attention to the wording/content of the Communal Lands Bill to assure that it allows for legal means for Conservancies and communities to gain increased control over natural resources;
- Preparation of a series of end-of-project analytical papers on the principal areas of LIFE investment with the objective of capturing lessons learned;
- Increased attention to the transfer of LIFE Programme functions to Namibian institutions as deemed possible and appropriate;
- Support, as requested, to restructuring of MET functions for CBNRM service delivery and for development of a Human Resources Development Unit;
- Increased focus on development of capacity for NRM and business management skills for those conservancies who have completed registration;
- Increased use of facilitators from established conservancies to assist other communities develop CBNRM capacity;
- Expand the membership of the National CBNRM Collaborative Group to facilitate technical and geographic expansion of the National Program; and
- Closely monitor the decentralization process and seek to influence it in favor of CBNRM development.

## 4.0 Proposed Goal Statement and Results Indicators

### 4.1. Objectives

The Team was asked to look at the Mission's existing goal, strategic objectives, intermediate results and intermediate results indicators in relation to the activities and options that are being proposed. The details of the follow-on options are given in the next chapter, but the five categories of potential activities are the following:

- Support for continued policy reform and inter-ministerial coordination for integrated resource management;
- Technical assistance and training for MET/DPW;
- Institutional strengthening of Namibian CBNRM organizations to work in communal areas;
- Sustainable support to communal areas conservancies including support to a national-level NGO acting as a secretariat and grant-making facility for CBNRM;
- expansion into community-based natural forest management.

**Goal** The Team believes that all of the proposed follow-on activities are fully consistent with the current goal of the Mission's programme:

*"The strengthening of Namibia's new democracy through the social, economic and political empowerment of Namibians historically disadvantaged by apartheid."*

Furthermore, the Team feels that the current wording of Strategic Objective #3 accurately reflects the collective objective of the range of proposed follow-on activities:

*"Increased benefits to historically disadvantaged Namibians (HDNS) from sustainable local management of natural resources"*

In at least two cases (EIF, support to HRD Unit in MET), pre-identified options that the Team considers to be non-strategic to SO #3, have been included for consideration simply because they are long-standing proposed activities. The Team's reasoning for not supporting them is presented in the "con" paragraph under each option.

The SO Indicators are the following:

- 3.1 Community income (gross) from program-supported natural resource management activities;
- 3.2 Number of individuals in target communities that benefit from program supported NRM activities;
- 3.3. Hectares of communal land under local management;
- 3.4. Number of conservancies created.

These indicators are all valid indicators of progress toward the strategic objective, although they stress the quantitative rather than the qualitative aspects of progress. They will become more difficult to monitor under the follow-on, because the proposed

follow-on activities would include support to a broader range of service providers (DPW/DCWM & DSS, RISE) to communities working in a broader geographic area while each would only provide partial services (awareness, information, core facilitation to CBO development) to emerging conservancies. Quantifying the impact due to USAID-funded assistance will be more difficult when compared to the LIFE I support of the full range of services in specific target areas.

For Indicator 3.4., support for sectoral policy reform may lead to the creation of community-level legal bodies for CBNRM that are called something other than conservancies. The wording might have to be changed accordingly.

Concerning the current intermediate results, IR 3.1 should remain a critical result in the follow-on. IR Indicators 3.1.1. and 3.1.2. remain appropriate for the follow-on.

IR 3.2. is "*Strengthening community-based natural resource management activities in target communities.*" Continued support to conservancies in the current target areas is included in the follow-on activities, and this will be relatively easy to monitor. As stated above, other support supplied through DPW, RISE or a central grants-making body may be more difficult to quantify – but no less important.

Indicator IR 3.2.1. is fully appropriate and will remain quite easy to measure. 3.2.2. and 3.2.3. will be more difficult to quantify because of the same reason given above – support to institutions that provide only part of the support services to communities.

On the GRN side, the proposed follow-on activities are also fully consistent with the goal of the National CBNRM Program:

"Communities take greater responsibility for managing and benefiting in an equitable manner from sustainably managed natural resources" **Appendix 2**

## **4.2. Clients**

### **Intermediate and Ultimate Clients**

The ultimate clients of the current LIFE Programme are historically disadvantaged Namibians living in rural areas who wish to organise themselves through conservancies to improve their livelihoods through the sustainable management of wildlife, wildlife-based tourism and other natural resources. The intermediate clients are the government and non government organisations and personnel which provide support and services to the communities forming conservancies. The ultimate clients in the current phase of the LIFE Programme are restricted to the LIFE Target areas of Otjozondjupa and Caprivi Regions and the Uukwaluudhi area, with some small-scale support going to the Grootberg community in the Kunene Region.

The second phase of LIFE will focus essentially on the same ultimate and intermediate client base, but will broaden out to include historically disadvantaged Namibians in areas other than the current target areas. Communities in southern Namibia, for example, are expressing interest in forming conservancies and an NGO, the Rural Institute for Social Empowerment (RISE), has expressed interest in supporting them. Support to an organisation such as RISE would broaden the base of the intermediate

clients of LIFE as well as the base of the ultimate clients. Collaboration with other programmes and projects with CBNRM goals and objectives would also enable LIFE to broaden its client base outside of current target areas.

### **4.3. Risks/Sustainability**

One of the greater risks in the proposed activities is the support for the development of NGO capacity to serve as a secretariat to the Collaborative Group and to manage grants to NGOs and CBOs in support of CBNRM. This would be done through either the creation of a new NGO or through added capacity to an existing NGO. In either case, there is the risk that these two capacities will not be sustained beyond the end of USAID funding. One solution to this would be to create an endowment for these two functions.

Creating a new NGO is always a relatively high risk undertaking. The Team has also identified an alternative that would build this capacity within an existing NGO – this presents a lower risk, but has other risks presented in the "con" paragraph for that option.

From a broader perspective, the Team feels one should not be overly concerned with long term funding support for these two functions or for CBNRM in general. If CBNRM is to ultimately succeed, it will have to grow into a self-sustaining socio-economic and political force within Namibia. If this doesn't occur within the next 15 years, then CBNRM may very well fail. For this reason, when considering endowments for CBNRM, one should give serious consideration to funds that decline to zero over a timeframe of about 15 years. This approach can provide significantly higher amounts available each year over this critical period during which CBNRM must prove itself.

Another particular risk is for the option in support of community-based natural forest management. Five years is a relatively short period of time to develop such a new natural resources management system into a self-sustaining endeavor. With USAID "graduating" from Namibia in 2005, one would have to run the risk of counting on other donors to continue support beyond USAID support.

## **5.0 Opportunities and Options for Support of a Focussed Approach to a Sustainable National CBNRM Programme in Namibia**

Two principles underlay the proposed support to the national CBNRM programme. First, the primary purpose of the programme is to benefit, financially and socially, the residents of communal areas. Second, the strategy must lay a sustainable foundation, politically, institutionally and financially, for CBNRM in Namibia. Thus, the approach emphasizes policy reform as it entrenches in the long-term the rights and responsibilities of communal area residents to their resources. A central component is institutional and human resource capacity building, both of the GRN (e.g.: the MET) and NGOs. NGOs will be provided technical assistance in raising funds, and will increasingly reduce their dependence on USAID over the life of the project.

The overall strategy proposed for the USAID SO#3 Results Package could, depending on funding and priorities established by the SO Team and partners, have five components, as follows:

- 1) **support for continued policy reform and inter-ministerial coordination for integrated CBNRM**, including policy analysis, support to fora for information dissemination and consultation, and networking among ministries, regional councils and the relevant standing committees of the National Assembly.
- 2) **technical assistance and training for MET/DPW**, including full-time advisors in the DCWM and DSS for CBNRM and "people-centred biology", respectively. The strategy is to increase the skills of the people already employed by the MET. Training would be on an "as needed" basis and would be accessed from Rossing Foundation, and other institutions in Namibia and the region.
- 3) **institutional strengthening of Namibian CBNRM organizations to work in communal areas**, including facilitating NGOs (IRDNC, RISE, Rossing), training institutions (Rossing Foundation, NIara), and partnerships with groups that are sector specific (NACOBTA, enterprise NGOs). Priority would be on conservancy "core skills", described below.
- 4) **support to a national-level NGO acting as a secretariat to the National Collaborative Group and grant-making facility for CBNRM**, including, as possible, a fund for small grants and technical assistance (up to US\$10,000) for NGOs/CBOs. May be through an endowment.
- 5) **expansion into community-based natural forest management** and additional technical areas as components of larger, integrated resource management projects funded by other donors.

This section examines the opportunities and options within these five core components. Given investment constraints, it is unlikely that USAID will be able to support all of these components. Therefore, a short discussion on the "pros" and "cons" of each option is included, as is an indicative level of anticipated costs (in US dollars on an annual basis). These options are discussed in more detail in the sector assessment paper and the reader is referred to that document for further information.

#### **Component #1: Support for continued policy reform and inter-ministerial coordination for integrated resource management.**

**Activity:** Support to: 1) policy analysis and studies, 2) fora for information dissemination and consultation among decision-makers, and 3) networking among ministries, including regional councils and relevant standing committees of the National Assembly. Special attention to be paid to decentralization. This function should be tied to the DEA/National CBNRM Collaborative Group nexus.

Pro:

- The evolving policy environment is supportive of CBNRM but incomplete in its present form. Policies, which potentially could either reinforce or undermine CBNRM, are still being developed and debated. There is an opportunity to influence their development in support of CBNRM efforts. Without a positive policy environment, the long-term potential and sustainability of CBNRM will be limited.

Indicative cost:        \$90,000

Activity: Support for: 1) increase of efforts to build a supportive network throughout the concerned ministries; 2) development of inter-ministerial Memoranda (similar to the one drafted for support of the Grootberg Conservancy); 3) development and dissemination of information materials to decision-makers; and 4) expansion of the National CBNRM Collaborative Group. This function should be tied to the DEA/National CBNRM Collaborative Group nexus and is linked to the previous activity.

Pro:

- There is recognition that inter-ministerial support is necessary for integrated resource management and a sustainable CBNRM programme. The Assessment Team believes that, at the field level, communities themselves can provide the framework for coordination. Experience has demonstrated that, as communities establish conservancies and gain rights over their resources, they may plan for the use and management of these resources in an integrated way. This framework can then guide government inputs into an area. Ministries can continue to respond to their primary client - communities - without losing their sectoral focus. Support is needed for inter-ministerial coordination at the national level.

Indicative cost:        \$20,000

Activity: Support to the Natural Resource Economics Programme in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA).

Pro:

- The impact of the resource economics programme on policy development has been significant. Results of the programme have been used to justify higher park entry fees, increased operational budgets for the MET, and support for CBNRM as it contributes to the national economy. The economics programme should provide support and training to NACOBTA for assessing the financial viability of tourism options and analyzing/ negotiating joint-venture agreements.

Con:

- USAID has supported the resource economics programme since 1994 as part of its support to policy reform. In support of this initiative, it was anticipated that the MET would dedicate a post to this programme. This has not occurred. Furthermore, the economics programme has diversified its activities and, while

it has positive impacts on natural resource management in general, its application to conservancies in communal areas is more limited.

Indicative cost: \$125,000

### **Component #2: Technical assistance and training for MET/DPW.**

Activity: A full time advisor to the DCWM, combined with training on an "as needed" basis. Training would be accessed from Rossing Foundation, and other institutions in Namibia and the region.

Pro:

- The proposed restructuring of the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM), including the cross-cutting DCWM, will provide a focus and structure for support to CBNRM in communal areas. An advisor to this division will be provided in 1998-1999 with funding from USAID/Namibia. Training and equipment will also be provided. The Advisor will contribute to:

- 1) revising duty statements;
- 2) identifying training needs and developing plans;
- 3) ensuring that appropriate skills are developed;
- 4) assisting in the integration of new knowledge and skills into on-going responsibilities; and
- 5) coordinating with other divisions in the DPW, among other tasks.

The Advisor will work closely with the HRD Unit to ensure all developments in the Directorate: Parks and Wildlife and DCWM are consistent with, and supported by, Ministry policy and the HRD Unit. The team believes the Advisor should be extended for two additional years beyond the current project. This on-going support will build lasting change in this division and further the sustainability of the MET's support to CBNRM in communal areas. As attitudes change and knowledge increases, there will be need for specific skills-building training, accessible through Rossing Foundation and other training institutions. Development of extension materials will also need support.

Indicative costs: \$100,000 (Advisor)  
\$ 40,000 (Training/materials development - additional support available from Rossing)

Activity: Support to the Human Resources Development (HRD) Unit within the Directorate of General Service in MET.

Con:

- Evolving from the Training Needs Analysis for the DRM completed in 1994, the USAID/LIFE Programme will support the planning and establishment of a Human Resources Development (HRD) Unit in the MET. The HRD Unit will be located in the Directorate: General Services and will service the Ministry as a whole. Given the proposed restructuring, the Team believes limited USAID funds will have more impact on CBNRM in communal areas if they are spent in direct support of the Directorate: Parks and Wildlife and the DCWM, than if they are used to support the HRD Unit generally.

Activity: Support to an Environmental Education Programme.

Con:

- Information and awareness of conservancy development in communal areas is critical to the development of a national CBNRM programme. However, this need is addressed above by the proposed support to the DCWM, whose functions include information dissemination, extension and environmental education. In addition, facilitating NGOs, described below, will also undertake these activities. It is anticipated that both the MET and other NGOs will avail themselves of the expertise and infrastructure for environmental education which has been developed in Rosing Foundation.

Activity: A full-time advisor to the DSS for "people-centred biology". An advisor specifically for developing resource management plans, including maps, and appropriate monitoring systems for conservancies in communal areas is also necessary.

Pro:

- The capacity for developing resource plans and conducting wildlife surveys, censuses, and ecological monitoring in the context of communal area conservancies is limited in Namibia. Within the DPW, the DSS is responsible for these tasks, in collaboration with the Divisions of Parks and Wildlife. The DSS is a cross-cutting programme and will work throughout Namibia. The DSS has expressed to the Assessment Team the need for developing experience and skills in working in the context of communal area conservancies. The Advisor/People-Centred Biology would work along side the existing staff of the DSS, building capacity through providing on-going training and support to staff. The Advisor, would respond to requests from conservancies for support in monitoring, resource planning and research.

Indicative costs:     \$100,000 (Advisor/biology)  
                                   \$ 25,000 (Advisor/planning & monitoring)

### **Component #3: Institutional strengthening of Namibian CBNRM organizations to work in communal areas**

**Activity:** Support to facilitating NGOs (including IRDNC, RISE, Rossing Foundation) with priority on conservancy "core skills", including:

- Development of Conservancy Committee (internal governance/representation, accountability, transparency, equitable benefit distribution, strategic planning, monitoring, advocacy, etc.)
- Financial/business management skills (budgeting, balancing income/expenses, cash flow projections, sustainability, investments, etc.)
- Natural resource management/basic resource planning skills (establishing management rules, land use/resource use plans, monitoring, etc.)
- Management of external relations (establishing boundaries and building neighbor relations, negotiating contracts with the private sector, collaboration with MET and other ministries, public relations, conflict management, etc.)

**Pro:**

- CBNRM has both economic and social benefits for Namibians historically disadvantaged by apartheid, including financial returns, rights and responsibilities over resources, empowerment, and diversification of livelihood strategies, among others. As communities learn about conservancies, the demand for technical assistance and support will increase. Two years after Parliament amended the legislation, development of 18 conservancies in communal areas is underway. The first conservancy was approved by the Minister in February, 1998. Demand for assistance for conservancy development is going to increase incrementally over the coming years. To ensure that NGOs are able to respond to these requests and that this capacity is sustainable, the Team believes USAID should provide support to existing NGOs to enable them to incorporate new knowledge and skills into their organizations and to provide much needed services to emerging conservancies. Furthermore, a particular emphasis should be made to increase the involvement of NGOs headed by historically disadvantaged Namibians.
- Facilitation of conservancy development and implementation will be provided by Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC) and Rossing Foundation (with funding from DIFID). The Team also believes that IRDNC requires support for the articulation and implementation of a vision promoting staff diversity at the management level. This could include, among other activities, a visit to some of the National Land Committee affiliates in South Africa which have undergone a similar process with funding from the Ford Foundation.

The Team also held discussions with the Rural Institute for Social Empowerment (RISE) who expressed interest in working with CBOs to establish conservancies. RISE must now hold internal discussions and debate to determine whether they are interested in pursuing conservancy development. If RISE decides to enter into conservancy formation and support, it is clear that technical assistance and training in the content area of CBNRM and general natural resource management planning would be necessary.

- The Nyae Nyae Conservancy, the first conservancy in a communal area to be gazetted, has received significant support from the USAID/LIFE Programme. While financial support to Nyae Nyae can be reduced, continued facilitation and technical assistance will be required. While this topic requires much more debate, especially with the Nyae Nyae Conservancy Committee, the Team believes either RISE or Rossing Foundation might be able to provide this support. Both organizations have an existing institutional relationship with the Nyae Nyae community.
- In addition, community-level conservancy facilitators are emerging from the more developed conservancies and these individuals are being used effectively by facilitating NGOs to assist in the conservancy development process. Interns, both from the Polytech and the University of Namibia (UNAM), could also be used to support specific aspects of conservancy development. Given that they would not be available for extended periods of time and would be quite junior, they would need extensive support and guidance from NGOs working in the field. The Team believes this is a very positive development and recommends that these facilitators be fully supported with training, networking, and consistent follow-up.
- Lastly, technical support and training for the facilitation and NGO-strengthening component is required. A CBNRM/Institutional Development specialist should be employed for the full five years of the programme. This individual should be seconded to RISE, but also be available to support the community-level facilitators. Further discussions are required with the parties involved to clarify reporting requirements and responsibilities.
- The Namibian NGO Forum (NANGOF), an NGO umbrella organization, has recently initiated a dialogue with the national CBNRM programme. NANGOF staff have stated that they see conservancies as an essential tool for gaining rights and responsibilities for communities. They have requested additional information on the linkages between conservancies and development objectives. With time, it is envisioned that NGOs will increasingly become interested in conservancy development and CBNRM. It is important that this coordination and communication with the NGO community be institutionalized within the national CBNRM programme.

The Team envisions three potential roles for NANGOF in the national CBNRM programme. First, NANGOF could provide information and build awareness

regarding conservancies. Their network of regional centres could be used for outreach to members in the communal areas. Second, NANGOF, as an NGO umbrella organization, could facilitate the development of partnerships between its members. Third, as a member of the National CBNRM Collaborative Group, NANGOF would represent the interests of the broader NGO community and would need to keep them informed of developments at the national level.

Indicative Costs:     \$350,000 (IRDNC - Core staff costs)  
                              \$80,000 (RISE - Core staff costs)  
                              \$50,000 (Support to Nyae Nyae Conservancy)  
                              \$50,000 (Community-level facilitators)  
                              \$100,000 (Advisor/Conservancy Facilitation)

Activity: Support to training institutions (including Rossing Foundation, N!ara).

Pro:

- Training is critical to the sustainability of the CBNRM programme. As new communities come on board, they will require additional knowledge and skills. Similarly, as NGOs and GRN expand their activities, training will be needed. The Team proposes that training activities are designed and implemented by Namibian organizations. The Rossing Foundation has recently received a grant from DIFID to initiate a comprehensive programme for training in support of the national CBNRM effort. Given the breadth of knowledge and skills that will be required, no one organization will be able to respond to all the requirements for training. Thus, a partnership approach which combines the skills and resources of several organization is proposed. Training institutions such as N!ara and Private Sector Foundation can be used.

Indicative costs:     \$50,000 (Rossing Core staff costs - additional resources from DIFID)  
                              \$20,000 (N!ara and/or other institution)

Activity: Partnerships with groups that are sector specific (NACOBTA, enterprise NGOs).

Pro:

- NACOBTA provides training and business development assistance to community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) in conservancies. Benefits flow directly to Namibians historically disadvantaged by apartheid. Benefits are both financial and social, including increased skills and sense of empowerment through ownership and control of the enterprises. NACOBTA is successfully raising funds from other donors (e.g.: SIDA and the EU) and requires reduced support from this activity. Continued support is required to cover management and core activities, including raising funds, marketing, training, business development, and networking. Technical assistance and training are also needed in marketing tourism destinations, analyzing the financial viability of

CBTEs, negotiating joint ventures, developing advocacy skills, and mediating conflict.

- There is an opportunity for facilitating organizations to build partnerships with enterprise NGOs to deliver specialized services and skills. Although limited in number, the business development and training NGOs in Namibia seem to be effective. While not essential that these groups have an in-depth knowledge of CBNRM, it is critical that they work in collaboration with a facilitating NGO to ensure that the enterprises and training they provide are integrated in the CBNRM framework. This activity should be explored further.

Indicative costs:      \$60,000 (NACOBTA Core staff costs)  
                                     \$40,000 (partnerships with enterprise NGOs)

#### **Component #4: Sustainable Support to Communal Area Conservancies**

Activity: Support to the creation and development of a national-level NGO acting as a secretariat and grant-making facility for CBNRM.

Pro:

- To be effective, the National CBNRM Collaborative Group needs the support of a "secretariat" - two or three individuals at a technical level able to: 1) undertake information dissemination, publicity, and advocacy; 2) coordinate training, technical assistance, and evaluation of CBNRM activities; 3) document CBNRM experiences; 4) provide facilitation and logistical support for networking trips and visitors; and 5) generate additional funds to support CBNRM, among other functions. It is also highly desirable that this same NGO develop the capacity to award and manage small grants to NGOs and CBOs.

Con:

- Creating a new institution is a relatively high risk endeavor that should be avoided when possible. Developing capacity for grants management in a newly created NGO is an especially difficult and high risk undertaking.
- Assuring funding for a newly created NGO beyond USAID's "graduation" from Namibia present additional risks unless USAID would be willing to endow the NGO to cover long-term core costs.

Indicative costs:      \$250,000/year

Activity: Same as above, except the capacity would be built within an existing NGO (such as NNF or Rossing) that already has a solid capacity for managing funds. Additional capacity to award and manage grants and additional staff to serve as a secretariat would be added.

Pro:

- Building the grants management capacity should be much easier. Also, the secretariat would benefit from the established administrative systems of an established NGO. This alternative solves some of the internal institutional relationship issues linked to developing a new NGO.

Con:

- Existing institutional rivalries may be a constraint. It is sometimes easier to create new structures and systems than to rebuild existing ones.

Indicative costs: \$175,000/year

Activity: Establishment of a fund for small grants (up to US\$10,000 each) for NGOs/CBOs.

Pro:

- CBNRM is an evolving process which requires a flexible approach. One of the strengths of the existing USAID/LIFE Programme is its grants making capability enabling it to respond to "windows of opportunity" as they arise. Field implementation has to be strongly adapted to local cultural, socio-economic and ecological conditions.
- Given the evolving nature of CBNRM in Namibia, it is also important that funding be available to support NGOs and CBOs as they identify new areas for interventions. While conservancies will be responsible for covering many of their costs, some investments in conservancy operations and resource management may exceed their resources. Small grants could also be used to support social, economic and ecological research and other activities necessary to generate knowledge and information for informed-decision making. It is important that all research activities clarify how the information will be disseminated and used, and by whom, before the activity is funded. Travel grants for networking trips, which have been found to be very effective at building understanding and commitment to CBNRM, could also be made available.

Indicative costs: \$100,000

Activity: Support the creation of the proposed Environmental Investment Fund and provide an initial endowment of \$3,000,000.

Pro:

- The creation of the EIF is a priority for the MET. Its creation can provide a long-term source of funding for environmental activities.

Con:

- The EIF is only weakly linked to the CBNRM program. As proposed, the EIF will fund a very broad range of environmental activities. The proportion of grants

going to CBNRM would probably be quite small. Endowing the EIF is not an efficient use of funds if the objective is to support CBNRM. See Appendix 1 for more detailed commentary on the EIF proposal.

Indicative costs:     \$150,000 (Establishment)  
                              \$3,000,000 (Endowment)

Activity: Establishment and endowment of a trust fund dedicated to support of the National CBNRM Programme. The trust could fund core costs of the secretariat to the National CBNRM Collaborative Group as well as grants to NGOs and CBOs. The endowment could be used in a fashion that uses interest plus a portion of the capital over a period of 10-20 years, thus significantly increasing the amount of money available on a yearly basis. The amount of the endowment is a variable to be decided.

Pro:

- This option would provide key funding for the Secretariat and for a grants-making capability. The grants-making capability of the current LIFE Programme Team is widely considered to be one of its main strengths.

Con:

- USAID has a limited budget envelope for the follow-on to LIFE. Endowing a CBNRM trust would come at the expense of the EIF or of other priority CBNRM activities over the next five years. USAID had programmed the three million to be available in 2004 and 2005.

Indicative costs:     Establishment costs would be negligible  
                              Endowment variable

### **Component #5: Expansion into community-based natural forest management**

Activity: Support for five-year pilot CBNRM development with strong focus on natural forest management for fuelwood production for urban markets. The project would work with a half dozen Community Forest Reserves north of Etosha Pan. The project would assist communities to develop and implement management plans integrating forest, range, fire and wildlife management. Forest management would cover fuelwood, posts and poles, small sawtimber, thatch and other woody and non-woody products as a function of local resource potential and market conditions.

Pro:

- CBNFM is well-developed in similar ecological types in West Africa where it was first piloted by USAID. It is crucial that pilot activities be undertaken at an early stage to adapt policies, technologies, and approaches to Namibian conditions. The pilot stage is a necessary step on which to build an expanded program at a later time.

Con:

- USAID funding for pilot CBNFM would come at the expense of other strategically important activities. Also, it is possible that other donors may be willing to fund these activities. (The only planned activity that the Team learned about is with OXFAM)

Indicative costs: \$400,000

## 6.0 Roles and Responsibilities

### 6.1 Proposed roles and responsibilities are presented in Table 1

#### Roles and Responsibilities, by Implementation Partner

Institution	Roles and Responsibilities
MET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Policy reform</li> <li>● Inter-ministerial coordination</li> <li>● Information and awareness about conservancies in communal areas</li> <li>● Wildlife monitoring, planning and management</li> <li>● Raising funds and donor coordination</li> </ul>
Other Ministries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Inter-ministerial coordination</li> <li>● Policy reform</li> <li>● Integration of CBNRM into on-going and future approaches to resource management</li> </ul>
National Collaborative Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evolving philosophy, overall guidance and direction to the CBNRM Programme</li> <li>● Raising funds and donor coordination</li> <li>● Policy Reform</li> <li>● Inter-ministerial coordination</li> <li>● Coordination of implementation</li> </ul>
National CBNRM Institute/NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support to collaborative group</li> <li>● Account for donor funding to be passed to support conservancy development</li> <li>● Monitor donor funding and produce an annual report on the status of conservancies in Namibia</li> <li>● Raising funds</li> <li>● Publicity and advocacy at a national level</li> <li>● Assist conservancies to access required service providers</li> </ul>

NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide training, technical assistance and facilitation to CBOs in carrying out their tasks</li> <li>● Facilitating conflict management/mediation</li> <li>● Promote the sustainability of CBO activities by building competencies and developing secure funding mechanisms (e.g: promote profitable enterprises)</li> <li>● Maintaining a documentation centre</li> </ul>
CBOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Conservancy implementation, including natural resource management and enterprise development</li> <li>● Ensure CBOs are representative, accountable, and transparent with the communities they serve</li> <li>● Manage conflicts within the communities they serve</li> <li>● Distribution the benefits equitably</li> <li>● Represent communal area conservancy interests at the national level</li> </ul>
PVO Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ensure sustainability of service-providing NGOs by building institutional and technical capacity and developing appropriate funding mechanisms</li> <li>● Overall administration of USAID funds</li> <li>● Provide and manage technical staff, including a Chief of Party, Financial Manager, and 3-4 Advisors</li> </ul>

## 6.2 Indicative Budget (US \$, Year one)

### Component #1

Policy Support	90,000
Inter-ministerial Coordination	20,000
Natural Resource Economics Programme Advisor	<u>125,000</u>
Sub-total:	235,000

### Component #2

Advisor, DCWM, MET	100,000
Training, DCWM (materials development - additional support available from Rossing)	40,000
Advisor/biologist, DSS, MET	100,000
Advisor/planning and monitoring, DSS	<u>25,000</u>
Sub-total:	265,000

### Component #3

Facilitating NGOs:	
Institutional support to IRDNC	350,000
Institutional support to RISE	80,000
Community-level facilitators	50,000
Support to Nyae Nyae Conservancy	50,000

Advisor/conservancy facilitation	100,000
Training/institutional support to Rossing	50,000
Training/other	20,000
Institutional Support to NACOBTA	60,000
Enterprise Partnerships	40,000

Sub-total: 800,000

**Component #4**

Create an NGO for secretariat and grants	250,000
Support existing NGO for secret. and grants	175,000
Fund for Small Grants	100,000
Support creation of EIF	150,000
(endowment	3,000,000)

Sub-total: 525,000

**Component #5**

**PVO Support and Administration**

In-country manager	125,000
Financial officer	125,000
Monitoring and Evaluation	50,000
Home Office/G + A	80,000

Sub-total: 380,000

## NATIONAL CBNRM PROGRAMME

The National CBNRM Programme is a dynamic programme that stresses process, rather than product, and responds to and grows with changes in the ecological, social, and economic context. It is guided by a philosophy and principles, not by a blueprint design. The programme promotes experimental pilot activities demonstrating that sustainably managed natural resources can result in social development and economic growth, and in suitable partnerships between local communities and government. Partner institutions (MET, NGOs, communities) undertake sound monitoring and evaluation of all activities so that the impact and effectiveness of these activities, as well as the approaches and principles used in implementing them, in reaching social and economic objectives can be assessed. Field experiences are analyzed and documented to demonstrate the viability of the approach, including economic values of natural resources, and disseminated to local politicians, other decision-makers and the general public, as well as to field implementors who adapt as appropriate the lessons learned.

The programme targets groups on the brink of irreversible decisions regarding less resilient resources, particularly where resources are critical, whether currently or potentially, to the survival of local residents. As many natural resources are communally managed, communities are targeted as the appropriate decision-making and planning level, rather than individuals or regional bodies. Communal areas and buffer zones to national parks and other managed areas are priorities.

While all wild resources are included in the National CBNRM Programme, wildlife is specifically targeted, given its potential for utilization and for generating economic benefits. As wildlife is most often excluded from resource use activities, it is necessary to highlight Namibia's decision to not only include, but also promote wildlife in its resource use policies.

The *specific objectives* of the national CBNRM Programme are:

- 1. To change both conservation and development philosophies and practices so that they view natural resources, including wildlife, grazing and water resources, as critical to national and local economic growth.*
- 2. To manage natural resources for recovery, as a national and local economic resource and, where appropriate, promote utilization programmes.*
- 3. To promote partnerships between communities, Government and the private sector.*
- 4. To create an enabling environment (policy, coordination, etc.) for the decentralization of natural resource management decision-making.*
- 5. To support organizations that work to build up the capacity of local communities to participate in natural resource management and to optimize benefits from this management in the long-term ("capacity" includes: skills, institutions, legal identity, sense of community, etc.)*

6. *To support the development of capacities and awareness of the Government of Namibia (i.e. MET, local government structures), NGOs, unions, and other institutions supporting CBNRM.*
7. *To develop links with and support other ministries, NGOs and other institutions using a community-based approach to resource management.*

## **ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE GROUP**

Activities towards these objectives will be implemented by three primary groups: firstly, NGOs and MET will continue field implementation, including informing local communities of their natural resource rights and other knowledge necessary for decision-making and planning; and secondly MET will monitor and evaluate pilot activities, as well as develop and promote appropriate government policies and legislation. Thirdly, a Collaborative Group is being formed to provide a forum for the coordination and analysis of field experiences, and to promote CBNRM nationally.

Specifically, the collaborative group will:

- Provide a forum for the documentation of field experiences, exchange of information, and the integration of field experiences into the conceptual basis of CBNRM;
- Provide the mechanism and opportunities for exchange visits within Namibia, southern Africa, and the continent;
- Provide a mechanism and ensure that information generated is available to other groups working in CBNRM (i.e. through workshops, the resource centre, documentation);
- Act as a coordination structure;
- Promote awareness of the approaches, principles, and results of CBNRM among local political representatives, other decision-makers, and the general public, including directing a public relations campaign;
- Facilitate skills training in areas identified by the member groups, with a focus on Training of Trainers; and
- Support the institutionalization of CBNRM in the MET, as requested.

## **COLLABORATIVE GROUP MEMBERSHIP**

Given the roles outlined above, it is proposed that the membership of the Collaborative Group includes organizations presently and potentially addressing natural resource management, specifically - but not limited to - wildlife. The approach is to have a core working group, supplemented by other organizations as appropriate.

Core working group members are indicated with \*.

#### Government Ministries:

- Ministry of Agriculture, Water Affairs, and Rural Development (MAWRD)
  - Sustainable Animal, Range and Development Programme (SARDEP)
  - Water committees
  - Directorate of Rural Development
  
- \* ● Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)
  - Directorate of Management and Research
  - Directorate of Tourism
  - Directorate of Environmental Affairs
  
- \* ● Social Science Division (SSD) of Multidisciplinary Research Centre, University of Namibia

#### NGOs:

- The Environmental Network of NANGOF
- \* ● Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC)
- \* ● Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDFN)
- \* ● The Rossing Foundation
- Namibian National Farmers' Union (NNFU)
- \* ● Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF)

#### Producer Associations:

- Game Producers' Association
- Professional Hunters' Association
- Tourism Association

The Collaborative Group will create a secretariat to: coordinate meetings; prepare briefing papers; collect and disseminate information to the members and other interested groups, including developing a resource centre; arrange for publications; facilitate training events and workshops; prepare press releases; and act as a contact for the media and other individuals and groups interested in visiting project sites, among other responsibilities. It was decided that in the short-term the LIFE Programme Team could perform this role. However, it will be critical for the Collaborative Group to establish itself as a legal entity, with staff as necessary, as soon as possible.

The Collaborative Group will hold quarterly meetings (with the next one planned for June 7, 1994), until otherwise decided by the members, to coincide with the LIFE Programme Steering Committee Meetings.

#### **OTHER ISSUES**

Following the first meeting, held on January 31, 1994, to explore the possibility of a National CBNRM Programme and resulting issues, four primary concerns remained, including:

1. There is a need for an acronym.
2. How can local communities be involved at the national level?
3. How to promote access to the National CBNRM Programme by other NGOs and projects not currently involved?
4. What is the best means of promoting CBNRM philosophy in government leadership, including MET and other ministries?

## **ACTIONS**

- MET will distribute this document to all members of the core working group.
- WWF will organize and coordinate the next meeting of the core working group of the National CBNRM Programme on June 7, 1994.
- WWF will organize a roundtable discussion with SARDEP/MAWRD.
- WWF will send a letter to the core working group regarding services it can provide as Secretariat.

## Observations on the Proposed Environment Investment Fund

I have had an opportunity to fill in from here some of the information blanks on the Environmental Trust Fund (EIF) and talk to Irene Kamau regarding the team interview on Game Management Trust Fund with SSG Malan Lindeque on the Monday after I left. The team only had one copy of the reports of the November two hour and January one day workshop on the EIF, which I left with Roy in Windhoek, so I am going from memory and my meeting notes on the EIF.

I got the impression from the Mission that the evaluation team wished to include information on the EIF in the evaluation. I thought the following might more properly go into the Assessment. The work of EIF consultant, Joe McGann was financed by Mission PD&S funds, managed by the Mission and not by the LIFE project team. It is a result deemed important by the LIFE team and might contribute to achievement of the present SO or the next one. By the same logic, however, one should include in the evaluation observations of the READ project environmental education activities.

As I observed in my written notes to Roy, I thought the EIF to date has been designed from a low experience base. The bibliography included a couple of publications from the early design of the Belize Trust Fund, the USAID 1996 Guidance on Endowments and Trust Funds and papers developed from within Namibia. It did not include the experience or documentation from the Zimbabwe-American Development Foundation, the endowment experience in Swaziland or the Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (I have pouched the proposal to the mission and have requested an electronic copy). It did not include the suite of publications from the USAID/World Bank Sustainable Financing Initiative (I have provided electronic copies in Adobe PDF format to the Mission and WWF of what I believe to be two key documents 1) Endowments in Africa: A Discussion of Issues for Using Alternative Funding Mechanisms to Support Agricultural and Natural Resources Management Programs and 2) The Road to Financial Sustainability: How Managers, Government, and Donors in Africa Can Create a Legacy of Viable Public and Non-Profit Organizations and pouched those two documents as well as others in the SFI series). It did not include the current experience in Belize, the strength of which is it's rolling fund aspect which has only 5% of it's income going to it's endowment (the Belize Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund is WWW URL <http://www.belizenet.com/pact.html>). Another WWW page of interest is a paper by Barry Spergel at <http://www.feem.it/feem/notifeem/196/13.html>. It also did not include a publication I consider to be an excellent reader on sustainable financing for non-governmental institutions called "A Guide to strengthening non-governmental institutions in natural resources management" (which I have also pouched to the mission).

It was not very clear to me how the conceptualization of the EIF evolved between the first and second workshop and subsequently. The first workshop seemed to be introductory consisting mostly of presentations followed by some Q&As. The second workshop did include some brainstorming activities but the draft legislation was not available to the evaluation team so I was not sure what aspects had been adapted into

the legislation.

With the exception of the consultant hired by the mission to research the EIF and push the process, I did not get the impression of a conventional wisdom in Namibia that the EIF was a necessary component to achieve the SO. The operative seemed to be "don't pick my pocket but I want to be a beneficiary".

The EIF is taking some strategic directions that I do not completely understand. The present design is such that an act of Parliament is necessary for the EIF to be created. Private Foundations are legally possible now in Namibia, witness the Rossing Foundation et al. In addition, the government has the power to administratively create institutions that can generate and disperse funds, witness the Game Management Trust Fund, which was created to receive funds from the sale of stockpiled ivory and has received income in trust for candidate Conservancies from the sale of hunting concessions and game auctions.

Similarly, the suite of potential recipients includes most Namibian entities including individuals and the government of Namibia. Some donors may wish to limit applicants to a smaller suite, for example, community-based organizations and a small business credit scheme, which may also serve to create multiple funding windows.

The EIF as presently designed has a quite broad definition of acceptable environmental activities it might fund. USAID scope of acceptable activities it might like to support would be narrower. Barry Spergel, the World Wildlife Fund consultant also with Belize experience brought in to support the second workshop, cautioned that multiple windows each with different funding criteria increased complexity and should be avoided.

The EIF as presently designed is a perpetual endowment with off-shore investment in low risk (low yield) instruments. A declining endowment over a 10, 20 or 30 year time frame can make more than twice as many resources available. Risk and yield are a balance the Foundation will have to achieve, yield has to beat management fees, inflation and currency fluctuations. It may be the best investment for Namibia is increasing the productive capacity of Namibian institutions today (building the machine) rather than squirreling away resources to build or run the machine tomorrow. There is an opportunity cost of money.

As presently designed, the EIF Executive body will have, among other responsibilities, the responsibility to work with candidate recipients to develop acceptable funding proposals if they are unable to do so themselves. This technical assistance commitment can be a bottomless pit that could eat up resources. The Foundation needs to be able to say no, rather than how can we help?.

As presently designed, the Foundation Board is organized and chaired by the government. The government may also receive funds from the endowment, for actions that the government is unwilling or unable to fund. Resources going into the funds can not be from sources where the government could have been the recipient or from

fungible donor funds from which the government could have been the recipient. This design approach may limit the attractiveness of the fund to some external donors.

So where does that leave us. The experience elsewhere is that emphasis frequently and initially is on where to get the money to put in a bucket and that inadequate attention is spent on the quality of the bucket and it's ability to hold and carry money. In Swaziland and elsewhere, leakage and evaporation have resulted in nothing left to water the tree that someday might bear fruit.

Efforts to date have increased the level of awareness on one option for financing environmental activities in Namibia. The consultant has also succeeded in identifying a number of Namibian sources of contribute to sustaining environmental actions. For me the most intriguing of which is the gasoline tax.

With the caveat that I claim no special experience in endowments and trust funds but am rather simply familiar with some of the experience elsewhere in Africa and the USAID universe on this subject, I think a route has been too early chosen and progress has been made and experience gained in going down that route. I am not convinced it will take the Strategic Objective team to it's desired destination. As implied above, I think there has been an inadequate understanding among the community interested in the EIF on the roads not taken. I would recommend 1) a review of some of the literature and experience from elsewhere 2) If appropriate, technical assistance by external consultants such as the people working with SD SO5 on our Sustainable Financing Initiative such as Paul Weatherly, Derrick Brinkerhoff or Lynn Ellsworth, and 3) pay more attention to the establishment of the foundation Board even prior to the establishment of the enabling legislation.

Tim Resch  
Tropical Forestry and Biological Diversity Advisor  
US Agency for International Development  
Africa Bureau AFR/SD SO5 and more  
1111 19th Street Room 210  
Arlington (Rosslyn), VA 22209-1704

W = 703 235 3786  
F = 703 235 3805  
[tresch@USAID.gov](mailto:tresch@USAID.gov)

## NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

### PREAMBLE

The National Programme for Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) is an initiative of a coalition of Namibian governmental and non-governmental institutions working under the policy framework expressed by the National Constitution and the new policy on "Wildlife Management and Utilization in Communal Areas" of the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism (MET). Article 95 of the Constitution states:

*The State shall actively promote and maintain the welfare of the people by adopting .... policies aimed at ... the maintenance of ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity of Namibia, and utilization of living natural resources on a sustainable basis for the benefit of all Namibians, both present and future....*

Globally, it is being recognized that wild resources are valuable and are, or can be, of economic benefit to communities and their development. Wild resources are complementary to other economic production and critical to diversification and long-term security, especially in times of drought.

The importance of the environment to the development of Namibia and its people is further stated in Namibia's Green Plan:

*The health of individuals, society and the economy are inextricably linked to the health of the environment. A healthy environment provides the opportunity of realizing the full developmental potential of a region and country.*

*Recognizing* the dependence of local communities on natural resources for economic survival, food security, and maintenance of their cultural identity and values;

*Recognizing* that these communities no longer receive socio-economic benefits from these resources and are vulnerable to alienation from their resources;

*Recognizing* decentralization of decision-making regarding natural resource management has proven more effective than centralized decision-making; and

*Recognizing* that the Government of Namibia does not accept the current status of the wild resources and argues that they need to be managed for recovery as national, and local, resources;

The coalition of Namibian governmental and non-governmental institutions has initiated a National CBNRM Programme. The *goal* of this programme is that:

*Communities take greater responsibility for managing and benefiting in an equitable manner from sustainably managed natural resources.*