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NOTICE OF A FARMERS UNION MEETING

GROOTBERG FARMERS UNION: DEPARTMENT AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
MEETING AT GROOTBERG BREEDING STATION 4.1.1991

TIME: 10H00

AGENDA:

1. CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF ELEPHANTS IN WARD 4, GROOTBERG.
2. THE PROSPECTS OF THE 1991 HUNTING SEASON.
3. THE SUPERVISION BY A FARMER OF GAME ON A SPECIFIC FARM.
4. DROUGHT AID.

WITH THANKS

D. GAOGOSEB
SENIOR AGRICULTURAL OFFICER
ANKER
On the 4th January, 1991, the Welitschia Farmers Union invited the MWCT staff and myself to attend a meeting to discuss the problems which are being experienced because of the elephants in the Huab catchment area. Week before the meeting, on Christmas Eve, a young boy Colin Beukes, was unfortunately killed by an elephant while herding his uncle’s cattle on horseback. The accident happened when the horse and rider walked too close to the elephant which was standing hidden amongst trees. The incident was a double tragedy for us, due to the fact that the uncle Mr. Manfred Bauser, was a leader in the local community in his belief that game should be protected and he had tolerated the presence of elephant herds with fortitude. The incident naturally caused extreme upset amongst the community and the family itself. The elephant was tracked down and shot the following day, by staff of the MWCT. It was not a happy Christmas for any of us! At the farmers’ meeting there were many calls for the extermination or removal of all elephant from the farming area. There were however, many others farmers who felt that, there needed to be a full investigation into the situation before any drastic decisions were taken. Some farmers spoke out in favour of the elephants remaining. This has resulted in a survey questionnaire which has been drawn up by myself, Sharon Montgomery and the staff of the MWCT and is to be circulated amongst all the farmers. (Append.) The results of the survey will only be known at the end of March. The MWCT has however, agreed to circulants (Append.) being circulated through our project and entitled “CLOPRICNOS”, to endeavour to bring returns to the community who live with the elephants, through donations from tourists who visit the area.
R10 DONATION TO SAVE THE ELEPHANT OF DAMARALAND

"WHY DO WE NEED YOUR R10?"

History of the elephants:
The elephants which you will see during your visit to Damaraland are internationally famous, they are the only elephants living in such arid desert conditions. In 1983, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature declared these "desert" elephants a top priority in Africa for protection. In 1991, these elephants still remain top of the priority list.

Present Situation
The elephant numbers have increased due to the strict protection measures which have been implemented by the Government, heavily aided by Non-Government Organisations and support from the public. The elephants have been saved from the dreadful slaughter which took place in the past. However, unknown to many people, the elephants spend much of their time during the dry season, on communal farmlands, where water is more plentiful.
The people of the communal lands are incredibly tolerant of the elephants; many of them feel that the elephants belong to the land and have a right to be there, but at the same time, they are scared of them, especially when herding the goats or cattle, or when children have to go to school, walking through the bush.
The elephants, being so large and with babies to feed, tend to cause problems at farm homesteads. They break the windmills if water is not pumping out, they trample the small vegetable gardens, they tear up pipes to find water, they chase stock, and recently a young boy died when he fell from his horse when an elephant chased them.
In other words, the farmers who tolerate the elephants, receive no benefits from having them on their farms. The independence of Namibia has brought a new freedom to everyone and with it, the farmers are asking WHY there is no benefit for them from the tourists who come to see the "desert" elephants.

PLEASE HELP US TO HELP THE COMMUNITY

How many ten rand can your group afford to help us help the community and

SAVE THE ELEPHANTS
WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO YOUR DONATION?

1. Your donation will be kept safely and will be banked monthly by the Save the Rhino Trust in a special account named "Elefriend Fund".
2. The Community Council leaders will advise us on the needs of the community.
3. Payments to the community will be made twice a year.

Other projects aimed at creating benefits for the community are already in progress. The Save the Rhino Trust is working on a joint venture with the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism. This joint venture is specifically aimed at protecting the elephants which utilise the communal farming areas. The major part of the project is to bring benefits to the community. Unfortunately, progress is slow due to the continual lack of funds, but visitors to Twyfelfontein will have seen an example of the type of community involvement and benefits which can be achieved. Twyfelfontein is an example of the joint venture mentioned above. The project directors are planning to provide other such facilities for the tourist to Damaraland. All of these projects are joint ventures for the community to benefit from the many thousands of visitors who come to see the spectacular scenery, the symbol of Africa - the elephant and hopefully, the highly endangered and very rare black rhino.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION

Blythe Loutit
Save the Rhino Trust
Elefriend Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Occupants</th>
<th>Do you wish to become an ELEFRIEND member Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill and Skitch Rosenthal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>624 East 52 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, New York, 10022, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR RECEIPT FOR BRINGING BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY TO HELP THE PEOPLE AND THE ELEPHANTS

DONATION MADE: R70

THANK YOU FROM THE ELEFRIEND FUND
REPORT ON MEETING HELD BY THE COMMUNITY OF THE WELWITSCHIA
DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL UNION AT
GROOTBERG PRIMARY SCHOOL AT ERWEE IN DAMARALAND
ON SATURDAY 16.11.1991

The meeting was a second meeting held to address the problems faced by the
communal farming community in the Huab and surrounding areas regarding
elephant damage to fences, gardens and the dangers they hold for the
humans. The meeting continued for 12 hours and lively discussion ensued.
Initially the meeting consisted of approximately 300 people, but later
dwindled to 68 farmers. Women and the elderly were well represented and
took an active part in the meeting.

The Chairman of the meeting was Nahor Hwoseb of the Ministry of Wildlife,
Conservation and Tourism (HWCT). The meeting was attended by Paramount
Chief Justus Garoeb and other local chiefs, elders, the Commissioners of the
North West Region and Otjiwarongo, the Chairman of the Grootberg Regional
Farmers Union and several other community leaders.

Initially the community was given a report back on the situation and the
survey conducted earlier in the year by the Ministries of Agriculture, and
Wildlife Conservation and the Save the Rhino Trust. Several options were
raised for discussion in an attempt to find a solution to the problems.
Print-outs of the survey results were pinned up for viewing by the
meeting.

Towards the end of the day, when all information had been assimilated and
questions had been answered, it was decided by the meeting that those who
had left the meeting early had forfeited their chance to participate in the
final discussions and it was voted that the panel discussions continue
and some resolution be reached by those still present.

The panel discussions took place in three groups. Each group was attended
by a Damara-speaking Nature Conservator who was there to answer further
queries that arose during discussion. Outsiders and members of the Save
the Rhino Trust did not participate in the panel discussions.

The groups had been asked to consider the following options:
1. Shoot/destroy all the elephants (which number ± 85 in that region)
2. Retain present situation
3. Should ground be purchased to resettle those who wish to move
4. Should ground dams be built to attract elephants
5. Should consideration be given to building a stone wall to contain
   elephant movements
6. Should a special committee be appointed to further investigate
   solutions to the problems

The report back from the groups through their spokesmen were as follows:

GROUP 1 LEADER: HR TSUSEB

1. The group decided that shooting would not provide an overall solution
   and that a peaceful solution should be found.
2. The group felt that the present situation was untenable as the
   problems had led to a direct threat to people's lives and a solution
   should be sought.
3. The group felt that as the people had been resettled in the homeland involuntarily in the first place, resettlement was not an option and asked that the elephants be resettled this time.

4. Regarding the building of ground dams, the group felt that if this was seen to be a solution, it should go ahead.

5. The stone wall would be valuable if built outside farming areas and the group identified Hobotere as a possible location.

6. It was felt that if a committee was established, the Welwitschia Farmers Union was the ideal vehicle for further discussion.

7. The group felt that more direct links with traditional leaders were required. They also felt that the Namibia Agricultural Union should be more closely involved as a mother body. They stated that they could be counted on to help in trying to find a peaceful solution to the problem which they identified as a crisis situation. They also expressed gratitude to Blythe Loutit for attempting to provide short-term intermediate solutions.

GROUP 2 LEADER: MR DAWID GAOGOSEB

This group chose to reply to all points in one summary.

1. They felt a departmental investigation should be conducted with the farmers in the area of all aspects of the problems.
2. They requested that all information regarding elephant movements and statistics be provided to the community leaders to facilitate appraisals of the situation.
3. The group felt that should a suitable area be identified, elephant numbers may have to be reduced by culling to prevent movement to farming areas. Hobotere was once again identified as a possible area.
4. It was felt direct representation to the Chiefs' Council should be made and that any decision taken should involve the development and upliftment of the farmers and under no circumstances should they be negatively affected.

GROUP 3. LEADER MR HUMPHRIES

1. The group strongly opposed shooting all the elephants as they felt that their descendants had a right to see the animals and because of their value as tourist attractions.

2. It was felt that the present situation was untenable and had to be changed through discussions such as were being held.

3. It was felt that with the desire to keep the elephants and the desire to continue farming, the best solution would be to separate the farmers and the elephants. They felt that the identification of a special area for elephants should be left to those capable of making a decision, as they felt they did not have the knowledge, but trusted that those making the decision would do so with the best interests of both the farmers and the elephants in mind.
4. The group stressed that should a solution entail moving farmers, this could be done in such a way as to allow farmers to continue their farming activities. They expressed the fear that if no solution could be found or worked towards during the present meeting, they would have to get together every year to discuss the same problems.

Lively discussion followed the report back with a call from Mr Gaogoseb to form a small committee that would work with the MWCT and Save the Rhino Trust to investigate the entire situation with the proviso that any decisions made should be brought to the community for approval.

The point was raised that Hobatere would only provide sanctuary for a very small number of elephants and was better for farming than the more western arid region.

The Regional Commissioner of Otjiwarongo said there were some of those present who had hidden agendas, in that they were thinking of moving to commercial farming areas in any case. He recommended that the committee consider three points:

1. Who wants to move to commercial areas,
2. Who wants to stay in the communal area with the elephants, and
3. Who in the communal area wants to stay, but without the elephants.

The committee appointed was as follows:
Mr David Gaogoseb (Treasurer)
Mr Nahor Howoseb
Mr Dudu Hururwa (Chairman)
Mr Ismael Bachmann
Mr James Mapenga
Mr Felix Humphries (Secretary)

The first meeting of the committee with the Save the Rhino Trust was scheduled to take place in Khorixas on Monday 18th November 1991 and a further meeting of the community was scheduled for January 1992.

Addendum to Report

BD Loutit reported on 18.11.1991 that she had met with the committee which is called The Rural Conservation Committee for the Huab Catchment Area. They informed her that their aim was to solve the problems existing between the elephants and the humans in the area. They had developed the motto that Wildlife and Human Life are each dependent on one another.

The committee visited the commissioner and were very positive during discussions about identifying an area for use as an IUCN Category 6 Multi-use Management Area. The Save the Rhino Trust has agreed to carry the expenses incurred by the committee during its investigation.
WWF PROJECT NO 3884 - NAMIBIA, THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA CONSERVATION PROJECT, DAMARALAND: Project Excutant B D Loutit: 5 December, 1991

The above named project has been in operation for 3 years and has reached a stage where the rural farming community of the Huab area have formed a committee to handle the co-operative project involving the Ministries of Wildlife Conservation, Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Lands and Resettlement with NGOs the Worldwide Fund for Nature, Save the Rhino Trust and the locally formed RURAL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE.

HUAB & DESERT ELEPHANT - CONFLICT WITH FARMERS IN THE COMMUNAL AREA OF DAMARALAND - AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.

1. The Rural Conservation Committee will liaise between all the groups involved.

2. The Chairman of the RCC, Mr Dudu Murorua, will be appointed as Wildlife Manager for the WWF/SRT to work on this project.

3. The initial aim is to permanently solve the problems which the community are experiencing by having elephants damage their possessions, and to give the farmers a more favourable climate to continue their farming practices.

4. To give the elephants a peaceful home area where they are able to drink and feed without causing damage to farmer’s property.

5. Develop tourism to bring returns to the region through properly managed tourist enterprises.

6. To develop a system which will bring benefits to the community living in this area near to or with the elephants.

7. To find funding to enable the purchase of land for farmers who wish to move out of the area where the elephant will remain.

To achieve the above aims, the following suggestions have been discussed with those members of the community who experience most problems or who live within an area which would be suitable for the elephant habitat.

a) An area to be identified, with the help of the community, where elephants can remain as part of Damaraland’s heritage.

b) Once the area is identified and agreed upon by the community, traditional leaders, elephant behavior experts and the Ministries of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism, Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, the international African Elephant funding bodies will be approached to help provide funds towards purchasing land for commercial farmers onto which they can move with their stock.

c) Approach the International African Elephant funding organisations to fund the moving of communal farmers and their stock to areas within the communal area which has been vacated by the commercial farmers.
d) Investigate the possibility of moving those communal farmers who wish to move to other communal areas or the possibility of purchasing farm which could be used on a co-operative basis, for communal farmers who wish to enter into a co-operative farming scheme.

d) Allow inspection of the alternative land by all those of the community who are agreeable to moving.

e) Build a stone wall around the eastern, northeastern and southeaster part of the identified area, to prevent the elephants from moving back into communal farming areas, but allowing the continued migration of the Huab elephants to the western desert which is their normal pattern of behaviour.

f) Raise funds to cover the costs of building the stone wall, and providing electric fencing for short sections across river courses.

g) Allow those who wish to remain within the identified elephant area, to do so on the understanding that domestic stock may be limited, they may be required to become directly involved in the protection management and control of the area and the wildlife and become involved in tourist projects with the aim of creating income to ensure that the project becomes self-sustaining.

h) Ensure that all participants in this ambitious project feel happy and secure that these are sincere attempts to better their living conditions.

i) Ensure that this project is in keeping with the aims of the Land Conference.

These aims are subject to discussion and approval by the traditional leaders. The meeting will take place on Friday the 6th December, 1991 at Khorixas. These aims will be presented by the Chairman of the Rural Conservation Committee, Mr. Dudu Murorua.

Blythe Loutit,
Project Executant
WWF Project 3684
Director of Fieldwork,
Save the Rhino Trust.

cc

Dudu Murorua & RCC
WWF International
David Shepherd Conservation Foundation
Nick Carter
Tommy Hall
John Hanks
Rudi Loutit
Sharon Montgomery
Honourable Chief Garoeb,

The World Wide Fund for Nature, the Save the Rhino Trust and the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation & Tourism have been working with the regional representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Affairs and Rural Development in an endeavour to find an acceptable and permanent solution to the problem of elephants in the communal farming area of the Huab catchment.

As you are aware, there has been a survey conducted amongst the rural farming communities and various meetings and discussions have been held, this culminated in the ELEPHANT DAY meeting at Erwee on the 16th November, 1991.

A Rural Conservation Committee has been formed and I believe that the Chairman, Mr Dudu Murorua, and some of the members of the Committee have visited you to discuss our hopes of finding a solution.

On behalf of the Rural Conservation Committee and the abovementioned non Government and Government organisations, I wish to seek consent from yourself as Paramount Chief and other traditional leaders, to pursue plans to find a solution to the problems of elephants in communal farming areas. These are points which have been discussed with the farming community:

1. The identification of an area which may be proclaimed for the community as a multi-use conservation area. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has categorised such areas under "IUCN Category VIII - Multi-use Management Area".

2. The implementation of plans to seek commercial farmland for those farmers who wish to move away from the communal land, so as to improve their farm management skills on commercial land.

3. To draw up an agreement with the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, that the farms vacated in the communal area by commercial farmers outside of the Multi-use Management Area, will be held specifically for those communal farmers who wish to move out of the Multi-use Management Area and onto those vacated farms, thereby remaining in the communal area.

4. To build an elephant-proof stone wall on the east, northeast and south east, to keep elephants permanently within the Multi-use Management Area, but still allowing them to continue their seasonal migrations to the western desert area.
5. To request advice from the Traditional Leadership on how the Huab Game Reserve should be managed as well as how the income from this area should be utilised.

6. To enquire from the Traditional Leadership whether they would consider the utilisation of Palmfontein as a tourism site, as it falls within its jurisdiction.

7. To request a commitment from the Traditional Leadership and the Government of Namibia not to allow new settlement of people in the Multi-use Management area unless these people are fully prepared to farm in the presence of elephant. This area will, however, be available to surrounding farmers for emergency grazing during periods of drought.

8. To request provision of a date for an appointment with the Traditional Leadership as soon as possible, to enable the Rural Conservation Committee to fully inform it of the details of the project and possibly to obtain decisions and permission on the above points.

You may recall my visit to you with Mr Nick Carter, nearly 3 years ago, to brief you of our wish to begin this project to try and solve the problem of the Huab elephants. I have now been working as Project Executant on this co-operative project for the past two and a half years to find a solution to the problem of the elephants on communal land. However, due to the political changes, until now, it has been difficult to find enough international funding to implement this plan which we feel is at last, a permanent solution which is hopefully, acceptable by all parties.

I would be very grateful if you would consider these proposals as a genuine wish to ensure a better future for both the communal farmers and the elephants who are part of our Heritage in Africa.

Yours sincerely,

Blythe Loutit,
Project Executant - WWF Project No 3884
Director of Fieldwork - Save the Rhino Trust
REPORT BACK ON PROGRESS ON HUAB ELEPHANT/COMMUNITY PROJECT
14TH MARCH 1992

At the Elephant Day meeting held on the 16th November 1991 at Erwee Primary School, the need to find a solution to the elephant/community problem was discussed and the following points were suggested:

1. that an area be identified where elephants could live with other wildlife.

2. that people who did not wish to continue living with the elephants, move to a safer area outside the area proposed for the elephants.

3. that a land use management plan be implemented for the farmers and for the wildlife.

4. that the question of alternative land for commercial and communal co-operative farming be investigated.

5. that outside funding and Government assistance be sought to enable farmers to move from the identified elephant area.

6. that the feasibility of building a stone wall to keep the elephants away from the people outside of the proposed elephant/wildlife area, be investigated.

7. that, if the wall is acceptable, it must be seen as a community project and that funds generated from its construction be kept within the community.

Since then the SRT/WWF and the RCC have been very busy having discussions with Chief Justus Garoeb, the relevant Government departments, traditional leaders, local farmers, conservationists, and community development organisations.

The Regional Commissioner, Hans Boois, very kindly arranged for the RCC and SRT to attend a private meeting with the highest Government official, the Honourable First Prime Minister, during his visit to this area. The Honourable Mr Ben Ulenga, Deputy Minister of MWCT, paid a personal visit to the area to familiarize himself with the elephant/community problem and the RCC and SRT were able to discuss the communities' problems at length.

In January, the Worldwide Fund For Nature, who have been funding this project from Switzerland, sent three representatives to look at the project.

On 11th March 1992 the annual visit of the Director and Senior Officials to the MWCT Khorixas Regional Office took place and Principal Game Ranger Nahor Hwoseb who is a member of the RCC was asked to give a report on the activities of the RCC. The Director was very impressed with the community, Farmers Union and RCC input and determination to find a solution to the elephant problems. Mr Swart has promised his personal and MWCT's support in lobbying Cabinet to provide formal assistance in reaching a satisfactory solution for the people and the elephants and to complete management strategy for better land use options.
To solve the problem between the people and the elephants, the most important points are:

a) giving a place to the elephants.

b) building a barrier to keep the elephants from wandering back onto the farms.

c) finding alternative land for the people who wish to move.

The question of finding funds and land for those who wish to move will depend upon the people concerned coming to an agreement on these three points.

Although the majority of farmers indicated at the last meeting that the elephants should have an area, there are some farmers who seem to be unsure about the suggestion to make a place for the elephants and to build a barrier. This creates difficulties for us in making a proposal to acquire alternative land.

The other problem which we have encountered recently, is the movement of more people into the proposed area for the elephants, if people continue to move in, the elephants will have no place to go and there will be more problems for the people, and we will have more difficulties in finding alternative land for people who do not wish to share land with the elephants.

The question of alternative land and funds to buy land is already being investigated. A preliminary proposal for land acquisition for the farmers who wish to move from the western, most arid area has been put to the WWF and SANP. These organisations have agreed to send an expert on elephant/community problems to investigate the situation in May.

If the ecologists, the community developers, the funding organisations, the traditional headmen, the farmers and the Government all agree, then the proposal to make a place for the elephants and to build a barrier in the form of a stone wall can go ahead.

NOTE

The land proposed for the elephant should be available to small subsistence farmers and emergency grazing if they wish to stay with the elephants, but there would be very limited assistance for elephant damages.

International funding will not always be available, especially if a project does not have any hope of becoming self-sufficient, ie if we are not able to reach an agreement in giving place to the elephants and thereby creating income and returns to the community through sustainable land use and tourists coming to see the elephants and other game, we will not be able to continue to assist the farming community with non-Government funding as we have been doing in the past 3 years.
Enabling them to buy up 'white' properties

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER

Government has announced plans for 100% loans to help communal farmers buy land in the commercial farming areas and develop their stock.

Described as "affirmative action loans and advances" by Minister of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development Mr Gert Hanekom during his contribution to the second reading debate on the mini-budget in the National Assembly yesterday, the money will be repayable at low interest over 25 years, with an initial two-year period of grace.

But the scheme would also introduce a measure of control to ensure that commercial farmers would not sell their farms at inflated prices.

Mr Hanekom said that to qualify for assistance, communal farmers would have to be full-time farmers and own a minimum of 150 large stock units or 400 small stock units. They would also not be entitled to farm on communal as well as commercial land.

Because it was anticipated that communal farmers would experience problems in financing loans, they would be able to obtain them from the Agricultural Bank of Namibia "even up to 100 per cent," he said.

There will be close scrutiny of the viability of farming enterprises to ensure that "the purchase price of the farm in relation to the ability of the farm constitutes a financial proposition."

Mr Hanekom said there were a number of farmers expecting to sell their farms at inflated prices and had to "disillusion them", because it would not happen. The government would not finance transactions which were not realistic as "it would not be in the interest of emerging farmers."

Loans would be made available for a 25-year period. During the first two years the loans will interest-free and no capital repayments would be expected. From the third year on, the capital would be redeemed at a scaled-up interest rate.

To avoid speculation on property with cheap government money, a 10-year restriction clause would be imposed on title deeds. This means that during the first ten years farmers would only be allowed to sell the property with the consent of the Bank under specified conditions.

Mr Hanekom said the scheme would also help "other persons who were left out in the past" to acquire land in the commercial areas.

Cont. on next page

Cont. from previous page

Furthermore, small-scale farmers would be helped to develop their infrastructure to ensure "optimum utilisation of their resources", including assistance in soil conservation, fencing, camperection and water provision.

Loans would be available for granted if the total stock on the farm exceeded 70 per cent of the carrying capacity of the land.

The scheme would also help small scale farmers to provide better housing for their families and farm workers.

Mr Hanekom said in addition to the "affirmative action loans" which would be handled by the Bank of Namibia, further assistance would be given to communal farmers by the Future Agricultural Development Corporation (FADC), which is to be taken over from the Future National Development Corporation (FNDC).

The act to establish the ADC, which "would become the implementing arm of the Agriculture Ministry", would be passed in parliament "as soon as possi-

THESE SCHEMES ARE BEING HANDLED BY THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA AND GOVERNMENT HAS RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF THE AGRICULTURAL BANK TO PUT THE AGRICULTURAL ADVANCE SCHEMES INTO OPERATION WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAY.
THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA AMENDMENT ACT, PASSED BY PARLIAMENT IN 1991, CONTAINS, AMONGST OTHERS, ONE VERY IMPORTANT ADDITION, NAMELY, SECTION 46 OF THE ACT, WHICH ENVISAGE ADVANCES TO BE GIVEN BY THE BANK IN ORDER TO PROMOTE CERTAIN GOVERNMENT SCHEMES OR PROJECTS. SUBSECTION (a) OF THE SAID SECTION ENVISAGE ADVANCES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF NAMIBIANS CONTEMPLATED IN ARTICLE 23(2) OF THE NAMIBIAN CONSTITUTION, IN OTHER WORDS: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION. SUBSECTION (b) OF THE SAID SECTION THEN FURTHER PROVIDES FOR THE PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE IN GENERAL IN NAMIBIA AND/OR FOR THE COMBATTING OF EMERGENCIES THREATENING AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES OR NEEDS IN NAMIBIA.

AS REGARDS SUBSECTION (a) OF SECTION 46, IN OTHER WORDS, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ADVANCES, GOVERNMENT HAS DECIDED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA THAT THE FOLLOWING SCHEMES BE PUT INTO OPERATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE:

1. COMMUNAL FARMERS TO ACQUIRE LAND IN COMMERCIAL AREA.

2. OTHER PERSONS (LEFT OUT IN THE PAST) TO ACQUIRE LAND IN COMMERCIAL AREA.
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING

TEL: (0651) 3702
FAX: (0651) 2760
TELEX:

OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL
COMMISSIONER-OTJIWARONGO
P.O. BOX 1526

26 November 1991

OUR REF: ORC. 125/26/91 YOUR REF:
ENQUIRIES: T. TSHISHOME

ATTENTION: BLYTHE LOUTIT

Save The Rhino Trust
P.O. Box 83
KHORIXAS

RE: APPLICATION FOR RESSETLEMENT FROM COMMUNAL FARMING AREA TO COMMERCIAL FARMING AREA.

I am thankful to the organisers of Elephant Day which was held on the 16th November 1991 at Erwee in Damaraland.

Like many others who attended the meeting, I also like elephants because many countries have no elephants. It is an attraction for overseas and foreign tourists from other countries and a source of income to Namibia.

I do remember that the meeting revealed that people as well as elephants increased tremendously in numbers. For Nature Conservation to move elephants away from where they are scattered, it is too expensive to hire a helicopter, thus the whole financial implications is a heavy burden for the government of the day.

Me, as a farmer who farms at Dorsland Post 621 which is the entrance of elephants from Kaokoland into Damaraland would like to appeal to your good office as follows:

As a farmer, I would like to make some progress with farming. I don't want to be disadvantaged through living and farming among elephants, giraffes and other predatory animals although I like them.

My appeal to you is that I wish and would like to be moved away from elephant areas to a better commercial farming land where there is no elephants and other predators.
I hope that the dream of Save The Rhino Trust for collecting funds will become a success and soon before Christmas you may succeed to purchase the first ten commercial farms.

I wish that I will be resettled in the first groups of farms that will be made available by your good office.

Yours faithfully

Othnel Kazombiaze
REGIONAL COMMISSIONER OTJWARO
Elephants are alleged to be causing a lot of misery and fear in Damaraland. Farmers are appealing to the Government to take a strong action on the free-ranging population of elephants in the area. Some demanded their total destruction.

Two days before Christmas, young Colin Beukes, 11 years old, was killed in the Huab valley, when the horse he was riding met a bull elephant head-on. The boy was visiting his uncle from Grootefontein during the school holidays.

The elephant was shot by Conservation officials on Christmas day.

This tragic accident has sparked off a wave of concern among Damara communal farmers. Recently, the Grooteberg Farmers called a meeting to put their demands to officials from the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation & Tourism and the Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Development.

Spokesman for the meeting, Mr D. Goagoseb, senior agricultural officer, chairman of the Welwitschia Regional Agricultural Union and Secretary of the Grooteberg Farmers Union pointed out that although the people were aware that game could be a great asset, very little benefit had been reaped from having elephants on the farms. He stressed that the people had been placed on these and farms by the Odendaal Commission in the sixties and that they had enough troubles farming in the arid area.

His suggestion was that the elephants be moved to a specific area away from the inhabited farms. The meeting was lively, although many farmers indicated that they were interested in keeping the elephants if they were paid compensation for damages and given help to live with them. However, some asked for the total destruction of the elephant population. "Just shoot them all."

Elephants and man have lived together in this area for over one hundred years. Until a few years ago, they were shot if the farmers considered them a threat to life or property. Now things have changed. Permits for the shooting of elephants are not simply handed out on request any more. The elephant population stands at approximately 200 and is increasing well.

The problem between man and elephant occur is water. There are over 400 artificial water points in Damaraland and many areas around natural springs are also inhabited. The increase in water points has caused elephants to spend more time on the farms. This means that farmers and elephants will always meet. If the reservoirs are full, there is normally no problem, but the breeding herds, with young calves to look after, become very angry when a reservoir they are used to drinking from is empty.

Cont. on next page
Shooting will cause a furor.
Even if large numbers of the animals could be moved north of the red-line or into the west, and fenced in, elephant movements are seasonal and few fences can keep these giants in.

While understanding the fear and reluctance of some of the farmers to live among elephants, in Namibia, a project has been on the go for two years to begin solving the problems faced by men and elephants in Damaraland.

It is essential that communities who live among these giants should gain direct benefit for having them on their lands. Unfortunately, authorities in Africa have ignored the problems and the requirements of the people.

Though Tourism has been run on a formal basis in Damaraland for about ten years, the local people have not benefited from the tourists that come to see the elephants and the rhino of the area.

The Save the Rhino Trust project, started in the Huab catchment area two years ago. This was aimed to assist farmers by compensating them for losses, creating new water points to entice elephants away from farm houses and reservoirs. Vegetable gardens were fenced off and low-key tourism was established on the scale. The Government's decision would not be an easy one. On the other hand there is understandable fear and on the other...there is an irreplaceable treasure that Namibia would not afford to lose.

Powerful jet brings big load of tourists

More than 100 German tourists arrived aboard a Boeing 737-500 of the airline Hapag Lloyd, a German company with substantial holdings in the shipping industry and in later years also buying a stake in the aviation industry.

Half of the group will travel the south of Namibia in the course of the weekend, and the other half will go to the north, staying over at Mokuti for a visit to the Etosha National Park.

The jet which brought them landed late on Thursday night at Windhoek International, an unusual Boeing 737 because the designation 500 identifies a type of 737 with much more powerful engines than those for example used by South African Airways and Namib Air on domestic routes.

The aircraft was delayed, but the reasons for this were not given. Also expected was a flight by interflug, which did not arrive. South West Safaris sent eight buses to collect the tourists.
Evict Elephants, Demand Villagers

By Ehrudt Oxirub

LOCAL COMMUNITIES frustrated by the damage done by elephants to their property, crops and environment here, have appealed to government to move the beasts to another area.

The Save the Rhino Trust recently formed a Rural Conservation Committee which visited the ravaged area to speak to the people about the need for nature and wildlife conservation and consult them on a possible solution to the elephant problem.

Regional Commissioner for North-West, Hans Booys, thought that the presence of elephants in the area would attract tourists and thus benefit the areas economically.

But recent damage has angered some people who feel the animals must simply be moved elsewhere. The people have been particularly incensed by a recent incident in which a boy was pulled off the back of a horse and trampled into the ground by an elephant.

Besides this, elephants are said to be damaging water-pipes, boreholes and drilling machines as well as felling fences and damaging peoples' crops. Environmental damage is done by the elephants when they uproot trees and shrubs.

Commissioner Booys said ideally people and the elephants should co-exist in harmony. He said the Save the Rhino Trust, the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism and the community were working closely to solve the problem.

The elephants have in particular been a problem to a cattle breeding scheme where Afrikaner bulls were being bred for sale at low prices to local small scale farmers.

Chief agricultural officer in Khorixas, Leonard Kambonde, told New Era the scheme was facing a problem in controlling the breeding as a result of fences being brought down by the elephants, making it difficult to monitor the animals.

A Khorixas resident suggested that the elephants should be put in a camp somewhere since they had become too dangerous.

A clerk in the Regional Commissioner's Office said wherever the elephants were to be moved there should be enough water since the animals were drinking up water meant for human consumption.

Walter Geiseb said a game reserve should be established in the area so that the people who wanted to see the animals could go and see them there.
Elephant Man Confrontations

Elephant man confrontations are an endemic issue throughout Africa and the community in the Hluhluwe River Catchment area is no exception. It is with regret that we report the death of an elephant bull known affectionately as "Japie" by tourists for whom he used to perform mock charges.

Japie was shot by a member of the Rural Conservation Committee, Mr Siam Diepsloot, a black farmer, at approximately 22h00 on the night of March 15. The incident was reported to the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism officials immediately and the following day an investigation was conducted, involving officials of the Ministry, the Wildlife Manager of the WWF, Dudu Murorua and a number of Chiefs, including Paramount Chief Justus Garob.

We include sections of the statements made by Mr Siam Diepsloot and Mr Dudu Murorua as they were recorded during the investigation.

"I, Siam Diepsloot, a farmer of Hluhluwe, state : ...

... On the morning of the 15th March 1992 I was in bed early. My bed is on the front porch of my house. About 20h45 I heard my brother Frans Diepsloot shouting: "The elephant is coming, the elephant is coming". I grabbed my rifle which was standing beside my bed and walked towards my main gate. There was moonlight outside and I could see my brother coming and then I saw the elephant by his house, situated about 60m from mine. When my brother was in my yard I fired a warning shot into the air to scare the elephant off. The elephant did not react in a manner to flee, instead he came closer. He was standing in the pathway of the vehicle track coming from the main road. Now he was standing between my brother's house and the sheep kraal. I feared (for) the safety of my family and my stock so I aimed and shot at the chest of the elephant.

The elephant turned around and walked away screaming. He went in the eastern direction. After a short distance he stood still. He stood still for a while, we went back to the house. A little while later I went to look again, I saw a smaller shape where he stood and could not make out what was happening. I got into my car and drove closer to where I had seen the elephant standing. I could see in my car's headlights that the elephant was lying down on his side. I then decided to report the incident to the nearest Nature Conservation Office ..."

... I want to state further that my water installation can't provide enough water for my stock and elephant. My water installation is of that kind which only pumps water when the wind blows. I have no engine or powerhead to pump faster water. I have asked the water affairs section to provide me with engines and a powerhead but to no avail. I have also complained to Nature Conservation that the elephant drink all my water and break the water pipes. They have helped me by sending people to build a stone wall to protect the water. I have very little water at the house; my small stock have to drink ... at the fountains. Most of the fountains have dried up this season. My stock have to go without water sometimes a day or two. Sunday the 15th March 1992 was no exception and there was no water. The elephant could not drink, so he came closer to the house to search for water.

I had no intentions to shoot the elephant, I had no choice, I shot the elephant to protect my family and my stock. I regret having to shoot the elephant."

Extract from the statement of Themistokles "Dudu" Murorua:

"... My conclusion and observation is that:

1. Mr Siam Diepsloot very deeply regrets the fact that he killed the elephant.
2. It was entirely done to protect his family and livestock.
3. Mr Siam Diepsloot and all the others in the area have been living there for more than ten years, they have tolerated the elephants for drinking up all the water they have got for themselves and their livestock. They tolerate the fact that there is no proper water installation to provide enough water for the elephants and for themselves, and it is thus logical that he might have reached breaking point, not against the elephants themselves, but against the whole situation, which, for any normal person, is unbearable.

In this regard I humbly request the government, the surrounding community, the local headmen and all the donor agencies to support the idea of the SRT/WWF Project, morally and financially, to build a barrier with stones and create a multi-use management area for the elephants and all the other game in the area."

(Elephant/Men continued on page 6)
Earth Africa in Damaraland

At the community Elephant Day meeting reported on in the December newsletter, the Rural Conservation Committee was appointed to find a solution to the elephant/community problems by discussing the following issues:

1. identifying an area where elephants could live with other wildlife;
2. that people who did not wish to continue living with the elephants move to a safer area outside that proposed for the elephants;
3. that a land-use management plan be implemented for farmers and for wildlife;
4. that the question of alternative land for commercial and communal farming be investigated;
5. that outside funding and Government assistance be sought to enable the farmers to move from the identified elephant area;
6. that the feasibility of building a stone wall to keep elephants away from people outside the proposed elephant/wildlife area be investigated;
7. that if the wall is acceptable, it must be seen as a community project and that funds generated from its construction be kept within the community.

Following this meeting, the Save the Rhino Trust invited Dr Norman Reynolds of Earth Africa to visit Damaraland. The aim of the visit was to help the RCC and SRT to put together ideas on land-use, conservation, tourism and community.

After meetings with the Rural Conservation Committee, several proposals were suggested for presentation at a report-back by the RCC to the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and community meeting.

These included the productive use of drought aid to institute public works and retain a form of cash economy in a drought-ridden community, as opposed to encouraging dependence by food handouts. Adopting this form of public works for payment from income generated by drought aid, might well best fund the building of the elephant stone wall suggested by the community.

Potential options were proposed and discussed for land-use and land acquisition that require community action within new rules for resource management, based on the Community Land Trust concept, in which all adults enjoy equal membership shares and are issued with annual tradable rights to grazing, water, woodland etc. A Community Land Trust concept within the walled elephant area, where an IUCN Category VIII Multi-use Management area is proposed, would be the most viable way of ensuring equal distribution of income from the benefits of wildlife management and tourism.

These recommendations are contained in a document presently being considered and discussed by the RCC who were empowered by the community to investigate sources of funding for a full investigation by professional consultants into the feasibility of those recommendations.

Various potential donor organisations will also be approached for assistance in a project that could prove a useful pilot for voluntary community decisions over food relief or public works and elements of reform within the very limited timetable available in the face of such a severe drought. Should an investigation of this kind be made possible, it could provide guidelines for a model of interest to other communities on a voluntary basis.

Dr Reynolds’ visit took the form of a voluntary investigation and the value of his input towards finding solutions for the problems experienced in Damaraland will hopefully be reflected in a new sense of common purpose between community, Agricultural Union, government and donors (through the counterpart funds generated by food-aid). The SRT has been able to respond to a community request for additional support in the crucial area of land-use. Our sincere thanks to both him and Earth Africa for giving us new hope and a new outlook on the possible future of the region.

---

(Continued from page 3)

I would also further request that it is of no use to lay a charge against Mr Mapanka, since this is, according to me, not a criminal offence. But if, from now on, we do not try to implement the above mentioned idea, which is in fact a suitable and also workable solution from which all of us can benefit, in the near future, we are going to face this huge commercial farmers, who are also troubled by the same elephants and they will do exactly what Mr Mapanka did in protection of his family and property. In this way, we stand the chance of losing all the elephants in the Huab valley, which are in fact, the famous desert elephants."

This case will now be referred to the Attorney General who will decide whether charges should be pressed.

The Riemvasmaker community living in Damaraland were moved into the area by the South African government in the 1960's when the area in which they lived in the Northern Cape was set aside as a military base.

Japie was identified as a problem elephant as early as 1989 and offered to a visiting hunter as a trophy animal by the then Department of Nature Conservation. The hunter turned the offer down on the grounds that the ivory was not suitable. Japie probably never intended to harm anyone and he was used to tourists photographing him. However, he was known to harass people in donkey carts and those walking along the road.

All incidents of this kind are thoroughly investigated by Ministry officials and if there are any suspicions of wanton shooting, wounding or killing elephants, charges will be pressed. It is to be hoped that the death of Japie is not the first of a series of deaths among these giants of our and area.
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PREAMBLE

It is recommended that these proposals be considered as a contribution from the community in Damaraland towards potential solutions for problems currently being experienced in this and other communal areas, notably as a model for drought management and for the reform of communal land systems.
A INTRODUCTION

The people of Damaraland, the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and the Damara Kings Council have held a series of meetings over five months that began with land-use issues and, with the emergence of the drought, has become wider in scope.

The proposals contained herein cover:

- a land-use plan for the region and the establishment of a Community Land Trust;
- the reform of communal grazing systems by the introduction of equal ownership by adults and of exchangeable annual grazing rights;
- the introduction of new economic institutions, democratically owned and controlled;
- the establishment of a local tax base through the expression in monetary terms of the value of local agricultural activity;
- the setting aside of a sanctuary for wildlife and tourism over which the community seeks formal legal title or rights (this is presently state land) under the Community Land Trust;
- the conversion of food relief provided by international donors and government, destined for Damaraland, into a Damaraland Development Fund to finance public construction works of a labour intensive nature. The wages from these works will be used by the people to purchase food and fund other basic necessities;
- the provision of an additional fund to ensure that wages can sustain other basic activities such as schools and the local economy. In exchange the donor will hold 5% of the region's grazing rights for three years (as a form of voluntary local taxation) and which is to be held by a Trustee. These rights would be sold annually to community members and the proceeds would be used for maintenance and development purposes as negotiated by the Community Land Trust and the Trustee.

The major planned construction item is an "elephant wall", a 1.5m high, stone wall that would deter elephants and rhino from leaving the new wildlife sanctuary and hence protect farms and public alike without creating a barrier to the movement of other fauna of the area.

The beginning of a regional housing programme which would start

- with the collection of suitable stone for building at central places, to be owned and sold by the Community Land Trust;
- with the irrigated production of indigenous reeds for roofing materials using the effluent of Khorixas (to fall under a Khorixas Trust Company) and other concentrated settlements and
- with developments to fully realise the potential of existing gardens and date plantations at Sesfontein, Khowarib, Okombahe and Fransfontein.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PREAMBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BACKGROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LAND PURCHASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 GRAZING MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 DROUGHT, FOOD AID, EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 PERIODIC MARKETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 NEXT STEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 BUDGET FOR PLANNING EXERCISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 INITIAL BUDGET FOR DROUGHT PROGRAMME OF PUBLIC WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 APPENDIX 1 THE WARD TRUST COMPANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FIGURE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 APPENDIX 2 CONSERVANCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 APPENDIX 3 OSTRICH FARMING AS AN OPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 DISCUSSION OF ECOLOGICAL SURVEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Damara people have lived in a closely administered fashion as wards of the state since their re-settlement on arid marginal farms in 1968. Existing housing is largely dilapidated, unsuitable for local weather conditions and constructed roughly from imported materials. By assuming responsibility for land-use and management, the Damara people now want to express their cost-independence confidence in the form of better housing, using local materials and by the adoption of aesthetic and environmentally sound designs and construction methods.

5 OFFICIAL RESPONSE TO THE DROUGHT

The Government has responded to the drought affecting large parts of Namibia with a massive food import and distribution programme. The latest information (New Era April 23-29, 1992 pp 1 & 2) is that Government plans to feed 250,000 during 1992. Food imports will cost R50 million, while transport and distribution will amount to about R70 million, giving a total expenditure of R120 million. Khorikas has been selected as a "9" centre or regional depot.

The food relief programme will cost almost R500 per person, or at an average of eight persons per family, R4,000 per family.

In Damaland no crops of note are produced. The drought causes a loss of capital. Livestock is sold under distress conditions or dies in the veld. It is estimated that about half of the present livestock will be lost, resulting in capital loss of about R18,000 on average per family.

Although there is a large number of livestock in Damaland, in normal years only a small number is sold. The economy is poorly developed with few non-farming activities and hence few wage earners, or salaried jobs. Consequently the drought will have a major impact on the local economy. The need is not simply food relief, but to sustain, and lay the foundation for an improved, local economy.

Food relief alone will not keep open local businesses, protect the few existing jobs and preserve the ability to continue to pay school and clinic fees. Indeed, it will impede the cash economy, making the downturn of the local economy steeper, as was experienced in 1989 when food for work was distributed in drought-stricken areas.

The people of Damaland request the Government and donors to convert its share of food relief into a Development Fund to finance public works programmes.

There are 3,700 families in Damaland. The region's share of food relief is therefore R14.5 million.

It is proposed to turn the relief expenditure into investment by generating over one million man days of labour on construction sites.

In labour intensive public works, 40% of expenditure is set aside for wages. At a target daily earning per person under piece rates of R10 per day, 280,000 man days will be generated. A further 200,000 man days will be paid under transport, material preparation and local job creation and preservation, funded out of the 40% balance of expenditure which covers materials, supervision and transport.
Families will earn on average R2 360 from wages, undertaking an average of 225 days over the period from July 1992 to April 1993. At an average of two members per family, this means an average of only twelve days work per person, per month. Taking into consideration weather and organisation, the peak work periods may be July - October 1992 (4 months) and March - April 1993 (2 months).

BACKGROUND

Independence has brought political freedom and the promise of human and social rights. A longer battle, and one which underwrites the former, is to establish economic rights. Economic rights take longer to achieve because they arise through programmes and institutional development. In this area law is often a blunt instrument. Additionally, they have to be defended continuously by the further development of programmes and institutions as conditions change.

In Omari Namibia there is an on-going process of community exploration of land use issues that bodes well for the future. It contains within it the seeds of larger changes towards self-management that are of interest to Namibia.

The land use issue arose around the question of the elephants entering farms and destroying property and crops and posing a danger to residents. Through a survey and at a public meeting in November 1991 convened by the Waluwawani Agricultural Union, it was decided that the elephant enjoyed rights in the area. The question was one of how best man and elephant could share the region to mutual advantage.

At the same meeting the new post-independence opportunity of land purchase was raised. Could some members of the community who aspired to commercial ranching acquire commercial farms? What would this mean to land use in the present farm area?

The meeting appointed a Rural Conservation Committee (RCC) to look into:
- an area for elephant and other wildlife
- a land use plan that accommodated farmers, elephants and wildlife
- an institutionalized legal, financial and management structure that links community conservation, investment and land use to tourism and wildlife development
- government and donor funding for land purchases for commercial and "co-operative/communal farming".

At a recent report back, March 1992, the RCC added another local issue that is also of national concern. There is as yet no clear local right to exclude others from settled land. For some time more powerful neighbours and, today, opportunistic outsiders are using loopholes in present land administration in the communal areas to muscle onto land already occupied; which is increasing the pressure on natural resources such as wetlands, vegetation and wildlife through over-utilisation and disturbance/displacement respectively.

Provisions in the Constitution which seek to enable Namibians to enjoy the right to reside anywhere in the country have on occasion been blamed. These provisions are not intended to overthrow other rights of occupation and of ownership but until the future of tenure in the communal areas is settled, sporadic land anarchy may continue. How best can communities that seek to introduce elements of land use, secure the right to manage their resources?
The problem of incursions onto communal farms (state land) in DamaraLand, is the opposite phenomenon to the enclosure movement by means of fencing underway, in particular, in Gwambaland. Enclosure occurs under open communal grazing systems. The more powerful use fencing to "privatise" communal land. This creates a landless class of significant magnitude and leads to all the social inefficiencies of insecurity, urban drift and rising theft. The growing occupancy by people and domestic stock is foreclosing other land use options such as tourism and wildlife utilisation on a number of farms.

In DamaraLand a part of the problem, discussed by the community, is that in the western zone at least, the people were dumped in an area too arid for livestock, even goats. The result is an insecure livelihood, the destruction of the veld, and the mining of the ground-water. The latter forces people to move to natural springs, heightening the conflict with wildlife, the elephant in particular. In times of drought it often becomes a question of power rather than of good management as herds are moved across farm boundaries.

The lack of resource management is the result of history. The present exercise is an attempt to move beyond the limited vision imposed by apartheid and the thralldom in which government held the community.

The community lacks the economic institutions through which to open up alternate land uses. One alternative now being explored, but without a full financial option in place, is for the community to devote an increasing area to tourism and wildlife, retrofitting as it were to more stable livestock production in the western East.

A Commission investigating the role of Traditional Chiefs in Namibia has yet to report. The Commission has the difficult task to steer between the risks of traditional authority over land allocation when that is a broken and frequently corrupt system and some modern bureaucratic control that denies community interest. The option the Damara King's Council and the RCC have adopted, opens up a "third way", the reform of community systems that combine private and group interests, avoiding the either/or of private versus community.

The King's Council and the RCC stressed that any plan must be capable of becoming financially self-sufficient, though there will be a need for funded professional inputs.

The sections below look in some detail at the individual issues. The intention is to produce an integrated land use plan which also deals with resource management. Land purchase and drought management have entered the list of subjects to be addressed urgently.

LAND PURCHASE

Government has announced a land purchase support scheme to assist communal farmers to acquire commercial farm land. The scheme is a subsidized mortgage. The total subsidy over twenty or so years will amount to a large capital grant to the individual beneficiaries.
The community devised land-use plan to be prepared by the RCC for Damaraland will include land purchase. However, there are powerful reasons for community and government not to use the individual scheme, though this may be left open to private initiative. An effective community land use plan that incorporates settlement on new land requires a degree of certainty that the planned number of families, with given amounts of livestock, to move onto new land, will do so within a few years.

To bring any benefit to those families left behind, community, and government as the financial partner, needs to know that the intended grazing relief from land purchase has been realised and maintained. This problem is but an extension of the existing problem of migrant and urban wage earners investing in livestock, carried at only private, but not full, social cost (which includes land degradation). This requires that there be internal reform of the grazing management on the present farms so that carrying capacities can be fixed in socially acceptable ways and the full costs of grazing be apportioned.

In the official land purchase programme, community members, individually or collectively, realise the subsidies. There is no reason why community should sanction large capital grants to individuals. If the community includes land purchase within a land use plan and promotes the acquisition of new land, then the community should claim the subsidies inherent in government's expected land purchase programme. Government, in turn, should favour work with communities. To do so, a Community Land Trust (CLT) for Damaraland will be established which will acquire purchased farms.

The additional land is then leased out, converting government's subsidies from private capital gain to a land endowment to community which, through the lease of farms, creates an unencumbered income to community in perpetuity. Government could appoint one of the Trustees of the CLT, strengthening its ability to oversee the management of the land and the use of the income, without infringing community autonomy. In this case both community and government have to organise for partnership.

GRAZING MANAGEMENT

The King's Council and the RCC have established that there is general interest in improved grazing management. The problem, as elsewhere with communal systems, has been how to set a carrying capacity each year and distribute that herd amongst community members. The RCC illustrated the dilemma with reference to a farm with five families who presently own different size herds. The total herd is in excess of the carrying capacity. The answer proposed is to divide the carrying capacity equally amongst the families. They would then have to sell to each other and release the surplus into the market. While egalitarian and magnanimous, it leaves unanswered the question, "For how long will the families remain with equal sized herds and how often can the redistribution exercise take place?"

The continued practice of semi-nomadic shifts by families with large stock numbers creates pockets of pressure at localities possessing above average available water and grazing or browse. Continued settlement of western parts has reduced the viability of such land to a degree where alternative forms of land use such as tourism and game farming seem the only logical conclusions.
The attempt to solve the grazing problem by creating equal herds is common to similar exercises in neighbouring countries. It appears that culturally and for reasons of inexperience with other systems of ownership, communal farmers try first to manipulate the cattle and livestock. The land and water resource is not an object for management.

A national programme in Zimbabwe, that has arisen through community and district council action, the Rural Structural Adjustment Programme, converts, by voluntary agreement, villages into Village Trust Companies (VTC). The VTC redefines village membership from a right of access to land to an equal share, for both men and women, in the assets of the village: from a right to exploit a free good, practised unequally, to an asset husbandry body of equal members.

Annual rights to different resources, like grazing, woodland, gardens and water, are issued equally to each member. The annual rights are then traded amongst members. This allows members to optimise their individual, family or group positions as against other members, within the limits of resource use set by the general body. Members have a common interest; the rights gives rise to ruling prices and creates a financial and investment system. (See Appendix 1)\(^1\)

Damaraland has chosen to follow the VTC model. Each ward will become a Ward Trust Company (WTC) and a member of the regional CLT. The CLT would then become the service body for its member WTCs. Government endowment through CLT land purchase and farm rents would provide the income, together with member contributions to pay the overhead and investment expenses of the CLT; that is training, business advice, audit and joint CLT/WTC investments. The CLT will run the proposed wildlife sanctuary and oversee tourism development.

The flexible, responsive land management system that arose would enable individual farmers and community to seek to optimise the use and rotation of water points for grazing and for wildlife management, since it would fit small and big land units into a whole. Donors will find the set of land use, land management, community economic system, equal woman's rights, wildlife and tourism, and land redistribution of great interest.

**Drought, Food Aid, Employment and Investment**

The concerned people of Damaraland, through the King's Council, the Agricultural Union and the Rural Conservation Committee recommend that the drought situation be turned to community advantage.
At recent meetings with the RCC, the troubled farmers agreed to investigate a land use plan to alleviate the problem of having elephants living in communal farming areas in the Huab River Catchment. The possibility of identifying a place for the elephant and then building a barrier in the form of a loose stone wall, with intermittent electrified ditches at river crossings, has been proposed, discussed and agreed upon.

The building of the wall should be seen as a community project to be built by the members of the community.

The drought presents the opportunity for a high profile, redistributive use of funds generated by food-aid. Food relief and Food for Work schemes have, in the past, proved inefficient and financially wasteful and form a dependency pattern among communities on government, which is later resisted. The community seeks formal agreement that a donor of food aid to Namibia be asked to:

a. agree that food be sold to the commercial grain industry for normal distribution; (communities in Damaraland purchase the major part of their provisions normally)

b. that the counterpart Rands generated from the sale of the food from food-aid agencies (which will bear a special stamp to encourage buyers to support the project) be placed in an Employment Guarantee Fund for this project and other areas which seek similar treatment;

c. that government assist the RCC and Farmers Unions to build the wall by offering employment to members of the community;

d. that work be laid out and paid by piece rates to groups that contract to build sections of the wall;

e. That normative work tables be used to arrive at a normative wage; that wage to be set at a discount of 25% of normal casual work rates in that area, since this is additional, not full-time work and income or at R10 per day;

f. that the project provides simple campsite necessities near worksites, plus transport to and from their homes during rest periods; a minimum of eight day work periods should be requisite, to keep transport costs down;

g. that the project provides materials such as cement and funds tools which may be purchased with the wage payment of the scheme. Tools increase labour productivity and so should be self-financing. They could include donkey carts and donkeys for carrying provisions or stones etc.;

h. that government partner the community and Farmers Union in the management of the scheme. (It may be convenient to contract an engineer/company to manage the work for Government);

i. payment be made in stages, as determined by the parties, (possibly upon completion and certification of the foundation, an interim stage, and again upon the completion of the wall);

j. the people of Damaraland, in exchange for the right to work on public works, agree to buy food in the normal markets. Damaraland buys in food under normal conditions, hence food distribution systems through the business community are already in place.

k. as the wall may not be completed during the year 1992, the community asks that Government consider the merits of an Employment Guarantee Scheme and:

- runs the scheme for a second year on food aid
- accepts the principle that such a scheme is socially, financially and economically efficient.
PERIODIC MARKETS

Government is organised in ministerial hierarchies. This means that government departments tend to deliver services and convene meetings independently of each other. Each department operates in a spatial and temporal manner; i.e., periodic. If government disciplined itself, or, and more likely, if community did so, and delivered all its services to market sites on market days, it would create new opportunities for the working of efficiency of scale for both services and for traders. Already the pension payouts and the livestock auctions, which are monthly events, form embryo market days and can be built upon.

The Welwitschia Agricultural Union can spawn a Market Society (together with the CLT if in existence). The Society, working with the Regional Government, chooses market sites and sets a calendar of market days. Local market committees run the market site, charging the sellers of goods or services for entry.

The vast distances of Damaraland can be accommodated into a market plan. Markets operate in space (distance from each other), in time (periodicity which can vary between markets, usually fortnightly or monthly), in hierarchy (primary markets feed into larger secondary markets that follow a day or two later and which have present the bank and more specialized services), and by agricultural season (in periods of low income, markets can be less frequent or operate without higher order services).

Periodic markets cut the costs of exchange. In rural Zimbabwe, urban traders now compete with rural traders on market day off the back of trucks. The result has been a drop in the cost of merchandise to an average of 64% of previous prices in rural areas. This has raised real rural incomes appreciably and has strengthened the flow of cash in the countryside, making more viable the local production of food, goods and services for local sale. Rural traders could now specialise, following the "ring" of markets.

Markets are colourful events suited to tourism. As important, they improve the flow of information, provide a platform for public campaigns such as health, raise local revenues, and create a regional distribution system which can support live entertainment and film shows, reducing isolation and promoting local cultural expression.

NEXT STEPS

The King's Council and the RCC seek funding for professional inputs to complete the planning quickly. The drought and the possibility of building the elephant wall under an Employment Guarantee Scheme through food-aid finance presents a tight and crucial timetable.

A comprehensive plan outline with greater details on items to be implemented is needed that covers:

Drought management:
The ecological survey of the proposed game sanctuary;
The building of the elephant wall in lieu of food relief;
Land purchase, land-use and community, the Community Land Trust;
Internal farm reform, the Village Trust Company;
Periodic Markets;
Wildlife, tourism, land use and resource management.
The wall is a symbol of community action. Donors and government should accept the financial package of piece rate activity on the wall and on stone collection for building, irrigated reed beds and other public works projects in lieu of food handouts as a step forward. The complimentary institutional, land use and wildlife conservation reforms proposed are the real prices and make investment in the wall part of a larger management reform system.

The different parts, at least in principle, should proceed together even if implementation varies. This means that the planning phase must be completed during June/July. The months of May and June will be vital for action during the rest of the year when the drought will bite. The King’s Council, the RCC and the consultants will have to work intimately, including at the discussions/meetings with community if the whole plan preparation cum community exploration and commitment is to go ahead speedily.

BUDGET FOR PLANNING EXERCISE

A rough budget for the planning exercise, with professional inputs, is presented below.

Damaraland Planning May to end July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants:</th>
<th>man weeks</th>
<th>of which in field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team leader/economist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional planner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>S.A.RANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCC, Kings' Council, Welwitschia Agricultural Union: travel, meetings, publications</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation : Regional Worship - Zimbabwe</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant travel and subsistence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 car weeks at R2.80/km and/or R298/day</td>
<td>approx. 25,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 weeks field subsistence at R700 pw</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks in Windhoek at R350/day</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees:</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Man weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local office support (Save the Rhino Trust)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological survey: (Hydrology, Ground Water, River Flow, Grazing, Browse &amp; Physical Impact of Wall as Elephant Barrier)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL + 5% Contingency</strong></td>
<td><strong>415,930</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIAL BUDGET FOR DROUGHT PROGRAMME OF PUBLIC WORKS

Equivalent Food Relief Costs for Damaraland : R14.8 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Man Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% Wages</td>
<td>R9.8 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Overheads/materials transport</td>
<td>R6.0 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>R14.8m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional funds to sustain Economy during Drought until October 1992 : R10 million.

In return for additional funding, 5% of grazing rights for three years placed with Trustee appointed by donor, sells annual rights to members, uses funds to maintain/develop assets as negotiated with the CLT.

A Trust Fund to match WTC income for investment for three years, after which the WTC accepts 20% local tax on disbursed income to members (dividend).

Initial estimate R12 000 x 12 Wards x 3 years = R432 000
APPENDIX 1

THE WARD TRUST COMPANY

Brief Description and Rules

All adults, men and women, are owner/members.
All common assets are vested in the WTC. (Land, water, woodland, fencing, roads, pipes etc.)
Three to five Trustees are appointed to supervise the democratic functioning of the WTC. The senior local member of the King’s Council is Chairman. Half the other Trustees are appointed by the CLT and half elected by the members of the WTC.
Various management committees are elected by the members: e.g. for grazing management, water, electricity and other infrastructure, building construction and maintenance etc.

At the A.G.M.:
the register of members is verified;
the carrying capacity of the land for the next year is set;
annual grazing rights are issued equally to each member;
members buy and sell grazing rights, optimising their grazing interest as against other members at the ruling price;
members agree to the proportion of the (now known) value of the grazing to be retained for investment and maintenance;
members pay in the proportion set in Rands, perhaps raising the amount by selling grazing rights and/or livestock or contributing labour to the community;
in addition to the monies retained for investment, members set the labour contribution of each member as X number of days per year;
an investment/maintenance plan and budget is approved;

Members are equal in the vote, in ownership, grazing rights and investment.

Grazing Illustration

A WTC with 100 members has a carrying capacity of 1000 livestock units.
Each member receives grazing rights for 10 livestock units.
Members buy and sell their grazing rights.
A price per grazing right arises of R10.
The value of the WTC grazing is 1000 X R10 = R10 000.
Each member’s share of 10 grazing rights is worth R100.
The members decide to invest half the value of the grazing i.e. R5 000
plus 20 man days per member i.e. 2 000 man days at R10/day = R20 000:
a total investment of R25 000.
Each member contributes R50 from the R100 worth of grazing rights received.
The WTC management can now approach a bank for a loan, as there is a cash flow for repayment purposes.
The Trustees, not wanting to allow the mortgaging of the future, will
limit committed repayments to no more than 30% of expected retained income. Over a seven year loan this would be R5 000 x 7 x 30 = R10 500. Hence the investment capacity of the WTC with R10 000 grazing is very high:

R5 000 + R20 000 + R10 300
or
R35 500 which is 350% of current income.

The intention is to seek a donor who will create a Trust Fund from which to match the retained income for investment for three years R1:R1. In return, WTCs agree that, after three years, a local government tax to fund roads and other regional infrastructure may be levied on the disbursed income (here R50 per member) at the rate of 20% or R10. This tax will act as an incentive to communities to retain a high proportion of income for investment, strengthening future WTC incomes and hence building up to the agricultural tax base.

Adjustment to Drought

The A.G.M. takes place before the rains and the new season, probably in December. If by quarter year, March end, it is clear that there is a drought in any WTC area, an emergency General Meeting can be called. This meeting would:
- cancel existing holdings of grazing rights; this means that those who sold grazing rights for the year must compensate the buyers for three quarters of the payments made. R7.50 per grazing right;
- decide a new carrying capacity for the next nine to twelve months when the veld and water supplies may have improved and stabilised;
- issue new equal grazing rights to members (perhaps only 500) which they then buy and sell as before, establishing a new price for grazing, which should be higher, reflecting the scarcity, perhaps R16 each;
- mount an internal investment programme to pay wages for member labour inputs based on piece rates, from a Reserve Fund established at the formation of the WTC, which should receive 10% of the annual retained income, plus, if any, government and donor finances for public works.
COMMUNITY LAND TRUST. (CLT)

Land-use planning, training, advice, management supervision, auditing, land purchase, game sanctuary, tourism. Membership: All adults as equal owners.

12 WARD TRUST COMPANIES
Equal adult ownership
Annual exchangeable grazing rights
Retained profit and labour investment

WILDLIFE SANCTUARY
CLT MANAGED

FIGURE 1. The relationships between and functions of the Community Land Trust, the 12 Ward Trust Companies and the Wildlife Sanctuary and local tourist industry.
APPENDIX TWO

CONSERVANCIES

The initiation of conservancies forms an important part of the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism’s new policy in Namibia. Obviously the ownership of wildlife is the crux to promoting the conservancy concept amongst farming communities.

With ownership a probability through the application of the Zimbabwe model (Rural Structural Adjustment Programme) and via the definition of “appropriate authority” down to district council or community level, it seems possible to consider the advent of conservancies, should rural farmers wish to control, protect and utilise wildlife collectively on state land, or, as above, but with adjoining commercial farmers on private land (joint-venture concept).

This combined approach would greatly facilitate the concept of catchments becoming units of planning in an overall land-use programme.
APPENDIX 3
OSTRICH FARMING AS AN OPTION

The recent interest in ostrich farming has spread to Damaraland with requests from groups of farmers and individuals alike (a block of farms north of the Ugab river from Sorris Sorris/Anixab to Vegloop).

Further interest has been shown by the community of Uis to possibly become involved in the rearing of chicks and the incubation of eggs. This could also be a possibility at Nai-nais which has plots of arable land for fodder and power and water utilities which are a legacy from the Uis mining days.

Provisionally, ownership of ostriches would have to be decided (wild or domestic, state owned or privately owned) and possibilities exist for stocking areas from wild populations or collecting eggs under license.

Birds could be farmed for skins, meat, feathers, bone meal, the sale of live adult and young birds, incubation of eggs and sale of eggs. These options could be practised alongside domestic stock farming.

Such a scheme could possibly involve groups of farmers in the form of a co-operative, such as proposed by the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation in Bushmanland, or through Community and District Council Action through the Namibian Agricultural Union, if the birds were domesticated. In the latter case, this form of farming would fall under the Ministry of Agriculture and not Wildlife Conservation.

Sufficient water exists in the Ugab River to sustain the growth of fodder crops such as lucerne and barley to supplement the feed for domestic stock and ostriches.
APPENDIX 4

DISCUSSION OF ECOLOGICAL SURVEY

Most of the questions to be investigated by experts of various disciplines such as botany, ethno-botany, ethology, ecology and geology are self-explanatory. However, some questions need to be highlighted.

The most important aspects to be investigated by the survey are:

i. Whether the western-most farms could be released (re-allocated) to create wildlife space; this would in particular effect the farms currently being used by the Riemvassmakers.

ii. Where the final proposed stone barrier should be erected and what route it should ideally follow;

iii. Taking ii) above into consideration, how many road and river crossings would be required to be constructed.

It is proposed that the target dates for the Ecological survey be June, July, August and September 1992 as in the winter months it would be more feasible to determine the following points:

a. How ground water holds out at specific pumping rates
b. How long wetlands last and the changes in the quality of the water in the wetlands.
c. The grazing and browse pressures, especially taking into account the present situation of drought.
d. The hydrology and drainage patterns within and outside the proposed wall/barrier. *

*It is proposed that this section of the survey be conducted by the Ministry of Water Affairs. Funding would have to be sought on a budgetary assistance level, as the survey would not have been included in the budget of the Ministry. Historical records would be required that would only be available to this Ministry such as:

A review of all existing boreholes;
Number of boreholes defunct and when they became defunct
How many boreholes have been cleaned and deepened
What the shortfall is at present
How many farm dams are in existence within and without the proposed wall area and in commercial farming areas
What the success rate of water installations in the area has been and whether there is an indication of mining rather than sustainable utilisation of water resources,
Investigation of the alarming failure of several permanent water points on commercial farms, bordering Damaraland in the Huab area.
Identification of potential sites within the area to provide either ground dams or weirs/ walled dams and better water points.
An assessment would have to be made of the stock unit grazing capacity both inside and out of the area to be walled to determine the limits to domestic stock and wildlife species specifically.

Research into economic shares for the community within the potential walled area from the hunting of elephant as trophy animals, which presently fetch R15 000 per animal. Investigation of government policy, legal status and possible donation of certain animals to the community for sale to trophy hunters would have to be investigated.

A point that would be valuable to take into consideration in this survey would be that by building the stone barrier to the west of the Veterinary Cordon Fence from Werda to Grootberg (Farms Makalani and Humor) the Veterinary Cordon Fence would finally provide a secure, permanent barrier to stock and wildlife.

It would then be possible for Hobatere (The Five Farms) to become a closed managed unit and act as a satellite of the Etosha National Park. This improved status would allow for the creation of a Rhino Sanctuary in this area with additional spin-offs for education of local tour guides, rangers and as a potential protein producer based on excess game numbers.
1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that the presence of elephants on the commercial farms in the eastern area of the Huab river catchment, are causing problems for commercial cattle farmers. There have been suggestions that elephants should be shot in an effort to lessen the problem. However, those who have worked in this area for many years, maintain that the shooting of some elephants will not result in a permanent solution and that within a short time, the problems will recur. Some of the commercial farmers have indicated that they are willing to sell their farms. Others have indicated that they are willing to remain farming with the elephants present.

2. Investment in elephants for tourism

A group of people willing to purchase the farms which elephants frequent in this area have requested that a meeting be called at a local level to discuss the potential economic value of investing in these farms. The group of potential investors wishes to discuss the possibility of forming a Conservancy among all landowners in the immediate area who are willing to participate. The conditions leading to the formation of a Conservancy will also be discussed with the Rural Conservation Committee with the purpose of integrating the aims of the Conservancy with the aims of the communal farmers who are trying to find a solution to the elephant problem in the western areas of the Huab river catchment.*

3. Tourist camp and accommodation at the farm Monte Carlo

The potential investors consist of people well qualified and experienced in conservation, tourism and craft making. All of the investors have indicated their wish to participate in training programmes. Local people with knowledge of bush-lore could also become involved in the running of instruction courses.

4. Benefits to the community in the west

The safety and protection of the wildlife in the proposed conservancy would depend upon the successful protection of wildlife, especially the elephant, in the communal areas to the west. It is therefore suggested that a revolving fund be established by the conservancy holders to contribute to the management and maintenance of the Sanctuary or Multi-use Management area it is proposed to establish west of the commercial farms.

Note:
A group of safari operators has recently purchased farms on the eastern boundary of the communal farming area which is utilised by the elephants. These investors are planning to form a conservancy for the elephants and wish to cooperate with the plans for conservation on the communal lands to the west. There have also been discussion on forming a training centre for tourist guides and the making of handcrafts for the community.
EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

PUBLIC AWARENESS

PAGES

1. List of schools visited during extension work.
2. Children's story on general environment.
3. Framework for talks on rhino at Damara schools.
5. Information leaflet for visitors to the Hoanib river.
7. Extracts from newsletter "Run Rhino Run".
### Schools Visited During the Course of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gariseb</td>
<td>Sorris-Sorris</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandberg Primary</td>
<td>Uis</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunfels Agricultural School</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Goroseb High School</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibason Junior Secondary</td>
<td>Okombah</td>
<td>7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Bowe Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Garo. b Primary</td>
<td>Anker</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Amxab Primary</td>
<td>Sesfontein</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans Frederick Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grootberg Primary</td>
<td>Erwee</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Training Centre</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob Basson Primary</td>
<td>Bergsig</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!De /Gab Primary</td>
<td>Tubusis</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus Ganeb High School</td>
<td>Uis</td>
<td>8 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th. F. Gaab Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrified Forest Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwitschia Junior Secondary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai Gams Junior School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Ho're Privaatschule</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George's Diocesan School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia High School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English School</td>
<td>Swakopmund</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German School</td>
<td>Swakopmund</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 27 schools and approximately 9500 pupils were lectured by both MCT, WWF and SRT staff during the course of the project. General environmental awareness, lectures on specific species, talks on local and regional environmental problems such as overgrazing, elephant problems and poaching as well as video shows were presented.

* All extension work at the schools was organised and planned by Nahor Hovoseb, Chief Ranger of the MWCT in Khorixas. He has attended several courses in environmental education including courses at Wêreidsend Environmental Education Centre.
CARLOS THE JACKAL

It was a misty morning on the Skeleton Coast. In the distance a group of people were standing with rods in their hands and lines in the water.

"What are they doing?" asked Brak, the jackal puppy.

"They are fishing," said Mother Jackal. "The nylon line has bait on it which hides a barbed hook. The line is thrown into the sea, the fish bites the bait and gets caught. Then the fisherman pulls in the line with a fish on it."

A human boy saw the jackals and ran over, throwing sticks and stones. "Go away," he shouted. "Shoo — shoooo."

"Why is he shouting 'shoo' at us?" asked Carlos. "I left that shoe far away near the houses."

A human girl yelled, "Look at all this rubbish." She handed Carlos a kelp gull.

A stone landed near the jackal family and they moved off to a safe distance. They all lay down to watch the fishermen.

"We must watch carefully now," said Mother Jackal. "We may get a chance to take a fish which is lying about. Some humans are very careless. Perhaps we could get a nice meal."

Finally the fishermen left. The jackals immediately trotted over and began to clean up. There were two barbels and some pieces of bait. Each one managed to get something. But Carlos was still searching for more.

There were beer bottles, cool-drink cans and plastic wrappers. Carlos could smell the delicious smell of sardines on the plastic, so he lay down and began to chew.

"Stop, stop, Carlos! That will kill you if you eat it," shouted a crow from above him.

He floated down and landed next to Carlos. It was Peg-leg. He had lost a leg a little while ago when it got caught in a tangle of fishing line on the beach.

"Kraak, kraak," croaked Peg-leg. The gull drifted off. "I just fly away to a clean place and look for mussels to eat."

"The kelp gull doesn't care today," said Peg-leg. "But one day there won't BE a clean place to go to."

Why is there all this effort to protect the rhino?

Because we want to protect your future by protecting Namibia's most valuable wild animal. By protecting the rhino we automatically protect your environment too! That includes everything, from the grass, the trees, the birds and all other wild animals, because we patrol intensively to make sure that no one comes to shoot the rhino during the patrols all problems are recorded.

1. Rhino must have a good environment to live in, this means that:
   - water must be available
   - grass and trees and shrubs must be available for rhinos to feed on
   - soil erosion must be checked
   - dams must not be built in the wrong place as this may cause water to stop flowing to the western, drier areas where other animals need the water
   - visits by strange people are recorded and checked
   - the area must be clean and free of litter and pollution because tourists spend a lot of money to travel and see the rhino and they do not want to visit dirty places which are full of litter
   - all the wild animals and increase in numbers are recorded
   - traps and snares to catch or kill animals are collected

What means do we use to protect the rhino?

1. We monitor and count the rhino
2. We photograph each one and give it a name to recognise it
3. We record where it is seen
4. We record every new calf that is born
5. We know how many cows and how many bulls there are in each area
6. We know when any one rhino is missing
7. When we think an area is unsafe because of poachers or because some rhinos are missing, we cut off the horns of those rhinos which remain in that area (because the poachers kill the rhino only for their horn which is sold to people in the East who think it will cure headaches and stomach troubles, or it is sold to rich people in the East for making dagger handles)
8. we offer a big reward to anyone who will give us information about those people who deal in rhino horn or have shot a rhino

9. there are heavy fines, anyone who shoots a rhino or deals in rhino horn faces a charge of R200,000 or 20 years in jail

10. we try to educate the people through visiting schools and farms to tell them how important it is to protect the rhino

The value of a rhino to the community and your future

1. soon the first Damaraland rhinos will be sold for R1 million for a pair (1 cow & 1 bull)

2. we are presently trying to ensure that some of that money will come back to the community and school requirements so that everyone will want to help protect the rhino and will benefit from the value of the rhino which they have protected.

3. but, the most important reason for protecting the rhino is to be able to go to the wild places where the rhino is and to see the beauty of Africa and the wild animals of Africa living free in a beautiful land which has not been spoilt by killing and destruction. The community will then be proud of themselves for the part they took in keeping it that way

How are we sure that by dehorning the rhino we will not endanger their lives as wild animals?

1. we have done intensive studies of the behaviour of these rhino in the wild

2. there are very few or no lions in the areas where the rhino have been dehorned, so they do not have to use their horns to fight off lions

3. the food which they eat is mostly available to the rhino without having to break branches with their horns

4. the rhino in Damaraland do not have to fight each other for space as there are few in a large area

5. the size and fierceness of a rhino is enough to frighten away any other animal which may threaten them or their calf

6. because we have studied the rhino population and their movements we dehorn rhino which do not mix with other rhino

How do we know that we can take rhino away and sell rhino without harming the small population that we have?

1. because our studies and collection of records over the past 10 years show that some of the young rhino are going into areas where there are people living and rhino and people are not able to live together as they are a danger to each other. So we have to take some young rhino away every year.
A great step for the desert giants

Those 'desert' elephants! For more than a decade, the controversy over a population of elephants living in the very arid habitat of the Northern Namib and Pro-Namib known as the Kaokoveld (a collective botanical name for Kaokoland and Damaraland), has raged on. Some people felt that elephants in a desert had to be suffering, that they had been forced there by circumstance; others felt that they could be a new race of elephant; some even thought they should be saved by translocating them to a bushveld habitat where they wouldn't have to "struggle" to survive.

Then there were those who felt that they should be shot — for fun, for illegal ivory trading or for hunting trophies. There has been much speculation over their differences: are they taller? Do they have bigger feet? Is their ivory heavier? Do they slide down the dunes? Do they visit the Atlantic for a quick dip? Do they survive for a week without water? Do they travel more than 70 kilometres in a night?

These questions and beliefs are often the central point of discussion around the glowing campfires of tourists, who are now privileged to visit and see the giants in their arid habitat. Photographic safari groups have today taken the place of the poacher of the past, and the sceptics have to admit that the 'desert' elephants shall remain, and are becoming a money spinner as a tourist attraction.

Blythe Louitl and Malan Lindeque

Poachers and glory seekers had reduced the elephant population from an estimated 1000 or more in Damaraland and Kaokoland in 1960 (Vijoen 1987) to about 70 in the western areas and about 250 in the central and eastern region of Kaokoveld in the early 1980's. This indiscriminate killing, which became a virtual slaughter in the early 1980's, was curtailed by the eleventh hour intervention of concerned conservationists who combined forces from the private sector, locally, and internationally, with Government personnel. Council Representatives from Damaraland and Headmen in Kaokoland. The tidal wave of slaughter was slowly stilled by strict law enforcement measures, conservation extension work amongst the local human inhabitants and monitoring of the elephant population by ground patrols.

Today the elephants which survived to live and breed in this unusual habitat are thriving. Since 1985 the population has shown a marked increase in recruitment rate and new calves are now commonly seen with the small herds. However, they are still subjected to certain limiting pressures from man. This usually comes from the agricultural sector. Because the climate and terrain does not lend itself to conventional forms of agriculture, the presence of stock or crop farms are restricted in the Kaokoveld. Nonetheless, stock such as goats and cattle are slowly encroaching into areas which could be more sustainably utilised by the indig...
enous wildlife. Elephants can and do co-exist surprisingly well with the subsistence farmers who inhabit the edge of the arid zone. There are however problems which crop up from time to time. When a herd insists on returning to drink water at a Damara homestead they occasionally play havoc with the donkeys, hens, chickens and goats, plus upsetting the entire family. This is when the Directorate of Nature Conservation is called upon to chase them off, an unpleasant business. Getting rid of a herd of stubborn, wily and sometimes playful elephants is often very time consuming. A group of game rangers has to sit and wait through the night for their stealthy approach. Then, suddenly the still of the night is rent with a barrage of booms, bangs and flashing lights. This uninvited fireworks display ensures that the elephants do not return to that homestead and will probably keep to the wilder, uninhabited areas in future.

The Directorate of Veterinary Services is subjected to another form of irritation from the elephants. In the mid-1970's an enormous double fence was erected across Damaland from east to west, stretching well into the very arid desert area. The fence was erected to comply with European Economic Community requirements for the export of beef from SWA/Namibia. Naturally the elephants had age old routes which they followed to water, or followed in their local migration patterns. So the fence is broken repeatedly. A fence is no obstacle to an elephant, and it is unlikely that they will change their ways and stop breaking the fence, which the Veterinary Department feels would be too costly to electrify.

Human orientated problems and scientifically based questions regarding these world renowned 'desert elephants' and the presently being investigated. The Directorate of Nature Conservation has recently launched a combined project on the status of large mammals in the Kaokoveld, which consists of investigations into various aspects of wildlife. Each aspect is supervised by a researcher specialising in that section.

Elephants, Black Rhinos, Lions, Giraffe and Black-faced Impalas are the main concerns for study, against a background of human land use of the area, condition of the vegetation and climate. This project might be a first for Namibia, as all Nature Conservation staff members operating in Damaland and Kaokoland, and several private individuals cooperate in collecting information. Each theme of study is coordinated by a researcher specialising in that section. Regular liaison with the Damaland Representative Council has been established, and recently the Administration for Kaokoland has joined the planning discussions.

It was plainly obvious that more information had to be collected on the movements of elephant herds. In October 1987, six elephant cows from widely separated herds were immobilized by the Game Capture Unit of the Directorate of Nature Conservation, and fitted with special radio collars. These collars have very powerful radio transmitters and their signals are received by satellite, rather than the usual ground or aircraft method of radiotracking. Information relayed from the satellite is received in Ondouka, in Etosha National Park, where a computer calculates the locality of each elephant. This elaborate, and very expensive system of radiotracking was necessary to cover the very rugged and vast area of the Kaokoveld, which is otherwise largely inaccessible to researchers.

The capture and collaring operation proceeded smoothly, and each elephant was back on its feet within 12-15 minutes. Cows rejoined their herds very quickly, as disturbance was minimal and the rest of a herd never moved very far away from the immobilized animal. All the while the helicopter sat idling nearby to make sure the protective herd did not return too close. The agility of these elephants in such rocky terrain was ably demonstrated.
by one old cow which made a very swift charge before the drug took effect. The capture team ran as if there were no rocks at all!

Within the first two weeks after being fitted with the satellite collars, all three herds which were marked west of the veterinary fence had moved east across it into the farming area of Damaraland. Local rainfall seems to have been the cue for movements, and it is clearly advisable for elephants to follow the sparse and isolated green patches in response to rain.

Now that the poaching tide has been turned and the Kaokoveld has received good rainfall in the past few years, it is especially important to monitor the population and to ensure its recovery. A long term plan for the Kaokoveld elephants is necessary, as their ultimate survival in an area that cannot be set aside for wildlife only, but must be regarded as a multi-use conservation area, depends on the benefits received by the local inhabitants for having elephants there at all. Movement patterns to and from the farming area can now be monitored by the satellite system. This information, in addition to regular counts and assessments of herd structure, will aid greatly in the management of the population, to the benefit of the local people.

The historical records indicate that the 'desert' elephants have lived in this arid habitat for hundreds if not thousands of years. It is not a different race or species, but those inhabiting the more arid and extremely arid areas to the west survive where other elephants probably would not.

To they take a dip in the ocean? Do they slide down the dunes? Yes they do, as elephants anywhere would take advantage of their environment. Artist Koos von Ellinckhuizen has seen them on the beaches of the Skeleton Coast Park. Photographers Des and Jen Bartlett have seen them 'sliding' down the dunes. Elephants in a desert habitat will, in many respects, remain a mystery to the human race, and many of their secrets may never be discovered. However, with today's science and technology, most important facts on their movements and range are being revealed, and this will ensure that proper conservation measures are taken and that *Loxodonta africana* will have a secure future in its arid habitat.

---

Reference


About the authors

Blythe Loult is an artist, botanist and expert on the desert dwelling Black Rhinoceros of the Kaokoveld. She was one of the concerned people who helped turn the tide of poaching and slaughter that decimated the rhino and elephant populations in the 1970s. She lives in Khorixas, where her husband Rudi is Principal Nature Conservator for Damaraland and the Skeleton Coast. Address: P.O. Box 83, Khorixas 9000, South West Africa/Namibia.

Malan Lindeque is Biologist with the Directorate of Nature Conservation, Okakarara Ecological Centre, Etosha National Park; via Outjo 9000, SWA/Namibia. His current research programme on the desert elephants is the first in Africa to utilise a ground receiving station for satellite radio-telemetry of wild animals.
Dear Traveller

During your travels in the Hoanib river area you are bound to see some of the unique desert dwelling elephants that have made their homes here.

These animals are part of a remaining population that was almost wiped out by poachers in the late 1970's and early 1980's. No calves survived for 7 years due to constant persecution.

This population has been designated as high priority for conservation by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

These elephant, which are uniquely adapted to the harsh and arid environment you see around you, spend their entire lives in this region which receives less than 150mm of rain annually. Their home range, now under study, appears to be limited to the area between the Huab and Hoanib river catchments.

Their recent history of perpetual disturbance and harassment has made these elephant apprehensive of humans. As soon as they hear your vehicle approach, they will move away. If you want to see them clearly, it is necessary to travel slowly; stop and wait patiently and before long they will resume their normal activities.

Your best photographs will be taken when the elephants are relaxed and feel unthreatened. Only then will you see them to your advantage.

Should the elephants move into dense bush it would be best to carefully climb to a high vantage point to view and photograph them rather than follow them on foot or by vehicle.

Remember, these animals are potentially dangerous, particularly when it seems to them that they or their young are being threatened.

Please avoid camping within 4 km of any open water or drinking holes. If you do so you will keep the elephants away. As they may not have drunk for three days, this will cause them major stress, particularly the calves and cows with young.

We shall be grateful for any observations of behaviour and copies of photographs you may be able to share with us. Please make sure you note the time, date and place of such remarks and photos. We need all the information you may be able to collect but please ensure the elephants are not disturbed or harassed by such efforts.

If you are unable to complete the form... we shall still appreciate its return with any comments to SRTF, P.O.Box 83, Khorixas 9000, Namibia.

Thank you for your cooperation and wherever you may be able to contribute to our records.

TAKE ONLY PHOTOGRAPHS
LEAVE NOTHING BUT YOUR FOOTPRINTS
Exhilarated by the proximity of water, a pair of elephants charge down a dune. With hind legs bent and forelegs straight, the bulls raced to the bottom and plunged into a nearby water hole, called Aussi, for a boisterous splash. These desert-adapted elephants travel as far as 45 miles a day and can go without water for three or four days. Their knowledge of the land has accumulated over many generations, as echoed by an elephant incised in a rock engraving carved perhaps thousands of years ago.

Africa's Skeleton Coast
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INFORMAL SURVEY OF RIEMVASMAKER FARMERS
IN THE WEST OF THE HUAB RIVER CATCHMENT
JANUARY 1990

From the 13th to 17th January 1990, staff of the SRT and ACT
volunteer Jason Mortimer undertook an informal socio-ecological
survey on the 18 most western farms of the WWF project area. The
survey was done after consultation with the headmen Mr Jacob Basson
and Mr Petrus Loeriesfontein. The communities on the farms were
informed that their cooperation in the survey was optional. 37 he-
of families took part, all those approached were willing to answer
the questions.

The survey has not been fully analysed, but the questionnaires are
available for future reference. The main purpose of the survey was
assess the number of people living there; the numbers of stock;
visits by elephants; the state of grazing and water availability;
where the families originated; how many farmers wanted to move to
better farming areas and whether anyone wished to become involved
game farming. Problems experienced with wildlife or otherwise, wer
also noted.

A summary of the main points are as follows:

a. The 37 families consisted of a total of 122 adults and 152
children.
b. Total stock numbered 9 375.
c. 26 families had adequate water.
d. 27 families stated their grazing was inadequate.
e. 9 families wished to move to better farming areas. 3 were unsu
f. 1 man wished to remain and change to game farming, but did not
have the experience or money to make the change.
g. 25 families came from South Africa.
h. 8 families originated in Damaraland.

The most western communal farms, which are situated west of the 10
isohyet are cause for concern. The farms had been vacated by white
commercial farmers in the late 1980's, or in some cases were used
farm owners only in years of good rainfall. The land was otherwise
considered to be too arid for permanent occupation by domestic etc

Today's permanent occupation has brought degradation of the
vegetation, soil erosion, excess firewood consumption and increasi
human and domestic stock numbers which is exacerbating a creeping
desertification of the land. The full analysis of this survey cou
provide important reference data for better land use management an
environmental planning.
RIEMVASMAAK CENSUS  JANUARY 1990

NAME  Pietrus Louis Fritz (headman)  FARM/POST  De Reit  ||
NO. OF FAMILIES  1  NO. OF ADULTS  6  NO. OF CHILDREN  1

HOW LONG IN RESIDENCE  Since 1974  FROM WHERE  RSA

ARE THERE ELEPHANTS  no  LIONS  yes  RHINOS  no  HYENAS  yes  JACKALS  yes

DO THEY CAUSE PROBLEMS  yes
WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS
1. 1 - have killed four goats in 1989
2. 2 - have killed five goats in 1989
3. 3

WHEN DO THE PROBLEMS OCCUR  DRY SEASON  WET SEASON  ALL YEAR

ARE THERE SUFFICIENT SCHOOLS  yes  SHOPS  yes  CHURCHES  yes  CLINICS  no

HOW MANY GOATS  37  SHEEP  0  CATTLE  17  DONKEYS  5  HORSES  0  DOGS  1

ARE THERE FACILITIES TO SELL STOCK  he sells them here

ARE SALES PRIVATE  yes  OR GOVT ORGANISED  no

IS THERE ENOUGH WATER  yes  GRAZING  no

DOES THE RESIDENT FARMER WANT TO MOVE  yes

TO WHERE  between Windhoek & Rehoboth

OR WOULD THE FARMER LIKE TO GIVE UP STOCK FARMING  no

WOULD HE/SHE LIKE TO CHANGE TO GAME FARMING  no

SIGNATURE (OPTIONAL)  Pietrus Louis Fritz

DATE  14-1-90

NOTES  # This man is recognised as the headman here. There are many small-time farmers with lands of five or less. We asked him to recommend the people we should talk to. He gave us the names of other farmers in the area. There may have been more, but there were so many people that we could not tell.
SURVEY OF FARMS IN THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA

During April/May 1991, a survey was made by staff of the Khorixas office of the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, Ministry of Agriculture and the WWF/SRT on all the occupied farms where elephants may have created conflict. The surveyors used a questionnaire of 63 points to ensure the maximum possible uniformity of answers. When contradictory answers were given or if the farmer being interviewed had no specific answer, these were categorised accordingly. Completed questionnaires were analysed according to the seven major groups of questions.

The following persons conducted the survey:

N Howoseb
A Ucham
E Aibeb
B Ilonga
G Awaseb
S James
W Oppel
G Eihab
H Gurirab
A Kanseb
H Gaogoseb
R Dausab
GV Useb
F Hendriks
J Nuab
MC Tsusib.
MAP OF DAMARALAND

- Reported elephant problems 1989-1991
- Protected artificial water holes (WWF project)
- Game guards (WWF project)
- National Monument (Twyfelfontein)
- Tourist development (WWF project)
- Rivers
- Wildlife Safari Concessions/
  National Tourist area
- Commercial Farms/
  Proposed elephant conservancy
14 Do you want the wildlife protected by law?

15 Do you want benefits from the wildlife? (meat.....fees from trophy hunters.....fees paid by tourists visiting the game areas.....)

16 How many times a year do the elephants visit this post/farm?

17 If "YES", in what numbers do they come?

18 How long do they stay?

19 Do you use any noises to warn the elephants while you are travelling

20 What sort of noises?

.......... ...........................................................

........... ...........................................................

21 Do you use any noises to chase elephants away from your homestead?

22 What sort of noises?

........... ...........................................................

........... ...........................................................

23 Do you know of any noise that will chase the elephants away?

........... ...........................................................

........... ...........................................................

24 What damages have been caused by the elephants in the past 2 years?

........... ...........................................................

........... ...........................................................
25 Are you interested in making use of the natural resources such as wildlife?

26 What time of the year do the elephants come to your farm

Jan Feb Mar Apr May June July Aug Sept Oct Nov Dec

27 What is your suggestion to help stop the problems between humans / stock and elephants?


28 Who do you report to when there are elephants giving trouble?


29 How often do the elephants come to the water installation?

30 Do you think the elephants have increased in the last 3 years?

Y/N

31 Why?

32 How many elephants do you think there are?

33 Do you think there are too many elephants?

34 Do you know of anyone being killed by elephants in your lifetime,

SECTION III

35 Is there enough water for the stock and the game on the farm?

36 How many windmills do you use?
37 How many diesel pumps do you use?
38 Do you have any dams?
39 How many dams do you use?
40 Do your stock drink at natural water springs?
41 How many natural springs are on this farm?
42 Are there any springs which you know of which are used only by the wildlife?
43 How many springs do you know of which are used by wildlife only?
44 Do you need protection for your water installations?
45 Is there enough water on the farm?

SECTION IV (DOMESTIC)

46 Do you have any other sort of income?
47 What income do you get from your stock?
48 Do you have protection for your stock? (herders/night paddocks/dogs)
49 Do you have protection for your house and vegetable garden?
50 Where do your children go to school?

51 How do they travel to school
a) by donkey cart. Y/N...
b) by motor vehicle. Y/N...
c) on horse back. Y/N...
d) on foot Y/N?
52 How many times a year do the children have to travel?

53 What transport do the people on the farm use?
   a) Donkey cart.
   b) Donkey/horse/mule riding
   c) Motor vehicle
   d) By foot

SECTION V

54 How many head do you have of:
   a) goats
   b) sheep
   c) cattle
   d) donkeys
   e) horses

55 Do you look after someone else’s stock?

56 Is your grazing always good?

57 or always bad?

58 Do you have to move your stock to other grazing seasonally?

IF YES:

59 What time of the year do you move your stock?

60 Does the stock have to be moved every year?
61 How much stock did you have 2 years ago?
   a) Goats......
   b) Cattle......
   c) Sheep......
   d) Donkeys....
   e) Horses......
   f) Mules......

62 Do you fix the broken fences yourself

63 Does the government fix the broken fences?

Thank you for your co-operation, we hope very much to be able to help you.

Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism & Save the Rhino Trust - Elefriends.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE FARM SURVEY DURING APRIL/MAY 1991

Characteristics of farms.

Almost all farmers interviewed (98%) had legal right of land occupancy (Table 2.). Furthermore, the majority of farmers had only one or two water points which accentuated the conflict between elephants and the farmer. Most farmers originated from the communal land areas such as Damaraland. The reasons for occupying their present farm were numerous. The five major ones (57%) were; drought, the Odenthal commission which created black "homelands"), expansion of farming operations, expulsion from farms elsewhere, and problem animals (lions, elephants, hyenas) on previous farms.

Table 1: Reaction of 209 farmers in Damaraland to elephants occurring in the Huab Catchment area, expressed as a percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARMERS MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS</th>
<th>ACCEPTABILITY OF ELEPHANTS TO FARMERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a protected area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocate to Etosha.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce / cull problem elephant.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide electrified fences.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move farmers away.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply special water points.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocate north of red line.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use as a tourist attraction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Acceptability of elephants.

Farmers were divided into two main categories: those who said elephants were acceptable on their farms and those opposing the presence of elephants (Table 1.). Both categories were also asked what their proposals for management of elephants in their areas were. Table 1. shows that 90% of farmers did not want elephants on their farms. The clear majority (54%) proposing that elephants be isolated in an area set aside for their protection.
Table 2: Characteristics of 214 occupied farms in the Huab Catchment Area and the northern extremity of the elephant’s range in Damaraland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER MEASURED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of occupancy to land (%)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of water points (range)</td>
<td>1.7 (0-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of farmers to relocate (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin of farmers (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal land</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upington RSA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began here</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for occupancy of land (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odendaal Commission</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand farming</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled elsewhere</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem animals elsewhere</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better habitat here</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated - Upington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water problems elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency grazing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer people</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock theft elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied land</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started farming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Reaction of 211 farmers in Damaraland to farming in conjunction with wildlife, expressed as a percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to farm together with wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - but not with elephants.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - including elephants.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want benefits from wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in using wildlife sustainably?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want wildlife protected by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reaction of farmers to farming with wildlife.

Four questions in this regard were put to farmers and their answers divided into acceptance, rejection and undecided (Table 3). It is obvious that the majority (86%) of farmers wanted wildlife (excluding elephants on their farms (10% were prepared to have elephants as well). A higher percentage (89%) were interested in benefiting from wildlife and using it sustainably, while nearly all (97%) wanted legal protection for wildlife.
Figure 1: Monthly distribution of elephant related complaints. Most problems occurred in the winter months and involved damage to water installations and gardens or were prompted by elephants drinking "too much" water. 82 complaints were entered in 37 months.

Table 4: Frequency of elephant visits to farms and the categories of damage recorded for such visits. (74 farms - 203 families) (Excluding 33 families recording no visits or damage.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER MEASURED - Visits (n=203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No damage recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only drank water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to gardens and garden products by trampling / eating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to water installations e.g. pipes pulled out, taps broken or windmills bent, engines damaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to fences at houses, paddocks and around water installations &amp; gardens near reservoirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing / maiming stock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table records the month and type of elephant related complaint registered in the complaints book between May 1989 until June 1992. "Water" refers to complaints of elephant drinking all or too much water. "Damage" includes all complaints of damage to property, such as water pipes or fences. "Problems" includes all other complaints, such as people being worried about elephant near their homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>DAMAGE</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Rube Karras</td>
<td>Logukop</td>
<td>LOW ACRE PULLED OUT THE WATER PIPE. HE MARY LOW DRINK WATER THERE. WANTS NO US TO TAKE A DRUM OF DIESEL FROM KARRAS TO LOGUKOP.</td>
<td>LOW DERG OF 2000 LITRE DIESEL. LOCALS USING THE TUBE TO FIX THE RIS. THEY SAY THEY HAVE FIXED THE RAPID LOW COME AND DRINK THERE SPORADICALLY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diesel pumps</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 38. Dams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dams</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 39. Dam use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dams used</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working yet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 40. Natural springs - stock use of

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry season</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 41. Number of springs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Springs</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 42. Natural springs only used by wildlife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Illustrates the results obtained to the question "What sort of noises do you use to chase elephants away from your homestead?" Of those that used noises, whip-cracks and banging drums and other objects were the noises most used.

Figure 3. Shows the response to the question "Do you know of any noise that will chase the elephants away?" Most people (58%) thought that elephants could be chased away by noises with whip-cracks and drums being the most effective. 32% thought that no noises were effective.
Figure 4: Of those who thought that noises were effective; 33% thought whip-cracks and 31% beating drums was the best method. This compares with actual methods people said they used, namely 27% whip-cracks and 46% banging drums (see Figure 4).
4. Increase in domestic stock numbers.

Farmers were asked to provide estimates of their stock numbers two years previously (1989) and at the time of interview (1991). The total number of stock reported was 4% lower in 1991 (55413 in 1989 compared to 53176 in 1991). These figures give a simplified idea of what has happened and are slightly misleading. Figure 6, shows that in fact more families had more stock in 1991 than 1989 but some of those families with the most stock reported decreases since 1989. Figure 4, shows how the relative abundance of different stock types changed. The percentages (of all stock for each period) and numbers, of sheep and cattle increased in 1991 whereas the number of goats reportedly decreased. Figures 7, to 10 present data on the overall and individual family situation for each species except horses (see the figure legends for detailed explanations).
Figures 7, to 10. Each square represents the stock holding of a family. Those falling below the straight line reported fewer stock in 1991 than in 1989 and those falling above the line owned more stock in 1991. Trends can therefore be seen. Those falling on the line reported unchanged stock numbers. Those on the Y-axis had no stock in 1989 or were not in the area then.

Figure 6. Shows the family distribution of total stock in 1989 and 1991. There were fewer families with large stock numbers in 1991 but more families had increased their stock in the 400-800 range. It can also be seen that most families had less than 300 animals.

(See Figure .)
Figure 7: This figure shows that cattle have increased with many more families owning up to 50 animals. A similar number of families appear to have increased as decreased their cattle holdings in those with more numerous cattle.

Figure 9: Clearly shows that those families with over 500 goats in 1989 had fewer in 1991 but that there has been a large change in fortune of families owning from 200 to 400 goats with an overall increase. Most families had fewer than 400 animals. (See Figure 7.)
Figure 9. The figure shows that there was a relatively large increase in the number of sheep owned by families having between 100 and 200 sheep in 1989 and an overall increase for those families having more than 100 animals.

Figure 10. Shows that there were fewer families with more than 10 donkeys in 1991 but that many more families have less than 10 animals and these families have increased their donkey ownership.
Figures 11 and 12 illustrate the distribution of stock with respect to families in the survey area. For instance, the ownership level for 50 cattle was about 28% of families in 1989 but had increased to about 34% percent in 1991. Similarly, 50% of families had more than about 110 goats in 1989 but by 1991 50% of families had more than about 137 goats.
ELEPHANTS AND
THE COMMUNITY - 2

4. COMMUNITY MEETINGS TO DISCUSS ELEPHANT RELATED PROBLEMS.
5. POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.
6. EXTENSION ACTIVITIES AND PUBLIC AWARENESS.
SURVEY RE FARMERS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ELEPHANT - HUAB CATCHMENT

Information

The elephants of Damaraland have become internationally famous and they have been given top priority protection status by the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

The people of Damaraland have been complimented by international organisations for their protection of the elephants.

These elephants are of importance to Namibia because they attract many tourists to the country to spend money here.

It is difficult and very expensive to move elephants, if they are moved, they will come back again because they have very long memories and live to be 70 years old, and they teach their young where to find food and water.

The farming community have seen no benefit from having the elephants on their farms, or for living in close proximity to the elephants.

The Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism and the Non Government Organisations want to bring cash returns to the community, and they want to help the farmers to defend their property from destruction from the elephants and to make it safer for the people who live here.

We also want to know who would like to move away from living with the elephants, if we can find the money to buy other farms to live on.

We want to know who would like to learn more about farming with wild animals and domestic stock. (mixed farming)

Those who would like to stay and carry out mixed farming, will have to understand that they may have to keep the domestic stock numbers low in order to give more area to the wildlife.

The wildlife would take a few years to increase enough to allow for culling or culling the game, which would then bring cash returns to the farmers.

We are presently looking for ways to keep the elephants away from the houses, vegetable gardens and donkey carts, but they will always want water, so we will build other drinking places for the elephants on the pathways that lead to the reservoirs away from the homesteads.

This survey is to help us decide where most of the problems are and how we can help you to live safely with the elephants and solve current problems.
SURVEY

SECTION I

1 Name of farm

2 Name of person who has occupational or grazing rights (optional)

3 Name of post

4 Are you the occupying farmer?

5 How many posts are on this farm?

6 Do you want to move?

7 Where else have you farmed and for how long?

8 How long have you lived on the farm?

9 Why did you move here?

10 How many people were at the post/farm when you started?

11 How many people are there now?

SECTION II

12 Do you want to farm with the elephants and other wildlife?

13 Do you want to farm with other wildlife without the elephants?
14 Do you want the wildlife protected by law?

16 Do you want benefits from the wildlife? (meat......fees from trophy hunters......fees paid by tourists visiting the game areas......)

18 How many times a year do the elephants visit this post/farm?

17 If "YES", in what numbers do they come?

18 How long do they stay?

19 Do you use any noises to warn the elephants while you are travelling

20 What sort of noises?

21 Do you use any noises to chase elephants away from your homestead?

22 What sort of noises?

23 Do you know of any noise that will chase the elephants away?

24 What damages have been caused by the elephants in the past 2 years?
25 Are you interested in making use of the natural resources such as wildlife?

26 What time of the year do the elephants come to your farm

Jan Feb Mar Apr May June July Aug Sept Oct Nov Dec

27 What is your suggestion to help stop the problems between humans / stock and elephants?

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

28 Who do you report to when there are elephants giving trouble?

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

29 How often do the elephants come to the water installation?

30 Do you think the elephants have increased in the last 3 years?
Y/N

31 Why?

32 How many elephants do you think there are?

33 Do you think there are too many elephants?

34 Do you know of anyone being killed by elephants in your lifetime,

SECTION III

35 Is there enough water for the stock and the game on the farm?

36 How many windmills do you use?
37 How many diesel pumps do you use?
38 Do you have any dams?
39 How many dams do you use?
40 Do your stock drink at natural water springs?
41 How many natural springs are on this farm?
42 Are there any springs which you know of which are used only by the wildlife?
43 How many springs do you know of which are used by wildlife only?
44 Do you need protection for your water installations?
45 Is there enough water on the farm?

SECTION IV (DOMESTIC)
46 Do you have any other sort of income?
47 What income do you get from your stock?
48 Do you have protection for your stock? (herders/night paddocks/dogs)
49 Do you have protection for your house and vegetable garden?
50 Where do your children go to school?
51 How do they travel to school
   a) by donkey cart.Y/N...
   b) by motor vehicle.Y/N...
   c) on horse back.Y/N...
   d) on foot Y/N ?
52 How many times a year do the children have to travel?

53 What transport do the people on the farm use?
   a) Donkey cart.
   b) Donkey/horse/mule riding
   c) Motor vehicle
   d) By foot

SECTION V

54 How many head do you have of:
   a) goats
   b) sheep
   c) cattle
   d) donkeys
   e) horses

55 Do you look after some one else's stock?

56 Is your grazing always good?

57 or always bad?

58 Do you have to move your stock to other grazing seasonally?
   IF YES:

59 What time of the year do you move your stock?

60 Does the stock have to be moved every year?
61 How much stock did you have 2 years ago?

a) Goats.....
b) Cattle.....
c) Sheep.....
d) Donkeys....
e) Horses.....
f) Mules.....

62 Do you fix the broken fences yourself

63 Does the government fix the broken fences?

Thank you for your co-operation, we hope very much to be able to help you.

Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism & Save the Rhino Trust - Elefriends.
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P. O. Box 83
KHORIXAS 0000
Tel. 78

1. PROJECT INTEGRATION WITH MINISTRIES AND OTHER NGO’S.
2. BACKGROUND TO HUAH COMMUNITY AND ELEPHANT CONFLICTS.
3. SUBSEQUENT SURVEYS.
PROJECT INTEGRATION WITH
MINISTRIES AND OTHER NGO'S

PAGES

1. Table of links between the Huab Project and other institutions.

2. Elephants and water supplies: Ministry of Agriculture.

4. Internal correspondence regarding the project: HWCT.


## Links Between the Huab Project and Other Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Regional Offices</th>
<th>NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Regional Commissioner.  
Wildlife, Cons.  
and Tourism.  
Agriculture.  
Lands & Resettlement.  
Trade & Industry.  
Water Affairs.  
Education and Culture.  
Local Govt. & Housing. | SRT  
HUAB PROJECT  
MINISTRY WILDLIFE CONS. & TOURISM  
WLF  
DERU (Gobabeb)  
WLS of Namibia  
NNF  
NWT  
NDT  
WWF Int.  
EWT (IRDNC)  
WLS of S. Africa  
REF  
David Shepherd F.  
ACT  
Earth Africa |

### Damaraland

- Paramount Chief Garoeb
- Council Members
- Agricultural Union
- Rural Conservation Committee
- FNDC
ELEPHANTS AND WATER SUPPLIES

1. The problem with elephants damaging water supplies in the Damaraland/Kaokoland region has been brought to the attention of this Department and a meeting was convened between the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, the Department of Water Affairs and the Directorate Rural Development. Please refer to the attached minutes of the meeting.

2. The problem can be summarized as follows:

2.1 More people and stock moved into the area concerned.

2.2 The communal water supplies are not maintained and no diesel is supplied to pump water.

2.3 Less water is therefore available to both humans and stock, as well as for the elephants in the communal area. The elephants damage installations which are not operational because they smell the water and break the installations to try and get at the water.

2.4 The elephants also go into the adjacent commercial farming areas in search of water and damage fences.
3. Possible remedial action could be the following:

3.1 Maintenance and operation of communal water installations.

3.2 The provision of diesel, if appropriate and allowable.

3.3 Mobilization of the communal farmers to look after their water installations and to pump enough water for all.

3.4 Elephant management measures in the region by determining which water points are the critical one for the elephants and to ensure that borehole installations receive particular attention to remain operational.

3.5 The development of possible small farm dam type water supplies at locations identified in terms of the proposed elephant management programme.

4. The participating institutions to ensure the success of the above strategy are:

4.1 Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism

Proposal of elephant management measures and a communal farmers awareness programme in the affected region, identification of critical water points which should be made available for elephant watering, the location of small, farm dam type watering places for the elephants and requesting assistance for the establishment of those farm dams through the Division: Agricultural Engineer in the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.

4.2 Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

Mobilization of the communal farmers to operate and maintain their water installations within the proposed elephant management programme.

4.3 Department of Water Affairs

Assistance will be given with the appointment of consultants to facilitate the location and drilling of boreholes at suitable sites according to the proposed elephant management programme on condition that funds are made available to finance the establishment of new water sources. The installation of such boreholes will not be the responsibility of Water Affairs.

5. From the above it is clear that elephant management or the operation of communal water supplies fall outside the scope of activities of the Department of Water Affairs and that the problem should be resolved between the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism and the Department of Agriculture
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CHIEF NATURE CONSERVATION OFFICER
SKELETON COAST NATURE RESERVE
P.O. Box 83

4 APRIL 1989.

Deputy Chief NW
Direkteur Nasionale Konserwasserskeep
Phong 133 56
Windhoek
9 000.

WWF Funding of Huab Catchment Area Wildlife Conservation and Utilization Project, Damara Land.

The attached document gives the details of a project which will enable funding of issues at present causing problems e.g. elephant interactions on farms with Damara farmers.

Obviously the close co-operation between the Damara authority, Direkteur Nasionale Konserwasserskeep and SWA/Namibia during mid-April 1989, hopefully the start of project can uplift the deteriorating position with regard to large mammals and vegetation utilization within the Huab Catchment Area.

I.

R. 200 000. 2 Thos.
Introduction:

During April 1987 a new project was initiated by the Directorate of Nature Conservation, initially called the "Kandiwerd Project", now named the "Damaalanda/Kandiwerd Project".

This multi-disciplinary project will attempt to a) carry out certain initial research into the main wildlife species occurring in Damaalanda. Such research aims at establishing more accurate

1) Status of each species i.e. the number of animals in the population;

2) Distribution and home ranges of each species i.e. how they are spread over the area, the type of country used for feeding and living space. Routes habitually used are also to be determined so as to understand seasonal movement;

3) Age structure of each population i.e. the make up of the population from calves, juveniles, sub-adults through to adults.

The structure of a population, age wise, indicates the health of that population.
b) **Long-term Monitoring of Interactions between Farmers on Farms in Damaraland, Semi-nomadic Farmers and Each Species of Wildlife, Especially Problem Animals and Losses of Livestock.**

- **Attempted monitoring of climatic events e.g. rainfall,**
  - not only at specific sites but on a transect basis,
  - along rivers (East to West), through Damaraland.
  - River flooding would be included e.g. how long a river flows,
    - each rainfall season.

- **Assessment of livestock numbers at farm homesteads and posts on old farms, plus the numbers of persons resident,**
  - fuelwood used (species) and especially how they move,
  - in the wet and dry seasons.
  - This seasonal/annual movement is of special importance, so as to understand
  - the interactions and competition for food and water, between
  - livestock and wildlife species.

e) **Plant Phenology in All Main Rivers and Their Tributaries i.e.**

- **All Main Catchments.**
  - This with centres around the population dynamics of each main species of tree/shrub in
  - these rivers.
  - Counts are made of how many of each species
  - per km from East to West, through Damaraland to Skeleton Coast Park.
  - Ages of trees are assessed for each species, as well
  - as the utilization by both domestic and wild animals.

f) **The Impact of the Veterinary Carbon Fence, was monitored to indicate possible preferred routes used by elephants,**

- through the fence line. This was a fairly intensive survey
  - in 1987-98. Such work has been repeated in April 1989
  - and will again be carried out in November 1989.

- Such data is aimed at possible future changes in the
NECESSARY, AND AGREED UPON AT GOVT. LEVEL, BY PARTIES INVOLVED.

9) TO CARRY OUT SEASONAL GROUND AND AIR SURVEYS OF WILDLIFE NUMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION, OVER THE DHAMARAYAND/SKELETYN COAST REGION, BY VEHICLE, FOOT AND MOUNTED PATROLS ON THE GROUND AND USING THE GOVT. AIRCRAFT, OR, NATURE CONSERVATION, IN THE AIR.

2) MONTHLY AND SURVEILLANCE FLIGHTS IN THE AIRCRAFT ARE CARRIED OUT TO ASSESS WILDLIFE DISTRIBUTION, LIVESTOCK AND PEOPLE MOVEMENTS, RAINFALL PATTERNS, AVAILABILITY OF WATER AT SPRINGS AND IN RIVERS. THIS ACTS AS A LAW ENFORCEMENT MEASURE AS WELL.

In conclusion, it can be seen that this project covers not only wildlife, but approaches conservation and wildlife in the current African context; it attempts to understand and monitor the conflict and interactions between wildlife, domestic stock, humans, and the environment. In doing so, we hope to create an awareness in the value of wildlife, and humanise wildlife in showing consideration for the human point of view, tolerate, and allow a more understanding attitude in our conservation efforts, regarding the human aspects involved.

New initiatives emanating from these actions

1) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR EQUIPMENT, AIRCRAFT FUEL & RUNNING COST, VEHICLES, FUNDS TO PAY FOR INFORMATION DURING LAW ENFORCEMENT.

2) CLOSE UNION WITH DOMESTIC AUTHORITIES ON PROBLEM ANIMALS, ESPECIALLY LIONS AND ELEPHANTS, LEADING TO RESISTANCE IN ERADICATING 3 PROBLEM LIONS IN UGAAB RIVER 1 AND
3) Obtaining funds for additional security guards in Hluhluwe and Southern areas, to assist in monitoring elephant and rhino.

4) Initiating the reforming of rhinoceros following new poaching wave - the first in Africa and the world - to catch rhino's.

5) Obtaining funds to dart and collar 20 elephant bulls in Hluhluwe and raising donations for setting up I.D. units, especially on bulls.

6) Obtaining permission to work more closely with DVO for seasonal counts, especially seasonally in wildlife counts / domestic stock assessments.

7) Funding monitoring of rhinoceros to: food, equipment and
camping equipment; for all species.

8) Promoting policy statement on "why only hunting in 1989 for traditional feasts" plus a proposal for a May 1990 Namibia Independence wildlife stucturing centre up W. Kaokoland, Skeleton Coast Park and Oshana as a Unit, to show the country what has been achieved by nature conservation, N.G.O.'s and the domestic animal and breeders, including P.N.P.'s for the conservation of this national asset of the country.
MINUTES OF THE ELEPHANT STRATEGY COMMITTEE HELD IN ROOM 511, GOVERNMENT BUILDING ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1992

MEETING STARTED AT 08:40.

PRESENT:  
H Rumpf  (HWCT) Chairperson  
P Swart  (HWCT) Vice-chairperson  
G Owen-Smith  (IRDNC)  
D Murorua  (SRTF/RCC)  
D Grobler  (HWCT)  
J Tagg  (HWCT)  
B Beytell  (HWCT)  
T Haritz  (Kamanjab Farmers' Union)  
R Robertse  (KFU)  
D Googoeseb  (Welwitschia Farmers' Union)  
C Eyre  (HWCT)  
A Cilliers  (HWCT)  
H Lindeque  (HWCT)  
T Hall  (HWCT)  
R Loutit  (HWCT)  
B Loutit  (SRTF)  
H Jacobsohn  (IRDNC)  
H Rice  (IRDNC)  
L Baker  (HWCT)  

1. WELCOME

The chairperson welcomed all present. He said the meeting had been called to find solutions to current elephant problems experienced in Namibia, adding that the Minister, Nito Bessinger, supported this effort.

He asked farmers present to indicate if any farms in the commercial area of the Huab catchment region were for sale, as there was a possibility of farms being bought by people interested in establishing water points and grazing areas for elephants. He pointed out that realistic prices should be negotiated.
Mr Robertse later indicated that four or five farms were up for sale in the Commercial area.

The Chairperson excused himself from the meeting due to an appointment with the President of Nigeria. Mr Polla Swart was asked to chair the meeting.

It was then decided to discuss problems experienced in each region.

2. DAHARALAND

2.1 Background

Rudi Loutic presented figures relating to elephant numbers counted in 1986, 1990, 1991 and April 1992. Rainfall figures were also presented. These indicated that most rain recorded this season had fallen on farms while little was recorded in the Huab catchment area. Many boreholes in Daharaland have dried up, and it appears that the water table has dropped.

The situation brought humans and elephants into conflict as they shared the same waterholes - usually stock used these during the day while elephants moved in at night.

2.2 Problems and Discussion

Other factors influencing elephant/human conflict as identified by the committee were:

- An increase of farmers in the area since 1987;
- The influence of the drought. Commercial farmers reported that elephants had remained on farms this year instead of moving away as usual;
- Communal farmers feel that to date, despite a number of meetings, no conclusive solution had been produced for the communal areas;

It was felt that establishment of a sanctuary was a possible permanent solution to the conflict as this would separate people and elephants.

Dudu Huroroa said the building of a wall had been proposed by the Rural Conservation Committee as a solution to the problem. The distance of the boundary to be demarcated is between 180 km to 200 km. Some debate ensued about the merits of a stone wall versus an electric fence.

A sub-committee was established to determine the feasibility of a permanent elephant sanctuary in the Huab valley, as well as the boundary to be demarcated by the barrier. The committee would also investigate financial implications and compile a submission to the Minister.
This would then be sent for Cabinet approval. This sub-committee, however will only start functioning once the socio-ecological survey of the Huab region of Damaraland has been completed.

THE SUB-COMMITTEE: R Loutit (convenor)
N Lindeque
T Hall
J Loutit
G Owen-Smith
D Gaagoseeb
R Roberts
A member of the executive council of the King’s council

The possibility of the utilisation of some elephants in the area was discussed. Options included trophy-hunting and live capture of calves. It was pointed out that the population could not withstand large-scale utilisation.

2.3. Recommendations:

2.3.1 SHORT TERM SOLUTIONS:

a. Funds be made available for the buying of diesel to be distributed to farmers experiencing serious problems with elephants at waterholes also used by stock;

b. A utilisation system be introduced to deal with problem animals in the region.

2.3.2 LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS:

a. Information should be collected during the forthcoming socio-ecological survey to determine:
- the attitudes of people living in the proposed sanctuary to moving out of the region;
- the possible establishment of a conservancy in the commercial area;
- other possible solutions to problems.

The Damaraland sub-committee should then pick-up on issues.

b. The Ministry should go ahead with a survey of groundwater in the region;

c. The sub-committee investigate the exact route of the proposed barrier, plus costs and the type of barrier (stone wall, electric fence or both) and draw up a submission to the Minister.
The Permanent Secretary

30.05.92.

MEETING TO DISCUSS SHORT TERM MEASURES TO DEAL WITH THE HUAB ELEPHANT PROBLEM, Khorixas, 27.05.92.

PRESENT:

B Jones (Chairman - MWCT)
C Grobler (MWCT)
R Loutit (MWCT)
T Hall (MWCT)
S Ganuseb (Office of the Regional Commissioner)
D Murorwa (HWC) ACC
B Loutit (SRT)
G Owen-Smith (IRDNC)
C Nott (IRDNC)
I Momboro (IRDNC)

1. Welcome

The chairman welcomed those present. He said the meeting had been convened to discuss short term measures for the Huab elephant problem, which has been made worse by the drought. He wished to emphasise the word 'measures' rather than 'solutions' as it would not be possible to find solutions in the short term and these should be examined as part of the broad conservation context which will be discussed during the proposed socio-ecological survey.

He said we should also look at measures which involve a partnership between the government and the local people and not just the government doing things for the people.

2. Problems caused by elephants

The meeting identified the following problems related to elephants in the Huab catchment:

a) Using up available water at drinking troughs, causing the farmer to use extra diesel to pump more water for his stock.

b) Damage to water installations.
c) Damage to fences.

d) Killing of stock. (An occasional problem which could become more frequent due to increased competition for water.)

e) Damage to small gardens around homesteads.

f) People constructing buildings around a water point, cutting off access to elephants and increasing the potential for conflict.

e) The persistent presence of individual elephants such as old bulls around a homestead is seen by people as a threat to them and their stock and water installations.

3. Short term measures to deal with the problems

The following measures are proposed as an integrated package which should be implemented immediately:

a) Continuation of the protection of reservoirs with stone walls by MWCT and WJF. Local people should be encouraged to participate in this as much as possible. Commercial farmers should be encouraged to protect their installations in the same way.

There is a shortage of money to pay for fuel for the large truck used to transport stone. R Loutit will request the Ministry of Agriculture through the Commissioner's Office to make their truck available as well.

b) Continuation of the supply of diesel to homesteads where elephants drink regularly and use up the available water.

c) The SRT will seek funds for the expansion of the protection programme and supply of diesel.

d) A campaign should be launched to make people aware of the need to leave space around water points so that elephants have access. This should be done via the radio (local staff and regional radio), through farmers' union meetings, school extension programmes, routine visits to homesteads by MWCT and SRT staff and through Agricultural Officers (R Loutit to approach Agriculture).

e) SRT will seek funds to appoint an extension officer to work full time with local people on elephant problems and measures to combat them.
f) The SRT will investigate the possibility of food aid to the region being sold to raise money for the payment of wages to build protective walls around water installations.

g) The collection of funds from tourists should be revived and carried out through the tourist camps in the region. SRT will negotiate with camps which have not supported this so far. The Ministry should provide a letter of support.

h) The MWCT should provide a letter of support for the applications of potential commercial farmers who want to obtain loans from the Land Bank to purchase farms in the commercial farming area. This support should be of a general nature e.g. that the movement of people off the communal land, making more land available for other people and wildlife is consistent with the conservation aims for the region. Support should not be given to specific individuals.

i) To address the problem of damage to fences, the MWCT and SRT will investigate the redesign of paddocks with local people. R Loutit to send a proposal to C Grobler.

j) NGOs should investigate the payment of compensation for stock losses caused by elephants. Compensation would only be paid once the incident has been fully investigated and evidence of damage caused by elephants is clear. The Government will not pay compensation. The SRT will approach the World Food Programme for food to be provided as compensation for damage to gardens. Again, there needs to be clear evidence of damage caused by elephants.

k) If an elephant persistently remains around homesteads and is a potential threat to the lives of humans or their livestock the Ministry undertakes to destroy that elephant.

The decision to destroy an elephant must be preceded by an investigation by MWCT personnel. The decision will be influenced not only by the actual physical threat (e.g. the elephant has already chased people or stock) but also by the acknowledgement that the persistent presence of an elephant close to a homestead will cause fear among the people living there. The 'problem' animal must be clearly identifiable by the people at the homestead.

If all attempts to induce the elephant to stay away from the homestead fail, the animal should be destroyed as a matter of policy.
1) The culling of a herd of elephants as suggested during the 'elephant meeting' of 07.05.92. is not viewed as either necessary or desirable. The trophy hunting of elephants in the region was opposed in the past because of concerns about elephant numbers. It will be very difficult to justify the culling of a large group of elephants in the light of these past concerns.

m) SRT will investigate through WWF the possibility of funding for an ecologist to look at animal (livestock and game) carrying capacity in the region, present and potential elephant numbers and other related issues.

n) R Loutit will approach Water Affairs about the possibility of a ground water survey for the region so that this information can be available for land-use planning.

m) Once these measures have been approved, the Information Section should issue a comprehensive media release aimed particularly at the people of the region explaining that the MWCT, in conjunction with NGOs and the local people, has launched a package of measures to deal with elephant problems and drought over the short term. The media release should also announce the socio-ecological survey planned for the region in September.

BRIAN JONES
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING UNIT
BACKGROUND TO HUAB COMMUNITY

AND ELEPHANT CONFLICTS
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ABSTRACT: This is a follow-up survey to a similar one done in July 1965. This year 47 elephant were sighted in the Upper Huab against two last year. The elephant are concentrated in the Huab east of Eersbegyn towards Tweelingskop and in the Soutrivier towards Walkom. Elephant appear to move into the area in the dry season and stay until after the rains. Their distribution on the farms seems to be linked to the rainfall on the individual farms and thus the browse available. Observations on other animal species are listed.

INTRODUCTION: This survey was done from the 9th-17th July 1966. Using the "SAVE THE RHINO FUND" Landrover 110, 1032 km were driven (Ugabmund-Ugabmund) and 310 litres of petrol were used; fuel consumption 4.9km/l, which is good for the difficult terrain traversed.

For the area covered see maps 1 and 2.

From Ugabmund to Khorixas: via Gamebok river track to Brandberg West, Goantagab, Granisetkop, Goedgevind, Khorixas.
Werdeinsend to Ugabmund: along Springbok river, Colin's track, Gai-Ae, Brandberg West, road to Henties Bay, across to Myl 108 and Ugabmund.

In this report I present my own observations as well as information gained from the local farmers. An effort was made to hear their views about the game on their farms.
**ELEPHANT**

*Summary of the elephant activities on the different farms.*

Farm Howel: only in the western part, up to the big spring on the south bank of the Soutrivier.

Tweelingskop: all along the Huab, using the spring on the mountain side, situated about 1 km downriver from the house. The farm is unoccupied.

Annab: drink at both springs, which both have Damara settlements. A few spoors in the Kakatswa river.

Brambach: only in the last two years, the people spoken to, stay on the farm since 1970, did elephant move through the farm along the Kakatswa river.

Engelbrecht: in the last two years, elephant have started moving through the farm. This farm borders onto the Outjio district.

Freyer: very few signs of elephant, they just move through.

Brakwater: elephant had been on the farm until May, now they only move through.

Ruipoort: elephant only moving through.

Eersbegin: elephant all along the Huab and the Soutrivier. The Damara farmers are not too concerned about the elephant, as the elephant tend to stay in the river and do not drink at the house itself.

Noue: all along the Huab. Unoccupied farm.

Aandgloe: all along the Huab and the river towards Nugas.

Suiderbruins: elephant had been on the farm until May, now only moving through.

Kuyper: elephant on the farm until May, now none.

Nugas: elephant had been on the farm until May, now only moving through. They make use of the river running parallel to Kliprivier.

Tweespruit: a fair number of elephant use the Kliprivier, there are several well used paths along the river. This is an unoccupied farm.

Avante: also using the Kliprivier, unoccupied farm.

Nil Desperandum: all along the Kliprivier, make extensive use of the big spring at the old farm house. The spring on the western side of the farm is used irregularly. There is a small Riemvasmaker post at this spring, otherwise the farm is unoccupied.

In May Nature Conservation apparently did an aerial survey with a helicopter and according to the locals, chased elephant off some of the farms. May also is the end of the rainy season for this area. What caused the apparent movement of the elephant away from the farms is open to speculation, since the elephant tend to leave the farms naturally at the end of the rainy season.
REASONS FOR THIS SURVEY AND WHY FUTURE WORK ON THESE FARMS IN THE UPPER HUAB SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN.

The Damara Second Tier Government comes under increasing pressure by its own people and from the outside to give out a hunting concession in the Upper Huab, allowing elephant trophy hunting. Before a final decision regarding the concession is made the following points should be considered:

1. The elephant as a group are not a resident population in the Upper Huab and at this stage we do not know to which sub-population(s) they do belong.

A elephant bull shot on these farms might be one of a handful of the so-called "desert elephant" bulls or a bull from the transition subpopulation or from the western Etosha subpopulation.

"Volgens Krenz (1933) het die Ehobib- en Huabriviere minstens tot 1933 geskikte habitat aan olifante verleen.

In 1965 het W.Schenk (pers.med.) ook 60 olifante in die Fransfontein- en Ugabontreke aangetref. "Also the following extract under the heading present distribution."In Damaraland kom daar nog sowat 150 olifante voor waar hul verspreiding hoofsaaklik tot die Huab- en Homanriviere, die Palmfonteingeie en die bolope van die Unjabrivier beperk is" (H.Roux, pers.med.)"(de Villiers & Kook 1984 Verspreidingspatrone van olifante (LOXODONTA AFRICANA) in Suidwes-Afrika met spesiale verwysing na die Nasionale Etoshawildtuin).

Although the elephant might have started using some farms in the east only recently, the elephant in the Huab are nothing new.

2. "How can one ask a peasant with a craving for protein to appreciate the aesthetic value of a live buck? My people all live below the breadline and are lucky if they get meat once every two "-months" (Buthelesi 1971 in Owen-Smith (ed.) 1983 Management of large mammals in African conservation areas). The same can be said for these farmers. It must be borne in mind by the conservationist that the elephant is a potentially dangerous animal. Most of the Damara are terrified by the elephant. Added to this the fact that the elephant break fences and the occasional waterinstallation it is not surprising that the Damara and Herero all want the elephant removed from their farms. At this stage the farmer is not benefiting by tolerating the elephant on his land.

3. Research done in Natal has shown the following: "More than 79 per cent of both local and foreign people who filled in questionnaires (9000 were returned) put wildlife at the top of the list of tourist preferences" (Ferrario 1981 in Owen-Smith (ed.) 1983).

The elephant and lion are the main attraction for most people visiting a game reserve.

Game reserves have a certain carrying capacity regarding visitors, thus the larger an area we are able to maintain in its wild state with its big game, the more tourists we will
be able to attract to South West Africa/Namibia and also accommodate in future. The African landscape is a fast shrinking resource, with a ever faster growing demand for recreation in nature by our society, its value cannot be overemphasized. Kenya’s main source of foreign currency is its tourist trade, grossing over US 75 million in 1972 (Hanks 1979 A Struggle for Survival-The Elephant Problem).

4. At the moment half of the farms are unoccupied, because it is too difficult to farm in this region. All of the farms in the Upper Huab get less than 250mm of rain per annum on average (van der Merwe (ed.) 1983 National Atlas of South West Africa/Namibia). There is thus no question of wildlife competing with man for high potential agricultural land, but the question arises whether it would not be more profitable to the country’s economy as a whole and to the local community, if a proper management plan for this area was drawn up, whereby the wildlife in this area would be utilized on a sustainable basis and at the same time these unviable areas could act as a buffer-zone between the farming community in the east, without any big game on the farms, and the traditional non-farming area in the west with its big game. A plan similar to the one proposed here is at the moment implemented in the Sabungwe region in Zimbabwe. For such a management plan, more monitoring and baseline data is required.

I want to use this opportunity to thank the SWAKOPMUND WILDLIFE SOCIETY for their continued support for my work in Damaraland.

K.P. Erb
Stellenbosch
30/7/1986
Principal Nature Conservator
P/Bag 2005
Khorixas

Elephant problems on Damaraland "Red Line" Fence

The destruction of the rogue elephant at Kandescha has solved most of our problems in that area, for which we are grateful. We still have reasonably serious elephant problems south of Kandescha at Palmfontein and Keiserfontein. The fence is being continuously and seriously damaged here, and our maintenance team is thus totally unable to give attention to the southernmost part of the fence around Wolvekraal. There are also elephant problems in the Humor-Persianer area.

Unfortunately, we have to look to you for assistance in solving these problems. We may, at some stage, have to consider electrifying the fence, but that will be expensive, and will at any rate not solve our immediate problem. I intensely dislike shooting elephants, but it looks as though this will be our only short-term solution. Should you have any other ideas that will work, please contact me as soon as possible.

I must report back to my Head Office on this matter within 30 days, so please let me know by the end of the month what action can or has been taken regarding the elephants.

We are also looking at the possibility of creating 'one-way funnels' in the fence so that game that does happen to escape from west of the Red Line will have entry ports to return to the west. I'm sure that will make Garth Owen-Smith feel a lot better.

Thanking you very much for your co-operation.

Roger Faskin
State Veterinarian: Outjo
INFORMAL SURVEY OF RIEMYSMAKER FARMERS
IN THE WEST OF THE HUAB RIVER CATCHMENT
JANUARY 1990

From the 13th to 17th January 1990, staff of the SRT and ACT volunteer Jason Mortimer undertook an informal socio-ecological survey on the 18 most western farms of the WWF project area. The survey was done after consultation with the headmen Mr Jacob Basson and Mr Petrus Loeriesfontein. The communities on the farms were informed that their cooperation in the survey was optional. 37 hea of families took part, all those approached were willing to answer the questions.

The survey has not been fully analysed, but the questionnaires are available for future reference. The main purpose of the survey was assess the number of people living there; the numbers of stock; visits by elephants; the state of grazing and water availability; where the families originated; how many farmers wanted to move to better farming areas and whether anyone wished to become involved game farming. Problems experienced with wildlife or otherwise, were also noted.

A summary of the main points are as follows:

a. The 37 families consisted of a total of 122 adults and 152 children.
b. Total stock numbered 9 375.
c. 26 families had adequate water.
d. 27 families stated their grazing was inadequate.
e. 9 families wished to move to better farming areas. 3 were unsuccess.
f. 1 man wished to remain and change to game farming, but did not have the experience or money to make the change.
g. 25 families came from South Africa.
h. 8 families originated in Damaraland.

The most western communal farms, which are situated west of the 10° isohyet are cause for concern. The farms had been vacated by white commercial farmers in the late 1960's, or in some cases were used by farm owners only in years of good rainfall. The land was otherwise considered to be too arid for permanent occupation by domestic stock.

Today's permanent occupation has brought degradation of the vegetation, soil erosion, excess firewood consumption and increasing human and domestic stock numbers which is exacerbating a creeping desertification of the land. The full analysis of this survey could provide important reference data for better land use management and environmental planning.
RIEMVASEAK CENSUS  JANUARY 1990

NAME: Pictius Louis Patem (headman)  FARM/POT: De Reit 1

NO. OF FAMILIES: 1  NO. OF ADULTS: 6  NO. OF CHILDREN: 1

HOW LONG IN RESIDENCE: SINCE 1974 FROM WHERE: RSA

ARE THERE ELEPHANTS: yes  LIONS: no  RHINOS: no  HYENAS: yes  JACKALS: yes

DO THEY CAUSE PROBLEMS
WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS
1. #1 - have killed four goats in 1985
2. #2 - have killed five goats in 1985
3. 

WHEN DO THE PROBLEMS OCCUR: DRY SEASON  WET SEASON  ALL YEAR

ARE THERE SUFFICIENT SCHOOLS: yes  SHOPS: no  CHURCHES: yes  CLINICS: no

HOW MANY GOATS: 17  SHEEP: 0  CATTLE: 17  DONKEYS: 5  HORSES: 0  DOGS: 1

ARE THERE FACILITIES TO SELL STOCK: he sells from here

ARE SALES PRIVATE:  OR GOVT ORGANISED: 

IS THERE ENOUGH WATER: yes  GRAZING: no

DOES THE RESIDENT FARMER WANT TO MOVE: yes

to WHERE: between Windhoek  &  Rehoboth

OR WOULD THE FARMER LIKE TO GIVE UP STOCK FARMING: no

WOULD HE/SHE LIKE TO CHANGE TO GAME FARMING: no

SIGNATURE (OPTIONAL): Pictius Louis Patem

DATE: 14-1-90

NOTES: # This man is recognised as the headman here. There are many small-scale farmers with kinds of five or less. We asked him to recommend the people we should talk to. He gave us the names of other farmers in the area. There may have been more, but there were so many people that we could not tell.

INTRODUCTION.

Since late April, 1987 PNCO T. A. Hall has been made responsible for all elephant project work, monitoring and problem animal control in DamaraLand. Since the inception of the Koonoveld Project in late April 1987, considerable attention has been paid to the study and monitoring of the Huab Valley elephant population [ majority of this work carried out by Hall and junior staff, small input at irregular intervals by Loutit ].

A series of elephant incursions into the White farming area in April 1987 led to a petition from the Kamanjab farming community being sent to the Director of Nature Conservation. Later in the year a meeting was convened at Kamanjab to discuss such problems. Following such meeting it was evident that numerous parties were interested in the possible reduction of the elephants.

CASE NO 1. MORTALITY OF 7 GOATS AT EERSTE BEGINS (E. N. O. K. PROJECT 1).

While in Windhoek for official reasons I was contacted by PNCO Hall regarding elephant problems at Eerste Begin. His information led me to refer him to Mr Rocher, for further instructions. As the Khorixas stock only provided a single 458. I expressed my concern for the staff's safety owing to the lack of a second weapon. [ a 375 was loaned from the Damara Authority ] Both Hall and C. G. R. Britz investigated the incident but could not identify a specific animal as being that elephant which had killed the goats following a series of shocks from the electric fencing. Further investigations at a later date still yielded no aggressive animal intent on molesting humans and stock alike. At a later date I received a call from Mr Rocher, inquiring as to the results achieved. I reported that no specific animal could be identified as the culprit and that no bulls were in the vicinity since the incident. [ at this period in time Deputy Chief Piepmeyer was on leave ] Some time after the incident both myself and PNCO Hall were approached about compensation for the losses. I made it clear that the Govt, in the form of the Directorate of Nature Conservation did not compensate people for their losses but that Non-Govt Trust Funds would possibly be interested in helping the people. [ it was no secret that my wife belonged to a non-govt organisation ] In the course of events that followed, the months went by and eventually in February, 1988, Earth Owen-Smith, produced the funds, from the Save The Rhino Fund, [ he had known of the event for some time as did my wife, and the fund committee felt it could assist in compensating the Damaraes, being a non-govt organisation ].

The money was left at our offices and I gave PNCO Hall instructions to get Mr J van den Heever, the manager of the project at Eerste Begin, to bring the labourers in to receive their cash. This could not be arranged and during one of his routine patrols in the area PNCO Hall paid the individuals out, explaining that this money came from a private organisation and not Nature Conservation [ period between event and compensation August 1987 to February 1988 ].
CASE NO 2.

At a later date information was received from Mr van den Heever of E. N. O. K. that a elephant or elephants were supposedly responsible for killing a cow near Eerste Begin. The investigation was carried out at a later date following the initial complaint by Mr Andries Awarab, due to nobody being available at the time he reported the incident [Refer investigation by P. N. C. O. Hall]. Following the preliminary investigation I was informed by Hall that no conclusive evidence was available to prove that the cow was killed by elephants. When I conveyed this to Mr Awarab he flew into a rage and accused me of protecting the elephants and not caring about his problems. I explained that the Govt. would not pay compensation. He requested me to get him compensation from non-government organisations. I said I would see what I could do. During the following months he came in to prompt me for compensation via private funds. I did nothing for a few months but finally in late July, 1988 he stated that he had a court action pending. During a visit in late July by Owen-Smith to see myself and my wife, Mr Awarab accosted me at the Khorixas Rest Camp, while in the company of Mr Owen-Smith and my wife. Once again the necessary funds were made available from the Save The Rhino Fund a non-govt organisation that has promoted this concept in the past. The funds R 700 were delivered to my wife, who handed the money over to me. I locked it in our safe at the office and in due course Mr Awarab collected the money from P.N.C.O. Hall who was the only official on duty at the time. At this time there were no representatives present or available from the Save The Rhino Fund, in Khorixas.

R. LOUTIT
SUBSEQUENT SURVEYS
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1. Informal survey of Riemvasmaker farmers. 1990.


5. Questionnaire.

12. Results and Discussions.
SURVEY OF FARMS IN THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA

During April/May 1991, a survey was made by staff of the Khorixas office of the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, Ministry of Agriculture and the WWF/SRT on all the occupied farms where elephants may have created conflict. The surveyors used a questionnaire of 83 points to ensure the maximum possible uniformity of answers. When contradictory answers were given or if the farmer being interviewed had no specific answer, these were categorised accordingly. Completed questionnaires were analysed according to the seven major groups of questions.

The following persons conducted the survey:

N Mowoseb
A Ucham
E Aibeb
B Ilonga
C Awasob
S James
W Oppel
G Eichab
M Gurirab
A Kamseb
M Gaogoseb
R Dausab
GV Useb
F Hendriks
J Nuab
MC Tsusib.
MAP OF DAMARALAND

Reported elephant problems 1989-1991

* Protected artificial water holes (WWF project)

+ Game guards (WWF project)

◊ National Monument (Twyfelfontein)

◊ Tourist development (WWF project)

Rivers

Wildlife Safari Concessions/ National Tourist area

Commercial Farms/ Proposed elephant conservancy
SURVEY RE FARMERS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ELEPHANT - HUAB CATCHMENT

Information

The elephants of Damaraland have become internationally famous and they have been given top priority protection status by the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

The people of Damaraland have been complimented by international organisations for their protection of the elephants.

These elephants are of importance to Namibia because they attract many tourists to the country to spend money here.

It is difficult and very expensive to move elephants, if they are moved, they will come back again because they have very long memories and live to be 70 years old, and they teach their young where to find food and water.

The farming community have seen no benefit from having the elephants on their farms, or for living in close proximity to the elephants.

The Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism and the Non Government Organisations want to bring cash returns to the community, and they want to help the farmers to defend their property from destruction from the elephants and to make it safer for the people who live here.

We also want to know who would like to move away from living with the elephants, if we can find the money to buy other farms to live on.

We want to know who would like to learn more about farming with wild animals and domestic stock. (mixed farming)

Those who would like to stay and carry out mixed farming, will have to understand that they may have to keep the domestic stock numbers low in order to give more area to the wildlife.

The wildlife would take a few years to increase enough to allow for culling or culling the game, which would then bring cash returns to the farmers.

We are presently looking for ways to keep the elephants away from the houses, vegetable gardens and donkey carts, but they will always want water, so we will build other drinking places for the elephants on the pathways that lead to the reservoirs away from the homesteads.

This survey is to help us decide where most of the problems are and how we can help you to live safely with the elephants and solve current problems.
SURVEY

SECTION I

1 Name of farm

2 Name of person who has occupational or grazing rights (optional)

3 Name of post

4 Are you the occupying farmer?

5 How many posts are on this farm?

6 Do you want to move?

7 Where else have you farmed and for how long?

8 How long have you lived on the farm?

9 Why did you move here?

10 How many people were at the post/farm when you started?

11 How many people are there now?

SECTION II

12 Do you want to farm with the elephants and other wildlife?

13 Do you want to farm with other wildlife without the elephants?
14 Do you want the wildlife protected by law?

15 Do you want benefits from the wildlife? (meat.....fees from trophy hunters.....fees paid by tourists visiting the game areas.....)

16 How many times a year do the elephants visit this post/farm?

17 If "YES", in what numbers do they come?

18 How long do they stay?

19 Do you use any noises to warn the elephants while you are travelling?

20 What sort of noises?

21 Do you use any noises to chase elephants away from your homestead?

22 What sort of noises?

23 Do you know of any noise that will chase the elephants away?

24 What damages have been caused by the elephants in the past 2 years?
25. Are you interested in making use of the natural resources such as wildlife?

26. What time of the year do the elephants come to your farm?
   Jan Feb Mar Apr May June July Aug Sept Oct Nov Dec

27. What is your suggestion to help stop the problems between humans / stock and elephants?

28. Who do you report to when there are elephants giving trouble?

29. How often do the elephants come to the water installation?

30. Do you think the elephants have increased in the last 3 years?
   Y/N

31. Why?

32. How many elephants do you think there are?

33. Do you think there are too many elephants?

34. Do you know of anyone being killed by elephants in your lifetime, SECTION III

35. Is there enough water for the stock and the game on the farm?

36. How many windmills do you use?
37 How many diesel pumps do you use?
38 Do you have any dams?
39 How many dams do you use?
40 Do your stock drink at natural water springs?
41 How many natural springs are on this farm?
42 Are there any springs which you know of which are used only by the wildlife?
43 How many springs do you know of which are used by wildlife only?
44 Do you need protection for your water installations?
45 Is there enough water on the farm?

SECTION IV (DOMESTIC)

46 Do you have any other sort of income?
47 What income do you get from your stock?
48 Do you have protection for your stock? (herders/night paddocks/dogs)
49 Do you have protection for your house and vegetable garden?
50 Where do your children go to school?
51 How do they travel to school
   a) by donkey cart.Y/N...
   b) by motor vehicle.Y/N...
   c) on horse back.Y/N...
   d) on foot Y/N?
52 How many times a year do the children have to travel?

53 What transport do the people on the farm use?
   a) Donkey cart.
   b) Donkey/horse/mule riding
   c) Motor vehicle
   d) By foot

SECTION V

54 How many head do you have of:
   a) goats
   b) sheep
   c) cattle
   d) donkeys
   e) horses

55 Do you look after some one else's stock?

56 Is your grazing always good?

57 or always bad?

58 Do you have to move your stock to other grazing seasonally?
   IF YES:
59 What time of the year do you move your stock?

60 Does the stock have to be moved every year?
61 How much stock did you have 2 years ago?
   a) Goats......
   b) Cattle......
   c) Sheep......
   d) Donkeys....
   e) Horses.....
   f) Mules......

62 Do you fix the broken fences yourself

63 Does the government fix the broken fences?

Thank you for your co-operation, we hope very much to be able to help you.

Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism & Save the Rhino Trust – Elefriends.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE FARM SURVEY DURING APRIL/MAY 1991

Characteristics of farms.

Almost all farmers interviewed (98%) had legal right of land occupancy (Table 2.). Furthermore, the majority of farmers had only one or two water points which accentuated the conflict between elephants and the farmer. Most farmers originated from the communal land areas such as Damaraland. The reasons for occupying their present farm were numerous. The five major ones (57%) were; drought, the Odenthal commission which created black "homelands"), expansion of farming operations, expulsion from farms elsewhere, and problem animals (lions, elephants, hyaenas) on previous farms.

Table 1: Reaction of 209 farmers in Damaraland to elephants occurring in the Huab Catchment area, expressed as a percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARMERS MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS</th>
<th>ACCEPTABILITY OF ELEPHANTS TO FARMERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a protected area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocate to Etosha.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce / cull problem elephant.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide electrified fences.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move farmers away.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply special water points.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocate north of red line.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use as a tourist attraction.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Acceptability of elephants.

Farmers were divided into two main categories: those who said elephants were acceptable on their farms and those opposing the presence of elephants (Table 1.). Both categories were also asked what their proposals for management of elephants in their areas were. Table 1. shows that 90% of farmers did not want elephants on their farms. The clear majority (54%) proposing that elephants be isolated in an area set aside for their protection.
Table 2: Characteristics of 214 occupied farms in the Huab Catchment Area and the northern extremity of the elephant's range in Damaraland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER MEASURED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of occupancy to land (%)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of water points (range)</td>
<td>1.7 (0-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of farmers to relocate (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin of farmers (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal land</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial land</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upington RSA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began here</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for occupancy of land (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odendaal Commission</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand farming</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled elsewhere</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem animals elsewhere</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better habitat here</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated - Upington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water problems elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency grazing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer people</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock theft elsewhere</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied land</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started farming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Reaction of 211 farmers in Damaraland to farming in conjunction with wildlife, expressed as a percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to farm together with wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - but not with elephants.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - including elephants.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want benefits from wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in using wildlife sustainably?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want wildlife protected by law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reaction of farmers to farming with wildlife.

Four questions in this regard were put to farmers and their answers divided into acceptance, rejection and undecided (Table 3). It is obvious that the majority (86%) of farmers wanted wildlife (excluding elephants on their farms (10% were prepared to have elephants as well). A higher percentage (89%) were interested in benefiting from wildlife and using it sustainably, while nearly all (97%) wanted legal protection for wildlife.
Figure 1. Monthly distribution of elephant related complaints. Most problems occurred in the winter months and involved damage to water installations and gardens or were prompted by elephants drinking "all" or "too much" water. 82 complaints were entered in 37 months.

Table 4: Frequency of elephant visits to farms and the categories of damage recorded for such visits. (74 farms - 203 families) (Excluding 33 families recording no visits or damage.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER MEASURED - Visits (n=203)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No damage recorded</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only drank water</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to gardens and garden products by trampling / eating.</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to water installations e.g. pipes pulled out, taps broken or windmills bent, engines damaged.</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some damage to fences at houses, paddocks and around water installations &amp; gardens near reservoirs.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing / maiming stock.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. This table records the month and type of elephant related complaint registered in the complaints book between May 1989 until June 1992. “Water” refers to complaints of elephant drinking all or too much water. “Damage” includes all complaints of damage to property, such as water pipes or fences. “Problems” includes all other complaints, such as people being worried about elephant near their homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>DAMAGE</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/91</td>
<td>Ernst Gwirag</td>
<td>Dwarstrek</td>
<td>Broken gate, came and stayed around the cave near edge of Isibele</td>
<td>Called the Ranger (6313) 15h32: Explained I will go and investigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/91 Dwarstrek: POS 1 POS 2 Stillman POS Crystal Estaff POS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel off at 24h57 at Estaff POS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/80</td>
<td>ABNEW Hare</td>
<td>Loabkops</td>
<td>Pulled out the water, no many pipe, no water. WANTS US TO TAKE A</td>
<td>Loaded of 200 drum diesel, locals living there say they have fixed the pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drum of diesel from Khomas to Loabkops.</td>
<td>He came and drink there sporadic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diesel pumps</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 38. Dams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dams</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect answers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 39. Dam use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dams used</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working yet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 40. Natural springs - stock use of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry season</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 41. Number of springs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Springs</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replies</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 42. Natural springs only used by wildlife.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Illustrates the results obtained to the question "What sort of noises do you use to chase elephants away from your homestead?" Of those that used noises, whip-cracks and hanging drums and other objects were the noises most used.

Figure 3. Shows the response to the question "Do you know of any noise that will chase the elephants away?" Most people (58%) thought that elephants could be chased away by noises with whip-cracks and drums being the most effective. 32% thought that no noises were
NOISES THOUGHT EFFECTIVE FOR ELEPHANT

Figure 4: Of those who thought that noises were effective; 33% thought whip-cracks and 31% beating drums was the best method. This compares with actual methods people said they used, namely 27% whip-cracks and 46% banging drums (see Figure ...).
4 Increase in domestic stock numbers.

Farmers were asked to provide estimates of their stock numbers two years previously (1989) and at the time of interview (1991). The total number of stock reported was 4% lower in 1991 (55413 in 1989 compared to 53176 in 1991). These figures give a simplified idea of what has happened and are slightly misleading. Figure 6 shows that in fact more families had more stock in 1991 than 1989 but some of those families with the most stock reported decreases since 1989. Figure 7 shows how the relative abundance of different stock types changed. The percentages (of all stock for each period) and numbers, of sheep and cattle increased in 1991 whereas the number of goats reportedly decreased. Figures 7 to 19 present data on the overall and individual family situation for each species except horses (see the figure legends for detailed explanations).
Figures 7 to 10. Each square represents the stock holding of a family. Those falling below the straight line reported fewer stock in 1991 than in 1989 and those falling above the line owned more stock in 1991. Trends can therefor be seen. Those falling on the line reported unchanged stock numbers. Those on the Y-axis had no stock in 1989 or were not in the area then.

Figure 9. Shows the family distribution of total stock in 1989 and 1991. There were fewer families with large stock numbers in 1991 but more families had increased their stock in the 400-800 range. It can also be seen that most families had less than 300 animals. (See Figure 10.)
Figure 7. This figure shows that cattle have increased with many more families owning up to 50 animals. A similar number of families appear to have increased as decreased their cattle holdings in those with more numerous cattle.

Figure 9 Clearly shows that those families with over 500 goats in 1989 had fewer in 1991 but that there has been a large change in fortune of families owning from 200 to 400 goats with an overall increase. Most families had fewer than 400 animals. (See Figure .)
Figure 9. The figure shows that there was a relatively large increase in the number of sheep owned by families having between 100 and 200 sheep in 1989 and an overall increase for those families having more than 100 animals.

Figure 10. Shows that there were fewer families with more than 10 donkeys in 1991 but that many more families have less than 10 animals and these families have increased their donkey ownership.
4. Community Meetings to Discuss Elephant Related Problems.

5. Potential Solutions and Recommendations.
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NOTICE OF A FARMERS UNION MEETING

GROOTBERG FARMERS UNION: DEPARTMENT AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

MEETING AT GROOTBERG BREEDING STATION 4.1.1991

TIME: 10H00

AGENDA:
1. CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF ELEPHANTS IN WARD 4, GROOTBERG.
2. THE PROSPECTS OF THE 1991 HUNTING SEASON.
3. THE SUPERVISION BY A FARMER OF GAME ON A SPECIFIC FARM.
4. DROUGHT AID.

WITH THANKS

D. GAOGOSEB
SENIOR AGRICULTURAL OFFICER
ANKER
FIRST FARMERS MEETING TO DISCUSS ELEPHANT PROBLEMS
GROOTBERG JANUARY 1991

On the 4th January, 1991, the Welitschia Farmers Union invited the MWCT staff and myself to attend a meeting to discuss the problems which are being experienced because of the elephants in the Huab catchment area. Week before the meeting, on Christmas Eve, a young boy Colin Beukes, was unfortunately killed by an elephant while herding his uncle’s cattle on horseback. The accident happened when the horse and rider walked too close to the elephant which was standing hidden amongst trees. The incident was a double tragedy for us, due to the fact that the uncle Mr Manfred Bauser, was a leader in the local community in his belief that game should be protected and he had tolerated the presence of elephant herds with fortitude. The incident naturally caused extreme upset amongst the community and the family itself. The elephant was tracked down and shot the following day, by staff of the MWCT. It was not a happy Christmas for any of us! At the farmers’ meeting there were many calls for the extermination or removal of all elephant from the farming area. There were however, many others farmers who felt that, there needed to be an investigation into the situation before any drastic decisions were taken. Some farmers spoke out in favour of the elephants remaining. This has resulted in a survey questionnaire which has been drawn up by myself, Sharon Montgomery and the staff of the MWCT and is to be circulated amongst all the farmers. (Append.)

The results of the survey will only be known at the end of March. The MWCT has however, agreed to circulate (Append.) being circulated through our project and entitled "ELEFRIENDS", to endeavour to bring returns to the community who live with the elephants, through donations from tourists who visit the area.
R10 DONATION TO SAVE THE ELEPHANT OF DAMARALAND

WHY DO WE NEED YOUR R10?

History of the elephants:
The elephants which you will see during your visit to Damaraland are internationally famous; they are the only elephants living in such arid desert conditions. In 1933, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature declared these "desert" elephants a top priority in Africa for protection. In 1991, these elephants still remain top of the priority list.

Present Situation
The elephant numbers have increased due to the strict protection measures which have been implemented by the Government, heavily aided by Non-Government Organisations and support from the public. The elephants have been saved from the dreadful slaughter which took place in the past. However, unknown to many people, the elephants spend much of their time during the dry season, on communal farmlands, where water is more plentiful.
The people of the communal lands are incredibly tolerant of the elephants; many of them feel that the elephants belong to the land and have a right to be there, but at the same time, they are scared of them, especially when out herding the goats or cattle, or when children have to go to school, walking through the bush.
The elephants, being so large and with babies to feed, tend to cause problems at farm homesteads. They break the windmills if water is not pumping out, they trample the small vegetable gardens, they tear up pipes to find water, they chase stock and recently a young boy died when he fell from his horse when an elephant chased him.
In other words, the farmers who tolerate the elephants, receive no benefits from having them on their farms. The independence of Namibia has brought a new freedom to everyone and with it, the farmers are asking WHY there is no benefit for them from the tourists who come to see the "desert" elephants.

PLEASE HELP US TO HELP THE COMMUNITY

How many ten rand notes can your group afford to help us help the community and

SAVE THE ELEPHANTS
WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO YOUR DONATION?

1. Your donation will be kept safely and will be banked monthly by the Save the Rhino Trust in a special account named "Elefriend Fund."
2. The Community Council leaders will advise us on the needs of the community.
3. Payments to the community will be made twice a year.

Other projects aimed at creating benefits for the community are already in progress. The Save the Rhino Trust is working on a joint venture with the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism. This joint venture is specifically aimed at protecting the elephants which utilise the communal farming areas. The major part of the project is to bring benefits to the community. Unfortunately, progress is slow due to the continual lack of funds, but visitors to Twyfelfontein will have seen an example of the type of community involvement and benefits which can be achieved. Twyfelfontein is an example of the joint venture mentioned above. The project directors are planning to provide other such facilities for the tourist to Damaraland. All of these projects are joint ventures for the community to benefit from the many thousands of visitors who come to see the spectacular scenery, the symbol of Africa - the elephant and hopefull, the highly endangered and very rare black rhino.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION

Blythe Loutit
Save the Rhino Trust
Elefriend Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Occupants: [ ] Do you wish to become an ELEFRIEND member Y/N

Name: BILL AND SKITCH ROSENTHAL

Address: 424 EAST 52 ST
NEW YORK, NEW YORK, 10022, USA

YOUR RECEIPT FOR BRINGING BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY TO HELP THE PEOPLE AND THE ELEPHANTS

DONATION MADE: R70

THANK YOU FROM THE ELEFRIEND FUND
REPORT ON MEETING HELD BY THE COMMUNITY OF THE WELWITSCHIA
DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL UNION AT
GROOTBERG PRIMARY SCHOOL AT ERWEE IN DAMARALAND
ON SATURDAY 16.11.1991

The meeting was a second meeting held to address the problems faced by the
communal farming community in the Huab and surrounding areas regarding
elephant damage to fences, gardens and the dangers they hold for the
humans. The meeting continued for 12 hours and lively discussion ensued.
Initially the meeting consisted of approximately 300 people, but later
dwindled to 86 farmers. Women and the elderly were well represented and
took active part in the meeting.

The Chairman of the meeting was Nahor Howoseb of the Ministry of Wildlife,
Conservation and Tourism (MWCT). The meeting was attended by Paramount
Chief Justus Garoeb other local chiefs, elders, the Commissioners of the
North West Region and Otjiwarongo, the Chairman of the Grootberg Regional
Farmers Union and several other community leaders.

Initially the community was given a report back on the situation and the
survey conducted earlier in the year by the Ministries of Agriculture, and
Wildlife Conservation and the Save the Rhino Trust. Several options were
raised for discussion in the attempt to find a solution to the problems.
Print-outs of the survey results were pinned up for viewing by the
meeting.

Towards the end of the day, when all information had been assimilated and
questions had been answered, it was decided by the meeting that those who
had left the meeting early had forfeited their chance to participate in
the final discussions and it was voted that the panel discussions continue
and some resolution be reached by those still present.

The panel discussions took place in three groups. Each group was attended
by a Damara speaking Nature Conservator who was there to answer further
queries that arose during discussion. Outsiders and members of the Save
the Rhino Trust did not participate in the panel discussions.

The groups had been asked to consider the following options:
1. Shoot/destroy all the elephants (which number ± 85 in that region)
   Retain present situation
3. Should ground be purchased to resettle those who wish to move
4. Should ground dams be built to attract elephants
5. Should consideration be given to building a stone wall to contain
elephant movements
6. Should a special committee be appointed to further investigate
solutions to the problems

The report back from the groups through their spokesmen were as follows:

GROUP 1 LEADER: MR TSUSEB

1. The group decided that shooting would not provide an overall solution
   and that a peaceful solution should be found.
2. The group felt that the present situation was untenable as the
   problems had led to a direct threat to people’s lives and a solution
   should be sought.
3. The group felt that as the people had been resettled in the homeland involuntarily in the first place, resettlement was not an option and asked that the elephants be resettled this time.

4. Regarding the building of ground dams, the group felt that if this was seen to be a solution, it should go ahead.

5. The stone wall would be valuable if built outside farming areas and the group identified Hobatere as a possible location.

6. It was felt that if a committee was established, the Welwitschia Farmers Union was the ideal vehicle for further discussion.

7. The group felt that more direct links with traditional leaders were required. They also felt that the Namibia Agricultural Union should be more closely involved as a mother body. They stated that they could be counted on to help in trying to find a peaceful solution to the problem which they identified as a crisis situation. They also expressed gratitude to Blythe Loutit for attempting to provide short-term intermediate solutions.

GROUP 2 LEADER: MR DAWID GAOGOSEB

This group chose to reply to all points in one summary.

1. They felt a departmental investigation should be conducted with the farmers in the area of all aspects of the problems.

2. They requested that all information regarding elephant movements and statistics be provided to the community leaders to facilitate appraisals of the situation.

3. The group felt that should a suitable area be identified, elephant numbers may have to be reduced by culling to prevent movement to farming areas. Hobatere was once again identified as a possible area.

4. It was felt direct representation to the Chiefs’ Council should be made and that any decision taken should involve the development and upliftment of the farmers and under no circumstances should they be negatively affected.

GROUP 3. LEADER MR HUMPHRIES

1. The group strongly opposed shooting all the elephants as they felt that their descendants had a right to see the animals and because of their value as tourist attractions.

2. It was felt that the present situation was untenable and had to be changed through discussions such as were being held.

3. It was felt that with the desire to keep the elephants and the desire to continue farming, the best solution would be to separate the farmers and the elephants. They felt that the identification of a special area for elephants should be left to those capable of making decision, as they felt they did not have the knowledge, but trusted that those making the decision would do so with the best interests of both the farmers and the elephants in mind.
4. The group stressed that should a solution entail moving farmers, this could be done in such a way as to allow farmers to continue their farming activities. They expressed the fear that if no solution could be found or worked towards during the present meeting, they would have to get together every year to discuss the same problems.

Lively discussion followed the report back with a call from Mr Gaogoseb to form a small committee that would work with the MWCT and Save the Rhino Trust to investigate the entire situation with the proviso that any decisions made should be brought to the community for approval.

The point was raised that Hobatere would only provide sanctuary for a very small number of elephants and was better for farming than the more western arid region.

The Regional Commissioner of Otjiwarongo said there were some of those present who had hidden agendas, in that they were thinking of moving to commercial farming areas in any case. He recommended that the committee consider three points:
1. Who wants to move to commercial areas,
2. Who wants to stay in the communal area with the elephants, and
3. Who in the communal area wants to stay, but without the elephants.

The committee appointed was as follows:
Mr Dawid Gaogoseb (Treasurer)
Mr Nahor Hwoseb
Mr Dudu Mururwa (Chairman)
Mr Ismael Bachmann
Mr James Mapenga
Mr Felix Humphries (Secretary)

The first meeting of the committee with the Save the Rhino Trust was scheduled to take place in Khorixas on Monday 18th November 1991 and a further meeting of the community was scheduled for January 1992.

Addendum to Report

BD Loutit reported on 18.11.1991 that she had met with the committee which is called The Rural Conservation Committee for the Huab Catchment Area. They informed her that their aim was to solve the problems existing between the elephants and the humans in the area. They had developed the motto that Wildlife and Human Life are each dependent on one another.

The committee visited the commissioner and were very positive during discussions about identifying an area for use as an IUCN Category 8 Multi-use Management Area. The Save the Rhino Trust has agreed to carry the expenses incurred by the committee during its investigation.
The above named project has been in operation for 3 years and has reached a stage where the rural farming community of the Huab area have formed a committee to handle the co-operative project involving the Ministries of Wildlife Conservation, Agriculture Water and Rural Development, Lands and Resettlement with NGO's The Worldwide Fund for Nature, Save the Rhino Trust and the locally formed RURAL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE.

HUAB & DESERT ELEPHANT - CONFLICT WITH FARMERS IN THE COMMUNAL AREA OF DAMARALAND - AIDS AND OBJECTIVES.

1. The Rural Conservation Committee will liaise between all the groups involved.

2. The Chairman of the RCC, Mr Dudu Murorua, will be appointed as Wildlife Manager for the WWF/SRT to work on this project.

3. The initial aim is to permanently solve the problems which the community are experiencing by having elephants damage their possessions, and to give the farmers a more favourable climate to continue their farming practices.

4. To give the elephants a peaceful home area where they are able to drink and feed without causing damage to farmer's property.

5. Develop tourism to bring returns to the region through properly managed tourist enterprises.

6. To develop a system which will bring benefits to the community living in this area near to or with the elephants.

7. To find funding to enable the purchase of land for farmers who wish to move out of the area where the elephant will remain.

To achieve the above aims, the following suggestions have been discussed with those members of the community who experience most problems or who live within an area which would be suitable for the elephant habitat.

a) An area to be identified, with the help of the community, where elephants can remain as part of Damaland's heritage.

b) Once the area is identified and agreed upon by the community, traditional leaders, elephant behavior experts and the Ministries Wildlife Conservation and Tourism, Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, the international African Elephant funding bodies will be approached to help provide funds towards purchasing land to commercial farmers onto which they can move with their stock.

c) Approach the International African Elephant funding organisations to fund the moving of communal farmers and their stock to areas with the communal area which has been vacated by the commercial farmers.
d) Investigate the possibility of moving those communal farmers who wish to move to other communal areas or the possibility of purchasing farms which could be used on a co-operative basis, for communal farmers who wish to enter into a co-operative farming scheme.

e) Build a stone wall around the eastern, northeastern and southeaster part of the identified area, to prevent the elephants from moving back into communal farming areas, but allowing the continued migration of the Huab elephants to the western desert which is their normal pattern of behaviour.

f) Raise funds to cover the costs of building the stone wall, and providing electric fencing for short sections across river courses.

g) Allow those who wish to remain within the identified elephant area, to do so on the understanding that domestic stock may be limited, that they may be required to become directly involved in the protection, management and control of the area and the wildlife and become involved in tourist projects with the aim of creating income to ensure that the project becomes self sustaining.

h) Ensure that all participants in this ambitious project feel happy and secure that these are sincere attempts to better their living conditions.

i) Ensure that this project is in keeping with the aims of the Land Conference.

These aims are subject to discussion and approval by the traditional leaders. The meeting will take place on Friday the 8th December, 1991 in Khorixas. These aims will be presented by the Chairman of the Rural Conservation Committee, Mr Dudu Murorua,

Blythe Loutit,
Project Executive
WWF Project 3884
Director of Fieldwork,
Save the Rhino Trust.

cc
Dudu Murorua & RCC
WWF International
David Shepherd Conservation Foundation
Nick Carter
Tammy Hall
John Hanks
Rudi Loutit
Sharon Montgomery
Honourable Chief Garoeb,

The World Wide Fund for Nature, the Save the Rhino Trust and the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation & Tourism have been working with the regional representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Affairs and Rural Development in an endeavour to find an acceptable and permanent solution to the problem of elephants in the communal farming area of the Huab catchment.

As you are aware, there has been a survey conducted amongst the rural farming communities and various meetings and discussions have been held, this culminated in the ELEPHANT DAY meeting at Erwei on the 16th November, 1991.

A Rural Conservation Committee has been formed and I believe that the irman, Mr Dudu Murroura, and some of the members of the Committee have visited you to discuss our hopes of finding a solution.

On behalf of the Rural Conservation Committee and the abovementioned non-Government and Government organisations, I wish to seek consent from yourself as Paramount Chief and other traditional leaders, to pursue plans to find a solution to the problems of elephants in communal farming areas.

These are points which have been discussed with the farming community:

1. The identification of an area which may be proclaimed for the community as a multi-use conservation area. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has categorised such areas under "IUCN Category VIII - Multi-use Management Area".

2. The implementation of plans to seek commercial farmland for those farmers who wish to move away from the communal land, so as to improve their farm management skills on commercial land.

3. To draw up an agreement with the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, that the farms vacated in the communal area by commercial farmers outside of the Multi-use Management Area, will be held specifically for those communal farmers who wish to move out of the Multi-use Management Area and onto those vacated farms, thereby remaining in the communal area.

4. To build an elephant-proof stone wall on the east, northeast and southeast, to keep elephants permanently within the Multi-use Management Area, but still allowing them to continue their seasonal migrations to the western desert area.
5. To request advice from the Traditional Leadership on how the Huab Game Reserve should be managed as well as how the income from this area should be utilised.

6. To enquire from the Traditional Leadership whether they would consider the utilisation of Palmfontein as a tourism site, as it falls within its jurisdiction.

7. To request a commitment from the Traditional Leadership and the Government of Namibia not to allow new settlement of people in the Multi-use Management area unless these people are fully prepared to farm in the presence of elephant. This area will, however, be available to surrounding farmers for emergency grazing during periods of drought.

8. To request provision of a date for an appointment with the Traditional Leadership as soon as possible, to enable the Rural Conservation Committee to fully inform it of the details of the project and possibly to obtain decisions and permission on the above points.

You may recall my visit to you with Mr Nick Carter, nearly 3 years ago, to brief you of our wish to begin this project to try and solve the problem of the Huab elephants. I have now been working as Project Executant on this co-operative project for the past two and a half years to find a solution to the problem of the elephants on communal land. However, due to the political changes, until now, it has been difficult to find enough international funding to implement this plan which we feel is at last, a permanent solution which is hopefully, acceptable by all parties.

I would be very grateful if you would consider these proposals as a genuine wish to ensure a better future for both the communal farmers and the elephants who are part of our Heritage in Africa.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Blythe Loutit,
Project Executant - WWF Project No 3884
Director of Fieldwork - Save the Rhino Trust
REPORT BACK ON PROGRESS ON HUAB ELEPHANT/COMMUNITY PROJECT
14TH MARCH 1992

At the Elephant Day meeting held on the 16th November 1991 at Erwee Primary School, the need to find a solution to the elephant/community problem was discussed and the following points were suggested:

1. that an area be identified where elephants could live with other wildlife;

2. that people who did not wish to continue living with the elephants, move to a safer area outside the area proposed for the elephants;

3. that a land use management plan be implemented for the farmers and for the wildlife;

4. that the question of alternative land for commercial and communal co-operative farming be investigated;

5. that outside funding and Government assistance be sought to enable farmers to move from the identified elephant area;

6. that the feasibility of building a stone wall to keep the elephants away from the people outside of the proposed elephant/wildlife area, be investigated;

7. that, if the wall is acceptable, it must be seen as a community project and that funds generated from its construction be kept within the community.

Since then the SRT/WWF and the RCC have been very busy having discussions with Chief Justus Garoeb, the relevant Government departments, traditional headmen, local farmers, conservationists, and community development organisations.

The Regional Commissioner, Hans Bousis, very kindly arranged for the RCC and SRT to attend a private meeting with the highest Government official, The Honourable First Prime Minister, during his visit to this area. The Honorable Mr Ben Ulenge, Deputy Minister of M WCT paid a personal visit to the area to familiarize himself with the elephant/community problem and the RCC and SRT were able to discuss the communities' problems at length.

In January, the Worldwide Fund For Nature, who have been funding this project from Switzerland, sent three representatives to look at the project.

On 11th March 1992 the annual visit of the Director and Senior Officials to the MWCT Khorixas Regional Office took place and Principal Game Ranger Nahor Howoseb who is a member of the RCC was asked to give a report on the activities of the RCC. The Director was very impressed with the community, Farmers Union and RCC input and determination to find a solution to the elephant problems. Mr Swart has promised his personal and MWCT's support in lobbying Cabinet to provide formal assistance in reaching a satisfactory solution for the people and the elephants and to complete a management strategy for better land use options.
To solve the problem between the people and the elephants, the most important points are:

a) giving a place to the elephants.
b) building a barrier to keep the elephants from wandering back onto the farms.
c) finding alternative land for those who wish to move.

The question of finding funds and land for those who wish to move will depend upon the people concerned coming to an agreement on these three points.

Although the majority of farmers indicated at the last meeting that the elephants should have an area, there are some farmers who seem to be unsure about the suggestion to make a place for the elephants and to build a barrier. This presents difficulties for us in making a proposal to acquire alternative land.

The other problem which we have encountered recently, is the movement of more people into the proposed area for the elephants, if people continue to move in, the elephants will have no place to go and there will be more problems for the people, and we will have more difficulties in finding alternative land for those who do not wish to share land with the elephants.

The question of alternative land and funds to buy land is already being investigated. A preliminary proposal for land acquisition for the farmers who wish to move from the western, most arid area has been put to the WWF and SANP. These organisations have agreed to send an expert on elephant/community problems to investigate the situation in May.

If the ecologists, the community developers, the funding organisations, the traditional headmen, the farmers and the Government all agree, then the proposal to make a place for the elephants and to build a barrier in the form of a stone wall can go ahead.

NOTE

The land proposed for the elephant should be available to small subsistence farmers and emergency grazing if they wish to stay with the elephants, but there would be very limited assistance for elephant damages.

International funding will not always be available, especially if a project does not have any hope of becoming self-sufficient, in which case we may not be able to reach an agreement in giving place to the elephants and thereby creating income and returns to the community through sustainable land use and tourism. Coming to see the elephants and other game, we will not be able to continue to assist the farming community with non-Government funding as we have been doing in the past 3 years.
Enabling them to buy up 'white' properties

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER

Government has announced plans for 100% loans to help communal farmers buy land in the commercial farming areas and develop their stock.

Described as "affirmative action loans and advances" by Minister of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development Mr Gert Haneckom during his contribution to the second reading debate on the mini-budget in the National Assembly yesterday, the money will be repayable at low interest over 25 years, with an initial two-year period of grace.

But the scheme would also introduce a measure of control to ensure that commercial farmers would not sell their farms at "inflated prices".

Mr Haneckom said that to qualify for assistance, communal farmers would have to be full-time farmers and own a minimum of 150 large stock units or 600 small stock units. They would also not be entitled to farm on communal as well as commercial land.

Because it was anticipated that communal farmers would experience problems in financing loans, they would be able to obtain them from the Agricultural Bank of Namibia "even up to 100 per cent", he said.

There will be close scrutiny of the viability of farming enterprises to ensure that "the purchase price of the farm in relation to the ability of the farm constitutes a financial proposition".

Mr Haneckom said there were a number of farmers expecting to sell their farms at inflated prices and he had to "dissuade them", because it would not happen. The government would not finance transactions which were not realistic as "it would not be in the interest of emerging farmers".

Loans would be made available for a 25-year period. During the first two years the loans will interest-free and no capital repayments would be expected. From the third year on, the capital would be redeemed at a scaled-up interest rate.

To avoid speculation on property with cheap government money, a 10-year restriction clause would be imposed on title deeds. This means that during the first ten years farmers would only be allowed to sell the property with the consent of the Bank under specified conditions.

Mr Haneckom said the scheme would also help "other persons who were left out in the past" to acquire land in the commercial areas.

Cont. on next page

Furthermore, small-scale farmers would be helped to develop their infrastructure to ensure "optimum utilisation of their resources", including assistance in soil conservation, fencing, crop erection and water provision.

Loans would be available for grazing if farmers' stock increased if the total stock on the farm exceeded 70 per cent of the carrying capacity of the land.

The scheme would also help small-scale farmers to provide better housing for their families and farm workers.

Mr Haneckom said in addition to the "affirmative action" which would be handled by the bank, Cabinet had further decided that would be given to communal farmers by the future Agricultural Development Corporation (ADC), which is to take over from the First National Development Corporation (FNDLC).

The act to establish the ADC, which "would become the implementing arm of the Agriculture Ministry" would be passed in parliament "as soon as possible".

loans for peasant farmers

THESE SCHEMES ARE BEING HANDLED BY THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA AND GOVERNMENT HAS RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF THE AGRICULTURAL BANK TO PUT THE AGRICULTURAL ADVANCE SCHEMES INTO OPERATION WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAY.
THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA AMENDMENT ACT, PASSED BY PARLIAMENT IN 1991, CONTAINS, AMONGST OTHERS, ONE VERY IMPORTANT ADDITION, NAMELY, SECTION 46 OF THE ACT, WHICH ENVISAGE ADVANCES TO BE GIVEN BY THE BANK IN ORDER TO PROMOTE CERTAIN GOVERNMENT SCHEMES OR PROJECTS. SUBSECTION (a) OF THE SAID SECTION ENVISAGE ADVANCES FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF NAMIBIANS CONTEMPLATED IN ARTICLE 23(2) OF THE NAMIBIAN CONSTITUTION, IN OTHER WORDS: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION. SUBSECTION (b) OF THE SAID SECTION THEN FURTHER PROVIDES FOR THE PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE IN GENERAL IN NAMIBIA AND/OR FOR THE COMBATTING OF EMERGENCIES THREATENING AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES OR NEEDS IN NAMIBIA.

AS REGARDS SUBSECTION (a) OF SECTION 46, IN OTHER WORDS, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ADVANCES, GOVERNMENT HAS DECIDED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF THE AGRICULTURAL BANK OF NAMIBIA THAT THE FOLLOWING SCHEMES BE PUT INTO OPERATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE:

1. COMMUNAL FARMERS TO ACQUIRE LAND IN COMMERCIAL AREA.

2. OTHER PERSONS (LEFT OUT IN THE PAST) TO ACQUIRE LAND IN COMMERCIAL AREA.
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING

TEL: (0651) 3702
FAX: (0651) 2750
TELEX:

OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONER-OTJIWARONGO
P.O. BOX 1526
26 November 1991

OUR REF: ORC. 125/26/91 YOUR REF:
ENQUIRIES: T. TSHISHOME

ATTENTION: BLYTHE LOUTIT

Save The Rhino Trust
P.O. Box 83
Khorixas

RE: APPLICATION FOR RESSETTLEMENT FROM COMMUNAL FARMING AREA TO COMMERCIAL FARMING AREA.

I am thankful to the organisers of Elephant Day which was held on the 16th November 1991 at Erwee in Damaraland.

Like many others who attended the meeting, I also like elephants because many countries have no elephants. It is an attraction for overseas and foreign tourists from other countries and a source of income to Namibia.

I do remember that the meeting revealed that people as well as elephants increased tremendously in numbers. For Nature Conservation to move elephants away from where they are scattered, it is too expensive to hire a helicopter, thus the whole financial implications is a heavy burden for the government of the day.

Me, as a farmer who farms at Dorsland Post 621 which is the entrance of elephants from Kaokoland into Damaraland would like to appeal to your good office as follows:

As a farmer, I would like to make some progress with farming. I don't want to be disadvantaged through living and farming among elephants, giraffes and other predatory animals although I like them.

My appeal to you is that I wish and would like to be moved away from elephant areas to a better commercial farming land where there is no elephants and other predators.
I hope that the dream of Save The Rhino Trust for collecting funds will become a success and soon before Christmas you may succeed to purchase the first ten commercial farms.

I wish that I will be resettled in the first groups of farms that will be made available by your good office.

Yours faithfully

Otniel Kazombiaze
REGIONAL COMMISSIONER- ODIWARDGO

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
ODIWARDGO REGION

1991-11-26
Elephants are threatened by fears of inhabitants

Elephants are alleged to be causing a lot of misery and fear in Damaraland. Farmers are appealing to the Government to take a strong action on the free-ranging population of elephants in the area. Some demanded their total destruction.

Two days before Christmas, young Colin Beukes, 11 years old, was killed in the Huab valley, when the horse he was riding met a bull elephant head-on. The boy was visiting his uncle from Groodfontein during the school holidays.

The elephant was shot by Conservation officials on Christmas day.

This tragic accident has sparked off a wave of concern among Damara communal farmers. Recently, the Grooetberg Farmers called a meeting to put their demands to officials from the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation & Tourism and the Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Development.

Spokesman for the meeting, Mr. D. Gogoseb, senior agricultural officer, chairman of the Welwitschia Regional Agricultural Union and Secretary of the Grooetberg Farmers Union pointed out that although the people were aware that game could be a great asset, very little benefit had been reaped from having elephants on the farms. He stressed that the people had been placed on farms and farms by the Odendaal Commission in the sixties and that they had enough troubles farming in the arid area.

His suggestion was that the elephants be moved to a specific area away from the inhabited farms. The meeting was lively, although many farmers indicated that they were interested in keeping the elephants if they were paid compensation for damages and given help to live with them. However, some asked for the total destruction of the elephant population. "Just shoot them all."

Elephants and man have lived together in this area for over one hundred years. Until a few years ago, they were shot if the farmers considered them a threat to life or property. Now things have changed. Permits for the shooting of elephants are not simply handed out on request any more. The elephant population stands at approximately 200 and is increasing well.

The problem between man and elephant occurs in water. There are over 140 artificial water points in Damaraland and many areas around natural springs are also inhabited. The increase in water points has caused elephants to spend more time on the farms. This means that farmers and elephants will always meet. If the reservoirs are full, there is normally no problem, but when the reservoirs are empty, they become very angry and start to look after their calves to look after their herds. 

Cont. on next page
Shooting Will Cause a Furore
Even if large numbers of the animals could be moved north of the red-line or into the west, and fenced in, elephant movements are seasonal and few fences can keep these giants in.

While understanding the fear and reluctance of some of the farmers to live among elephants, in Namibia, a project has been on the go for two years to begin solving the problems faced by men and elephants in DamaraLand.

It is essential that communities who live among these giants should gain direct benefit for having them on their lands. Unfortunately, authorities in Africa have ignored the problems and the requirements of the people.

Though Tourism has been run on a formal basis in DamaraLand for about ten years, the local people have not benefited from the tourists that come to see the elephants and the rhino of the area.

The Save the Rhino Trust project, started in the Huab catchment area two years ago. This was aimed at assisting farmers by compensating them for losses, erecting new water points to entice elephants away from farm houses and reserves. Vegetable gardens were fenced off and low-key tourism was established on the scale.

The Government's decision would not be an easy one. One hand there is understandable fear and on the other there is an irreplaceable treasure that Namibia would not afford to lose.

Benpowerful jet brings big load of tourists

More than 100 German tourists arrived on board a Boeing 737-500 of the airline Hapag Lloyd, a German company with substantial holdings in the shipping industry and in later years also buying a stake in the air industry.

Half of the group will travel the south of Namibia in the course of the weekend, and the other half will go to the north, staying over at Mukuri for a visit to the Etosha National Park.

The jet which brought them landed late on Thursday night at Windhoek International, an unusual Boeing 737 because the designation 500 identifies a type of 737 with much more powerful engines than those for example used by South African Airways and Namib Air on domestic routes.

The aircraft was delayed, but the reasons for this were not given. Also expected was a flight by Interflug, which did not arrive. South West Safari sent eight buses to collect the tourists.
Evict Elephants, Demand Villagers

By Ehrudt Oxurub

SESFONTEIN

LOCAL COMMUNITIES frustrated by the damage done by elephants to their property, crops and environment here, have appealed to government to move the beasts to another area.

The Save the Rhino Trust recently formed a Rural Conservation Committee which visited the ravaged area to speak to the people about the need for nature and wildlife conservation and consult them on a possible solution to the elephant problem.

Regional Commissioner for North-West, Hans Boois, thought that the presence of elephants in the area would attract tourists and thus benefit the areas economically.

But recent damage has angered some people who feel the animals must simply be moved elsewhere.
The people have been particularly incensed by a recent incident in which a boy was pulled off the back of a horse and trampled into the ground by an elephant.

 Besides this, elephants are said to be damaging water-pipes, boreholes and drilling machines as well as felling fences and damaging peoples' crops. Environmental damage is done by the elephants when they uproot trees and shrubs.

Commissioner Boois said ideally people and the elephants should co-exist in harmony. He said the Save the Rhino Trust, the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism and the community were working closely to solve the problem.

The elephants have in particular been a problem to a cattle breeding scheme where Afrikaner bulls were being bred for sale at low prices to local small scale farmers.

Chief agricultural official in Khorixas, Leonard Kambonde, told New Era the scheme was facing a problem in controlling the breeding as a result of fences being brought down by the elephants, making it difficult to monitor the animals.

A Khorixas resident suggested that the elephants should be put in a camp somewhere since they had become too dangerous.

A clerk in the Regional Commissioner's Office said wherever the elephants were to be moved there should be enough water since the animals were drinking up water meant for human consumption.

Walter Griesel said a game reserve should be established in the area so that the people who wanted to see the animals could go and see them there.
Elephant Man Confrontations

Elephant man confrontations are an endemic issue throughout Africa and the community in the Hluhluwe River Catchment area is no exception. It is with regret that we report the death of an elephant bull known affectionately as "Japie" by tourists for whom he used to perform mock charges.

Japie was shot by a member of the Rural Conservation Committee, Mr. Jiem Mapanka at approximately 21h00 on the night of March 15. The incident was reported to the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism officials immediately and the following day an investigation was conducted, involving officials of the Ministry, the Wildlife Manager of the WWF, Dudu Murorus and a number of Chiefs, including Paramount Chief Justus Garoob.

We include sections of the statements made by Mr. Jiem Mapanka and Mr. Dudu Murorus as they were recorded during the investigation.

"I, Jiem Joseph Mapanka .... Riemvassmaker Namibian, ..... state:

.... On the evening of the 15th March 1992 I was in bed early. My bed is on the front porch of my house. About 20h45 I heard my brother Frans Mapanka shouting: "The elephant is coming, the elephant is coming". I grabbed my rifle which was standing beside my bed and walked towards my main gate. There was moonlight outside and I could see my brother coming and then I saw the elephant by his house, situated about 60m from mine. When my brother was in my yard I fired a warning shot into the air to scare the elephant off. The elephant did not react in a manner to flee, instead he came closer. He was standing in the pathway of the vehicle track coming from the main road. Now he was standing between my brother's house and the sheep kraal. I feared for the safety of my family and my stock so I aimed and shot at the chest of the elephant.

The elephant turned around and walked away screaming. He went in the eastern direction. After a short distance he stood still. He stood still for a while, we went back to the house. A little while later, I went to look again. I saw a smaller shape where he stood and could not make out what was happening. I got into my car and drove closer to where I had seen the elephant standing. I could see in my car's headlights that the elephant was lying down on his side. I then decided to report the incident to the nearest Nature Conservation Stores.....

... I want to state further that my water installation can't provide enough water for my stock and elephant. My water installation is of that kind which only pumps water when the wind blows. I have no engine or powerhead to pump faster water. I have asked the water affairs section to provide me with engines and a powerhead but to no avail. I have also complained to Nature Conservation that the elephant drink all my water and break the water pipes. They have helped me by sending people to build a stone wall to protect the water. I have very little water at the house; my small stock have to drink .... at the fountains. Most of the fountains have dried up this season. My stock have to go without water sometimes a day or two. Sunday the 15th March 1992 was no exception and there was no water. The elephant could not drink, so he came closer to the house to search for water.

I had no intentions to shoot the elephant, I had no choice, I shot the elephant to protect my family and my stock. I regret having to shoot the elephant."

Extract from the statement of Themistokles "Dudu" Murorus:

"... My conclusion and observation is that:

1. Mr. Mapanka very deeply regrets the fact that he killed the elephant.
2. It was entirely done to protect his family and livestock.
3. Mr. Mapanka and all the others in the area have been living there for more than ten years, they have tolerated the elephants for drinking up all the water they have got for themselves and their livestock. They tolerate the fact that there is no proper water installation to provide enough water for the elephants and for themselves, and it is thus logical that he might have reached breaking point, not against the elephants themselves, but against the whole situation, which, for any normal person, is unbearable.

In this regard I humbly request the government, the surrounding community, the local headmen and all the donor agencies to support the idea of the SRT/WWF Project, morally and financially, to build a barrier with stones and create a multi-use management area for the elephants and all the other game in the area.

(Elephant Man .... continued on page 6)
Earth Africa in Damaraland

At the community Elephant Day meeting reported on in the December newsletter, the Rural Conservation Committee was appointed to find a solution to the elephant/community problems by discussing the following issues:

1. Identifying an area where elephants could live with other wildlife;
2. That people who did not wish to continue living with the elephants move to a safer area outside that proposed for the elephants;
3. That a land-use management plan be implemented for farmers and for wildlife;
4. That the question of alternative land for commercial and communal farming be investigated;
5. That outside funding and Government assistance be sought to enable the farmers to move from the identified elephant area;
6. That the feasibility of building a stone wall to keep elephants away from people outside the proposed elephant/wildlife area be investigated;
7. That if the wall is acceptable, it must be seen as a community project and that funds generated from its construction be kept within the community.

Following this meeting, the Save the Rhino Trust invited Dr Norman Reynolds of Earth Africa to visit Damaraland. The aim of the visit was to help the RCC and SRT to pull together ideas on land-use, conservation, tourism and community.

After meetings with the Rural Conservation Committee, several proposals were suggested for presentation at a report-back by the RCC to the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and community meeting.

These included the productive use of drought aid to institute public works and retain a form of cash economy in a drought-ridden community, as opposed to encouraging dependence by food handouts. Adopting this form of public works for payment from income generated by drought aid, might well best fund the building of the elephant stone wall suggested by the community.

Potential options were proposed and discussed for land-use and land acquisition that require community action within new rules for resource management, based on the Community Land Trust concept, in which all adults enjoy equal membership shares and are issued with annual tradable rights to grazing, water, woodland etc. A Community Land Trust concept within the walled elephant area, where an IUCN Category VIII Multi-use Management area is proposed, would be the most viable way of ensuring equal distribution of income from the benefits of wildlife management and tourism.

These recommendations are contained in a document presently being considered and discussed by the RCC who were empowered by the community to investigate sources of funding for a full investigation by professional consultants into the feasibility of these recommendations.

Various potential donor organizations will also be approached for assistance in projects that can possibly be used to provide a useful pilot for voluntary community decisions over food relief, public works and elements of reform within the very limited timetable available in the face of such a severe drought. Should an investigation of this kind be made possible, it could provide guidelines for a model interest to other communities on a voluntary basis.

Dr Reynolds' visit took the form of a voluntary investigation and the value of his input towards finding solutions for the problems experienced in Damaraland will hopefully be reflected in a new sense of common purpose between community, Agricultural Union, government and donors (through the counterpart funds generated by food-aid). The SRT has been able to respond to a community request for additional support in the crucial area of land-use. Our sincere thanks to both him and Earth Africa for giving us new hope and a new outlook on the possible future of the region.

(Elephant/Human ... continued from page 3)

I would also further request that it is of no use to lay a charge against Mr Mapanka, since this is, according to me, not a criminal offence. But if, from now on, we do not try to implement the above mentioned idea, which is in fact a suitable and also workable solution from which all of us can benefit, in the near future, we are going to face the white commercial farmers, who are also troubled by the same elephants and they will do exactly what Mr Mapanka did in protection of his family and property. In this way, we stand the chance of losing all the elephants in the Huib valley, which are in fact, the famous desert elephants."

This case will now be referred to the Attorney General who will decide whether charges should be pressed.

The Riërvosmaker community living in Damaraland were moved into the area by the South African government in the 1960's when the area in which they lived in the Northern Cape was set aside as a military base.

Japie was identified as a problem elephant as early as 1989 and offered to a visiting hunter as a trophy animal by the then Department of Nature Conservation. The hunter turned the offer down on the grounds that the ivory was not suitable. Japie probably never intended to harm anyone and he was used to tourists photographing him. However, he was known to harass people in donkey carts and those walking along the road.

All incidents of this kind are thoroughly investigated by Ministry officials and if there are any suspicions of wanton shooting, wounding or killing elephants, charges will be pressed. It is to be hoped that the death of Japie is not the first of a series of deaths among these giants of our area.
POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 1: "Damaraland : Community, Land Use and Resource Management."
The Damara King’s Council, RCC, Welwitschia Agricultural Union, Dr N. Reynolds (Earth Africa). April 1992.

Section 2: (Final Page) Elephant Conservancy - Draft Discussion
PREAMBLE

It is recommended that these proposals be considered as a contribution from the community in Damaraland towards potential solutions for problems currently being experienced in this and other communal areas, notably as a model for drought management and for the reform of communal land systems.
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A INTRODUCTION

The people of Damaraland, the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and the Damara Kings Council have held a series of meetings over five months that began with land-use issues and, with the emergence of the drought, has become wider in scope.

The proposals contained herein cover:

a land-use plan for the region and the establishment of a Community Land Trust;
the reform of communal grazing systems by the introduction of equal ownership by adults and of exchangeable annual grazing rights;
the introduction of new economic institutions, democratically owned and controlled;
the establishment of a local tax base through the expression in monetary terms of the value of local agricultural activity;
the setting aside of a sanctuary for wildlife and tourism over which the community seeks formal legal title or rights (this is presently state land) under the Community Land Trust;
the conversion of food relief provided by international donors and government, destined for Damaraland, into a Damaraland Development Fund to finance public construction works of a labour intensive nature. The wages from these works will be used by the people to purchase food and fund other basic necessities;
the provision of an additional fund to ensure that wages can sustain other basic activities such as schools and the local economy. In exchange the donor will hold 5% of the region's grazing rights for three years (as a form of voluntary local taxation) and which is to be held by a Trustee. These rights would be sold annually to community members and the proceeds would be used for maintenance and development purposes as negotiated by the Community Land Trust and the Trustee.
the major planned construction item is an "elephant wall", a 1.5m high dry, stone wall that would deter elephants and rhino from leaving the new wildlife sanctuary and hence protect farms and public alike without creating a barrier to the movement of other fauna of the area.

the beginning of a regional housing programme which would start

i. with the collection of suitable stone for building at central places, to be owned and sold by the Community Land Trust

ii. with the irrigated production of indigenous reeds for roofing material using the effluent of Khorixas (to fall under a Khorixas Trust Company) and other concentrated settlements and

iii. with developments to fully realise the potential of existing gardens and date plantations at Sesfontein, Khobarib, Okombahe and Fransfontein.
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The Damara people have lived in a closely administered fashion as wards of the state since their re-settlement on arid marginal farms in 1968. Existing housing is largely dilapidated, unsuitable for local weather conditions and constructed roughly from imported materials. By assuming responsibility for land-use and management, the Damara people now want to express their cost-independence confidence in the form of better housing, using local materials and by the adoption of aesthetically and environmentally sound designs and construction methods.

B OFFICIAL RESPONSE TO THE DROUGHT

Government has responded to the drought affecting large parts of Namibia with a massive food import and distribution programme. The latest information (New Era April 23-29, 1992 pp 1 & 2) is that Government plans to feed 250,000 during 1992. Food imports will cost R50 million, while transport and distribution will amount to about R70 million, giving a total expenditure of R120 million. Khorixas has been selected as a "E" grade, or regional, depot.

The food relief programme will cost almost R500 per person, or at an average of eight persons per family, R4,000 per family.

In Damaland no crops of note are produced. The drought causes a loss of capital. Livestock is sold under distress conditions or dies in the veld. It is estimated that about half of the present livestock will be lost, resulting in capital loss of about R18,000 on average per family.

Although there is a large number of livestock in Damaland, in normal years only a small number is sold. The economy is poorly developed with few non-farming activities and hence few wage earners, or salaried jobs. Consequently the drought will have a major impact on the local economy. The need is not simply food relief, but to sustain, and lay the foundation for an improved, local economy.

Food relief alone will not keep open local businesses, protect the few existing jobs and preserve the ability to continue to pay school and clinic fees. Indeed, it will impede the cash economy, making the downturn of the local economy steeper, as was experienced in 1989 when food for work was distributed in drought-stricken areas.

The people of Damaland request the Government and donors to convert its share of food relief into a Development Fund to finance public works programmes.

There are 3,700 families in Damaland. The region's share of food relief is therefore R14.8 million.

It is proposed to turn the relief expenditure into investment by generating over one million man days of labour on construction sites.

In labour intensive public works, 60% of expenditure is set aside for wages. At a target daily earning per person under piece rates of R10 per day, 880,000 man days will be generated. A further 200,000 man days will be paid under transport, material preparation and local job creation and preservation, funded out of the 40% balance of expenditure which covers materials, supervision and transport.
Families will earn on average R2 360 from wages, undertaking an average of 250 days over the period from July 1992 to April 1993. At an average of two members per family, this means an average of only twelve days work per person, per month. Taking into consideration weather and organisation, the peak work periods may be July – October 1992 (4 months) and March – April 1993 (2 months).

BACKGROUND

Independence has brought political freedom and the promise of human and social rights. A longer battle, and one which underwrites the former, is to establish economic rights. Economic rights take longer to achieve because they arise through programme and institutional development. In this area law is often a blunt instrument. Additionally, they have to be defended continuously by the further development of programmes and institutions as conditions change.

In Damaraland there is an on-going process of community exploration of land use issues that bodes well for the future. It contains within it the seeds of larger changes towards self-management that are of interest to Namibia.

The land use issue arose around the question of the elephants entering farms and destroying property and crops and posing a danger to residents. Through a survey and at a public meeting in November 1991 convened by the Weiwitsch Games Agricultural Union, it was decided that the elephant enjoyed rights in the area. The question was one of how best man and elephant could share the region to mutual advantage.

At the same meeting the new post-independence opportunity of land purchase was raised. Could some members of the community who aspired to commercial ranching acquire commercial farms? What would this mean to land use in the present farm area?

The meeting appointed a Rural Conservation Committee (RCC) to look into:

- an area for elephant and other wildlife
- a land use plan that accommodated farmers, elephants and wildlife
- an (institutionalised legal, financial and management) arrangement that links community conservation, investment and land use to tourism and wildlife development
- government and donor funding for land purchases for commercial and "co-operative/communal farming".

At a recent report back, March 1992, the RCC added another local issue that is also of national concern. There is as yet no clear local right to exclude others from settled land. For some time more powerful neighbours and, today, opportunistic outsiders are using loopholes in present land administration in the communal areas to muscle onto land already occupied, which is increasing the pressure on natural resources such as wetlands, vegetation and wildlife through over-utilisation and disturbance/ displacement respectively.

Provisions in the Constitution which seek to enable Namibians to enjoy the right to reside anywhere in the country have on occasion been blamed. These provisions are not intended to overthrow other rights of occupation and of ownership but until the future of tenure in the communal areas is settled, sporadic land anarchy may continue. How best can communities that seek to introduce elements of land use, secure the right to manage their resources?
The problem of incursions onto communal farms (state land) in Damaraland, as the opposite phenomenon to the enclosure movement by means of fencing undereway, in particular, in Owamboland. Enclosure occurs under open communal grazing systems. The more powerful use fencing to "privatise" communal land. This creates a landless class of significant magnitude and leads to all the social inefficiencies of insecurity, urban drift and raising theft. The growing occupancy by people and domestic stock is foreclosing other land use options such as tourism and wildlife utilisation on a number of farms.

In Damaraland a part of the problem, discussed by the community, is that in the western zone at least, the people were dumped in an area too arid for livestock, even goats. The result is an insecure livelihood, the destruction of the veld, and the mining of the ground-water. The latter forces people to move to natural springs, heightening the conflict with wildlife, the elephant in particular. In times of drought it often becomes a question of power rather than of good management as herds are moved across farm boundaries.

The lack of resource management is the result of history. The present exercise is an attempt to move beyond the limited vision imposed by the warthog and the thralldom in which government held the community.

The community lacks the economic institutions through which to open up alternate land uses. One alternative now being explored, but without a solid financial option in place, is for the community to devote an increasing area to tourism and wildlife, retreating as it were to more stable livestock production in the wetter East.

A commission investigating the role of Traditional Chiefs in Namibia has yet to report. The Commission has the difficult task to steer between the rocks of traditional authority over land allocation when that is a broken and frequently corrupt system and some modern bureaucratic control that denies community interest. The option the Damara King's Council and the RCC have adopted, opens up a "third way" the reform of community systems that combine private and group interests, avoiding the either/or of private versus community.

The King's Council and the RCC stressed that any plan must be capable of becoming financially self-sufficient, though there will be a need for funded professional inputs.

The sections below look in some detail at the individual issues. The intention is to produce an integrated land use plan which also deals with resource management. Land purchase and drought management have entered the list of subjects to be addressed urgently.

**LAND PURCHASE**

Government has announced a land purchase support scheme to assist communal farmers to acquire commercial farm land. The scheme is a subsidized mortgage. The total subsidy over twenty or so years will amount to a large capital grant to the individual beneficiaries.
The community devised land-use plan to be prepared by the RCC for Damaraland will include land purchase. However, there are powerful reasons for community and government not to use the individual scheme, though this may be left open to private initiative. An effective community land use plan that incorporates settlement on new land requires a degree of certainty that the planned number of families, with given amounts of livestock, to move onto new land, will do so within a few years.

To bring any benefit to those families left behind, community, and government as the financial partner, needs to know that the intended grazing relief from land purchase has been realised and maintained. This problem is but an extension of the existing problem of migrant and urban wage earners investing in livestock, carried at only private, but not full, social cost (which includes land degradation). This requires that there be internal reform of the grazing management on the present farms so that carrying capacities can be fixed in socially acceptable ways and the full costs of grazing be apportioned.

In the official land purchase programme, community members, individually or collectively, realise the subsidies. There is no reason why community should sanction large capital grants to individuals. If the community includes land purchase within a land use plan and promotes the acquisition of new land, then the community should claim the subsidies inherent in government’s expected land purchase programme. Government, in turn, should favour work with communities. To do so, a Community Land Trust (CLT) for Damaraland will be established which will acquire purchased farms.

The additional land is then leased out, converting government’s subsidies from private capital gain to a land endowment to community which, through the lease of farms, creates an unencumbered income to community in perpetuity. Government could appoint one of the Trustees of the CLT, strengthening its ability to oversee the management of the land and the use of the income, without infringing community autonomy. In this case both community and government have to organize for partnership.

GRAZING MANAGEMENT

The King’s Council and the RCC have established that there is general interest in improved grazing management. The problem, as elsewhere with communal systems, has been how to set a carrying capacity each year and distribute that herd amongst community members. The RCC illustrated the dilemma with reference to a farm with five families who presently own different size herds. The total herd is in excess of the carrying capacity. The answer proposed is to divide the carrying capacity equally amongst the families. They would then have to sell to each other and release the surplus into the market. While egalitarian and magnanimous, it leaves unanswered the question, “For how long will the families remain with equal sized herds and how often can the redistribution exercise take place?”

The continued practice of semi-nomadic shifts by families, with large stock numbers creates pockets of pressure at localities possessing above average available water and grazing or browse. Continued settlement of western parts has reduced the viability of such land to a degree where alternative forms of land use such as tourism and game farming seem the only logical conclusions.
The attempt to solve the grazing problem by creating equal herds is common to similar exercises in neighbouring countries. It appears that culturally and for reasons of inexperience with other systems of ownership, communal farmers try first to manipulate the cattle and livestock. The land and water resource is not an object for management.

A national programme in Zimbabwe, that has arisen through community and District Council action, the Rural Structural Adjustment Programme, converts, by voluntary agreement, villages into Village Trust Companies (VTC). The VTC redefines village membership from a right of access to land to an equal share, for both men and women, in the assets of the village: from a right to exploit a free good, practised unequally, to an asset husbandry body of equal members.

Annual rights to different resources, like grazing, woodland, gardens and water, are issued equally to each member. The annual rights are then traded amongst members. This allows members to optimise their individual, family or group positions as against other members, within the limits of resource use set by the general body. Members have a common interest; the conservation and the development of the productive base. The exchange of rights gives rise to ruling prices and creates a financial and investment system. (See Appendix 1)

Damaraland has chosen to follow the VTC model. Each ward will become a ward Trust Company (WTC) and a member of the regional CLT. The CLT would then become the service body for its member WTCs. Government endowment through CLT land purchase and farm rents would provide the income, together with member contributions to pay the overhead and investment expenses of the CLT; that is training, business advice, audit and joint CLT/WTC investments. The CLT will run the proposed wildlife sanctuary and oversee tourism development.

The flexible, responsive land management system that arose would enable individual farmers and community to seek to optimise the use and rotation of water points for grazing and for wildlife management, since it would fit small and big land units into a whole. Donors will find the set of land use, land management, community economic system, equal women’s rights, wildlife and tourism, and land redistribution of great interest.

DROUGHT, FOOD AID, EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT

The concerned people of Damaraland, through the King’s Council, the Agricultural Union and the Rural Conservation Committee recommend that the drought situation be turned to community advantage.
At recent meetings with the RCC, the troubled farmers agreed to investigate a land use plan to alleviate the problem of having elephants living in communal farming areas in the Huab River Catchment. The possibility of identifying a place for the elephant and then building a barrier in the form of a loose stone wall, with intermittent electrified ditches at river crossings, has been proposed, discussed and agreed upon.

The building of the wall should be seen as a community project to be built by the members of the community.

The drought presents the opportunity for a high profile, redistributive use of funds generated by food-aid. Food relief and Food for Work schemes have, in the past, proved inefficient and financially wasteful and form a dependency pattern among communities on government, which is later resented. The community seeks formal agreement that a donor of food aid to Namibia be asked to:

a. agree that food be sold to the commercial grain industry for normal distribution; (communities in Damaraland purchase the major part of their provisions normally)

b. that the counterpart Rands generated from the sale of the food from food-aid agencies (which will bear a special stamp to encourage buyers to support the project) be placed in an Employment Guarantee Fund for this project and other areas which seek similar treatment;

c. that government assist the RCC and Farmers Unions to build the wall by offering employment to members of the community;

d. that work be laid out and paid by piece rates to groups that contract to build sections of the wall;

e. that normative work tables be used to arrive at a normative wage; that wage be set at a discount of 25% of normal casual work rates in that area, since this is additional, not full-time work and income or at R10 per day;

f. that the project provides simple campsites necessities near worksites, plus transport to and from their homes during rest periods; a minimum of eight day work periods should be requisite, to keep transport costs down;

g. that the project provides materials such as cement and funds tools which may be purchased with the wage payment of the scheme. Tools increase labour productivity and so should be self-financing. They could include donkey carts and donkeys for carrying provisions or stones etc.;

h. that government partner the community and Farmers Union in the management of the scheme. (It may be convenient to contract an engineer/company to manage the work for Government);

i. payment be made in stages, as determined by the parties, (possibly upon completion and certification of the foundation, an interim stage, and again upon the completion of the wall);

j. the people of Damaraland, in exchange for the right to work on public works, agree to buy food in the normal markets. Damaraland buys in food under normal conditions, hence food distribution systems through the business community are already in place.

k. as the wall may not be completed during the year 1992, the community asks that Government consider the merits of an Employment Guarantee Scheme and:

   runs the scheme for a second year on food aid
   accepts the principle that such a scheme is socially, financially and economically efficient.
PERIODIC MARKETS

Government is organised in ministerial hierarchies. This means that government departments tend to deliver services and convene meetings independently of each other. Each department operates in a spatial and temporal manner; i.e. periodic. If government disciplined itself, or, and more likely, if community did so, and delivered all its services to market sites on market days, it would create new opportunities for the working of efficiency of scale for both services and for traders. Already the pension payouts and the livestock auctions, which are monthly events, form embryo market days and can be built upon.

The Welwitschia Agricultural Union can spawn a Market Society (together with the CLT if in existence). The Society, working with the Regional Government, chooses market sites and sets a calendar of market days. Local market committees run the market site, charging the sellers of goods or services for entry.

The vast distances of Damaraland can be accommodated into a market plan. Markets operate in space (distance from each other), in time (periodicity which can vary between markets, usually fortnightly or monthly), in hierarchy (primary markets feed into larger secondary markets that follow a day or two later and which have present the bank and more specialized services), and by agricultural season (in periods of low income, markets can be less frequent or operate without higher order services).

Periodic markets cut the costs of exchange. In rural Zimbabwe, urban traders now compete with rural traders on market day off the back of trucks. The result has been a drop in the cost of merchandise to an average of 64% of previous prices in rural areas. This has raised real rural incomes appreciably and has strengthened the flow of cash in the countryside, making more viable the local production of food, goods and services for local sale. Rural traders could now specialise, following the "ring" of markets.

Markets are colourful events suited to tourism. As important, they improve the flow of information, provide a platform for public campaigns such as health, raise local revenues, and create a regional distribution system which can support live entertainment and film shows, reducing isolation and promoting local cultural expression.

NEXT STEPS

The King's Council and the RCC seek funding for professional inputs to complete the planning quickly. The drought and the possibility of building the elephant wall under an Employment Guarantee Scheme through food-aid finance presents a tight and crucial timetable.

A comprehensive plan outline with greater details on items to be implemented is needed that covers:

- Drought management;
- The ecological survey of the proposed game sanctuary;
- The building of the elephant wall in lieu of food relief;
- Land purchase, land-use and community, the Community Land Trust;
- Internal farm reform, the Village Trust Company;
- Periodic Markets;
- Wildlife, tourism, land use and resource management.
The wall is a symbol of community action. Donors and government should accept the financial package of piece rate activity on the wall and on stone collection for building, irrigated reed beds and other public works projects in lieu of food handouts as a step forward. The complimentary institutional, land use and wildlife conservation reforms proposed are the real prizes and make investment in the wall part of a larger management reform system.

The different parts, at least in principle, should proceed together even if implementation varies. This means that the planning phase must be completed during June/July. The months of May and June will be vital for action during the rest of the year when the drought will bite. The King’s Council, the RCC and the consultants will have to work intimately, including at the discussions/meetings with community if the whole plan preparation cum community exploration and commitment is to go ahead speedily.

**BUDGET FOR PLANNING EXERCISE**

A rough budget for the planning exercise, with professional inputs, is presented below.

**Damaraland Planning May to end July**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants:</th>
<th>man weeks</th>
<th>of which</th>
<th>in field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team leader/economist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional planner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>S.A.RANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCC, Kings’ Council, Welwitschia Agricultural Union: travel, meetings, publications</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation : Regional Workshop - Zimbabwe</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant travel and subsistence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 car weeks at R2.80/km and/or R298/day</td>
<td>approx. 25,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 weeks field subsistence at R700 pw</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks in Windhoek at R350/day</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Man weeks</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local office support (Save the Rhino Trust)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological survey: (Hydrology, Ground Water, River Flow, Grazing, Browse &amp; Physical Impact of Wall as Elephant Barrier)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL + 5% Contingency</strong></td>
<td>415,930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIAL BUDGET FOR DROUGHT PROGRAMME OF PUBLIC WORKS

Equivalent Food Relief Costs for Damaraland: R14.8 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Man Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% Wages 8.8 m.</td>
<td>880 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Overheads/materials transport</td>
<td>200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL R14.8m.</td>
<td>1 080 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional funds to sustain Economy during Drought until October 1992: R10 million.

In return for additional funding, 5% of grazing rights for three years placed with Trustee appointed by donor, sells annual rights to members, uses funds to maintain/develop assets as negotiated with the CLT.

A Trust Fund to match WTC income for investment for three years, after which the WTC accepts 20% local tax on disbursed income to members (dividend).

Initial estimate R12 000 X 12 Wards X 3 years = R432 000
APPENDIX 1

THE WARD TRUST COMPANY

Brief Description and Rules

All adults, men and women, are owner/members.
All common assets are vested in the WTC. (Land, water, woodland, fencing, roads, pipes etc.)
Three to five Trustees are appointed to supervise the democratic functioning of the WTC. The senior local member of the King’s Council is Chairman. Half the other Trustees are appointed by the CLT and half elected by the members of the WTC.
Various management committees are elected by the members: e.g. for grazing management, water, electricity and other infrastructure, building construction and maintenance etc.

At the A.G.M.: the register of members is verified;
the carrying capacity of the land for the next year is set;
anual grazing rights are issued equally to each member;
members buy and sell grazing rights, optimising their grazing interest as against other members at the ruling price;
members agree to the proportion of the (now known) value of the grazing to be retained for investment and maintenance;
members pay in the proportion set in Rands, perhaps raising the amount by selling grazing rights and/or livestock or contributing labour to the community;
in addition to the monies retained for investment, members set the labour contribution of each member as X number of days per year;
an investment/maintenance plan and budget is approved;

Members are equal in the vote, in ownership, grazing rights and investment.

Grazing Illustration

A WTC with 100 members has a carrying capacity of 1000 livestock units.
Each member receives grazing rights for 10 livestock units.
Members buy and sell their grazing rights.
A price per grazing right arises of R10.
The value of the WTC grazing is 1000 X R10 = R10 000.
Each member’s share of 10 grazing rights is worth R100.
The members decide to invest half the value of the grazing i.e. R5 000 plus 20 man days per member i.e. 2 000 man days at R10/day = R20 000; a total investment of R25 000.
Each member contributes R50 from the R100 worth of grazing rights received.
The WTC management can now approach a bank for a loan, as there is a cash flow for repayment purposes.
The Trustees, not wanting to allow the mortgaging of the future, will
limit committed repayments to no more than 30% of expected retained income. Over a seven year loan this would be R5 000 × 7 × 30 = R10 500. 

Hence the investment capacity of the WTC with R10 000 grazing is very high:

R5 000 + R20 000 + R10 500

or

R35 500 which is 350% of current income.

The intention is to seek a donor who will create a Trust Fund from which to match the retained income for investment for three years R1:R1. In return, WTCs agree that, after three years, a local government tax to fund roads and other regional infrastructure may be levied on the disbursed income (here R50 per member) at the rate of 20% or R10. This tax will act as an incentive to communities to retain a high proportion of income for investment, strengthening future WTC incomes and hence building up to the agricultural tax base.

Adjustment to Drought

The A.G.M. takes place before the rains and the new season, probably in December. If by quarter year, March end, it is clear that there is a drought in any WTC area, an emergency General Meeting can be called. This meeting would:-

cancel existing holdings of grazing rights; this means that those who sold grazing rights for the year must compensate the buyers for three quarters of the payments made, R7.50 per grazing right;

decide a new carrying capacity for the next nine to twelve months when the veld and water supplies may have improved and stabilised;

issue new equal grazing rights to members (perhaps only 500) which they then buy and sell as before, establishing a new price for grazing, which should be higher, reflecting the scarcity, perhaps R16 each;

mount an internal investment programme to pay wages for member labour inputs based on piece rates, from a Reserve Fund established at the formation of the WTC, which should receive 10% of the annual retained income, plus, if any, government and donor finances for public works.
COMMUNITY LAND TRUST (CLT)

Land-use planning, training, advice, management supervision, auditing, land purchase, game sanctuary, tourism. Membership: All adults as equal owners.

12 WARD TRUST COMPANIES
Equal adult ownership
Annual exchangeable grazing rights
Retained profit and labour investment

WILDLIFE SANCTUARY
CLT MANAGED

FIGURE 1. The relationships between and functions of the Community Land Trust, the 12 Ward Trust Companies and the Wildlife Sanctuary and local tourist industry.
APPENDIX TWO

CONSERVÂNCIES

The initiation of conservancies forms an important part of the Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism's new policy in Namibia. Obviously the ownership of wildlife is the crux to promoting the conservancy concept amongst farming communities.

With ownership a probability through the application of the Zimbabwe model (Rural Structural Adjustment Programme) and via the definition of "appropriate authority" down to district council or community level, it seems possible to consider the advent of conservancies, should rural farmers wish to control, protect and utilise wildlife collectively on state land, or, as above, but with adjoining commercial farmers on private land (joint-venture concept).

This combined approach would greatly facilitate the concept of catchments becoming units of planning in an overall land-use programme.
APPENDIX 3
OSTRICH FARMING AS AN OPTION

The recent interest in ostrich farming has spread to Damaraland with requests from groups of farmers and individuals alike (a block of farms north of the Ugab river from Sorris Sorris/Anixab to Vegloop).

Further interest has been shown by the community of Uis to possibly become involved in the rearing of chicks and the incubation of eggs. This could also be a possibility at Nai-nais which has plots of arable land for fodder and power and water utilities which are a legacy from the Uis mining days.

Provisionally, ownership of ostriches would have to be decided (wild or domestic, state owned or privately owned) and possibilities exist for stocking areas from wild populations or collecting eggs under license.

Birds could be farmed for skins, meat, feathers, bonemeal, the sale of live adult and young birds, incubation of eggs and sale of eggs. These options could be practised alongside domestic stock farming.

Such a scheme could possibly involve groups of farmers in the form of a co-operative, such as proposed by the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation in Bushmanland, or through Community and District Council Action through the Namibian Agricultural Union, if the birds were domesticated. In the latter case, this form of farming would fall under the Ministry of Agriculture and not Wildlife Conservation.

Sufficient water exists in the Ugab River to sustain the growth of fodder crops such as lucerne and barley to supplement the food for domestic stock and ostriches.
APPENDIX 4

DISCUSSION OF ECOLOGICAL SURVEY

Most of the questions to be investigated by experts of various disciplines such as botany, ethno-botany, ethology, ecology and geology are self-explanatory. However, some questions need to be highlighted.

The most important aspects to be investigated by the survey are:

i. Whether the western-most farms could be released (re-allocated) to create wildlife space; this would in particular affect the farms currently being used by the Riemvasmakers.

ii. Where the final proposed stone barrier should be erected and what route it should ideally follow;

iii. Taking ii) above into consideration, how many road and river crossings would be required to be constructed.

It is proposed that the target dates for the Ecological survey be June, July, August and September 1992 as in the winter months it would be more feasible to determine the following points:

a. How ground water holds out at specific pumping rates

b. How long wetlands last and the changes in the quality of the water in the wetlands.

c. The grazing and browse pressures, especially taking into account the present situation of drought.

d. The hydrology and drainage patterns within and outside the proposed wall/barrier. *

*It is proposed that this section of the survey be conducted by the Ministry of Water Affairs. Funding would have to be sought on a budgetary assistance level, as the survey would not have been included in the budget of the Ministry. Historical records would be required that would only be available to this Ministry such as:

A review of all existing boreholes;
Number of boreholes defunct and when they became defunct
How many boreholes have been cleaned and deepened
What the shortfall is at present
How many farm dams are in existance within and without the proposed wall area and in commercial farming areas
What the success rate of water installations in the area has been and whether there is an indication of mining rather than sustainable utilisation of water resources.
Investigation of the alarming failure of several permanent water points on commercial farms, bordering Damaraland in the Huab area.
Identification of potential sites within the area to provide either ground dams or weirs/ walled dams and better water points.
An assessment would have to be made of the stock unit grazing capacity both inside and out of the area to be walled to determine the limits to domestic stock and wildlife species specifically.

Research into economic shares for the community within the potential walled area from the hunting of elephant as trophy animals, which presently fetch R15 000 per animal. Investigation of government policy, legal status and possible donation of certain animals to the community for sale to trophy hunters would have to be investigated.

A point that would be valuable to take into consideration in this survey would be that by building the stone barrier to the west of the Veterinary Cordon Fence from Werda to Grootberg (Farms Makalani and Humor) the Veterinary Cordon Fence would finally provide a secure, permanent barrier to stock and wildlife.

It would then be possible for Hobatere (The Five Farms) to become a closed managed unit and act as a satellite of the Etosha National Park. This improved status would allow for the creation of a Rhino Sanctuary in this area with additional spin-offs for education of local tour guides, rangers and as a potential protein producer based on excess game numbers.
1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that the presence of elephants on the commercial farms in the eastern area of the Huab river catchment, are causing problems for commercial cattle farmers. There have been suggestions that elephants should be shot in an effort to lessen the problem. However, those who have worked in this area for many years, maintain that the shooting of some elephants will not result in a permanent solution and that within a short time, the problems will recur. Some of the commercial farmers have indicated that they are willing to sell their farms. Others have indicated that they are willing to remain farming with the elephants present.

2. Investment in elephants for tourism

A group of people willing to purchase the farms which elephants frequent in this area have requested that a meeting be called at a local level to discuss the potential economic value of investing in these farms. The group of potential investors wishes to discuss the possibility of forming a Conservancy among all landowners in the immediate area who are willing to participate. The conditions leading to the formation of a Conservancy will also be discussed with the Rural Conservation Committee with the purpose of integrating the aims of the Conservancy with the aims of the communal farmers who are trying to find a solution to the elephant problem in the western areas of the Huab river catchment.*

3. Tourist camp and accommodation at the farm Monte Carlo

The potential investors consist of people well qualified and experienced in conservation, tourism and craft making. All of the investors have indicated their wish to participate in training programmes. Local people with knowledge of bush-lore could also become involved in the running of instruction courses.

4. Benefits to the community in the west

The safety and protection of the wildlife in the proposed conservancy would depend upon the successful protection of wildlife, especially the elephant, in the communal areas to the west. It is therefore suggested that a revolving fund be established by the conservancy holders to contribute to the management and maintenance of the Sanctuary or Multi-use Management area it is proposed to establish west of the commercial farms.

Note:

A group of safari operators has recently purchased farms on the eastern boundary of the communal farming area which is utilised by the elephants. These investors are planning to form a conservancy for the elephants and wish to cooperate with the plans for conservation on the communal lands to the west. There have also been discussions on forming a training centre for tourist guides and the making of handicrafts for the community.
EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

PUBLIC AWARENESS

PAGES

1. List of schools visited during extension work.
2. Children's story on general environment.
3. Framework for talks on rhino at Damara schools.
5. Article on "desert" elephants. BD Loutit, M. Lindeque. Quagga.
8. Information leaflet for visitors to the Hoanib river.
11. Extracts from newsletter "Run Rhino Run".
### Schools Visited During the Course of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Town/Village</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Gariseb</td>
<td>Sorris-Sorris</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandberg Primary</td>
<td>Uis</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunjels Agricultural School</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Goroseb High School</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibassen Junior Secondary</td>
<td>Okombahe</td>
<td>7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Bowe Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Garo.b Primary</td>
<td>Anker</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Axmab Primary</td>
<td>Sesfontein</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans Frederick Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groothberg Primary</td>
<td>Erwee</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Training Centre</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob Basson Primary</td>
<td>Bergsig</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!De /Gab Primary</td>
<td>Tubusis</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus Ganeb High School</td>
<td>Uis</td>
<td>8 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th. F. Gaeb Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrified Forest Primary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwitschia Junior Secondary</td>
<td>Khorixas</td>
<td>7 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Gams Junior School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Ho.re Privaatschule</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s Diocesan School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia High School</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>7 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English School</td>
<td>Swakopmund</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German School</td>
<td>Swakopmund</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 27 schools and approximately 9500 pupils were lectured by both MWCT, WWF and SRT staff during the course of the project. General environmental awareness, lectures on specific species, talks on local and regional environmental problems such as overgrazing, elephant problems and poaching as well as video shows were presented.

All extension work at the schools was organised and planned by Nahor Howoseb, Chief Ranger of the MWCT in Khorixas. He has attended severe courses in environmental education including courses at Wêreldsend Environmental Education Centre.
CARLOS THE JACKAL

by Blythe Loutit
and Claudia Waskow

It was a misty morning on the Skeleton Coast. In the distance a group of people were standing with rods in their hands and lines in the water.

"What are they doing?" asked Brak, the jackal puppy.

"They are fishing," said Mother Jackal. "The nylon line has bait on it which hides a barbed hook. The line is thrown into the sea, the fish bites the bait and gets caught. Then the fisherman pulls in the line with a fish on it."


"Why is he shouting 'shoe' at us?" asked Carlos. "I left that shoe far away near the houses."

chance to take a fish which is lying about. Some humans are very careless. Perhaps we could get a nice meal."

Finally the fishermen left. The jackals immediately trotted over and began to clean up. There were two barbels and some pieces of bait. Each one managed to get something. But Carlos was still searching for more.

There were beer bottles, cool-drink cans and plastic wrappers. Carlos could smell the delicious smell of sardines on the plastic, so he lay down and began to chew.

"Stop, stop, Carlos! That will kill you if you eat it," shouted a crow from above him.

He floated down and landed next to Carlos. It was Peg-leg. He had lost a leg a little while ago when it got caught in a tangle of fishing line on the beach.

"Kraak, kraak," croaked Peg-leg. "The rubbish these humans leave behind will be the death of us. That plastic you're chewing will choke you if you swallow it, Carlos. And only yesterday I saw a little gerbil mouse who was stuck inside a dumpy beer bottle and couldn't get out."

"Thank you, Peg-leg," said Mother Jackal. "I never know what Carlos will be up to next. How will we ever be able to make the humans understand how dangerous all this is for us?"

"Hey! Why is everyone looking so glum down there?" called a kelp gull.

"Look at all this rubbish," shouted Carlos. "Wouldn't you be glum if you had to live on the ground among it?"

"but one day there won't BE a clean place to go to"

A stone landed near the jackal family and they moved off to a safe distance. They all lay down to watch the fishermen.

"We must watch carefully now," said Mother Jackal. "We may get a

The gull drifted off. "I just fly away to a clean place and look for mussels to eat."

"The kelp gull doesn't care today," said Peg-leg. "But one day there won't BE a clean place to go to."

Why is there all this effort to protect the rhino?

Because we want to protect your future by protecting Namibia's most valuable wild animal. By protecting the rhino we automatically protect your environment too. That includes everything, from the grass, the trees, the birds and all other wild animals, because we patrol intensively to make sure that no one comes to shoot the rhino, during the patrols all problems are recorded.

A rhino must have a good environment to live in, this means that:

1. water must be available
2. grass and trees and shrubs must be available for rhinos to feed on
3. soil erosion must be checked
4. dams must not be built in the wrong place as this may cause water to stop flowing into the western, drier areas where other animals need the water
5. visits by strange people are recorded and checked
6. the area must be clean and free of litter and pollution because tourists spend a lot of money to travel and see the rhino and they do not want to visit dirty places which are full of litter
7. all the wild animals and increase in numbers are recorded
8. traps and snares to catch or kill animals are collected

What means do we use to protect the rhino?

1. we monitor and count the rhino
2. we photograph each one and give it a name to recognise it
3. we record where it is seen
4. we record every new calf that is born
5. we know how many cows and how many bulls there are in each area
6. we know when any one rhino is missing
7. when we think an area is unsafe because of poachers or because some rhinos are missing, we cut off the horns of those rhinos which remain in that area (because the poachers kill the rhino only for their horns which is sold to people in the East who think it will cure headaches and stomach troubles, or it is sold to rich people in the East for making dagger handles)
8. We offer a big reward to anyone who will give us information about those people who deal in rhino horn or have shot a rhino.

9. There are heavy fines, anyone who shoots a rhino or deals in rhino horn faces a charge of R200,000 or 20 years in jail.

10. We try to educate the people through visiting schools and farms to tell them how important it is to protect the rhino.

The value of a rhino to the community and your future:

1. Soon the first Damaraland rhinos will be sold for R1 million for a pair (1 cow & 1 bull).

2. We are presently trying to ensure that some of that money will come back to the community and school requirements so that everyone will want to help protect the rhino and will benefit from the value of the rhino which they have protected.

3. But, the most important reason for protecting the rhino is to be able to go to the wild places where the rhino is and to see the beauty of Africa and the wild animals of Africa living free in a beautiful land which has not been spoilt by killing and destruction. The community will then be proud of themselves for the part they took in keeping it that way.

How are we sure that by dehorning the rhino we will not endanger their lives as wild animals?

1. We have done intensive studies of the behaviour of these rhino in the wild.

2. There are very few or no lions in the areas where the rhino have been dehorned, so they do not have to use their horns to fight off lions.

3. The food which they eat is mostly available to the rhino without having to break branches with their horns.

4. The rhino in Damaraland do not have to fight each other for space as there are few in a large area.

5. The size and fierceness of a rhino is enough to frighten away any other animal which may threaten them or their calf.

6. Because we have studied the rhino population and their movements we dehorn rhino which do not mix with other rhino.

How do we know that we can take rhino away and sell rhino without harming the small population that we have?

1. Because our studies and collection of records over the past 10 years show that some of the young rhino are going into areas where there are people living and rhino and people are not able to live together as they are a danger to each other. So we have to take some young rhino away every year.
A great step for the desert giants

The drugged cow lags behind the herd as the helicopter guides her to a safe position.

Those 'desert' elephants! For more than a decade the controversy over a population of elephants living in the very arid habitat of the Northern Namib (Pro-Namib known as the Kaokoveld or collective botanical name for Kaokoland and Damaraland), has raged on. Some people felt that elephants in a desert had to be suffering, that they had been forced there by circumstance; others felt that they could be a new race of elephant; some even thought they should be saved by translocating them to a bushveld habitat where they wouldn't have to 'struggle' to survive.

Then there were those who felt that they should be shot — for fun, for illegal ivory trading or for hunting trophies. There has been much speculation over their differences: are they taller? Do they have bigger feet? Is their ivory heavier? Do they slide down the dunes? Do they visit the Atlantic for a quick dip? Do they survive for a week without water? Do they travel more than 70 kilometres in a night?

These questions and beliefs are often the central point of discussion around the glowing campfires of tourists, who are now privileged to visit and see the giants in their arid habitat. Photographic safari groups have today taken the place of the poacher of the past, and the sceptics have to admit that the 'desert' elephants shall remain, and are becoming a money spinner as a tourist attraction.

Blythe Loulit and Malan Lindeque

Poachers and glory seekers had reduced the elephant population from an estimated 1000 or more in Damaraland and Kaokoland in 1960 (Pienaar 1967) to about 70 in the western areas and about 230 in the central and eastern region of Kaokoveld in the early 1980's.

This indiscriminate killing, which became a virtual slaughter in the early 1980's, was curtailed by the eleventh hour interference of concerned conservationists who combined forces from the private sector, locally, and internationally, with Government personnel, Council Representatives from Damaraland and Headmen in Kaokoland. The tidal wave of slaughter was slowly stilled by strict law enforcement measures, conservation extension work amongst the local human inhabitants and monitoring of the elephant population by ground patrols.

Today the elephants which survived to live and breed in this unusual habitat are thriving. Since 1985 the population has shown a marked increase in recruitment rate and new calves are now commonly seen with the small herds. However, they are still subjected to certain limiting pressures from man. This usually comes from the agricultural sector. Because the climate and terrain does not lend itself to conventional forms of agriculture, the presence of stock or crop farms are restricted in the Kaokoveld. Nonetheless, stock such as goats and cattle are slowly encroaching into areas which could be more sustainably utilised by the indigenous people for their own benefit.
Elephants can and do co-exist surprisingly well with the subsistence farmers who inhabit the edge of the arid zone. There are however problems which crop up from time to time. When a herd insists on returning to drink water at a Damaraland homestead, they occasionally play havoc with the donkeys, hens, chickens and goats, plus upsetting the entire family. This is when the Directorate of Nature Conservation is called upon to chase them off, an unpleasant business. Getting rid of a herd of stubborn, wily and sometimes playful elephants is often a time-consuming task. A group of game rangers has to sit and wait through the night for their stealthy approach. Then, suddenly the still of the night is rent with a barrage of booms, bangs and flashing lights. This undignified fireworks display ensures that the elephants do not return to that homestead and will probably keep to the wider, uninhabited areas in future.

The Directorate of Veterinary Services is subjected to another form of irritation from the elephants. In the mid-1970's an enormous double fence was erected across Damaraland from east to west, stretching well into the very arid desert area. The fence was erected to comply with European Economic Community requirements for the export of beef from SWA/Namibia. Naturally the elephants had age-old routes which they followed to water, or followed in their local migration patterns. So the fence is broken repeatedly. A fence is no obstacle to an elephant, and it is unlikely that they will change their ways and stop breaking the fence, which the Veterinary Department feels would be too costly to electrify.

Human oriented problems and scientifically based questions regarding these world renowned 'desert' elephants, are presently being investigated. The Directorate of Nature Conservation has recently launched a combined project on the status of large mammals in the Kaokoveld, which consists of investigations into various aspects of wildlife. Each aspect is supervised by a researcher specialising in that section.

Elephants, Black Rhinos, Lions, Giraffe and Black-faced Impalas are the main concerns for study, against a background of human land use of the area, condition of the vegetation and climate. This project might be a first for Namibia, as all Nature Conservation staff members operating in Damaraland and Kaokoland, and several private individuals cooperate in collecting information. Each theme of the study is coordinated by a researcher specialising in that section. Regular liaison with the Damaraland Representative Council has been established, and recently the Administration for Kaokoland has joined the planning discussions.

It was plainly obvious that more information had to be collected on the movements of elephant herds. In October 1987, six elephant cows from widely separated herds were immobilized by the Game Capture Unit of the Directorate of Nature Conservation, and fitted with special radio collars. These collars have very powerful radio transmitters and their signals are received by satellite, rather than the usual ground or aircraft method of radiotracking. Information relayed from the satellite is received in Okaukuejo, in Etosha National Park, where a computer calculates the locality of each elephant. This elaborate, and very expensive system of radiotracking was necessary to cover the very rugged and vast area of the Kaokoveld, which is otherwise largely inaccessible to researchers.

The capture and collaring operation proceeded smoothly, and each elephant was back on its feet within 12-15 minutes. Cows rejoined their herds very quickly, as disturbance was minimal and the rest of a herd never moved very far away from the immobilized animal. All the while the helicopter sat idling nearby to make sure the protective herd did not return too close. The agility of these elephants in such rocky terrain was ably demonstrated.
by one old cow which made a very swift charge before the drug took effect. The capture team ran as if there were no rocks at all.

Within the first two weeks after being fitted with the satellite collars, all three herds which were marked west of the veterinary fence had moved east across it into the farming area of Damaraland. Local rainfall seems to have been the cue for movements, and it is clearly advisable for elephants to follow the sparse and isolated green patches in response to rain.

Now that the poaching tide has been turned and the Kaokoveld has received good rainfall in the past few years, it is especially important to monitor the population and to ensure its recovery. A long-term plan for the Kaokoveld elephants is necessary, as their ultimate survival in an area that cannot be set aside for wildlife only, but must be regarded as a multi-use conservation area, depends on the benefits received by the local inhabitants for having elephants there at all. Movement patterns to and from the farming area can now be monitored by the satellite system. This information, in addition to regular counts and assessments of herd structure, will aid greatly in the management of the population, to the benefit of the local people.

The historical records indicate that the 'desert' elephants have lived in this arid habitat for hundreds if not thousands of years. It is not a different race or species, but those inhabiting the more arid and extremely arid areas to the west survive where other elephants probably would not.

To they take a dip in the ocean? Do they slide down the dunes? Yes they do, as elephants anywhere would take advantage of their environment. Artist Koos von Ellinckhuizen has seen them on the beaches of the Skeleton Coast Park. Photographers Des and Jen Bartlett have seen them 'sliding' down the dunes. Elephants in a desert habitat will, in many respects, remain a mystery to the human race, and many of their secrets may never be discovered. However, with today's science and technology, most important facts on their movements and range are being revealed, and this will ensure that proper conservation measures are taken and that Loxodonta africana will have a secure future in its arid habitat.
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Dear Traveller

During your travels in the Hoanib river area you are bound to see some of the unique desert dwelling elephants that have made their homes here.

These animals are part of a remaining population that was almost wiped out by poachers in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. No calves survived for 7 years due to constant persecution.

This population has been designated as high priority for conservation by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

These elephant, which are uniquely adapted to the harsh and arid environment you see around you, spend their entire lives in this region which receives less than 150mm of rain annually. Their home range, now under study, appears to be limited to the area between the Huab and Hoanib river catchments.

Their recent history of perpetual disturbance and harassment has made these elephant apprehensive of humans. As soon as they hear your vehicle approach, they will move away. If you want to see them clearly, it is necessary to travel slowly; stop and wait patiently and before long they will resume their normal activities.

Your best photographs will be taken when the elephants are relaxed and feel unthreatened. Only then will you see them to your advantage.

Should the elephants move into dense bush, it would be best to carefully climb to a high vantage point to view and photograph them rather than follow them on foot or by vehicle.

Remember, these animals are potentially dangerous, particularly when it seems to them that they or their young are being threatened.

Please avoid camping within 4 km of any open water or drinking holes. If you do so you will keep the elephants away. As they may not have drunk for three days, this will cause them major stress, particularly the calves and cows with young.

We shall be grateful for any observations of behaviour and copies of photographs you may be able to share with us. Please make sure you note the time, date and place of such remarks and photos. We need all the information you may be able to collect but please ensure the elephants are not disturbed or harassed by such efforts.

If you are unable to complete the form, we shall still appreciate its return with any comments to SRTF, P.O. Box 83, Khomas 9000, Namibia.

Thank you for your cooperation and whatever you may be able to contribute to our records.

Take only photographs
Leave nothing but your footprints
Exhilarated by the proximity of water, a pair of elephants charge down a dune. With hind legs bent and forelegs straight, the bulls raced to the bottom and plunged into a nearby water hole, called Auset, for a boisterous splash. These desert-adapted elephants travel as far as 63 miles a day and can go without water for three or four days. Their knowledge of the land has accumulated over many generations, as echoed by an elephant inclusion in a rock engraving carved perhaps thousands of years ago.

Africa's Skeleton Coast
WWF Elephant and Community Project Report Back

This project, supported by the EC through WWF International, seeks to find a solution to the confrontation between elephant and man through direct returns from tourism to the community, as well as protecting installations and constructions from elephant damage. It has been on the go now for nearly two years.

Recently we received the news that WWF International will continue partial sponsorship of the project by contributing SFR 100 000 towards it for the next year.

Milestones to date are the successful construction by WWF, SRT & Elias Ngobha tourist camp and guide facilities at Twyelfontein. This has led to other communities wanting to create more formal arrangements at areas of tourist interest, both to protect the sites, as well as to bring returns from the ever increasing influx of tourists to the communities who live with the elephants on their doorsteps.

Handcraft shops have been created at Twyelfontein, Khwano and Onganga as well as in Khorixas. There have provided much needed outlets for crafts made by the people in DamaraLand.

Several secondary water-holes have been constructed on farms to attract elephants away from reservoirs and other installations that they may damage. These water-holes are specially designed to provide the easiest access for elephants of all sizes.

Installations and vegetable gardens have been protected by building stone walls around them to keep the elephants out. It is amazing how much damage only 200 elephants can do in such a small area.

Obviously this is an ongoing project which, if it is estimated, will need our support for several years before the community is able to take it over. The most rewarding aspect, however, has been the fact that in a recent survey, 90% of the farmers questioned did not want the elephants destroyed, despite the damage they do.

The survey, conducted jointly by the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism staff and the Save the Rhinos Trust, involved 220 farmers. They were asked for their opinions on the elephants, the damage they cause and for possible solutions. The data from the survey has been compiled in a report which is going to both the community and the Ministry for comment.

Unresolved problem: ElephantHESTION

Voice from the Bush

Unresolved problem: Elephantuestion

Allow me to have a quick word with you in Afrikaans (letter translated - Efi):

Dear Mowellers, here I am caught tight in a corner with my dear dumb friends who face threats every day and don’t even know where to give their children water or food. The men in green overalls and the people in the Land Rover with a rhino painted on the side are at their wits end. Until now they have built drinking holes, bought diesel, built stone walls around water installations and WWF has even bought a pump to help, but no-one seems to be able to see this. Everyone just moans and moans.

I have come up with a thought or a plan if we want to help these elephants survive. These elephants are very fond of Kip River. If there is a lot of water, let’s build a big ground dam to catch the Kip River water so that the conservators can chase the animals there and let them out of sight. Then our problems will be solved.

Truly, just ask Uncle Rudi (Luita) or Cousin Tommy (Hallie) any of the other conservators there and all of us will ask: “When can we begin?” We could probably get some help from Agriculture to build a big dam with their ground moving machines. After all, it’s everyone’s problem and in this case we can help one another.

I forgot. Unfortunately we have no money and someone will probably have to help us, and you, dear reader, are my only hope. I know you are far away, but I trust that you will answer me and then I’ll come out of my little corner in the bush and we can talk further.

Next time I write, I’ll send photos of possible sites which I have in mind. Stay well, everybody.

Voice from the Bush

DamaraLand

David Shepherd Helps Desert Elephants

The David Shepherd Foundation has long been of great assistance to the Trust in its work with the elephants and the community. Last year the sum of 30 000 Zloty Sterling was donated to the Trust for use in this project. This funding directly supported actions which led to the election and formation of the Rural Conservation Committee by the Hub farming community.

Recently the Trust received 250 prints of David Shepherd’s beautiful painting of a herd of elephants entitled “The Ivory is Theirs”. We plan to release the sale of the paintings at a function soon and hope to encourage large corporations to consider them an ideal corporate gift, combining not only a beautiful painting, but also the knowledge that all the proceeds will go towards supporting the activities of the RCC, the SRT and the community in finding a solution to the elephant/man problems experienced in DamaraLand.

It has been recommended that the prints sell at R 145 each and should you like to place an order now, you are most welcome to do so. We would like to express our most sincere thanks to David Shepherd and his Foundation for their ongoing support and friendship and their dedication to elephant conservation throughout the world.
TOTAL'S R 12 000

Total Namibia last year launched a Save the Rhino Knife campaign, during which Total pledged R 10 towards the Save the Rhino Trust for every beautiful hand-made knife sold. All 1 200 knives have been sold and the vast sum of R 12 000 has been realised. This donation has proved invaluable for the purchase of a vehicle for the Trust for use in the field and in the community/elephant project. Our sincere thanks to Total Namibia.

Each knife was numbered and the draw for the lucky number, the owner of which will win a painting by Blythe Loutit, was made on 20th March 1992. To avoid a no-claim, five numbers were drawn, the first of which will win the painting if it is claimed within three weeks calculated from March 20. If the painting is not claimed the following lucky number will win it, also with a period of grace of three weeks. Should none of the lucky numbers drawn claim the painting within their periods of grace, it will be sold by closed tender and the proceeds will be donated to the Trust.

Proof of ownership must be provided to Total in Windhoek or any of the Total Service Stations in Namibia or South Africa. The painting may be collected at Total Namibia, Kenya House, Windhoek, Tel: 061 - 37650.

The winning numbers are as follows:

1. 236 to be collected before 10th April 1992
2. 1198 to be collected before 30th April 1992
3. 558 to be collected before 22nd May 1992
4. 1020 to be collected before 12th June 1992
5. 746 to be collected before 3rd July 1992

V.I.P. Visits to Damaraland

The Rural Conservation Committee (RCC) and the SRT were honoured to have been able to meet the Prime Minister of Namibia, Mr Hage Geingob, during a recent visit to our area. The meeting was arranged by the Regional Commissioner of the Kunene Province, Mr Hans Boois and gave the RCC and the Trust an opportunity of presenting to him the particular problems facing both the community and the elephants in the area.

The Prime Minister reacted sympathetically at meetings with the community and the Dama Chiefs' Council and was presented with a joint report from the RCC and SRT outlining the recommendations of the RCC based on their investigation into solutions of the elephant/farmer problems and their discussions with the individuals involved.

The RCC was elected by the community at an Elephant Day meeting held in November 1991, to find long-term solutions to the elephant problems experienced by the farmers in the Huab River Catchment area.

Another important visit to the area was that of the Deputy Minister of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism, Mr Ben Ulenga. Once again the RCC were given an opportunity to discuss progress in their difficult task and to foster understanding of the problems on a very high level.

The area was also recently visited by the Directors and senior officials from the Directorate of Nature Conservation and Research who expressed their support of the election and formation of the Rural Conservation Committee.

The SRT is grateful for the understanding and sympathy expressed towards conservation matters by Government and local readers, which give all those working towards a viable and mutually acceptable solution hope for the future of both farmers and game in the region.
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1. JUSTIFICATION

The Huab Catchment Project began in April 1989. The initial project proposal was submitted to the European Community by consultant L A Carter and Blythe Loulit of the Namibian NGO, Save the Rhino Trust.

Once accepted by the EC, the project was funded through WWF International who were responsible for managing it, while field implementation was carried out by Save the Rhino Trust (SRT) in close collaboration with local staff from Namibia's wildlife authorities.

When the proposal was drafted in late 1988, the elephant and rhino populations of the Huab catchment area were under increasing threat from poaching and early in 1989 several elephant were killed illegally in the Huab valley.

A major aim of the project was thus to find ways of sustaining the earlier recovery of the elephant and rhino populations in the region.

In the early 1980s IUCN had identified the elephants of north-western Namibia as a top priority for protection, partly because of their ability to survive in the semi-desert and desert habitats of the region.

NGOs working in the region had also noted the friction between rural livestock farmers and the elephants, due largely to elephant damage to water installations and fences, and to fear of these animals.

The need to conserve the elephants and black rhino, the need to deal with the problems elephants caused the rural community, the need to engage the support of the rural community for maintaining wildlife populations and the ecological value of river catchment protection, provided the rationale for developing the original project.

In September 1991 the project was extended for a further year and the terms of reference slightly altered.

In 1992 WWF carried out a review of its support to the activities of Save the Rhino Trust, and to the project in the Huab catchment area.

The objectives, activities and budget of the current project (Phase 2) were the result of the conclusions and recommendations of the final report to the EC on the first phase of the project, as well as the review carried out by Dr David Cumming of the WWF Multispecies Project in Zimbabwe.

The current project activities are viewed as a holding action until a) proper land use planning can take place in the Huab area, b) more information is acquired regarding elephant movements and population dynamics and c) the necessary policies and legislation are approved which will enable
local communities in Namibia to assume a greater responsibility for natural resource management (particularly wildlife) and to retain the revenue from sustainable use of these resources.

Point c) is particularly important as only if rural people have a real stake in conservation of large mammals such as elephant and rhino will these animals survive on communal land outside protected areas.
3. ACTIVITIES

3.1. The Huab Catchment Area

3.1.1. Definition of the Huab Catchment Area

The Huab Catchment comprises the Huab, Ehoeb, Kakatswa, Sout, Klip and Aba Huab rivers and for the purpose of the project extends west to the veterinary fence and north to the border with Hobatere. (Fig.2.)

3.1.2. Topography and Geology

An east-west transect of the area includes the relatively flat highland plains (elevation 1,000-1,200 m) which stretch from the old Damaraland border with the commercial farmland in the east, to the basalt ridges of the Grootberg in the west. The Grootberg, rising to 1,645 m forms the edge of the escarpment which drops to the plains of the pro-Namib at an elevation of about 500 m.

The Huab river has incised into the highland plains creating in places a fairly deep valley. The river is dry for most of the year, and when it does flow, rarely reaches the sea. Mini wetlands occur where water is forced to the surface and flows in stream form for short distances.

3.1.3. Climate

The Huab catchment receives summer rainfall (October to April). There is an east-west rainfall gradient from the commercial farms bordering the communal land (annual average 300 mm), westwards to the Grootberg Pass (annual average 240 mm) and the pro-Namib (130 mm a year).

Rainfall is highly variable and is often erratic both seasonally and spatially. An area with a long term mean of 240 mm has a high probability of receiving anything between 80 mm and 400 mm in a given season.

The evaporation rate is about 3 m a year, 11.5 times greater than the rainfall.

3.1.4. Vegetation

The eastern part of the catchment area falls within the transition of mopane scrub woodland to Karoo-Namib scrubland, while the western part of the region falls within the Bushy Karoo-Namib scrubland zone.

Mopane Colophospermum mopane and the ana tree Faidherbia albida along with the camelthorn Acacia erioloba and Acacia nebrownii are found along the dry water courses. The ana tree is
2. OBJECTIVES

The following are the project objectives:

a) To maintain the recovery of elephant and rhino populations in the Huab Catchment Area of central Kunene Region (formerly Damaraland).

b) To remove sources of conflict with, and bring benefits to, local Damara subsistence farmers.

c) To employ game scouts.

d) To carry out extension and education work among the farmers.
particularly important to wild animals and livestock for the shade it provides as well as the value of its pods as fodder.

3.1.5 Mammals

At least 82 species of mammal are known to occur in the Huab catchment and surrounding area. The six endemic species include the black mongoose and Hartmann's mountain zebra. The only endangered species is the black rhino, which occurs in low numbers on the western fringes of the catchment.

Ten species found in the region are classified vulnerable. They include the elephant, spotted and brown hyenas, lion, cheetah and pangolin. Lion are confined to the fringes of the region.

Table 1. gives minimum estimates of seven species of large game counted during an aerial census carried out during October 1992 by R Loutit and I Douglas-Hamilton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Springbok</th>
<th>Hartmann's mountain zebra</th>
<th>Oryx</th>
<th>Ostrich</th>
<th>Giraffe</th>
<th>Elephant</th>
<th>Kudu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.6 Human population

The human population of the Huab catchment area is estimated to be 4,000. There is a scattered settlement pattern with the majority of people living on farms in family groups with larger concentrations where there are schools, clinics or other government offices.

Many of the people in the area have been moved from elsewhere. Under the Odendaal Plan for carving up the then South West Africa into ethnic homelands, Damaraland was supposed to be the homeland for the Damara people. Some people defined by the government at the time as 'Damaras' were forcibly moved from within the country to Damaraland.

Others, known as the 'Riemvasons' suffered from one of the strange quirks of South Africa's former apartheid system. They were moved nearly 2,000 km from near Upington in South Africa because they were considered to be related to the 'Damaras'.

The Riemvasons in particular are still bitter about their forced removal to Damaraland, where they have to cope with harsh climatic conditions as well as wild animals such as elephants and
lions, which were outside their previous experience.

Although the Upington region of South Africa also experiences low rainfall and high temperatures, many of the Riemvasmakers lived close to the Orange River, which provided all their water needs, as well as irrigation water for growing vegetables. The provision of water is one of the main problems facing the people living in the Huab catchment, and a source of conflict with elephants.

An important feature of the settlement pattern in the region is that most families are living on surveyed farms formerly belonging to white farmers, and which were incorporated into Damaraland as part of the Odendaal Plan.

These farms are in an area which is only marginal for livestock farming, and many of the farms had been abandoned or used only for supplementary grazing by their former owners. Several family groups have now settled on each farm and overgrazing is apparent on most units. Most farms remain fenced and their boundaries are clearly defined.

This settlement pattern is different to most other communal areas in Namibia where land is unfenced and there are concentrations of people into villages and satellite settlements.

Most people live a subsistence existence, although there are a handful of fairly wealthy livestock owners who farm commercially. The main form of subsistence is livestock farming particularly with goats and sheep and to a lesser extent with cattle. Climatic factors make crop farming impossible, except on the smallest possible scale, and even livestock rearing is precarious.

There is little employment in the rural areas although each larger centre usually has a core of government employees such as teachers or health workers.

3.2. Project partners

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (formerly Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism) was the project executant.

Implementation was carried out largely by a Project Field Officer, Mr Dudu Mororua, who was hired privately by the project to carry out field activities. Mr Mororua was also field officer for the Save the Rhino Trust when it was implementing the project.

During this second phase of the project, Save the Rhino Trust has provided Mr Mororua with office, administrative and logistical support for which it received a monthly fee.

The project was managed by a Steering Committee consisting of Mr B Jones, Principal Planning Officer in the MET based in Windhoek, Mr R Loutit, Chief Conservation Officer for southern Kunene Region, based in Khorixas, and Mr Mororua, also based in Khorixas.

3.3. Project activities
3.3.1. Employment of local game scouts to provide information regarding game populations and suspected poaching activities.

Elephant and rhino poaching took place in the Huab valley early in 1989 and both species remain vulnerable to further poaching due to the remoteness and size of the area. The MET does not have sufficient staff or transport to monitor the whole area, and the project employs eleven game scouts to assist in monitoring the rhino and elephant populations as well as other wildlife.

The game scouts are not employed to catch or arrest poachers, but to provide information about suspicious activities, assist in monitoring wildlife, and provide a link between their communities and the MET. The game scouts also provide information about elephant movements and damage to water installations and property.

The game scouts have received monthly wages of NS300 and rations as their payment. They provide a monthly report to the project field officer who delivers their wages and rations at the end of each month.

They are located in key areas of the catchment which elephants are known to frequent fairly permanently or at least seasonally.

Apart from salaries and rations, the project provided the game scouts with field equipment for patrols.

Monthly reports were given to the Project Field Officer on a regular basis by the game scouts.

3.3.2. Protection of water installations, maintenance of protective features (e.g. stone walls) and the supply of diesel.

The conflict between elephants and local farmers remains a key issue in the Huab catchment. One of the main conflicts is over water. Elephants destroy water installations, rip up pipes and drink dry the water pumped for livestock. They also break fences, and there have been incidents of killing livestock. Over the project period since 1989, one person has been killed by elephants.

While most farmers have a certain degree of tolerance for elephants, they will lose this tolerance if elephant/human conflicts cannot be dealt with.

In an attempt to mitigate the problems caused by elephants the project has assisted farmers in building or maintaining stone walls around wind or diesel pumps.

It has provided diesel to farmers whose water pumped for livestock has been consumed by elephants.

The project has also built alternative water points for elephants in an attempt to draw them away from water points at settlements.
3.3.3. Employment of a Project Field Officer

The Project Field Officer was employed to carry out the following:

i) Liaise with the community, NGOs, the MET and other relevant government departments on all project activities where appropriate. In particular, the project field officer should keep all appropriate community leaders and organisations informed of project activities.

ii) Supervise the inspection of damage to water installations, the construction of protective measures and alternative water points for elephants, the transport of diesel to farmers and the reporting on work carried out, particularly its successes or problems encountered.

iii) Carry out extension and education work among the local community.

iv) Deliver monthly salaries and rations to game guards, receive their monthly report and assist in their supervision.

v) Submit a monthly report to the Chief Conservation Officer and other members of the project steering committee on activities for the month, success, problems, expenditure and all relevant information supplied by the game guards.

vi) Keep financial records of expenditure and keep a record of vehicle kms, services and petrol expenditure.

vii) Keep written records on project activities, success, problems encountered and other important information, in order to provide technical reports on project progress.

3.3.4. The payment of reward money to informers for information provided concerning poaching activities.

The payment of rewards for information concerning poaching activities is a recognised tool in protection measures for wildlife such as elephant and rhino.

This was included as a budget line to ensure that sufficient funds would be available if appropriate information was offered to the Ministry.

As it turned out, over the past year there was little need to draw upon the funds.

3.3.5. Support activities

These included administrative, logistical and office support from the Save the Rhino Trust and training for the Project Field Officer.
4. RESULTS

4.1. Recovery of elephant and rhino populations

No illegal killing of rhino took place in the Huab catchment or surrounding areas during the project period. One elephant was shot and killed, but the ivory was not removed.

Table 2. Results of aerial counts of elephants in the Huab catchment since May 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>May '90</th>
<th>Nov '90</th>
<th>Jan '91</th>
<th>May '91</th>
<th>April '92</th>
<th>Aug '92</th>
<th>Oct '92</th>
<th>Oct '93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are obviously seasonal and annual variations in elephant numbers and in the absence of large scale poaching, these can be attributed to movements in and out of the area.

The population appears to be stable and probably increasing.

Numbers of rhino are not published in accordance with MET policy. The population on the fringes of the Huab catchment appears to be stable.

Numbers of other species such as kudu, springbok, oryx and mountain zebra appear to be increasing according to ground observations and information from game guards.

Although it is difficult to quantify, it would appear that project activities have contributed to maintaining the wildlife population of the Huab Catchment. The lack of poaching or killing of elephants out of personal fear or revenge for causing damage indicates a generally positive attitude by local people, or at least an indication that frustrations with elephants have not yet reached a critical point. Through the project activities local farmers can see that conservation is not just animal oriented, but also takes into account the needs of people.

4.2. Removing sources of conflict with, and bringing benefits to, local Damara subsistence farmers.

4.2.1. Removing conflict

Elephants are the most important source of conflict between farmers and wildlife in the Huab catchment (see point 3.3.2. above).

The project has focused on trying to alleviate the plight of farmers who suffer damage from elephants and to prevent damage from occurring.

At the start of this phase of the project there were an estimated 220 water installations in the
Huab catchment and 50 of these were identified as needing protection from elephants. Fourteen had been protected by the building of stone walls during the first phase of the project.

Due to the seasonal variations in movement and watering patterns of elephants and livestock, attention has been given to the water points most frequently damaged by elephants.

During the second phase of the project, the following was carried out:

a) Repairs to stone walls damaged by elephants

b) Provision of diesel to farmers where elephants regularly consume water pumped for livestock

c) Cleaning and deepening of wells

d) Building of new reservoirs and troughs for elephants to drink from in order to draw them away from water installations near settlements. The alternative drinking places at Oortrek, Blauwpoort, Engelbrecht and Mooirivier appear to be working well and elephants are not going close to the settlements. Two other alternative drinking places have been provided at Palm and Palmpos, but the elephants have not moved to these locations yet.

e) Re-laying of pipes and repairs to reservoirs damaged by elephants.

f) The MET office in Khorixas has kept a record of all complaints regarding elephants and action taken. A total of 62 complaints related to damage by elephants to water installations and other damage were received from the Huab Catchment area. Elephants pushed over windmills at four settlements and damaged a brick building at another.

4.2.2. Bringing benefits to local farmers

The benefits provided to the project to local farmers have been as follows:

a) Protection of water installations and compensation through the provision of fuel (see 4.2.1. above).

b) During the winter of 1993, at the start of the project's second phase, the community in certain parts of the Huab catchment carried out its own game cropping operation for the first time. Previously this had been done for the community by the MET. The benefits included meat and revenue from the sale of hides. The Project Field Officer gave considerable assistance to this programme.

c) The local people have continued to benefit directly and indirectly from the tourism enterprise set up by a local Damara-speaking entrepreneur with assistance from SRT and WWF during the first phase of the project.

The Huab project will continue with WWF funding and further attention will be given to the possibility of developing new tourism enterprises in the future.
d) The wages to the game guards represent a significant cash income for 11 families in a poor region.

4.3. Employment of game scouts

Eleven game scouts have been employed at strategic points in the region. During the project period, three game scouts were added to the eight employed during the first phase of the project. The game scouts continue to live on their farms and tend their stock, but carry out regular patrols in their areas.

Over the project period, each game scout provided regular information on game observations, particularly elephants.

Information received by the MET from one game scout, led to the conviction of a local man for illegally hunting a kudu.

The game scouts would also appear to act as a deterrent to poaching due to their patrols of the back country.

4.4. Extension and education

This was an ongoing function of the project field officer and MET staff and was carried out through:

a) Attending Farmer's Union and Agricultural Union meetings to discuss elephant problems.

b) Visiting farms and villages to discuss elephant and other conservation-related problems.

c) Providing suggestions to farmers about how to minimise elephant problems.

d) Meetings with Agricultural unions and members of the Traditional Council to discuss new MET policy on wildlife utilisation on communal lands and plans to change legislation.

Game scouts also played an important role in the dissemination of information and creating awareness of their work in the community.
5. ANALYSIS

5.1. Recovery of elephant and rhino populations

Project personnel have had neither the means nor the opportunity to carry out the variety of surveys necessary to determine cause and effect with relation to the continued recovery of the elephant and rhino populations.

There could be a variety of contributing factors, including improved rainfall, in-migration of animals, etc.

However, project personnel and other MET staff believe there is sufficient evidence to link the continued recovery of all game species in the Huab, at least partly to project activities.

Assistant Director, and Head of Resource Management for the MET's northwestern region, Mr Chris Grobler, believes the lack of poaching in the area can be ascribed to several factors:

a) the general co-operation and positive attitude of the local population as a result of extension work carried out by MET staff and the Project Field Officer.

b) the assistance given by MET staff and the Project Field Officer to farmers for the protection of water installations, the provision of diesel, and building of alternative elephant drinking places.

c) the good relations developed between local people and the MET's local Wildlife Protection Service (anti-poaching) unit.

The overall low level of poaching in the region, either commercial (elephant and rhino) or subsistence, reflects the success of the game scout system as well as of the MET's own anti-poaching activities.

The fact that there were so few poaching cases over the past year indicate that the combined game scout and MET activities are acting as a deterrent to poaching.

It is clear, however, that fear of being caught is not the only factor which is keeping poaching at low levels.

The extension work, compensation through provision of diesel, protection of water points and building of alternative drinking points for elephants have helped to maintain good relations between the people and the MET and to enable farmers to 'afford' the presence of elephants.

5.2. Removing sources of conflict with, and bringing benefits to, local Damara subsistence farmers.

Practical problems encountered in meeting this objective have been that transport has not always
been available for the carrying of materials to locations where construction or repairs of installations is required. The MET truck is often being used for other activities and runs on a limited budget.

The Department of Water Supply does not allow others to work on windmills and boreholes and this restricts the ability of the project to deal with instances of elephant damage to this type of installation.

Although the assistance to farmers and benefits have helped to maintain a level of tolerance for elephants, there are some key issues which the project needs to address in future.

Several local farmers have said that fear of elephants was a major motivation for them not wanting elephants near their settlements. In some cases in the past, the provision of alternative drinking places for elephants did not prevent elephants from approaching houses. The reasons for elephants approaching settlements when there is alternative water are not clear. At some settlements, gardens and vegetable patches close to houses could be the attraction.

It was planned during the project period to carry out an assessment through questionnaires and interviews of the effectiveness of the present construction activities and provision of diesel. It was not possible to carry out these activities, partly due to pressure of existing work and illness of project personnel. They will be carried out during the next phase of the project.

Although the local people appear to be relatively tolerant of the elephants, there is still a high level of frustration when damage is caused. Fear of elephants is also an important factor.

It is important that the project activities continue until more sustainable and more far reaching methods are found to resolve the problems.

It should be recognised, however, that short of culling all the elephants, there can be no ‘final’ solution which will end all conflict.

There is still pressure within the region for the building of a stone wall to confine the elephants to one part of the Huab catchment and separate them from the main farming areas. This proposal involves the purchase of land elsewhere so that farmers within the elephant area can be resettled.

The MET does not favour this idea and both its regional biologist and elephant specialist believe the stone wall to be impractical, particularly on ecological grounds. Elephants move widely over the area, responding opportunistically to rainfall and grazing.

Over the past two years they appear to be expanding their range, or more probably recolonising former parts of their range. They have moved to areas along the Aba-Huab River and very recently right out of the project area as far south as the Ugab River.

Any barrier such as a stone wall will seriously curtail the elephants' ability to move in search of water and food, and will also prevent movement of other species.

The course proposed by the MET is a mixed strategy of continuing to provide relief for farmers
in the short term, developing the idea of a zoned 'elephant conservation area', but with a 'soft' boundary, and developing ways in which the elephants can be turned into an economic asset to the area through tourism and trophy hunting.

The MET is continuing with the development of legislation which will enable communities on communal land to manage and benefit from wildlife on their land, and to have a greater involvement in tourism ventures.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

The Huab Project appears to be succeeding in assisting the maintenance and recovery of elephant, and to a lesser extent, rhino populations in the Huab Catchment Area in particular and the Kunene Region of Namibia in general. It also appears to be contributing to the increase in other game species.

This is being achieved through project activities as well as the ongoing work of the MET's local staff, in particular the Wildlife Protection Service personnel.

The project is succeeding in alleviating the problems experienced by local farmers as a result of conflicts with elephants. This is being done by providing direct assistance to farmers in protecting their water installations, drawing elephants away from water near settlements and providing diesel for pumping water, where elephants have consumed all the water pumped for livestock.

Farmers see that conservation does not just focus on the needs of wild animals, but is also concerned with the welfare of people.

The project activities have helped to maintain a level of tolerance of elephants by local farmers in order to gain time for more long-term solutions to be developed and implemented.

A limited amount of cash income for local people has been generated by the project through employment of game scouts and labourers.

The project activities do not provide the ultimate solution to the problems of elephant conservation, and in particular elephant-human conflict, in the Huab Catchment, and they are not sustainable in the long term. They are worth continuing, however, in the short term, until more lasting solutions can be implemented.

6.2. Recommendations

The project activities should continue in the short term - at least for two more years.

The possibilities of extending the project in the following ways need to be investigated:

a) A researcher needs to be appointed to investigate elephant movements and population dynamics and to critically assess the types of problems caused by elephants and the best methods of preventing these problems from occurring.

b) An evaluation system needs to be developed for a better assessment of whether the direct assistance to farmers is successful in preventing or alleviating elephant problems and affects the attitude of farmers towards elephants.
c) The potential for development of community-based enterprises related to conservation and tourism needs to be further investigated, with a particular focus on the appropriate level of community involvement. If and where appropriate, such enterprises should be developed.

d) The Namibian government should be encouraged to develop a land-use plan for the region as soon as possible, which integrates conservation needs with the agricultural needs of the local people.

e) For long-term and sustainable development of the region, attention needs to be given to providing local people with secure land and resource tenure and assisting them to develop sustainable range and livestock management systems.

6.3. Continuation of the project

The current project activities will continue for a further year funded by WWF-International with a greater emphasis being placed on monitoring and evaluation.

The possibility of expanding the project to address some of the issues raised in 6.2. above will be investigated, and a new project proposal developed.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The final report includes the history, terms of reference, activities, conclusions, recommendations and financial report.

b. The project has provided a strong foundation from which the community can continue to seek long-term solutions to elephant/man confrontations.

c. It is strongly recommended that the project continues to institute short-term solutions while investigating the long-term solutions suggested by the community thus far.

d. Should the project continue as recommended, the Project Executant appointed should be a capable member of the community of Damaraland.

2. Appendices 1 - 6 provide details and results of activities carried out during the course of the project.
MAP OF DAMARALAND

- Reported elephant problems 1989-1991
- Protected artificial water holes (WWF project)
- Game guards (WWF project)
- National Monument (Twyfelfontein)
- Tourist development (WWF project)
- Rivers
- Wildlife Safari Cessions/National Tourist area
- Commercial Farms/Proposed elephant conservancy
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Namibian based NGO project to protect the wildlife of Damaraland began during the early 1980's under the umbrella of the Namibia Wildlife Trust and Namib Wildlife Society in Swakopmund. During the early stages of the establishment of NGO participation, the friction between the communal farmers and elephants in the Huab river catchment came to our attention.

In the early 1980's the IUCN had identified the elephants of this region as a top priority for protection. The status of the elephants, combined with the problems which elephants cause the rural community, and the ecological value of river catchment protection, pinpointed the Huab catchment as a subject of major importance to community needs and conservation management.

In 1985 and 1986 Karl Peter Erb, a resident of Namibia and studying at the University of Stellenbosch carried out a preliminary informal socio-ecological survey among the farmers affected by elephants in the communal farming area of the Huab catchment. The results and recommendations of the 1986 study and the assessment of complaints from communal farmers, were taken into consideration when the proposals for a more intensive project were discussed with Mr L. A. (Nick) Carter of the Environmental Investigation Agency in 1988.

In 1988, Mr Carter visited Khorixas to meet Paramount Chief Justus Garoëb, Mr Simson Tjongarero, the late Mr Simson Gobs. In Windhoek he met Mr Leon van Rooyen, Mr Stoffel Rocher and Dr Peet van der Walt of the Directorate of Nature Conservation at their Head Office in Windhoek. The proposal to implement a project incorporating elephant and human interaction was discussed and it was agreed to implement it as a management project.

The project proposal was drawn up and submitted to the E.E.C. in September 1988. Copies were sent to the Head Conservation Officer for Damaraland (Mr Leon van Rooyen), the Chief Conservation Officer of Damaraland (Mr Rudi Loutit) and to the Director of Fieldwork of the Save the Rhino Trust (Mrs B Loutit). The proposal was also discussed with the late headman, Mr J Tsuseb.

The WWF project No 3884 (NA0002) entitled: THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA CONSERVATION PROJECT - DAMARALAND" was approved in November 1988. Funding was received in April 1989.

In September 1991, the project was extended for another year and the title was altered to read "HUAB CATCHMENT AREA CONSERVATION PROJECT, NAMIBIA". The terms of reference were also slightly changed.

No final report was submitted in January 1991 due to the agreement to the extension of the project until August 1992. This report is therefore submitted as the final report for both contracts.
ELEPHANTS

The elephant numbers in the Huab catchment fluctuate between 60 and 260 according to rainfall and seasonal changes. The easternmost boundary of the elephants' range includes commercial farms, on which a conservancy is planned, at the top of the Huab river catchment. Their range of seasonal migration extends into the western desert areas where they have become known as Namibia's famous desert elephants. The elephants have occupied this part of the Namib desert since time immemorial.

COMMUNAL FARMERS

Many of the present communal farmers have not permanently occupied this area until recently. The few who lived here previous to the take-over by white farmers practised a nomadic lifestyle suited to the arid environment, moving with the rains and unhampered by fences.

The communal farmers of today were moved onto fenced farms in the Huab river catchment and inherited European farming practices which are not well suited to this arid African environment. During the early 1970's the political policy to form "homelands" was introduced. Families were translocated from Riemvasmaak in South Africa to the most arid areas in the west of the new homeland named Damaraland.

The manner in which they were moved to the area gave them no choice but to share their "homeland" with the elephants. This led to unhappy conflicts of an ongoing nature. Little was done to assist the farmers previous to the implementation of the WWF project which has brought hope of an eventual solution to suit the community and the elephants.

The area ranges from extremely arid to arid habitat. Rainfall averages less than 200 mm per annum (see rainfall figures) and is unsuitable for conventional stock farming. The growing of crops is almost non-existent. However, during the twenty or so years that communal farming has taken place in the area, some farmers have outgrown the subsistance farming level and are now practising commercial farming on communal land.

In January 1990 the WWF/SRT project staff, accompanied by volunteer, Jason Mortimer of the the African Conservation Trust (ACT), undertook a preliminary socio-ecological survey among the 38 families who came from Riemvasmaak in South Africa.

(See Appendix 1 Section 3, p.1)

Another socio-ecological survey was undertaken among 220 groups of communal farmers in the Huab project area in May 1991. This survey was undertaken by the local office of the MMCT/Agriculture and WWF project staff.

(See Appendix 1 Section 3, pp.3 - 26.)
VEGETATION

Vegetation was not scientifically monitored due to lack of manpower and specific funding. Species diversity, utilization by game species, seasonal changes and preferences by elephants were noted throughout the course of the project. (See Appendix 4 Sections 1 & 2.)

PROTECTION FOR WATER INSTALLATIONS

The WWF project provides employment for members of the rural community in areas where problems with elephant occur. The construction team consists of a Supervisor, a Foreman and a team of 4 or 5 men from Khorixas or workers from the community living in the area of work. Their duty is to build loose stone walls as protection for domestic water installations where elephants habitually damage these structures.

Compensation

All complaints involving elephant problems were investigated and their validity assessed. This was done either by staff of the WWF project or by staff of MWCT and reported to the Project Executant.

Applications for extra diesel supplies were investigated and assessed according to the number of elephant drinking and the number of times the herds visited the installation. Diesel is supplied to farmsteads to compensate for any extra pumping of water to supply the elephants, only after investigation of the complaint.

Applications for cash compensation were investigated and reacted upon if the situation warranted a payout. (See Specific Activities p.12)

COMMUNITY & TOURISM

SRT and WWF Funding, with logistic support from MWCT, has provided for one rustic campsite which caters for the ever increasing demand by the eco-tourism market. The project also provides for the protection of rock engravings which are a National Monument. This part of the WWF project has proved to be extremely popular and successful.

One trails shelter was built in the project area.

The Directorate of Veterinary Services/MWCT/ SRT and WWF project have combined forces to improve the facilities and aesthetic appearance of the Veterinary Control Gate on the farm Palm as requested by the staff resident at the gate. (See Appendix 3 Section 1 & 2.)
The Rural Conservation Committee was formed to liaise between the farmers and conservation authorities.

An integrated, NGO/community/Government Departments socio-ecological survey supervised by the MWCT, Windhoek head office, Planning Unit is planned to take place in September/October 1992.

**COOPERATION WITH MWCT**

The project was designed to work in close cooperation with the previously named Directorate of Nature Conservation, now named the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism. It is not a self-contained WWF project, but is integrated with the MWCT and the SRT. It is structured to assist the government in lessening the problems caused by the conflict between farmers and elephant, to bring benefits through tourism or wildlife utilization to the community and to contain the poaching.

**EXTENSION WORK**

The MWCT runs extension-awareness services in conjunction with the WWF/SRT project staff. This has contributed greatly towards the drop in poaching in the Huab catchment area. The duties of the WWF home based game guards are to report on game movements, watering places of game, vegetation utilisation by game and humans, conflict between elephants and humans, and record local names and uses of plants by humans. They are involved in local meetings and discussions on conservation problems. (See Appendix 6 Section 1)

**GAME FARMING**

Discussions about game farming possibilities have taken place in most of the meetings with farmers. There is a most obvious interest shown by the Damara people.

The concept of ostrich farming is very popular. The Rural Conservation Committee and the MWCT, Khorixas office, has called together a group of farmers interested in this form of game farming. Paramount Chief Justus Garoeb himself is a leading figure in this field. (See Appendix 1.2 Section 5 and Appendix 2 Section 2 pp. 30 -35.)

An area on the farm Opdraaand, which has expanses of open water and abundant vegetation, may be suitable for breeding warthog for meat and hides. The possibility of breeding guinea fowl and increasing the giraffe population have also been considered.

Training and funding for establishing game farming projects are presently not available.
APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES

The present lack of an appropriate authority in this regional communal area hampers the process of bringing benefits to the community. The structure for channeling cash flow income for community benefit is yet to be agreed upon. While waiting for an appropriate structure to be formulated at Cabinet level, these projects have operated on a basis of donations towards the management and maintenance of the campsites. Income over expenses is presently being banked in a central fund run by the manager of the camp.

MULTI-USE CONSERVATION AREA/CONSERVANCY

Proposals to investigate the feasibility of creating a Multi-use Conservation Area (IUCN Category VIII) or a Conservancy and building a cordon to keep elephant off farmland have been discussed at all levels since September 1991. Discussion of these proposals was requested by the communal farmers, the Farmers Union, the Traditional Headmen, the Rural Conservation Committee, the Kings Council, the Regional Commissioner, The Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism (Khorixas regional office), the Save the Rhino Trust and the Proj. Exec. of the WWF Huab project.
OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the project were achieved as follows:

1.1. Recovery of Elephants

The movements of elephants, population increases and mortalities were assessed and documented by Rudi Loutit and Tommy Hall (MWCT) from records of aerial surveillance and census flights, as well as from ground identification of individuals done by various organisations dating back to 1976. The staff of the WWF project contributed to field data which was passed on to the staff of Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism. The involvement of the community in conservation matters contributed to a marked decline in poaching of elephants.

(See Appendix 2 Sections 1 – 4)

1.2. Recovery of Rhino

Due to the shy habits of black rhino in this area where they were very heavily poached up to 1983, and again in 1988/89, they do not frequent human inhabited areas. Few rhino remain on the communal farmland of the WWF project area. These are not an isolated group, but are on the eastern periphery of the main population of rhino. Their home ranges include parts of farms immediately to the west and north west of the catchment itself, where human inhabitants are few.

All rhino within the project area were dehorned to secure their safety, new calves have been born since dehorning, Ad hoc surveillance patrols and periodic visits to the area are made by SRT staff to ensure that the rhino remain safe. Observation of their habits indicate that there is no change since losing their horns. There has been no poaching in this area since the start of this project.

It is an accepted fact that the rhino will not be protected on communal land without the support of the community living on the borders of the rhino habitat. The WWF project has ensured that there is community involvement. This has brought greater support for conservation efforts as the project involves more people.

(See Appendix 3 Sections 1 - 3.)

1.3. Removal of sources of conflict

The removal of sources of conflict between subsistence farmers and the elephants are recorded under Specific Activities, pp.11 & 12.

1.4. Benefits to the local Damara subsistence farmers

These benefits are recorded under Specific Activities pp. 12 & 14.
1.5. Employment of game guards (scouts)

12 Game guards were employed at the start of the project which has contributed directly to the drop in poaching. They were selected through discussions with the headmen or Council Members of the Ward in which they live. They are based at their homes and were selected to suit the project's specific needs. The government-employed, Wildlife Protection Services (anti-poaching unit) follow up on reports made by the WWF game guards.
(See Appendix 6 Section 2.)

2.1 Long-term utilization

The promotion of long-term utilization of the full spectrum of plant and animal resources of the region will be evident when the management plan is finalised. However, it has been possible to arouse the interest and support of the community through extension work and discussions with the farmers.

3.1 Increased production of protein

Due to the increase in game numbers in the western part of the project area, a limited number of selected game species have been cropped for consumption by the community on an annual basis. This was undertaken by the staff of the MWCT in conjunction with the headmen.
(See Specific Activities pp.12 & 13.)

3.2 Economic benefits from tourism

Benefits going directly to the community from tourism were regarded as an extremely important part of the project. However, the lack of appropriate authorities through which to distribute funds brought in from tourism remains problematic. Tourism is fast increasing in the area of the project, mainly due to the international fame of the desert elephants.
(See Appendix 5 Sections 1 - 3.)
SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

Specific activities include the following:

\textbf{a. Protection of Water Installations}

Water installations were protected by building loose stone walls, some with an inner ditch, to keep elephant off the machinery or piping. The stone wall barriers constructed in areas to keep elephants from breaking installations proved to be a successful management option. These barriers took, on average, 6 days each to build, depending on the proximity of stone used in their construction.

The stone wall barriers were found to be unsuccessful when used to protect an entire water reservoir from elephant use. This was probably due to the fact that the elephants were attracted by the presence of fresh water close at hand and had a special need to cross the barrier of the stone wall.

Four alternative drinking places for elephant have been built, three of which are successfully utilised. The fourth is no longer viable because of failure of the borehole which yielded 1 800 liters/hour when the facility was built, but failed six months later.

Diesel pumps belonging to the Ministry of Agriculture (who had no emergency funds available) were repaired on Kaiserfont, Kyper, Estorf Pos, Engelbrecht Pos, Dorsland, Kamdesha, Gortrek and Grootberg Breeding Station with WWF Funding. MWCT repaired water installations on Dorsland, Guo Vadis and Grootberg.

\textbf{b. Electric fencing as a protection for gardens.}

The option to use electric fencing for the protection of gardens and water reservoirs was discarded early in the project. The first farm where electric fencing was attempted, "Spaarwater Pos", was the home of one of the ex-Riemvasmaak families who had been translocated from their home in South Africa to the arid western farmland bordering the Namib desert.

There had been numerous problems with the elephant at this "pos" and the family felt that it was the job of the Government, or in this case an NGO, to repair all the breaks caused to the fencing by their own goats or donkeys. At the time no breaks were caused by elephant. It was decided that it would be wasteful to connect the electric current as the family was not interested in maintaining or looking after the fencing.

During the construction of the protective fence, one part of the family group built a new house outside of the large protected area and asked that the new house also have protective fencing. It was obvious that the stone wall protection for installations only would be more successful in these cases.
The second attempt to help by setting up electric fencing was started at the farm "Drie Fontein", where another of the ex-South African families lived. When the fencing of the residential area was complete, the head of the family requested that the electric current should not be installed as he was afraid that the children may be injured.

Six months after the fence was complete the farmer moved away; the drought had set in and there was no grazing for his stock. Elephants destroyed his small garden in his absence. This family may not return to the farm as their problems with elephant and the harsh arid environment are too severe.

Both exercises were considered uneconomical and impractical due to the circumstances, therefore the stone wall option was implemented and has proved more successful.

c. Compensation Funds

The project supplied diesel to farmers who had to tolerate heavy utilisation of their domestic water by elephant. The supply of diesel was to compensate farmers for having to pump extra water where diesel pumps are used instead of windmills.

There have been compensation payments made for loss of livestock and on one occasion to a family for funeral costs when a boy was killed by an elephant.

d. Reintroduction of Species and Increased Production of Protein

The reintroduction of 10 giraffe was undertaken in 1990 by the MWCT as a direct result of a proposal submitted by the WWF project. Two of these giraffe died shortly after release, the remaining 8 have settled down well and have joined up with local groups of giraffe. (See Management Options pp.24 & 25.)

The analysis of game numbers indicated that the kudu antelope were increasing well and that it was not necessary to reintroduce them. "With respect to Kudu, there has been a 66% increase in animals observed between 1986 and 1990 censuses." (excerpt from p.125, R Loutit - Report to the Commission of the European Communities on Contract No 946/89-48 The Wildlife Survey of Skeleton Coast Park, Damaraland and Kaokoland, North West Namibia May/June 1990. By the Contractor L A "Nick" Carter, Windhoek July 1990. Springbok and oryx may be introduced if a Multi-species Conservation Area/Conservancy is recognised. (See Appendix 2 Section 2 pp.30 - 35.)
ii. The MWCT handled all aspects of the treatment of animal by-products such as hides gained from the cropping of some species. Carcasses were delivered to headmen, communities and schools. Hides were salted and treated for sale to tanneries.

The possibility of developing a community based tanning industry is being investigated through contacts with the local representative for Trade & Industry. This would require training of local people to manage such an industry as a further means of benefiting the community through wildlife conservation and utilization programmes.

A pilot project in leatherwork has been undertaken and a structure for training and marketing of the leatherwork is being implemented. This project is now funded by CIDA.

e. i. Inter-action between farmers and wildlife

An Elephant Day meeting was arranged by MWCT, the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and the Headmaster of Erwee Primary School, during which options for management strategies were further discussed among the farming community affected by elephants. The direct result was the appointment of the Rural Conservation Committee, consisting of local farmers and members of the community and chaired by the Wildlife Manager of the WWF project, which was charged with investigating long-term solutions to elephant problems.

(See Appendix 6 Section 2 p.7.)

ii. Management Plan

The production of a final Management Plan would at present be precipitous, considering the lack of governmental policy guidelines from both MWCT and the Ministry of Agriculture Water and Rural Development.

The past three years has laid a framework for constructive discussion of problems and a cooperative investigation into solutions. Lack of manpower and of a national policy framework have slowed down the process. However, options identified by the community have included the creation of a sanctuary, partially enclosed by an elephant-proof cordon, to be used as a Multi-use Conservation Area or Conservancy with increased tourist facilities and thus increased revenue for the community remaining in the area. This option is presently being investigated with relevant traditional and government authorities.

(See Appendices 1 & 2)
f. Local Handcrafts

Craftmaking and marketing of products to tourists passing through the area was encouraged and is proving successful. Income from the crafts go directly to the artist. This has brought a new view of life to the people of Sesfontein, Huab and Khorixas.

(See Appendix 5 Sections 1 - 3)

g. Development of Small Tourist Camps

The project's undertaking to assist in the development of a small tourist camp aimed at providing employment, protecting sensitive areas from unsupervised camping and bringing returns to the rural people, has proved successful and popular. The Aba-Huab campsite caters for an alternative form of tourism and eco-tourism. The manager of the campsite provides employment for 12 people, caters for the local community and arranges educational trips to the desert.

A further rustic campsite to provide facilities for backpackers and low key safari camping was constructed on the farm Moorivier. It is maintained by a home-based game guard and the Wildlife Society of Namibia is to draw up bird, plant and mammal lists and map out day-trails in the vicinity, during September. The location and facility will be publicised for the forthcoming tourist season.

The integration of local people into the increasing tourism trade has proved worthwhile, although the benefits are, as yet, minimal. The people are showing a progressive and positive attitude towards wildlife and tourism. The WWF project has stimulated interest in wildlife through recognition of the talents of the people, as well as bringing returns for work done, thus embarking on a road to self-sufficiency.

(See Appendix 5 Sections 1 - 3.)

h. Extension Activities

Continuous extension activities were undertaken throughout the area. Schools, Farmers Unions, community gatherings, the general public (through the media) and service clubs were included in this work. The activities were conducted by WWF Project, MWCT and SRT staff.

(See Appendix 6 Section 1)
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In July 1992, three elephant bulls were sighted drinking water at a reservoir 15 kilometers outside of Khorixas. This is a clear indication that the drought and the influx of people to the valley have caused the elephants to range further into farming areas. The elephants' water requirements are essentially the crux of the problem in this instance. The natural waters have mostly been taken over by humans and stock as their numbers have increased in recent years causing pressures on space and grazing.

2. The community’s need for safety and compensation for damaged property may be alleviated somewhat by further efforts to gain returns from the lucrative income which tourism is bringing to the area. This is presently almost exclusively of benefit to white owned safari companies and safari concession holders.

3. At the Elephant Day meeting arranged by Nahor Howoseb and David Gagoseb, on November 16 1991 and during subsequent discussions, the need to investigate the possibilities of cordonning off an area to keep elephant away from the majority of communal farms has been identified. The possibilities are discussed under the heading "Cordons or barriers to keep elephant out of communal farmland" (p.17).

4. The environmental conservation of river catchments for the future stability of agricultural practices, land-use planning and grazing rights of permanent residents of the Huab Catchment, is an important factor. The protection of the catchment and the protection of the resident community from the influx of outsiders is of prime importance for the project area.

(See Earth Africa Document Appendix 1.2 Section 5 p.26.)

5. The information gained from the MWCT staff’s records of elephant movements and identification are a valuable base for future management planning and should be continued. The services of a full-time ecologist to investigate long-term solutions would be advisable. Ground Water sampling and analysis should be undertaken as an urgent priority.

6. There is a serious lack of understanding of the economic value of tourism in the north west region. There is no appointed tourist officer for that region and all present data is collected and analysed by Rudi Loutit (Chief Nature Conservation officer MWCT). There is much need for formal investigation into the potential economic value of tourism, wildlife utilisation, and marketing of locally made crafts in communal areas.

7. The Twyfelfontein and Aba-huab project has achieved goals and overcome problems which had been a major source of worry before the start of the WWF project. This project has revealed that training in tourism and wildlife conservation management for black Namibians has been and still is sadly lacking in this country.

(See Appendix 5)
8. The employment of game guards from within the community has contributed directly to the decrease in poaching. It is important to continue their employment.

(See Appendix 6)

9. This WWF project is of great worth to the community, the MWCT, the Welwitschia Agricultural Union and for the wildlife of the Huab catchment. The development of a community based Rural Conservation Committee and the smaller conservation groups which are developing since the start of the project are a barometer of the local people’s integration and interest in conservation. It is important to continue the project’s major facets of success.

10. It should be kept in mind that environmental changes (such as drought or additional rainfall) may influence the feelings of the community at the time chosen for a socio-ecological survey. Political activities such as national or regional elections could also influence opinions of those surveyed. However, data collected remains very useful for reference in assessing such changes.

Recommendations for Short Term Solutions

1. Short term solutions in this instance may be regarded as partial relief strategies which will lessen the problems experienced by both the elephants and the community, but will not solve the basic problem caused by elephants on farmland.

2. Some of the short term solutions, such as protection of water installations and compensation by supplying diesel for water, has already encouraged an increased human and domestic stock population. This takes up progressively more land and water in an area which is almost completely surrounded by tourist safari concessions (see map) and which is too arid to support conventional agriculture.

3. The building of protective stone walls barriers around water installations are mostly successful in keeping elephants away from pipping and machinery, but the problems of elephants living on fenced farmland and endangering schoolchildren, herders and residents travelling on foot and in donkey-carts and stock moving around in the area has not been removed.

4. In spite of these observations, it is necessary to continue with the more important short term activities in the interim, while making further investigations into long term solutions.

5. Recommendations made by Dr David Cumming (Review of WWF Project No 3884 : Huab Catchment Area Conservation Project, Namibia June 1992) were discussed with headmen, wildlife officials, agricultural officers, the Rural Conservation Committee and the communal farmers. The four points ([7.2.3. a),b),c),d)]) which Dr Cumming has made are unanimously agreed upon.

(See pp. 20 & 21.)
6. Dr Cumming recommended that the Project Excutant be retained by
the MWCT. However, it has been suggested by those directly
involved in conservation matters in Damaraland, that this project
could be successfully handled by a competent member of the
community of the Khorixas area.

7. The WWF's wildlife manager, Mr TD Murorua, appointed for the
project, has shown the ability and the will to be able to handle
the running of the continuation of this project. He would have
willing and able assistance from both the MWCT and the SRT in
Khorixas. It is therefore recommended that to avoid any further
delays in continuing the field work of the project, Mr Murorua be
appointed as Project Executant.

8. A further recommendation is that, should the project continue,
WWF International sends out to the project area, a member of its
team at the start of the project and once a year during its
course, to guide the project executant and to avoid any confusion
regarding reporting and administrative procedures.

Long Term Solutions to elephant/farmer problems

Meetings with the community through the Agricultural Union have
expressed the need to "make a place" for the elephant. The
identification of a Multi-use Area or Conservancy may be the only long
term solution. This would require a cordon or barrier to be built
through part of the area to maximise the protection for the community
living outside the identified area.

(See map.)

Discussion of cordons or barriers to keep elephant out of communal
farmlands.

1. Barriers to keep elephants from people have been tried throughout
the world where elephants still exist. Research into the use and
success of such barriers has been difficult due to the fact that
Khorixas is situated far from reference libraries, a workable
telephone and postal service or "fax" machines. However, during
travels through parts of Africa, it was found that the solution
to the human elephant problem remains largely unsolved in most
parts of Africa.

2. It has been possible to examine electric fencing of the WWF
project in Zimbabwe and discuss the problems with Russel Taylor
and Charlie Mackie of the WWF/Zimbabwe Trust's Campfire project.
The problems experienced were almost entirely attributed to lack
of maintaining the full current throughout the length of the
fence.

3. In Kenya, Peter Jenkins was able to show us the effects and
success of the electric fencing at Meru Game Reserve. Peter
maintained that the Meru elephants had grown to accept the fence
and they seldom broke it. Maintaining the electric current was
supervised according to a strict routine by the Park's staff.
4. During discussions with many of those involved in solving this problem it became apparent that electric fencing alone has not proved very successful unless the maintenance and supervision is strict. A permanently employed team has to ensure that the electric current runs evenly throughout the day and night, keeping the wires clear and preventing the local communities’ children from playing tricks with the live wires. Elephants too are well known for pushing young animals into the wires to cut the flow of current or just barging through the fence.

5. Compact, well built loose stone walls to keep elephants in or out of an area, have proved reasonably successful in Kenya where they are used at the Laikipia and Lewa Downs game farm/sanctuaries. The wall at Laikipia is 150km long. Loose stone walls have not proved completely fool proof, elephants do, on occasion, remove stones to create gaps.
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A combination of two types of cordons, (electric fencing and loose stone wall) should be considered as a solution in this situation. A stone wall topped by two strands of electric wire would be easier to maintain as a double cordon against the elephants. Electric fencing could be used as a cordon across rivers.

Points in favour of creating a Multi-use Management Area/Conservancy, partly surrounded by a stone wall topped with electric wires as a cordon, are:

a) A stone wall is environmentally and community friendly.
b) The building of the wall would directly involve the community in the creation of their own conservation area.
c) The building of the wall would create work for many unemployed over a long period.
d) The holistic importance of river catchment conservation and management would manifest itself in one multi-faceted, environmentally important project.
e) Tourists would be attracted by the wall which would be aesthetically pleasing and photographically attractive.
f) The endless expense and man hours spent by WWF, MWCT and SRT in investigating and trying to prevent the elephants from causing problems with the community would be reduced to a minimum.
g) Those of the community who have expressed a wish to take part in game farming, conservation and tourism would have access to their own community project.
h) The conservation area would encourage better land use practices, reduce overstocking by domestic stock and establish ecologically balanced vegetation and water utilization.
i) The stone wall lends itself to changes and modifications to suit the situation.
j) The area under consideration would create a corridor for the movement of elephant and other game from the eastern commercial farms’ conservancy to the western state land free-range area.
k) A programme of food for work or public works may be arranged, which would lessen the costs considerably.

(See Appendix 1.2 Section 5 p.26.)
l) The problems related to continued desertification would be lessened through a reduction of commercial stock on arid land.

Problems which the building of a stone wall cordon may create:

a) The movement of elephant and other smaller game species will be forced to alter. This aspect needs to be studied by an ecologist.
b) Some farmers, situated within the most suitable area for creating the conservation management area, may not be willing to share land with the elephants.
c) Funding at a rate of approximately R5,000,000 (1,000,000 pounds sterling) for 3 years, may be difficult to raise.
8.4- Project Budgets

8.5 Proposal for extension in 1992/93

Huab Catchment Wildlife Conservation Project

Some key elements of the previous Huab Project need to be maintained because if they are abandoned at this stage in the development of wildlife conservation in the Huab the credibility of wildlife based landuse options in Damaraland may be seriously undermined. The following elements of the previous project have been effective and need to be continued if the momentum of wildlife conservation programmes is to be maintained in the Huab catchment:

1. The Game Guard unit
2. Water supply protection and support unit
3. Wildlife Manager position
4. Reserve fund for rewards

An annual budget for each of these components is provided below.

1. Game Guards.

Ten Game Guards have been supported by the project over the last three years. The costs per Game Guard are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Rations (R80.00 and R250 per month)</td>
<td>3,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman's compensation (R12.50 per month)</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,485.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transport costs of servicing the game guards include a monthly supply run and occasional additional trips which amount to approximately 1,000 km per month at R1.50 per km or R1,500.00 per month.

The annual costs for keeping 10 Game Guards in the field thus amount to 12 x R5,985.00 or R71,820 per annum.

2. Water supply protection and support unit

This unit carries out two functions. One is the construction of protecting walls around water installations and the other is providing fuel and mobile rigs for farmers that are pumping water for elephants. The effectiveness of the unit is influenced by the availability of transport and a 5 tonne, 4 x 4 Mercedes truck is required at an estimated cost of R260,000. Estimated annual operational costs are as follows:

a) Water supply protection

An annual target of protection 15 water installations is realistic and the costs per installation would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport (4x0 km @ R5.00/km for a 5t 4 x 4 truck)</td>
<td>R2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver (Salary of R450 per installation)</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour (On farm contracts: 8 men for 2 wks @R20/d)</td>
<td>2,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,690.00 (per month)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated costs for 15 units would thus be R70,350.
b) Fuel supplies and mobile pumping rigs

The fuel compensation programme involves 40 pumps and each of the farmers is provided with 3 drums of fuel and some oil for the year. The mobile rigs need to be serviced and repaired at regular intervals and transport costs are involved in servicing these installations and delivering fuel. Estimated costs are as follows:

Fuel and Oil (120 drums @ R350 and oil @ R40) ................................................. R46,800
2 x Mobile rigs (4 major services @ R1,000) ................................................... 8,000
(4 minor services @ R250) ........................................................................... 2,000
Transport (6 round trips of 800km @ R1.50/km) ........................................... 7,200

Total ................................................................................................................ 63,000

3. Wildlife Manager

The Wildlife Manager, Mr. D. Mororua, was engaged by SRT in January, 1992, and funds are available for his position for the remainder of 1992. He would be responsible for assisting the project executant in servicing the Game Guards and supervising the Water supply protection unit. He also plays a valuable extension and liaison role between the project and the Huab valley farmers. The Wildlife manager is employed at a rate of R3,000 per month which includes allowances for travel and subsistence. The budget for January to June 1993 would thus be R18,000.

4. Reward Reserve Fund

A reserve fund from which rewards for information leading the arrest and prosecution of poachers can be paid is needed. A sum of R10,000 is proposed.

5. Summary Budget for 1992/93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Game Guard Unit</td>
<td>R 71,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Water Supply Protection Unit</td>
<td>133,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wildlife Manager</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reward Reserve fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>233,170</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes 5 ton 4x4 Truck</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>493,170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This budget represents a fairly complete costing for the above operations. It is higher than has been previously been available because many of the costs, particularly of transport, have been incurred by the MWCT. The supervisory costs of the project are not included as this would probably be provided by the MWCT if they take over as project executants.
MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

GAME GUARDS BASED WITHIN THE COMMUNITY

As a management option for the Huab area, the employment of game guards which was adapted to suit the community has proved to be a successful management option and must be continued.

The success of this form of "home guard" community conservation liaison officer to keep contact between the community and the government conservation officials, has been proved by similar community based conservation projects throughout the world.

Successful community based projects in Africa are the WWF/ADMADE project which runs the village scout programme in Zambia and the WWF/EWT auxiliary game guard programmes in Namibia and Mozambique. These are just two examples of the form of community based vigilante programmes which may be adapted to suit the different community's needs.

There can be no prescribed formula for community conservation. Each community of a different language or environmental group needs to be able to adapt to suit their particular culture or circumstance. Therefore, in this project, adaptations were made to suit the predominantly Damara community who reside in the project area where they inherited land and fenced farms which no longer fitted the traditional form of communal land.

GAME GUARD WILLEM CEISES - OSHIHAVUCA
STONE WALL PROTECTIONS

The building of compact loose stone walls surrounding water installations was a management option which is successful in most cases and has brought relief from the numerous complaints received due to elephant breaking piping and mechanical installations. This management option was found to be preferable to the installation of electrically charged fencing because it was cheaper, and it enabled the resident farmers to make repairs themselves.

Problems did occur however, where farm residents removed stones to enable them to carry water from the protected area for domestic use and did not replace the stones. (see staff reports Section )
RESTOCKING OF GIRAFFE in the Huab Catchment

The translocation of giraffe to the Huab as a proposal agreed to by MWCT was a management option well suited to the Huab catchment. Giraffe are well suited to the area and suitably fit the requirements needed in promoting wildlife utilisation amongst the communal farmers.

Contact Reference: WWF 3884, Namibia: The Huab Catchment Area Wildlife Conservation and Utilisation Project, Damaraland.

Motivation for the translocation of twenty - thirty (20 - 30) excess giraffe from the Etosha National Park to the Huab River.

A. In accordance with the above mentioned Contract entered into with the Worldwide Fund for Nature, and according to the Terms of Reference No. 1, 2 & 3 therein, and in cooperation with the Directorate of Nature Conservation and the Ovambo Authorities, the employment of locally resident Game Scouts for the protection of the wildlife in the Huab catchment has recently begun and should be complete by the middle of August 1989.

B. I propose therefore that, according to the Terms of Reference (c) and due to the favourable habitat available for giraffe in the Huab river and catchment areas, the Contractors, in cooperation with the members of the Damaraland/Kaokoland Ecological Survey, request that:

i) An agreement is reached with the Director of Nature Conservation in consultation with Hanan Lindeque (Bioligist), Rudi Loutit (Chief Conservator for Damaraland), Louis Geldenhuys (Chief Game Capture Officer), the Damaraland interim representative, Mr Jan Hanan (Secretary) and the contractor Blythe Loutit for the delivery of 20 - 30 giraffe to the closest point in the upper Huab river near the farm Eersbegin. The cost of transportation to be paid for by the WWF Huab Project Funds.

ii) That suitable bomas are built for the temporary housing of the giraffe and paid for by the WWF Huab Project Funds.

iii) That a small semi-permanent structure be built in the Huab river environs for use in follow-up research on elephants, the relocated giraffe and other wildlife, including botanical.

NOTE

Local labour would be used for all these constructions and paid for by the WWF Huab Project Funds, according to the Terms of Reference No 1.

Blythe Loutit
Fieldworker SRTE/WWF Huab Project
June 22 1989

Giraffe Monitoring
KAMEELPEROEPJIE

DATUM: ___________________________ KILOMETERLESING: ___________________________
LOKALITEIT: ___________________________
LIGGING: ___________________________
VOEDINGSPANTE: ___________________________
PLANTELE: ___________________________
VLUGAFSTAND: ___________________________
TROPGROOTE: ___________________________

Hoogte Klasse

Skryf aantal in elke klas in spatie op figure. Littekens (as horings ens.) moet op figuur aangebring word.
Elephant bulls were fitted with collars bearing notches for individual identification. This form of identification was used to enable the game guards and patrol teams to take part in the monitoring of identifiable individuals. The monitoring of the size and range of movements for better understanding of the habits of the elephants needs has proved useful. However, extra funding was required which came from Elifund in the U.K.

The collaring exercise took place under supervision and direction of Nature Conservation. All records are kept by Tommy Hall at the MWCT offices in Khorixas. This has proved to be a valuable management option which will hopefully be continued and enlarged upon.

**Elephant Monitoring**

**Collar Code**

- Ax marks on ears, tusks, tail (kinks, hair). If ears intact, indicate by ✓.
- Cross out view not seen.

![Diagram](image)
Mr Ian Redmond  
Elifund  
60 Seymour Ave  
Bristol BS7 9HN  
Great Britain  

30.10.1989

Dear Ian

Once more a sincere thank you from all concerned in the elephant collaring for the prompt assistance which allowed the project to proceed as planned. I have as yet not received the full costs to pass on to the SWA/Namibia Nature Foundation, but will fax them through to you as soon as they are forthcoming.

So far it seems that we will be well within the budget, with an estimated R17 000 for helicopter flying time added to the provisional costs of the vehicles and capture team as set down below:

1. 1 275 km @ R2.50/km  
   R3 142.50
2. 1 275 km @ R1.00/km  
   R1 275.00
   Subtotal  
   R4 417.50
3. 9 bottles of M99 10mg/ml @ R670.00  
   R6 030.00
Total for Game Capture Unit  
R10 447.50

Plus estimated helicopter flying costs @ R 17 000  
R27 447.50

If my estimations are correct we will be completely covered by the amount you have already sent to the Foundation and so I have included, with the report for the sponsors, a shopping list which is varied and may be rather ambitious, but what the hell.

As the funds from the Foundation, when repaid to Nature Conservation, will go directly into state coffers, the Capture Vet has suggested that we ask them to buy replacement M99 as an alternative. This I am still negotiating with them.

It was super speaking to you the other day. Please do try to get down here some time as I am sure the elephants in the desert will fascinate you as much as your’s in the caves do and we’d be delighted to take you to them.

Once again many many thanks for all your help

Yours

Sharon

Sharon Montgomery

cc. Nick Carter  
Tommy Hall  
Blythe Louit
DEHORNING RHINO

Dehorning as a management option under the circumstances which prevailed proved extremely successful. Apart from ad hoc surveillance patrols by SRT & MWCT staff, the dehorned rhino were regarded as safe from poachers and the SRT patrol staff were deployed in areas where horned rhinos remained and required continuous monitoring. All the expenses for the dehorning programme were covered by MWCT and SRT. The WWF and SRT staff assisted with tracking and identification of individuals. «
### FINANCIAL REPORT
**WWF PROJECT NO. 3884**
**THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA CONSERVATION PROJECT**
**DAMARALAND**
**SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE**
**APRIL 1989 - JULY 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZAR</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>15,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Wages and Rations</td>
<td>159,086</td>
<td>85,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Vehicle Expenses</td>
<td>89,053</td>
<td>36,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Protections and water installations.</td>
<td>51,699</td>
<td>27,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Tents, camp equipment, clothing and boots.</td>
<td>36,779</td>
<td>19,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Photographic equipment and binoculars.</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td>3,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Radio installations.</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>3,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Project Running Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Building and development.</td>
<td>51,873</td>
<td>27,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Information, compensation and reward payments.</td>
<td>11,442</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Project field data analysis.</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>3,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ZAR</th>
<th>SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>428,978</td>
<td>229,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCHANGE RATE : R1.00 = SFR 0.5351**

**ADDITIONAL EXPENSES INCURRED DURING COURSE OF PROJECT (See notes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>37,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Project Running Expenses</td>
<td>16,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ZAR</th>
<th>SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,240</td>
<td>31,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FINANCIAL REPORT**  
**WWF PROJECT NO. 3864**  
**THE HUAB CATCHMENT AREA CONSERVATION PROJECT**  
**DAMARALAND**  
**SUMMARY OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE**  
**APRIL 1988 - JULY 1992**

**INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZAR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>246,878</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>488,881</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,306</td>
<td>189,278</td>
<td>117,121</td>
<td><strong>84,273</strong></td>
<td><strong>428,978</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>BALANCE</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59,703</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>37,823</th>
<th>16,272</th>
<th>5,045</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>BALANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59,240</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>463</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Financial Report

**February 1992 - July 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>DAVID SHEPHERD</th>
<th>WWF INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Wildlife Manager</td>
<td>18 000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td><strong>Daily Paid Assistants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Wages (Patrol Staff)</td>
<td>15 380.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td><strong>Capital Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Cameras</td>
<td>1 437.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Binoculars</td>
<td>3 107.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Tents</td>
<td>2 870.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Equipment for patrols</td>
<td>1 239.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Diesel machinery (water insta.)</td>
<td>5 600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Cameras/compensation for loss of radio equipment and repairs</td>
<td>509.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Radio installations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td><strong>Project Running Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Cooking Utensils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Rations</td>
<td>13 930.66*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1 353.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>2 009.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Vehicle Repairs/Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Transport of teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Fencing/water installation, repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Fuel for vehicles</td>
<td>1 891.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Rations for 20 game guards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diesel for pumping water</td>
<td>3 400.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vehicle maintenance</td>
<td>11 484.81*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Repairs/Equipment for patrols with carts or horse/mule/donkeys</td>
<td>939.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Information and reward payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Project field data analysis</td>
<td>1 359.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of Field Costs**

- 26 404.16
- 57 888.86

**10 WWF INT. 15% MGMT Fee**

**Total**
NOTES ON THE FINANCIAL REPORT

Financial and project reports did not coincide with existing year-ends of administering organisation. It was not practical for the auditors to audit the books twice a year.

No administrative funding was made available to cover separate administration costs.

The change in reporting format between the two sections, from figure to table, caused confusion.

Budgeted items did not coincide with the Terms of Reference.

Delay and uncertainty about arrival of funds caused confusion. The change in contract dates and payments by SANF also added to the confusion. (See attached letter from Mr R. Blair, SANF).

Uncertainty regarding the continuation of the project after July 1992 and the possibility of having to carry the project until such a decision is made, led to underspending on certain budget items.

However, the nature of the contract required the purchase of two second hand vehicles in order to comply with the Terms of Reference (one each for the Wildlife Manager and Building Supervisor). The first was partially sponsored by Total Namibia (R12 000 of R30 165, leaving a balance of R18 165) and the other cost R19 758.

Rental and administration costs were incurred throughout the project, both in Khorixas and Windhoek. This is reflected in "Additional Expenses". The final report required a full month from both the Project Executant and Director of Publicity and Education of the SRT during which other work was suspended. Additional stationary and administration costs were also incurred.

Underspending occurred on the following budget items:

01  Salary - Wildlife Manager
    This occurred as a result of a suitable candidate for Wildlife Manager being identified only by January 1992. The project was obliged to offer a one year contract to carry the project through.

06  a)  Protections and Water Installations
      Assistance from HWCT (lorry) and the Dept./Ministry of Water Affairs alleviated the costs of building and machinery to a great extent.

06  b)  Tents and Equipment
      Unsolicited donations in kind of camp equipment, tents and uniforms items decreased spending on these items.
FUTURE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

1. A management plan should be drawn up in consultation with the Agricultural Union, regional authorities, communities, the Rural Conservation Committee and the Planning Unit of the MWCT.

2. It should incorporate an urgently needed policy to protect the grazing and water rights of the permanently resident subsistence farmer. A model structure is incorporated in the recommendations made by Dr Reynolds in the Earth Africa paper "Community, Land Use and Resource Management".

3. Domestic stock carrying capacity for low rainfall areas should be assessed and applied through relevant legislation, to arrest the creeping desertification of the Huab Catchment and surrounding areas.

4. Special attention would have to be paid to the zoning of the whole project area to ensure effective conservation of water resources, soil, vegetation and wildlife.

5. There is an urgent need for legislation to be rewritten in favour of bringing revenue from tourism and wildlife sales directly to the community.

6. Revenue through trophy hunting is unlikely to bring large amounts of money to the community as is evident in Zimbabwe and Zambia, but the rapid increase in tourist numbers to the Khorixas and Sesfontein regions could become economically beneficial to the communities on whose land these safari tour groups travel to view the scenery and wildlife.

7. There should be provision made for the protection of cultural and historic assets, scenic beauty and roadside vegetation.

8. Areas of tourism potential should be identified and proposals submitted to rural development agencies for assistance in funding the alternative tourism potential.

9. Training in tourism requirements should be incorporated for local people. Provision should be made for advertising and promotion of the rest camps, lodges and rustic camps to draw touring parties away from fragile areas.

10. The browse plant species diversity indicated that more giraffe could be introduced to the project area. Giraffe are not a cause of conflict, and are an extremely useful species, of appeal to tourists and a good source of protein and animal by-products. Further re-introduction of this species should be encouraged.

11. The possibility of finding alternative land for farmers who wish to move from communal land or move out of an area which may be identified as a Multi-Use conservation area, would entail approaching Government or international funding agencies for assistance. Six letters detailing reasons for wishing to move have been received.
c) & d) Radio equipment and replacements

The need for vehicles was considered of supreme importance. Radios would have been of no use without vehicles to put them into.

It is recommended that until a firm decision is reached regarding the continuation of the project, the balance of the amount owing according to the contract (SFR 20,000), be used to maintain the staff and provide continuity regarding the short term solutions. Should all activities cease in the interim, hard-won community goodwill would be lost and a major setback would be encountered if the project were to go ahead.

Note: It must be kept in consideration that during the course of this project Namibia was in the process of becoming independent. The three years of the project span pre-independence and post-independence periods. Changes in organisation and structure of both government institutions and communities were very obvious during this period and led to delays in some aspects of the project such as the appointment of a Wildlife Manager.
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