Conservancies grew out of the recognition that wildlife and other natural resources had disappeared in many areas and that the livelihoods of communities could be improved if these losses were reversed.

By integrating conservancies, community forests, and a range of other natural resource uses with various traditional land uses such as livestock herding and crop production, rural communities can maximise their income opportunities.

Through effective management and modern, market-based approaches, conservancies can ensure that the sustainable use of natural resources delivers a range of benefits to communities and individual households, thus contributing to rural development while ensuring biodiversity conservation.
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Support and partner organisations

The wise use and management of natural resources has the potential to drive rural development and economic growth, as well as delivering biodiversity conservation objectives.

Collaborative sustainable resource management across borders is crucial in ensuring the health of many large ecosystems. This is especially true in the Caprivi, a narrow strip of land dissected by perennial rivers that are vital biodiversity corridors.

Elephants are amongst the most valuable natural resources for conservancies. Yet, the conflicts they create with other land-uses and infrastructure also present a major challenge for the CBNRM programme.

Tourism generates the largest portion of benefits for conservancies. However, these benefits can be significantly expanded through broader engagement by the private sector, especially amongst mobile operators.

Following page: Although many rural people in Caprivi still consider livestock, crops and fish their most important livelihood resources, wildlife and tourism are providing an increasing range of benefits.
Each year since 2003, we have been reporting on the progress and challenges of Namibia’s communal area conservancies. Each year, we have been able to document increases in income, wildlife, and the number of conservancies. We have also included brief reports on the progress of community forests. In this edition, we again focus on the successes, but we have also taken more time and space to address some of the problems and challenges. Yes, we can report that overall income to conservancies in 2009 reached over N$ 35 million, but we also recognise that an aggregated amount such as this hides many disparities in income between individual conservancies. We recognise that there are many disparities in performance between conservancies, with some facing critical governance problems. We further recognise that increased numbers of wildlife can create increased problems for rural farmers, particularly where predators kill livestock and elephants destroy crops or damage water installations. We recognise that, due to the rapid increase in the number of conservancies, support organisations (both government and NGO) are suffering from a lack of capacity to provide all the support that is needed. Finally, we recognise that questions of land tenure, land-use planning and zoning, and improved coordination amongst all stakeholders need to be addressed to unlock the true potential of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) as a vehicle for balanced rural development and the maintenance of functioning ecosystems.

The critical question regarding the problems and challenges facing conservancies and community forests is “What is being done to address them?” Apart from providing the usual information about income, expenditure and wildlife numbers, we provide some more in-depth case studies on what is being done to deal with some of the problems. These case studies demonstrate the extent to which CBNRM in Namibia is still evolving. It requires the testing and fine-tuning of various approaches to best achieve rural democracy, giving communities the opportunity to work out how best to make decisions about their use of income from natural resources. It requires some experimentation in the most useful approaches to local level management of wildlife and plant resources, as communities debate among themselves what should be conserved and how resources can best be managed by a group. It also requires the experimentation, testing and fine-tuning of business development, as communities learn how to best manage tourism enterprises and contracts and develop new income generating opportunities. Finally, it requires careful monitoring, flexibility, responsiveness and adaptation, as all stakeholders within CBNRM are faced with a rapid growth in both scale and complexity – the number of conservancies and community forests, as well as the activities within them and the number of people involved, continue to increase. It is a balanced rural development and conservation approach that is providing great results, but has the potential for even greater achievements, and one that is receiving more and more international attention.

The successes achieved, and the way in which all stakeholders in CBNRM are trying to find innovative solutions to the problems, provide testament to the hard work and dedication of government officials, NGO personnel, the private sector and the community members themselves. The conservancy and community forest programme in Namibia is implemented through partnerships between the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Directorate of Forestry within the Ministry of Agriculture Water and Forestry, regional councils, non governmental organisations (NGOs), the private sector and rural communities. These partnerships have been supported by a broad range of donors and international NGOs who are listed below. At the time of writing, a new phase of external support is about to begin through the United States Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and the Millennium Challenge Account Namibia.

NACSO (on behalf of all its members) and the Ministry of Environment & Tourism would like to thank all its partners who have collaborated in developing and implementing the conservancy approach in Namibia. Non-government assistance is largely provided through the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO), a collaboration of 14 local NGOs, the University of Namibia, an international conservation NGO, regional conservancy associations and individual associate members. Investors from the tourism sector have become increasingly important partners over the last 10 years. In association with conservancies, they offer the bulk of jobs to conservancy members and facilitate significant returns of cash income to conservancies. A broad range of donors support the programme through the provision of technical expertise and funding. Since becoming a national programme, the main initial foreign contributors to CBNRM were the founding donors, namely the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and WWF (UK, International and USA). These early investments were followed by valuable funding from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA); United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID); Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA); European Union; Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Global Environment Facility (GEF); World Bank; Fonds Français pour l’Environnement Mondial (FFEM); WWF-US, Netherlands, Norway, Germany and Sweden; German Church Development Service (EED); Swiss Development Corporation; Humanistisch Instituut Voor Ontwikkelingsaanwerking (HIVOS); Canada Fund; Comic Relief; UK Lottery Fund; British High Commission; Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD); Austrian Government, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA); Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC); Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO) and World Bank (WB).
THE 59 REGISTERED CONSERVANCIES IN 2009 ON AN ELEVATION MAP OF NAMIBIA

1 Nyae Nyae 31 Joseph Mbambangandu
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5 Wuparo 35 Sheya Shuushona
6 Doro Inawas 36 !Gawachab
7 Uibasen Twyelfontein 37 Muduva Nyangana
8 Kwandu 38 Ojijuuo
9 Mayuni 39 African Wild Dog
10 Puros 40 King Nehale
11 Marienfluss 41 George Mukoya
12 Tsiseb 42 Okamatapati
13 Ehirovipuka 43 Kasika
14 Oskop 44 Impalila
15 Sorri-Sorris 45 Balyerwa
16 Mashi 46 Ondjou
17 Omatendeka 47 Kunene River
18 Otjimboyo 48 Ohungu
19 Uukwaluudhi 49 Sobbe
20 Orupembe 50 /Audi
21 Okangundumba 51 Ovitoto
22 //Huab 52 !Han/Awab
23 !Kho!b !Naub 53 Okondjombo
24 //Gamaseb 54 Otjambangu
25 Anabeb 55 Eiseb
26 Sesfontein 56 Sikunga
27 Sanitatas 57 Okongo
28 Ozondundu 58 Huibes
29 N≠a-Jaqna 59 Dzoti
30 #Gaingu

THE 13 REGISTERED COMMUNITY FORESTS IN 2009
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At the time of compiling this report, a letter appeared in a national newspaper asking some hard-hitting questions about conservation in Namibia. The letter writer wanted to know from the conservation community and the tourism industry: What is the incentive for locals to tolerate predators in their areas? When does protection of the environment come into conflict with the protection of local people?

These questions go to the heart of the Namibian Government’s community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) programme and represent the valid concerns of communal area residents who are seeing wildlife, including predators and elephants, increasing on their land. This report examines the issues raised by the letter writer’s questions and the concerns of rural residents in areas where potentially destructive wildlife is increasing. It is clear that the devolution of rights over natural resources to rural people referred to above by His Excellency the President has led to an
increase in wildlife in many communal areas, particularly in the conservancies of the north-east and north-west. Chapter 3 documents these increases as well as the growing number of human wildlife conflict incidents. There are several reasons for the increase in wildlife numbers, but a significant factor has been the management activities of conservancies and an acceptance by the communities themselves of wildlife and wildlife-based tourism as productive forms of land use. Without this acceptance and community tolerance of animals such as predators and elephants, wildlife would not be able to increase at the rate it has.

Chapter 2 illustrates how various benefits from wildlife and other natural resources are contributing to the welfare of local communities, and are helping to offset some of the losses and problems caused by some wild animals. Income to conservancies has increased from N$ 600,000 in 1998 to the 2009 level of N$ 35.02 million (Figure 1). Directly and indirectly, the Namibian economy earned over N$ 266 million from CBNRM activities in 2009 (Figure 11, Chapter 2). While these figures are impressive, all stakeholders in CBNRM realise that for rural people to continue to tolerate wildlife on their land, or to show the willingness to zone land for wildlife and tourism use, more needs to be done. Conservancies need to deliver more benefits to households, particularly the poorest households and those affected by human wildlife conflict.

The innovative ideas for addressing human wildlife conflict documented in Chapter 3 need to be introduced more widely and in more communities. Local level land-use planning needs to be improved to help avoid conflicts.

This report, like its predecessors, focuses primarily on wildlife and tourism within conservancies and touches on community forests and other CBNRM activities. But this is only part of the picture of what goes on from day to day in communal areas. At the same time as developing wildlife and tourism-based enterprises, conservancy members are also continuing with their other livelihood activities such as livestock farming and crop growing. The conservancy approach simply allows rural communities to add wildlife, tourism and other CBNRM activities to their existing livelihoods.

**Figure 1.** Incomes from the overall CBNRM programme grew from nothing in 1994 to about N$ 42.48 million in 2009. The incomes are shown in two categories: incomes to conservancies and incomes from CBNRM activities outside conservancies.

![Hartmann's mountain zebras, which are endemic to Namibia, have recovered particularly well in the conservancies of the north-west.](image-url)
strategies and to choose how to balance various options. Increasingly, conservancies are becoming the framework for other key activities such as sustainable rangeland management, which is crucial for livestock owners (see Chapter 3). In several conservancies, members are learning new methods of crop farming that reduce the need for forest clearing, conserve water and build up nutrients in the soil. Other conservancies are supporting women’s groups in the harvesting and sale of products from indigenous plants (see Chapter 2). And there is growing cooperation between conservancies and community forests, with the aim of ensuring that timber and non-timber resources in our woodlands are conserved and used sustainably (see Chapters 2 and 3).

The 59 registered communal area conservancies and 13 community forests therefore provide local structures for the management of a variety of common property resources. As legal entities, established according to the provisions of national legislation, registered conservancies and community forests are mechanisms for control and management at the local level. They are required to operate in a transparent and accountable way and enable people to make informed decisions. Chapter 4 provides information about the governance of conservancies and provides examples of how accountability and transparency in decision-making are being promoted.

The CBNRM approach implemented through conservancies and community forests is based on well-established economic and management principles of (a) devolution of rights and responsibilities to the lowest appropriate level, (b) proprietorship and tenure over the resources in defined geographic areas, and (c) the creation of appropriate incentives through empowerment, economic opportunities and the reinstatement of traditional, cultural and heritage values.

As part of this approach, conservancies are self-defined social units or communities of people that choose to work together and become registered with the Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET). Registration requires communities to fulfil a series of prerequisites laid down in legislation and associated regulations. The main requirements are that conservancies must be legally constituted with clearly defined boundaries that are not disputed by neighbouring communities; they must have a defined membership and a committee representative of community members; and they require a clear plan for the equitable distribution of conservancy benefits to members. Once these conditions have been met and approved by the Minister of Environment and Tourism, conservancies are registered and gazetted in the Government Gazette.

Once registered, a conservancy acquires new rights and responsibilities with regard to the consumptive and non-

The sustainable harvesting of devil’s claw tubers has become an important source of income for women in many conservancies.
The area covered by registered communal conservancies has grown rapidly, as has the number of people who live in conservancies.

A number of communities are combining forest management with wildlife management and seven registered and 31 emerging community forests overlap in some way with conservancies. There are currently no truly integrated conservancies and community forests. Nyae Nyae Conservancy is likely to be the first integrated conservancy and community forest while another 26 can potentially become integrated entities.

The 59 conservancies manage 132,697 square kilometres of communal land, embracing approximately 234,300 residents (Figure 2 & Table 1) while the 13 community forests cover 4,652 square kilometres and embrace 36,784 residents. Another 20 to 25 communities are forming conservancies and 45 community forests are in the process of being established or waiting to be gazetted. Conservancies are creating important linkages between national parks and are facilitating natural wildlife movements over large areas, thereby achieving conservation at a large landscape scale (Figure 3).
Table 1. The 59 conservancies that had been registered by the end of 2009, the year on which this book focuses. Detailed information on each conservancy is given in the Conservancy Profiles section, starting on page 84.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date registered</th>
<th>Area (square kilometres)</th>
<th>Number of people in conservancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyae Nyae</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Feb.1998</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salambala</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Jun.1998</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torra</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jun.1998</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uibasen Twyfelfontein</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Dec.1999</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doro !lawas</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Dec.1999</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwandu</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Dec.1999</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayuni</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Dec.1999</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuparo</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Dec.1999</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puros</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsiseb</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>Jan.2001</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehirovipuka</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jan.2001</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marienfluß</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jan.2001</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskop</td>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>Feb.2001</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorri-Sorris</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Oct.2001</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashi</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Mar.2003</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uukwalaudhi</td>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>Mar.2003</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omatendeka</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Mar.2003</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjimboyo</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>Mar.2003</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!Khob!Naub</td>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/!Gemaseb</td>
<td>Karas</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/!Huab</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orupembe</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitatas</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anabeb</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesfontein</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongandumbu</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!Nâ-Jaqa</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozondandu</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Jul.2003</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mbambangandu</td>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>Mar.2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/!Gaanu</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>Mar.2004</td>
<td>7,731</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!Gwachab</td>
<td>Karas</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mukoya</td>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muduva Nyangana</td>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamungwa</td>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uukolonkadhi Ruacana</td>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okamatapati</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozonahi</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Wild Dog</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjituuo</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheya Shushona</td>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>35,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Nehale</td>
<td>Oshikoto</td>
<td>Sep.2005</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impalila</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Dec.2005</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasika</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Dec.2005</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobbe</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene River</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//Audi</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohungu</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondjou</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>8,729</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balyerwa</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Oct.2006</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovitoto</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communal conservancies have added substantially to the network of areas under sustainable natural resource management in Namibia. At the end of 2009, they covered 16.1% of the country. This area, together with the 0.2% of community forests that do not overlap with conservancies, 16.5% of Namibia’s surface area within state protected areas, 0.8% under tourism concessions and a further 6.1% in freehold conservancies, brought the total land surface under conservation management to 39.7%. This figure does not include the significant area covered by private game reserves and other freehold farms under wildlife management which fall outside conservancies.

**Figure 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date registered</th>
<th>Area (square kilometres)</th>
<th>Number of people in conservancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>!Han / Awab</td>
<td>Karas</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okondjombo</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Aug.2008</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjambangu</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>Mar.2009</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiseb</td>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>Mar.2009</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikungua</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Jul.2009</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okongo</td>
<td>Oshangwena</td>
<td>Sep.2009</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzoti</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>Oct.2009</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huibes</td>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>Oct.2009</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>132,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>234,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CBNRM sector in Namibia is growing in scope and complexity. In addition to conservancies and community forests, there is also a network of water point committees established throughout the country to manage the provision and use of water at local levels, and important progress is being made in the community management of inland fisheries. This publication focuses on conservancies and to some extent community forests and describes their progress in managing wildlife and other natural resources, in promoting good governance and democracy at a local level, and in generating a wide range of benefits for rural residents. Yet it is important to emphasise that conservancies and community forests form only two parts of a complex system of natural resource use in communal areas. Increased integration of all the components of communal area land use – including the various aspects of agriculture, tourism, wildlife and natural plant product use – though proactive collaboration and effective zoning, will greatly enhance the ability of rural communities to improve their socio-economic status.

A major challenge in addressing problems facing community management of natural resources is linked to the great variation in the character of conservancies: Some of the 59 registered conservancies are in desert areas while others are in zones of much higher rainfall where woodlands and large river systems are features of the landscape. Some have abundant wildlife, rugged and scenic terrain, and high tourism potential, while others have only modest potential to benefit from wildlife and tourism. Their sizes vary enormously: Nyae and N≠a-Jaqna in Otjozondjupa both cover around 9,000 square kilometres, nearly 100 times bigger than the mere 95 square kilometres of Oskop in Hardap, for example. The human population embraced by individual conservancies varies enormously, from less than 200 people in the Oskop Conservancy to over 35,000 in the Sheya Shuushona Conservancy. In addition to differences in climate, human population and culture, biodiversity values and landscapes, conservancies are also heavily influenced by location and a range of socio-political and economic factors.

These differences in conservancy character mean that they do not all have an equal ability to generate income. While some conservancies can generate an annual income of more than N$ 1 million from their wildlife and tourism resources, others are earning only around N$ 50,000, which hardly covers their operating costs. Such differences can raise unrealistic expectations and cause disgruntlement. Under these circumstances, members often lose interest and committees cease to function effectively. Approaches need to be developed to maximise the economic opportunities of low-earning conservancies by re-building wildlife populations, establishing new tourism products and markets and by exploring other innovative forms of income generation. In some conservancies, more focus could be placed on managing resources such as water, grazing, timber and non-timber forest products. Chapter 5 gives more attention to the overall challenges facing CBNRM and some of the means for addressing these challenges.
Namibia’s communal conservancies

KEY EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF CBNRM AND CONSERVANCIES

Early 1980s Local leaders, Nature Conservation staff and NGOs agreed to start the Community Game Guard system in north-west Namibia to curb poaching of wildlife. This was the first CBNRM activity in Namibia.

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

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

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

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

1996 Parliament passed the new conservancy legislation for communal areas.

1998 The first communal area conservancies were gazetted. A workshop was held to plan and launch a national CBNRM coordinating body.

September 1998 Official public launch of Namibia’s Communal Area Conservancy Programme by His Excellency the President, Sam Nujoma. On behalf of Namibia and the CBNRM programme, the President received the WWF International award for ‘Gift to the Earth’ in recognition of the value and uniqueness of the conservancy programme.

August 1999 The 2nd phase of the LIFE Programme started. This was to last a further five years.

July 2000 The CBNRM Association of Namibia, CAN, (consisting of MET and NGOs) was established. It was later renamed the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO).

2001 The Forest Act was passed by parliament.

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

October 2004 The ICEMA, LIFE Plus and IRDNC Kunene /Caprivi CBNRM Support Projects were launched.

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

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

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

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

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

February 2006 The first 13 community forests were gazetted in terms of the Forest Act.

2007 Cabinet approved the National Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land


2009 The number of communal conservancies gazetted increased to 59. CBNRM generated N$ 42.48 million in benefits during 2009, of which N$ 35.02 million came from registered conservancies. A record 29 joint-venture (JV) tourism agreements were in place.
## AWARDS

Regional and international interest in the CBNRM programme continues to grow, as an increasing number of high profile delegations visits Namibia to study and learn from its experience. The Namibian CBNRM programme also hosted the Regional CBNRM Best Practices Conference in March 2003, drawing 158 representatives from 11 countries. A host of awards from international, regional and Namibian organisations have recognised the success and progress made in developing CBNRM and conservancies in communal areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobsohn (IRDNC): Goldman Grass-roots Environmental Prize for Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Republic of Namibia: WWF Gift to the Earth Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Benny Roman (Torra Conservancy): Namibia Professional Hunting Association (NAPHA) Conservationist of the Year Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Patricia Skyer (NACSO): WWF Woman Conservationist of the Year Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Patricia Skyer (NACSO): Conde Nast Traveller Magazine’s 2002 Environmental Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobsohn (IRDNC): Cheetah Conservation Fund Conservationist of the Year Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>King Taaipopi (Uukwahuudhi Conservancy) and Chris Eyre (MET): Namibia Nature Foundation Environmental Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Chris Weaver (WWF/LIFE): Namibia Professional Hunting Association (NAPHA) Conservationist of the Year Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Torra Conservancy: 2004 UNDP Equator Prize for the best Community Environmental Project in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Beaven Munali (IRDNC Caprivi): Go Green Environmental Award, Nedbank Namibia and Namibia Nature Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Anton Esterhuizen (IRDNC Kunene): Namibia Professional Hunting Association (NAPHA) Conservationist of the Year Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Chief Mayuni (Mafwe Traditional Authority, Caprivi): Go Green Environmental Award, Nedbank Namibia and Namibia Nature Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Dorothy Wamunyima (Namibia Nature Foundation): River Eman Catchment Management Association’s Water Award, SIDA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2

Income, livelihoods and development

Conservation successes outside state protected areas depend on the benefits that local people gain from the natural resources being conserved.

The benefits need to (a) substantially outweigh the costs associated with conservation, such as living with potentially destructive wildlife, and (b) be competitive with other forms of land use, thereby making it economically attractive to set aside land for wildlife and other natural resource management. When strong linkages are created between conservation goals and the economic value of natural resources, one can talk about market-based conservation – conservation that delivers significant economic returns while safeguarding the environment.

As discussed in the Introduction, people living in the communal areas of Namibia depend on the land and the natural resources around them for their survival. Here, livelihoods are generally composed of a mixture of activities, including livestock herding and crop production, complemented by cash income from wages, trade and government pensions.

Over the last decade and a half, the CBNRM programme has increasingly delivered on one of its central aims: improving the livelihoods of rural people through the sustainable use of natural resources. The programme is contributing an ever-increasing percentage of benefits to the livelihood strategies of people in communal areas – where economic opportunities were historically very limited. Conservancies and community forests have provided formal structures to generate benefits from indigenous natural resources and are allowing people to diversify their livelihoods and improve their wellbeing (Figure 4).
The data on total benefits presented in Figure 4 and Table 2 is divided into two categories: benefits generated within conservancies and benefits from CBNRM activities that fall outside conservancies. In addition, the data is disaggregated between cash income (mainly as cash to conservancies or to households within conservancies in the form of wages) and non-cash benefits that can be reflected in monetary values (for example, game meat). While some information on benefits within community forests is provided in the Community Forest Focus in this chapter, the main focus is on conservancies.

Most benefits from CBNRM have been generated within conservancies, with the ‘earning power’ of conservancy-based activities being much greater than that of all other CBNRM activities. In 2009, conservancies generated over N$ 35.02 million in benefits, which represents over 82% of the total CBNRM income of N$ 42.48 million.

CBNRM INCOME OUTSIDE CONSERVANCI ES

Figure 4 and Table 2 show additional incomes of more than N$ 7 million from CBNRM activities outside conservancies. Some small amounts generated within conservancies came from enterprises that had no formal relationship with the conservancies. Most of the income was generated by thatching grass (N$ 2,269,381 to 3,070 people) followed by crafts (N$ 1,956,784 of which N$ 1,499,291 went directly to 1,616 producers) small tourism enterprises such as campsites, cultural villages and guiding (N$ 1,795,658), JV tourism contributions outside conservancies (N$ 791,951), veld products (N$ 501,623 to 3,000 people) and community forests (N$ 143,759). The reduction in CBNRM income outside conservancies is partly because some income is now captured in newly registered conservancies.

Table 2. The total value of income each year to conservancies and other CBNRM activities not related to conservancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash income to conservancies (N$)</th>
<th>Non-cash income to conservancies (N$)</th>
<th>Income from other CBNRM activities (N$)</th>
<th>Total (N$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>568,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>568,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>860,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>860,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>592,467</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559,309</td>
<td>1,151,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>980,724</td>
<td>537,412</td>
<td>921,687</td>
<td>2,439,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,138,258</td>
<td>831,200</td>
<td>1,441,802</td>
<td>3,411,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,741,124</td>
<td>639,610</td>
<td>2,743,461</td>
<td>6,124,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,110,734</td>
<td>1,965,086</td>
<td>4,054,132</td>
<td>11,129,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,692,037</td>
<td>1,006,148</td>
<td>4,804,870</td>
<td>13,503,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7,887,450</td>
<td>1,748,480</td>
<td>4,881,537</td>
<td>14,517,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10,436,142</td>
<td>3,310,422</td>
<td>6,199,204</td>
<td>19,943,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14,506,221</td>
<td>4,539,632</td>
<td>7,132,551</td>
<td>26,178,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20,582,789</td>
<td>7,065,336</td>
<td>11,479,858</td>
<td>39,127,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26,010,255</td>
<td>6,486,754</td>
<td>9,391,853</td>
<td>41,888,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25,919,349</td>
<td>9,102,510</td>
<td>7,459,156</td>
<td>42,481,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL BENEFITS

The most significant benefit to individual people living in a conservancy comes in the form of direct employment in positions that have been created through CBNRM, most of which did not exist prior to the start of the programme.

In 2009, community-based natural resource management created around 1,669 formal jobs. The tourism industry provides most of the jobs within conservancies and is dealt with in greater detail in the Tourism Focus in this chapter. In 2009, the Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector provided 789 full-time and over 250 part-time jobs, most of which were filled by local community members. Such jobs in tourism represent great career opportunities, as staff can 'rise through the ranks' to the level of regional management or beyond, something that a number of community members have achieved.

Conservancies themselves are the second largest job creator, with all jobs being filled by local people. Conservancies are able to provide such employment through the income they generate from their resource management activities. Conservancies employed 406 staff using their own funds, while donor support covered the salaries of another 157 staff. Salambala, Nyae Nyae, Puros and Sesfontein Conservancies and the Kyaramacan Association also paid the salaries of staff employed at their enterprises, such as campsites, traditional villages and craft centres. The value of conservancy-funded jobs has increased tenfold from N$ 480,906 in 2003 to N$ 4,815,410 in 2009 (Figure 5). There has been a significant addition of administrative and managerial employees in recent years, because of the recognition that additional staff is needed for the effective management of conservancy finances.

Lastly, the trophy hunting industry provides significant employment for community members. In 2009, hunting operators employed approximately 14 full-time and 53 part-time staff, most of whom were local community members. The hunting industry, like the tourism industry, also plays an important role in capacity building within local communities. More detail on the trophy hunting industry is provided in the Trophy Hunting Focus in this chapter.

The harvesting of indigenous plant products presents important opportunities for individual community members to earn direct cash income for themselves. This opportunity to supplement other livelihood strategies has been especially important for women, who have traditionally been marginalised in their access to income opportunities. As international corporations search the globe for new biological ingredients for their products, an activity called

Figure 5. The main sources of incomes to households during 2009. Conservancy management embraces all conservancy jobs such as game guards, resource monitors and managers. Individual benefits from joint-venture tourism also come largely in the form of direct employment.
bio-prospecting, further opportunities are likely to open up. Such bio-prospecting needs to be carefully controlled and Namibia is taking steps to safeguard its resources from uncontrolled exploitation. While the harvesting of indigenous plant products falls under forestry legislation, conservancies are assisting in the management of the sector in areas where no community forest structures exist.

Although veld products generated little overall income for conservancies or community forests, they did provide a significant source of cash income to individuals. In 2009, the sector generated N$ 568,361 for 938 people in conservancies. Most of this came from the harvesting and marketing of devil’s claw tubers, *Commiphora* resin and to a smaller extent from marula oil, Kalahari melon seed, mopane seed and *Ximenia*. The growth of the sector is likely to continue, as the demand for natural products grows in developed countries, especially for products certified as ‘fair trade’ and harvested locally in a sustainable manner.

The collection and sale of firewood is rapidly increasing, as the demand from the tourism industry increases. The roadside sales of firewood to tourists on camping safaris, especially in the north-west, have grown significantly in recent years. Income from sales is currently only documented where these occur within community forests, as the use of this resource falls under forestry legislation. Outside community forests, the sector is neither documented nor managed to ensure sustainability. In the many areas where community forest structures currently do not exist, conservancies may need to address the issue to avoid over-utilisation.

Craft production and sales represent another important sector through which individual community members can improve their financial situation. In 2009, documented craft income totalled N$ 1,233,047, although the actual figure is significantly higher, as data from the sales of countless informal craft outlets is not collected. Craft sales do not depend on conservancies and community forests, so the linkage between craft sales and CBNRM might not always be immediately apparent. However, conservancy and community forest management of natural resources, especially wildlife, creates the basis for the Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector, which in turn provides the market for craft products. In addition, most crafts are produced from locally obtained natural materials.

In addition to the above incomes which individuals can earn for themselves within conservancies, many conservancies also distribute benefits such as game meat or in some cases cash.
Within the Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector, there are now 29 formal joint-venture (JV) lodges and campsites, and one JV safari operator, who work in collaboration with their host communities. In addition, there are four JVs operating in principle with a signed agreement pending, and another nine ventures with whom the conservancies are negotiating.

All JVs in communal conservancies combined represent 1,356 bed nights, 789 full-time jobs and over 250 seasonal positions. The number of joint-venture lodge agreements has increased by 111% since 2005.

At the epicentre of tourism in communal conservancies is the relationship between each conservancy and their private sector partners, formalised through joint-venture agreements. This relationship is critical to the growth and development of the sector.

There is a wide mix of joint-venture models throughout the country, ranging from simple ‘lease fee’ agreements to those that incorporate ‘community equity’, where the conservancy is an actual shareholding partner in the venture.

The predominant model in Namibia has been a ‘build, operate and transfer’ (BOT) approach. This relies on 100% investment by a private sector partner who builds and operates the lodge for a period normally ranging between 15 and 30 years. The agreement usually includes a fee ranging from 5-10% of net income, a guaranteed minimum payment to the conservancy, an empowerment plan indicating training and staff development programmes, and an environmental management plan.

In this approach, the private sector partner provides all capital (and holds any debt obligation), creates access to the market and provides management expertise. The conservancy provides access to the land (leasehold), manages wildlife and other natural resources, ensures local community support for tourism and provides local labour.

**100% Private Sector Investment: White Lady Lodge**

The Tsieb Conservancy has partnered with a private business to open the White Lady Lodge. The agreement is typical of a Build–Operate–Transfer model, where the lodge is owned by the private sector partner for an initial 20 years, after which the assets will transfer in full to the conservancy. The JV agreement requires the owner to pay

---

*Joint-venture tourism provides the largest overall source of benefits to conservancies.*

**TOURISM FOCUS**

Unlocking Namibia’s Comparative Advantage: The Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector
a minimum amount each month to the conservancy. As occupancy and revenue increase, the conservancy will also receive a percentage of profits. Payment from the White Lady Lodge is the largest revenue stream the conservancy has at present.

100% Community Investment: Grootberg Lodge
Grootberg Lodge is a partnership between the Khoadi-/Hôas Conservancy and a tourism management company, EcoLodgistix. In this case, the conservancy was given access to ‘community equity’ financing from the EU-funded Namibia Tourism Development Programme. The lodge was built using 100% community equity and is therefore fully owned by the conservancy. However, the conservancy decided to contract a management company to manage the lodge on their behalf – EcoLodgistix.

The initial management agreement was for five years with a renewal option. The lodge is performing well and both partners have signed an MOU to carry on working together for another five years. Given that the management partner was only required to borrow capital for moveable assets and initial operational costs, the levy was negotiated at a higher level of net income than the BOT model. In addition, the agreement contains clauses that ensure training of staff and promotion of local staff to management level positions.

The lodge currently employs 31 full-time staff, with all but the General Manager coming from the local community. Outside of government, the lodge is the largest employer in the conservancy. It is also the largest source of conservancy benefits.

Partial/Joint Shareholding in Lodge Development: Damaraland Camp
Damaraland Camp is a partnership between the Torra Conservancy and Wilderness Safaris.

As per original agreement, Wilderness Safaris began to gift an annual 20% equity in the business to the Torra Conservancy after 10 years. At the end of 15 years, Torra thus owned the lodge 100%. Wilderness were then offered, and purchased, 60% of Damaraland Camp back from Torra and are now operating as equity partners, with the JV leasing the land from the conservancy for a fee based on a percentage of revenue. Both parties have since invested their own capital to upgrade Damaraland Camp, with the community using the cash earned from selling a portion of their lodge. This ‘community capital’ came from the deal struck with Wilderness Safaris and involved no outside donor or lender.

From its beginnings, Damaraland Camp has been breaking down traditional perceptions of how JVs should operate. Not only was it the first example of a conservancy choosing to become equity partners in a JV, Damaraland Camp also had the first black woman Camp Manager in Namibia – Pascolena Florry, the daughter of a local goat herder who grew up in the conservancy.

These successes are shifting the pendulum of expectations about how communal conservancies and the private sector can work together. At the same time, they are re-crafting the image of Namibia as a global leader in achieving both conservation and community development objectives – a comparative advantage for the destination that is Namibia.

Challenges and Lessons Learnt
Branding the sector – the overall campaign to ‘brand’ and market the Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector is taking root, but will require ongoing efforts to fully engrain this product as a ‘comparative advantage’ for Namibia

Policy constraints – although progressive, current policy and legislation does not create an enabling environment for tourism investment in communal areas

Financial and business barriers – in addition to policy constraints, two further barriers constrain investment and tourism growth in conservancies – access to investment capital and a lack of conservancy understanding and capacity in tourism and business

Use of and payment for tourism resources – most operators and independent tourists are currently enjoying amazing tourism experiences in communal areas for little or no payment; there is a need to increase consumer awareness of these resources and ensure that a fair payment is made to conservancies for such experiences

Capacity of Business and Tourism Support Providers – although improving, partner NGOs and government agencies require further capacity development in terms of business and tourism skills

Private sector involvement – the involvement of the private sector in conservancies is improving all the time, but requires further facilitation. Apart from a limited number of progressive operators, many still lack the understanding or confidence to exploit tourism opportunities in communal areas in equitable ways

Sharing lessons learned – there is a need to continually strive to capture and disseminate key lessons learned both from a technical and policy perspective; exchanges can help ensure much of the ‘learning’ isn’t lost
payments to individual members of the conservancy. The value of all game meat (trophy hunting and own-use) distributed to conservancy members amounted to N$ 5,004,055 in 2009, while N$ 937,382 in cash payments were made to individual community members, households and villages.

The CBNRM programme has clearly created a variety of direct and significant economic opportunities for individual community members, many of which did not exist in the past (Figure 5). Nonetheless, when considering the number of people living in conservancies and the area conservancies cover, it becomes clear that more people need to be reached by individual benefits. People currently falling outside the sphere of direct benefits are often affected by some of the costs of conservation, such as living with destructive wildlife. This is leading to frustration and disgruntlement and may undermine some of the successes the CBNRM programme is achieving.

The potential exists to further expand the opportunities for individuals, especially by opening up new employment and business options through innovative approaches (for example by supplying more goods and services to the tourism and hunting industries). A better understanding of natural resources, potential and existing markets, as well as improved training amongst community members are also key factors in expanding on current individual benefits.

While the benefits described above go directly to individuals, a large portion the overall income generated from the largest sectors such as tourism and hunting goes into conservancy funding and community initiatives.

**COMMUNITY BENEFITS**

Conservancies and community forests create the ability to channel a variety of income from communal resources into community benefits while at the same time ensuring the health of the resource base through monitoring and management.

Members have a direct say in how conservancy income is used and Chapter 4 provides information on how some of the challenges of financial management and planning are being met, and how conservancies now respond more effectively to the needs of their members. Some of the uses of conservancy income are discussed in more detail under the heading Rural Development, below.

A total of 39 conservancies and the Kyaramacan Association earned some cash income during 2009. Nine conservancies earned N$ 500,000 or more in cash, 13 conservancies earned between N$ 100,000 and N$ 500,000 and 17 conservancies earned less than N$ 100,000. As both the amount and the sources of income grow, conservancies face increasing challenges in managing all their income. Figure 6 gives an overview of the variation in sources and amounts of income in a selection of conservancies from different parts of the country.

Before conservancies or community forests can spend money on community projects or distribution to individual households, they need to be able to cover their own operational expenses in order to ensure that the resource
Table 3. There is a steady increase in the number of conservancies covering their own operational costs. Due to loss of income in 2008 and 2009, Sorri-Sorris Conservancy and the Kyaramacan Association were unable to cover all of their costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Conservancies covering 1 – 49% of annual operational costs</th>
<th>Number of Conservancies covering 50 - 99% of annual operational costs</th>
<th>Number of Conservancies covering 100% of annual operational costs</th>
<th>List of Conservancies covering 100% of annual operational costs</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uibasen-Twyelfontein</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Torra</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salambala, Nyae Nyae, Doro Inawas, Kwandu, Mayuni, Wuparo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>No disaggregated data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>#Khoadi-/Hôas, #Khoact-/Hôas, Balyerwa, #Sorri-Sorris, #Ndakala, #Kyaramacan Association</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mashi, Sorri-Sorris, Tsiseb, Kasika, Marienfluss, Kyaramacan Association</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Puros, Sobbe, Balyerwa, [Sorri Sorris] [Kyaramacan Association]</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Puros, Sobbe, Balyerwa, [Sorri Sorris] [Kyaramacan Association]</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Uukwaluudi, Sesfontein, [Sorri Sorris] [Kyaramacan Association]</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been a steady increase in the number of financially independent conservancies, from only four in 2003 to 20 in 2009 (Table 3). Due to the loss of trophy hunting income to the Kyaramacan Association in 2008 and 2009, it was not able to finance its own running cost in these years (see further information in the Trophy Hunting Focus in this chapter).

Joint-Venture Tourism provides the largest overall source of benefits to conservancies. In addition, increased tourism generally results in a variety of new and expanded services and increases commerce in an area. The sector generated N$ 19,979,916 in 2009 (Figure 7 & Table 4). This income can be disaggregated into a number of categories and includes the individual wages discussed above (N$ 10,269,119), as well as a variety of in-kind benefits such as food, housing and related amenities, and other contributions such as transport, medical assistance, education materials, equipment and bursaries. Such contributions are often made by joint venture partners and totalled an estimated N$ 4,098,455 in 2009. Cash payments to conservancies, made as part of revenue sharing contracts with private operators, make up N$ 5,612,343 of the total benefits of the sector.

A similar portion of cash income to cover the running costs of conservancies tends to come from the trophy hunting industry. Lucrative hunting concessions provide significant cash income to conservancies. N$ 5,435,518 of the overall benefits of N$ 7,515,236 from trophy hunting in 2009 (Figure 7 & Table 4) was in the form of cash payments to conservancies. Other benefits are employment and the distribution of the meat from hunted animals discussed above (N$ 1,790,325).

Although meat distributed from trophy hunting is an ‘in-kind’ income, it provides a very direct benefit to members and the community. Apart from its nutritional
Figure 6. There is great variation between conservancies in how much they earn and what their sources of revenue are, with some depending largely on one kind of income while others have diverse enterprises. The histograms indicate how incomes have changed over the years and the pie diagrams show the different sources of income for each conservancy during 2009. Information is shown for a selection of 14 conservancies. Note that N$ values on the y-axes differ between some conservancies.
The National Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land, which was developed by the Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET), and approved by the Namibian Cabinet in November 2007, allows conservancies which have been negatively affected by national parks to benefit directly from those parks through the award of tourism and wildlife concessions. This policy is unique in the southern African region as it proactively and innovatively addresses significant challenges for rural communities living next to parks, such as unemployment and poverty, loss of human life, stock losses or crop damage from dangerous or destructive wildlife, and a reduction of livelihood options.

Before concessions can be awarded, the MET needs to be certain that a viable business opportunity exists, and this is determined through a tourism plan or feasibility study. Once a concession opportunity has been confirmed, a conservancy may officially apply for this using the guidelines provided by the MET Concessions Unit. If approved, the conservancy is awarded a ‘head concession contract’, which may entitle or require them to either implement the concession themselves, or enter into a ‘concession operator contract’ with a private partner who has the financial resources and expertise required to fully develop the concession. For all new concessions awarded directly to conservancies inside protected areas, the appointment of a third-party operator will require a tender process to be conducted. This is to ensure transparency, obtain fair market value for the concession, and to allow the general public an opportunity to compete for the opportunity.

Importantly, the MET has agreed in many cases to significantly reduce the concession fee payable by conservancies to the State. This allows the conservancies to benefit financially from concessions by reaping the difference between market-related concession fees obtained from the third-party operator and the reduced amount paid to the MET. Furthermore, the conservancy is able to set empowerment obligations for the concession to ensure preferential employment of local people, skills development and other social investments by the third-party operator.

The policy is thus enabling communities living adjacent to national parks to gain substantial benefits from state protected areas, from which they were disenfranchised in the past. This creates an environment of ‘friendly park neighbours’ who support the conservation efforts of the State. As conservancies also practice sustainable wildlife management and create buffer zones around and connectivity between parks, the protected area network in Namibia is significantly strengthened by these developments.
value, the distribution of meat strengthens local support for wildlife and conservancies, because people see the link between wildlife and conservation in the form of a tangible, immediate benefit. The quota setting that regulates off-take and ensures sustainability of this sector is discussed in Chapter 3.

The aspect of capacity building and skills transfer from both the tourism and trophy hunting industries was already touched on under individual benefits, above, and also represents an important community benefit. Communities have the opportunity to ‘grow into’ both sectors and over time should be able to run community-owned tourism and trophy hunting businesses with little outside assistance. More detail is provided in the focus on both sectors and some of the current challenges of true community-based tourism are touched on below.

Conservancies also generate income and in-kind benefits for their communities through a variety of own activities that do not directly involve private sector operators. Currently, the most important of these is the harvesting of wildlife resources. Own-use harvesting of wildlife for meat generated an approximate value of N$ 3,153,750 for communities in 2009. Own-use hunting is also vital in reinforcing the importance of wildlife management as a central part of rural life. Traditionally, most communities practiced hunting to secure meat, a right that was suppressed during the colonial period. Today, own-use hunting supplies meat for traditional authorities, cultural festivals and distribution to individual households, thereby reinstating traditional community linkages to and values associated with wildlife.

Shoot-and-sell hunting allows conservancies to harvest meat from surplus wildlife stocks for sale to butcheries or individuals.
outside the conservancy. This can be an important source of cash income and generated N$ 1,367,986 for conservancies in 2009. Some of the logistical challenges conservancies face during the harvesting of game are discussed in Chapter 3. The overall value of harvested meat from trophy hunting, own-use and shoot-and-sell harvesting is shown in comparison to other income in Figure 7 and Table 4.

Live capture and sale of surplus game is another income option open to conservancies. Rapid growth in wildlife numbers has allowed some conservancies to initiate capture operations and sell wildlife to other conservancies or private landowners. The capture operations are handled by professionals and the cost thereof becomes part of the transaction between seller and buyer. Sale of live game generated N$ 263,760 in income to conservancies in 2009. In addition to generating income, the translocation of surplus wildlife into areas with low populations is assisting the rapid recovery of overall wildlife stocks in Namibia.

All of these consumptive use options are subject to annual quotas granted to conservancies, based on continuous monitoring of the resource base. The systems and challenges of ensuring sustainability of such activities are discussed in Chapter 3.

Community-based tourism is a sector that has received a lot of attention in Namibia over the last two decades. True community-based tourism initiatives are those where local communities operate their own enterprises. There are numerous community tourism enterprises within as well as outside conservancies. While delivering some revenue and providing some employment, such enterprises have not always reached their full potential. Two factors have created significant challenges. Firstly, local communities seldom have enough tourism experience for suitable product development and are not in a position to do sound marketing or create linkages to international operators. Secondly, enterprises are often not managed effectively, as management tends to be dictated by community interest rather than business principles. Thus, income generated from camping sites and other community-based tourism enterprises provided less than 3 % of total income (N$ 915,827) to conservancies in 2009.

The concept of ‘growing into’ the industry through joint-venture agreements (discussed above as well as in the Tourism Focus in this chapter), rather than communities setting out on their own in developing tourism enterprises appears to be a good approach. While communities have received significant support in recent years in the development of enterprises such as community camp sites and self-catering lodges and some excellent products have been developed, both management and marketing remain significant challenges.

The discussed range of benefits and incomes has significant potential for expansion. More engagement with the private sector represents the greatest opportunities. In the tourism industry, few mobile operators currently share the benefits they generate from operating in communal areas with the people living there. There are also still a number of accommodation establishments who are not sharing revenue with conservancies. Improved management of current activities and a greater understanding of natural resource potential and markets are again keys to unlocking further value.

It must also be mentioned that while CBNRM delivers the above benefits, the sudden introduction of new sources of income into an area can cause community conflicts. In some emerging conservancies such conflicts, where different community factions struggle over control, may threaten the conservancy formation process. It is vital that support organisations assist in resolving such conflicts.

The effective management of generated income can be another serious challenge for conservancies and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4. How some of the income is used is dealt with in more detail under the heading Rural Development, below.

Conservancies with thousands or even tens of thousands of members may also find it difficult or impossible to provide meaningful benefits to individual households. But this should not mean that these conservancies are inferior. The focus in such conservancies should be on projects that benefit the overall community.

Finally, conservancies create a great variety of less measurable community benefits such as increasing the participation of women in decision-making, supporting initiatives to combat HIV/AIDS, creating a sense of community pride and ownership over resources, and increasing community awareness of issues. Conservancies strengthen local level democracy and understanding, create awareness of business and sustainability issues, open opportunities for entrepreneurship and generally diversify livelihoods, thereby reducing people’s vulnerability. Some of these benefits are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.
Hunting concessions in communal conservancies and national parks offer trophy hunting operators an unparalleled opportunity to develop genuine hunting products in unfenced, wild areas. Concessions in various parts of the country include the most sought after trophy species such as buffalo, leopard, lion and elephant, as well as a diversity of plains game. Hunting is carried out in the spectacular, vast landscapes that conservancies offer. In addition, clients are able to meet local communities and engage in cultural interchange.

At the same time, hunting concessions provide conservancies that manage valuable wildlife resources with vital sources of income. The rapid manner in which conservancies can secure benefits from wildlife through trophy hunting is a key driver in conservancy formation. Off-take quotas are set soon after conservancy registration, allowing conservancies to quickly seek private sector partners to market and manage their lucrative trophy hunting concessions. In most instances, a newly registered conservancy can start receiving income from trophy hunting concessions.

Lucrative trophy hunting concessions provide significant cash income to conservancies.
hunting within four months of registration. The immediacy of the income and affiliated benefits (meat, employment, etc.) is a crucial reward to communities who may take two years or longer to secure conservancy registration. In 2009, 32 trophy hunting concessions provided N$ 7,515,236 in benefits to 37 conservancies. The increase in the number of conservancies practicing trophy hunting tends to run parallel to the increase in registered conservancies, an indication of the importance of the sector.

Conservancies enter into direct agreements with trophy hunting operators, either through individual negotiations or a tender process, facilitated by support organisations. Negotiations and tenders include the price for a fixed quota of huntable animals, as well as other benefits provided by the operator, such as employment and training, or the development of infrastructure. A distinction is usually made between a ‘guaranteed quota payment’ for a mix of high value species and some plains game, which the operator must utilise, and an additional ‘optional quota payment’ for additional numbers of the less valuable species, which the operator can utilise if he is able to sell the additional trophy animals to his clients. The timeframe for a concession agreement tends to be three to five years to allow the operator to market the area. This has been reduced by conservancies in recent years, as conflicts with some operators have decreased the willingness to enter into longer contracts.

The Kyaramacan Association is a unique version of the conservancy model operating in Bwabwata National Park, which has benefited from some of the most lucrative hunting concessions in Namibia. Legislation only allows for the registration of conservancies on communal land and not in national parks. Residents living in what was then the West Caprivi Game Reserve formed the Kyaramacan Association, which was registered in 2006. The Association began benefiting from the trophy hunting concessions in the park in 2006, sharing the overall concession income equally with MET. This provided the Kyaramacan Association with an income of N$ 2.43 million during 2006 and 2007. Additional benefits included meat distribution from hunted animals and the employment of 17 community members. Unfortunately, the concession was not re-awarded to the Kyaramacan Association in 2008 or 2009 due to a mixture of bureaucratic delays and misconduct by a private operator during tender negotiations. This loss of income has been a major problem for the local community and is reflected in a slightly slower growth in the national income of the programme.

Hunting also plays a vital role in areas not suitable for tourism, as the sector does not depend on the same degree of accessibility or immediacy of attractions as the tourism industry. On the other hand, it is possible to balance hunting and tourism in a conservancy through effective zoning. Ideally, a part of a conservancy is zoned for specific and often exclusive hunting use to avoid conflicts with other sectors.

Due to the much lower volume of clients, hunting does not create the same amount of employment that the tourism industry does. Nonetheless, the trophy hunting industry provides important jobs and valuable capacity building within conservancies. Over the last decade, 12 community game guards have been trained to become hunting guides and are now in a position to guide clients, and over time can develop their own hunting outfits. In addition, all hunting contracts stipulate that trackers and skinners are trained by the operators.

Key challenges for the trophy hunting industry include

- Increased awareness and understanding of the needs of the industry amongst communities, including an understanding that a successful hunting outfit requires specialised skills, not only in hunting and hospitality, but also in marketing and creating access to clients through participation in hunting trade fairs etc.
- Increased awareness and understanding of the needs and dynamics of local communities amongst hunting operators, many of whom are used to operating on their own private land, where conditions are very different.
- Greater transparency and due diligence by conservancies in the process of awarding hunting concessions to operators; ‘under the table’ deals have lead to conflicts, and have resulted in agreements that disadvantage the conservancy.
- Honouring of contracts, and especially of payment conditions, by hunting operators; in 2009, outstanding payments from hunting operators posed a significant challenge for conservancies and support organisations.
- Improved coordination amongst, and management of, the different types of utilisation such as trophy hunting, own-use hunting, shoot-and-sell and live-capture-and-sale; indiscriminate utilisation can reduce trophy quality and thus the value of a hunting concession.
- Increased general awareness of the benefits of the industry; trophy hunting continues to carry a stigma, as people who do not understand the industry find it difficult to reconcile conservation of wildlife with trophy hunting; unfortunately, hunters have at times been their own worst enemy – careless operators have shot valuable individual animals collared for research purposes and have created negative publicity through unethical practices.
**RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

When one considers the variety of benefits being generated, it becomes clear that CBNRM has created a new rural economy in the communal areas of Namibia.

CBNRM is recognised by the Namibian government as contributing to national development goals for both the environment (Table 10 Chapter 3) and socio-economic development, including the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, and job creation (Table 5), as set out in the National Development Plan 3 (NDP3), Rural Poverty Reduction Strategy and Vision 2030.

CBNRM is creating jobs and providing an ever-increasing range of business opportunities to rural Namibians. The growth of various sectors such as tourism and trophy hunting shows how conservancies are beginning to unlock the value of natural resources (Figure 8). The drop in trophy hunting income in 2009 can be attributed mainly to the fact that the Kyaramacan Association did not generate income from its concessions in Bwabwata National Park, discussed in more detail in the Trophy Hunting Focus.

Conservancies are also becoming important spenders within the rural economy, channelling funds generated from natural resource management to communities. Prior to the establishment of conservancies, the revenue generated by tourism and other sectors was significantly less, and almost all of it was drawn out of the area by businesses based in urban centres. Now, an increasing proportion of generated revenue stays within conservancies.

N$ 32,235,149 was spent by conservancies in 2009, the money broadly going to either the management of conservancies or as wages and benefits to member households. Revenue was...
Spending by conservancies has grown more than five-fold since 2003, rising from a total of N$ 6,352,886 to N$ 32,235,149 in 2009. Disbursed in 46 of the 59 registered conservancies and the Kyaramacan Association; the remaining 13 more recently established conservancies had no income or expenditure. While several conservancies receive support from donors and a few conservancies have avoided operational costs by keeping management to a minimum (as in Oskop), the N$ 32,235,149 spent by conservancies excludes any spending by donors or other support agencies.

Conservancies spent approximately N$ 11,944,025 of their own income on conservancy management to cover running costs, capital developments and the employment of staff in 2009 (Figures 9 & 10). This amounted to approximately 37% of all conservancy funds disbursed.

Annual operational expenditure ranged between N$ 939,287 and N$ 900 in different conservancies during 2009. These amounts covered the running of vehicles, salaries and associated benefits for conservancy managers, community game guards, community resource monitors, field officers and administrative staff, allowances for committee members, costs of travel, meetings (for committees, staff and members), insurance, office administration and training activities.

As their revenue increases, conservancies are also funding more and more initiatives aimed at maintaining or uplifting general living conditions in rural areas and are hereby at times supplementing the work of government in providing services and support to rural communities. At the time of compiling this report, members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Economics, Natural Resources and Public Administration undertook a familiarisation visit to conservancies. The Chairman of the Committee applauded the initiative of conservancies in providing community support, but emphasised that they should not try to take over the duties of government in delivering primary services such as access to water, electricity and education. That conservancies have taken it upon themselves to provide some of these services shows their commitment to rural development.

Examples of activities and infrastructure funded by conservancies during 2009 include water supply to communities in the Nyae Nyae, Tsiseb and Uukolonkadhi-Ruacana Conservancies, equipment for the harvesting of devils claw tubers as well as purchase of agricultural seed in Nyae Nyae, bursaries for students and grants to schools, kindergartens and sports tournaments, funding of medical treatment, grants to the elderly, transport and funeral assistance for community members and a variety of other social activities in many conservancies. In addition, seven conservancies spent a total of approximately N$ 237,000 on the mitigation of human wildlife conflict through the HACCSIS scheme, discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.
Table 5. An overview of the contributions of CBNRM to development goals contained in the National Development Plan 3, particularly the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger.

### NDP 3 Goal: Eradication of extreme Poverty and Hunger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Contribution of CBNRM</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengthen &amp; diversify the agricultural base of poor rural communities through measures that diversity &amp; improve agricultural production to ensure food security and expanded livelihoods with attention to gender equity</td>
<td>Increased attention to conservation farming and holistic range management as part of CBNRM activities in conservancies.</td>
<td>Holistic range management practised in 6 conservancies. Conservation farming providing increased crop yields in Kyaramacan Association, K wandu, Mashi &amp; Balyerwa Conservancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure poor communities, particularly those in rural areas, are able to broaden their income base by participating in non-farming activities while maintaining environmental sustainability</td>
<td>CBNRM adds wildlife and tourism as land uses and provides new income generating opportunities.</td>
<td>19 community campsites, 5 official craft markets and 6 cultural villages in operation, as well as bee keeping, fish farming, poultry farming, horticulture and indigenous plant product harvesting as a result of CBNRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase access and improve quality of basic/general education in rural areas</td>
<td>Conservancies support education through funds for class rooms, meat for hostel children, accommodation for teachers, and support to mobile schools.</td>
<td>Conservancies contributed over N$ 89,000 in cash to education in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengthen &amp; sustain Namibia’s safety nets for the temporarily and chronically vulnerable, including people with disability and those affected by HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Many conservancies have their own HIV/AIDS policies and strategies and some support OVC.</td>
<td>23 registered conservancies have their own locally developed and implemented HIV/AIDS policies in place. Approximately 431 peer educators work in the 59 registered conservancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expand employment opportunities</td>
<td>Conservancies create additional jobs themselves, and many new jobs are created through joint-venture tourism &amp; hunting enterprises. Many conservancy-linked jobs are in remote areas where few other jobs are available.</td>
<td>Communal Conservancy Tourism Sector provided 789 full time and over 250 part time jobs in 2009. Conservancies employed 406 staff using their own funds, while donor support covered the salaries of another 157 staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thatching grass is a forestry resource generating significant benefits for individuals.*
Since its official launch in January 2008, the programme Community Forestry in Namibia (CFN) has contributed considerably to the improvement of rural livelihoods. The establishment of community-managed forest areas in nine different regions of the country (Caprivi, Kavango, Kunene, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshikoto, Oshana, Otjozondjupa and Omaheke) has proven to be an essential pillar of Namibia’s CBNRM programme.

Members of community forests not only derive important economic gains from the sustainable use of natural forest resources and profit from non-monetary prerogatives such as grazing rights and the rights to forest products for personal use, but also receive a variety of organisational benefits. As institutionalised user groups, community forests qualify for technical and financial support from various development programmes. Moreover, large community-managed forest areas play an important role in terms of environmental stability and nature conservation.

The concept of CFN rests on the assumption that sustainability can only be achieved by finding the right balance between economic gains, environmental and organisational benefits, as well as non-monetary advantages (see Illustration). Community forests are only viable as long as the community’s commitment to sustainable use and conservation is not eroded by an unsustainable quest for short-term benefits. It is the responsibility of the respective management bodies to keep their forest system in balance.

Community forests are enterprises capitalizing on the economic potential of forest resources. Income is generated through three core activities:
1. The issuing of permits and use-concessions
2. The marketing of (value-added) forest products
3. The marketing of ‘Non-Timber Forest Products’ (NTFP) and ‘Indigenous Natural Plants’ like devil’s claw, *Ximenia*, monkey oranges, manketti nuts and Kalahari melons

Namibian community forests have been generating a substantial income over recent years. In the Kavango Region for example, the four gazetted Community Forests Mbeyo, Ncaute, Ncamagoro and Ncumcara have generated a total of N$ 98 100 in 2009.

Income varies substantially between community forests, since the availability of resources, the efficiency of management procedures and the commitment of stakeholders differ. Illegal activities also matter – in areas where the illegal trade of forest products is flourishing, the value of those commodities is under strain.

Benefits are distributed at regular intervals and shared between traditional authorities, management bodies and communities according to a Benefit-Sharing Plan. Most funds are allocated to community development and invested in programmes such as the procurement of school uniforms, blankets for the needy or diesel for the community water pump.

The environmental benefits of community forests are manifold. Management bodies and communities are trained to focus on sustainable forest and habitat management practices to prevent forest degradation and soil erosion, stop the uncontrolled depletion of natural resources and protect wildlife habitats. Trees, shrubs and other indigenous natural plants are conserved for future generations. Awareness campaigns of various support organisations promote environmentally friendly harvesting practices and contribute to a better understanding of the importance of conservation while the Directorate of Forestry and other stakeholders in concerted efforts enable communities to prevent and control bushfires and fight conflagrations.

Even with regard to climate change, community forests play an important role. Since as much as 25% of the greenhouse gas driving global warming comes from the destruction of forests in developing countries every year, the conservation of large forest areas in Namibia directly contributes to the mitigation of the negative effects of climate change.
Figure 10. About N$ 32,235,149 of funds earned by conservancies was paid out in 2009. The histograms show disbursements in a selected number of conservancies. Payments for private sector and conservancy jobs have been pooled. Note that N$ values on the y-axes differ between some conservancies.
Lastly, by providing a natural resource management service over large tracts of land, conservancies and community forests are ensuring the health of the resource base on which much of the rural economy depends and which has great potential for expansion and growth. While direct, individual benefits to community members are very important, this overall management service is vital in ensuring long-term sustainability.

Tourists come to Namibia firstly to see wildlife in the stunning settings our country offers. Large tracts of land devoid of wildlife hold limited tourism potential. When large charismatic wildlife such as elephant, giraffe, rhino and buffalo, and most especially large predators such as lion, leopard, cheetah and wild dog are present, the tourism value soars. Trophy hunting can only be carried out in areas that have healthy game populations, although these might be areas with limited tourism value due to their inaccessibility or more monotonous landscapes. Craft sales depend on visitors drawn to the area by its attractions. Livestock herding is only truly productive if rangelands are healthy. The same holds true for a broad range of economic activities that depend either directly or indirectly on the natural resource base – and thus conservancies as entities which sustainably manage that resource base.

CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH

In addition to delivering the variety of incomes and livelihood contributions already discussed, the CBNRM programme contributes significantly to nation building by driving national economic growth and has a much broader reach than might be immediately apparent.

The total value of measurable benefits earned for communities by the CBNRM programme in 2009 was N$ 42,481,015, most of which was generated through conservancies. Yet, the programme also has an impact on the broader economy of the country, significantly exceeding this figure. The economic contributions of CBNRM extend beyond direct benefits to rural communities and support the development of the country as a whole. This national impact can be assessed by calculating the degree to which the programme increases national income by including all incomes earned by communities, government and the private sector as a consequence of CBNRM.

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

The initial direct benefits generated by conservancies and other CBNRM activities therefore induce impacts on the broader national economy, through so-called ‘linkage and multiplier’ effects. The calculation of these additional incomes...
is done using data from tourism and natural resource use surveys, data from the national wildlife, forest and tourism satellite accounts, detailed financial and economic enterprise models for tourism and natural resource use activities, as well as a national economic model, the social accounting matrix. The national income that is attributable to the CBNRM programme is thus significantly more – some 5.7 times more – than that earned directly within communities.

All the economic contributions described here may be termed contributions to net national income (NNI). The NNI can be defined as the value of goods and services that activities, CBNRM activities in this case, make available each year to the nation. In 2009, the NNI contribution by CBNRM reached approximately N$ 241 million, and the cumulative addition to NNI over the years that the programme has run has amounted to more than N$ 961 million. These figures were adjusted for inflation to be equivalent to the value of Namibia dollars in 2009.

Contributions made by CBNRM to NNI should also include adjustments for stock appreciation. This is the accumulated capital value of increasing wildlife numbers, to which conservancy management and conservation are making an important contribution. The incremental value of the animals produced is therefore seen as an extra economic benefit of conservancies. The animals’ value is taken as their monetary value ‘on the hoof’, in other words the value they could fetch if they were to be sold or harvested commercially. The total estimated cumulative value of increased wildlife populations between 1990 and 2009 adds up to an estimated N$ 220 million. These figures were again adjusted for inflation.

The capital stock values of wildlife are those attributed to growing numbers of wildlife in the north-west conservancy areas, and exclude values associated with the other areas for which suitable data are lacking. But the north-west figures are considered to provide at least an indication of the relative values of wildlife that have benefited from protection in conservancies. Evidence suggests that there have been substantial increases in wildlife stock values elsewhere, especially in the north-east. Care is needed in estimating capital stock values, because if other factors – such as good rainfall and other conservation activities – also contributed to the stock increases, the appreciation in values might not be due to conservancies alone and might thus be exaggerated. Besides stock values, further economic values could be

![Figure 11. Estimates of economic investment costs and economic benefits in term of national income over 19 years of CBNRM programme implementation.](image-url)
counted if adequate measures were available, including the
economic value of local management institutions and the
capacity which resulted from training provided to people
associated with conservancies.

The total value of NNI and increased capital value of wildlife
in north-western Namibia from 1990 to 2009 amounts to a
cumulative sum of about N$ 1,181 million. Figure 11 shows this
income. This is an impressive figure, which has been increasing
rapidly. But what investments have been made to achieve these
benefits? Figure 11 also shows the value of spending on the
CBNRM programme each year, which cumulatively adds up to
N$ 939 million of investment between 1990 and 2009. Donors
supplied most of the funds, while the MET and NGOs also
provided inputs, mainly as ‘in-kind’ contributions, such as staff,
vehicles and other kinds of support.

Table 6. Measures of economic efficiency – economic
rates of return and net present values – for the CBNRM
programme between 1990 and 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Rate of Return (ERR)</th>
<th>Net Present Value @6% (NPV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-100,692,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-31,907,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>94,523,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>222,481,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic merits of the programme spending can be
seen by comparing the investment in CBNRM to benefits
in terms of NNI and increasing annual stock asset values
in a cost-benefit analysis. This can provide an indication of
the degree to which the investment made in the CBNRM
programme has contributed overall to the national economy
and whether this investment has been economically efficient.
Table 6 shows economic rates of return and net present
values calculated 13, 15, 17, and 19 years after the start of
the programme.

In the first 13 years of the programme, costs exceeded
benefits, but in the following six years rapidly growing
benefits far exceed costs. Positive economic returns for
the programme (economic rate of return above 6% –
the estimated real discount rate) have become evident
during the latter years. Over the 19 years since 1990, the
programme has had an economic internal rate of return of
18 % and has earned an economic net present value of some
N$ 222 million. This is a very acceptable economic return
for a programme investment.

MAKING A GLOBAL CONTRIBUTION

While delivering the variety of immediate and tangible
benefits already described, conservancies and community
forests also provide an important service to the nation and
the world by maintaining healthy natural ecosystems.

By generating income that covers their own running costs,
many conservancies are able to do this without government
or donor support.

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

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

---

i  NNI is simply the gross national income (GNI) less any depreciation of capital assets. GNI is also roughly comparable with gross national product (GNP) and
the gross domestic product (GDP). Use was made of CBNRM enterprise models as well as the social accounting matrix (SAM) model for Namibia developed
by the Namibia Economic Policy Research Unit.

ii  It is noted that the values estimated for wildlife stock increases resulting from CBNRM have been restricted to the north-western conservancies. Ongoing
efforts to update and further develop Namibia’s wildlife resource accounts will ensure that, in the future, wildlife capital asset values due to CBNRM will be
fully and appropriately accounted for.
Natural resources are the main drivers of rural economic growth and development when their full potential is unlocked through modern, market-based conservation approaches.

Natural resources always form the basis of rural economies, because people in rural areas depend on natural resource use for their survival, be it through wildlife management and tourism, indigenous plant use, fisheries, agriculture, mining or a combination of these and other activities. The sustainable use of soils and water, wild animals and plants is thus at the heart of the CBNRM programme, because the wise, integrated use of these resources enables rural people to diversify their livelihoods and improve their socio-economic status while ensuring biodiversity conservation.

Rural communities have been using and managing natural resources for countless generations. Many traditional uses, including livestock herding, hunting for own use, harvesting of plant products, cropping and fishing, continue in conservancies and community forests today. However, changing aspirations driven by the modern world and human population growth are placing ever-increasing demands on natural resources in rural areas. In many places, this has led to serious levels of environmental degradation that have had severe impacts on people’s livelihoods.

One of the central challenges in natural resource management in conservancies and community forests is finding a balance between various resource uses while ensuring that modern aspirations can be met without
negative impacts on the environment. By maximising the benefits of sustainable natural resource use through smart, adaptive management that is responsive to business opportunities, rural communities can escape the descending spiral of declining resources, environmental degradation and poverty.

Through the active use of charismatic African wildlife and other valuable resources, conservancies and community forests have been able to gain new benefits from the environment, which lay largely untapped in the past. New uses, such as tourism, trophy hunting, sport fishing, craft production and the harvesting of indigenous plant products for niche markets, have diversified rural livelihoods. Importantly, the potential has only just begun to be realised. This chapter highlights how the CBNRM programme can further unlock the potential value of a wide range of natural resources to reduce poverty and create employment and wealth, whilst ensuring that resources are used sustainably and where necessary are rehabilitated.

The conservancy programme started with a wildlife focus, not because game is a more important resource than plants, fish or other natural assets, but because wildlife had drastically declined in the 1980s and because wildlife could produce tangible and competitive economic returns on investments. Its rehabilitation not only served a conservation objective, but presented many opportunities for rapidly unlocking potential benefits from the environment. In addition, wildlife was one of the key resources that local people had been dispossessed of during the colonial period. Conservancy legislation and the associated CBNRM programme returned these rights to communities.

MODERN, MARKET-BASED APPROACHES

The CBNRM programme has introduced modern approaches and technologies to enhance the value and improve the utilisation of wildlife and other natural resources.

Such approaches did not exist during pre-colonial days, when rural communities relied completely on the direct use of natural resources for their survival. Market-based conservation is not an attempt to return to some romantic ideal of pristine nature, but rather a modern approach that enables rural people to capitalise on Namibia’s global comparative and competitive advantages – its wildlife, scenery, cultures and service industries. This enables rural communities to significantly improve their socio-economic status while at the same time ensuring the long-term health of the resource base – the natural environment.

Today, sustainable use of wildlife through tourism, trophy hunting and more traditional own-use activities is a well-entrenched rural development strategy in Namibia. This is particularly valuable in communal areas where human development needs are high and the chances of making a decent living from traditional land uses are limited by low and erratic rainfall, infertile soils and limited access to markets and services.
Incomes from wildlife and other natural resources have proven to be substantial (see Chapter 2). The variety of benefits generated through sustainable natural resource use, for example cash income, meat supply, employment, transport, education, training and infrastructure development, add a new dimension to human development that traditional forms of resource use were not able to deliver on their own. Whilst many CBNRM activities are driven by efforts to derive more revenue from traditional uses, the benefits gained from modern sustainable use are significantly expanding economic opportunities in rural areas. The cultural value these modern uses deliver are also important, as they serve to keep communities in touch with the resources that their ancestors valued.

The conservancy structure is proving to be an effective organisational framework for managing a variety of communal resources in addition to wildlife. CBNRM activities such as holistic range management and minimum tillage conservation farming focus on adapting traditional agricultural practices to mitigate increasing human pressure on resources, while optimising returns from these activities. The development of the craft and thatch industries has successfully opened up new business opportunities. More recent work is providing an additional range of benefits through activities such as sport fishing and the sustainable harvesting of indigenous plant products used in the pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries. The Namibian government has responded through changes to the forestry and fisheries legislation, which now allow communities to increasingly utilise and manage these natural resources in a variety of ways, including the establishment of legal instruments such as fish reserves. See both the Community Fisheries Focus and Community Forest Focus in this chapter for more details.

The main focus of this chapter is on natural resource management systems and on information that quantifies conservation results and demonstrates the sustainability of the wider CBNRM programme. While some information on community forests is provided, the main focus is on conservancies. The income and benefits derived through the use of natural resources are captured in Chapter 2.

**ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

Effective management of natural resources is a key to both sustainability and maximising economic benefits.

Conservancies operate in large, open systems with highly variable climatic conditions. Rainfall is extremely sporadic. Ungulates move over vast areas following available grazing and browse; predators roam in search of prey; elephants follow ancient migration routes. While community forests mostly operate in smaller areas and deal with immobile resources, they are also faced with seasonal challenges such as fire and sporadic rainfall. The effects of climate change are likely to increase this variability. Adaptive management that takes changing circumstances into account is vital in such systems. Planning, monitoring and evaluation are thus core aspects of conservancy and community forest activities, as they allow for adaptive management through the strategic use of gathered information.

A variety of management and monitoring systems have been implemented in conservancies. Indeed, adaptive management has been critical in the evolution of the conservancy system. There are two main components to natural resource management. The first is staffing, and many people are now formally employed by conservancies to help manage natural resources. The involvement of local community members is vital and participation has grown ever since communities first appointed local people to look after wildlife in the north-west in the early 1980s. At the end of 2009, 57 conservancies had taken over the full responsibility of natural resource management in their areas, including the supervision of staff. 27 conservancies pay their staff from conservancy-generated funds, and thus no longer rely on donor support (see also Table 3, Chapter 2).

Most employees are called Community or Conservancy Game Guards, Community Rangers or Environmental Shepherds, and are the local agents responsible for natural resource monitoring. In some areas, women are employed as Community Resources Monitors to monitor plant resources such as plant foods, palms and dye plants used for basket weaving. All these staff report to conservancy committees or equivalent local structures.

A suite of tools aimed at collecting, evaluating and disseminating information to assist in decision-making forms the second component. This includes the Event Book System, wildlife censuses, a quota-setting system, and mapping services.

A mapping service was developed to enable conservancies, MET and supporting NGOs to generate detailed maps of their areas for registration, planning, management, monitoring and communication purposes. The first step is the establishment and mapping of area boundaries, which is important in publicly proclaiming the existence of a registered conservancy and the rights that go with its formation. The mapping support then generates maps that show important local features which are helpful for planning and monitoring. The entire mapping process is participatory, with community members being supported and trained to gather data that results in maps with local relevance and ownership.

A suite of tools aimed at collecting, evaluating and disseminating information to assist in decision-making forms the second component. This includes the Event Book System, wildlife censuses, a quota-setting system, and mapping services.

A mapping service was developed to enable conservancies, MET and supporting NGOs to generate detailed maps of their areas for registration, planning, management, monitoring and communication purposes. The first step is the establishment and mapping of area boundaries, which is important in publicly proclaiming the existence of a registered conservancy and the rights that go with its formation. The mapping support then generates maps that show important local features which are helpful for planning and monitoring. The entire mapping process is participatory, with community members being supported and trained to gather data that results in maps with local relevance and ownership.
The overall objective of the Community Forestry in Namibia (CFN) programme, based on the CBNRM model, is to improve forest resource management and the livelihoods of local people, by empowering communities through forestry usage rights. With the extension of the original programme to the entire country in 2008, the integration of community forestry with conservancies has become an important pillar of the CFN programme. The programme promotes a better understanding of the ecosystem approach through training and public awareness. It also initiates and facilitates empowerment, capacity-building, integrated land management and business development to assist the implementation of sustainable resource management.

Although conservancies and community forests originally evolved as separate components of Namibia’s CBNRM programme, both strategies aim to assist rural communities by strengthening their ability to manage their natural resources sustainably. In recent years, communities have expressed a growing interest in establishing both CBNRM components in the same area. This not only provides additional sources of income, but also offers opportunities for integrated ecosystem management.

Legal issues and the integration of management options for the use of different natural resources in the same or in adjacent areas are the main challenges for integrated community forests/conservancies. While conservancies have the rights to manage and utilise wildlife, people living in a community forest are allowed to use wood and non-wood forest products and issue permits for their commercial utilization.

Community forests calculate an “annual allowable cut” which is binding for a 5-10 year period and is based on a resource inventory. Inventories are done by community members under the guidance of the National Forestry Inventory (NFI) Department, who also analyse the data and compile inventory reports which form the crucial component of management plans.

Increased demand for integrated resource management is particularly obvious in areas where both valuable wildlife and forest resources occur. Communities hope to realise additional income opportunities through integration. Communities which were supported by NGOs in the past show an increased interest in utilising all available natural resources, as they know their value to tourism and biodiversity conservation.

Conflicts may arise because of increased land-use pressure and differing interest and priorities of people. Through registration as a conservancy or community forest, communities can implement their own by-laws and therefore have some power to exclude those who abuse land-use laws. In this context, grazing management and increased utilisation of forest produce for domestic use (e.g. fire wood, poles for kraals) are the most important issues.

While both conservancies and community forests follow similar approaches, they are based on different laws and regulations, implemented by different Ministries, and have specific technical requirements for resource management. Community forestry falls under the Forest Act (2001) and is the responsibility of MAWF, while conservancies fall under MET. In order to integrate both institutions in the same area, it is therefore necessary to harmonise constitutional arrangements and to develop joint management strategies.

The CFN programme currently works with 30 conservancies who want to integrate with community forests. Support organisations are working with communities to establish innovative approaches to integration, as there are few comparable experiences to learn from.

Indigenous trees may take many decades to grow to large sizes and harvesting must be carefully controlled to avoid over-utilisation.
The Event Book System is a highly successful management and monitoring tool that has been developed and introduced over the past nine years. This simple but rigorous monitoring system promotes conservancy involvement in the design, planning and implementation of natural resource monitoring. Each conservancy decides what resources it needs to monitor while bearing in mind issues on which conservancies are obliged to report to MET. The resources or themes identified may include human wildlife conflict, poaching, rainfall, rangeland (veld) condition, predators and bush fires, and a variety of others. Increasingly, conservancies are monitoring a larger suite of resources such as plant foods (melon seed, mangetti nuts, marula oil), palms, fish, honey, rangeland, and even livestock.

For each topic selected for monitoring, there is a complete system that begins with data collection, goes through monthly reporting and includes long-term reporting. Every year, an annual ‘audit’ of the system is conducted where all data is collated and compiled into a conservancy’s Annual Natural Resource Report, which is sent to the MET and provided to NACSO to update its monitoring databases. At the end of 2009, the Event Book system was functioning in 47 registered conservancies and was rapidly expanding to
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**Figure 12.** Wildlife numbers in north-western Namibia have increased significantly over the past 25 years. Population estimates during the 1980’s and 1990’s were derived from aerial surveys (graphs at left indicating total population estimates) while the more recent figures are density estimates from the vehicle surveys of the annual North-West Game Count (graphs at right indicating number of animals recorded per 100 kilometres travelled). Note that the two census methods use very different methodologies and that the y-axes are different and not interchangeable. Current estimates for springbok indicate around 160,000 animals in the north-west.
include other natural resources. The basic concepts of the Event Book are also being applied to some small enterprises such as community campsites and craft sales. Due to its almost universal application, the system is now being ‘exported’ to state and private sector parks in Namibia, as well as to other countries in Africa and Asia.

In addition to day-to-day monitoring through the Event Book, most conservancies conduct periodic game censuses. The biggest of these is the North-West Game Count, which has been conducted annually over the past ten years (Figure 12) and is the largest road-based game count in the world. This includes all the conservancies and tourism concessions outside of national parks in the north-west. The count covers an area of around 6.6 million hectares and is undertaken as a joint exercise between conservancy members and staff, and MET and NGO staff. The same methodology has been expanded to conservancies and protected areas in the south of Namibia. Conservancies in other parts of Namibia also carry out annual game counts, but the methods differ to accommodate local conditions. The Nyae Nyae Conservancy performs an annual moonlight waterhole count, while conservancies in the north-east undertake foot counts. All census methods are intended to contribute to and work synergistically with other existing census methods, such as the aerial censuses conducted by MET.

All consumptive use of wildlife within conservancies is controlled through the allocation of annual quotas. A quota setting system has been used in conservancies since 1998. This is a consultative process coordinated by the MET with some support from NGOs. Annual quota setting meetings are held in each conservancy. They take into account both local knowledge and collected information, including game census and event book data, harvest returns and desired stocking rates of various species. The meetings allow discussion and information sharing, review a community’s vision for each species and encourage input from private sector operators active in the area. Through this process, the community agrees on a quota and how the harvest should be utilised, setting numbers for own-use, trophy hunting, shoot-and-sell or live-capture-and-sale. Conservancies then officially request their quotas from MET, and these are scrutinised and approved in Windhoek. Once approved, the quotas can be marketed by the conservancies to professional hunters, game capture operators and meat harvesting companies. The consumptive use of wildlife is discussed in more detail in the Sustainable Use Focus in this chapter.

A simple tool has been developed that provides a visual picture of the natural resource management performance of each conservancy. During the annual audits of conservancies undertaken in January of each year, progress in a number of key performance areas is scored against formal achievement ratings. This is used to develop two outputs: (i) a series of maps illustrating the comparative performance of conservancies; and (ii) a performance profile for each conservancy showing areas of strength and weakness (Figure 13). This allows support providers to more objectively target their interventions. The maps identify those conservancies most requiring support, whilst the conservancy performance profile enables particular areas of weakness to be quickly identified and addressed. The tool requires some further development and improvement, but early results are showing great promise.

A comprehensive digital information resource containing all conservancy and associated protected area information has been developed and expanded since the year 2000. Known as CONINFO, it comprises various databases, reports, maps, documents, posters, materials, manuals and decision support tools that conservancy support agents may require. It is freely available to all stakeholders. Considerable effort has been spent on the development of an interface to facilitate user access to the various data sets. Much of the information presented in this report has been compiled from various databases and files comprising CONINFO.
MANAGING HUMAN WILDLIFE CONFLICT (HWC)

The sound management of human wildlife conflict is central to the success of conservancies.

Innovative solutions need to be found to mitigate conflicts with key species such as elephants and large predators to ensure the overall success of sustainable use and biodiversity conservation in communal areas. The conflicts these species create are posing a threat to broad community support of many conservancies. Elephant conflicts in Caprivi and parts of northern Namibia, as well as lion conflicts in parts of the north-west, have reached levels that are creating increasing community opposition to some conservancy objectives. A balance needs to be found between the conservation of single species and the conservation of healthy ecosystems that meet the needs of local people.

Rural people engage in a variety of livelihood activities. Livestock herding plays an important role in the livelihoods of most communities, and crop production is carried out in many areas where rainfall and soil conditions make this possible. While wildlife can provide the significant benefits discussed above and presented in Chapter 2, living with wildlife often carries a cost, especially when game comes into conflict with other livelihood activities. This is reflected by the number of conflicts between people and animals occurring in conservancies (Table 7). The frequency of conflicts has increased as both human and animal populations have grown and expanded, as shown in 11 conservancies (four in the north-west and seven in Caprivi) that have consistently collected human wildlife conflict data since 2001 (Figure 14).

Country-wide, a total of 7,659 were reported in conservancies using the Event Book during 2009. In the north-west, most of the incidents were of livestock being attacked, whereas crop damage incidents were most prevalent in Caprivi and Kavango (Figure 15). Elephants in both areas frequently destroy crops and may damage water installations when attempting to gain access to water. In fact, the majority of HWC incidents were caused by elephants (27%), followed by hyaena (16.1%), jackal (13.7%) and cheetah (12.6%). Impacts by pigs (warthog and bush pig), hippo, leopard and lion are significant but relatively infrequent. Many human lives, as well as significant numbers of livestock, are lost to crocodiles each year in Caprivi. Clearly, the impact of

Table 7. The number of HWC incidents caused by all species in all conservancies over the past seven years. These data reflect HWC incidents in only those conservancies using the ‘Event Book’ monitoring system and thus are an underestimate of HWC in the country as a whole. Note that the increase is partly due to the increase in the number of conservancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Attack</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Attack</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>4,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop damage</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Damage</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>7,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crocodiles cause significant conflict in Caprivi each year.

Figure 15. The number and types of conflicts in different areas in 2009, reported by those registered conservancies audited in 2009. The map also shows only these conservancies.
individual species varies from region to region. In Caprivi, for example, elephants are by far the most problematic, while a wider range of species causes a similar number of problems in north-western conservancies (Figure 16).

Conservancies, the MET and NGOs are developing innovative ways to (a) avoid conflict and (b) react appropriately following a conflict incident. Conservancies in Caprivi and Kunene successfully tested a Human-Animal Conflict Conservancy Self-Insurance Scheme (HACCSIS) through which conservancy members who incur losses receive some compensation. Conservancies pay a major portion of the claims from own income and take the lead in running the scheme. Each participating conservancy has a Problem Animal Strategy, which links rights and responsibilities. For example, compensation may not be claimed for stock that has not been kept in an enclosure (kraal) at night, or which is killed inside a national park. A review panel consisting of representatives of MET, conservancy committees, traditional authorities and the facilitating NGO monitors the process.

In 2009, the MET launched a Human Wildlife Conflict Policy, which provides national guidelines to the management of conflicts with wildlife. This has created ambivalence regarding responsibility for conflict mitigation, and some conservancies have stopped their implementation of HACCSIS. Further work on the legislation should ensure that conservancy and government efforts to mitigate human wildlife conflict complement each other.

Practical efforts to reduce human wildlife conflict include electric fencing and the use of special repellents to keep wildlife away from fields and gardens, crocodile fences to provide safe access to water, predator-secure enclosures for keeping livestock safe at night, and appropriate physical barriers to protect water infrastructure. Some of these systems still require much broader implementation and community acceptance to effectively reduce incidents.

Generating income and other benefits from wildlife is central to any solutions. Firstly, visible benefits from wildlife promote community willingness to live with wildlife and accept the challenges associated with this. Secondly, solutions require funding and active management. Unfortunately, many human activities in communal areas (farming and settlement patterns, for example) work against maximising income from wildlife. Conservancies need to find long-term solutions that allow currently competing land uses to co-exist. One solution is to zone conservancies so that different land-uses are allocated to separate zones. Some communities have already zoned their conservancies in this manner, but a major limitation is the fact that conservancies do not have legal
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**Figure 16.** A comparison of species causing HWC in the two major areas of the conservancy programme: Caprivi (top) and north-west (bottom).
powers to enforce the zones. Some conservancies are now working with traditional leaders and regional Land Boards to make zonation more enforceable.

**MANAGING WILDLIFE**

Stunning Namibian landscapes harbouring healthy populations of charismatic African wildlife such as elephant, rhino, buffalo, leopard and lion create a tourism value that is not easily surpassed by other land uses.

Adding other rare and valuable species such as cheetah, wild dog, roan and sable, as well as classic tourism favourites such as zebra, giraffe, hippo, crocodile and antelope to the list further increases that value. Healthy populations of indigenous wildlife are a core component of efforts to unlock the value of natural resources in communal areas.

Wildlife management has thus been one of the central activities of the CBNRM programme. Conservancy efforts to minimise poaching and ensure sustainable use have been rewarded by a remarkable wildlife recovery in many parts of Namibia. Nowhere is this more evident than in Kunene, where wildlife populations had been reduced to small numbers through illegal hunting and ongoing drought by the early 1980’s. It is estimated that around this time there were only 250 elephants and 65 black rhino in the north-west, and populations of other large mammals had been reduced by 60 to 90% since the early 1970s.ii

A variety of data are available to show how wildlife numbers have increased in the north-west. The earliest come from aerial surveys which indicate that springbok, gemsbok and mountain zebra populations increased over 10 times between 1982 and 2000 (Figure 12), although this figure may be influenced to some extent by variations in methodology. A second set of data was collected from extensive fixed route vehicle surveys over the past ten years. In this short period, sightings of most species – in particular kudu, mountain zebra, springbok and gemsbok – increased rapidly and have recently stabilised. Additional evidence for increasing wildlife populations in the north-west is derived from other data collected by species specialists. For example, black rhinos and elephants have recovered from the poaching onslaught of the late 70s and early 80s with numbers having more than doubled (see rhino population increase Figure 17). While some of this growth has been due to recovery after an extremely severe drought in the 1980’s, the recoveries would not have been possible without management activities by conservancies and the virtual cessation of poaching.

Recent game count data is showing noticeable local fluctuations in the population numbers of some species. Importantly, neither mass mortalities nor significant poaching have been recorded. Harvest quotas are so small in relation to the overall population that these are unlikely to have any significant effect (for more detail, see the Sustainable Use Focus in this chapter). Game movement and range expansion, both into inaccessible terrain currently not being surveyed and into areas outside the survey zone, appear to be the main explanation for these fluctuations, as regional estimates remain relatively stable. Limitations in the accuracy of the census methods may also play a role. Finding ways to cover more of the inaccessible terrain currently excluded from the counts and expanding the census to cover some of the adjacent areas would provide a more accurate picture of population numbers. Additional monitoring that provides more information on seasonal migrations – especially of species such as springbok and gemsbok, would also help to answer some of the current questions.

**Figure 17.**
Population size of black rhino in the north-west of Namibia. iii
Natural population fluctuations also occur. Cycles of drought are a part of this system and it is expected that mass drought related mortalities will occur again and again in the future, as almost happened at the end of 2007. Most areas in the north-west were then in a desperate state and the condition of animals had severely declined. Fortunately, mortalities were avoided by the onset of excellent rains in February/March 2008. In times of drought, harvesting levels must be increased so that the value of animals can be realised and extensive rangeland damage, caused by wildlife biomass exceeding carrying capacity, is avoided. Smaller populations of wildlife are then able to come through the drought in good condition and breed more effectively to quickly rebuild the population.

There has also been a significant recovery of wildlife populations in the north-east of the country. Whilst still falling short of the potential of the area to carry game, the recovery is largely due to breeding, a reduction in poaching, as well as immigration from Botswana, as disturbances from poaching have declined (Figure 18). These increases have been confirmed by aerial censuses of the wetlands and floodplains of the Caprivi in 2004, 2007 and 2009 (Table 8). While confined to these special habitats, the surveys covered protected areas, conservancies and lands under other jurisdiction. Noticeable declines in the number of recorded sightings of buffalo, elephant and lechwe in conservancies in 2009 are likely to be due mainly to extensive flooding and the seasonal movement patterns of wildlife (often into or out of national parks or even neighbouring countries).

Data from the wetlands and floodplains aerial censuses (complete counts repeated in exactly the same way each time) show a dramatic increase in buffalo and a significant increase in elephant from count to count, including for 2009. The entire present range of lechwe in Namibia is covered by the aerial counts, which indicate a small but steady increase. The increase in wattled cranes is a response to the large floods of recent years. These data show the value of using different counting methods to gain a better understanding of wildlife dynamics.

The status of large predators can be a useful indicator of the health of wildlife populations. The remarkable recovery of the iconic ‘desert’ lions in the north-west between 1995 and 2007 in both numbers and range is a clear indication of the health of the ungulate prey base, as well as of a greater commitment by local communities to tolerate potential ‘problem animals’ that have great value (Figure 19). More recent monitoring indicates that lion numbers are again declining. This may be due to a reduced tolerance of lions, an attitude that seems driven more by fear than by
Figure 18. The trend in game population estimates in seven long-established conservancies in east Caprivi (Salambala, Mayuni, Wuparo, Kwando, Impalila and Kasika). The figures on the y axis are an index of sightings.

Figure 19. The range expansion of lion populations in the north-west of Namibia.
**Figure 20.** The number of ‘problem animals’ removed as a percentage of the number of conflict incidents recorded for various species in all north-western conservancies between 2001 and 2009. The disproportionate control of lion is probably because people are afraid of them. Yet, lions are the most valuable of all predators for tourism and trophy hunting and their removal reduces the value of areas for these industries.

**Figure 21.** Sightings of large predators by community rangers in five north-west conservancies (top) and in five east Caprivi conservancies (bottom) where predators have been monitored consistently since 2002 and 2001, respectively.
the actual negative impacts caused by lions. This is clearly portrayed in the response of communities, as the removal of almost 10% of lions causing conflict incidents is completely out of proportion to the damage that lion actually cause (Figure 20).

Population trends of other large predators in north-western and north-eastern conservancies have generally been positive (Figure 21). Leopard and wild dog have increased and populations of cheetah have increased and then stabilised in recent years. The numbers of all predators are well above pre-conservancy levels. In east Caprivi, where game count trend data are less reliable due to methodological difficulties, sighting trends of predators are important indicators for trends in prey species.

The presence of lions and other large predators greatly increases the tourism and trophy hunting value of an area. Conversely, predators can cause considerable stock losses and may pose a threat to human life. Zoning and active conflict prevention are vital components of predator management, but in the end, generating direct benefits from them is the best way to ensure community commitment to their survival.

### REBUILDING THE WILDLIFE BASE

Targeted reintroductions of game, which boost natural increases in wildlife, are allowing natural resource benefits to be realised more rapidly.

Between 1999 and 2009, a total of 7,119 animals consisting of 14 different species were translocated to 27 registered conservancies (Table 9). Whilst the bulk of the species were common game such as springbok, gemsbok, hartebeest, kudu and eland, the introductions have also included very valuable animals such as sable, black-faced impala, giraffe and black rhino. The game has been moved from areas where there is an oversupply of animals to areas where populations are low.

The translocations have re-established the range of several species that had become locally extinct, namely giraffe, black-faced impala, Burchell’s zebra, blue wildebeest, eland, sable and black rhino. Conservancy formation has helped to reinstate the range of these species, and a number of conservancies are now officially recognised as rhino custodians. Seven conservancies have received reintroductions of black rhino. The fact that communities are trusted by the Namibian government to be custodians of these highly endangered and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemsbok</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1 277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red hartebeest</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1 068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann’s zebra</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfaced Impala</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common impala</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black rhino</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbok</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Wildebeest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchell’s Zebra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1 097</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2 520</td>
<td>1 056</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
valuable animals is testament to the conservation performance of conservancies. Namibia is the only country in the world where black rhinos are increasing outside protected areas, and the only country where black rhinos are being translocated out of national parks into communal areas.

The total value of wildlife reintroductions (excluding black rhino) is well in excess of N$ 25 million. Many of the animals have been donated by MET and freehold farmers. The cost of purchasing, capturing and transporting the animals has largely been borne by funds provided by support agencies, the MET and private farm owners. This represents a significant investment into communal lands which not only has immediate conservation, financial and livelihood benefits, but also provides for tremendous capital appreciation. Many game species can breed and increase at between 10 and 25% per annum, directly translating the initial investment into compounded growth. Such rebuilding of the wildlife resource base creates the foundation for maximising conservancy benefits from tourism, trophy hunting and other forms of utilisation. Conservancies are also becoming important partners in the national biodiversity initiative to protect landscapes, ecosystems, species and genes.

Namibia is the only country in the world where endangered black rhinos are being translocated out of national parks into communal conservancies.

EXPANDING SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACROSS NAMIBIA

Year by year, the increasing area covered by conservancies and community forests is expanding the area of Namibia under sustainable resource management.

This is also increasing the network of landscape connectivity, which is vital in ensuring environmental resilience and countering the impacts of climate change. These developments must be considered as a huge success in Namibia’s efforts to fulfil its constitutional commitment to safeguard the environment while at the same time achieving economic growth and rural development.

CBNRM is recognised by the Namibian government as contributing to national development goals for both the environment (Table 10) and socio-economic development, including the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, and job creation (Table 5 Chapter 2), as set out in the National Development Plan 3 (NDP3), Rural Poverty Reduction Strategy and Vision 2030.
Table 10.
An overview of the contributions of CBNRM to national development goals for the environment as set out in the National Development Plan 3.

Environment Sub-sector Goal 1: Improved condition of natural resources and biodiversity throughout Namibia’s different vegetation and habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Contribution of CBNRM</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area of conservancies</td>
<td>Supports the establishment and operation of communal area conservancies</td>
<td>132,697 km² covered by conservancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Area under community forestry</td>
<td>Increasing support through the CBNRM programme to community forests where they intersect/overlap with conservancies</td>
<td>4,652 km² covered by community forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Targeted key wildlife species stable or increasing</td>
<td>Documented increases of key species in conservancies with key biomes/habitats</td>
<td>Black rhino population and range increasing; mountain zebra population increasing; cheetah population stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies Contribution of CBNRM Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Contribution of CBNRM</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manage protected areas, habitats and species</td>
<td>Conservancies adjacent to PAs provide support zones with land under compatible forms of land use and conservancies provide links between PAs, particularly in the north-east.</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Tourism, conservancies, community forests &amp; NGOs cooperate in the management of the Mudumu North Complex in Caprivi and the Khaudum North Complex in Kavango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promote CBNRM</td>
<td>The number of conservancies &amp; community forests continues to increase, along with the benefits from CBNRM</td>
<td>59 registered conservancies and 13 registered community forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incorporate awareness action into environment projects and programmes</td>
<td>CBNRM is raising general environmental awareness action through its activities in conservancies</td>
<td>47 conservancies use the Event Book monitoring system. 16 conservancies have integrated natural resource management plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environment Sub-sector Goal 3: A strong climate change strategy in place with Namibia prepared for the predicted impacts, especially those that affect Namibians living in rural areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Contribution of CBNRM</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve adaptation to climate change and mitigation efforts</td>
<td>Conservancies &amp; community forests can help counter habitat fragmentation, link protected areas with informally conserved areas, contribute to improved grassland management, and maintenance of forest cover. If livestock production becomes less viable, wildlife production will become more important to people’s livelihoods.</td>
<td>Conservancies &amp; community forests in the Mudumu North Complex and Khaudum North Complex link protected areas. Conservancies in the Kunene Region link Etosha with the Skeleton Coast Park. Holistic range management is practised in 6 conservancies. Community forests conserve 4,652 km² of forest resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservancies and community forests make an important contribution to the protection of Namibia’s major biomes.

Conservancies and community forests achieve both conservation and development results because they represent a commitment to sustainable use by a large sector of the rural population. Whilst there will always be some people that might not practice sustainable activities, the increasing area under registered conservancies and community forests can be seen as an indicator of the overall commitment to sustainable use principles by Namibians.

By the end of 2009, 132,697 square kilometres had been gazetted as communal conservancies. This represents 41.8% of all communal land in Namibia and 16.1% of Namibia’s total land area. At the same time, 13 community forests over an area of 4,652 square kilometres had been gazetted. Six of these community forests have some overlap with conservancies and so it is not possible to simply add the two land areas to arrive at a total figure for the communal area under sustainable use. Taking this into consideration, the overall surface covered by community resource management is 134,185 square kilometres. In combination with the 16.5% covered by state protected areas, 0.8% by tourism concessions and another 6.1% in freehold conservancies, this brings the total land surface in Namibia covered by sustainable resource management and biodiversity objectives to 39.7% (Figure 22, Table 11). Whilst the level of conservation management differs within the various areas, all endorse the principle of sustainability and the elimination of illegal and destructive use of natural resources.
Table 11. Percentages of Namibia’s total surface area within communal and freehold conservancies, concession areas and national parks and game reserves (top row) and the proportions of different biomes conserved by these conservation areas. Communal area conservancies contribute more to the protection of broad-leafed savannah than do other types of protected areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOME</th>
<th>Communal conservancies</th>
<th>Community forests</th>
<th>Concession areas</th>
<th>Freehold conservancies</th>
<th>National parks &amp; game reserves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area of Namibia</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes and salt pans</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nama Karoo</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namib Desert</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succulent Karoo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia savanna</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-leafed savanna</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22. Communal conservancies, community forests, state protected areas, tourism concessions and freehold conservancies in relation to Namibia’s six major biomes, which are areas that share similar plant life and climatic features.
The conservation of biodiversity is one of the key objectives of CBNRM, and the maps in Figure 23 provide an indication of how the formation of conservancies relates to the diversity of plant and animal life in Namibia. The most notable contributions to the protection of biodiversity ‘hot spots’ are in the north-east of the country. Figures 24 shows how communal conservancies and community forests, together with state protected areas, tourism concessions and freehold conservancies, are contributing to the protection and sustainable management of an ever-increasing percentage of Namibia’s 29 major vegetation types.

In contrast to patterns of overall biodiversity richness, which is highest in the north-east, concentrations of endemic species are greatest in the dry western and north-western regions. Endemics are species whose distribution is largely or completely confined to Namibia. Our country has a special responsibility for the conservation of endemic species. Conservancies in the arid Kunene and Erongo Regions therefore make a valuable contribution to the conservation of such special plants and animals. A number of conservancies have included key species in their monitoring systems, such as large predators, wattled cranes, black-faced impala, roan and sable.
Figure 24. Registered conservancies, community forests and other protected areas in relation to Namibia’s main vegetation types.
COMMUNITY FISHERIES FOCUS
Integrated Co-Management of the Zambezi/Chobe Fisheries Resources

For the past four years, a fisheries project has been conducted on the Zambezi-Chobe wetland system to understand the ecology and functioning of this dynamic system, including the biology and ecology of the fishes, current fishing practices, markets and pressures. Based on this knowledge, the project seeks to develop a sustainable approach to the fisheries in partnership with the fishing communities, so that people can derive optimum benefits without damaging the resource. The aim is to enhance community livelihoods while simultaneously introducing sustainable fishery management practices for the shared Zambezi River System between Botswana, Namibia, and Zambia. Management of these inland fisheries resources is particularly important for the Namibian Government, as freshwater fish serve as a source of protein for a large sector of the Namibian people, especially the rural poor.

The actual project goal is that “the shared Zambezi/Chobe River fisheries resources are sustainably managed by promoting trans-boundary coordination and collaboration on the introduction of fully integrated fishery management systems.”

This project links up with the community-based natural resource management approaches in Namibia’s wildlife sector, where devolution of benefits and management rights to local communities has proven to provide incentive for resident communities to promote sustainable use of their natural resources.

Research has shown that some preferred fish species are currently under severe fishing pressure from both recreational and subsistence fishermen and some sort of management should be implemented to prevent a total collapse of fisheries as we know it. Similar collapses in fisheries in Africa have taken place with negative impacts on the adjacent riverine communities.

The shared nature of the Zambezi and Chobe Rivers further complicates the management of the fish resources. Therefore, one major output of the project is to set up structures involving all three countries in the joint management of fisheries within these systems. A basin-wide approach will be followed although the current project boundary is restricted to the Eastern Caprivi.

Through the already established fisheries management committees, the project will develop sound management practices, including Fish Reserves (where agreements with angling tourism operations will be arranged), agreements on local regulations to suit local aquatic habitats, agreements on closed seasons, and monitoring of activities and catches. Four areas have already been identified by local communities that will be proclaimed as Fish Reserves. These initiatives are currently being supported by all major stakeholders. The next step will be to amend the fisheries legislation to incorporate the initiatives, followed by the inclusion of areas in neighbouring countries.

An overall fisheries management plan was drafted and will be submitted to all stakeholders, including neighbouring countries, for endorsement. This will outline the way forward and will also facilitate fisheries management on shared river systems, which may serve as a model for other freshwater fisheries, particularly where floodplains are involved, in other parts of Namibia as well as in other countries in central and southern Africa.

Although riverine habitats are spatially small in the context of the entire country, the importance of these linear oases is magnified considerably, because they transect arid terrain and thus provide critical refugia for wildlife from adjacent areas. While conservancies in north-western Namibia provide critical protection of these habitats (Figure 25 and Table 12), riverine habitats in the wetter eastern regions of Kavango and Caprivi are less well protected. This is due to the tendency for roads and associated settlements to have developed along river courses, even if these fall under conservancy management. Whilst there has been considerable discussion on the need to prioritise and zone these areas to ensure their protection, this has only been achieved by the Mayuni conservancy along the Kwando River.

The expansion of areas under sustainable resource management is one benefit of communal conservancies, especially in regions and habitats where there are no state protected areas. Another benefit is the fact that many conservancies adjoin other conservation areas, thus enlarging the contiguous area under sustainable resource management (Figure 26 and Table 13). This creates landscape-level approaches that allow wildlife populations to move freely according to seasonal needs.

The largest contiguous area is created in the arid north-west, where conservancies and tourism concession areas now form the entire eastern boundary of the Skeleton Coast National Park and create a broad link to Etosha National Park through...
Table 12. The percentage of various wetland habitats in Namibia under some form of protection, illustrating the key role that communal conservancies play in protecting and managing these critical and rare habitats in arid Namibia. The rivers were considered to be linear habitats and the percentage protected was estimated as being the linear proportion of the main river course that fell in one of the conservation categories. The other wetland habitats were based on percentage of their total areas that fell in one of the conservation categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland Habitat Types</th>
<th>Total wetland habitat protected</th>
<th>National parks</th>
<th>Concession areas</th>
<th>Communal conservancies</th>
<th>Freehold conservancies &amp; parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perennial rivers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeral rivers</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshanas, flood plains, lakes &amp; dams</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pans</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. The percentage of various wetland habitats in Namibia under some form of protection, illustrating the key role that communal conservancies play in protecting and managing these critical and rare habitats in arid Namibia. The rivers were considered to be linear habitats and the percentage protected was estimated as being the linear proportion of the main river course that fell in one of the conservation categories. The other wetland habitats were based on percentage of their total areas that fell in one of the conservation categories.

Figure 25. Registered conservancies, community forests and other protected areas in relation to Namibia’s wetlands.
Namibia’s communal conservancies

Namibia’s communal conservancies

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Communal/Protected Concession/Freehold Private Contiguous areas Areas Forest conservancy Reserve Total

1. Coastal parks, Ai-Ais & Etosha NP 123,861 67,967 7,210 2,886 201,924
2. Waterberg, Khaudum NP 4,238 50,835 7,314 0 62,387
3. Bwabwata, Mudumu, Mamili 7,330 1,876 0 0 9,206

135,429 120,678 14,524 2,886 273,517

Staff of the Ministry of Environment & Tourism and conservancies work together on annual game counts and regular wildlife monitoring in both national parks and conservancies.

Figure 26 and Table 13.
The contiguous areas are under sustainable resource management and conservation through adjacent state protected areas, communal conservancies, community forests, tourism concessions, private reserves and freehold conservancies.
adjacent conservancies. This is particularly important here, as animals need to be able to move in response to climatic conditions to maintain productive populations.

One of the challenges facing protected area managers is the zone of potential conflict along park borders, where the land uses of park neighbours often conflict with park objectives. The most effective way of dealing with this is for protected areas to create incentives for neighbours to practice compatible land uses. Direct community benefits from wildlife and tourism that result from the proximity of conservancies to neighbouring parks achieve this objective. In some cases conservancies have received the rights to manage concessions in adjacent parks, with the resulting benefits going directly to the conservancies and their members. The percentage of park boundaries in communal areas that are shared with conservancies, concession areas and community forests has increased dramatically over the past 14 years to about 75.6% at the end of 2009 (Figure 27).

In several areas, adjacent conservancies, community forests and national parks are now working together in joint management forums that allow collaborative landscape level management and planning. The advantages of such collaboration include more effective management of mobile wildlife populations, improved monitoring and land-use planning, and more effective anti-poaching activities and fire management. Such approaches are also more cost effective and ensure that the necessary capacities and resources are available to do the job.

The Mudumu North Complex, the Kaudum North Complex and the Greater Waterberg Complex are examples of such joint management. The institutional structures consist of representatives from MET, conservancies, community forests and the private sector. The forums also have representation from supporting sectors such as agriculture, police, defence force, local government, water affairs, traditional authority and NGOs. Importantly, such complexes provide the impetus to the practical implementation of zonation that sets aside areas for wildlife and wildlife based enterprises.

As a pioneer, the Mudumu North Complex has attracted donor interest that is providing additional resources and opportunities for trans-frontier work in neighbouring Zambia, Botswana and Angola. There is a critical need to create these linkages with conservation areas across national borders in the Caprivi, as the area is a narrow strip intersected by rivers that form natural trans-frontier migration and habitat corridors for a wide range of species. The main power of management complexes is that they remove barriers to connectivity, allow landscape-level management and generate economies of scale for both investments (e.g. game reintroductions, training, planning, anti-poaching, etc) and enterprise opportunities.
SUSTAINABLE USE FOCUS

The consumptive use of wildlife can be an emotive and contentious issue. Much of the disagreement is ideological. Some people disagree in principle with the idea of hunting or harvesting any wildlife. These people tend to live in urban areas and tend to be removed from the realities of food production and land management. Their inclination is more towards animal rights than conservation. They focus on individual animals rather than on the survival and welfare of populations and species. Sadly, many of their well-intended actions are detrimental to sound conservation objectives. Mainstream global consensus, expressed via the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), places sustainable use at the heart of people-centred conservation. This is also Namibia’s approach, as reflected in its Constitution.

The information in this book clearly illustrates the importance of generating a broad spectrum of benefits from wildlife to enable rural communities to set aside land for wildlife and conservation, or a mixture of wildlife and other land uses. This has proven to be a successful approach for conserving wildlife outside state protected areas. Consumptive use of wildlife includes own-use, shoot-and-sell, premium and trophy hunting, as well as the live capture and sale of game.

Off-take levels for harvesting wildlife require careful consideration based on sound scientific methodology. Over the last two decades, a clear system of wildlife utilisation in communal conservancies has been developed to ensure that off-take levels are sustainable (Figure 28). The various aspects of this system are touched on in the main text of this chapter.

In the vast, unfenced environments covered by communal conservancies, wildlife moves over large areas in response to the seasonal availability of food and water. In such systems, which often have significant climatic variations, it is extremely difficult for any given conservancy to track wildlife population trends, or to explain apparent declines or increases, when only looking at wildlife numbers in their conservancy. The seasonal movement of wildlife makes quota setting and harvesting at a local level more challenging.

Monitoring population trends across clusters of conservancies is a more useful approach. Sudden declines in a population in one conservancy can usually be matched with sudden increases in neighbouring conservancies. In addition, animals move into areas that are not covered by the game counts (e.g. in drier years animals tend to move into inaccessible, mountainous areas which are difficult to count, or may move out of the area altogether). This creates the situation where populations periodically ‘disappear’ from census data, only to ‘reappear’ the following year. It is therefore necessary to monitor population trends at a landscape level rather than at a conservancy level, as well as over long periods of time.

Off-take levels in the conservancies of the north-west as a whole are very conservative (Figure 29). Off-take rates are calculated as a percentage of the total population. Even when one calculates the annual off-take as a percentage of only those animals actually seen during the North-West Game Count, this remains below 20% for all species for all years. As it is impossible to see every animal during a game count, the actual percentage is of course much lower. When calculating the annual off-take as a percentage of the likely population estimate, the levels are below two percent and therefore significantly below annual growth rates. It is also worth noting that the road-based North-West Game Count is unable to cover approximately 30% of the overall area due to inaccessible terrain. The population estimation method used assumes that there are no animals in these areas – which is obviously not the case. Assuming that there are no animals in almost one third of the north-west provides a significant additional safety net against over-utilisation at a regional level.

While over-utilisation is clearly not a concern, there is a need to improve harvesting methods. In order to improve conservancy hunting skills, community game guards from 55 conservancies attended a rifle training course in 2009. Five conservancies now have meat handling facilities to enable them to process harvested meat more effectively. Further work to broaden conservancy understanding of key issues and improve skills should continue to refine the sustainable use of wildlife in communal conservancies.
The sustainable use of wildlife is controlled through a detailed system of monitoring, consultation, evaluation and adaptive management.

**Utilisation Cycle**

1. Monitoring
   - Event Books
   - Ground Counts
   - Aerial Censuses

2. Use Data Previous Year

3. Local Knowledge

4. Utilisation Arrangements:
   - Trophy Hunting Agreements
   - Game Capture Agreements
   - Shoot-and-Sell Agreements
   - Premium Hunting Agreements
   - Own Use Planning

5. Utilisation Management:
   - Zonation
   - Communication
   - Concession Management
   - Harvest Skills Improvement
   - Offtake Monitoring

6. Suggested Quota

7. Conservancy Quota Meeting

8. Quota Application

9. MET Quota Review Process

10. Quota Approved by MET

**Figure 28.** The bars represent numbers of animals utilised as a percentage of the animals counted or estimated during the game count of the previous year. The different colours indicate the off-take as a percentage of different methods of estimating the overall wildlife population. The minimum estimate (blue) is calculated using a ‘belt transect method’ while the likely population estimate (red) is calculated using the ‘DISTANCE’ programme. Such systems for estimating game populations are necessary because it is not possible to accurately count wild animals.
Above: The integration of various land uses needs to be improved to maximize potential benefits from natural resources for communal area residents.

Below: Innovative solutions need to be found to address human wildlife conflicts with key species such as elephants.
**CHALLENGES FOR NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Conservancies and community forests have done much to expand the network of areas under sustainable natural resource management in Namibia. Increased populations of wildlife in most areas are clear indicators of the success of this approach. Despite the success, important challenges lie ahead for conservancies, community forests and the agencies that support them. For the management of natural resources, the key challenges include:

1. **The integration of various land-uses to maximise potential benefits for communal area residents.** While important steps have been taken to integrate conservancies, community forests and community fisheries, much work needs to be done to bring the agricultural and wildlife management sectors closer together. In addition, improved integration of the policies and activities of the various line ministries (MET, MAWF, MFMR, MLR, MRLGHRD) should ensure that sectoral barriers are removed and that all sectors optimise their outputs.

2. **The devolution of further rights and responsibilities over wildlife and other natural resources such as rangelands, forests, and fresh water fish to the appropriate local community organisations.** There is a host of new legislation that is supporting this trend, but to be effective, the devolution needs to include not just the responsibility for managing and benefiting from resources, but also the legal means to prevent the exploitation of resources by other sectors.

3. **Increasing wildlife numbers create an opportunity to intensify and diversity wildlife-based enterprises, and to capture greater benefits from the various supply chains.** For example, large conservancies could have more than one trophy hunting contract, and the conservancies in the north-east could specialise in the breeding and live sale of high value wildlife species.

4. **The collaborative management of large areas that link conservancies, community forests and state protected areas in 'management complexes' needs to be promoted further, both within Namibia and across international boundaries.** Landscape-level management and planning has a variety of management advantages and opens up new economic opportunities.

5. **Conservancies need to become more proactive in management.** For example, local-level monitoring has become more streamlined and rigorous, but communities now need to move to a stage where they react more rapidly to monitoring data through appropriate decision-making.

6. **Improved quota setting and wildlife harvesting methods are needed so that conservancies can benefit from abundant wildlife without harming other forms of land use such as tourism.** In addition, because of ‘boom and bust’ climatic conditions in the north-west, people should ensure appropriate harvesting of animals before the impacts of inevitable droughts set in.

7. **Human wildlife conflict management must be improved.** Innovative solutions need to be found to address conflicts with key species such as elephants and large predators. Conflicts between different land uses can be minimised through effective management and zonation and through improved communication and collaboration between the different sectors. Most importantly, the benefits generated from wildlife need to far outweigh the costs associated with wildlife conservation and management.

8. **Natural resource management support through the NACSO Natural Resources Working Group and other initiatives is becoming increasingly overstretched as the number of conservancies, community forests and community-fishing institutions increase.** Some of the support services traditionally provided to communities can be gradually withdrawn as they become better skilled and resourced. However, for most natural resource sectors there will always be a role for a team of skilled support providers to provide both an extension function to communities and to manage the monitoring systems that a national programme demands. MET has taken on many of the functions of conservancy support, but further support from NGOs and the private sector is still required in a collaborative effort.

---


iii From information supplied by Pierre du Preez.


v From information supplied by Flip Stander
Good governance is vital for the success of conservancies.

This chapter looks specifically at the issue of ‘governance’ in conservancies, i.e. how decisions are taken, who takes them and who is accountable to whom. At the heart of each conservancy is the relationship between the conservancy members and their elected management committee. This management committee is expected to take decisions that are in the interests of the members, to manage the conservancy income and expenditure and to manage the conservancy’s relationship with business partners such as tourism and trophy hunting operators. If committees are not properly accountable to conservancy members, the possibility of mismanagement, elite capture or corruption increases.

There are a number of different ways to ensure that good governance takes place within conservancies. NGOs and government can provide training to build the capacity of conservancy committees and managers to develop proper procedures for taking decisions. Financial management training, which emphasises the separation between those who approve expenditure and those who keep the books, is a good example. In addition, government can ensure that conservancies comply with the legislation that requires adherence to the conservancy constitution.

Ultimately though, good governance comes from within – when conservancy members take an interest in the affairs of the conservancy and demand accountability and good financial management from the committee. In this respect, the 59 registered conservancies represent a country-wide experiment in rural democracy that is
unprecedented in Namibia. In theory, each conservancy member has the opportunity to vote for committee members to represent their interests and vote for the removal of those people if they fail to deliver. Each member has the opportunity to help craft a constitution that governs the way the conservancy is run and which defines the extent to which residents are involved in major decisions. In theory, each conservancy member has the opportunity to attend a conservancy annual general meeting (AGM) to take part in major decisions such as approving the conservancy budget. In practice, as can be expected, things don’t always work out so smoothly. In some conservancies, committees have taken all the major decisions themselves without involving members. In a few cases large sums of money are unaccounted for, there are examples of committee members giving themselves large loans and many conservancies were spending all their income on operational costs, leaving little for community benefits. In many conservancies, there was little involvement of members in developing the constitution.

One response to these governance problems is to call for more government regulation or more supervision of conservancies by NGOs. Another and more appropriate response has been taking place in the conservancies themselves. Increasingly, conservancy members have been showing dissatisfaction with those committees that don’t act in the interests of the members. They have removed the committee members and elected new ones. They have insisted on financial statements being made public and they have insisted on approving budgets. This is where democracy is taking hold – through the ongoing interactions between conservancy members and their elected representatives.

It is not easy to measure progress in improving conservancy governance. One approach is to collect data on key aspects of conservancy management and decision-making. In this year’s report, we have introduced a table (Table 14) that provides this data for 2009 and compares the information with previous years. It should be noted that there will be differences year on year simply because of the changing number of conservancies. As data such as these do not provide a good picture of the dynamic interactions within conservancies that are leading to improved governance, the next sections present several case studies from around the country to illustrate the nature of these interactions.
This was identified by the 2007 report on conservancy progress. The problem was recently highlighted again in Caprivi, where conservancy members started dismissing chairpersons and managers who were being accused of financial mismanagement. While this was a good example of conservancy members calling elected conservancy officials and employees to account, it is not a permanent solution to the underlying problems of financial management in conservancies.

NGOs working with the conservancies realised the main problem was that the internal control systems in place were weak and this resulted in money going missing and being unaccounted for. In one case, around N$120,000 had gone missing. Clearly this was a serious situation that had to be addressed. The NGOs realised that although conservancy committees and staff had been trained in financial management in the past, more needed to be done. One solution was to engage a professional accountant who could help the conservancies to institute proper control systems and work with the conservancy committees and employees to ensure the systems and procedures were adhered to. This meant not just training staff, but carrying out frequent visits to the conservancies to check on progress.

Table 14. Summary of key conservancy governance data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNANCE INDICATOR</th>
<th>2009 (59 registered conservancies)</th>
<th>2008 (53 registered conservancies)</th>
<th>2007 (50 registered conservancies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of management committee members</td>
<td>819 (285 female)</td>
<td>767 (264 female)</td>
<td>765 (285 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female management committee members</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management plan/framework in place</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management plan sent to Land Board</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability or business plan in place</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM held</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee elections held</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial report presented/approved</td>
<td>36 presented 34 approved</td>
<td>32 approved</td>
<td>32 approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget approved by members at AGM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of conservancy staff</td>
<td>563 (137 female)</td>
<td>468 (121 female)</td>
<td>416 (115 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female conservancy staff members</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutions revised and approved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of conservancies that are members of a regional association or forum</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of conservancies covering 100% of operating costs from own income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of female treasurers/financial managers</td>
<td>32 (53.3%)</td>
<td>27 (50.9%)</td>
<td>31 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of female chairperson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS policy (or draft) in place</td>
<td>22 (+3 drafts)</td>
<td>13 policies &amp; plans (+7 drafts)</td>
<td>6 policies (+12 drafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS action plan (or draft) in place</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25 (+3 drafts)</td>
<td>14 (+7 drafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Peer Educators trained</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and Ownership

The accountant has worked to address a number of problems including the following:

- The need for approved financial policies and procedure manuals to be in place which are relevant to the organisation, and are known and used by staff;
- The need for all transactions to be properly authorised and documented;
- The need for the identification of authorised signatories – who signs, the number of signatories and from which committee;
- The need for establishing proper procedures for handling cash payments;
- The need for the separation of duties (e.g. approving payments, procuring goods, accounting for payments) in order to provide checks and balances;
- The need for the budgetary control system to be done monthly and be systematic and involve all the committees;
- The need to improve the basic accounting system.

Following intensive work by NGO staff and the accountant, the following improvements are taking place in the registered conservancies in Caprivi that are earning income:

- Conservancies are keeping accurate and up-to-date records of their expenditure;
- Budgets are being prepared by the management committees and presented to special general meetings for approval by members;
- Treasurers prepare regular reports for their management committees;
- NGO support staff have made monthly field checks of all the treasurers since the beginning of 2010;
- Work has started on improving the internal control system as well as the general bookkeeping and filing systems;
- Transaction authorisation forms are being introduced;
- Budgetary control systems are being implemented;
- Chairpersons, managers and treasurers are receiving training in basic financial management; and
- Management committees are carrying out monthly reviews of conservancy finances.

This represents good progress in establishing sound financial management in the Caprivi conservancies. One of the main changes to past practice is that support agencies are now working to help conservancies institutionalise the use of the financial systems that are established. This means regular visits and follow-up sessions to ensure the conservancy staff are following the proper procedures. In order to build on this foundation, a number of next steps need to be taken.

In recent years, more than 50% of the financial management in conservancies has been handled by women.
These include making sure that cash and bank records are maintained; that training is provided in the preparation of basic financial reports; that the financial management capacity of committees as a whole (rather than of just of one or two individuals) is improved and that budgeting and overall control mechanisms are improved.

**MANAGING COMPLEXITY IN THE PUROS CONSERVANCY**

As conservancies evolve, they are required to manage an increasing and complex range of activities.

The Puros Conservancy provides an interesting example of the unique circumstances that characterise most conservancies. Covering an area of 3,562 square kilometres, it is home to a small population of approximately 260 people. The conservancy has been engaged in tourism activities since the 1980s and opened one of the most viable conservancy-owned campsites in 1996. Since these small beginnings, Puros has become a major tourism attraction in the dry north-west and today it is engaged in at least ten different ways of earning income for the conservancy, as well as directly for members. The ten ventures include three joint-venture lodge agreements, three different hunting concessions, a conservancy campsite, a Himba cultural village, a conservancy-owned mid market lodge and the harvesting and sale of the valuable perfume ingredient, *Commiphora* resin.

In 2008, the conservancy recorded nine different sources of income into the conservancy bank accounts and six in 2009. These tourism and indigenous natural product activities also provided 95 part-time and 40 full-time jobs. This means that the members of Puros conservancy benefit from one of the highest conservancy-member employment rates across the country. Although cash income to the conservancy is not as high as in many other conservancies engaged in similar activities, managing the conservancy finances is a complex affair.

Being located in a remote desert area without electricity or telephone infrastructure (other than expensive satellite phones at the lodges) brings added complications. Some of the income earned by the conservancy is paid directly into the bank account in Opuwo, a five hour drive from the village of Puros, while other income is paid on site in cash. The simple task of depositing cash or collecting necessary bank statements is thus a significant effort.

*Established conservancies often handle a wide range of business and resource management activities.*
GOVERNANCE AND OWNERSHIP

With support from partner NGOs, Puros has established an appropriate financial management system that helps the conservancy cope with their multiple sources of income, manage remote bank accounts and responsibly handle large amounts of cash. The conservancy has also employed a full-time financial administrator who has the necessary skills to maintain the records and accounts of the conservancy. There are still numerous challenges such as ensuring regular feedback between staff and committee members, as well as between the committee and conservancy members. Ensuring that funds are set aside for member benefits has received renewed attention, now that the fundamental part of accurately maintaining conservancy records and accounts in under control.

REVISING THE NYAE NYAE CONSERVANCY CONSTITUTION

The conservancy constitution is an important tool for good governance, as it provides the foundation for ensuring accountability and transparency in decision-making.

All registered conservancies have constitutions, as this is a prerequisite for registration. However, many conservancy constitutions were developed quickly in order to meet registration requirements and did not receive much community input. In these cases, conservancy members have little knowledge of the contents of the constitution, or how the constitution can be used to ensure good governance. In addition, as conservancies evolve, they are changing their structures and decision-making procedures, which means that constitutions need to be revised to accommodate the changes.

In response to the growing demand for the revision of conservancy constitutions, the NACSO Institutional Development Working Group established a process and a set of guidelines for constitution review and revision. Several conservancies have used this process, adapting it to their individual circumstances. One of these was the Nyae Nyae Conservancy in eastern Otjozondjupa Region, which revised its constitution in 2009.

The original Nyae Nyae Conservancy Constitution was developed in 1996, largely by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. It was a detailed 20 page document in English and was largely unknown to the Nyae Nyae Conservancy management and the community.

Thus a review of the constitution was necessary to:
- Enable the community to provide input and have ownership of the constitution;
- Make the constitution a reference document for the conservancy committee and staff; and
- Produce a summary that would be easy to understand and would improve the use of the constitution.

The steps in the constitution revision process included:
1) Identification of a team of facilitators drawn from the conservancy, the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDFN) and MET;
2) Training of the team on the importance of conservancy constitutions and how to facilitate constitution revision;
3) Adaptation of the NACSO guidelines to suit the Nyae Nyae circumstances and planning of the revision process;
4) Visits to villages by the facilitation team to gain inputs from conservancy members;
5) Compilation of a new draft constitution based on member input;
6) Presentation of the draft constitution at the conservancy AGM;
7) Finalisation of the constitution based on inputs at the AGM;
8) Production of a summary in layman’s English.

Experience in other conservancies has shown that revising the constitution can be a long and expensive process. Yet, in Nyae Nyae there was a clear need to involve members in the process as far as possible. The method used in Nyae Nyae to balance participation against time and cost was to develop a checklist of issues which was used to collect member input. In order to ensure participation, two or three villages were clustered together and then members from the villages were brought together to discuss the proposed constitution. If members did not agree with proposals on the checklist, they were then asked to suggest alternatives. The alternatives would then be discussed by the members until a consensus was reached.

This approach worked well. When the constitution was presented at the AGM (which is attended by elected village representatives rather than all members), the constitution was adopted without amendments and with general agreement from those present. The village representatives were reasonably familiar with the contents of the constitution. There were some questions and issues raised, but these were more concerned with implementation than content.

The conservancy constitution revision process in Nyae Nyae achieved two significant objectives: improving the understanding of conservancy members of the importance
and content of the constitution and enabling as many conservancy members as possible to participate in the process. Another approach to amending the constitution could have been to simply hire a lawyer to formulate a new draft based on issues identified by committee members and NGO staff. But this would have meant a lost opportunity to use the revision of the constitution as a means to improve conservancy governance. Now the challenge for the conservancy committee and members is to make sure that the new constitution is used to guide future decision-making and relationships within the conservancy.

CONDUCTING EFFECTIVE AGMS IN ANABEB AND ORUPEMBE CONSERVANCIES

One of the most important events in a conservancy's annual cycle is the planning and conducting of the annual general meeting.

This meeting is required under the conservancy legislation and is reflected as such in all conservancy constitutions. It is the key event for the conservancy committee to communicate with its members. The challenge for conservancies is to conduct an effective AGM, rather than just hold the meeting because it is a requirement.

In most regions, NGOs and MET have put considerable effort into assisting conservancies with their AGMs. At an AGM, the conservancy committee provides conservancy members with information about conservancy affairs and plans for future activities. Reports from the chairperson, the treasurer (financial report and proposed budget), as well as from the natural resource management staff have to be tabled and approved by a constitutionally directed quorum. At the meeting, new committee members are elected and major plans and strategies for the conservancy are ratified.

In most conservancies, the AGM was becoming the only meeting that included the committee and conservancy members, and insufficient time was made available for members to gain clarity on issues, discuss plans or resolve problems. With little communication during the year, AGMs often became drawn-out affairs and key business on the agenda was often not completed.

During 2009, two conservancies took a new approach that made a significant improvement to the conducting of their AGMs. Both Anabeb and Orupembe Conservancies have been sub-divided into conservancy blocks, as members live spread out across a large geographic area, with poor roads and no communication facilities. While meetings are held with members in conservancy blocks on a quarterly basis, there are only one or two occasions during the year when representatives from various parts of the conservancy come together. For this reason, the two conservancies decided to hold pre-AGM meetings, where a number of issues were identified for discussion that would not normally appear on the AGM agenda. These included some difficult and sensitive issues around money, employment and traditional authority involvement. In both cases the pre-AGM meetings took at least two days, but provided an important platform for difficult issues to be ironed out and resolutions reached. The two conservancies then proceeded to hold their official AGMs a few days later, with a clear agenda and limited time for long debates and discussions. Both AGMs were well-run and smooth, with members, committees and support agencies in agreement that they were the best AGMs held to date. This has provided an important example for other areas and the process will be implemented by other conservancies during the next year.

HIV/AIDS

The HIV/AIDS pandemic poses several threats to conservancies and the management of natural resources.

Short-term needs arising from the impact of HIV/AIDS have the potential to cause overexploitation of resources and damage to the environment on which people depend. For example, young men weakened by HIV/AIDS will no longer be able to move to remote cattle posts with livestock. Cattle will remain near homesteads throughout the year and will overgraze the land. A weakened labour force could
reduce food production, increasing the tendency to resort to illegal hunting to obtain food. In addition, conservancies can lose skilled employees and experienced committee members to the disease, reducing the capacity of the conservancy to function effectively. For these reasons, NACSO has supported a programme of mainstreaming HIV/AIDS issues in conservancy activities.

The initial focus of the programme was primarily on awareness raising. NGO policies on HIV/AIDS were developed and conservancies are now developing their own policies and implementation plans. Around 431 trained peer educators are disseminating information on HIV/AIDS to conservancy members in 47 out of the 59 registered conservancies. A baseline survey, conducted in April 2009 in two conservancies in the Erongo Region and six conservancies in the Caprivi Region indicated that awareness levels in conservancies are now above 90%. However, although people know about HIV/AIDS, they are still not changing their behaviour.

As a result, a new approach – ‘behaviour change communication’ – has been taken to address HIV/AIDS within conservancies since October 2009. The main drivers of the HIV pandemic in conservancies have been identified through a baseline survey as being alcohol and drug abuse, having multiple and concurrent partners and the fact that people are unwilling to go for voluntary counselling and testing. These drivers are now being addressed through a Behaviour Change Communication Strategy. This strategy is being implemented in the Caprivi Region (Mayuni, Mashi, Wuparu, Salambala, Kwando and Impalila Conservancies) and the Erongo Region (Gaingu Conservancy). 37 peer educators are now targeting conservancy groups to change their behaviour. The strategy has also been introduced to three conservancies in the Kunene Region, the King Nehale Conservancy in the Oshikoto Region and is planned to be introduced to the Nyae Nyae Conservancy in Otjozondjupa Region soon. The NACSO HIV/AIDS Working Group, consisting of NGO staff, is spearheading the programme, with technical assistance by a team of three NACSO staff members.

**LESSONS AND CHALLENGES**

One of the most important lessons to emerge over the past 12 years of conservancy development is that conservancies need time to experiment with different forms of governance to find out what works and what doesn’t. This has been happening in areas such as Caprivi, where there has been a clear evolution from situations where committees were taking all the decisions, financial management was weak and members did not know what was happening to their money. In the past three years, Caprivi conservancy members have been demanding more accountability from their committees and have removed committees that did not act in the interests of the members. At the same time, as reported above, there have been major efforts by NGOs to help conservancies improve their financial management. However, the current wave of firing committees also has negative impacts. Community leaders are becoming wary of taking up positions on conservancy committees, because they fear the consequences if members do not appreciate what they are doing. Conservancy members are realising that they need to be more strategic when exercising their rights to remove committee members who are not performing. Wholesale sacking of committees can lead to a leadership vacuum that can be just as damaging as having the wrong people on the committee.

Another major lesson is that governance is linked to benefits. The more a conservancy earns, and the more it is capable of meeting the different needs of members, the more interest members take in its affairs. Once members realise that large sums of money are at stake, they want to know how that money is being used. It is therefore important to look at how benefits can be increased as part of improved governance within conservancies. One of the main ways to increase benefits in future will be for conservancies to gear themselves to operate more like businesses. Currently, conservancies are constituted as social organisations – associations of individuals who come together to manage wildlife and tourism and share the benefits. Conservancies are not companies with the appropriate structures and mechanisms for running businesses and using income most efficiently. Restructuring conservancies as businesses is likely to be a major governance challenge over the next few years. This may require establishing community-owned companies that are responsible for managing the business interests of the community, such as managing contracts with tourism and hunting operators, running conservancy campsites, developing investment portfolios and managing conservancy assets such as vehicles and equipment.

Another challenge facing conservancies is the need to have a voice at regional and national levels, where key decisions are taken that affect conservancy interests. There is a need for conservancies to develop a stronger role in regional government structures and processes, but currently there are only four regional conservancy associations or forums, and only two of these are really active. In addition, conservancies need to be represented at national forums that discuss land and development issues, but there is currently no national association of communal area conservancies. More and more conservancies are indicating the desire to strengthen existing regional associations, to establish new associations and to establish an overall national association.
The Namibian CBNRM programme has made impressive in-roads and achievements since the registration of the first four communal conservancies in 1998. Previously ignored as a land use, wildlife is now being managed as a valued community asset due to its ability to generate income, create employment and provide meat.

This attitudinal shift has promoted a widespread recovery of wildlife populations and precipitated new investment opportunities, allowing the private sector to team with conservancies in the creation and operation of 29 joint-venture lodges and 32 trophy hunting concessions. The CBNRM programme has, in effect, introduced a community conservation paradigm built upon market-based conservation and devolved rights over natural resources. With 59 registered conservancies, and 16 more close to final approval, the conservancy movement is on its way to cresting. By 2015, it is believed that most land suitable for communal conservancies will be part of the movement, and an estimated 90 communal conservancies will encompass close to 21% of Namibia’s land surface (slightly more than half of the communal lands).

While the formation of community forests has not occurred at quite the same speed, the 13 registered and 45 emerging community forests represent a significant parallel movement. Increasing efforts are being undertaken to integrate the two sectors, as well
as the use of other natural resources such as inland fisheries, in order to optimise sustainable community management of all natural resources. However, optimising this growth and sustaining CBNRM achievements requires that a number of programmatic challenges be successfully addressed.

**CHALLENGES**

The conservancy movement has grown and expanded at a speed which could not be anticipated and is being confronted by a number of challenges. Some of these challenges were predictable, but have arisen faster than the programme’s ability to respond. Others have been less predictable due to the rapid evolution of conservancies and their desire to expand into spheres of activity which exceed the original scope of the conservancy legislation. Following are some of the key challenges and barriers facing CBNRM in Namibia.

**Inadequate CBNRM Support**

There is inadequate capacity in CBNRM support organisations (NGO and government) to meet the ever-increasing training/support needs of existing and emerging conservancies and community forests. As a consequence, emerging entities are not receiving systematic and comprehensive capacity-building support, while new committees in established conservancies and community forests are not being trained to the level of preceding committees. Consequently, there is an erosion of institutional capacities of conservancies and community forests to manage themselves, their staff and their assets. There is an imperative need to strengthen CBNRM support capacities while concomitantly introducing new training approaches which are more efficient and cost effective.

**Need for Improved Conservancy Management**

Limited resource tenure remains a challenge to the conservancy movement. Since conservancies only have recognised tenure rights over wildlife and tourism resources, they have limited capacities to promote effective, integrated management of the full suite of natural resources found within the conservancy. This favours fragmented resource management and limits the ability of conservancies to influence and control access to other types of potentially competing and/or complimentary resource uses (i.e. livestock grazing, harvesting of veld products, fresh water fishery stocks, etc.). There remains a need for various ministries to recognise and validate the potential role that conservancies can play in coordinating effective, integrated resource management in collaboration with community forests and other entities. Some of these problems could
be addressed through the development of a truly national CBNRM policy that provides the framework for one community institution to gain rights over all resources.

As conservancies mature and engage in multiple enterprises, the risks of increased conflict between different forms of wildlife use grow. It is common knowledge that photographic tourism and hunting in the same concession, unless carefully managed, do not go well together. However, conservancies are increasingly finding that different forms of wildlife use (i.e. trophy hunting, own-use hunting, shoot-and-sell hunting and live game capture) can also conflict with one another. There is a growing need for conservancies to practice and enforce both spatial and temporal zonation between photographic tourism and consumptive use of wildlife, and to improve the management of different forms of wildlife utilisation to optimise the benefits.

Human wildlife conflict continues to escalate as elephants and apex predators (lion, spotted hyaena, cheetah, leopard, crocodile) grow in population and range. Proactive steps are being taken to assist conservancies with the development of human wildlife conflict management plans and to introduce site-specific mitigation mechanisms. However, these efforts need to be ratcheted up to a higher level and adjustments need to be made to the recently passed Human Wildlife Conflict Policy of the Ministry of Environment & Tourism (MET) to promote better engagement and to increase both the authority and responsibility of conservancies towards human wildlife conflict mitigation.

Rhino Poaching has been increasing at alarming rates across southern Africa, especially in South Africa and Zimbabwe. Long considered as having southern Africa’s best-managed park system, South Africa has been unable to counter increasing Asian demands for rhino horn, having had 121 rhino poached from within its park boundaries and private reserves during 2009. Namibia now has the world’s largest population of black rhino, and it is only a matter of time before commercialised efforts are made to poach our rhino.

Innovative approaches, modern technologies and good collaboration amongs stakeholders are required to overcome the challenges and counter the threats facing CBNRM in Namibia.
There is a need for conservancies, support NGOs, private sector partners and the MET to proactively prepare for and counter this externally driven threat.

**Inadequate Integration and Policy Harmonisation**

*Insufficient recognition of the conservancy movement by some ministries remains an impediment to the long-term sustainability of conservancies.* While the proposed new legislation of the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR) makes provisions for the granting of head and sub-leases to conservancies and tourism operators, respectively, current plans by MLR to impose unrealistically high lease fees on tourism operators in communal areas could result in reduced profitability of joint-venture (JV) lodges, less income from JV lodge contracts to conservancies, failure of some lodge operations, and reduced long-term sustainability of conservancies.

Similarly, a number of JV lodges are suffering from conflicts with resident traditional authorities (TAs) who demand direct payments from the lodges instead of through the conservancies. There is a need for joint intervention and coordination between MET and counterpart ministries like MLR and the Ministry of Regional & Local Government & Housing & Rural Development (MRLGHRD) to address these issues.

Improved collaboration between the agricultural and wildlife sectors is needed to reduce conflicts and ensure optimum benefits from available resources. This is true at both the ministerial and community levels. While closer collaboration between MET and the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) could remove barriers and avoid conflicting developments, effective zoning of land-uses at conservancy level would reduce conflicts, lead to increased investment and boost production.

On the positive side, the role of conservancies in fresh water fishery management is being increasingly recognised by the Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources (MFMR), while MLR’s new draft legislation continues to recognise the importance of including a conservancy representative on communal land boards, and community forests are working closely with conservancies to harmonise their constitutions and management plans.

**BENEFITS AND INCENTIVES**

The benefits generated by Namibia’s CBNRM programme and affiliated conservancy movement have provided strong incentives for neighbouring communities to also form conservancies or community forests. In total, the CBNRM programme has contributed close to N$ 1 billion (2007 N$ values) to Namibia’s Net National Income since 1991. The growth of the CBNRM programme’s annual contributions have slowed over the past two years due to the global recession, but it is believed that significant escalations in annual returns will occur as global economic conditions normalise. However, optimal returns to the programme and its participants will best be achieved if the following concerns are addressed.

**Private sector engagement** in the CBNRM programme, especially in conservancies, needs to be promoted and strengthened. At present, private sector investments are being constrained by a number of barriers, including: absence of head and sub-lease arrangements between conservancies and lodge operators; short lease durations for lodge operations (10 year ceiling unless approved otherwise by the Minister of MLR); inability to secure commercial loans from banks due to the insecure tenure arrangements and short leaseholds; and MLR plans to heavily ‘tax’ lodges on communal lands. Addressing these constraints will unlock potential and catalyse major private sector investments in communal conservancies.

There remains a strong need for conservancies to diversify income generation. Conservancies presently receive the majority of their income and benefits from JV lodges and trophy hunting concessions. There is a need to strengthen the development of further enterprises based upon indigenous plant products, value-added processing of such products, and capturing of benefits along various parts of the tourism value chain. Similarly, a range of spin-off enterprises can be developed and exploited as conservancy tourism visitations grow. In addition, conservancies need to become more business oriented in the management of their enterprises and resources.

**Financial governance** remains a challenge to the programme. Conservancies often use a disproportionate amount of cash income to cover operational and staff costs, while a number of conservancies have not been able to fully account for their income to their members. Such situations can lead to reduced conservancy management effectiveness, internal conflict, and loss of conservancy credibility with government and private sector partners. Systems need to be strengthened around the management and accounting of conservancy income and transparency around decision-making of conservancy budgets, while greater proportions of benefits need to reach individual member and household levels.
A VISION FOR THE FUTURE
The Namibian conservancy movement has become an internationally acclaimed community conservation success model. Conservancies are making significant biodiversity contributions, creating synergies with national parks, and are contributing to rural development, employment and livelihoods at the community level. The continued expansion of conservancies and community forests is countering habitat fragmentation and increasing connectivity of biological corridors at large landscape scales. The resultant improved management of Namibia’s deserts, savannas and woodlands is enhancing carbon storage in soils and vegetation and laying a foundation to mitigate climate change. Over the next 10 years, it is envisioned that communal conservancies and community forests will spread to more than 50% of all communal lands, allowing rural Namibians to further market their unique wildlife, tourism and forestry resources to a growing global market that has an increased willingness to pay for the type of tourism products that Namibia offers. However, in order to do so, the above challenges and barriers must be overcome, while steps must be taken to bolster the long-term sustainability of the support services which are critical to the operations of conservancies and community forests.

Programmatic Sustainability
It has taken almost two decades to change national policies, catalyse wildlife recoveries and initiate the mainstreaming of the CBNRM movement in Namibia. While much has been achieved, the full potential and promise of the conservancy movement and community forest programme still remains largely untapped. It will take many more years to reap the benefits the programme is sowing now. This will require new and innovative approaches and mechanisms to elevate conservancies and community forests to greater heights and establish means of permanently maintaining their success.

At present, conservancies and community forests are in transition from very capital intensive development stages to less costly, long-term ‘maintenance’ stages. Twenty of the older, established conservancies have attained financial self-sufficiency, while the majority of conservancies and community forests are still in pursuit of this milestone achievement. However, financial independence on its own will not lead to permanently sustainable conservancies and community forests.

It has been recognised that these community-based organisations will require routine access to a range of critical

While much has been achieved, the full potential of conservancies and community forests still remains largely untapped.
support services and skills. The availability of these support services will be dependent upon the ability of the national CBNRM programme to permanently provide such services as training of new committees, assistance in developing or revising management plans, brokering of new JV lodge and trophy hunting agreements, constitutional reforms, conflict resolution, quota setting, enterprise development, advocacy, programmatic monitoring and management, financial management, business decision-making, etc. In short, there is a need for a permanent CBNRM extension service for conservancies and community forests and the CBNRM sector in general.

The CBNRM programme has embarked upon a sequence of steps to identify the long-term maintenance needs of communal conservancies and community forests. The programme is finalising its National CBNRM Sustainability Strategy, and this will be complemented by the creation of conservancy/community forest Sustainable Finance Plans. Sustainable financing sources for conservancies and community forests will be explored from amongst a variety of opportunities, ranging from recovery payments for services rendered and biodiversity offsets to business ventures and offshore investments. Many of these income sources will be managed under the umbrella of a CBNRM Trust Fund which can be used to sustainably pay for critical support services to not only the conservancies and community forests, but also for national level services provided by NACSO.

The success of the conservancy movement has prompted a bold vision for the long-term development and impact of Namibia’s CBNRM programme. This vision recognises that success cannot be permanent unless programme sustainability becomes a core focus, and that substantial effort and innovation must be applied to take current successes to higher levels of impact. The vision also recognises that a key component of the future sustainability of the programme is the achievement of financial independence. While the Namibian CBNRM programme has already crossed into new frontiers of community conservation, there are many more thresholds to pass before the communal conservancy and community forest movements can be truly sustainable.

The vision for Namibia’s CBNRM programme recognises that success cannot be permanent unless programme sustainability becomes a core focus.
Chapter 6

Profiles

of 59 conservancies, registered in 2009

LEGEND FOR THE MAPS

- Agriculture or forestry station
- Baobab tree
- Borehole
- Closed mine
- Active mine
- Conservancy office
- Cultural attraction
- Dam
- Farm house
- Health facility
- Lodge
- Palms
- Pans
- Picnic place
- Place of interest
- Quarantine camp or veterinary fence control point
- Rock art
- School
- Settlement
- Spring
- Tourist campsite
- Main road
- Minor road
- Main river
- Minor river
**!GAWACHAB**

(derived from the name of a farm that was part of the Odendaal Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>!Gawachab Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 422, Keetmanshoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>081 2292885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Khoekhoegowab, Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>132 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Karas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Arid area with average annual rainfall of 100-150 mm. Fairly flat with isolated, low sand dunes in central area. Riverine woodland fringes Löwen River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Löwen River, nearby Naute Dam. Old railway station and road used mostly by tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Steenbok, gemsbok, springbok, African wild cat, black-backed jackal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of five men and two women; no staff at present; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>None at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support agencies</td>
<td>MET, K.R.C, NDT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**!HAN /AWAB**

- **Registered**: May 2008
- **Address**: !Han /awab Conservancy
  P.O. Box 135, Bethanie
- **Telephone**: 063 283059
- **Approximate population**: 780
- **Main home languages**: Khoekhoegowab, Afrikaans
- **Area**: 1,923 square kilometres
- **Region**: Karas
- **Geographical features**: Semi-desert area of dwarf shrub savannah. Receives about 100-150 mm average annual rainfall.
- **Unusual or important features**: Pans and rugged terrain.
- **Major wildlife resources**: Springbok, kudu, gemsbok, steenbok, leopard, black-backed jackal, baboon, ostrich.
- **Management**: Management Committee of four women and five men; 14 volunteer Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
- **Enterprises**: No formal enterprises; locally manufactured crafts out of leather, semi-precious stones and other materials.
- **Support agencies**: MET, NDT (main support NGO), NNF, RWS, DEES
!KHOB !NAUB
(named after the !Khob !Naub Plateau)

Registered
July 2003

Address
!Khob !Naub Conservancy
PO Box 2185, Keetmanshoop

Telephone
063 257022

Approximate population
5,000

Main home languages
Khoekhoegowab, Otjiherero, Afrikaans,
Oshiwambo

Area
2,747 square kilometres

Region
Karas

Geographical features
Semi-desert receiving about 150 mm
average annual rainfall. Sparse savannah
and grasslands. Northern part dominated
by plateau, eastern and western parts flat
and rolling, with sand dunes towards the
central area.

Unusual or important features
Giant quiver trees on top of the plateau.

Major wildlife resources
Steenbok, springbok.

Management
Management Committee of four women
and five men; seven volunteer Community
Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using
annual road-based count and Event Book
monitoring system.

Enterprises
Own-use hunting; shoot-and-sell
hunting.

Support agencies
MET, NDT (main support NGO), NNF,
MAWF, UNAM, NACOBTA, DRWS,
DOF, ICEMA, DEES, RWS
//AUDI
(named after the eight natural springs in the conservancy area)

Registered
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support Agencies

October 2006
//Audi Conservancy
P.O. Box 416, Khorixas
067 331194
1,000
Khoekhoegowab
335 square kilometres
Kunene
Average rainfall is about 300mm per year. Mountainous with lowland Mopane. Altitude ranges between 1500m-2000m above sea level.
Rock paintings, engravings and an attractive two kilometre long cave at Tsumamas.
Kudu, mountain zebra, gemsbok, black-backed jackal, cheetah, caracal, leopard, springbok, steenbok, warthog.
Conservancy Committee of six women and nine men; no staff at present; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
None at present.
MET
//GAMASEB
(named after the mountain used to house medicine, food and water)

Registered: July 2003
Address: //Gamaseb Conservancy
P.O. Box 372, Karasburg
Telephone: 063 270711
Approximate population: 5,000
Main home languages: Khoekhoegowab, Afrikaans, Oshiwambo
Area: 1,748 square kilometres
Region: Karas
Geographical features: Semi-desert receiving about 150 mm average annual rainfall. Sparse savannah and grasslands. Landscape dominated by the flat Gamaseb Mountain in the north-west.

Unusual or important features: Gamaseb Mountain.
Major wildlife resources: Steenbok, gemsbok, springbok.
Management: Management Committee of three women and six men; no staff at present; six volunteer Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises: Own-use hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting.
Support agencies: MET, NDT, MAWF, NNF, DEES, RWS, LAC, UNAM, NACOBTA, Bondelswarts Traditional Authority

Traditional Authority: //gamasebB
Namibia's communal conservancies

//HUAB
(named after the Huab River which passes through the conservancy)

Registered
July 2003

Address
//Huab Conservancy
P.O. Box 228, Khorixas

Telephone
067 331392

Approximate population
5,000

Main home languages
Khoekhoegowab

Area
1,817 square kilometres

Region
Kunene

Geographical features
Semi-arid with less than 300 mm average annual rainfall. Mostly sparse savannah, with wooded river valleys separating hills and plains.

Unusual or important features
Huab River

Major wildlife resources
Elephant, leopard, mountain zebra, kudu, duiker, warthog, steenbok, klipspringer, ostrich, gemsbok, springbok.

Management
Management Committee of five men and three women; staff of four Community Game Guards and one Liaison Officer; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises
Trophy hunting; own-use hunting.

Support agencies
MET, NNF, WDT (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, UNAM and ICEMA
# KHOADI-//HÔAS
(named after the Khoekhoegowab phrase for ‘elephant’s corner’)

**Registered**
June 1998

**Address**
KHOADI-//HÔAS Conservancy
P O Box 119, Kamanjab

**Telephone**
067 333017

**Approximate population**
3,200

**Main home languages**
Khoekhoegowab, Otjiherero

**Area**
3,364 square kilometres

**Region**
Kunene

**Geographical features**
Grootberg Mountain with hills and plains, receives 100-250 mm average annual rainfall.

**Unusual or important features**
Grootberg Mountain range, Forum for Integrated Resource Management (FIRM).

**Major wildlife resources**
Elephant, black rhino, leopard, mountain zebra, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, giraffe, duiker, klipspringer, warthog, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal, cheetah.

**Management**
Management Committee of 14 men and three women; Executive Committee of six members; Traditional Authority acts as advisor; staff of seven Environmental Shepherds, one Environmental Shepherd Coordinator and one Information Officer; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

**Enterprises**
Grootberg Lodge (community-owned, managed by private sector partner); trophy hunting; own-use hunting; Hoada (meaning ‘everyone’s’) Campsite (community campsite).

**Support agencies**
MET, LAC, WWF In Namibia, MAWF, SRT, ICEMA
**#GAINGU**
*(named after the Khoekhoegowab name for ‘Spitzkoppe Mountain’)*

| **Registered** | March 2004 |
| **Address** | #Gaingu Conservancy  
P.O. Box 357, Usakos |
| **Telephone** | 064 530859 |
| **Approximate population** | 2,800 |
| **Main home languages** | Khoekhoegowab |
| **Area** | 7,731 square kilometres |
| **Region** | Erongo |
| **Geographical features** | Arid with less than 200 mm average annual rainfall. Rolling, flat landscape in which the Spitzkoppe Mountain stands out. |
| **Unusual or important features** | Spitzkoppe National Monument Area, Rössing Mountain. The conservancy is close to and en route to the two coastal towns and tourist destinations of Walvis Bay and Swakopmund. |
| **Major wildlife resources** | Kudu, gemsbok, springbok, leopard. |
| **Management** | Management Committee of nine men and five women, including a representative from the Traditional Authority; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system. |
| **Enterprises** | Spitzkoppe Community Camp (community rest camp); trophy hunting; semi-precious stone market. |
| **Support agencies** | MET, Rössing Foundation, RISE, WWF In Namibia |
**AFRICAN WILD DOG**  
(named after African wild dogs that move through the area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>African Wild Dog Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 49, Okakarara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>062 529097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Otjiherero, Ju/'hoansi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>3,824 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Thornveld savannah, sandy area with 350–400 mm average annual rainfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Holy monument places at Ozonguti and Okozonduzu, underground water resource close to ground surface in some areas of Okonodjatu Pans, Ngunib Omuramba. Borders commercial farms and conservancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Wild dog, kudu, warthog, ostrich, gemsbok, eland, cheetah, leopard, vultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of ten men and nine women; Executive Committee of nine members; one female staff; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Devil’s claw harvesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Agencies</td>
<td>NDT (main support NGO), MET, NNF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANABEB
(named after the Ana tree)

Registered
July 2003
Address
Anabeb Conservancy
P.O. Box 33, Kamanjab
Telephone
065 275 311/33
Approximate population
2,000
Main home languages
Otjiherero, Khoekhoegowab
Area
1,570 square kilometres
Region
Kunene
Geographical features
Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.

Unusual or important features
Khowareb Schlucht, Hoanib River, rock paintings, Ongongo Spring.

Major wildlife resources
Elephant, leopard, cheetah, mountain zebra, gemsbok, springbok, ostrich, steenbok, kudu, klipspringer, black-backed jackal, lion, caracal.

Management
Management Committee of 14 men and three women; staff of nine Community Game Guards, a Conservancy Manager, a Financial Administrator and a Community Activator; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises
Joint-venture tourism agreement with Ongongo Camp; Palmwag Tourism Concession; Khowareb Rest Camp (community rest camp); trophy hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.

Support agencies
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, WWF In Namibia, LAC, SRT, ICEMA
**BALYERWA**
(derived from the Yeyi name for a now dry swamp that provided residents with a variety of natural resources)

- **Registered**: October 2006
- **Address**: Balyerwa Conservancy, P.O. Box 2028, Ngweze
- **Telephone**: 081 3630908
- **Approximate population**: 1,500
- **Main home languages**: Siyeyi
- **Area**: 223 square kilometres
- **Region**: Caprivi
- **Geographical features**: A mosaic of woodland and grassland. The average annual rainfall is 600 mm.
- **Unusual or important features**: Kwando River, Mamali National Park on southern border and Mudumu National Park on northern border.
- **Major wildlife resources**: Elephant, hippo, kudu, buffalo, leopard, bush pig, duiker, warthog, black-backed jackal, lion, spotted hyaena, crocodile, plains zebra, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
- **Management**: Management Committee of eight men and one woman; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.
- **Enterprises**: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Lianshulu Lodge (in Mudumu National Park); trophy hunting; own-use hunting.
- **Support Agencies**: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, LAC, NNF, WWF In Namibia
DORO !NAWAS
(named after the Doros Crater which means ‘the place where rhinos roam’ in Khoekhoegowab)

Registered: December 1999
Address: Doro !Nawas Conservancy
           P.O. Box 34, Khorixas
Telephone: 067 331940
Approximate population: 1,500
Main home languages: Khoekhoegowab
Area: 3,978 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah.
Landscape of rugged, folded hills, plains and wooded river valleys.
Unusual or important features: Ugab river, Petrified Forest, abundant welwitschia plants.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, black rhino, cheetah, steenbok, kudu, ostrich, giraffe, gemsbok, mountain zebra, springbok, klipspringer, duiker.
Management: Management Committee of nine men and five women; staff of four Community Game Guards, one Office Coordinator, two Conservancy Facilitators and one Secretary; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Doro Navas Lodge; Granietkop Campsite (community campsite); Bloukrans Petrified Forest; trophy hunting; premium hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.
Support agencies: MET, WDT (main support NGO), NNF, NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia, SRT, ICEMA
**DZOTI**  
(named after the Dzoti River Channel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Registered</strong></th>
<th>October 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Address**   | Dzoti Conservancy  
P.O. Box 1532, Ngweze |
| **Telephone** | 066 252666 |
| **Approximate population** | 1,100 |
| **Main home languages** | Siyeyi |
| **Area**      | 245 square kilometres |
| **Region**    | Caprivi |
| **Geographical features** | Linyanti River with associated flood plain areas. Broad-leafed tree and shrub savannah away from the river. 550-600mm average annual rainfall. |
| **Unusual or important features** | The south-western corner of Dzoti borders with Mamili National Park. The Linyanti River forms the south-eastern boundary of the conservancy as well as the international border with Botswana. |
| **Major wildlife resources** | Elephant, buffalo, lion, leopard, wild dog, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal, hippo, crocodile, lechwe, sitatunga, bushbuck, reedbuck, kudu, common impala, roan, plains zebra, duiker, steenbok, warthog, bush pig, baboon, interesting bird life. |
| **Management** | Management Committee of six men and six women; staff of six Community Game Guards and four Community Resource Monitors; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system. |
| **Enterprises** | Trophy hunting. |
| **Support agencies** | MET, IRDNC  
(main support NGO),  
NNF, WWF In Namibia |

![Map of Dzoti Conservancy](image-url)
**EHIROVIPUKA**
(named after the Otjiherero phrase for ‘place of wildlife’)

**Registered**
January 2001

**Address**
Ehirovipuka Conservancy
P.O. Box 192, Kamanjab
065 276200

**Telephone**

**Approximate population**
2,500

**Main home languages**
Otjiherero

**Area**
1,980 square kilometres

**Region**
Kunene

**Geographical features**
Semi-desert with 250–300 mm average annual rainfall. Savannah woodlands cover the rolling landscape while the river valleys support taller trees. Ombonde River.

**Unusual or important features**
Ombonde River.

**Major wildlife resources**
Elephant, leopard, lion, cheetah, eland, kudu, duiker, warthog, steenbok, gemsbok, giraffe, springbok, ostrich, mountain zebra.

**Management**
Management Committee of 12 men; Executive Committee of six members; staff of five Community Game Guards, one Field Officer and one Community Activator; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

**Enterprises**
Trophy hunting; own-use hunting.

**Support agencies**
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, ICEMA, WWF In Namibia, SRT, ICEMA
EISEB

Registered
March 2009

Address
Eiseb Conservancy
P O Box 26166, Windhoek

Telephone
081 2849859

Approximate population
5,000

Main home languages
Otjiherero, San

Area
6,625 square kilometres

Region
Omaheke

Geographical features
Undulating northern Kalahari woodland and grassland with 350–400 mm average annual rainfall. A few well-defined drainage lines cross the conservancy.

Unusual or important features
Traditional culture of Herero people.

Major wildlife resources
Elephant, leopard, giraffe, eland, kudu, gemsbok, steenbok, wild dog, spotted hyaena, cheetah, black-backed jackal.

Management
Management Committee of seven men and five women; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises
None at present.

Support agencies
MET, NNF (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia
GEORGE MUKOYA
(named after a famous elephant hunter, who was a particularly good shot and tracker)

Registered: September 2005
Address: George Mukoya Conservancy
          P.O. Box 2113, Rundu
Telephone: 066 256145/146
Approximate population: 2,000
Main home languages: Rugciriku
Area: 486 square kilometres
Region: Kavango
Geographical features: Northern Kalahari sandveld with average annual rainfall of 500-600mm. Relatively close to Okavango River.
Unusual or important features: Located on northern border of Khaudum National Park, adjacent to Muduva Nyangana Conservancy.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, wild dog, leopard, kudu, plains zebra, common impala, eland, steenbok.
Management: Management Committee of four women and six men; staff of ten Resource Monitors, a Senior Resource Monitor and a Coordinator; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system; George Mukoya is part of the Khaudum North Complex collaborative management forum.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Khaudum Camps (in Khaudum National Park); crafts; trophy hunting; own-use hunting; thatching grass, Kalahari melon seed, Ximenia and devil’s claw harvesting.
Support agencies: MET, MAWF, DoF, DED, MFMR, NNF (main support NGO), ICEMA, OAT, CFN
HUIBLES

Registered: October 2009

Address: Huibes Conservancy
P.O. Box 249, Mariental

Telephone: 0668 1612/1522

Approximate population: 1,200

Main home languages: Khoekhoegowab, Afrikaans

Area: 1,327 square kilometres

Region: Hardap

Geographical features: Arid area of dwarf savannah. Larger trees occur along river valleys. 150-200 mm average annual rainfall.

Unusual or important features: Situated along Lewer River.

Major wildlife resources: Springbok, kudu, steenbok, ostrich, black-backed jackal, baboon.

Management: Management Committee of four women and three men; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises: None at present.

Support agencies: MET, NDT (main support NGO), DEES and RWS
**IMPALILA**
(named after Impalila Island which means ‘the far-away place’)

- **Registered**: December 2005
- **Address**: Impalila Conservancy
  P.O. Box 2435, Ngweze
- **Telephone**: 066 252666
- **Approximate population**: 1,500
- **Main home languages**: Subia
- **Area**: 73 square kilometres
- **Region**: Caprivi
- **Geographical features**: The island is bounded by the Zambezi and Chobe Rivers. Average annual rainfall is over 600 mm.
- **Unusual or important features**: Prominent baobab tree from which people can view four countries bordering each other.
- **Major wildlife resources**: Elephant, buffalo, crocodile, hippo, waterbuck, common impala, lechwe, sitatunga, warthog, bushbuck, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
- **Management**: Management Committee of five men and four women; Executive Committee of two men and four women includes a representative of the traditional authority as advisor; staff of a Manager, a Secretary, a Treasurer, four Community Game Rangers, two Community Resource Monitors, three Tour Guides and a Watchman; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.
- **Enterprises**: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Impalila Island Lodge; tourism activities include birding, fishing, village visits and crafts; trophy hunting.
- **Support Agencies**: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NNE, WWF In Namibia, LAC, ICEMA
**JOSEPH MBAMBANGANDU**  
(named after a senior headman who was the first to come into the area from Zambia and founded the villages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>March 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Joseph Mbambangandu Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 702, Rundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>081 2008874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Rumanyo (Rushambyu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>43 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Kavango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Average annual rainfall of 550-600 mm. Located on the banks of the Okavango River with Kalahari woodlands, oxbow lake and floodplains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Riparian woodland in good condition, river and oxbow lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Hippo, crocodile, interesting bird life, various fish species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of six men and four women; Traditional Authority serves on the committee as advisor; Mbamba Campsite has five staff; no wildlife monitoring at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Mbamba Campsite (community campsite); crafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support agencies</td>
<td>MET, NNF (main support NGO), MAWF, DoF, MFMR, Basin Wide Forum, OAT, WWF In Namibia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of the area](image_url)
KASIKI
(meaning the small Mangosteen tree)

Registered December 2005
Address Kasika Conservancy
P.O. Box 749, Ngweze
Telephone 066 252666
Approximate population 1,500
Main home languages Subia
Area 147 square kilometres
Region Caprivi
Geographical features Average annual rainfall of over 600 mm. Floodplain area between Chobe and Zambezi Rivers.
Unusual or important features Close to Chobe and Zambezi Rivers, with water visible throughout the year. Borders Chobe National Park in Botswana.
Major wildlife resources Elephant, buffalo, crocodile, hippo, lechwe, sitatunga, waterbuck, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
Management Management Committee of 33 members, of which nine are women; Executive Committee of eight members including a Traditional Authority representative as advisor; staff of a Manager, a Secretary, a Treasurer, six Community Game Guards and two Community Resource Monitors; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises Joint-venture tourism agreements with King’s Den Lodge and Chobe Savanna Lodge; tourism activities include traditional dancing, birding, fishing trips and crafts; trophy hunting; own-use hunting.
Support Agencies MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, NNF, Conservation International, ICEMA
**KING NEHALE**
(named after the late Nehale ya Mpingana, King of the Ondonga Traditional Authority)

Registered: September 2005
Address: King Nehale Conservancy
P.O. Box 19099, Omuthiya
Telephone: 065 244095 (craft centre)
Approximate population: 20,000
Main home languages: Oshiwambo
Area: 508 square kilometres
Region: Oshikoto
Geographical features: Flat area with woodland, grassland and mixed thorn bush. Average annual rainfall of 400–500 mm.
Unusual or important features: Located on northern border of Etosha National Park. Spring which has been running since 1956.
Major wildlife resources: Gemsbok, springbok, kudu, blue wildebeest, giraffe
Management: Management Committee of 32 members, of which 20 are women (includes craft, tourism, and traditional authority representatives); Executive Committee of 11 members; staff of five; wildlife monitoring using annual count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Craft shop; trophy hunting; own-use hunting; Kalahari melon seed harvesting.
Support Agencies: Rössing Foundation, NDT, MET, CRIAA, WWF In Namibia, NNF, LAC
**KUNENE RIVER**  
*(named after the Kunene River which forms the northern boundary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>October 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Kunene River Conservancy P.O. Box 87, Opuwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>065 274002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Oshiwambo, Otjiherero, Otjihimba and Dhembra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,764 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Mountainous with river boundary along north. Average annual rainfall of 300–400 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Kunene River forms northern boundary (international boundary with Angola).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Black-faced impala, kudu, black-backed jackal, Damara dik dik, leopard, hippo, mountain zebra, springbok, ostrich, duiker, elephant, crocodile, steenbok, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Conservancy committee of five women and eight men, including two traditional authority representatives; staff of five Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Joint-venture tourism agreement with Kunene River Lodge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Agencies</td>
<td>MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Namibia
KWANDU
(named after the Kwando River on the western boundary of the conservancy)

Registered
December 1999

Address
Kwandu Conservancy
P.O. Box 8075, Ngweze

Telephone
066 252518 or 252666

Approximate population
4,300

Main home languages
Sifwe

Area
190 square kilometres

Region
Caprivi

Geographical features
Average annual rainfall of about 600 mm. Grassland and swamp vegetation dominate the floodplain, while much of the woodland on higher ground to the east has been cleared or damaged by frequent fires.

Unusual or important features
Kwando River and its floodplains.

Major wildlife resources
Lion, leopard, elephant, roan, reedbuck, kudu, duiker, lechwe, crocodile, bushbuck, tsessebe, warthog, bush pig, hippo, sitatunga, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.

Management
Management Committee of nine men and three women; Executive Committee of four members and six trustees; staff of a Manager, a Secretary, a Treasurer, three Community Game Guards, two Community Resource Monitors and a Field Officer; joint monitoring unit with Mashi, Sobbe and Mayuni Conservancies; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system; Kwandu is part of the Mudumu North Complex collaborative management forum.

Enterprises
Bum Hill Campsite (community campsite); living museum (Mafwe); crafts; trophy hunting; thatching grass harvesting.

Support agencies
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NNE, LAC, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA, Likwama Farmers Union, CRIAA
**MARIENFLUSS**
(named after the Marienfluss Valley)

**Registered**
January 2001

**Address**
Marienfluss Conservancy
P.O. Box 38, Opuwo

**Telephone**
065 685993

**Approximate population**
300

**Main home languages**
Otjihimba

**Area**
3,034 square kilometres

**Region**
Kunene

**Geographical features**
Desert with less than 100 mm Average annual rainfall. Rugged hills cover the eastern area, while grasslands dominate the broad, central Marienfluss and Hartmann’s Valleys. Extensive dunes cover the western section.

**Unusual or important features**
Kunene River, Marienfluss Valley, dune fields, Hartmann’s Valley, Baynes Mountains.

**Major wildlife resources**
Leopard, cheetah, giraffe, duiker, steenbok, gemsbok, springbok, ostrich, mountain zebra, crocodile, kudu.

**Management**
Management Committee of ten men and six women. Executive Committee of six members; staff of four Community Game Guards, two Field Officers and two Community Activators; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

**Enterprises**
Joint-venture tourism agreements with Camp Syncro, Marienfluss Lodge, Kunene Camp and Serra Cafema; Okarohombo Campsite (community campsite); trophy hunting; own-use hunting; *Commiphora* resin harvesting.

**Support agencies**
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), LAC, WWF In Namibia
MASHI
(derived from the name of a tree that produces fruits; also an alternative name for the Kwando River)

Registered: March 2003
Address: Mashi Conservancy
P.O. Box 8061, Ngweze
Telephone: 066 252108
Approximate population: 3,900
Main home languages: Sifwe, Mbukushu
Area: 297 square kilometres
Region: Caprivi
Geographical features: Kwando River and its floodplains, with Kalahari woodlands to the east. Rainfall averages 600 mm per year.
Major wildlife resources: Lion, leopard, elephant, hippo, roan, sitatunga, cheetah, tsessebe, reedbuck, kudu, duiker, warthog, crocodile, bushbuck, lechwe, steenbok, hippo, tsessebe, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
Management: Management Committee of 11 men and one woman; four representatives of the traditional authority; staff of 11 Community Rangers and Resource Monitors, a Chairman, a Treasurer and a Secretary; joint monitoring unit with Kwandu, Sobbe and Mayuni Conservancies; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system; Mashi is part of the Mudumu North Complex collaborative management forum.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreements with Camp Kwando and Namushasha Lodge; Lizauli Traditional Village; own-use hunting; crafts; thatching grass harvesting.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), LAC, OAT, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA
MAYUNI

Registered
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support agencies

December 1999
Mayuni Conservancy
P.O. Box 8011, Mayuni, Kongola
066 252518
2,400
Sifwe
151 square kilometres
Caprivi
Average annual rainfall of about 600 millimetres.
The Kwando River floodplain is dominated by grasslands and swamp vegetation, while much of the woodland on higher ground to the east has been cleared or damaged by frequent fires.
Kwando River and its floodplains.
Lion, leopard, elephant, buffalo, steenbok, kudu, duiker, lechwe, reedbuck, crocodile, hippo, bushbuck, interesting bird life, tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
Management Committee of nine men and three women and two men as trustees; staff of six Anti-Poaching Officers, a Manager and a Community Resource Monitor; joint monitoring unit with Kwanu, Sobbe and Mashi Conservancies; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system; Mayuni is part of the Mudumu North Complex collaborative management forum.
Joint-venture tourism agreements with Susuwe Island Lodge, Mazambala Island Lodge and Kubunyana Campsite; Nambwa Campsite (community campsite); Mashi Craft Centre; trophy hunting; own-use hunting; thatching grass harvesting.
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NNE NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA.
MUDUVA NYANGANA
(named after a former traditional chief of the Gciriku people in Kavango; he was a soldier and participated in the war against the German colonial forces)

Registered
September 2005

Address
Muduva Nyangana Conservancy
P.O. Box 344, Rundu

Telephone
066 256145/146

Approximate population
2,000

Main home languages
Rugciriku

Area
615 square kilometres

Region
Kavango

Geographical features
Kalahari sandveld with average annual rainfall of 500-600 mm. Relatively close to Okavango River.

Unusual or important features
Located on northern border of Khaudum National Park, adjacent to George Mukoya Conservancy.

Major wildlife resources
Elephant, wild dog, leopard, kudu, plains zebra, common impala, eland, steenbok, woodland birdlife.

Management
Management Committee of three women and seven men; staff of ten Resource Monitors, a Senior Resource Monitor and a Coordinator; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system; Muduva Nyangana is part of the Khaudum North Complex collaborative management forum.

Enterprises
Joint-venture tourism agreement with Khaudum Camps (in Khaudum National Park); crafts; trophy hunting; own-use hunting; thatching grass, Kalahari melon seed, Ximenia and devil’s claw harvesting.

Support agencies
MET, MAWF, DoF, MFMR, Basin Wide Forum, NNF (main support NGO), ICEMA
N≠A-JAQA
(named after the buffalo thorn tree)

Registered: July 2003
Address: N≠a-Jaqa Conservancy
P.O Box 1049, Grootfontein
Telephone: 067 245047
Approximate population: 7,000
Main home language: Ju/'hoansi
Area: 9,120 square kilometres
Region: Otjozondjupa
Geographical features: Average annual rainfall of 400–450 mm. Kalahari sands cover flat landscape of broadleaf and acacia woodland.

Unusual or important features: Traditional culture of San people.

Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, eland, duiker, steenbok, gemsbok, kudu, giraffe, black-backed jackal, cheetah, warthog, spotted hyaena.

Management: Management Committee of eight men and four women; additional members from traditional authority; no staff at present; two game guards trained in trophy hunting, monitoring and data collection techniques; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises: Omatako Valley Rest Camp (community rest camp); Grashoek Cultural Village; crafts; trophy hunting; own-use hunting; dry wood harvesting project; devil’s claw harvesting.

Support agencies: MET, WIMSA (main support NGO), NNF, LAC, WWF In Namibia, CRJAA, ICEMA, NNDFN
NYAE NYAE
(meaning ‘place without mountains, but rocky’)

Registered: February 1998
Address: Nyae Nyae Conservancy, P.O. Box 45, Grootfontein
Telephone: 067 244011
Approximate population: 2,300
Main home languages: Ju/'hoansi
Area: 8,992 square kilometres
Region: Otjozondjupa
Geographical features: Mix of broad-leafed and acacia woodlands around a series of large pans that fill after good rains. The Aha Hills in the east are prominent in the flat landscape.
Unusual or important features: The culture of the San people, the Nyae Nyae Pans and other pans, Dorsland Trek Baobabs.
Major wildlife resources: Lion, reedbuck, buffalo, elephant, leopard, roan, cheetah, wild dog, hartebeest, kudu, duiker, warthog, steenbok, gemsbok, springbok, blue wildebeest, eland, giraffe.
Management: Conservancy Board of six women and 13 men; management Committee of six members; staff of ten Community Rangers, a CBNRM Field Officer, a Project Manager, a Public Relations Manager, four members of the water team, four Junior Teachers, a Pre-School Teacher and an Education Coordinator; wildlife monitoring using annual full moon count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreements with Nyae Nyae Fly-In Camp and Nyae Nyae Safari Camps; Nyae Nyae Campsites (community campsites); craft centre and various crafts; trophy hunting; devil's claw harvesting.
Support agencies: MET, NNDFN (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, ICEMA, KPF, LAC, CRIAA, NNF
**OHUNGU**
(named after the symbolically important mountain at Ozondati in the conservancy)

- **Registered**: October 2006
- **Address**: Ohungu Conservancy
  P.O. Box 173, Omaruru
- **Telephone**: 064 570916
- **Approximate population**: 1,000
- **Main home languages**: Otjiherero
- **Area**: 1,211 square kilometres
- **Region**: Erongo
- **Geographical features**: Average annual rainfall of 200 mm. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Mountainous in the northern half of the conservancy.
- **Unusual or important features**: Ugab River Valley.
- **Major wildlife resources**: Elephant, leopard, cheetah, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, duiker, mountain zebra.
- **Management**: Management Committee of five women and eight men, including two Traditional Authority representatives; no staff at present; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
- **Enterprises**: Crafts.
- **Support Agencies**: MET, NNF, Rössing Foundation
**OKAMATAPATI**
(named after the area itself, which comes from the locally common tree Omutapati, usually eaten by goats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Okamatapati Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 63, Okamatapati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone</strong></td>
<td>067 318033/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate population</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main home languages</strong></td>
<td>Otjiherero, Ju/'hoansi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>3,096 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographical features</strong></td>
<td>Thornveld savannah. Flat sandy area with average annual rainfall of 350–400 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unusual or important features</strong></td>
<td>Terminalia sericea (main source of food for cattle during dry period of the year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major wildlife resources</strong></td>
<td>Wild dog, kudu, warthog, steenbok, duiker, eland, gemsbok, leopard, spotted hyena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>Management Committee of 13 men and five women. Executive Committee of nine members; one female staff; close cooperation between conservancy and local farmers association; conservancy has a representative on local development committee; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprises</strong></td>
<td>Devil’s claw and Ozombanwi harvesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Agencies</strong></td>
<td>MET, NNF (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, NDT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OKANGUNDUMBA
(named after a headman; the place is holy)

Registered: July 2003
Address: Okangundumba Conservancy
          P.O. Box 214, Opuwo
Telephone: 061 228506 (IRDNC Windhoek)
Approximate population: 2,500
Main home languages: Otjiherero/Otjihimba
Area: 1,131 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid with less than 200 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.

Unusual or important features: Dolomite mountains.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, mountain zebra, giraffe, kudu, gemsbok, springbok, steenbok, duiker, klipspringer, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal, cheetah, ostrich, black-faced impala.
Management: Management Committee of 14 men and three women; staff of four Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Camp Aussicht; trophy hunting.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, SRT
OKONDJOMBO

Registered  August 2008
Address  Okongjombo Conservancy
          P.O Box 25040, Windhoek
Telephone  065 273257
Approximate population  300
Main home languages  Otjiherero, Otjihimba
Area  1,645 square kilometres
Region  Kunene
Geographical features  Arid area receiving less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Hills, plains and wooded river valleys make up the landscape.
Unusual or important features  Ovahimba culture, Otjize ochre mine.
Major wildlife resources  Elephant, giraffe, kudu, springbok, gemsbok, mountain zebra, klipspringer, steenbok, ostrich, cheetah, leopard, black-backed jackal, baboon.
Management  Management Committee; staff of six Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises  Joint-venture tourism agreement for game viewing in conservancy; trophy hunting; premium hunting; Commiphora resin harvesting.
Support agencies  MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), LAC, WWF In Namibia
OKONGO

Registered
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support agencies

September 2009
Okongo Conservancy
P.O. Box 13244, Eenhana
Telephone 0811277156
2,000
Oshiwambo
1,340 square kilometres
Ongwediva
Broad-leaved woodland and shrub savannah. 500-550 mm average annual rainfall.
Conservancy borders community forest to the east.
Kudu, duiker, steenbok, occasionally elephant.
Management Committee of ten men and six women. No wildlife monitoring at present.
Omauni Campsite and Cultural Village.
MET, NNF, DoF
OMATENDEKA
(named after reddish rocks in the area)

Registered: March 2003
Address: Omatendeka Conservancy
         P.O. Box 71, Opuwo
Telephone: 065 276611/04
Approximate population: 2,500
Main home languages: Otjiherero
Area: 1,619 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid with less than 250 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.
Unusual or important features: ‘Serengeti Plains’ scenic area.
Major wildlife resources: Giraffe, kudu, duiker, warthog, steenbok, gemsbok, springbok, ostrich, klipspringer, mountain zebra, eland, elephant, leopard, lion, black rhino, cheetah.
Management: Management Committee of 12 men; Executive Committee of six members; staff of four Community Game Guards, a Community Activator and a Field Officer; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, SRT, ICEMA
ONDJOU
(named after the Otjiherero word for 'elephant')

Registered: October 2006
Address: Ondjou Conservancy
Private Bag 2008, Grootfontein
Telephone: 067 245509
Approximate population: 2,000
Main home languages: Otjiherero, San
Area: 8,729 square kilometres
Region: Otjozondjupa
Geographical features: Characterised by undulating landscape and diverse vegetation including woodlands, grassland and well-defined drainage lines. Rock outcrops may have archaeological significance.
Unusual or important features: Traditional culture of Herero people.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, lion, leopard, giraffe, kudu, steenbok, gemsbok, wild dog, spotted hyaena, cheetah, black-backed jackal.
Management: Management Committee of six women and ten men; one staff; no wildlife monitoring at present.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting; devil's claw harvesting.
Support Agencies: MET, MAWF, NCDC, LAC, NNF
ORUPEMBE
(meaning wilderness area)

Registered: July 2003
Address: Orupembe Conservancy
         P.O. Box 353, Opuwo
Telephone: 061 228506 (IRDNC Windhoek)
Approximate population: 400
Main home languages: Otjihimba
Area: 3,565 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely
semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a combination of hills,
plains and wooded river valleys.
Unusual or important features: Onjuva Plains. Culture of Ovahimba people.
Major wildlife resources: Leopard, cheetah, steenbok, kudu, ostrich, giraffe, gemsbok, mountain zebra, springbok,
klipspringer.
Management: Management Committee of six men and three women; staff of a Field Officer, three
Community Game Guards and a Community Activator; wildlife monitoring using annual
road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreement with House on the Hill; Orupembe Campsite (community
campsite); crafts; trophy hunting; premium hunting; own-use hunting; Commiphora resin
harvesting.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, SRT
OSKOP
(name derived from a freehold farm in the area)

Registered  
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support agencies

February 2001
Oskop Conservancy
Private Bag 2003, Gibeon
063 252253
120
Khoekhoegowab
96 square kilometres
Hardap
Flat landscape of shrub savannah. Average annual rainfall of 100-200 mm.
None
Springbok, ostrich, steenbok, gemsbok
Management Committee of six men and three women; no staff at present; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Own-use hunting.
MET, NDT (main support NGO) MAWF, WWF In Namibia
OTJAMBANGU

Registered
March 2009

Address
Otjambangu
Conservancy
P.O. Box 24050,
Windhoek
065 273257

Telephone
Approximate population
300
Main home languages
Otjiherero
Area
348 square kilometres
Region
Kunene

Geographical features
Arid area with less than 200 mm average annual rainfall. Sparse savannah woodland. Landscape consists of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.

Unusual or important features
Dolomite mountains with fresh water springs.

Major wildlife resources
Springbok, kudu, mountain zebra, steenbok, klipspringer, ostrich, leopard, cheetah, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal, baboon, occasionally elephant.

Management
Management Committee; staff of five Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises
Trophy hunting.

Support agencies
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, LAC
OTJIMBOYO

Registered: March 2003
Address: Otjimboyo Conservancy
P.O. Box 51, Uis
Telephone: 064 504167 (RISE office)
Approximate population: 1,000
Main home languages: Ojihero
Area: 448 square kilometres
Region: Erongo
Geographical features: Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.
Unusual or important features: Ugab River Valley.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, cheetah, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, duiker.
Management: Management Committee of 11 women and four men; Executive Committee of six members; staff of two Community Game Guards and one Community Activator; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting; premium hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.
Support agencies: MET, RISE (main support NGO), NNF, WWF in Namibia.
OTJITUUO
(name means the curve or bend of the Omuramba Omatako)

Registered
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support Agencies

September 2005
Otjituuo Conservancy
P.O. Box 2081, Grootfontein
067 243615/240079
9,000
Otjiherero, Ju/'hoansi
6,133 square kilometres
Otjozondjupa
Flat thornveld savannah. Average annual rainfall of 350–400 mm.
Wild dog, kudu, gemsbok, leopard, eland, warthog, steenbok, Klipspringer, spotted hyaena.
Management Committee of seven men and five women; staff of one Office Coordinator; close collaboration with local farmers association; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.
Crafts; devil’s claw and Ozombanwi harvesting.
MET, NDT (main support NGO), NNF, WWF in Namibia
OVITOTO

Registered

May 2008

Address

Ovitoto Conservancy
P.O. Box 309, Okakarara
Telephone 067 317132

Telefonie

067 317132

Approximate population

1,000

Main home languages

Otjiherero

Area

625 square kilometres

Region

Otjozondjupa

Geographical features

Thorn bush covering hilly areas while the river valleys support taller trees. 300-350 mm average annual rainfall.

Unusual or important features

Situated close to Von Bach Dam and Recreation Resort.

Major wildlife resources

Kudu, steenbok, warthog, black-backed jackal, baboon, occasionally gemsbok.

Management

Management Committee of three women and four men; no staff at present; no wildlife monitoring at present.

Enterprises

None at present.

Support Agencies

MET, NNF (main support NGO)
## OZONAHII
(named after an area referred to as the ‘flat muddy surface that holds water during the rainy season’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Ozonahi Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 264, Okakarara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>067 317770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Otjiherero, Ju/'hoansi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>3,204 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Central Kalahari sandveld and thornveld savannah biome. Average annual rainfall of 350–400 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Herero/German battle sites. Ohakane, Hamakari, Ondeka and Otjihenda Pans. Borders commercial farms and freehold conservancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Kudu, ostrich, steenbok, duiker, black-backed jackal, cheetah, eland gemsbok, leopard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of 11 men and six women; Executive Committee of nine members; one female staff; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>None at present; individual crafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Agencies</td>
<td>MET, NDT (main support NGO), NNF, WWF In Namibia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OZONDUNDU
(named after local mountains)

Registered: July 2003
Address: Ozondundu Conservancy
P.O. Box 104, Opuwo
Telephone: 061 228506 (IRDNC
Windhoek)
Approximate population: 2,000
Main home language: Otjiherero
Area: 745 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid with less than 150 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah.
Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys.
Unusual or important features: Mountain with ochre stones used by Himba women for colouring; dry waterfall, Otjapitjapi Spring.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, mountain zebra, kudu, gemsbok, springbok, steenbok, klipspringer, ostrich.
Management: Management Committee of five men and four women; staff of four Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting; own-use hunting; pilot Hoodia cultivation project.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, CR1AA
PUROS
(derived from Omburo meaning ‘fountain’ in Otjiherero)

Registered
Address
Telephone
Approximate population
Main home languages
Area
Region
Geographical features
Unusual or important features
Major wildlife resources
Management
Enterprises
Support agencies

May 2000
Puros Conservancy
00870762711719
260
Otjiherero, Otjihimba
3,562 square kilometres
Kunene
Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys. Khumib and Hoarusib Rivers.
Culture of the Ovahimba and Herero people. Wildlife and domestic stock grazing together near villages. Hoarusib River, spectacular dunes, hills and desert landscapes.
Elephant, lion, leopard, black rhino, cheetah, giraffe, kudu, duiker, springbok, steenbok, gemsbok, mountain zebra, klopperspringer.
Management Committee of four women and eight men; Executive Committee of six members; staff of three Community Game Guards, two Conservancy Activators and two Field Officers; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Joint-venture tourism agreements with Okahirongo Elephant Lodge, Puros Camp and Skeleton Coast Camp; Puros Bush Lodge (self-catering community lodge); Puros Campsite (community campsite); Puros Traditional Village and craft market (community managed); trophy hunting; premium hunting; own-use hunting; Commiphora resin harvesting; film location.
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NNF, NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia, SRT
**SALAMBALA**
(named after the lovers Sala and Bala whose illicit relationship resulted in them being banished to the forest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>June 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Salambala Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 1797, Ngweze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>066 252875/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Subia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>930 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Average annual rainfall of 600 mm. Mopane woodland dominates the northern area, while floodplain grasslands cover the southern section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>High diversity of bird species, including many that are rare elsewhere in Namibia; strategic location opposite Botswana's Chobe National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Lion, elephant, leopard, buffalo, waterbuck, tsessebe, kudu, duiker, reedbuck, common impala, blue wildebeest, lechwe, hippo, crocodile, plains zebra, warthog, steenbok, interesting bird life, various fish species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of 14 women and 26 men. Executive Committee of nine members; staff of nine Community Game Guards, two Community Resource Monitors, three Campsite Workers and an Environmental Awareness Officer; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Salambala Campsite (community campsite); Ngoma Craft Centre; trophy hunting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support agencies</td>
<td>MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NNEW, WWF In Namibia, NACOBTA, LAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANITATAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>July 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Sanitatas Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 18, Opw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>061 228506 (IRDNC Windhoek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate pop.</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home langs.</td>
<td>Otjihimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,446 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Hills, plains and wooded river valleys make up the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual</td>
<td>Sanitatas Spring. Culture of the Ovahimba people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Leopard, giraffe, kudu, duiker, klipspringer, steenbok, gemsbok, ostrich, mountain zebra, springbok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of six men and two women; staff of four Community Game Guards and one Field Officer; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Joint-venture tourism agreement for game viewing; trophy hunting; Commiphora resin harvesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support agencies</td>
<td>MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia, SRT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Sanitatas Conservancy Profile Map](image-url)
SESFONTEIN
(named after the Afrikaans word for 'six fountains')

Registered

July 2003

Address

Sesfontein Conservancy
P.O. Box 39, Kamanjab

Telephone

065 275536

Approximate population

2,500

Main home languages

Otjiherero, Khoekhoegowab

Area

2,465 square kilometres

Region

Kunene

Geographical features

Arid with less than 150 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys

Unusual or important features

Scenic Hoanib River Valley, fountains, historic German fort.

Major wildlife resources

Elephant, leopard, lion, black rhino, cheetah, mountain zebra, giraffe, kudu, gemsbok, springbok, duiker, steenbok, klipspringer, ostrich.

Management

Management Committee of seven men and two women; staff of five Community Game Guards, one Field Officer, a Receptionist, a Financial Administrator and a Cleaner; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises

Joint-venture tourism agreement with Fort Sesfontein Lodge; Palmwag Tourism Concession; Sesfontein Fig Tree and Sesfontein Kanamub Campsites (community campsites); trophy hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.

Support Agencies

MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, WWF In Namibia, SRT, LAC
**SHAMUNGWA**
(name derived from a salty fruit that used to exist in the conservancy core area)

Registered: September 2005  
Address: Shamungwa Conservancy  
P.O. Box 5034, Rundu  
Telephone: 081 298 8533  
Approximate population: 1,000  
Main home languages: Thimbukushu  
Area: 53 square kilometres  
Region: Kavango  
Geographical features: Kalahari sandveld and woodland with average annual rainfall of 500-600 mm.  
Unusual or important features: None.  
Major wildlife resources: Elephant.  
Management: Management Committee of four women and six men. No staff at present. No wildlife monitoring at present.  
Enterprises: Crafts.  
Support agencies: MET, MAWF, DED, DoF, MFMR, Basin Wide Forum, NNF (main support NGO)
SHEYA SHUUSHONA
(named after the brave King of the Ongandjera Traditional Authority)

Registered: September 2005
Address: Sheya Shuushona Conservancy
          P.O. Box 2, Okahao
Telephone: 065 252087
Approximate population: 35,360
Main home languages: Oshiwambo, Otjiherero and San
Area: 5,066 square kilometres
Region: Omusati
Geographical features: Flat landscape dominated by mopane shrubland with areas of grassland, Kalahari woodland and mosaic sands. Average annual rainfall of 350–400 mm.
Unusual or important features: Salt pans. Located on northern border of Etosha National Park.
Major wildlife resources: Hartebeest, spotted hyaena, elephant, kudu, duiker, steenbok, springbok, occasionally lion.
Management: Management Committee of 81 members, of which 30 are women; Executive Committee of 20 members; Staff of ten people; wildlife monitoring using annual count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting; own-use hunting; mopane caterpillar harvesting.
Support Agencies: MET, Rössing Foundation (main support NGO), LAC, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA
SIKUNGA
(named after a river channel which ‘brings things together’)

Registered: July 2009
Address: Sikunga Conservancy
P.O. Box 578, Ngweze
Telephone: 081 3381938
Approximate population: 2,000
Main home languages: Subia
Area: 287 square kilometres
Region: Caprivi
Geographical features: Mainly floodplain grassland along the Zambezi River with broad-leafed woodland on areas of high ground away from the river. Average annual rainfall over 600 mm.
Unusual or important features: Zambezi River.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, hippo, bush pig, crocodile, lechwe in very low numbers; interesting birdlife; tiger fish, catfish, various tilapia fish species.
Management: Management Committee of eleven women and six men; staff of four Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Trophy hunting.
Support Agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, LAC, NNF
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SOBBE
(derived from the Sifwe expression ‘that which one owns cannot be taken away from you’)

Registered
October 2006

Address
Sobbe Conservancy
P.O. Box 621, Ngweze

Telephone
066 252666

Approximate population
2,000

Main home languages
Sifwe

Area
404 square kilometres

Region
Caprivi

Geographical features
Woodland and grassland. Average annual rainfall of 600 mm.

Unusual or important features
Located on border of Mudumu National Park.

Major wildlife resources
Kudu, elephant, roan, eland, plains zebra, warthog, duiker, spotted hyaena, black-backed jackal.

Management
Management Committee of three men and six women. Staff of 12; joint monitoring unit with Kwandu, Mayuni and Mashi Conservancies; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system; Sobbe is part of the Mudumu North Complex collaborative management forum.

Enterprises
Trophy hunting; own-use hunting; crafts.

Support Agencies
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), WWF In Namibia, LAC, ICEMA
SORRI-SORRIS
(named after the Khoekhoegowab phrase for an ‘abundance of sunlight’)

Registered: October 2001
Address: Sorri-Sorris Conservancy
P.O. Box 83, Khorixas
Telephone: 067 331393
Approximate population: 1,300
Main home languages: Khoekhoegowab
Area: 2,290 square kilometres
Region: Kunene
Geographical features: Arid area receiving 100 mm average annual rainfall. Sparse grass cover and trees, mostly along dry river courses. Landscape of hills and plains descending to scenic Ugab River.
Unusual or important features: Ugab River Valley.
Major wildlife resources: Elephant, leopard, black rhino, cheetah, mountain zebra, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, duiker, giraffe.
Management: Management Committee of five men and four women; staff of three Community Game Guards, one Liaison Officer and one Project Coordinator; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.
Enterprises: Joint-venture tourism agreement with Matisa Lodge; trophy hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting.
Support agencies: MET, WDT (main support NGO) CRIAA, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA
 TORRA  
(named after the red ‘torra’ rocks predominant in the area)

Registered  
Address  
Telephone  
Approximate population  
Main home languages  
Area  
Region

June 1998  
Torra Conservancy  
P.O. Box 2009  
Khorixas  
067 697063  
1,200  
Khoekhoegowab, Otjiherero and Afrikaans  
3,493 square kilometres  
Kunene

Geographical features  
Unusual or important features  
Major wildlife resources  
Management  
Enterprises  
Support agencies

Arid with less than 100 mm average annual rainfall. Largely semi-desert and sparse savannah. Landscape is a mix of hills, plains and wooded river valleys, including the scenic Huab River.  
Huab River and wildlife in stark desert scenery.  
Elephant, lion, leopard, black rhino, cheetah, ostrich, kudu, duiker, warthog, steenbok, gemsbok, springbok, giraffe, mountain zebra, klipspringer, spotted hyaena.  
Management Committee of seven men and one woman; staff of five Community Game Guards, a Field Officer, a Community Activist and a Receptionist; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.  
Joint-venture tourism agreements with Damaraland Camp and Kuidas Camp; Palmwag Tourism Concession; live sale of springbok; trophy hunting; shoot-and-sell hunting; own-use hunting  
MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, WWF In Namibia, SRT
### TSISEB
(named after the Tsib Gorge in which the White Lady rock painting is located)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>January 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Tsiseb Conservancy, P.O. Box 72, Uis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>064 504162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Khoekhoegowab and Otjiherero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>7,913 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Arid area with average annual rainfall of less than 100 mm. Rolling or flat landscape in which the Brandberg massif stands out. The Ugab River forms the northern border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Brandberg, Namibia’s highest mountain which has an abundance of rock art including the famous White Lady. Ugab River, Omaruru River and Messum Crater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Elephant, black rhino, leopard, cheetah, mountain zebra, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, black-backed jackal, klipspringer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of 12 men and four women; Executive Committee of six members; staff of three Game Guards, a Manager, an Office Clerk and a Cleaner; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Joint-venture tourism agreement with Brandberg White Lady Lodge; Ugab Campsite (community campsite); Daureb Mountain Guides; Daureb Information Centre with Daureb Crafts, Vicky’s Coffee Shop and internet café; semi-precious stone market; trophy hunting, own-use hunting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support agencies</td>
<td>MET, NACOBTA, WWF In Namibia, SRT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UIBASEN TWYFELFONTEIN**
(Twyfelfontein is named after an Afrikaans phrase meaning ‘doubtful fountain’; Uibasen is named after the Khoekhoegowab phrase for ‘live for yourself’)

**Registered**
December 1999

**Address**
Twyfelfontein–Uibasen Conservancy, P.O. Box 398, Khorixas

**Telephone**
067 687047

**Approximate population**
230

**Main home languages**
Khoekhoegowab

**Area**
286 square kilometres

**Region**
Kunene

**Geographical features**
Semi-arid area receiving 100–200 mm average annual rainfall. Landscape is a mix of hills, sparse savannah, plains and wooded river valleys with areas of scenic granite kopjes.

**Unusual or important features**
Twyfelfontein World Heritage Site housing a high number of interesting rock engravings; Burnt Mountain and Organ Pipes.

**Major wildlife resources**
Elephant, leopard, mountain zebra, kudu, gemsbok, ostrich, springbok, steenbok, duiker, klipspringer.

**Management**
Management Committee of three women and four men; no staff at present; wildlife monitoring using annual road-based count and Event Book monitoring system.

**Enterprises**
Joint-venture tourism agreements with Twyfelfontein Country Lodge and ballooning company; Twyfelfontein guides; Damara living museum.

**Support agencies**
MET, NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia, SRT
### UUKOLONKADHI-RUACANA
(named after a district area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Uukolonkadhi-Ruacana Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>065 270092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main home languages</td>
<td>Oshiwambo, Otjiherero, Otjihimba and Dhemba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,993 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Omusati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical features</td>
<td>Flat to mountainous area with grasslands and woodlands. Average annual rainfall of 300-400 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual or important features</td>
<td>Ruacana Falls on the Kunene River (border with Angola), Olushandja Dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major wildlife resources</td>
<td>Elephant, springbok, mountain zebra, ostrich, black-faced impala, hippo, crocodile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management Committee of ten men and nine women; staff of four Community Game Guards; two volunteer Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>Otjipahuriro Campsite (community campsite), onguma (rocks producing ochre powder); trophy hunting; own-use hunting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Agencies</td>
<td>MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), Rössing Foundation, LAC, WWF In Namibia, ICEMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UUKWALUUDHI**
(named after the Uukwaluudhi ethnic group; means small group of one clan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Registered</strong></th>
<th>March 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Uukwaluudhi Conservancy, Private Bag 5566, Oskahakati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone</strong></td>
<td>065 273099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate population</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main home languages</strong></td>
<td>Oshiwambo, Otjiherero and Himba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1,437 square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td>Omusati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographical features</strong></td>
<td>Small hills dot the flat landscape of savannah woodland. Average annual rainfall of 350–400 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unusual or important features</strong></td>
<td>Core wildlife area with re-introduced high-value species. Multiple cultures (Wambo, Herero, Himba, Dhemba and San)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major wildlife resources</strong></td>
<td>Black rhino, black-faced impala, kudu, duiker, hartebeest, eland, plains zebra, giraffe, springbok, elephant, eland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>Management Committee of four women and 14 men. Executive Committee of nine members; staff of two Community Game Guards; wildlife monitoring using annual count and Event Book monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprises</strong></td>
<td>Joint-venture tourism agreement with Uukwaluudhi Safari Camp; Uukwaluudhi Homestead (in Tsandi); craft outlet; information centre; trophy hunting, shoot-and-sell hunting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support agencies</strong></td>
<td>MET, Rössing Foundation (main support NGO), NACOBTA, NNEN WWF In Namibia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WUPARO
(named after Siyeyi word for ‘life’)

Registered: December 1999
Address: Wuparo Conservancy
P.O. Box 1707, Ngweze
Telephone: 066 252518
Approximate population: 2,100
Main home languages: Siyeyi
Area: 148 square kilometres
Region: Caprivi
Geographical features: Originally a floodplain but now a mosaic of woodland and grassland. Average annual rainfall of 600 mm.

Unusual or important features: Wuparo lies between the Mudumu and Mamili National Parks.
Major wildlife resources: Lion, elephant, buffalo, leopard, roan, tsessebe, kudu, duiker, reedbuck, blue wildebeest, warthog.
Management: Management Committee of two women and eight men. Executive Committee of six members; staff of seven Community Game Guards, a Manager, a Community Resource Monitor, a Treasurer and a Secretary; wildlife monitoring using annual count on foot and Event Book monitoring system.

Enterprises: Wuparo Campsite (community campsite); trophy hunting; crafts; Rupara Environmental Centre.
Support agencies: MET, IRDNC (main support NGO), NACOBTA, LAC, WWF In Namibia
# Organisations

supporting communal area conservancies in Namibia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM (MET)</td>
<td>Private Bag 13306, Windhoek, Namibia</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 263195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 239506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Parks and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Mr Ben Beytell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bbeytell@mweb.com.na">bbeytell@mweb.com.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM Sub-Division (CSD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Control Warden: Ms Tsukhoe //Garoes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 253 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tmgaroes@iway.na">tmgaroes@iway.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Mr Theo Nghitila</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 240 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:nghitila@dea.met.gov.na">nghitila@dea.met.gov.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.dea.met.gov.na">www.dea.met.gov.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Scientific Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Ms Luisa Mupetami</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 259 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:imupetami@met.na">imupetami@met.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Tourism (DoT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Mr Sem Shikongo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 221 930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sts@met.na">sts@met.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 230 692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Administration and Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Ms S. Shidute</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 309 071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sshidute@met.gov.na">sshidute@met.gov.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA) Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 284 2726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Party: Mr Jo Tagg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 249 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jotagg@mweb.com.na">jotagg@mweb.com.na</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# NAMIBIAN ASSOCIATION OF CBNRM SUPPORT ORGANISATIONS (NACSO)

| NACSO Secretariat | P.O. Box 98353  
| Coordinator: Ms Maxi Louis  
| Windhoek  
| Tel: +264 61 230 888  
| Fax: +264 61 237 036  
| maxi@nacso.org.na  
| www.nacso.org.na |

## NACSO MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Area of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Centre for Research Information Action in Africa - Southern African Development and Consulting (CRIAA SA-DC)**  
Director: Mr Michel Mallet  
P.O. Box 23778  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 220 117  
Fax: +264 61 232 293  
criaawhk@africaonline.com.na  
www.criaasadc.org.na | Technical advice, feasibility assessments and market linkages to organisations and communities on development of the veld product industry | National |
| **Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN)**  
Director: Ms Viviane Kinyaga  
P.O. Box 20232  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 377 500  
Fax: +264 61 230 172  
drfn@drfn.org.na  
www.drf.org.na | Support to community organisations on desertification and livelihood issues | National |
| **Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC)**  
Director: Mr John Kasaona  
Director: Mr Colin Nott  
Director: Ms Karine Nuulimba  
P.O. Box 24050  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 228 506  
Fax: +264 61 228 530  
irdnc@iafrica.com.na  
www.irdnc.org.na | Field based NGO providing technical support to registered and emerging conservancies | Kunene and Caprivi |
| **Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)**  
Director: Ms Toni Hancox  
P.O. Box 604  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 223 356  
Fax: +264 61 234 953  
info@lac.org.na  
www.lac.org.na | Legal advice, training and review to conservancies on constitution development, support and representation on contracts and conflict resolution; development and review of CBNRM related policies and legislation; advocacy for CBNRM issues | National |
| **Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre (MRC-UNAM)**  
Director: Dr Hina Mu Ashekele  
Private Bag 13301  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 206 3051  
Fax: +264 61 206 3050  
hmuashekele@unam.na  
www.unam.na | Research into the social effectiveness of CBNRM and conservancies in Namibia | National |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Area of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Namibia Community Based Tourism Assistance Trust (NACOBTA)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 86099 Windhoek Tel: +264 61 250 558 Fax: +264 61 222 647 <a href="mailto:office@nacobta.com.na">office@nacobta.com.na</a> <a href="http://www.nacobta.com.na">www.nacobta.com.na</a></td>
<td>National support to community-based tourism enterprises (CBTE), joint venture lodge developments, tourism planning and advocacy on CBT related issues</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Namibia Development Trust (NDT)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 8226 Bachbrecht, Windhoek Tel: +264 61 238 003 Fax: +264 61 233 261 <a href="mailto:info@ndt.org.na">info@ndt.org.na</a></td>
<td>Field-based NGO providing technical support to registered and emerging conservancies</td>
<td>Karas, Hardap and Otjozondjupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 245 Windhoek Tel: +264 61 248 345 Fax: +264 61 248 344 <a href="mailto:nnf@nnf.org.na">nnf@nnf.org.na</a> <a href="http://www.nnf.org.na">www.nnf.org.na</a></td>
<td>Provides assistance in grant administration, fundraising, financial management and monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Namibia Non-Government Organisation’s Forum Trust (NANGOF Trust)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 70433 Windhoek Tel: +264 61 212503 Fax: +264 61 211306 <a href="mailto:nangof@iway.na">nangof@iway.na</a> <a href="http://www.nangoftrust.org.na">www.nangoftrust.org.na</a></td>
<td>Represents a broad range of CBOs and NGOs</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDFN)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 9026 Windhoek Tel: +264 61 236 327 Fax: +264 61 225 997 <a href="mailto:nndfn@iafrica.com.na">nndfn@iafrica.com.na</a></td>
<td>Field based NGO providing technical support to registered and emerging conservancies</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omba Arts Trust (OAT)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 24204 Windhoek Tel: +264 61 242 222 Fax: +264 61 242 799 <a href="mailto:Karin.leroux@omba.org.na">Karin.leroux@omba.org.na</a> <a href="http://www.omba.org.na">www.omba.org.na</a></td>
<td>Independent non profit initiative supporting the development and marketing and promotion of Namibian craft with emphasis on fair trade</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rössing Foundation (RF)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 284 Arandis Tel: +264 64 512 000 Fax: +264 64 512 001 <a href="mailto:frances.anderson@riotinto.com">frances.anderson@riotinto.com</a> <a href="http://www.rossingfoundation.com">www.rossingfoundation.com</a></td>
<td>Supports community craft development and marketing; targeted support for conservancies in north-central Namibia</td>
<td>National and Omusati, Ohangwena, Oshana and Oshikoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural People’s Institute for Social Empowerment (RISE)</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 50155 Bachbrecht, Windhoek Tel: +264 61 236 029 Fax: +264 61 232 597 <a href="mailto:pintiledavids@yahoo.com">pintiledavids@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Field based NGO providing technical support to registered and emerging conservancies</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Name Contact Services Provided Area of operation

**Save the Rhino Trust (SRT)**  
Chief Executive Officer: Mr Rudi Loutit  
P.O. Box 2159  
Swakopmund  
Tel: +264 64 403 829  
Fax: +264 64 400 166  
rudi@rhino-trust.org.na  
www.savetherhinotrust.org  
Rhino conservation and management, training and capacity building in rhino management  
South Kunene

**Welwitschia Development Trust (WDT)**  
Acting Director: Ms Edith Ingutia  
P.O. Box 437  
Khorixas  
Tel: +264 67 331751/2  
Fax: +264 67331751  
edithmuteshi@yahoo.com  
Support to Sorri-Sorris, Huab and Doro Inawas  
Kunene South

---

**NACSO ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Area of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kunene Regional Conservancy Association (KRCA)  
Secretary: Mr Joshua Kaisuma            | P.O. Box 293  
Opwo  
Tel: +264 65 271 257  
Fax: +264 65 273 257 | Independent umbrella organisation representing registered and emerging conservancies in the Kunene Region | Kunene |
| Otjozondjupa Conservancy Association     | P.O. Box 8226  
Bachbrecht, Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 238 003  
Fax: +264 61 233 261  
info@ndt.org.na | Independent umbrella organisation representing registered and emerging conservancies in the Otjozondjupa Region | Otjozondjupa |
| WWF In Namibia  
Managing Director: Mr Chris Weaver       | P.O. Box 9681  
Windhoek  
Tel: +264 61 239 945  
Fax: +264 61 239 799  
cweaver@wwf.na | Provides technical support to implementers in the field of natural resource management, enterprise and business development and institutional development | National |
| Dhyani Berger  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 61 225 680  
dhyani@iafrica.com.na |                                                                              |                   |
| Anna Davis  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 61 225 085  
ad@iway.na |                                                                              |                   |
| Brian Jones  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 61 236 186  
bjones@mweb.com.na |                                                                              |                   |
| Carol Murphy  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 66 254 721  
cmurphy@africaonline.com.na |                                                                              |                   |
| Hendrika Skei  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 81 274 4397  
ha@iway.na |                                                                              |                   |
| Annie Symonds  
Independent Consultant                  | Tel: +264 61 220 555  
anne.s@iway.na |                                                                              |                   |
### EMERGING REGIONAL CONSERVANCY FORUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Area of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi Chairperson’s Forum</td>
<td>Private Bag 1050, Ngweze</td>
<td>Independent umbrella organisation representing conservancies in the Caprivi Region</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: +264 66 252 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: +264 66 252 518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact through IRDNC - Caprivi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erongo Regional Conservancy</td>
<td>P.O. Box 72, Uis</td>
<td>Independent umbrella organisation representing registered conservancies in the</td>
<td>Erongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 211 7891</td>
<td>Erongo Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson: Rewae Hochobes</td>
<td>Fax: +264 64 504 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOURISM PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Operator</th>
<th>Conservancy</th>
<th>Operator Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>André Visser</td>
<td>Mayuni</td>
<td>Tel: +264 66 686 041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mazambala Island Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 66 686 042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mazambala@mweb.com.na">mazambala@mweb.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.mazambala.com">www.mazambala.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert &amp; Delta Safaris</td>
<td>Kasika</td>
<td>Tel: +27 83 960 3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chobe Savanna Lodge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@desert-delta-safaris.com">info@desert-delta-safaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.desert-delta-safaris.com">www.desert-delta-safaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologistix</td>
<td>=Khoadi-/Hôas</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 246 788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grootberg Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 243 079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lodge@grootberg.com">lodge@grootberg.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.grootberg.com">www.grootberg.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Sesfontein Lodge &amp; Safaris</td>
<td>Sesfontein</td>
<td>Tel: +264 65 685 034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Sesfontein Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 65 685 033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@fort-sesfontein.com">info@fort-sesfontein.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fort-sesfontein.com">www.fort-sesfontein.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz Schenk</td>
<td>Epupa</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 403 096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omarunga Camp</td>
<td>Fax: +264 64 402 097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaoko@iway.na">kaoko@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.natron.net/omarunga-camp/main.html">www.natron.net/omarunga-camp/main.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands in Africa</td>
<td>Impalila</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 401 047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impalila Island Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 401 057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayuni</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@islandsinafrica.com">info@islandsinafrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susuwe Island Lodge</td>
<td><a href="http://www.islandsinafrica.com">www.islandsinafrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Liebenberg</td>
<td>Mashi</td>
<td>Tel: +264 66 686 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Kwando</td>
<td>Fax: +264 66 686 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:reservations@campkwando.com">reservations@campkwando.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.campkwando.com">www.campkwando.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaokohimba Safaris</td>
<td>Marienfluss</td>
<td>Tel: +264 65 685 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Syncro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:koos.cunene@iway.na">koos.cunene@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epupa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kaoko-namibia.com">www.kaoko-namibia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epupa Campsite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Operator</td>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>Operator Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobus de Jager</td>
<td>Tsiseb</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 684 004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branderg White Lady Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 64 684 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ugab@iway.na">ugab@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.brandbergwlodge.com">www.brandbergwlodge.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene River Lodge</td>
<td>Kunene River</td>
<td>Tel: +264 65 274 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunene River Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 65 274 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@kuneneriverlodge.com">info@kuneneriverlodge.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.kuneneriverlodge.com">www.kuneneriverlodge.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liana Greeff</td>
<td>Anabeb</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 314 0216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongongo Camp</td>
<td>Fax: +264 67 302 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ongongo.campsite@hotmail.com">ongongo.campsite@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ongongocamp.co.za">www.ongongocamp.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions in the Sun</td>
<td>Puros</td>
<td>Tel: +264 65 685 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okahirongo Elephant Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 65 685 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marienfluss</td>
<td><a href="mailto:okahirongo@iway.na">okahirongo@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marienfluss Lodge</td>
<td><a href="http://www.okahirongolodge.com">www.okahirongolodge.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius Steiner</td>
<td>Okangundumba</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 234 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Aussicht</td>
<td><a href="http://www.campaussicht.com/">www.campaussicht.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Country Lodges</td>
<td>Mashi</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 374 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namushasha Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 256 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyae Nyae</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wdw@ncl.com.na">wdw@ncl.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyae Nyae Fly in Camp</td>
<td><a href="http://www.namibialodges.com">www.namibialodges.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twyfelfontein-Uibasen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twyfelfontein Country Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uukwaluudhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uukwaluudhi Safari Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namib Sun Hotel Group</td>
<td>Kasika</td>
<td>Tel: +264 66 686 057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kings Den Lodge</td>
<td>Fax: +264 66 686 058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chobe.kingsden@olfitra.com.na">chobe.kingsden@olfitra.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Pienaar</td>
<td>Sorris-Sorris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 406 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matisa Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton Coast Safaris</td>
<td>Puros</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 224 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puros Camp</td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 225 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marienfluss</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@skeletoncoastsafaris.com">info@skeletoncoastsafaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunene Camp</td>
<td><a href="http://www.skeletoncoastsafaris.com">www.skeletoncoastsafaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuidas Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Nott</td>
<td>Orupembe</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 570 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House on the Hill</td>
<td>Fax: +264 64 570 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:knott@africa.com.na">knott@africa.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Safaris Namibia</td>
<td>Anabeb, Sesfontein and Torra</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 274 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmwag Tourism Concession</td>
<td>Fax: +264 61 239 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balyerwa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@wilderness.com.na">info@wilderness.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lianshulu Lodge</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wilderness-safaris.com">www.wilderness-safaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doro Inawas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doro Nawas Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marienfluss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serra Cafema</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Operator</td>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>Operator Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wilderness Safaris Namibia (cont) | Nyae Nyae
Nyae Nyae Safari Camps
Puros
Skeleton Coast Camp
Torra
Damaraland Camp | Tel: +264 65 685 053
Fax: +264 65 685 055
reservations@epupa.com.na
www.epupa.com.na |
| Wouter van Zyl | Epupa
Epupa Falls Lodge | Tel: +264 81 252 8291 |

### TROPHY HUNTING PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy/Concession</th>
<th>Trophy Hunting Operator</th>
<th>Operator Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≠Khoadi–//Hôas</td>
<td>African Safari Trails</td>
<td>Tel: +264 62 682 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gerrit Utz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #Gaingu                | Gert van der Walt Hunting Safari | Tel: +264 67 243 391
didimala@mweb.com.na |
| //Huab                 | African Safari Trails   | Tel: +264 62 682 088 |
| (Gerrit Utz)           |                         |                  |
| Anabeb                 | Didimala Safaris        | Tel: +264 67 232 633 |
| (Keith Wright)         |                         |                  |
| Balyerwa               | Eden Hunting & Tourism  | Tel: +264 67 232 633 |
| (Jamie Traut)          |                         |                  |
| Doro Inawas            | Rexes Hunting Safaris   | Tel: +264 67 313 011
rheshunt@iway.na |
| (Rex Brandt)           |                         |                  |
| Dzoti                  | Ondjou Hunting Safari   | Tel: +264 61 241 431
vhsaf@mweb.com.na |
| (Hentie van Heerden)   |                         |                  |
| Ehirovipuka            | Thormahlen & Cochran    | Tel: +264 81 386 5510 |
| (Peter Thormahlen)     |                         |                  |
| George Mukoya          | Ndumo Hunting Safaris   | Tel: +264 81 128 5416
info@huntingsafaris.net |
| (Karl Stumpfe)         |                         |                  |
| Impalila               | Eden Hunting & Tourism  | Tel: +264 67 232 633 |
| (Jamie Traut)          |                         |                  |
| Kasika                 | Eden Hunting & Tourism  | Tel: +264 67 232 633 |
| (Jamie Traut)          |                         |                  |
| King Nehale            | Van Heerden Safaris     | Tel: +264 61 241 431
vhsaf@mweb.com.na |
| (Hentie van Heerden)   |                         |                  |
| Kwando                 | HuntAfrica              | Tel: +264 62 563 700
info@huntafrica.com.na |
| (Koos Pienaar/James Chapman) |                     |                  |
| Marienfluss            | Kunene Conservancy Safaris | Tel: +264 64 406 135 |
| (Tommy Hall)           |                         |                  |
| Mayuni                 | HuntAfrica              | Tel: +264 62 563 700
info@huntafrica.com.na |
| (Koos Pienaar/James Chapman) |                     |                  |
| Muduva Nyangana         | Ndumo Hunting Safaris   | Tel: +264 81 128 5416
info@huntingsafaris.net |
<p>| (Karl Stumpfe)         |                         |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy/Concession</th>
<th>Trophy Hunting Operator</th>
<th>Operator Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N#a-Jaqna</td>
<td>Eden Hunting &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>Tel: +264 67 232 633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Jamie Traut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyae Nyae</td>
<td>African Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 570 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kai-Uwe Denker)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:denkerk@iafrica.com.na">denkerk@iafrica.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okangundumba</td>
<td>Omujeve Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Corné and Nic Kruger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okondjombo</td>
<td>Kunene Conservancy Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 406 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tommy Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omatendeka</td>
<td>Omujeve Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Corné and Nic Kruger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondjou</td>
<td>Van Heerden Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 241 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hentie van Heerden)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vhsaf@mweb.com.na">vhsaf@mweb.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orupembe</td>
<td>Kunene Conservancy Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 406 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tommy Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjambangu</td>
<td>Omujeve Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Corné and Nic Kruger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjimboyo</td>
<td>Nick Nolte Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 570 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Nick Nolte)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nick-nolte-safaris@omaruru.na">nick-nolte-safaris@omaruru.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozondundu</td>
<td>Omujeve Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Corné and Nic Kruger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puros</td>
<td>Kunene Conservancy Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 406 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tommy Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salambala</td>
<td>Allan Cilliers Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 67 232 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Alan Cilliers)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:allan@cilliershunting.com">allan@cilliershunting.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitatas</td>
<td>Kunene Conservancy Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 64 406 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tommy Hall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesfontein</td>
<td>Didimala Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 67 243 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Keith Wright)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:didimala@mweb.com.na">didimala@mweb.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheya Shuushona</td>
<td>Camelthorn Safaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Fourie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikunga</td>
<td>Didimala Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 67 243 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Keith Wright)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:didimala@mweb.com.na">didimala@mweb.com.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobbe</td>
<td>Ndumo Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 5416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karl Stumpfe)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@huntingsafaris.net">info@huntingsafaris.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorris- Sorris</td>
<td>Rexes Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 67 313 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rex Brandt)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rexeshunt@iway.na">rexeshunt@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torra</td>
<td>Savannah Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 62 540 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Henk Fourie)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:henk@namibiasavannahsafaris.com">henk@namibiasavannahsafaris.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsiseb</td>
<td>Zighenzani Africa Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 61 400 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sigurd Hess)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uukulonkhadi/Ruacana</td>
<td>Ndumo Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 5416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karl Stumpfe)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@huntingsafaris.net">info@huntingsafaris.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uukwaluudhi</td>
<td>Country Lodges /Nimrod Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 128 5416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Karl Stumpfe)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karl@huntingsafaris.net">karl@huntingsafaris.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuparo</td>
<td>Caprivi Hunting Safaris</td>
<td>Tel: +264 81 230 4152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Colin Britz)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caprivihuntingsafaris@iway.na">caprivihuntingsafaris@iway.na</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Namibia's communal conservancies
Conservancies grew out of the recognition that wildlife and other natural resources had disappeared in many areas and that the livelihoods of communities could be improved if these losses were reversed.

By integrating conservancies, community forests, and a range of other natural resource uses with various traditional land uses such as livestock herding and crop production, rural communities can maximise their income opportunities.

Through effective management and modern, market-based approaches, conservancies can ensure that the sustainable use of natural resources delivers a range of benefits to communities and individual households, thus contributing to rural development while ensuring biodiversity conservation.