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Community conservation in Namibia... means practicing legally-entrenched community-based natural resource management under the guidance of a formal, national-level CBNRM programme. Communal conservancies, community forests and other community conservation organisations are officially registered entities with legal rights to manage the natural resources under their defined jurisdiction. Rural Namibians are empowered to govern their own environmental affairs, and the generated benefits flow directly to communities.
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vital components of community conservation...
• communities have legally-entrenched rights to manage natural resources
• activities are guided by national policies and legislation
• management areas are clearly defined and legally registered
• jurisdiction over resources is clearly defined
• the sustainable use of natural resources to generate returns for communities is strongly encouraged
• all resource use is guided by a system of monitoring, annually adjusted quotas, permits and controls
• all returns flow directly to the community conservation organisations and local communities
• tangible returns provide strong incentives for the wise management and conservation of resources
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the three pillars of community conservation in Namibia...

institutional development
• good governance creates the basis for resource management, benefit capture and distribution

natural resource management
• innovative resource management enables biodiversity conservation and sustainable use

business, enterprises and livelihoods
• market-based approaches enable a wide range of community returns
preface

a new reporting format for a rapidly growing movement

The State of Conservancies (or SOC) Report, as this publication has become known, has travelled far and wide since the launch of the first edition, which reported on the year 2003. The Namibian community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) programme has become internationally acclaimed, largely through the success of communal conservancies. Community-based natural resource management was not invented in Namibia and many countries in various parts of the world practice different forms of CBNRM. Yet many of the CBNRM systems and structures that were developed in Namibia have shown great success and have broad global applications. Delegations from some 20 countries have visited Namibia to observe – and learn from – our CBNRM activities. Representatives from Namibia have also travelled widely to share their experience, and the SOC Report has been studied in places as far away as the steppes of Mongolia (left).

CBNRM in Namibia continues to grow immensely and during the initial preparations for the the 2012 SOC Report, a decision was made to revise the reporting format to continue to do justice to the burgeoning programme. The practice of alternating between a brief and compact A5 sized report and a comprehensive biennial book has been done away with. The present format will become the annual report, while more comprehensive reports with additional case studies and data will be published periodically to celebrate major milestones.

CBNRM is an unwieldy acronym. The name ‘community conservation’ aptly encompasses the various forms of community-based natural resource management, all of which seek to conserve resources for the sustainable use and benefit of current as well as future generations. Community conservation is doing exactly that – through rights-based proprietorship over resources, it is generating a wide range of returns for communal area residents across Namibia, and it is strengthening not only the natural resource base, but also fostering community cohesion, instilling a sense of pride, and creating a sound governance foundation.

CBNRM is much broader than the conservancy movement, which was initiated to improve wildlife management for the benefit of the people in communal areas. Today, a whole range of resources is managed by local communities. Increasing efforts are being made to integrate the management of wildlife, forestry, inland fisheries, water and rangeland resources into one overall CBNRM movement. This has culminated in the launch of the National CBNRM Policy by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) in early 2013. The policy, while continuing to recognise the different community-based resource management structures, creates the needed framework for a more integrated approach to CBNRM.

Importantly, community conservation cannot be successful without sound governance. Without good and equitable governance, it is not possible to manage resources effectively, and even less likely that the resources will be used sustainably or will generate optimum benefits. It is the broad and generally effective governance structures that have been created by community conservation, which represent one of its greatest, but largely overlooked, successes. For this reason, governance has in this version of the report been elevated to the starting position, the position of a vital foundation, that it deserves.

Perhaps too much emphasis has been placed on immediate and tangible household returns, and this has led to unrealistically high expectations – both amongst local communities seeking to gain benefits from natural resources, and amongst those evaluating the achievements of the programme. Benefit creation is vital. There is no justification for an activity, especially one of such enormous proportions as the community conservation movement, if it has no benefits. But benefits should not be sought only at an individual or household level, and certainly not only in financial terms. It is important to look at the overall picture of community conservation in Namibia and evaluate what is being achieved – at an astounding range of levels and in a great variety of sectors.
to live with wildlife...

...means striving for balanced land use and a healthy environment. Game does not need to be eradicated from a landscape because it may pose a threat to crops or livestock. Wildlife can create a great range of returns that far exceed its costs. Game – and all natural resource use – can be integrated with other rural livelihood activities for the benefit of the people and the land...

Community conservation is about managing natural resources sustainably to generate returns for rural people. Conservancies, community forests and other community conservation initiatives create the needed legal framework for this. By choosing to live with wildlife, rural communities are broadening their livelihood options as well as enabling a healthier environment. Through wise and sustainable management and use, the resources are conserved for future generations while providing significant returns today.

a little history... The earliest community-based conservation initiatives in Namibia, which grew into what is today the national CBNRM programme, started before Independence, when the first community game guards were appointed by local headmen in an attempt to reverse wildlife declines. At the time, people living in communal areas had few rights to use wildlife. Wild animals were seen as little more than a threat to crops, livestock and infrastructure, as well as community safety. Ground-breaking legislation passed in the mid-nineties laid the foundation for a new approach to natural resource use. By forming legally recognised community conservation organisations such as conservancies and community forests, people in communal areas can now actively manage – and generate benefits from – natural resources in their area. This continues to encourage wildlife recoveries and environmental restoration. While community conservation organisations are ‘resource management units’, they are defined by social ties, uniting groups of people with the common goal of managing their resources. The first conservancies were registered in 1998, and the first community forests in 2006.
People, places and wildlife...

The communal areas of Namibia represent over 40 percent of the country and harbour a wealth of resources. This is land that was set aside for livelihood use by local communities, owned by the state but governed by local people. It is therefore local communities, rather than outsiders, who should rightfully be the main beneficiaries of resource use in these areas.

Community conservation offers an enchanting mix of...

- vibrant cultures and dynamic communities committed to sustainability – people united through community conservation share a common vision for managing their area and its resources
- vast, diverse and spectacular landscapes – dunes, mountains, rivers, woodlands... healthy environments diversify opportunities and drive economic growth
- a suite of natural resources – charismatic, free-roaming game, diverse plant resources, fish... natural resources generate a variety of returns for local people

Community conservation is renewing a sense of ownership over resources and through this is reinforcing a vital sense of responsibility; it is also cultivating community cohesiveness and pride in cultural heritage.

Building foundations for sustainable resource management

Prior to Independence, without the existence of formal management structures and lacking ownership over resources, communities undertook few coordinated natural resource management activities. This resulted in fragmentation, neglect and over-exploitation. Today, community conservation not only monitors and manages resource use, it also provides legitimate structures for the tourism and trophy hunting industries, as well as a suite of other private sector, government and donor stakeholders, to formally engage with communities in an equitable manner. Legally recognised entities have empowered communities to stand up for their rights. Chapter 2 portrays the details of community conservation governance.
Managing a Broad Spectrum of Communal Resources

Modern approaches have not only returned the rights to the people and the wildlife to the land, but are enabling an increasing range of benefits from natural resources, which were unheard of only a few decades ago. This success is based on community empowerment, as well as innovative systems and tools that enable effective management and sustainable use of natural resources. Chapter 3 illustrates the details and successes of community-based natural resource management activities.

Improving Rural Lives

Many conservancies are showing that community conservation can generate a broad range of community and individual returns (Figure 2) while covering its operational costs from own income. Community conservation is funding rural development projects and empowering communities, while individual households are benefiting through job creation and new income opportunities, as well as in-kind benefits and improved access to a range of services. Details are provided in Chapter 4.

Community conservation embraces a large number of Namibia’s communal area residents and covers a vast portion of communal land (Figure 3). It also creates important linkages with state protected areas and initiatives on freehold land (Figure 4). By joining huge contiguous areas where wildlife can roam free, community conservation is enabling environmental restoration, healthy game populations, and diverse community returns. Through this, the true potential of Namibia’s spectacular places can be realised.

Entrenching a Proven Model

Community conservation has shown that it can improve rural lives while contributing to biodiversity conservation, and is recognised as a national development strategy. The movement is still young and growing rapidly, and continues to require broad support. Yet community conservation can become fully sustainable and largely self-financing in the foreseeable future, if appropriate resources can continue to be invested to entrench governance foundations, optimise returns, and mitigate threats and barriers. Chapter 5 looks to the future.

FIGURE 2.
Total cash income and in-kind benefits in conservancies

The total cash income and in-kind benefits generated in conservancies grew from N$ 592,467 in 1998 to over N$ 56 million in 2012. This includes all directly measurable income and in-kind benefits being generated, and can be divided into cash income to conservancies (mostly through partnerships with private sector operators), cash income to residents (mostly through employment and the sale of products), as well as in-kind benefits to residents (such as the distribution of harvested game meat).

FIGURE 3.
Community conservation cover

The area covered by conservancies and community forests has rapidly grown to 159,755 km², which is 52.2% of all communal land. Community conservation is embracing a growing number of communal area residents. At the end of 2012, there were approximately 172,000 people living in conservancies. This figure has been adjusted and updated using new methods to evaluate Namibia Population and Housing Census data for 2001 and 2011. More information is provided on page 42 in Chapter 4.

FIGURE 4.
The expansion of sustainable natural resource management across Namibia

At the end of 2012, land managed for sustainable resource use and conservation covered 43.1% of Namibia. At Independence in 1990, there were no registered community conservation areas, freehold conservancies did not exist, and only around 12% of land was under recognised conservation management.
At a larger scale, resources can only be used sustainably if effective management structures exist to guide their use. On privately-owned land, these structures are created by the owner of the land and its resources. The progressive legal framework that allowed private land owners in Namibia to generate returns from wildlife was already created in 1967. This gave wildlife an economic value and led to large scale wildlife recoveries. Until Independence, all control over natural resources in communal areas rested with the state, with the result that no formal structures for natural resource management existed at a local level. Rural communities felt disenfranchised and the lack of a sense of ownership over resources led to indiscriminate exploitation and neglect. Community conservation has re-empowered communal area residents to manage their natural resources. In the process, an impressive framework has been created for sustainable and equitable resource management.

Conservancies, community forests and other legally recognised community conservation initiatives create effective formal structures for managing communal resources. This is in itself one of the greatest achievements of the CBNRM programme. A broad governance foundation is being created, which empowers local communities, generates significant benefits for them and makes a vital contribution to coordinated land use management in Namibia.
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Governance at a glance:

At the end of 2012 there were...
- 43 management plans in place
- 25 sustainable business and financial plans in place
- 44 annual financial reports completed
- 41 annual general meetings held
- 9% female chairpersons
- 49% female treasurers/financial managers
- 29% female committee members
- and 25% female employees in communal conservancies in Namibia

What’s being achieved?

Community conservation is...
- contributing to improved democracy in rural areas
- empowering individuals, including women, to actively participate in decision-making
- employing staff to manage a broad range of resources
- working according to management and benefit distribution plans
- unlocking human potential by providing new access to diverse training and capacity building
- enabling controlled tourism development and trophy hunting activities
- covering an increasing portion of operational costs through own income
- linking into regional conservation structures

New in 2012:
- increased focus on adhering to conservancy constitutions and revising ineffective constitutions
- improved financial reporting by conservancies

The biggest challenges?
- meeting the governance training needs of newly registered conservancies and community forests
- strengthening financial management and decision-making capacities
- addressing the high turnover amongst conservancy committee members and the resultant loss of institutional capacity and memory
- increasing the ability of conservancies to manage their contractual responsibilities towards the private sector
- managing competing expectations from stakeholders seeking access to returns from natural resource use

The freedom of choice

A central aspect of community conservation is choice. Communities choose whether to form a conservancy or not, and communities forming a conservancy are self-defining, and conservancies can choose how to use wildlife and what partnerships to engage in. The same principles apply to other sectors such as community forestry. The conservation approach is designed to allow rural communities to add natural resource use to their existing livelihood activities.

Managing complexity

Conservancies and community forests are responsible for managing natural resources across huge areas. They also need to manage a broad range of business interests linked to the resources, as well as community needs related to income generation and benefit distribution. These are complex tasks requiring different skill sets. Natural resource management at such a scale requires an excellent understanding of environmental dynamics; managing an array of business interests calls for a mix of financial, management and marketing skills; job creation and equitable benefit distribution require a sound socio-economic understanding. This demands training, and continued access to targeted training is a core aspect of community conservation success.

Managing the returns

The second most important function of community conservation is to manage the natural resource potential of their area and effectively capture its returns. The core work of a conservancy is to manage natural resources in a sustainable and equitable way. In open and dynamic systems such as communal conservancies, this depends on access to information about the resources and effective ways to use the information. Natural resource management systems in conservancies are based on a wealth of data gathered through a variety of monitoring activities including the Event Book. The processed data is accessible in the form of a range of management tools. This information flow enables informed management responsive to needs.

FIGURE 5.

The relationship between governance, resources and returns

At the core of a successful community conservation is governance. Without good governance, effective resource management is not possible, and without effective resource management, returns cannot be maximised.

FIGURE 6.

The conservation information cycle

The effective collection, evaluation and dissemination of information is a core component of the programme and enables informed adaptive management.
The Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry may declare a community forest as a fire management area, in which case the management committee of the forest takes on the responsibility of a fire management committee to implement an approved fire management plan.

Conservation complexes
A number of conservancies and community forests are forming joint management complexes to enable more effective management of resources and activities at a larger landscape level. The Mudumu North Complex, the Khudum North Complex and the Greater Waterberg Complex are examples. The institutional structures consist of representatives from the MET, conservancies, community forests and the private sector. The forums also have representation from supporting sectors such as agriculture, police, defence force, local government, water affairs, traditional authority and NGOs.

Transboundary contributions
At a still larger scale, community conservation supports international conservation connectivity. The Kavango Zambesi Transfrontier Conservation Area, KAZA, is a joint management initiative between Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe, which links state protected areas and communal lands across the five countries. Namibia’s formal community conservation structures enable wildlife movement across communal land and facilitate improved coordination of activities across these areas.

Community fish reserves
The Ministry Of Fisheries and Marine Resources regulates the use of all inland fisheries resources. A legal framework is being developed to enable communities to register rights and management authority over these resources. In the absence of clear legislation, several conservancies are supporting the management of fisheries in the Zambezi Region (formerly Captvri).

Community water management
Under the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, the Water Resources Management Act of 2004 provides the legal framework for communities to manage their water supply. Water point user associations embrace all users of a particular water point and are managed by water point committees elected from amongst the members. At a higher level, groups of water point user associations form local water user associations to coordinate the activities and management of their water points and protect rural water supply schemes. Both types of association are registered as non-profit organisations after approval of their constitution by the Minister. At the scale of water catchment areas, basin management committees provide a framework for integrated management.

Other community conservation initiatives
Further CBNRM initiatives include community rangeland management and conservation agriculture. Neither of these has legally entrenched governance structures and both are managed at area or site level by participants. Both fall under the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry. Conservancies are supporting these initiatives in many areas.

expanding the capacity for good governance

Management structures
Most community conservation initiatives have broadly similar structures, based on a defined resource area, a constitution, an elected committee and annual general meetings of the membership. A variety of management plans usually guide activities related to natural resources, zonation and land-use, sustainable business and financial management, and benefit distribution.

In the interests of the people
Good governance depends on the people doing the governing. It is crucial that community conservation organisations are run in the interests of their members rather than of a small elite. Democratic governance means that members participate in the most important decisions such as approving budgets and benefit distribution. Committees need to be accountable to the members who elect them and there needs to be good, transparent financial management. Democratic governance also means that when committees are not accountable or transparent, members are able to remedy the situation.

Guided by the constitution
The affairs of most community conservation organisations are guided by their constitutions. The constitution is an important tool for good governance, as it provides the foundation for ensuring accountability and transparency in decision-making.

Committee and staff
Community conservation organisations are headed by committees, elected to manage the natural assets of the community, the relationships with business partners, and the income and expenditure of the organisation. Based on funding capacities, the committee employs staff and supervises their activities. Natural resource management forms the core of community conservation functions. Typical employees include managers, game guards, resource monitors, field officers and administrative staff.

The membership
At the heart of community conservation is the relationship between the members and their elected management committee. Ideally, members are able to actively participate in the affairs of the organisation.

The AGM
Annual general meetings provide a vital platform for establishing democratic governance in community conservation organisations. At AGMs, management committee elections are held, annual budgets and financial statements are approved by members, issues are discussed and decisions are taken. The AGM fosters a positive relationship with members, facilitates accountability, and helps to avoid mismanagement, elite capture and corruption. The AGM must be held in compliance with the constitution.

Training and certification
Access to training, formal certification and technical support are vital aspects of consolidating governance foundations. A range of formal CBNRM training modules were formulated in 2011 to create an effective training framework for conservancies.

Empowerment and gender equality
The increased capacity of rural communities to govern themselves and take control of their resources is a major success of community conservation. Previously disenfranchised Namibians are making financial decisions, voting for office bearers and engaging with private sector partners, local and regional authorities and central government. Positions of responsibility are being filled in the tourism and hunting industries, and in a range of conservation roles. The provision of student bursaries from CBNRM income seeks to further increase the range of skills available to rural communities.

There has been a broad increase in the number of women participating in CBNRM governance. This is likely to have a beneficial impact on the overall position of women in rural areas. Progress on gender issues is linked to cultural norms. The community conservation movement embraces a broad spectrum of cultures, and different traditional values have various implications for gender balance.

HIV/AIDS mainstreaming
From 2000 onwards, HIV/AIDS has been mainstreamed into all conservation training programmes to emphasise the importance of fighting the epidemic. The holistic approach highlights the links between HIV prevention and the maintenance of conservancy-based livelihoods, and leverages existing governance structures in conservancies to engage in culturally appropriate prevention activities and behaviour-change communication. Surveys indicate that the initiative has helped to significantly reduce the primary behavioural determinant of the disease’s spread in Africa: men having more than one sexual partner. This strong programme impact has important implications for reducing infections in rural areas of Namibia.
monitoring performance to improve governance

In the same way that resources need to be monitored to enable their effective management, governance can only be successful if it is monitored and evaluated. Some of the performance monitoring systems being used by conservancies are still evolving, yet an impressive array has been implemented. They are owned by the conservancies and designed to display data visually to allow all audiences to understand performance, trends and impacts. Data is limited to indicators with local relevance.

Institutional Development

Information showing the status of institutional development is collected on an annual basis. Data includes the level of involvement of conservancy members in decision-making and benefit distribution. Conservancies use the information to evaluate and improve their governance, and support organisations are able to provide targeted assistance. Table 1 summarises 2012 data.

Natural Resource Management

A simple tool is used to portray the natural resource management performance of conservancies. This provides two outputs: maps illustrating the comparative performance of conservancies (Figure 7), and a performance profile for each conservancy. The maps identify those conservancies most requiring support, while the conservancy performance profile enables weaknesses to be quickly addressed, and support providers to more objectively target their interventions.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional development status category</th>
<th>Status in 2012</th>
<th>Status as a percentage of those reporting on it</th>
<th>No. of conservancies reporting on status category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered conservancies (incl. Kyaramacan Ass.)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving generating returns</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering operational costs from own income</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing cash or in-kind benefits to members, or investing in community projects</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy management committee members</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female management committee members</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female chairpersons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female treasurers/financial managers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy staff members</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female staff members</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy with Management Plans</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Business and Financial Plans</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy AGMs held</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reports presented at AGM</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reports approved at AGM</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets approved at AGM</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancies that are members of a regional conservation association</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 injecting with related governance structures

Traditional Authorities

Traditional Authorities play a very important role in communal areas. In most conservancies, the active involvement of Traditional Authority representatives ensures a positive relationship. Where this is not the case, conflicts often arise over resources and benefits. The Forestry Act stipulates that a community forest may only be registered with the consent of the Traditional Authority, facilitating collaboration from the outset.

Regional Councils

All community conservation organisations must comply with a variety of government regulations. By ensuring good communication with Regional Councils, community conservation organisations enable improved coordination of activities and land use planning.

Regional Land Boards

Regional Land Boards of the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement play an important role in land use allocation and regulation. Active collaboration with Land Boards avoids conflicts and improves land use planning.

Business, Enterprises and Livelihoods

A simple tool is used to portray the natural resource management performance of conservancies. This provides two outputs: maps illustrating the comparative performance of conservancies (Figure 7), and a performance profile for each conservancy. The maps identify those conservancies most requiring support, while the conservancy performance profile enables weaknesses to be quickly addressed, and support providers to more objectively target their interventions.

FIGURE 7. Event Book reporting compliance in conservancies

The map indicates compliance with Event Book reporting requirements. ‘No audit’, ‘no reporting’ and ‘partial reporting’ all show organisational weaknesses that should be addressed. Detailed information on the Event Book is provided on page 28 in Chapter 3.

No audit

Partial reporting

Full reporting

No reporting

Event Book reporting compliance in conservancies in 2012

A broad support network for CBNRM initiatives is provided through the members of the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO). NACSO embraces a variety of NGOs and individual members, who provide a great range of technical and funding support to community conservation. NACSO acts mainly as a platform facilitating communication, collaboration and coordination amongst its members and the broader CBNRM stakeholder community. The Association is headed by a small secretariat, while three dedicated working groups provide technical advice and support the coordination of activities. The Institutional Development Working Group (IDWG), the Natural Resources Working Group (NRWG) and the Business, Enterprises and Livelihoods Working Group (BELWG) are flexible constellations of key stakeholders that pool experience and resources to provide effective support. A list with contact details of conservancies, community forests, line ministries, NACSO members and private sector partners is provided on pages 60-63. [more info: www.nacso.org.na]

Community have been empowered to formally engage with stakeholders at all levels, from private sector operators to government ministers and parliamentarians. Here Torra residents discuss issues with a member of parliament.
Modern approaches and technologies introduced by community conservation are enhancing the value of natural resources and improving their use. Innovative systems are being applied to unlock the full potential of natural resources as a driver of rural economic growth and development. Simultaneously, this encourages environmental restoration and biodiversity conservation, and is linking individual entities into vast conservation landscapes where wildlife can roam for the benefit of the people.
Natural resources at a glance:

At the end of 2012 there were...

- 79 conservancies using the Event Book (incl. unregistered conservancies & Kyaramacan Ass.)
- 50 conservancies conducting an annual game count
- 4 national parks undertaking collaborative monitoring with conservancies
- 29 conservancies directly involved in tourism activities
- 45 conservancies with trophy hunting concessions
- 54 conservancies holding quota setting meetings
- 26 conservancies with a wildlife management plan
- 23 conservancies with a zonation plan
- 429 game guards and 30 resource monitors working in conservancies

What’s being achieved?

Community conservation is...

- combating poaching and other illegal activities
- mitigating human wildlife conflict and limiting losses incurred through living with wildlife
- zoning areas for different land uses to reduce conflicts
- enabling wildlife recoveries, effective natural resource management and environmental restoration
- working with neighbours to promote a large landscape approach to natural resource management
- black rhinos occur in 15 conservancies
- elephants occur in 46 conservancies
- lions occur in 24 conservancies
- species that had become locally extinct in the Zambezi Region, such as eland and giraffe, are thriving after re-introductions
- the North West Game Count is the largest annual, road-based game count in the world

New in 2012:

- piloting of new resource management tools
- targeted training in adaptive management

The biggest challenges?

- managing human wildlife conflict
- countering unfounded pressure on sustainable use from the anti-hunting lobby
- minimising impacts and optimising returns from consumptive game use

market-based conservation

Innovative approaches are required to effectively manage wildlife and other natural resources outside state protected areas, where local communities live. Especially in communal areas, where people use a variety of livelihood strategies, success depends on the benefits gained from natural resource use. Market-based conservation creates the needed linkages between conservation goals and the economic value of natural resources in order to deliver significant economic returns and in-kind benefits while safeguarding the environment. This chapter portrays the main resources being managed, and the systems being used to manage them.

resources and approaches

All natural resources are interlinked within the diversity of life. While different government structures have been developed to manage wildlife, plant and fish resources, it is possible for communities to integrate these and other sectors to avoid conflicts, and ensure cohesive overall land use and resource management.

Charismatic African wildlife

Wildlife is one of the greatest resources of Africa. Tourists come to Namibia firstly to see wildlife in the stunning, unfenced settings our country offers. Healthy populations of charismatic wildlife such as the Big Five – elephant, rhino, buffalo, leopard and lion – create a tourism value that is not easily surpassed by other land uses. Adding other rare and valuable species such as cheetah, wild dog, roan and sable, as well as classic tourism favourites such as zebra, giraffe, hippo, crocodile and antelope to the list further increases that value. The effective management of this immeasurable resource lies at the heart of community conservation. Conservancy management has facilitated large scale wildlife recoveries and enables the protection of valuable species, which is allowing wildlife values to be realised. All wildlife use is regulated through a system of annually reviewed quotas, permits and reporting.

Flourishing indigenous flora

Known mostly for its stunning desert scenery, Namibia is not perceived as a country of forests, yet forest resources form an extremely valuable asset for many rural communities. The use of a great variety of non-timber plant resources from all parts of the country is underlining the value of our indigenous flora. Woodlands in the north and north east harbour a variety of valuable trees such as kiaat and Zambezi teak with commercial timber value, and burkea and ushivi, used for construction. The growing range of veld products includes devil’s claw tubers, onumbiri (commiphora wildii) resin, Kalahari melon seed, thatching grass, as well as marula, baobab, Ximenia and Sarcoacaulon fruits. Harvesting is regulated through a licensing system and plant product user groups have formed to coordinate harvesting and marketing activities.

International corporations are searching the globe for new biological ingredients for their products, an activity called bio-prospecting. While this is likely to open further opportunities within the plant sector, bio-prospecting needs to be carefully controlled. Namibia is taking steps to safeguard its resources from uncontrolled exploitation.

Fabulous fish

Namibia’s northern rivers harbour excellent fish resources, including fine food fish as well as sport angling favourites such as tigerfish, catfish and bream. Inland fisheries are an important resource for communities. Fish productivity in rivers can be optimised by creating community fish reserves that facilitate undisturbed breeding. Although netting is generally not allowed within the reserves, communities enjoy increased fish harvests in adjacent areas, as healthy populations of large fish disperse. This is also beneficial to sport angling offered by tourism lodges, who may practice catch-and-release. In the absence of a clear legal framework empowering local communities to manage fish resources, conservancies are assisting in the issuing of fishing licenses.

Healthy rangeland

Healthy rangeland is a vital communal resource, forming the basis of domestic stock as well as wildlife production. Community rangeland management is a holistic approach that combines cutting edge rangeland science with traditional herding and animal husbandry techniques to ensure that sustainable rangeland practices are implemented. Grazing activities in rangeland areas are managed in a collaborative effort by participating farmers.

Productive soils

Conservation agriculture is a simple method designed to optimise crops yields in areas of relatively low or erratic rainfall and poor soils. The method applies various techniques to improve soil quality and optimise the use of rainwater. It produces good harvests from small areas, can increase yields without fertiliser by over 60% and increases harvesting chances in years of erratic rainfall. Conservation agriculture is being implemented by more and more communal farmers.

Vital water

Water is the basis of all life. In a dry country like Namibia, water management is particularly crucial. Especially at the level of water basin management, important collaboration can take place amongst the various land use sectors to ensure healthy water supplies.

The value of diversity and endemism

The conservation of biodiversity is a key objective of community conservation. The most notable biodiversity ‘hot spots’ are in the north-east of Namibia. By contrast, concentrations of endemic species are greatest in the dry western and north-western regions. Endemics are species whose distribution is largely or completely confined to Namibia, and our country has a special responsibility for their conservation. Through sustainable management of natural resources, conservancies and community forests are making valuable contributions to the conservation of both biodiversity and endemism (Figure 8).
Healthy wildlife populations

Remarkable wildlife recoveries

Conservation efforts to minimise poaching and ensure sustainable use have been rewarded by remarkable wildlife recoveries. This is most evident in the north-west, where wildlife had been reduced to small numbers through illegal hunting and drought by the early 1980s. It is estimated that there were only 250 elephants and 65 black rhino in the north-west at this time, and populations of other large mammals had been reduced by 60 to 90% since the early 1970s. Data from species experts shows that numbers of black rhinos and elephants have tripled since then. Aerial surveys indicate that springbok, gemsbok and mountain zebra populations increased over 10 times between 1982 and 2000 (Figure 9).

The game is free to move

Data from the annual North-West Game Count indicates clear fluctuations in the average number of animals seen per 100 kilometres driven (Figure 10). Game movement and range expansion into inaccessible terrain currently not being surveyed, and into areas outside the survey zone, appear to be the main explanation for the fluctuations. Limitations in the accuracy of the census methods may also play a role. Finding ways to cover more of the inaccessible terrain currently excluded from the counts and expanding the census to cover adjacent areas would provide a more accurate picture. Additional monitoring that provides more information on seasonal migrations of springbok and gemsbok would also help to answer some of the current questions. Importantly, while they are fluctuating, the estimated numbers of all species remain at or above the estimates recorded through the aerial surveys at the end of the recovery period.

Maintaining healthy populations

It is unrealistic to expect game populations in communal areas to continue to increase indefinitely to the kind of abundance found in national parks. Communal lands are not parks, but areas where local communities engage in a variety of livelihood activities. In community conservation areas, people have agreed to include natural resource management in the range of activities being practiced. Land use priorities are shifting to a healthy diversity where wildlife is not only tolerated, but communities are investing their own funds into conservation activities. Wildlife is managed in accordance with a community’s land use priorities, based on monitoring and off-take quotas.

Resource monitoring

GAME COUNTS

Most conservancies conduct periodic game censuses. The biggest of these is the North-West Game Count, conducted annually since 1999 (Figure 10). The count includes all the conservancies and tourism concessions outside of national parks in the north-west and is the largest annual road-based game count in the world. It covers an area of around seven million hectares and is undertaken as a joint exercise between conservancy members and staff, and MET and NGO staff. The same methodology has been expanded to conservancies and protected areas in the south of Namibia. Conservancies in other parts of the country also carry out annual game counts, but the methods differ to accommodate local conditions. Conservancies in the east perform an annual moonlight waterhole count, while conservancies in the north-east undertake counts on foot along fixed routes. All census methods are intended to contribute to and work synergistically with other existing census methods, such as the aerial censuses conducted by the MET.

AERIAL CENSUSES

Regular aerial censuses have been undertaken by the MET in different parts of Namibia. These confirm wildlife increases in both the north-west and north-east.
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The data also underlines the value of using different counting methods to gain a better understanding of wildlife dynamics.

THE EVENT BOOK

The Event Book is a highly successful management tool initiated in the year 2000. It has been continuously refined and is used by almost all registered conservancies, while being systematically introduced to upcoming conservancies during their formation. The simple but rigorous tool promotes conservancy involvement in the design, planning and implementation of natural resource monitoring. Each conservancy decides which resources it needs to monitor, bearing in mind issues on which conservancies are obliged to report to the MET. The resources or themes identified may include human wildlife conflict, poaching, rainfall, rangeland condition, predators and fire. The suite of resources being monitored is increasing and includes plants, fish, honey and even livestock. For each topic there is a complete system that begins with systematic data collection, goes through monthly reporting and includes long-term reporting.

Every year, an annual audit of the system is conducted where all data is collated into a conservancy’s annual natural resource report, which the conservancy uses as an important management tool. The report is also sent to the MET and provided to NACSO to update its databases, an important management tool. The report is also sent to the MET and provided to NACSO to update its databases, thus underlining the value of using different counting methods to gain a better understanding of wildlife dynamics.

Defining and tracking wildlife status

Once initial wildlife recoveries from population lows have been achieved, management aims change to maintaining game populations between lower and upper thresholds. Maintaining numbers above the lower threshold ensures that the species is able to recover from external impacts (drought, disease, predation, utilisation, poaching). Keeping numbers below the upper threshold ensures that the population stays in balance with its habitat and other land uses. Tracking population trends with the expectation that wildlife numbers should always increase is not an appropriate approach in the longer term. More sophisticated monitoring tools now define the ‘species richness’ and ‘population health’ of game in conservancies. Using game count data and information from a wide variety of other sources, wildlife experts compile ‘species richness’ lists for each conservancy. These show the present diversity of species in the conservancy relative to what occurred historically. The population health of each species is also scored, and from the two sets of information maps are generated to portray wildlife status in conservancies (Figure 12).

Meticulous monitoring is a core component of effective natural resource management. In many areas, monitoring is carried out as a collaborative effort between community conservation organisations and ministry staff.

more innovative tools

Staffing

Community conservation is by the people for the people and community participation has grown ever since local leaders first appointed community game guards to look after wildlife in the north-west in the early 1980s. Adequate staffing is a vital component of effective resource management, and an increasing number of people are formally employed by conservancies.

Mapping

A mapping service was developed to enable conservancies, the MET and support NGOs to generate detailed conservation maps for registration, planning, management, monitoring and communication. Boundaries are established and mapped first, which is important in publicly proclaiming the existence of a conservancy. Detailed maps show important features for planning and monitoring purposes. The entire process is participatory, with community members being trained to gather data that results in maps with local relevance and ownership.

Zoning

Land use planning has to consider both the needs of farmers to grow crops and rear livestock, and of wildlife to move across the landscape. Zoning conservancies for different land uses can significantly reduce conflicts, while wildlife corridors allow movement between seasonal ranges, reducing local pressure. Many conservancies have zoned their areas, but are constrained by the fact that they do not have legal powers to enforce the zones. Conservancies are working with traditional leaders and regional land boards to make zonation more enforceable.

Quota setting

All consumptive use of wildlife in conservancies is controlled through annual quotas that define the number of animals that may be used. The system has been in place since 1998 and is coordinated by the MET with support from NGOs. Annual quota setting meetings held in each conservancy take into account both local knowledge and collected information, including game census and Event Book data, harvest returns and desired stocking rates. The meetings allow discussion, review a community’s vision for each species and encourage input from private sector operators in the area. The community agrees on quotas for own-use, trophy hunting, shoot-and sell or live-capture-and-sell. Conservancies then request the quotas from the MET, and these are scrutinised in Windhoek before being approved or amended.

Game use rates and population numbers

Harvest rates require careful consideration based on sound scientific methods. Depending on environmental conditions, springbok populations can, for example, grow by 40% per year, while gemsbok and zebra populations may grow by 20%. Harvest rates of less than 20% per year for these species are thus unlikely to reduce overall populations under normal conditions. Game use data shows that harvest rates remain well below estimated growth rates, even as a percentage of the animals actually seen during game counts. It is impossible to see all animals during a count and compared to likely population estimates, use rates are minimal.

FIGURE 12. Species richness and population health of wildlife in conservancies

The wildlife species richness map (left) indicates the percentage of all large wildlife species that historically occurred, which are currently present in a particular conservancy. The wildlife population health (right) indicates the percentage of all large wildlife species that historically occurred, which currently have a healthy population in a particular conservancy.
boosting wildlife numbers

Targeted reintroductions of game, which boost natural increases to help rapidly rebuild the wildlife base, are allowing natural resource benefits to be realised more rapidly. Whilst the bulk of the species being moved are common game such as springbok, gemsbok, kudu and eland, the introductions have also included highly valuable animals such as sable, black-faced impala, giraffe and black rhino (Table 2). The game has been moved from areas where there is an oversupply of animals to areas where populations are low.

reclaiming range

The range of several species that had become locally extinct, namely giraffe, black-faced impala, Burchell’s zebra, blue wildebeest, eland, sable and black rhino, has been re-established through translocations. Conservancy formation has helped to re-stake the range of these species. A number of conservancies are now officially recognised as rhino custodians. The fact that communities are trusted by the Namibian government to be custodians of highly endangered and valuable species is testimony to the conservation performance of conservancies. Namibia is the only country in the world where black rhinos are being translocated out of national parks into communal areas.

TABLE 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common impala</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-faced impala</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartebeest</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue wildebeest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbuck</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchell’s zebra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann’s zebra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rhino</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>10,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceived threat 

The status of large predators can be a useful indicator of the health of wildlife populations. The remarkable recovery of the iconic desert-adapted lions in the north-west in both numbers and range after years of vehement persecution is a clear indication of the health of the prey base, as well as of a greater commitment by local communities to tolerate potential ‘problem animals’ that have great value (Figure 13). The perceived threat posed by lions continues to be disproportional to damage caused by this species, perhaps because it is also feared as a threat to human life (Figure 14). Yet the expansion of the population is being tolerated, and is facilitated by community conservation.

Population trends of other large predators in north-western conservancies have generally been stable or increasing. In the Zambezi Region, where game count trend data are less reliable due to methodological difficulties, sighting trends of predators are important indicators for trends in prey species. The numbers of all predators occurring in communal areas remain well above pre-conservancy levels.

Table 2.

Translocations of wildlife into conservancies

Between 1999 and 2012, a total of 10,023 animals of 15 different species were translocated to 31 registered conservancies and four conservancy complexes. The total value of the translocated animals (excluding black rhino) is in excess of N$ 30 million.

FIGURE 13.

Lion range expansion Numbers of the iconic ‘desert’ lions have increased dramatically from a low of around 25 individuals in 1995 to over 150 in 2012. The maps show the equally dramatic range expansion over this period. Lions are once again wandering along the misty shores of the Skeleton Coast, creating a spectacular tourism attraction. The fact that people are tolerating the presence of lions is a clear indication of the conservation commitment of rural communities.
managing human wildlife conflict

Perceptions of the problem
Wildlife is generating increasing cash income and in-kind benefits for rural communities, yet it regularly comes into conflict with farming activities. Perceptions of the conflicts are often skewed or exaggerated. The widespread belief that human wildlife conflict continues to increase is wrong. Total recorded incidents are increasing, because the number of conservancies is increasing, yet the average number of incidents per conservancy remains generally stable (Table 3). Data shows which species are causing most problems in which areas, and illustrates a disproportionate control of certain species, which are perceived to be the biggest threat, even though the data indicates otherwise (Figure 14).

Table 3. Human wildlife conflict incidents across all registered conservancies
The steady increase in the total number of human wildlife conflict incidents in conservancies is due to the increase in the number of conservancies, as the average number of incidents per conservancy has remained relatively stable for all categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total conflict incidents from all conservancies</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>7,659</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>7,298</td>
<td>7,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of conservancies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of human attacks per conservancy</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of livestock attacks per conservancy</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of crop damage incidents per conservancy</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of other damage incidents per conservancy</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total incidents per conservancy</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National guidelines
The MET launched the Human Wildlife Conflict Policy in 2009 to provide national guidelines for conflict mitigation. The policy makes clear that wildlife is just that – wild, and a part of the natural environment. Although government coordinates its protection, it cannot be held responsible for damage caused by wildlife. The policy sets out a framework for managing wildlife conflicts, where the conflict is vital in promoting community willingness to live with wildlife and to accept the challenges associated with this.

Avoiding conflicts
Conservancies, the MET and NGOs continue to develop innovative mitigation measures. Chili is used as a deterrent to keep elephants away from crops, crocodile fences provide safe access to water, predator-secure enclosures protect livestock, and physical barriers protect water infrastructure from elephants. Appropriate land-use planning and zoning are key elements in avoiding conflicts, while generating tangible benefits from wildlife is vital in promoting community willingness to live with wildlife and to accept the challenges associated with this.

Self-insurance
Prior to the launch of the MET Policy, conservancies in the Zambezi and Kunene Regions had already implemented the Human Animal Conflict Conservancy Self Insurance Scheme (HACCSS). Through this, losses to conservancy members were offset. Conservancies paid a major portion of the claims from own income, matched by donor funding, and took the lead in running the scheme.

Strict conditions for offsets
The Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme makes payments under strict conditions. Incidents must be reported within 24 hours and verified by the MET or a conservancy game guard. Payments will only be made if reasonable precautions were taken. Initial funding for the scheme was provided through the Game Products Trust Fund. All conservancies received a start-up fund, to which they are expected to add own funding. A portion of the income from problem animals that need to be destroyed flows back to the Game Products Trust Fund.

The impacts of human wildlife conflict on individual households can be severe, yet perceptions of the overall scale of the problem are often skewed. Here, a woman in Ehi-Rovipuka is faced with livestock losses to lions.
encompassing vast landscapes

Each year, the area embraced by community conservation continues to expand, increasing the number of people who benefit from natural resource use, as well as expanding the national conservation network. Whilst the level of conservation management differs within the various areas, all endorse the principle of sustainability and the elimination of illegal and destructive use of natural resources. This landscape connectivity spreading across Namibia is vital in ensuring environmental resilience and countering the impacts of climate change. The developments must be considered as a huge success in Namibia’s efforts to fulfil its constitutional commitment to safeguard the environment while at the same time achieving economic growth and rural development. CBNRM is recognised by the Namibian government as contributing to a range of national development goals, including several for the environment (Table 4).

TABLE 4.
CBNRM contributions to National Development Plan 4 aims related to the environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBNRM contribution</th>
<th>National Development Plan 4 aims related to the environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting biomes and habitats</td>
<td>What we cherish as a nation: pages 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community conservation embraces increasing portions of Namibia’s major biomes,</td>
<td>• is firmly grounded in article 95 of the Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetation types and wetland habitats (Figure 15 and Table 5). For many of the</td>
<td>• promotes equal access to natural resources through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categories, conservancies provide the largest portion of protection. Although</td>
<td>• formal management structures and participatory processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riverine habitats are spatially small in the context of the entire country, their</td>
<td>(77 conservancies, 13 community forests, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance is magnified because they cross arid land and provide critical refugia</td>
<td>community rangeland management sites etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for wildlife. Conservancies in north-western Namibia provide critical protection</td>
<td>• reduces environmental degradation through structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of these habitats, but they are less well protected in the western eastern regions</td>
<td>• natural resource management and use activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Kavango and Zambezi. This is due to the tendency for roads and associated</td>
<td>• emphasises a precautionary approach through natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlements to have developed along river courses.</td>
<td>• resource monitoring, evaluation and quotas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• creates landscape-level connectivity which mitigates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the effects of climate change on wildlife and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reduces pressure on individual resources through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• land-use diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promotes environmental responsibility through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community-owned structures and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>• enables sustainable use of natural resources through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We fully embrace...development that meets the needs of the present without</td>
<td>• formal management structures, benefitting present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limiting the ability of future generations to meet their own needs...we encourage</td>
<td>generations while conserving resources for future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people...to take responsibility for their own development...to promote...</td>
<td>• encourages a sense of ownership over natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...addresses the needs of the people and require increasing community contributions</td>
<td>resources and responsibility for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to development services and infrastructure.”</td>
<td>• addresses the needs of the people and increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Enablers:</td>
<td>• community contributions through community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management – pages 35 &amp; 39</td>
<td>• in activities and decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “The environmental challenges in Namibia include freshwater scarcity, land</td>
<td>• facilitates the reduction and reversal of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degradation, deforestation...and vulnerability to climate change...”</td>
<td>• and sustainable natural resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “The environmental strategies being NAP4 and beyond will include...the</td>
<td>• facilitates wise use of freshwater resources through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of an integrated (including spatial) planning...[and] the</td>
<td>• community water associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of the CBNRM programme.”</td>
<td>• facilitates integrated land-use planning through formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• management structures and collaboration with other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community, government and private sector stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• facilitates the implementation of CBNRM programme aims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting biomes and habitats
Community conservation embraces increasing portions of Namibia’s major biomes, vegetation types and wetland habitats (Figure 15 and Table 5). For many of the categories, conservancies provide the largest portion of protection. Although riverine habitats are spatially small in the context of the entire country, their importance is magnified because they cross arid land and provide critical refugia for wildlife. Conservancies in north-western Namibia provide critical protection of these habitats, but they are less well protected in the western eastern regions of Kavango and Zambezi. This is due to the tendency for roads and associated settlements to have developed along river courses.

FIGURE 15 AND TABLE 5.
Contributions to the protection of Namibia’s major biomes, vegetation types and wetlands

The map shows communal conservancies, community forests, state protected areas, tourism concessions and freehold conservancies in relation to Namibia’s main vegetation types and major biomes. The table indicates the portions of particular habitats and biomes covered by each conservation category, as well as the total percentage of the area covered and receiving protection through this.
**collaborative conservation**

In several areas, adjacent community conservation areas and national parks are working together in joint management forums that allow collaborative landscape level management and planning. The advantages of such collaboration include more effective management of mobile wildlife populations, improved monitoring and land-use planning, and more effective anti-poaching activities and fire management. Such approaches are also more cost effective and facilitate the availability of needed capacities and resources. Importantly, the complexes provide the impetus for the implementation of zonation that sets aside areas for wildlife and wildlife-based enterprises. The complexes remove barriers to connectivity and generate economies of scale for both investments and enterprise opportunities. The Mudumu North Complex, Khaudum North Complex and Greater Waterberg Complex are examples of such collaboration.

**Joining the parts**

Many conservancies adjoin other conservation areas, creating immense contiguous areas under sustainable resource management (Figure 17 and Table 6). The largest contiguous area is created in the arid north-west, where conservancies and tourism concession areas now form the entire eastern boundary of the Skeleton Coast Park and create a broad link to Etosha National Park through adjacent conservancies. The Kuiseb Valley Conservancy, which is the largest of the conservancies, connects with the adjacent conservancies in the Kuiseb Basin and also serves as a gateway to the Etosha Pan and the Namib Desert. The Kuiseb Valley Conservancy also provides a link to the Hoanib River, which is one of the main water sources for the Namib Desert.

**Across borders**

The Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area is one of the largest transfrontier conservation areas in Africa, covering parts of five countries: Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The area is home to a diverse range of wildlife species, including endangered species such as the African wild dog, black rhinoceros, and the black-footed ferret. The area is also important for the movement of wildlife across borders, allowing species to disperse and maintain genetic diversity.

**the scale of community conservation...**

158,247 square kilometres of land had been gazetted in 77 communal conservancies at the end of 2012. This represents 51.8% of all communal land in Namibia and 19.2% of Namibia’s total land area. At the same time, 13 community forests covering an area of 4,385 square kilometres had been gazetted. Six of the community forests have some overlap with conservancies. It is thus not possible to simply add the two land areas together to arrive at a total figure for the communal area under sustainable use. Taking this into consideration, the overall surface covered by community conservation at the end of 2012 was 159,755 square kilometres. In combination with the 16.8% covered by state protected areas, 0.8% by tourism concessions and another 6.1% in freehold conservancies, this brought the total land surface in Namibia covered by sustainable resource management and biodiversity objectives to 43.1% at the end of 2012.

**FIGURE 16. Increase in shared boundaries**

The percentage of state protected area boundaries in communal areas shared with conservancies, concession areas and community forests has increased dramatically since 1997 to about 78% at the end of 2012.

**FIGURE 17 AND TABLE 6. Contiguous conservation areas**

The contiguous areas under sustainable natural resource management created through community conservation linkages with state protected areas and initiatives on freehold land continue to grow. This enables landscape-level approaches that allow wildlife populations to move freely according to seasonal needs. In addition to the huge areas created within Namibia, important transboundary linkages are also created with the Iona/Skeleton Coast, KAZA and Halali/Ais/Richtersveld transfrontier conservation areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contiguous area</th>
<th>State protected areas</th>
<th>Community conservation/concessions</th>
<th>Freehold conservancies</th>
<th>Private reserves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal parks, Ai-Ais &amp; Etosha NP</td>
<td>124,669</td>
<td>90,787</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>225,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterberg, Khaudum NP</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>59,943</td>
<td>7,314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bwabwata, Mudumu, Mamili</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>138,437</td>
<td>152,686</td>
<td>14,524</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>306,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration is a key to large scale conservation success. A good relationship between government agencies, community conservation organisations and private sector partners enables effective landscape level management.
Community conservation is changing the face of rural Namibia. People have increasing access to a suite of new livelihood options based on wildlife, indigenous plants, fish and a variety of other natural resources. New job opportunities and benefit streams are being created, strengthening the economies of communal areas. Communities are able to integrate livestock herding, crop production, natural resource management and other activities into a balanced overall land use.

diversifying options and increasing opportunities... returns from wildlife and other natural resources generated through community conservation have proven to be substantial. The variety of opportunities and direct rewards being created add a new dimension to community empowerment that traditional forms of land use are not able to deliver on their own. This is particularly valuable in communal areas where human development needs are high and the chances of making a reliable living from traditional land uses are limited by low and erratic rainfall, infertile soils and limited access to markets and services. By diversifying land use and livelihood options and choosing a balanced mix of activities, communities can optimise the potential of their land and its resources. This reduces susceptibility to the impacts of climate change and other threats. Cultural and social benefits include empowerment, fostering community cohesion and keeping communities in touch with the resources that their ancestors valued.

to improve lives... means facilitating economic opportunities and empowering people to make their own choices from amongst a range of livelihood options that enable a healthy and dignified existence...
improving the livelihoods of rural people

Achieving aims
Since its inception, the community conservation movement has increasingly delivered on one of its central aims: improving the lives of rural people through the sustainable use of natural resources. The movement is generating increasing returns for people in communal areas, where economic opportunities were historically very limited. One of the most effective and common strategies for living in drylands and marginal areas is to diversify incomes. Natural resource use is a livelihood diversification. The aim is not to displace other activities, but to apply the most productive mix of land uses.

A productive mix of activities
Livelihoods in communal areas are usually composed of a mix of agricultural activities supplemented by cash income from wages, trade and pensions. Community conservation is significantly expanding this range by creating new jobs in tourism, hunting and conservation activities, providing a variety of in-kind benefits including game meat, improved access to transport, education, health and training, and by generating cash income for community conservation entities to cover their operational costs and fund social projects.

A growing diversity
While most community conservation returns have been generated within conservancies, there is a growing diversity of natural resource sectors that are generating income and benefits for communal area residents. The value of natural resources is increasing, as innovative approaches are being applied, international recognition of their potential grows, and market linkages are improving. This chapter portrays the returns currently being generated and how they can be further expanded.

appreciating potential differences

Significant differences exist between conservancies. There are vast differences in size (the biggest conservancies are more than 200 times as large as the smallest), as well as in the number of residents (ranging from several hundred to more than 30,000). Topography, rainfall and natural habitat, proximity to urban centres, land-use activities and other factors all influence the quantity and quality of natural resources available in a given area. There are big differences in the degrees of conservancy development, based on when a conservancy was registered, the level of commitment of the people involved, the availability of transport, electricity and water infrastructure, and the amount of support received.

Private sector involvement varies significantly from one area to the next, influenced by location, accessibility and tourism potential. All of these factors result in great differences in the potential to generate cash income and in-kind benefits. Figure 10 shows the differing earning power of conservancies. Clearly, conservancies should never be treated as if they were all the same. It is important to differentiate when evaluating the achievements of, or considering interventions in, conservancies. Nonetheless, all conservancies can empower communities to diversify their land-use options and provide important natural resource management services.

What's being achieved?
Community conservation...
• generated total cash income and in-kind benefits to rural communities of over N$ 58,364,273 in 2012
• trophy hunting generated N$ 17,238,895 in fees for conservancies
• tourism generated N$ 6,541,204 in fees for conservancies
• indigenous plants generated N$ 464,310 in fees for conservancies
• conservancy residents earned a total cash income of N$ 19,620,354 from enterprise wages (mostly tourism) and N$ 9,285,334 from conservancy wages
• of the total income to conservancy residents, N$ 3,794,072 was from indigenous plants and N$ 967,620 was from conservancy wages
• 498,523 kg of game meat worth N$ 8,475,350 was distributed to conservancy residents
• N$ 5,269,723 in cash benefits was distributed to conservancy residents
• thatching grass generated N$ 2,201,575 for communities

New in 2012:
• MCA-Namibia provided grants for JV tourism development
• joint venture tourism concessions were granted to conservancies (Hobate, Etendeke, Palmwag)

The biggest challenges?
• optimising land allocation and administration in communal areas
• increasing engagement with the private sector, e.g. with mobile operators
• increasing individual household returns from natural resource use
• developing revenue streams in areas with low tourism potential or few natural resources
TABLE 8. Living in conservancies

The size and population density of communal areas varies significantly across the different regions of Namibia, as does the diversity and abundance of natural resources in them. These and other factors influence the percentage of communal area residents living in conservancies. In the communal areas of some regions, the entire population lives in conservancies. In the north-central regions, more than 40,000 people live in conservancies, although this represents only around 5% of people in the densely populated area, many of whom live in urban centres. Other regions have only small communal areas, or none at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of people living in conservancies</th>
<th>Percentage of all communal area residents in region(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karas</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavango (E &amp; W)</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>43,307</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohangwena</td>
<td>42,696</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>6,558</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshana, Ohangwena, Oshana, Okahandja</td>
<td>35,124</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>28,589</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramab</td>
<td>28,589</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172,228</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment is one of the greatest benefits facilitated through community conservation.

Embracing the population

All communal area residents of the Otjozondjupa Region live in conservancies. In Kunene, conservancies embrace over two thirds of all people in communal areas, and in Erongo more than half. The Karas, Zambezi and Omaheke Regions also have a large portion of communal area residents living in conservancies. These people do not all receive direct returns from natural resource use, yet the areas certainly benefit from improved resource management and communities benefit in a variety of ways. In conservancies with a small population and an abundance of natural resources, individual households receive significant returns each year. Population estimates are shown in Table 8 and Figure 19.

The estimated number of people living in the different conservancies of Namibia varies from less than 100 to over 32,000 people.

wildlife as a driver of economic growth

Wildlife is central to generating returns from CBNRM. Game has a range of high-value uses and many species are able to breed quickly, allowing for rapid wildlife recoveries in areas with suitable habitat where game has become scarce. By turning wildlife use into a viable livelihood activity, and complementing it with other natural resource uses, community conservation can make a real difference in the lives of rural people, facilitated through effective overall management structures and improved access to markets. As private sector engagement in community conservation broadens, more opportunities continue to open up.

the complimentary roles of tourism and trophy hunting

Generating the highest returns

The largest portions of CBNRM returns come from tourism and hunting. The merits of hunting as a conservation tool compared to photographic tourism are often debated intensely. Community conservation emphasises the importance of using as broad a range of natural resources as possible to enhance their value and ensure their protection, as well as the protection of large areas of natural habitat. The Namibian model illustrates that it is extremely valuable to use wildlife for both tourism and hunting. Optimum returns are facilitated through strategic partnerships with the private sector, which offers specialised skills and market linkages. Capacity building and skills transfer create further benefits. Communities have the opportunity to ‘grow into’ both sectors and over time run successful community-owned tourism and trophy hunting enterprises. Figure 20 compares the two sectors.
A variety of community tourism enterprises, owned and operated by local communities, are offering exciting, authentic experiences such as living museums, craft centres and demonstrations to visitors. These enterprises provide important revenue and employment to community members, yet the potential of this sector can be further enhanced through targeted support.

**Trophy hunting and game harvesting**

Trophy hunting concessions in Namibia’s communal areas are providing some of the greatest hunting experiences on the African continent. Hunting is often wrongly criticised as having negative impacts on wildlife, but trophy hunting utilises such an insignificant percentage of the population (mostly post-reproductive males) that it generally has no impact on overall populations. It is important to note that most conservancies (including three of the first four that were registered), would not have been viable and probably would not have been established without wildlife use through hunting to initially fund conservancy operations. Cash income from trophy hunting continues to provide critical finance to cover the costs of conservation activities.

Cash income and in-kind benefits from trophy hunting are generated shortly after the registration of a conservancy and the awarding of a trophy hunting contact, providing a timely reward to communities for their conservation efforts. Conservancies may take longer to receive cash income from joint venture lodges due to more complex agreements, as well as much higher development costs. Joint ventures have an indirect fee structure based on a percentage of turnover, while hunting fees are based on a direct price per animal. Importantly, hunting is possible in areas that have little or no tourism potential due to their location or lack of scenic interest. Figure 21 shows in which areas each sector generates most returns. Other returns from trophy hunting include employment, training and the distribution of meat from hunted animals. Although meat is an in-kind benefit, it provides a very direct return. Apart from its nutritional value, game meat distribution strengthens local support for wildlife and conservancies, because people see the link between wildlife and conservation in the form of a tangible benefit. This is rated as a key benefit by most conservancy members, many of whom are poor and cannot afford to buy much meat.

Premium hunting is similar to trophy hunting, yet focusses only on the hunting experience. The visiting hunter does not take home a trophy and pays a much lower fee. Premium hunting is currently not practiced widely.

**Shoot-and-sell harvesting**

Shoot-and-sell harvesting allows conservancies to harvest meat from surplus wildlife stocks for sale to butcheries or individuals outside the conservancy, but needs to be carefully controlled to avoid negative impacts, as larger numbers are often harvested.

A rapid growth in wildlife numbers has allowed some conservancies to initiate live capture operations to sell wildlife to other conservancies or private landowners. The capture is handled by professionals and the cost thereof becomes part of the transaction between seller and buyer. In addition to generating income, the translocation of surplus wildlife into areas with low populations assists the rapid recovery of overall wildlife stocks in Namibia.

**Marketing Namibia**

All of Namibia is benefiting from the country’s status as a community conservation model, which is achieving a balance between conservation and community development. Tourism and hunting operators active in conservancies have a distinct marketing advantage in this regard, especially if they can show that they are contributing to the success story through the equitable sharing of their income and by engaging with communities in other development activities.

Shoot-and-sell harvesting allows conservancies to harvest meat from surplus wildlife stocks for sale to butcheries or individuals outside the conservancy, but needs to be carefully controlled to avoid negative impacts, as larger numbers are often harvested.

A rapid growth in wildlife numbers has allowed some conservancies to initiate live capture operations to sell wildlife to other conservancies or private landowners. The capture is handled by professionals and the cost thereof becomes part of the transaction between seller and buyer. In addition to generating income, the translocation of surplus wildlife into areas with low populations assists the rapid recovery of overall wildlife stocks in Namibia.

**Emphasising equitable resource use**

It is sometimes argued that tourism and trophy hunting in communal areas could and did exist without conservancies, and that the returns being generated should not all be attributed to conservancies. A number of lodges were established in communal areas well before conservancies were formed, and there were a few government-controlled trophy hunting concessions. But local communities generally had no democratic control over these activities and received minimal returns. All income from trophy hunting went to the hunting operator and government. Lodges tended to employ foreign staff and at best made token payments to traditional communities for their wildlife resources being used should be under their control. Conservancies have finally enabled equitable natural resource use, which did not exist prior to their formation. That joint venture lodges are based on formal agreements which oblige them to share profits and employ and train local staff, and that returns now go to conservancies and local communities should be attributed to the conservancies. The marketing of surplus wildlife into areas with low populations assists the rapid recovery of overall wildlife stocks in Namibia.
a widening spectrum of natural resource returns

In addition to returns from tourism, trophy hunting and game harvesting, community conservation is generating cash income and in-kind benefits from an increasing spectrum of natural resource sectors (Table 9). Variations in amounts and sources of returns, as well as how these are being used and distributed are shown in Figure 22.

Crafting a living

Visitors to communal areas are able to buy superb and uniquely Namibian crafts directly from the producers. The sale of crafts, the development of craft outlets and links to wholesalers have provided many people, and especially women, with an independent source of income, which is an important success. Craft making can be fitted into women’s daily routines without taking them away from the homestead. Many women are operating small businesses of their own. As self-employed entrepreneurs they feed into larger craft projects, living museums and other community-based enterprises, while lodges are also important sales outlets.

Making the most of indigenous plants

A great variety of valuable indigenous plants create an exciting natural resource sector. Income is generated from three major sources: the issuing of permits and use concessions in community forests, the sale of value-added products such as carvings, and the sustainable wild harvesting and sale of non-timber products. Non-timber products include thatching grass and produce from plants such as devil’s claw and omumbiri. The significant growth of this sector is likely to continue as new species with commercial potential are investigated and developed.

Strategic agreements with international cosmetic and pharmaceutical companies represent significant economic opportunities. The harvesting of the resources is an important source of income for a growing number of people. Indigenous plant nurseries, which sell seedlings to nurseries in urban areas, who in turn sell them to end users, represent another diversification of plant use.

Fishing for food

Fish are an important direct source of food for many people in northern Namibia, and are sold at markets by fishermen to earn cash income. While subsistence fishing is not directly controlled, both commercial fishing and sport angling require licences, and issuing these can generate income for communities. Recreational catch-and-release angling within fish reserves represents an important income opportunity, generated from rod fees charged by tourism lodges, who share the income with communities. Throwing lodges marketing sport angling as a key activity, especially for popular tigerfish, catfish and other species, can create a variety of additional benefits to communities.

TABLE 9
Sources of returns to conservancies and their members in 2012

The spectrum of natural resource sectors that generate returns for communities continues to widen. Joint-venture hunting and trophy hunting are making the greatest contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of cash income or in-kind benefits</th>
<th>Value in N$</th>
<th>Percentage of total cash income and in-kind benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint-venture tourism (includes all cash income and in-kind benefits to conservancies and members)</td>
<td>21,259,077</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophy hunting (includes all cash income to conservancies and members)</td>
<td>16,244,399</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophy hunting meat</td>
<td>4,757,246</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous plant products</td>
<td>4,258,382</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-use game harvesting meat</td>
<td>3,718,104</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based tourism and other small to medium enterprises</td>
<td>1,967,435</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot-and-sell game harvesting</td>
<td>1,393,746</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (e.g. interest)</td>
<td>1,157,561</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>967,620</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other hunting or game harvesting (e.g. problem animal control)</td>
<td>426,938</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live game sales</td>
<td>192,200</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium hunting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,162,698</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant community conservation return for individuals is direct employment in positions that have been created through natural resource management, most of which did not exist prior to the start of the conservancy movement. These are particularly important for people living in rural areas with few other means of earning regular cash, and have the greatest impact at both household and individual levels (Figure 23). Jobs in tourism represent great career opportunities, as staff can ‘rise through the ranks’ to the level of regional management or beyond, something that a number of people have achieved. Community conservation organisations are themselves important job creators, with all jobs usually being filled by local people. Jobs created through natural resource management and related tourism and trophy hunting activities are regarded as especially beneficial, because people no longer have to leave the land to seek employment in towns. Jobs can be balanced with a stable household and subsistence agriculture activities, improving social cohesion. Conservancies are able to provide diverse employment through the income they generate. The growth of administrative and managerial positions in conservancies is driven by the recognition that qualified staff is needed for the effective management of conservancy resources. Job creation in rural areas is particularly important given the high rates of unemployment in Namibia.

Diversifying income opportunities

Besides facilitating direct employment, community conservation is enabling a great variety of new income opportunities for individuals, of which craft production and the harvesting and sale of indigenous plant products are the two most important sectors. All new income streams from natural resource use provide much-needed household cash to supplement subsistence agriculture and improve individual lives.

FIGURE 22. Varied sources of natural resource returns... (above) There is a large variation between conservancies in terms of their sources of natural resource returns, influenced by the available resources, private sector partnerships and other factors. Four sample conservancies illustrate some of the differences in 2012. The bar charts show total income and in-kind benefits over time, and the pie charts illustrate the ratios between sources of returns.

... and disbursements (above right) Disbursements within conservancies vary considerably. The same conservancies illustrate some of the differences in 2012.

From overall returns of N$ 24,518,702, forty four conservancies received N$ 4,258,382 on operational costs including jobs, while N$ 5,269,723 was distributed to communities in cash, in-kind and social benefits, with the remainder being carried forward as reserves.

households returns from natural resources

Providing employment

The most significant community conservation return for individuals is direct employment in positions that have been created through natural resource management, most of which did not exist prior to the start of the conservancy movement. These are particularly important for people living in rural areas with few other means of earning regular cash, and have the greatest impact at both household and individual levels (Figure 23). Jobs in tourism represent great career opportunities, as staff can ‘rise through the ranks’ to the level of regional management or beyond, something that a number of people have achieved. Community conservation...
**Building capacity**

Skilled and educated young people often leave rural areas in pursuit of better opportunities in towns. As the success of community conservation broadens, it is helping to reverse urbanisation trends and is strengthening human potential in communal areas. By recruiting more skilled staff, community conservation organisations are able to improve their operations in an upward growth spiral. Positions of responsibility are being filled by community members in a range of roles including office management, book keeping and natural resource management, in the management of joint venture lodges, as tour guides, and as trackers and camp staff in the trophy hunting industry. Rural women are increasingly seen in leadership roles in conservancies, especially in the area of financial management. The provision of student bursaries from conservancy funds is aimed at increasing skills available to rural communities.

**Valuing the intangible benefits**

Community conservation creates a great variety of less measurable benefits such as strengthening a common identity and giving communities a collective voice, increasing the participation of women in decision-making, supporting initiatives to combat HIV/AIDS, creating a sense of community pride and ownership over resources, and increasing community awareness of issues. Through CBNRM, communities are recognised as the rightful custodians of natural resources. Community conservation strengthens local level democracy, creates awareness of business and sustainability issues, opens opportunities for entrepreneurship and generally diversifies livelihoods, thereby reducing people’s economic and social vulnerability, especially in the face of climate change.

**Distributing cash benefits**

Conservancies with strong revenue streams and a small membership often distribute significant cash benefits to villages and households, where just a small amount can make an important difference. Yet most conservancies cannot make regular cash payouts to members, and annual general meetings tend to support the concept of investment in community projects.

**Committed to rural development**

Increasing initiatives aimed at maintaining or uplifting general living conditions in rural areas are being funded by community conservation. Examples of initiatives funded by conservancies include water infrastructure, agricultural equipment and materials, bursaries for students and grants to schools, kindergartens and sports tournaments, medical treatment, grants to the elderly, transport and funeral assistance for community members and a variety of other social benefits. Through this, community conservation is demonstrating a clear commitment to rural development.

**Covering operational expenses**

A key objective of CBNRM is that community conservation should be self-financing and sustainable. Before conservancies or community forests can spend money on social projects or distribute benefits to households, they first need to cover their own operational costs. These include salaries for conservancy staff, allowances for committee members, travelling costs, insurance, office administration and training activities, and vehicle running costs. During their initial development stage, all conservancies and community forests are dependent upon external funding. As they move into a more productive operational stage, an increasing number of conservancies are covering all running cost from their own income (Table 1 on page 20 in Chapter 2).

**The costs and benefits of living with wildlife**

**Facilitating diversity**

Modern environmental understanding makes it clear that biodiversity is vital for the health of local ecosystems as well as the whole planet. An environment is healthiest when it supports a high diversity of indigenous species – including large wildlife. Community conservation facilitates this diversity by enabling communal area residents to achieve a balance between land uses that include wildlife use. But wildlife also creates conflicts and the benefits gained from natural resource use should clearly outweigh human wildlife conflict costs for farmers. Importantly, some of the generated returns need to be used to directly offset the losses of those who incur them.

**Setting the scale of the problem**

Losses caused by wildlife can undoubtedly be severe. This is especially true in the tragic cases where people are injured or killed by wild animals. Poor households surviving on small crop yields or low livestock numbers can also be very hard-hit by wildlife impacts. Nonetheless, perceptions of the scale of the problem are often skewed. Data evaluation has shown that in the majority of surveyed conservancies, the returns generated from wildlife far outweigh the losses incurred through it. In some cases the positive return ratio exceeds 50 to 1. The returns used in these comparisons do not include any of the farming income and in-kind benefits being generated by agriculture. It is thus possible to offset the losses from wildlife through returns from natural resource use alone, thereby largely recouping this inherent cost to agricultural activities. Such calculations are, however, made at an overall conservancy level. It is vital that the individual community members who incur losses receive fair compensation.

**A wide range of returns from natural resources can create a positive return ratio that far outweighs the costs of human wildlife conflict.** In King Nehale Conservancy, wildlife and livestock graze peacefully side by side.
Community conservation facilitates a wide range of new economic opportunities and contributes to poverty reduction, enabling enterprises such as this coffee shop, owned and run by a community member at the Tsiseb Conservancy Office.
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Contributing to national economic growth

The national impact

Community conservation has an impact on the broader economy of the country significantly exceeding direct returns to rural communities, and contributes to nation building by driving national economic growth. This national impact can be assessed by including all incomes earned by communities, government and the private sector as a consequence of community conservation.

What are these additional incomes?

Firstly, private sector tourism and hunting partners earn income which is not distributed in conservancies, for example as salaries for people outside the conservancy, profits for the company, interest and principal payments to financiers, as well as government taxes and rentals. Secondly, tourists drawn to Namibia by the attractions held in trust through community conservation also spend in the wider economy during their trips, generating direct income for urban hotels, airlines and car rental companies, for example. Thirdly, tourism and other enterprises use products, such as food and fuel from other sectors of the economy, and this generates further national income. Fourthly, part of all this new income earned by households, companies and government gets re-spent in the economy during further rounds of spending, producing additional income generation.

Contributions to net national income

All these economic contributions may be termed contributions to net national income (NNI). The NNI contributions can be defined as the value of goods and services that activities, community conservation activities in this case, make available each year to the nation. Contributions made by community conservation to NNI should also include adjustments for stock appreciation. This is the accumulated capital value of increasing wildlife numbers, to which conservancy management and conservation are making an important contribution. The incremental value of the animals produced is therefore seen as an extra economic benefit of conservancies. The animals’ value is taken as their monetary value ‘on the hoof’, in other words the value they could fetch if they were to be sold or harvested commercially. The capital stock values of wildlife are those attributed to growing numbers of wildlife in the north-west conservancy areas, and exclude values associated with the other areas for which suitable data are lacking. The north-west figures are considered to provide at least an indication of the relative values of wildlife that have benefited from protection in conservancies. Besides stock values, further economic values could be counted if adequate measures were available, including the economic value of local management institutions and the capacity which resulted from training provided to people associated with conservancies.

An excellent investment

The economic merits of programme spending can be seen by comparing the investment in community conservation to benefits in terms of NNI and increasing annual stock asset values in a cost-benefit analysis. This can provide an indication of the degree to which the investment made in the CBNRM programme has contributed overall to the national economy and whether this investment has been economically efficient. Table 11 shows economic rates of return and net present values. In the first 13 years of the programme, costs exceeded returns, but since then rapidly growing returns far exceed costs (Figure 24). Positive economic returns for the programme (economic rate of return above the estimated real discount rate) have become evident during the latter years. The depicted economic return is very positive for a programme investment.

Making a global contribution

While delivering the variety of immediate and tangible benefits described, community conservation also provides an important service to the nation and the world by maintaining healthy ecosystems.

Providing ecosystem services

Internationally, the concept of payments for ecosystem services is gaining hold, as ecosystems come under ever-greater pressure from industry and development. Ways need to be found to ensure that ecosystems continue to deliver vital services such as productive soils and healthy plant and animal communities, which create the basis for human activities and economies. The value of these services is calculated in monetary terms and options for creating payments to the entities that safeguard these services are being explored. Conservancies and community forests could in future become the beneficiaries of such payments and would thereby be able to carry out their functions more effectively and sustainably.

Benefitting from biodiversity offsets

Biodiversity offsets represent a related concept, developed to mitigate the impacts of destructive activities such as mining. The rapid growth of uranium and other mining across much of western Namibia is impacting on some conservancies. The pressure on mining companies to offset the biodiversity impacts of their activities will increase as global environmental concerns such as loss of biodiversity and climate change become more acute. Again, conservancies should benefit from these biodiversity offsets, because they are safeguarding national and global biodiversity.

FIGURE 24. Estimates of the national economic returns from CBNRM compared to economic investment costs

In 2012, the net national income (NNI) contribution made by CBNRM was about N$ 380 million. When the stock value of wildlife is added to this, the total contribution becomes N$ 393 million. The cumulative value of the NNI contribution between 1990 and 2012 amounts to N$ 2.9 billion. The increased capital value of wildlife in north-western Namibia between 1990 and 2012 is estimated at N$ 473 million. Together, the NNI contributions and increased capital value of wildlife over this period add up to about N$ 3.4 billion. This is an impressive figure, which has been increasing rapidly. The graph also shows the value of spending on the CBNRM programme each year, which cumulatively adds up to about N$ 1.4 billion of investment between 1990 and 2012. Donors supplied most of the funds, while the MET and NGOs also provided inputs, mainly as ‘in-kind’ contributions, such as staff, vehicles and other kinds of support.

TABLE 11. The economic efficiency of CBNRM

Since 1990, the programme has had an economic rate of return of 22% and has earned an economic net present value of some N$ 564 million. This is a very acceptable economic return for a programme investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic rate of return</th>
<th>Net present value at 6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>- N$ 18.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N$ 190.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>N$ 316.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>N$ 480.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>N$ 564.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures have been adjusted for inflation to be equivalent to the value of Namibian dollars in 2012. This means they are not directly comparable with those used in the 2011 State of Conservancies report, which used figures equivalent to the value Namibian dollars in 2011.
The aim of community conservation is to enable coordinated, integrated and equitable use of all natural resources such as wildlife, plants, soils and water, and through this to support a thriving rural economy based on a highly productive mix of land uses that includes tourism, trophy hunting, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, craft production and more. Community conservation can empower rural people to make the most of a wide range of livelihood choices to improve their lives.
The future at a glance:

Community conservation may grow to...
- 90-100 conservancies and 40-50 community forests
- cover over 21% of Namibia and well over 50% of all communal land
- embrace up to 15% of all communal area residents and well over 50% of rural communal areas residents in suitable areas

What might be achieved?

Community conservation can...
- facilitate significant further growth of tourism in communal areas and increase local involvement
- enhance the reputation of communal areas as offering some of the country’s most spectacular destinations
- entrench Namibia’s position as offering some of the best trophy hunting on unfenced land in Africa
- mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing dependence on subsistence agriculture
- maximise the potential of indigenous plants through further strategic international partnerships
- strengthen incentives for people to live with and manage wildlife so that our children’s children can continue to share in this important African heritage

New for 2013:
- launch of the National Policy on Community-Based Natural Resource Management
- introduction of a joint venture compliance framework for both conservancies and tourism operators as an important management tool
- introduction of sustainable business and financial plans as an important financial management tool

The biggest challenges?
- enabling optimum governance capacities, effective decision-making and wise leadership
- removing barriers to private sector investment in communal areas
- further promoting policy integration amongst government ministries
- ensuring ongoing technical support to community conservation structures
- achieving self-sufficiency and programmatic sustainability

what lies ahead for community conservation?

More rapid growth?

Community conservation in Namibia is still in a rapid growth phase. It is expected that when this slows by around 2015, between 90 and 100 conservancies and 40 to 50 community forests will embrace well over 50% of all communal lands, enabling a large proportion of rural Namibians to benefit from natural resources by presenting their unique wildlife, tourism and forestry assets to a growing global market with an increasing willingness to pay for Namibian products, services and experiences.

From development to maintenance

More and more conservancies are now undergoing the important transition from a support-intensive development stage to a less costly, long-term maintenance stage. 35 established conservancies have reached financial self-sufficiency, covering their running costs from own income, with 34 also distributing benefits to members. A growing number of others are generating income that is used to support their operating costs. However, financial independence on its own will not lead to sustainability.

Strengthening governance capacities

Management capacities still remain below ideal levels in many conservancies and community forests. Broader governance support is needed, especially during the early stages of institutional development. In addition, mechanisms should be implemented to reduce the loss of institutional memory during committee changes. Benefit distribution systems need to be strengthened, as do mechanisms to ensure full accountability for the use of funds.

facing threats and challenges

Combating the poaching onslaught

Commercial poaching of rhino and elephant has taken on catastrophic proportions in most range states of the species. The impact in Namibia has been comparatively small and localised, but poaching for ivory has increased alarmingly in the Zambezi Region and is likely to affect other species. Community conservation makes vital contributions to the protection of valuable species such as rhino and elephant, but the current highly organised and ruthless poaching threat requires the collaboration of all national and international conservation stakeholders to reverse the increasing impacts and ensure the long-term protection of these species.

Countering challenges to sustainable use

Namibia continues to demonstrate the important contributions to biodiversity conservation made by legal hunting, which generates significant income for communities. Sustainable hunting is a competitive land use that can safeguard habitat against destructive uses and does not have negative effects on overall game populations. Yet the knowledge that many species are internationally threatened casts a long shadow over all consumptive use of game, even in areas where populations are healthy. Trophy hunting is often lumped with evils such as poaching and habitat destruction and is seen as another threat to be countered. This has resulted in sustainable use coming under increasing international pressure, with trophy hunting banned completely in some African countries. Unfortunately, such decisions are often the result of uninformed international advocacy rather than objective local needs. The loss of legal hunting income would be extremely detrimental to conservancies, many of which would no longer be viable (Figure 25).

removing barriers

Private sector investments in communal areas continue to face barriers such as the absence of head- and sub-lease arrangements between conservancies and private sector operators, as well as short lease durations (there is a ten year ceiling unless approved otherwise by the Minister of Lands and Resettlement). This is further compounded by the inability of conservancies and/ or private sector partners to secure commercial loans from banks owing to insecure tenure arrangements. Finally, planned MLR legislation to heavily tax lodges on communal land would threaten their economic viability. This would, in turn, impact heavily on benefits flowing from joint venture tourism to communities. Removal of these barriers and threats needs to be urgently addressed through collaboration between the MLR, the MET, conservancies and the private sector.

mitigating climate change

The effects of climate change and global warming are increasingly evident all over the world. Most communal areas of Namibia have limited agricultural potential, which will be exacerbated by climate change. Community conservation reduces the dependency on subsistence crop production and livestock herding through livelihood diversification based on natural resource use. Community conservation facilitates increasing employment and income opportunities and reduces susceptibility to recurring events such as droughts and floods, thereby mitigating climate change impacts.
facilitating integration

Weak recognition of the conservancy movement by ministries other than the MET remains an impediment to the long-term sustainability of conservancies and other CBNRM activities. Integration of policies at ministry level, as well as of management structures and activities on the ground, can improve efficiency and significantly expand the current range of returns being generated. Improved integration of the policies, legislation and activities of the MLR and the MET is a pressing example discussed above. Other sectors that will benefit from closer collaboration include inland fisheries and agriculture.

adapting to growth and change

Operating in a dynamic environment

Community conservation operates in a dynamic domain and faces ongoing environmental and social changes, as well as the rapid growth of the CBNRM programme itself. Conservancies manage resources in large, open systems with highly variable conditions, a variability that is likely to increase with climate change. Economic and social challenges include resource and market fluctuations, as well as land use and resource conflicts.

Managing an increasing complexity

Established conservancies are faced with a growing complexity of business interests, which may compete for the same resources or areas. Conflicts may arise between tourism, trophy hunting and game harvesting interest, as well as between these and agricultural activities. Many conservancies are managing a multitude of agreements with joint venture lodges, hunting operators, shoot-and-sell harvesting clients, indigenous plant product buyers, and other stakeholders. At the same time, wildlife, including predators, is increasing and requires greater management attention, including the mitigation of human wildlife conflicts. As the success of conservancies grows, the often competing expectations of a variety of stakeholders seeking access to natural resource returns places increasing pressure on conservancy management. It is certainly commendable that conservancies are managing a multitude of agreements with joint venture lodges, hunting operators, shoot-and-sell harvesting clients, indigenous plant product buyers, and other stakeholders. At the same time, wildlife, including predators, is increasing and requires greater management attention, including the mitigation of human wildlife conflicts. As the success of conservancies grows, the often competing expectations of a variety of stakeholders seeking access to natural resource returns places increasing pressure on conservancy management.

Enabling adaptive management

By continually monitoring both resources and activities, as well as refining methods and approaches, community conservation can adapt to the dynamics of growth and change, while maximising returns for local people. Planning, monitoring and evaluation are thus core aspects of community conservation, as are ongoing training and technical support.

diversifying economic opportunities

Reducing dependency

There is a need for economic diversification within community conservation to reduce dependency on tourism and trophy hunting as the main sources of income. Periods of economic downturn or political instability translate to immediate impacts on visitor numbers, which in turn reduces community income and benefits. By broadening the range of natural resource use activities and increasing returns, this vulnerability can be significantly reduced.

Developing new enterprises

Strengthening the development of enterprises based on diverse resources including plants, fish, crafts and others can open new income streams. The value-added processing of products is only just beginning for most sectors and can be expanded significantly. A range of spin-off enterprises also needs to be developed as tourism in conservancies grows, and benefit capture along various parts of the tourism value-chain needs to be enhanced.

The importance of marketing

Marketing is a vital aspect of modern business. Collective marketing of the communal conservancy tourism sector through a dedicated website and marketing effort has achieved important recognition (www.namibialifefestafaris.com). Similar marketing of the communal conservancy hunting sector is also of importance and should be considered a priority. Individual conservancies are only just beginning to develop their own corporate identities. A pilot series of brochures and posters developed to profile individual conservancies needs to be used more effectively, and such materials need to be developed for more conservancies to enable better positioning with the private sector and amongst other stakeholders.

Some excellent marketing has been done for natural plant products and crafts, yet more can be done to achieve further recognition and improved sales in these sectors.

ensuring ongoing support

A range of core support services

To be sustainable, community conservation requires recurrent access to a range of core technical support services. These include governance support, private sector liaison, enterprise development, conflict resolution, programmatic monitoring, quota setting and so on. Just as important is ongoing access to training in these areas, as well as access to the support of specialists for targeted interventions. The use of management tools that facilitate improved understanding and action must become an integral part of community conservation activities. Such core support services are still in the early stages of development and require significant further input.

strengthening for sustainability

A strategic approach

The National CBNRM Sustainability Strategy emphasises the ongoing provision of minimum support packages based on the development phase and operational complexity of a conservancy or community forest. The Strategy also seeks to improve the efficiency of support through calendar-based training aimed at regional conservancy clusters.

Sustainable financing

A sustainable finance plan will reduce dependence on declining donor support to Namibia. Finance mechanisms may include tiered payments for services by conservancies and community forests (based on income), increased government support, an endowment to fund critical costs, and the receipt of biodiversity offsets from mining. These strategies and plans have been formulated, yet much work needs to be done to implement them.

Namibian community conservation is like a flourishing tree. It has developed multiple trunks and many strong branches. It can bear valuable fruit for a multitude of rural Namibians, yet it needs strong roots to withstand seasonal challenges and must be cultivated with care to ensure that it continues to grow and yield regular harvests...
key events in the life of communal conservation

Early 1990s Local leaders, Nature Conservation staff and NGOs agreed to start the Community Game Guard system in north-western Namibia to curb poaching of wildlife. This was the first coordinated CBMNR activity in Namibia.

From 1990 to 1992 A series of socio-ecological surveys identified key issues and problems from a community perspective concerning wildlife, conservation, and the then Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism (MWCT).

1992 MWCT developed the first draft of a new policy providing for rights over wildlife and tourism to be given to communities that form a common property resource management institution called a ‘conservancy’.

1993 The Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme brought major donor support (USAID and WWF) and the CBMNR programme started to evolve as a partnership between government, NGOs and rural communities.

1995 Cabinet approved the new policy for communal area conservancies, and work began on drafting legislation to put the policy into effect.

1996 Parliament passed the new conservation legislation for communal areas.

1998 The first four communal area conservancies were gazetted in terms of the Forest Act. Cabinet approved the National Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land.

2001 The Forest Act was passed by parliament.

2003 The Polytechnic of Namibia incorporated the teaching of CBMNR into its National Diploma in Nature Conservation, institutionalizing CBMNR as an option in its Bachelor of Technology (Nature Conservation and Agriculture) degree.

October 2004 The CEMA, LIFE Plus and IRDNC Kunene/Caprivian CBMNR Support Projects were launched.

February 2005 The first State of Conservancies Report, entitled Namibia’s Communal Conservation: - A Review of Progress and Challenges was launched.

2005 The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Economics, Natural Resources and Public Administration, which visited conservancies in the north-west, strongly endorsed conservancies and tourism for contributing to national development.

2005 The Forest Amendment Act was passed, amending the 2001 Forest Act.

2005 In its report Recommendations: Strategic Options and Action Plan on Land Reform, the Permanent Technical Team on Land Reform (PTT) recognised conservancies and community forests as CBMNR models to be followed for the development of Namibia’s communal lands.

2006 The six year Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAR) Project was officially started.

February 2006 The first 13 community forests were gazetted in terms of the Forest Act. Cabinet approved the National Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land.


2011 A Namibian delegation headed by Netumbo Nandi-Ndaitwah, Minister of Environment and Tourism, attended the Adventure Travel World Summit in Mexico and presented a bid to host the Summit in Namibia in 2013.

2013 The number of registered communal conservancies increased to 77. CBMNR generated over N$ 58,364,273 in returns during 2012.

awards

Regional and international interest in the CBMNR programme continues to grow, as an increasing number of high profile delegations visits Namibia to study and learn from its experience. A host of awards from international, regional and Namibian organisations have recognised the success and progress made in developing CBMNR and conservancies in communal areas:

1993 Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobson (IRDNC): ‘Goldman Environmental Prize’ (Africa).

1994 Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobson (IRDNC): United Nations Environmental Programme ‘Global 500 Award’.


1998 Republic of Namibia: WWF ‘Gift to the Earth Award’.

1998 Damaraland Camp (Torra Conservancy) and Wilderness Safaris Namibia: British Guild of Travel Writers ‘Silver Otter Tourism Award’.


2001 Benny Roman (Torra Conservancy): Namibia Professional Hunting Association (NAPHA) ‘Conservationist of the Year Award’.

2001 Prince George Muhwa (Salambala Conservancy): NNF ‘Environmental Award’.

2002 Patricia Skyer (NACSO): WWF ‘Women Conservationist of the Year Award’.

2002 Patricia Skyer (NACSO): Conde Nast Traveller Magazine ‘Environmental Award’.

2002 Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobson (IRDNC): Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) ‘Conservationist of the Year Award’.

2003 King Taapiopi (Ukwalulwadi Conservancy) and Chris Eyre (MET): NNF ‘Environmental Award’.

2004 Chris Weaver (WWF/LIFE): NAPHA ‘Conservationist of the Year Award’.


2005 Wilderness Safaris and Torra Conservancy’s Damaraland Camp: World Travel & Tourism Council ‘Tourism for Tomorrow Award’ (Conservation Award).
Community conservation grew out of the recognition that wildlife and other natural resources were disappearing in many communal areas, and that these losses could be reversed, and both rural livelihoods and the environment could be improved, if local communities were empowered to manage and use the resources themselves.