

# TERMINAL REVIEW OF THE SUSTAINABLE USE OF WILDLIFE IN NAMIBIA PROJECT

**Project Numbers:  
5026 (WWF-Norway)  
GLO-08/449-29 (Norad)  
NA000100 (WWF International)**

**NOVEMBER 2012**



**Prepared by David Grossman & Phillipa Holden**

# PREFACE

*Cover photo: Quota setting in Torra Conservancy, October 2012* ®

This report has been structured according to the outline provided in the Terms of Reference (see Table of Contents).

For convenience, we provide, in this preface, synoptic answers to key questions that have frequently arisen:

**FAQ 1: *Has the WWF Norway funding ensured that use of wildlife is in fact sustainable?***

ANSWER 1: Yes, from an ecological perspective: from census to final quota approval by the Minister (on recommendation from the Ministerial Quota Review Panel), sound and externally assessed census techniques coupled with data-based quotas for trophy and non-trophy animals are applied. While there is room for ‘irregularities’, cross-checks are continuously being refined. Further, a landscape perspective is increasingly being adopted, ironing out discrepancies that might creep in at a smaller conservancy level. Three-year wildlife number aggregates are also used for the quota setting, and the opinion of the trophy hunter is taken into consideration (whilst keeping an objective eye on information from this source). From a socio-economic perspective, the concept is firmly rooted in older conservancies and is gaining increasing traction with newer conservancies, with the perceived benefits (additional livelihood opportunities and income) outweighing the perceived risks and disadvantages. Financially, it is unlikely that all conservancies will be able to be entirely self sufficient and a certain minimum level of funding for the provision of technical support will likely always be required.

**FAQ2: *How has wildlife use expanded to generate more benefits?***

ANSWER 2: Steps have been taken to add value to harvested meat, including exploring through a detailed business plan the potential of smoking prime cuts and biltong production, with the rest of the carcass being available for own consumption. This option is receiving detailed attention, but in many ways would seem to make more sense than a simple ‘shoot and sell’. The preparation of hides for sale is also under investigation as a value adding activity. Field slaughtering facilities and cold rooms have been introduced to several conservancies. Conservancies are being assisted to implement measures to prevent trophy quality animals from being shot simply for meat. Contracts with hunters and tourism concessionaires are being refined to ensure improved and more secure delivery of benefits to the conservancies. Ways to market and promote adventure and eco tourism in Namibia are also being considered.

**FAQ3: *Has adaptive management been successfully applied?***

ANSWER 3; In essence, adaptive management entails learning by doing and doing to learn. The Project is an admirable example, as outputs such as management plans, event books, census techniques, quota setting, value-adding, data presentation and sharing, have been developed, implemented, evaluated at field level with users, and where necessary refined and upgraded, based on feedback and shortcomings.

**FAQ4: *What are the key future challenges/risks?***

ANSWER 4: A major challenge/risk is the sustainability of the necessary technical support as new conservancies emerge and conservancy committees change regularly. Although MET is

increasingly assuming ownership, they acknowledge that external technical expertise will be required for the foreseeable future, while in-house expertise is consolidated and greater budget allocations are secured. This further implies a need for suitably trained Namibians, which an expanded and adequately funded intern and conservation leader programme under the NRWG could assist. Finally, the small core Project team is worryingly and increasingly overstretched. This issue must be addressed, with the expansion of core pivotal project staff needed for field work seemingly essential.

NB We further note that, historically, CBNRM initiatives in southern Africa have been both enthusiastically embraced in certain quarters, whilst cynically tolerated in others. To elaborate, referring to one of the pioneer regional initiatives in southern Africa, respected academic Marshall Murphree cautioned against the emerging CBNRM projects as being perceived as attempts by the “conservation lobby in disguise” to persuade governments and communities to embrace wildlife use as a preferred form of land use. The government of Namibia, inspired by the success of the CBNRM initiative, has grown to support the demonstrably positive contributions that CBNRM adds to livelihood options of rural communities and to this end a CBNRM policy document is being prepared by MET and will soon be put forward for consideration by parliament. In this regard, the Sustainable Use Project has been instrumental (as a result of no-nonsense, transparent and committed endeavours) in indeed achieving the upfront goal of

*‘Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable wildlife utilization and conservation’.*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We wish to thank all who contributed to the preparation of this report by sharing their insights and knowledge (listed in Appendix 1). In particular, we thank Greg Stuart-Hill for arranging logistics, interviews and the field visit despite his usual hectic schedule. Greg, Chris Weaver and Melissa de Kock are thanked for comments and suggestions on the initial draft report. Much appreciated.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CONINFO	Conservation Information System
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
DSS	Directorate of Scientific Services, MET
FAQ	Frequently asked question
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation
MCA	Millenium Challenge Account
NACSO	Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
NNI	Net National Income
NRWG	Natural Resources Working Group
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
PH	Professional Hunter
R.I.S.E.	Rural Institute for Social Empowerment
SRT	Save the Rhino Trust
STF	Sustainability Task Force
TR	Terminal Review
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## The Project Goal and Purpose

Building on the foundations prepared over several years by pioneers in the field of rights-based CBNRM, and operating within the broader Namibian CBNRM Programme, the Sustainable Use Project supports the Namibia CBNRM Natural Resources Working Group to build capacity in natural resource management and monitoring capabilities in the CBNRM staff of member NGOs and the MET.

The *project goal* is:

‘Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable wildlife utilization and conservation’.

The *project purpose*, which the Project is expected to deliver by the end of its life time, is:

‘Strengthened sustainable wildlife utilization systems that improve community livelihoods and enhance conservation outcomes’.

## Outputs

The outputs below are expected to be produced by the end of the Project and in effect ensure the project purpose is achieved:

1. Conservancy management plans are widely recognized, integrated with management plans of neighbouring conservancies and parks, effectively implemented, and are leading to reduced conflicts between competing uses of land and wildlife resources;
2. Monitoring systems in support of wildlife utilization are functional at local, regional, and national levels and contributing to adaptive management;
3. Benefits from wildlife utilization increased and applied to improved conservation of the resource base and distributed to conservancy members in such a manner that livelihoods are improved;
4. Select regulatory controls for wildlife use, trade and transport are effectively implemented in an efficient and decentralized manner;
5. Capacity built into NRWG and Namibian service organizations to strengthen the ability of conservancies to develop and implement management and regulatory systems; and
6. High standards in the hunting industry are developed, implemented, and shared with relevant stakeholders in Namibia, the SADC region, and internationally.

## **The TR**

The main purpose of the Terminal Review of the Sustainable Use of Wildlife in Namibia Project is to:

- Assess the outcomes of the project in relation to the agreed goal, purpose and outputs;
- Assess any amendments made during the course of the project and the effectiveness thereof; and
- Assess and comment on the future sustainability of the project components.

Specifically, the objectives of the Terminal Review are to assess the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project, which includes specific assessment of the following:

1. The relevance of the Project;
2. The Log Frame design, with particular reference to any amendments agreed to during the term of the Project;
3. Assessment of the degree to which the objectives of the project have been achieved;
4. The lessons learnt;
5. The linkage of the budget to the deliverables;
6. The Project institutional arrangements;
7. The sustainability of the project outputs beyond the life of the project;
8. How the Project relates to other similar initiatives in Namibia or across its borders.

## **Main Findings**

The Project, working on a very modest budget in relation to the growing number of conservancies that require assistance, is largely achieving the Log Frame Objectives. Working effectively through the Natural Resource Working Group:

- conservancy plans have been developed and/or updated with conservancy management, with plans being available at the conservancy level (each committee member soon to get a file with all info presented in a less technical manner) and are also filed at MET and the project office;
- the event book monitoring system, a user-friendly tool with modules selected by conservancies, has been designed and is being implemented with the importance of maintaining this record impressed on all;
- annual game counts are held, based on defensible, externally assessed and continuously refined methodology and ongoing emphasis on the need for consistency in counting methodology, with MET increasingly taking ownership of the process;

- posters are produced for display at conservancy offices that summarise the essence of the management plans, game count, event book and other relevant data collected throughout the year;
- game harvesting quotas are set together with all relevant stakeholders, with MET increasingly taking ownership of the process. Further, the quota setting process has been refined – learning tools presented in poster format have been developed to build understanding about the rationale behind the process, all relevant data are available and easily accessed in a user-friendly format in order to improve the ‘accuracy’ of the quotas and increase confidence in the quotas that are set, and quota setting is also considered from a landscape (conservancy cluster) perspective;
- hunting concessions are awarded and tools are being developed to increase the efficiency and standards of the hunts and to build in safe guards against possible abuse (ticketing, tagging, improved contracts, etc.);
- tourism concessions are awarded and contracts have been refined, though tourism is apparently currently suffering from the global recession;
- an annual participatory audit is conducted;
- a preliminary business plan has been developed for the Project, which clearly allocates Project costs and suggest the order of funding that is actually required to fully support the necessary Project activities;
- wildlife numbers are stable and/or increasing across the communal areas (although increasing, in some instances, the potential for human-wildlife conflict);
- whilst quality of life indicators at the household level are not yet available (a strategy for recording such has been developed and is being rolled out, data to be included in CONINFO), cash flows to communities has reached the level of some N\$45 million per annum (2010 figures);
- detailed investigations have and are being conducted to identify practicable ways of adding further value to wildlife;
- sustainability issues at all level are receiving concerted attention and consideration;
- an intern and “Conservation Leaders” Programme has been launched to train and mentor young Namibians, and capacity in Namibian NGO’s and MET has benefitted from participation in the NRWG and field-based activities of the Project;
- the diversification of livelihood and land use options introduced by establishing conservancies with wildlife use and tourism potential and improved natural resource management is directly aligned with current strategies for adaptation to current and future climate changes.

NB. Minor modifications have been made to the Log Frame to more rigorously align it to the NRWG work plan (developed according to client need and consensus).

The review team ascribes the successes to:

- An enlightened and enabling legal and policy environment with committed support at the Cabinet and Ministerial levels;
- Commitment by conservancy committees and members;
- Ever growing support and commitment by MET personnel, including game restocking in key areas;
- Dedicated, passionate (albeit overstretched) project personnel that are sensitive to the socio-political context within which they are working;
- Efficient and effective project organization;
- Innovative custom-designed tools and methodologies at various levels, e.g. conservancy management plans, presented in understandable and easy to use format; the event book system; game census used for quota setting, all of which have been continuously monitored and refined in an adaptive process;
- Development of an accessible central data storage system that is continuously being refined with expanded capabilities for automated data analysis, report production and now moving towards integrating institutional and business information into it;
- Creative use of funds and clever leverage;
- Flexible and supportive approach of WWF-Norway; and
- Crucial donor support.

## **Challenges/risks**

The following issues and challenges to the success and sustainability of the project were identified during the TR:

- the need to finalise and implement an adequately funded strategic plan to service the ongoing needs of both established and newly-registered conservancies over the longer term, as reliance on at least some form of technical support at the conservancy level will be ongoing and some conservancies are already complaining about the lack of support and funding that they are receiving with mounting frustration over the matter;
- conflicts between, for example, tourism operators and hunting outfits (which in our view appear to be largely based on attitudes and perceptions and can be managed);

- the issue of optimising income by, for example, preventing trophy quality animals being “under-used” and ending up as “shoot and sell” or own use products (this too can be managed);
- the tendency of some conservancies to award only one year contracts to professional hunters; this makes it less attractive to established PH’s with credible reputations and more attractive to less ethical or reliable individuals;
- emerging and increasing human-wildlife conflict as animal numbers increase due to the success of the Namibian CBNRM initiative and the Project, particularly in the Caprivi area;
- managing the balance between maintaining and improving the core business of the NRWG, which is to support conservancies during their annual natural resource management cycle, whilst meeting the increasing *ad hoc* demands from the ever increasing number of conservancies;
- the resultant increasing demands placed on project personnel as the number and spatial extent of conservancies increase without any concomitant increase in key personnel (including technical experts as well as field workers);
- the limited number of experienced and skilled Namibian personnel that can be attracted to various positions within the Project, the NACSO partners and MET;
- the need to build the capacity of increasingly enthusiastic and involved MET partners at the regional level, to ensure sound understanding of CBNRM principles and effective, empathetic communication skills necessary for working with community partners;
- frequent changes in composition of elected conservancy management personnel, requiring the ongoing provision of training and resulting in the recurrent loss of an institutional memory at ground level;
- ever-present dynamics and tensions within communities, which can result in cynical opportunism threatening progress;
- the need to ensure that conservancies are broad based and inclusive, i.e. that most if not all community members are also registered conservancy members – now that there is better understanding of the concept and it’s application;
- global recession leading to drop in tourist numbers and decreasing opportunities for partnerships with the private sector; coupled with growing anti-hunting sentiment among sectors of society;
- the ‘ultra-green’ movement that is common in certain sectors. This stakeholder group does not understand the cause-effect relationships that are critical to conservation success in the developing world;
- appointment of key ministry figures that are anti CBNRM could scupper progress; and
- donor “fatigue” given the time span and ongoing need for technical support for this form of land use to be efficient and sustainable.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the recommendations that follow have already been articulated by project participants and were included in the mid-term review, but remain relevant:

- Expansion of the currently over-stretched project team, with the required funding, is strongly recommended. Frankly, the “cracks are showing” as this dedicated core struggles with an increasing work load under often arduous field conditions;
- As a corollary to the point above, efforts should be made to secure funding and an ultimate career path for promising young Namibians who are currently exposed to an initial one year of training and mentorship programme, but are not assured of further gainful employment or suitable employment contracts following their second year of attachment to a partner organisation;
- Continue with investigating and implementing ways of working more strategically and time/cost effectively through clustering, advanced calendar planning, etc.;
- Optimize income from consumptive use, including facilitating co-operation between tourism and hunting operators and ensuring that trophy quality animals are not under-used by ‘shoot and sell’ or own use. Further to this, continue with investigations into replacing ‘shoot and sell’ over time with value adding activities such as smoked meat, biltong and hide production, retaining non-prime cuts on conservancies for own use and developing greater business acumen within conservancies to ensure economic sustainability;
- Investigating the deployment of a carcass tagging system to minimize paperwork in the field and address loopholes whereby unscrupulous operators can abuse the ticket system;
- Conservancies should be encouraged to phase out one year contracts, establish relationships with reputable hunters, and offer at least 3-5 year contracts based on the new contracts being prepared. This is likely to help alleviate problems with ‘less scrupulous’ operators;
- Acceptance by all concerned, including donors, that technical support to conservancies will be permanently needed and that creative, sustainable finance mechanisms will be required to allow Namibia to fund these costs independent of external donor support. This in view of the responsibility assumed by conservancy management structures for ensuring sustainable resource use, equitable use of income, managing wildlife populations in communal areas, and the need to ensure that MET is assisted in developing appropriate ‘extension’ and support services in this regard;

The widespread success of the conservancy support systems should be recorded in the relevant scientific and semi-popular literature. The meticulous attention to fulfilling identified needs of conservancy management, on an ongoing and adaptive basis, is worthy of recording for all potential interested parties (academic, political, administrative and conservation managers), including the process involved. In order not to add to the workload of project personnel, this could be prepared in collaboration with a commissioned expert, much in the way that the paper on Buffalo in Caprivi was produced.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>v</b>
Challenges/risks .....	viii
Recommendations .....	x
<b>1. INTRODUCTION &amp; PROJECT BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Description.....	1
1.1.1 Project location.....	1
1.1.2 Project rationale .....	1
1.1.3 Project beneficiaries and stakeholders.....	2
1.1.4 Project Goal and Purpose .....	2
1.1.5 Project Outputs .....	2
1.1.6 Project Implementation Arrangements.....	3
<b>2. TERMINAL REVIEW PROCESS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 Objectives of the Terminal Review .....	4
2.2 The Review Team .....	5
2.3 Review Methodology .....	5
2.4 Management response to mid-term review recommendations .....	5
<b>3. MAIN FINDINGS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>10</b>
3.1 Relevance of the project .....	10
3.1.1 Strategic Alignment .....	10
3.1.2 Project design .....	13
3.1.3 Institutional Arrangements.....	14
3.2 Project progress and achievements against logframe purpose and outputs (indicators)	15
3.2.1 Purpose .....	15
3.2.2 Outputs .....	16
3.3 Assessment of Project Implementation and Management.....	37
3.3.1 Project Implementation .....	37
3.3.2 Project Management .....	39
3.4 Project Effectiveness, Efficiency and Impact .....	42

3.4.1	Effectiveness .....	42
3.4.2	Efficiency .....	44
3.4.3	Impact .....	44
3.5	Project Sustainability and Replicability .....	46
3.5.1	Sustainability .....	46
3.5.2	Replicability .....	48
3.5.3	Risks .....	49
<b>4.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1	Project Implementation .....	51
4.2	Project Management and Administration .....	52
4.3	Ensuring sustainability of relevant project components .....	52
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>55</b>
PROGRAMME	.....	55
PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED IN NAMIBIA, 30 September to 8 October 2012	.....	55

# 1. INTRODUCTION & PROJECT BACKGROUND

## 1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The WWF Norway funded Project under review (The Sustainable Use of Wildlife, 2008-2012) has involved many individuals and organizations, including the MET, NGOs and technical support personnel, not to mention the numerous men and woman of the rural areas who have enthusiastically embraced the opportunities provided by progressive legislation and policies.

The Project is part of a broader Namibian CBNRM Programme which has, in essence, been running for over two decades. As such, this review will of necessity refer to the “bigger picture” whilst commenting on the specifics of the particular WWF Norway funding component.

### 1.1.1 Project location

The Sustainable Use of Wildlife in Namibia Project, implemented by WWF in Namibia, and supported by WWF-Norway (with Norad funding) is a five year project which commenced in 2008 and will conclude at the end of 2012.

The activities of this Project predominantly take place in two regions in the northern communal and protected areas of Namibia. These regions are: 1) the portion of the Namib/Karoo Ecoregion, which contains a large number of conservancies in north-western Namibia; and 2) an extensive network of communal conservancies, parks, game reserves, and open communal lands in north-eastern Namibia encompassed by what WWF terms the Miombo Woodlands WWF Ecoregion and Priority Place and the Zambezi Flooded Savannas. These activities are supported from Windhoek, where the Natural Resource Working Group is located, as is the WWF in Namibia country office from where many of the project activities are managed and coordinated.

Due to the success and achievements of the conservancy initiative, additional conservancies have been established in other parts of Namibia, including those in communal areas south of Khaudom National Park, east of Otjiwarango and as far south as the Keetmanshoop area.

### 1.1.2 Project rationale

The Project supports the Namibia CBNRM Natural Resources Working Group to build capacity in natural resource management and monitoring capabilities in the NRM staff of member NGOs and MET. The NGO/MET staff work directly with conservancies and stakeholders in the wildlife management and utilization industry to develop or refine management plans and zones, develop

internal licensing and permit systems, census game and determine quotas, implement the event book system and conduct annual audits.

The Project assists in the development of national level support systems that enhance conservancy management/monitoring capacities and regulatory systems for game harvesting that can be field-tested and eventually rolled out at the national level.

### **1.1.3 Project beneficiaries and stakeholders**

The communal conservancy movement has proven highly popular, expanding from registration of the first four conservancies in 1998 to 76 conservancies in 2012 (June 2012 figures obtained from [www.nasco.org](http://www.nasco.org)), with communal conservancies now covering approximately 14.98 million hectares – or almost 18.2% of Namibia’s surface area. Communal conservancies encompass around 260,000 people, making the programme one of Namibia’s most widespread and successful rural development initiatives. It is estimated that communal conservancies will peak at 90-100 in number over the next five years.

Other stakeholders include the MET and the member organizations of NACSO.

### **1.1.4 Project Goal and Purpose**

The *project goal*, is:

‘Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable wildlife utilization and conservation’.

The *project purpose*, which the Project is to deliver by the end of its life time, is:

‘Strengthened sustainable wildlife utilization systems that improve community livelihoods and enhance conservation outcomes’.

### **1.1.5 Project Outputs**

The outputs below were expected to be produced by the end of the Project and in effect ensure the project purpose is achieved:

1. Conservancy management plans are widely recognized, integrated with management plans of neighbouring conservancies and parks, effectively implemented, and are leading to reduced conflicts between competing uses of land and wildlife resources;
2. Monitoring systems in support of wildlife utilization are functional at local, regional, and national levels and contributing to adaptive management;
3. Benefits from wildlife utilization increased and applied to improved conservation of the resource base and distributed to conservancy members in such a manner that livelihoods are improved;

4. Select regulatory controls for wildlife use, trade and transport are effectively implemented in an efficient and decentralized manner;
5. Capacity built into NRWG and Namibian service organizations to strengthen the ability of conservancies to develop and implement management and regulatory systems; and
6. High standards in the hunting industry are developed, implemented, and shared with relevant stakeholders in Namibia, the SADC region, and internationally.

### **1.1.6 Project Implementation Arrangements**

The project is implemented through the WWF in Namibia office via the NRWG and in partnership with MET, NACSO, NNF and IRDNC. The project is carried out by Windhoek based staff as well as the field based (Caprivi and Kunene) staff. Consultants are also contracted in by WWF in Namibia as and when needed. Two direct grants are allocated from the funds and these go to the IRDNC for its support activities to conservancies in the north-west and to the NNF which administers the fund on behalf of the NRWG in order to run the NRWG. The project works through the NRWG in order to ensure maximum involvement of all Namibian stakeholders and to encourage as much local ownership as possible. Whilst this may not raise the profile of WWF to the maximum, it is considered tactically “correct”, as there is some resistance to certain NGO’s (not WWF) which are perceived as overly top-down and patronizing in their approach (based on feedback from senior Namibian stakeholders).

The various NRWG partners and key personnel are, increasingly, centrally based in offices shared with WWF, leading to the further development of a cohesive team with more effective and easier communications and cooperation and access to a range of resource material.

Recently, the Project has been collaborating with, and gained from, tourism and business development experts deployed under the Namibian MCA Programme.

## 2. TERMINAL REVIEW PROCESS

### 2.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE TERMINAL REVIEW

The purpose of the Terminal Review of the Sustainable Use of Wildlife in Namibia Project is to:

- Assess the outcomes of the project in relation to the agreed goal, purpose and outputs
- Assess amendments made during the course of the project and the effectiveness thereof; and
- Assess and comment on the future sustainability of the project components.

The objectives of the Terminal Project Review are to assess the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project, which includes specific assessment of the following:

1. The relevance of the Project;
2. The Log Frame design, with particular reference to amendments agreed to during the term of the Project;
3. Assessment of the degree to which the objectives of the project have been achieved;
4. The lessons learnt;
5. The linkage of the budget to the deliverables;
6. The Project institutional arrangements;
7. The sustainability of the project outputs beyond the life of the project;
8. How the Project relates to other similar initiatives in Namibia or across its borders.

The Terminal Project Review is being carried out in line with the requirements of the signed contract between WWF Norway and WWF in Namibia.

## 2.2 THE REVIEW TEAM

The review team consisted of David Grossman and Phillipa Holden of David Grossman & Associates. Greg Stuart-Hill of the WWF in Namibia office also assisted in the review process and contributed information.

## 2.3 REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The TR commenced with a desktop assessment of all relevant documentation provided. This was followed by intensive interviews with key stakeholders and informants, both in Windhoek and in the field (Torra and Doro Inawas conservancies). These conservancies were chosen as the quota setting meeting at Torra coincided with the field visit dates, and the review team had been exposed to Caprivi conservancies during the mid-term review in 2010. The field trip also afforded the team the opportunity to view the cold room and meat processing facilities designed to “add value”; and to engage with field based Project, NGO and conservancy staff and to observe them at work, making the realities of the practical challenges they face more apparent to the review team.

The draft report was sent to Greg Stuart-Hill and then circulated to members of the NRWG and other relevant parties for comment.

## 2.4 Management response to mid-term review recommendations

In general, the Namibian project management team felt that the mid-term review process was a useful exercise as it provided an opportunity to reflect on the challenges facing the project/programme and explore possible solutions with independent outsiders. It also provided an external, and perhaps more objective, reflection on the positive achievements that the project/programme has been able to attain.

The WWF-Namibia responses to the detailed recommendations that emerged out of the mid-term review are detailed as follows, with comments by the TR team where relevant:

**Recommendation:** The original project Log Frame should be reworked in some sections to more directly align with the work plan of the NRWG which was reached through assessment of client (i.e. conservancies) needs and by consensus of all partner agencies.

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation. In December 2010 this recommendation was formally tabled at the end of year meeting of the NRWG. After some reflection and discussion, the NRWG made a number of recommendations to change the project logframe to bring it more into alignment with the NRWG logframe and work programme. They gave Dr Stuart-Hill the mandate to change the project logframe according to these recommendations and where ever else it was deemed necessary. This was completed by the end of February 2011.

**TR COMMENT:** Minor changes to indicators, these included the design and piloting of a field meat handling facility in order to improve efficiency and hygiene standards of own use of game harvesting, the adoption of a more active role in supporting game re-introductions to conservancies that need founder breeding stock in order to enter the game utilization 'industry', establishment of a borehole for a community that voluntarily moved to establish a critical wildlife zone, a no-cost change as project funds were used from savings as two members of project staff had to reduce their work-load due to serious illnesses. No significant changes to outputs.

**Recommendation:** Monitoring and reporting against outcomes rather than activities will streamline reporting and still inform donors as to actual progress and any obstacles encountered (although monitoring of activities will still be done by NRWG).

**Response:** The Namibian team agreed with this recommendation. The indicators for the outputs in the project logframe were accordingly revised in order for this more efficient reporting to be data rich. These new indicators were to be developed before the end of 2010 so that the final 2010 technical report could report against these new indicators.

**Recommendation:** WWF Norway has suggested that in future they would be happy to provide basket funding to WWF in Namibia, which could be used as required to achieve overarching programmatic outcomes. This would require incorporating various donors, including WWF Norway, into one overarching programme with one log frame and key outcomes and this suggestion is supported by the MTR (obviously with the necessary concurrence of contractual partners through appropriate MOU's).

**Response:** The Namibian team would prefer this solution but is concerned that a basket funding approach might dissuade certain donors from contributing to the Namibian programme. Due to time constraints and sensitivities with certain donors, we feel we are not presently in a position to lead champion this solution. We would, however, be happy to discuss this should a collective group of donor be willing to explore such a solution.

**TR COMMENT:** This is an ongoing process.

**Recommendation:** Optimizing income from consumptive use, including facilitating co-operation between tourism and hunting operators and ensuring that trophy quality animals are not undervalued by shoot and sell or own use

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation and sees this as an ongoing recommendation to conservancies to use their quotas wisely. In order to minimize the conflict and economic under performance of using shoot and sell and own use harvesting at the expense of trophy hunting and tourism the team will encourage conservancies to get either the trophy hunter or the tourism operators to undertake or co-ordinate these types of harvests on behalf of the conservancy.

**TR COMMENT:** Ongoing

**Recommendation:** Increasing the numbers of trained community hunting guides and making the use of such qualified guides compulsory, for trophy, premium and shoot and sell hunts

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation. Following this mid-term review recommendation, an additional hunters guides training course (using funds sourced from ICEMA)

was held. In total 17 participants attended the courses and seven have now qualified as hunting guides. The task, aside from further guide training, is now is to get these guides employed and/or exposed to more work experience so that the usual excuses of “lack of qualifications/experience” is removed. This task has been allocated to the IRDNC managed component of the project.

**Recommendation:** Examining the potential for breeding of high value species, including assessment of current and projected future market demand.

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation, but recognises the high startup capital and expertise required. The disease free buffalo herd in Nyae Nyae is an obvious example and pilot site. However, progress has proved to be extremely slow, mainly as a result of the MET not wanting to fully relinquish ownership of rare and endangered game (which the conservancy legislation does not fully devolve to communities). The way forward on this initiative is to develop a win-win understanding, formalized through MOU/Custodian agreements between the government and the conservancies and then probably a joint venture with a private sector operator to bring in the required capital, expertise and strong management required. This initiative will be further explored with the newly established MCA project.

**TR COMMENT:** Veterinary restrictions currently being addressed re buffalo, (which, incidentally, have obtained amounts up to ZAR26 million for bulls at South African auctions in 2012).

**Recommendation:** Exploring and encouraging management at the landscape rather than the socio-political boundary level, especially where highly mobile wildlife populations can bedevil quota setting and subsequent trophy hunting at conservancy level (i.e. “here today, gone tomorrow”).

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation, but cautions that totally ignoring the socio-political boundaries runs the risk of disempowering individual conservancies and reversing control and ownership to top-down entities. The project has however, responded to this need to manage at the appropriate scale by pushing for the establishment of co-management complexes. Since the review an additional unplanned complex (including conservancies to the south of Mudumu National Park) has been fast tracked. Accordingly, this output in the project logical framework is now receiving greater attention than was originally envisaged at the start of the project. In addition to this, a review panel has been established with DSS in the MET to analyse harvest quotas on a landscape scale (i.e. by aggregating individual quota applications by neighbouring conservancies) in order to evaluate their applicability. Care however, needs to be taken to avoid inadvertently undermining devolution and local ownership.

**TR COMMENT:** The approach adopted is endorsed.

**Recommendation:** Ensuring that proficiency and professionalism of shoot and sell operators is increased to minimize negative disturbance impacts of cropping on animal populations.

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation. As mentioned in a previous recommendation the team will now encourage conservancies to get either the trophy hunter or the tourism operators to undertake or co-ordinate the shoot and sell operations to minimize the negative impacts and monitor the professionalism. In addition, because there are now more trained conservancy hunting guides that can accompany the operators and provide improved oversight and control.

**TR COMMENT:** The use of “tags” system as employed in some European counties, USA etc may assist in streamlining controls; also, conservancies should consider the merits of awarding contracts for more than one year as this will select for more scrupulous operators rather than once-off opportunists.

**Recommendation:** Assessing the success of the emerging model of conservancy-owned hunting and tourism operations with a view to replication if successful.

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation, but feels that the evaluation of this particular enterprise is well beyond the scope and mandate of the project and the NRWG and even attempting this will threaten relationships in the CBNRM programme. We believe that this particular programme will, as a matter of course, be evaluated by its sponsors. However, the review’s recommendation that this model could be replicated, if successful, is fully accepted – but, again rolling this out will be the task of the Business and Enterprise working group (and probably the MCA project). Thus, whilst agreeing with the recommendation, we do not feel that it is an action that we will currently follow up on within this project.

**TR COMMENTS:** Agreed.

**Recommendation:** Technical support to conservancies will be needed for years to come, given the responsibility assumed by conservancy management structures for ensuring sustainable resource use, equitable use of income, managing wildlife populations in arid communal areas, etc. It is crucial to develop a strategic “Business Plan”, with funding, to service the ongoing needs of both established and newly-registered conservancies over the longer term. This will, of necessity also include longer term actions aimed at increasing the attractiveness of a conservation career to younger Namibians and assisting in the required formal and experiential training process

**Response:** The Namibian team agrees with this recommendation, but notes that this is a much bigger programmatic issue – not just confined to the natural resource aspects of the programme. A major strategy for NACSO is sustainable financing. This is also a major strategic focus for WWF in Namibia (and is supported by sustainable financing experts from the WWF US office). This particular project is concerned with the natural resource aspects of the programme. As such, it (the Natural Resource Working Group) is in the process of developing a long-term budget for providing this ongoing extension support to Conservancies. This will then be integrated with similar budgets from the other thematic support areas and an overall business plan developed for a comprehensive and integrated support service to Conservancies.

**TR COMMENTS:** The current strategic planning process is supported.

**Recommendation:** As a corollary, we would strongly recommend continued funding of the current suite of outcomes, as modified by the NRWG, beyond the 2012 cutoff, to ensure the necessary continuity.

**Response:** The Namibian team is pleased with this recommendation and is hopeful the WWF Norway will agree to this. The conservancy programme is still growing as increasing numbers of conservancies become registered. Also, whilst we have a number of good conservancy support systems well entrenched, there are still others (e.g. the quota setting system, true adaptive management decision making, application of management plans) that still require further

development. It is predicted that the sustainable financing solution will take a number of years to come into full operation and so, project funding will be required as an interim measure to fill the gap until the sustainable financing solution is fully functional.

**TR COMMENT:** It is understood that funding from WWF Norway for 2013-2016 has fortunately been obtained, although this will need to be supplemented given the increasing demands placed on the Project.

**Recommendation:** Attention should also be given to the issue of effective communication between the various levels of CBNRM management and implementation, from the ground up to the Ministries and a proactive and comprehensive communication and information strategy that is properly resourced would help to ensure the success of the project and programme as a whole

**Response:** NACSO, plus the working group concept, are the key communication strategies being employed by the CBNRM programme. The WWF in Namibia office, as well as NACSO, both have communication strategies plus share a communication officer. Sadly this communication officer has recently resigned but a replacement is being appointed. We feel that at the operational level communication between stakeholders is good and are thus not sure specifically if there are communication problems or the review is making a general point about the importance of communications. We do, however, acknowledge that there is room for communication improvement at the higher levels between organisations. In terms of the working group itself, if funding allows, we intend to retain a portion of the exiting communication officer's time on a part-time basis as he is familiar with the stakeholders and the working group's objectives and activities. We also need to better document our NRM tools to ensure their legacy and to be able to share these with others in southern Africa and beyond.

**TR COMMENT:** Documentation of the tools is strongly supported.

**Recommendation:** Expansion of the currently over-stretched project team is recommended and the option of obtaining additional funding in order to support this should be discussed, as should the appropriate placement of such personnel.

**Response:** The Namibian team strongly agrees with this observation and recommendation. The natural resource working group is struggling to keep up with existing services and there are still other services (e.g. human Wildlife Conflict) that are not being addressed adequately. Many of the working group members are only on part-time contracts yet performing full-time jobs. The obvious long-term impact of this is staff burn-out and lack of depth (if one or two key people should no longer be available). The hidden cost of the current work-load is that the team loses its ability to improve through self-development and training and also stops being innovative because it lacks the time, resources and energy to try new approaches.

**TR COMMENT:** Perhaps the most crucial risk to success and sustainability, project personnel are simply stretched too far.

## 3. MAIN FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

### 3.1 RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT

#### 3.1.1 Strategic Alignment

##### 3.1.1.1 Addressing Namibia's national priorities

WWF in Namibia, with support from this grant, together with other stakeholders funded through this project, are essentially supporting the *Government of Namibia's* CBNRM Programme. This includes supporting Namibian stakeholders, including the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and local Namibian CBNRM support organisations through the NACSO constituted Natural Resource Working Group.

This is directly aligned with Namibia's Vision 2030 which states as one of its major objectives: "Ensure the development of Namibia's 'natural capital' and its sustainable utilisation, for the benefit of the country's social, economic and ecological wellbeing" whilst one of the strategies therein is: "Maintaining stable, diverse and productive ecosystems managed for long-term sustainability".

The Conservancy CBNRM Programme in Namibia (of which this Project is a component) clearly enjoys highest level support, as articulated by His Excellency President Hifikepunye Pohamba, who stated:

*"Government has passed a range of legislation that devolved rights over resources to Namibians living in communal areas. This has enabled communities to manage the natural resources in their areas and use them for community benefit and improvement of individual livelihoods"*

*and*

*"To see the happiness on the faces of the people whose lives have been improved by the Programme is the ultimate testimony of success" (Message from the President, Conservation and the Environment in Namibia, 2010/11, p 3)*

### **3.1.1.2 Stakeholder support**

Based on discussions at various levels during the TR, the MTR and a review of the IRDNC programme previously, it is clear that this project continues to enjoy growing support from a wide range of stakeholders. There is increasingly active MET involvement in all facets of the Project, with the ministry as whole and particular individuals taking lead roles in some technical activities such as game counts and quota setting. The committed support of the Director is noticeable, and recent restructuring of the MET makes provision for increased leadership of the conservancy support initiative. This will include the continued use of what is deemed essential support and backup from the technical support service group within the NRWG (interview with Director of Parks and Wildlife, MET, Colgar Sikopo, 8<sup>th</sup> October).

Stakeholder support from the rural communities themselves is evidenced by the ongoing growth in voluntary applications for conservancy registration. Whilst not wanting to dampen the enthusiasm, in some instances the desire to create new conservancies might need to be worked through with communities in terms of what the expectations are and what might realistically be achieved and over what time period. The implications of the potential inability of the Project team to service the needs of the growing number of conservancies, especially the higher start up investment required for new conservancies, needs to be critically considered and a backlash is already anticipated as the Project fails to address the requests for assistance received from some of the new conservancies. *NB This does not imply that interested communities should in any way be discouraged from applying for conservancy proclamation, as there may be valid reasons other than significant financial or economic benefit. What it does imply is that all applications will need assessment of possible economic benefits, income and conservation value to ensure that expectations align with actual potentials.*

Products such as the event and incident book system and CONINFO have been embraced and utilised by stakeholders across the board, and recent refinements and additions to these products have been welcomed and are in active use e.g. information posters and booklets. In particular, participants will be in a position to easily obtain accurate data on income derived from the various sources (trophy, shoot and sell, tourism).

Through inclusive structures such as NACSO and the NRWG there appears to be good communication between the parties and a constructive, mutually beneficial working relationship with all parties focusing on common goals, each contributing to the development of the bigger picture. The level of co-operation and progress made as a result serves as a model to other countries.

### **3.1.1.3 Alignment with WWF's priorities- WWF's Global Programme Framework**

This programme is aligned with the WWF Global Programme Framework (GPF) (WWF Global Programme Framework 2008-2020), WWF's strategy for its future work providing internal guidance on the development of priority conservation programmes in terms of identified priority places and priority species.

This project, as a component of the greater Namibian CBNRM Programme, contributes to the improved management and sustainable use of wildlife in two of key areas identified in the GPF, namely the Miombo Woodlands Ecoregion and Priority Place, and the Namib-Karoo-Kaokoveld Ecoregion. This programme combats biodiversity loss caused by habitat and species loss through contributing to improving quality of life for local people living in conservancies, by enabling local communities to benefit from sustainable use of wildlife, thus encouraging improved natural resource governance through receipt of financial and non-financial incentives.

The communal conservancy movement has proven highly popular, expanding from registration of the first four conservancies in 1998 to 76 conservancies in 2012, with communal conservancies now covering approximately 14.98 million hectares – or almost 18.2% of Namibia’s surface area. Communal conservancies encompass around 260,000 people, making the programme one of Namibia’s most widespread and successful rural development initiatives. It is estimated that communal conservancies will peak at 90-100 in number over the next five years.

This project supports CBNRM, which is a rights-based approach to conservation and development, resulting in local people’s empowerment through *de facto* ownership and decision-making over wildlife and resulting benefits, and promotes equitable distribution of resources. As such, support for CBNRM through this project tackles drivers of biodiversity loss such as poverty and inequality.

This project thus also conforms to the WWF Policy on Poverty and Conservation (WWF, 2009) which recognises that conservation will only be successful in the long term if it addresses the development needs and aspirations of local communities.

Further, the diversification of sustainable land use options contributes directly to climate change adaptation.

#### **3.1.1.4 Alignment with Norwegian Development Cooperation**

The project promotes biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, and aims to improve poor people’s livelihood security and strengthen civil society towards good governance and, as such, responds to Norwegian Development Cooperation objectives, specifically the *Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation*<sup>[1]</sup> (MFA, 2006) which promulgates concerted actions on:

- sustainable management of biological diversity and natural resources;
- water resources management, water and sanitation; and
- climate change and access to clean energy.

The Programme also responds to the Principles for Norad’s *Support to Civil Society in the South*<sup>[2]</sup> (Norad, 2009) which promotes good governance and institutional strengthening, notably:

---

[1] HANDLINGSPLAN FOR MILJØRETTET UTVIKLINGSSAMARBEID, 06/2006

[2] Prinsipper for Norad’s Støtte til Sivilt Samfunn i Sør, 05/2009

- mobilise NGOs at all levels in the struggle against poverty and oppression;
- strengthen civil society actors working towards development, democratisation and the redistribution of power;
- support civil society organisations in their international work;
- ensure better documentation and reporting of results; and
- support effective work against corruption in all its forms (element of good governance).

The programme is also in line with Norad's *Platform for an Integrated Africa Policy*<sup>[3]</sup> (Norad, 2008) which promulgates: equitable and sustainable development; climate change, energy and the environment; democracy, human rights and gender equality; political dialogue and development cooperation particularly in relation to good governance over natural resources management.

### 3.1.2 Project design

The project goal and purpose are still entirely relevant to conservation and socio-economic development in Namibia and in fact, given the growing number of conservancies that have emerged in recent years, and increasing official commitment, are perhaps of increasingly critical importance. The project is aligned with Namibia's 2030 vision and gives practical effect to Namibia's conservation priorities, policies and strategies – to the extent that certain systems that have been designed and implemented by the project have been taken up by the MET as a suitable and effective way of managing wildlife in the national parks as well as conservancies (for example, the Event Book, known as the Incident Book in MET, and many aspects of the management plans for parks). What is particularly noteworthy in this regard is how MET officials, community game guards and even conservancy committee members at times, work together on game counts for both the parks and the conservancies, indicating not only a growing and strengthening partnership between them but also an increased sense of empowerment and pride within the community about the role they have to play as joint custodians of Namibia's wildlife. The positive impact of this type of teambuilding cannot be under-emphasized.

The LFA is logical in its design and gives practical effect to the expressed project goal and purpose. After the MTR it was slightly modified in order to align it more closely with the activities and work plan of the NRWG. This was important for two reasons – one being that it was important that WWF was and is seen to be providing support to the national agenda as opposed to setting its own agenda; and, the second being for project streamlining purposes in that the administrative burden placed on the WWF in Namibia staff needs to be minimized and managed.

Various other changes were made to the LFA design during 2010 and 2011, an indication that the project management is aware of and actively responding to the needs of the client i.e. the conservancies themselves. These included the design and piloting of a field meat handling facility in order to improve efficiency and hygiene standards of own use of game harvesting, the adoption of a more active role in supporting game re-introductions to conservancies that need

<sup>[3]</sup> Plattform for en Helhetlig Afrika-Politik, 11/2008

founder breeding stock in order to enter the game utilization ‘industry’, establishment of a borehole for a community that voluntarily moved to establish a critical wildlife zone, a no-cost change as project funds were used from savings as two members of project staff had to reduce their work-load due to serious illnesses.

The assessment of risks has received attention, but it is felt that some of these may become more serious if not actively addressed. This includes the increasing pressure on limited staff and skills resources to deliver support to an increasing number of conservancies, some at critical stages of development and most not yet able to manage without technical assistance on a number of fronts. The need to regularly reinforce the training that has already been conducted (particularly where new conservancy committees are elected) and to make sure that systems are properly implemented is critical to the long term success of the project and this issue is discussed further under Section 3.5 on Sustainability.

### **3.1.3 Institutional Arrangements**

The institutional arrangements of the programme are relatively complex in that WWF has only two full time staff dedicated solely to the project and does extensive sub-granting. WWF Namibia provides overall supervision of this Project, including technical assistance, management and financial oversight. Implementation of project activities is done by WWF Namibia and contracted consultants, the NRWG and its members<sup>1</sup>. The communal conservancies are the primary target of project interventions.

WWF in Namibia is the grant recipient, it in turn disburses some 35% of this grant directly to two sub-grantees – the NRWG (through NNF) and the IRDNC, and a further 20% for consultancy fees to service various activities related to particularly the NRWG, including CONINFO, management plans and game counts.

The Natural Resource Working Group is constituted under the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO). It comprises stakeholders from the government, NGOs and private sector (consultants) with expertise in natural resource management who provide support services for the conservancies to assist them to manage the sustainable uses of wildlife resources. The NNF administers the grant from WWF in Namibia on behalf of the NRWG. The NRWG has a fulltime coordinator supported under this grant, who was formerly based at the NNF, but has recently moved across to the NRWG workspace that is located on the top floor of 19 Lossen street. This office space has been converted from WWF in Namibia office space to be a NACSO work space for the NRWG. NACSO will sub-let this space from WWF in Namibia, and as an interim measure, WWF in Namibia will realign the project budget by granting the current “office running costs” across to NACSO. Appropriate NACSO branding will be installed shortly and the work-space will have its own separate entrance so that the NRWG has a physical presence and permanent meeting place. This is the first step in NACSO taking over the entire third floor of the building, and will be followed by the business and enterprise, and the Institutional working groups, eventually taking over the remaining office space on the top floor when the MCA project

---

<sup>1</sup> Member organisations include the MET, IRDNC, RISE, Rossing Foundation, Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia, SRT, NDT and NNF.

terminates. The grant supports the NRWG to build capacity in natural resource management and monitoring capabilities in the members, and to undertake various sustainable wildlife management activities, including implementation of the 'Event Book System', local level monitoring system, and annual audits of the Event Book data and to undertake annual game counts, both of which underpin the allocation of quotas in conservancies, in addition to refining and developing management plans or components thereof.

It is important that the roles of different institutions are clear. WWF is there to support local entities, contributing highly valued technical skills and insight, and not to replace local organizations active on the ground. Although a few parties voiced the opinion that the local partners must set the agenda and that total transparency must be maintained, it is our considered opinion that this is indeed largely so.

## **3.2 PROJECT PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST LOGFRAME PURPOSE AND OUTPUTS (INDICATORS)**

### **3.2.1 Purpose**

The project is making exceptional progress towards its purpose of '*strengthened sustainable wildlife utilization systems that improve community livelihoods and enhance conservation outcomes*'.

The 'big picture' wildlife trend results indicate that overall, the use has been overwhelmingly sustainable. There may be some areas of concern with certain large predators, but there is insufficient data to be certain - specifically cheetah in the north west of Namibia and lion and hyena in the north eastern parts of Namibia. This should be monitored over time to establish whether there is cause for concern. The possible declines of some large predators in certain areas are not related to utilization, as the quotas for these animals are either non-existent or extremely low. If real, these declines might be related to aggressive problem animal control measures - bearing in mind that most communities do not want these large predators amongst their livestock or in their villages.

Whereas we have not seen direct indicators of improved community livelihoods, it is inconceivable that the injection of capital, income from resource management, training, employment opportunities associated with increased levels of hunting and tourism, (as well as the self-esteem generated by the programme among rural people who have a say in their own destiny) do not contribute to improved livelihoods in a measurable manner. In 2008, conservancy incomes exceeded N\$32 million, conservancies employed some 276 people, and many conservancies introduced HIV AIDS programmes. According to the review of progress 2008 (*Namibia's Communal conservancies - a review of progress 2008 published by NASCO, 32 pp*) a number of conservancies used funds for social benefits such as contributions to local kindergartens and schools, church youth and farmers groups and traditional authorities. Other social spending included bursaries, water installations, human-wildlife conflict compensation, soup kitchens etc.

Income from hunting, meat and game capture for 2010 was N\$17,462,000. Figures for 2011 have not yet been finalized. In 2010, 619 Conservancy employees were paid from conservancy revenues of which 31% were women. A further 717 full-time and 3,044 part-time jobs were created by Conservancies. In 2010, 23 conservancies were funding 100% of their operational costs, whilst 18 (70%) conservancies were covering at least part of their operational costs (8 contributing over 50%). No data is yet available for 2011.

### **3.2.2 Outputs**

These are reported, as per Log Frame, in the following table, with comments by the review team in green.

**Table 1: Conservation Achievement KPI Rating Table**

(extracted from Project Technical Progress Report, January 2012 – NB. 2012 data not yet available)

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
<b>Project Goal:</b> Improved quality of life for rural Namibians through sustainable wildlife utilization and conservation	Amount of economic activity generated in rural areas as a result of devolved conservation activities	Benefits to local communities at the end of 2006 was approximately N\$26million. The contribution of CBNRM to the Namibian economy in 2006 was approximately N\$175 million	In 2010, the total Income due to CBNRM was N\$45.8 million. Data for 2011 is not yet available, but is expected to be in the order of N\$50 million.  The contribution of CBNRM to the Namibian economy up to 2009 was approximately N\$ 241 million. An updated figure for this has not been determined but is expected to be around N\$300 million	Annual state of CBNRM report	An ongoing increase in income from wildlife-based activities (hunting, tourism) in some established conservancies, and overall, with associated SMME and employment opportunities over time. No "quality of life" indicators <i>per se</i> . Social and economic data are collected by the Governance and Enterprise Working Groups whose data collection methods are currently being adapted so that data collected can be seamlessly incorporated into CONINFO along with NR data, for more effective interpretation
<b>Project purpose:</b> Strengthened sustainable wildlife utilization systems that provide tangible local socio-	Amount of income and benefits generated by conservancies from sustainable use of wildlife	Income of hunting, meat & game capture in 2006 was N\$8,300,001  In 2008 154 Conservancy employees were paid from conservancy revenues. A further	Income of hunting, meat and game capture for 2010 was N\$17,462,000. Figures for 2011 have not yet being finalized.  In 2010, 619 Conservancy employees were paid from conservancy revenues of which 31% were women. A further 717 full-time and 3044 part-time jobs were created by Conservancies.	Annual state of CBNRM report	Wildlife numbers and related income increasing over time as management regimes improve with use of "tool-kits" developed by the Project (management plans, event book, game counts, annual audits, etc.). Growing number of conservancies partially or completely self-financing, though need for ongoing technical support a constant. The perceived benefits of

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
economic benefits and enhance Conservation outcomes		605 full-time and 2,267 part-time Jobs were made possible by Conservancies. In 2008, 14 conservancies were funding 100% of their operational costs and a further nine conservancies were covering more than 50% from own income	In 2010, 23 conservancies were funding 100% of their operational costs whilst 18 (70%) conservancies were covering at least part of their operational costs (8 contributing over 50%). No data is yet available for 2011.		conservancies entrenched and interest in establishing new conservancies indicative of such.
	Game populations trends in Conservancies	Game populations in the NW of Namibia had been increasing for a number of years prior to 2007. Presently a number of species have reached their ecological carrying capacity and further increases are no longer desirable. The management objective is now to	In 2011: Population trends of most species in the conservancies of NW Namibia were either stable or increasing. The endangered Hartmann's zebra continues to show spectacular population increases.  Populations of almost all species in the north eastern parts of Namibia showed increases, most notably being elephant and buffalo. In the initial years the increase were mainly confined to the small (unfenced)		Whilst a high degree of accuracy in game count numbers is impossible to achieve, there is sufficient confidence that consistently conducted counts are reliably indicating game population trends and growth, notably in certain previously endangered species (based on independent assessment of methods by external experts such as Dr P Goodman). Quota setting is deliberately conservative, but has been further refined by making all relevant data available in summarized form for the quota

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
		<p>maintain these species and avoid drought induced die-offs.</p> <p>In the rest of the country, wildlife populations in 2007 were significantly below their ecological carrying capacity (with the exception of elephant in east Caprivi) and the objective is to see increasing population trend for the next 10 years.</p> <p>The objective for rare species is to see populations increase nationally.</p>	<p>national parks adjacent to the conservancies but in recent years wildlife populations in conservancies are also now expanding – although these numbers still remain at low levels. The interpretation is that the conservancy programme is having a beneficial conservation effect which is immediately being felt in the national parks with the benefits at conservancy level lagging a few years behind.</p> <p>Populations of Black Rhino, as an indicator of rare species, continued to increase in 2011 despite population declines in the rest of the world due to increased poaching. One possible case of suspected poaching was noted in Namibia in contrast to over 400 in South Africa.</p> <p>Sightings of all large predators in conservancies (excepting lion in Caprivi) have been steadily increasing.</p>		<p>setting process. The process is iterative and now also considers game populations at a landscape level (conservancy clusters) in order to ensure that the bigger picture is considered.</p> <p>A greater understanding of population dynamics and the effect of annual off-take together with other factors is being fostered in order to improve management capability and thereby increase sustainability. MET staff are engaging in the process and shortcomings are being addressed as the process is further refined. The desire for greater involvement of MET Scientific Services (currently hampered by workloads and capacity constraints) was expressed by various informants.</p>
<b>Output 1:</b> Conservancy management	At least 20 conservancies have updated wildlife	Nine conservancies had Wildlife management plans with zonation maps by	Thus far 23 conservancies now have standardized management plans containing the necessary content, and a further 28 have broad management	CONINFO  WWF Filing systems	Management plans are developed and presented in a participatory and understandable manner, a major achievement of this project. Such

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
<p>plans are widely recognized, integrated with management plans of neighbouring conservancies and parks, effectively implemented, and are leading to reduced conflicts between competing uses of land and wildlife resources</p>	<p>management plans including agreed zonation maps (i.e. four per year).</p>	<p>the end of 2007. But these plans were in various formats and varied greatly in quality. Most of the plans were not being implemented</p>	<p>planning frameworks in place. Systematic implementation of these plans remains a challenge.</p> <p>A management plan filing system has been established at the WWF in Namibia Office in Windhoek as well as digital copies on CONINFO. These files are duplicated in the MET, and each conservancy has a copy of its management plan.</p> <p>Fourteen high quality conservancy profile posters and booklets have been produced. These provide an overview of 18 Conservancies (six being included in two co-management complexes) – essentially containing the descriptive elements of the management plans. Large volumes were printed in order to ensure wider circulation including to JV operators within these conservancies.</p> <p>Management plan implementation is improving but remains a problem caused mainly by the loss of knowledge and ownership when a</p>	<p>Conservancy management plans and zone maps</p> <p>Co-management plans and zone maps</p>	<p>plans have been made accessible to the committees and whole community in the form of posters and booklets. The system for maintaining records of management plans has also been upgraded, with copies warehoused centrally as well as being available at field level. Thought needs to be given to ensuring that any changes that are made to plans at one level are captured at all levels i.e. that one master copy is always maintained and accessible to the rest of the team.</p> <p>Translating management plans into effective, operational level activities does however require ongoing technical support as capacity within communities is developed, and particularly as conservancy committee and responsibility for implementation change. The formation of new conservancies every year is adding to the ever increasing demands on the Project team, who are hard pressed to service the demand.</p> <p>Whilst not wanting to lose the autonomy of conservancies,</p>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			<p>new committee is elected.</p> <p>10 robust notice boards for management plan posters were erected outside conservancy offices and the Management plan posters and Zonation maps displayed so all conservancy members have a chance to view these.</p>		<p>landscape level complexes are increasingly being considered. However, challenges remain in getting different ministries to effect coordinated land use planning. This challenge, if not actively addressed, may lead to increasing conflict in areas such as Caprivi where wildlife numbers, particularly of elephants, continue to grow. Planned farming activities in the east are of great concern as the potential for human-animal conflict is very real and neighbouring land uses are not very compatible. Similarly, resettlement farms in the vicinity of Khaudom and neighbouring conservancies is likely to interrupt animal movements, particularly elephants, and result in increased human-wildlife conflict.</p>
	<p>At least two co-management plans between neighbouring conservancies and protected areas completed and collaborative</p>	<p>At the end of 2007 the only co-management plan in Namibia was for the Mudumu North Complex comprising three conservancies, three community forests</p>	<p>Four Collaborative management Complexes are at different stages of development:</p> <p>1. A first draft co-management plan was developed for the Khaudom North Complex but further work on this has been retarded because there is still no local service provider</p>		<p>Where possible and appropriate, co-management plans are being developed implemented and revised as needed. To date, four such plans, twice the target output, have been developed. However, progress is being hampered to an extent by the lack of available staff on the ground. This initiative is also having a</p>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
	management operational within the target areas.	and two national parks.	<p>working in the area.</p> <p>2. A draft co-management plan for the North West Peoples Park was developed in 2008 but further progress has been retarded because of a loss of confidence in the People's Park initiative around grazing rights in the park.</p> <p>3. The Mudumu North Complex Management plan is being implemented with significant positive progress. A "lessons learned" review was undertaken and a report and presentation prepared and delivered to stakeholders who are now in the process of revising the plan accordingly.</p> <p>4. Following comprehensive consultation with individual conservancies and the staff in the Mamili and Mudumu National parks the Mudumu South Complex was officially constituted in 2010. A complex management plan has been drafted and the implementation of certain strategies has already commenced.</p> <p>Following on the success of the</p>		<p>positive impact on transboundary conservation efforts such as KAZA. It is important that a balance be struck between cooperative management and maintaining a community based sense of ownership and responsibility.</p>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			<p>Mudumu North and South complexes, communities in the floodplains in east Caprivi have requested support to establish co-management complexes in their areas. It is envisaged that two co-management complexes will emerge in this area.</p> <p>The co-management complex approach is being adopted as the model to build up Trans-boundary conservation initiatives in the KAZA region and towards this a number of exchange activities have taken place between the Mudumu North Complex and stakeholders in neighboring Zambia.</p>		
<b>Output 2:</b> Monitoring and Information systems in support of wildlife utilization are functional at local, regional, and national	At least 90% of all registered conservancies have functioning Event Book systems.	In 2007 44 conservancies had event book systems	<p>67 conservancies (some not yet registered) were by 2011 using the Event Book monitoring system which has continued to grow from strength to strength.</p> <p>All data from the event book, game census, local knowledge and a variety of other sources are now aggregated together and made available for quota setting as well as being used to</p>	<p>CONINFO databases</p> <p>Annual NRM audit reports</p>	<p>Work on this aspect of the project continues to grow from strength to strength and constitutes a marvelous example of meeting the need for both dependable data for NR management purposes at a number of levels, as well as being implementable at the community level.</p> <p>Data that is collected is intelligently organized, analysed and presented,</p>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
levels and contributing to adaptive management			generate annual Natural Resource Reporting Posters for each Conservancy.		and made accessible to the various parties concerned for adaptive management purposes.
	At least 90% of registered conservancies undertake annual wildlife censuses	26 Conservancies held game counts in 2007	Landscape wide game censuses have been resuscitated and improved over the past four years so that presently the majority of conservancies with significant game populations (approx. 46) participate in more effective annual game counts. Further expansion of game counts to other Conservancies (with extremely low wildlife numbers) is problematic due to manpower and financial constraints and the methods used (which are designed for areas with higher game densities than occur in conservancies with low numbers) but this is not problematic as wildlife populations in these are furthermore too low to be utilized.	Game count result posters and CONINFO Databases	This area has received renewed attention and effort. However, it is essential that as the activity is increasingly conducted by MET staff working with Conservancy management, adherence to proper and consistent methods be maintained in order to ensure reliability of the data collected. The methods employed (essentially distance-based sightings over a fixed route) have been assessed by recognized experts and found to be defensible, with a further conservative factor included. Combined with local knowledge and overall control at a high level within MET, the census and data-based quota setting systems inspires confidence.
	All Conservancy quota setting meetings are	Twenty nine quota setting meeting were	48 participatory quota setting meetings were held in 2011. 43 of these meetings were using hard data	Annual quota setting sheets	Census and event book data has been collated and presented into posters that are supplied to each

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
	basing quota decisions on hard data generated by monitoring systems such as the Event book and annual censuses.	held in 2007	for quota setting decisions. 5 were initial conservative estimates based on first counts (i.e. before population trends could be established over time)		conservancy and are made available for use at quota setting meetings. Data includes three year aggregates and information at the landscape level. Improved understanding of the implications of data at conservancy level needs to be facilitated. Trophy hunters are also asked to comment on issues relating to trophy hunting and this information is factored into the decision making process. SEE ALSO BOX 1 AT END OF TABLE
	All Conservancies utilizing game are reporting information on trophy quality, utilization rates, and trends to adaptively adjust quotas	Zero Conservancies recorded trophy quality in 2007	Only four conservancies reported trophy quality in 2010. This is a failure of the system that requires both trophy hunters and conservancies to report on trophy quality. The hunters prefer to report only to the MET and the conservancies have no practical way to acquire and report on these data. In an effort to find an alternative solution, in 2011 a new questionnaire approach to monitoring trophy quality was piloted with seven hunters and was well received. This will now be used in future years in place of Conservancies reporting on		System piloted and now more widely introduced for assessing trophy quality through obtaining and referring to the opinion of contracted hunters in the quota setting process.

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			<p>trophy quality</p> <p>In 2011 67 Conservancies (some not registered) were reporting on own-use/shoot &amp; sell and capture (some reports were nil reports)</p>		
	A national information system stores and analyses relevant data and makes these available for reporting and decision making	In 2008 an embryonic information system, a collection of independent databases, was in place but no data analysis and reporting was undertaken from these.	<p>In 2011 the information system was able to:</p> <p>(i) automatically generate comprehensive annual NRM reporting posters for 20 conservancies.</p> <p>(ii) automatically generate reporting posters for all of the game counts undertaken in the conservancies.</p> <p>(iii) at the press of a few 'buttons' produce tables and figures for the Annual State of Conservancy Report.</p> <p>In addition, in 2011 the Quota Setting Decision Support System was significantly upgraded to now automatically include a wide range of data extracted from the various databases and make these available to the quota setting teams. Along with extensive nationwide training, this</p>		Further refinements to the data collection, management and utilization system have taken place. The system is possibly a world first if one considers the number of conservancies and the area of land under consideration, as well as the number and type of stakeholders actively participating in the Programme.

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			much improved system was used to support quota setting in 43 Conservancies		
<b>Output 3:</b> Benefits from wildlife utilization are increased, are captured at the local level, and are used to improve conservation and rural development	90% of registered Conservancies with viable game populations have authorized utilization quotas	Less than 35 conservancies had secured wildlife utilization quotas in 2007	49 Conservancies (88% of those with viable wildlife populations) secured new wildlife utilization quotas for 2012	Annual MET Quota allocations	Securing sustainable benefits is receiving ongoing attention, with innovative deployment of appropriate meat slaughtering and cold-room facilities, addressing problems encountered in some shoot and sell events, refining a carcass ticketing (and possibly tagging) system. Work is underway to improve data collection and management on categories of usage and income (by the governance and enterprise working groups), integrating it with NR data at the conservancy level and making it easier to determine what benefits are obtained and how these are distributed for each conservancy.
	All Conservancies with quotas are maximizing the potential benefits through transparent trophy hunting	Probably no conservancies were fully utilizing their quotas nor maximizing the benefits that they could derive from animals harvested.	During 2011, 52 conservancies received quotas:  All used some for own use  39 (75%) used some of their quotas for trophy hunting  Two used some of their quota for live	Annual state of CBNRM report	Steps are being taken to address conflict between shoot and sell and trophy operators and to manage shoot and sell operations more effectively, through the introduction of tagging systems and possible penalization if trophy animals are shot. Training for hunting guides

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
	contracts and other forms of sustainable use.		capture and sale 17 (32%) used some of their quotas for shoot and sell		was conducted in 2011, but the importance of managing the shoot and sell properly might require further discussion at the conservancy level. Contracts with trophy operators are long and often complicated and conservancies require ongoing assistance from MET and/or project staff to ensure that loopholes are removed and contracts are effective and enforceable. A consultant has been contracted to prepare a usable concise contract template.
	At least N\$10 million in benefits per annum are generated from sustainable use, all of which go directly to conservancies to be used for conservation management, community projects or distributions to	At end of 2006, the value of hunting, meat and game capture was N\$8,300,000.  Meat to the value of approx. N\$1,7 million was distributed directly to members.	Value of hunting, meat and game capture for 2010 was N\$17,462,000. No data yet available for 2011.  Meat to the value of approx. N\$4,36 million was distributed directly to members in 2010  In 2010, 619 Conservancy employees were paid from conservancy revenues of which 31% were women. A further 717 full-time and 3044 part-time jobs were created by the programme.  In 2010 413 game guards and 45 CRM's were employed by	Annual state of CBNRM report	Benefits being delivered to conservancies are indisputable and have continued to grow since the MTR.

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
	members, as determined through a transparent democratic process.		<p>Conservancies, these people directly working on conservation initiatives.</p> <p>Of the cash that conservancies accrued in 2009 (no more recent data available), N\$937.000 was distributed directly to members; N\$670,000 was spent on social services (pensions, soup kitchens, sports clubs, etc), N\$ 2.3 million was spent on capital projects within conservancies,</p> <p>In 2010 34 conservancies held democratic elections at their constitutional AGMs. 28 Conservancies had financial reports approved at AGM's. Women made up 35% of Conservancy management committees and 46% of conservancies have women running the day to day finances of the conservancy.</p> <p>All registered conservancies have constitutions which endorse democracy and transparency, and make reference to benefit distribution.</p>		
<b>Output 4: Local</b>	An efficient	As of 2007 there were	In 2009 quota setting was		The Project remains responsive to

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
controls for wildlife use are effectively implemented in an efficient and decentralized manner	decentralized quota setting system is in place and servicing all registered conservancies.	no controls formally decentralized to local level. Conservancies had however, been given problem animal quotas which entitled them to remove a limited number of problem animals but this was not operating efficiently and was open to abuse.	decentralized to local level but with a national review process to verify the figures before quotas were finalized. In 2010, this achievement was undermined due to the review process not taking place within MET and poor understanding and experience of field staff in MET resulting in a number of poorly set quotas. In 2011 a big collective effort improved the quota setting decision support tool, improved training of technical support providers in both MET and the NGO's and the 2012 quotas are now significantly improved.		emerging needs and challenges, developing suitable tools to ensure effective adaptive management and sustainable utilisation of wildlife. Continued capacity building is probably required at both the MET and the conservancy management committee level.
	A ticketing system to provide local control over own-use and shoot & sell harvesting is in place in all conservancies undertaking these activities	In 2007 no conservancies had local ticketing systems in place to control Shoot & Sell and Own-Use harvesting.	In 2011 a ticketing system was developed and, after a thorough review with MET, implemented in 5 conservancies in the north west. This pilot exercise has highlighted a number of improvements that need to be made; these are being addressed.	Conservancy level utilization permit books	In the case of trophy hunting in particular, and where shoot and sell is contracted out, standards are essentially dependent on the operators themselves and conservancies should consider "black-listing" operators who default or transgress. The model whereby the conservancies own their own safari company appears an efficient way of maximising internal returns

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
					to conservancies and other conservancies should be exposed to this option. A skilled operator still needs to be appointed though. The introduction of a simple but generally effective tagging system, as used in parts of Europe, USE etc, should be explored.
<b>Output 5:</b> Capacity built into Namibian service organizations to strengthen the quality of NRM services delivered to Conservancies	The NRM-WG expands to include all stakeholders providing NRM advice and support to Conservancies.	In 2007 the NRWG consisted only of NGO staff	The NRWG consists of 11 NGO staff members representing four NGO's, six MET staff members and six private sector professionals. The working group is a well-known conservation support entity in Namibia although people often struggle to understand exactly how the working group is constituted.	Annual NRM-WG technical report and member list	<b>Cooperation between the various stakeholders has continued to grow and an increasing number are now located within the same office space, further enhancing this. MET would seem to be taking increasing ownership of the Project, whilst more comfortably acknowledging and making use of the technical skills that are offered by the Project team.</b>
	The NRM-WG is fully implementing the agreed NACSO work plan and servicing all conservancies.	In 2007 approximately 2/3 of the work plan was being attended to and only 34 Conservancies were being serviced	All of the agreed tasks on the NACSO NRM annual work plan were completed satisfactorily for 63 conservancies. This working group continues to be recognized as the leading working group in NACSO and is the main Namibian contact point for all NRM related activities in the	NRM-WG Work Plan	<b>Whilst the NRWG is operating effectively, improving the capacity of the Governance and Enterprise WGs and then integrating the efforts of all three working groups requires ongoing attention at the broader CBRM Programme level.</b>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			CBNRM programme.		
	A business plan be developed for the NRWG to ensure its sustainability of service provision	No Business plan and totally reliant on short-term donor projects	A business plan, focused on the financial, manpower and transport needs was developed late in 2011 for the working group. This exercise exposed a number of gaps, some inefficiencies, as well as highlighted the overall under-budgeting and under-resourcing that the working group would need addressed in order to provide all of the demands expected of it. The working group is still reliant on short-term donor funds, but the load has been spread between a number of different donors/ projects. The NRWG has expanded to include more MET staff who are taking on more responsibility and their funding is assured through Government. Preliminary meetings have been held with a large Namibian corporation who is expressing interest in possibly funding the working group in the longer term as part of the social responsibility programme, but this funding will only become seriously		<b>A matter for concern if funding is not obtained to ensure continuity of inputs which are crucial to the continued success of conservancies (including annual census, quota setting, audit and general technical support as needed)</b>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			available towards the end of 2016 once their development phase is completed and they are in full production.		
<p><b>Output 6:</b> High standards in NRM and sustainable use are developed, implemented, and shared with relevant stakeholders in Namibia, the SADC region, and internationally</p>	<p>At least one presentation per year at an international conference or workshop on the NRM and sustainable utilization approaches being implemented in Namibia</p> <p>At least one science based article published per year covering various aspects of Namibia's NRM and sustainable utilization approach.</p> <p>At least two</p>	None in 2007	<p>Contributed the Natural Resource Management chapter and assisted with various other chapters in the Annual State of Conservancy Reports published each year.</p> <p>Contributed to the development and maintenance of the National CBNRM website hosted by NASCO.</p> <p>Four presentations and posters presented at the southern African Wildlife Management Association conference in South Africa in 2010 – two of which received prizes.</p> <p>Three scientific papers published between 2009 and 2011 covering topics such as sustainable use, payment for ecosystem services, and the relationship between biodiversity and economic benefits.</p> <p>Published at least three semi-popular</p>		<p><b>The Project is successfully showcasing itself and sharing systems, processes and lessons learned with other countries in the region and abroad.</b></p> <p><b>Various exchange visits to Namibia have been held and visits abroad (see lists)</b></p>

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
	<p>articles, manuals or other NRM tools be produced per year, aimed at field workers in similar operational environments or the popular press.</p> <p>At least one international study tour hosted in Namibia per year where the principles and practices of sustainable use are exposed</p>		<p>articles.</p> <p>Contributed to a number of television and international radio programmes.</p> <p>Developed five training manuals covering various aspects of Natural Resource Management in a CBNRM setting.</p> <p>Various study tours from the USA, Botswana, Mongolia, Ethiopia and Kenya (x2).</p> <p>Contributed to a CBNRM course for countries from Francophone Africa</p> <p>Met with, presented to and hosted a number of donor tours, including one from NORAD IN 2010</p> <p>Contributed to various regional CBNRM activities in southern Africa, in particular providing assistance to MOMS initiatives in neighbouring countries and playing a leading role in supporting the regional CBNRM programme with its Performance Monitoring and Evaluation objectives.</p> <p>In October 2012, the MET and NACSO</p>		

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (What You Are Measuring)	Baseline (Value & Date Of Measurement)	Current Status (Value & Date)	Data Source/ Means Of Verification	Reviewer's Comments (TR)
			<p>were the joint recipients of the CIC Markhor Award for Outstanding Conservation Performance. Through the Markhor Award, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) honors conservation projects from around the world that link sustainable wildlife use with human livelihoods and conservation of biodiversity.</p>		

## BOX 1

### **THE QUOTA SETTING PROCESS** (As observed at Torra Conservancy by the TR team)

The participants included the MET regional officials, Conservancy Committee and staff, members of the WWF Norway funded technical support personnel from WWF in Namibia and IRDNC, as well as a representative of the hunting concessionaire.

After a recap of the basic theory behind setting of quotas for trophy and non-trophy animals was presented using easy to understand graphics on posters, the Conservancy Committee presented its own estimates of current animal numbers based on field observations and counts, per species. Thereafter, census results were presented alongside the last three years' average and trends. The Conservancy Committee then presented their suggested quota, followed by inputs from the MET and technical support team. After discussions and explanations as to rationale for suggested quota, off-take requirements per species were recorded, and, in case of disparity between requested and assessed (based on calculated suggested quotas), comments were recorded with the final decision being deferred to the MET high-level review panel for final recommendation to the Minister. It is understood that this panel also takes landscape level information and national CITES quotas into account when coming up with their final quota.

## 3.3 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

### 3.3.1 Project Implementation

Although numerous parties are involved, the Project is structured in such a way (through the NRWG) that implementation has been effective with commendable delivery for all activities and outcomes. However, an increasingly critical challenge that remains is that the WWF in Namibia and related NRWG project staff are overstretched and increasingly unable to cope effectively with the growing demands being placed on them.

#### ***3.3.1.1 Critical manpower shortages in the NRWG***

To expand on the point above, the current NRWG team are hard pressed just meeting the escalating demands from the ever increasing number of conservancies. They are barely coping and the loss of even one of the key members of staff will create a huge hole in the service delivery expected of the NRWG.

By way of example, the Sustainable Use Project Manager, who should be 100% devoted to this project is “theoretically” engaged for only 60% of his time, plus has the following additional tasks

- Sall Conservation Project Project Manager
- Caprivi Fisheries Project Manager (Norway funded)
- WWF in Namibia Species Support Strategy Project Manager (WWF US and in future WWF Netherlands)
- Technical support to Kaza project
- Manager for various National M&E Databases and CONINFO
- Inputs to various research projects (from local and USA institutions)
- Support to technical and donor visits
- Support in Cambodia, Mongolia, Tanzania and Botswana
- Coordinator and technical advisor to regional CBNRM M&E Working Group
- Advisor to MET Census Group
- Co-ordinator to the FENCES working group (collaring and corridors in KAZA)
- Etc.

The strategic responses to this manpower constraint have been as follows (provided by G Stuart-Hill):

- To hand over increased responsibility to MET-CBNRM unit and in time the DSS, for more technical aspects (but, this has to be done sensitively and with associated capacity building)
- Contracting Namibian technical people, and including them into the NRWG, on recurring short-term contracts to deliver specific services, rather than employing more people on an unsustainable budget.
- Ensuring that all members of the NRWG are sufficiently trained and experienced to provide all of the expected services, including Map production (GIS), Event books, Audits, Game counts, Quota Setting, etc.
- Expanding the team through employing young Namibians.

The first three strategies are well underway. MET officials are increasingly assuming control, but as the Director of Parks at MET mentioned, still require the necessary training and sensitivity to adequately engage with community structures, and will still require the technical back-up provided by the Project personnel for some time (until DSS staff start playing a more active role).

The fourth strategy is being addressed through the conservation leadership scheme (a joint venture between NACSO and WWF in Namibia) which employs young Namibian interns for a two year period to fast track them by exposing them to as much work experience as possible. During 2012, the NRWG adopted an intern, who has been fully exposed to most of the services that the NRWG currently provides. His internship (along with two others) is supported by independent (non-Norway) funding. Whilst commendable, this scheme is perceived by some as problematic because:

- the trained interns will possibly leave the programme without a job should further funding not be secured;
- it was reportedly difficult to motivate the established NRWG team members to train these new interns because this training involves living for weeks with a new recruit under stressful conditions in the field, with the perception that once all the hard work has been done the intern may simply leave to take up some “some high powered job”.
- the NRWG possibly loses, due to lack of funding, the exact person that is required for strategy three above – i.e. “Expanding the team through employing young Namibians” (information provided by G Stuart-Hill and C Weaver).

The bottom line is that the NRWG sees itself as greater than any single project which has a finite time scale. It sees itself as providing essential services to Conservancies and the MET-CBNRM unit for many years to come, and this view has been reinforced by a number of external experts as well as the National CBNRM programme. In order to keep up with the ever increasing demands from the rapidly expanding conservancies, and despite MET increasingly taking the centre stage in this regard, the NRWG needs to expand to include young Namibians, and this requires sustained additional funding.

### **3.3.1.2 The shrinking budget**

The number of conservancies being registered has increased exponentially in recent years and at the same time the WWF office is taking on more projects and related tasks with virtually the same number of people responsible for doing them, and in the face of shrinking funding.

As a result, there are conservancies that have requested assistance that have not yet received any attention or intervention with potentially negative consequences for the project and the development of new conservancies, as well as longer term implications for the model as a land use. As was noted in the MTR, this issue will need to be addressed and additional funds will need to be secured in order to expand the project team. This is despite the creative use of external consultants in attempts to effectively service the increasing needs.

A further complicating factor and challenge is the shortage of skilled people that are able and willing to undertake the work and assist at all levels of project implementation. This is further discussed in Section 3.5.1 on Sustainability.

### **3.3.2 Project Management**

#### ***3.3.2.1 Financial aspects***

As far as could be ascertained, financial reporting is up to date and the budget is being spent according to plan. However, financial administration is still bedeviled by the need to work in different currencies with different donors ( a variety of currencies are received from donors, the office operating budget is in US\$ and many of the local costs are in Namibian dollars, for example, some staff contracts and external consultants contracts in USD, local in Namibian dollars). Fluctuating exchange rates complicate matters and, for example, exchange rates often differ from the time of receipt from Norway, to disbursement.

Further complications include having different bank accounts amongst the partners, managing different partners with different reporting systems and without always having a set schedule of payments for grantees (although apparently payment on demand against submission of monthly expenditure is possible). The Financial Manager is also under extreme pressure as he is also responsible for office IT, HR management and security. (NB It is understood that additional staff will shortly be employed to alleviate this situation).

The current system also does not reflect commitments until they have been paid, while the “tranches” or split payments are not directly related to actual timing of expenditure through the year. For example, whereas a particular funding line may incur substantial costs early in the year, the money required is only received later in the year, requiring the specific funding line to “borrow” and repay - a cumbersome additional burden. Adjustments to the percentage splits of the payments would be helpful, with greater loading to the beginning of the year.

Financial challenges that remain for the project include the need to source the additional funds required to fully serve the field support needs of conservancies practicing sustainable use in general, and in the north-west of Namibia in particular, as the operating costs required to service vast areas are extremely high as indicated by the Project business plan. Whilst unexpected funds

are sometimes very gratefully secured from WWF-Norway late in the financial year (unspent from other projects), the last minute rush to spend these additional funds puts extreme pressure on an already weary team at the end of the year. Some sort of innovative mechanism for accessing these earlier in the year and/or being able to roll over these additional funds in the first few months of the following year might be considered.

Project management would be improved if funding could be rolled over from one year to another. The need to go through a start-up and then a close-down each year creates both a lot of uncertainty as well as additional administration, and in particular, financial management burden. This is made particularly difficult as the financial years' of WWF Norway do not coincide with those of WWF-US. The financial systems of WWF-US do not provide up-to-date financial records to the project manager, thus making decision making towards the end of the project year extremely difficult.

Further, the transaction costs of managing a growing number of small and fragmented donors with different reporting requirements is taxing to the Project, WWF in Namibia and Project partners such as IRDNC and NNF. The administrative burden of such demands means that valuable time and resources need to be allocated to keeping up with the requirement of donors – as much as 30% to administer grants was reported to the review team.

### ***3.3.2.2 Administrative, Management and Implementation aspects***

The project is being competently and professionally managed and administered and the review team was again struck by the enthusiasm and dedication of everyone involved. Documentation and information appears to be effectively managed and stored and no insurmountable administrative problems became apparent or were reported during the review, other than staff being overstretched. It was however noted that the majority of people working on the Project are on short or extremely short (month to month) term contracts, and in one instance the person apparently has no contract at all. This provides no job security or outlook for career development.

It was explained that this is caused by the annual funding cycle where institutions (in particular NNF and IRDNC who are apparently cash strapped) are reluctant to renew contracts until they are sure the subsequent funding is secured and in the bank. The other issues are that whilst there are funds for the intern(s), there are no further funds for them as full time employees after their internship. Finally, labour law in Namibia is such that if short-term employment contracts are constantly renewed, then this is construed as full-time employment and institutions are accordingly reluctant to automatically renew contracts without some intervening period. The short-term annual funding cycle exacerbates this problem (it was also acknowledging that WWF Norway has recognised this and is going out of its way to secure longer term funding and allowing funds to be rolled over from one year to the other).

There appears to be clear communication between the project staff as well as between the project and other stakeholders, including MET, with a clear understanding of the roles to be

played by everyone. There is good cooperation and constructive interaction between the various parties, with the focus on a common goal. There also appears to be good communication and an effective partnership between WWF in Namibia and WWF Norway offices. The reported value of the relationship between WWF Norway and WWF Namibia is that the former is able to facilitate partnerships and brings networking value to the local office. The relationship between the two offices seems to be a constructive one with WWF Norway having a flexible approach that allows the Namibia office to 'own' the project and implement it as it sees best. This approach also allows WWF in Namibia to be adaptive and responsive to local needs.

As previously reported, the project has delivered an immense amount of value for relatively small donor spends. This can be attributed to the absolute commitment of the project staff, their hard work and enthusiasm, as well as to the coordinated agendas of the various stakeholders and the constructive working relationship between them, resulting in the whole being greater than the sum of the parts. This project continues to work in close partnership with the MET, in most cases jointly funding activities such as game censuses, quota setting, annual audits and management planning. Not only has this made project funds go much further, but has also greatly strengthened the working relationship between the project and the Ministry. It is evident to the review team that this partnership has further strengthened since the MTR, as confirmed by the MET Parks Director and Scientific Services Deputy Director.

It is clear that WWF in Namibia provides ongoing technical support to the various local stakeholders and has on a number of occasions provided rapid 'stopgap' support to other projects and initiatives when they have experienced problems or unforeseen funding shortfalls. This support has seemingly allowed the 'wheels to keep turning' in times of need with positive ramifications for all stakeholders.

Core products such as the event book system, game count, quota setting and annual audits have been clearly thought through and developed. They are practical and appropriate, having gone through various iterations and refinements, which are ongoing. For example, methods are currently being developed for covering wetland areas such as in Caprivi and ways of getting more meaningful data out of the fixed foot patrols are being considered, focusing on key areas and key data needs. This is reflected by the way in which these systems/products have been taken up at all levels and by a wide array of stakeholders. Active learning and improvement is ongoing and assistance is now being provided to the Governance and Enterprise working groups in order to ensure that they are able to collect and collate meaningful data that can be incorporated into CONINFO and interpreted together with NRM data.

Ongoing and open communication amongst the Namibian partner organisations is facilitated by regular contact through the NRWG and other forums, and communication between parties appears to be effective.

### ***3.3.2.3 Monitoring and reporting aspects***

It has previously been agreed that reporting will only take place at the output level and not the activity level in order to reflect the actual results of the project rather than the process. This was

intended to reduce the relatively onerous and time consuming nature of the prior reporting on the extensive log frame.

The onerous nature of reporting at activity level was also a result of the overly detailed log frame, which also did not enable adapting activities to suit new and evolving circumstances. As such it was agreed to relook at the log frame in conjunction with the NRWG, and also to ensure more consistency between the project log frame and the NRWG log frame / programme of work and this took place after the MTR.

WWF in Namibia is also supported by WWF Germany, the Netherlands, Washington (US) and Norway. Managing the different donors with different reporting frameworks is proving to be onerous and WWF in Namibia would still prefer to have better coordination between the donors with a coordinated log frame in order to lessen the administrative burden on the office. This is also in line with the WWF-Norway suggestion to have one overarching log frame and budget which they - and other donors if they prefer - can contribute to / allocate funds towards, rather than individual elements of the programme. This would also allow for reporting against the overarching programme log frame, rather than a number of different components which each have to be reported against. It is not clear whether or not there has been broader donor support for this suggestion.

### **3.4 PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY AND IMPACT**

#### **3.4.1 Effectiveness**

As already stated, the communal conservancy movement has proven highly popular, expanding from registration of the first four conservancies in 1998 to 76 conservancies in 2012, with communal conservancies now covering approximately 14.9 million hectares – or almost 18.2% of Namibia’s surface area. There have been very positive growths in wildlife populations since the first conservancy was created (both plains game and predators) and this has been bolstered by generous reintroductions, mostly by MET from national parks.

The value of benefits being captured by communities at the conservancy level is also increasing, accruing from tourism concessions with the private sector, trophy hunting contracts, ‘shoot and sell’, the increase in game populations, and meat for the pot. The value of benefits that accrued to communities in 2008 was close to N\$42 million and in 2009 was N\$43 million. There were 29 joint venture lodges and campsites, which provide almost 800 full-time and around 250 part-time jobs and generated close to N\$17 million in income. Trophy hunting alone in 2008 generated N\$8,25 million. Value of hunting, meat and game capture for 2008 and 2009 were N\$11,720,804 and N\$10,437,809 respectively. Of the cash that conservancies accrued in 2009 (no more recent data available), N\$937,000 was distributed directly to members; N\$670,000 was spent on social services (pensions, soup kitchens, sports clubs, etc), N\$ 2.3 million was spent on capital projects within conservancies.

Value of hunting, meat and game capture for 2010 was N\$17,462,000. (no data yet available for 2011), and meat to the value of approx. N\$4,36 million was distributed directly to members in 2010. In 2010, 619 Conservancy employees were paid from conservancy revenues of which 31% were women. A further 717 full-time and 3044 part-time jobs were created by the programme. A total of 413 game guards were employed by Conservancies, these people directly working on conservation initiatives. Thirty-four conservancies held democratic elections at their constitutional AGMs. Twenty-eight Conservancies had financial reports approved at AGM's. Women made up 35% of Conservancy management committees and 46% of conservancies have women running the day to day finances of the conservancy.

All registered conservancies have constitutions which endorse democracy and transparency, and make reference to benefit distribution.

Further value-adding activities, such as the production of biltong and smoked meat and the production of high value hides, are also under investigation by the Project. Wiser use of trophy animals is being encouraged and a number of conservancy hunting guides recently underwent advanced firearm and shooting training at a two-day course in Windhoek in order to increase skills in this regard.

The project's biological data are effectively and systematically collected and entered into the CONINFO system, which is available to all stakeholders via the web and is actively used by the MET for CBNRM tracking and reporting purposes. Management plans have been translated into poster format that are exhibited at and used by conservancy offices, making this information more accessible to the community and committees resulting in increased understanding and support from the ground level and a common vision to be worked towards. The CONINFO system also generates posters containing the latest event book and game count data. Conservancy committee members are soon to be issued with information files that contain a distilled, less technical version of all information relevant to their conservancies.

A part-time GIS consultant is providing mapping services to the Project and Conservancies, as well as to the Ministry, also assisting with the upskilling of MET staff in this respect. These maps provide and collate a number of different layers and types of information, and make the interpretation of data and understanding of the situation on the ground much easier. They also assist in communicating important aspects of the Project and broader CBNRM and wildlife/NR management issues to a variety of stakeholders.

The collection of social monitoring data is an area receiving attention by NACSO and the other working groups within the broader CBNRM programme and is necessary in order to indicate whether or not increased income and employment opportunities are translating into improved wellbeing for community members or not and how this might be aided or improved. What is interesting to note is that the government has generally accepted that CBNRM is a way of combating rural poverty and they are increasingly interested in the benefits that it brings. Whilst hunting brings a more obvious, faster and direct benefit, tourism brings a more diffuse, longer term benefit including employment opportunities. Various indicators and data collection/management criteria have now been agreed by the CONINFO manager and the

Governance and Enterprise working groups and are currently being integrated into the CONINFO system in order that they can provide useful linked insights.

The project has actively contributed to raising the capacity of various roleplayers to manage Namibia's natural resources sustainably, though there is still further work to be done. This has been done through ongoing training of committee members and frequent workshops among the project partners, where various technical aspects of the programme are worked through and explained, and by focused training of, for example, conservancy hunting guides and game guards.

### **3.4.2 Efficiency**

Creative use of relatively limited funds (compare the 5 year budget to, for example, that of a small engineering project to build a relatively short section of road), has enabled numerous conservancies to derive benefits from conservation and sustainable use.

In terms of reporting back to the various stakeholders including conservancies, the project appears to be running extremely efficiently and this is facilitated by the CONINFO system. Game numbers and reports are available to the conservancies within a month of the game counts taking place and this is due largely to the systems that have been developed and put in place to analyse and present the data. There are regular meetings of the NRWG, and progress is also reported at this forum. The project has also responded to the various challenges and constraints that it faces, particularly relating to time and manpower as well as funding shortfalls

### **3.4.3 Impact**

The positive impact the project has had on biodiversity conservation as well as on many rural communities socio-economic situation is irrefutable. There is published evidence of the increase in area under conservancy management, increases in wildlife numbers across most species, and some conservancies are even extending conservation management practices to their livestock ranges as well (under a separately funded but complementary "Holistic Range Management" Project).

"Hard" data relating to poverty alleviation, livelihoods, equality, and gender equity are harder to come by than those for biodiversity, and parameters such as gross conservancy income and jobs generated serve as broad surrogate indicators, together with anecdotal evidence. Equal participation of men and women on the conservancy committees is encouraged, with some 34% of members reportedly women (but it must be recognized that whilst women might not be seen to be leading decision making, quite often they are doing so from behind the scenes).

With respect to equality, commercial farmers received legal rights to use wildlife in the late 1960s, but it was only after independence that legislation was passed (in 1996), that gave communal area residents equal usage rights – by forming conservancies that would be able to manage their resources in a sustainable manner. The project serves to entrench and strengthen

these rights by ensuring that they are successfully implemented in a responsible, accountable manner.

A further cited benefit of conservancy formation is that it not only gives communities improved control over their natural resources, but being legally constituted community organizations they also give a democratic voice to rural communities and strengthen their institutional position in relation to government.

The annual game counts enjoy the full support of the MET and are included in the Annual Work Plans of relevant personnel. The project, together with other sources, assists with funding in various forms and it would be useful if MET were able to include full budgetary commitments as well as personnel.

The emphasis placed on participatory approaches and devolution of much decision-making to conservancy level has served to increase confidence and self-esteem amongst many rural people. This in turn engenders a spirit of responsible co-operation and shared interest in biodiversity conservation, as people feel more in control of their lives and less driven by external agendas. This rights-based approach to conservation distinguishes the Namibian CBNRM model from others where central Governments seem reluctant to lose absolute control (although it appears that some staff within MET are somewhat poorly informed as to the actual rights and responsibilities of conservancy committees in this regard, hence the need for training and sensitisation).

The project and broader CBNRM Programme have received numerous awards and have attracted international attention.

Examples include:

- **2004** Torra Conservancy: 2004 UNDP Equator Prize for the best Community Environmental Project in the world.
- **2005** NACSO and the Namibia Nature Foundation: Namibia National Science Award in the category: Best Awareness and Popularization for the book *Namibia's Communal Conservancies - A Review of Progress and Challenges*.
- **2005** Wilderness Safaris and Torra Conservancy's Damaraland Camp Lodge: World Travel & Tourism Council 'Tourism for Tomorrow Conservation Award 2005'.
- **2006** Beaven Munali (IRDNC Caprivi): Go Green Environmental Award, Nedbank Namibia and Namibia Nature Foundation.
- **2006** Anton Esterhuizen (IRDNC Kunene): Namibian Professional Hunting Association (NAPHA) Conservationist of the Year Award.
- **2007** Chief Mayuni (Mafwe Traditional Authority, Caprivi): Go Green Environmental Award, Nedbank Namibia and Namibia Nature Foundation.
- **2007** The Kyaramacan Trust and MET: Edmond Blanc Prize, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC).

- **2012:**The Markhor Award, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)

The following recent visits to the project by interested parties indicate the widespread interest generated by the conservancy initiative:

Year	Group
2011	Botswana Minister and delegation
2011	Carter Roberts and WWF Board Members
2011	Visit to Namibia by WWF Nepal and high-ranking Nepalese government staff, including six parliamentarians.
2011	Norwegian WWF programme staff followed by WWF Norway and Norad staff
2011	Great Plains Grassland group from USA studying rangeland management
2011	ZDF television reporting on KAZA and the involvement of the KfW
2011	NPR in the USA reporting on communal conservancies, tourism and sustainable use of wildlife
2011	Bild newspaper visit
2011	Northern Rangeland Trust and Kenyan wildlife experts visit to Namibia

### 3.5 PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICABILITY

#### 3.5.1 Sustainability

The broader CBNRM Programme, is widely acknowledged as a world leader in initiatives of this kind (as evidenced by the numerous awards, including the prestigious Markhor Award most recently). The empowerment of rural communities to form management institutions for the collective management of natural resources has also created a cohesive framework through which rural development is now taking place. To date, 76 conservancies have been formed.

However, as mentioned, the increasing number of conservancies is stressing the ability of service agencies, (NGOs and MET) to provide support services at the levels required. The question arises as to when enough is enough, in terms of donor and technical support to ensure that the broader CBNRM programme is sustainable.

According to WWF Technical Report 7, it was initially naively believed that following a few years of support, conservancies would be entirely self-sufficient. There is clear evidence that certain conservancies can become financially self-sufficient (47% of the 59 registered conservancies in 2010 were covering 100% of their own [core] costs), but it has also become clear that, as with many other businesses, external technical support is required from time to time. The nature and extent of such support will vary, with some conservancies requiring regular high-level input in key areas (e.g. quota setting, interpreting trends in animal population numbers, censusing, partnership agreements with hunters and tourism operators) whilst in other conservancies the needs for support may be less regular and less diverse.

It is therefore crucial to plan for the long-term sustainable finance of CBNRM support services, as it is not realistic to be permanently reliant on external funding sources that are already under decline. Project management, as well as management of the broader CBNRM Programme, are extremely conscious of this need and steps are currently underway to address the issue of sustainable support to conservancies over the long term.

In July 2007, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) organized a national stakeholder workshop entitled the *“Namibia CBNRM Sustainability and Sector Vision Workshop”*. This workshop identified and analysed a range of sustainability challenges facing the broader CBNRM Programme within which the WWF Project under review is located, and recommended the formation of a CBNRM Sustainability Task Force (STF) to develop a CBNRM Sustainability Strategy.

The STF has since collaborated on the production of a report entitled *“The Namibia National CBNRM Programme Sustainability Strategy”*, which provides a number of recommended actions and approaches to assist the broader CBNRM Programme to attain long-term viability and financial sustainability. Certain recommendations of this report are included in section 4.3 below.

Further it is understood that the Project staff are reflecting on ‘smart delivery’ – ways to increase the efficiency within which support is delivered to the conservancies by, for example, clustering training events and other services at a suitable level, and scheduling interventions in a more coordinated fashion in order to reduce time and travel costs. As well as this conservancies are being analysed to assess income and cost projections taking into account the type of conservancy in question, considering if and when they are likely to become financially self-sufficient and if there are gaps or shortfalls predicted, what type of finance would be most suited to address these. Literacy and education levels would seem to be an indicator of the level of ongoing support that might be needed and for which no quick fix is available.

With respect to sustainability at the conservancy level, there are a few issues that were brought to the review team’s attention. The need for conservancy membership to be more inclusive (to include a greater percentage of the community as registered members) was noted, given that sufficient time has passed for community members to adequately understand the conservancy and CBNRM concept and appreciate the benefits that are delivered.

Further issue that were noted is the less than ideal management of shoot and sell operations in some instances, with corruption taking place, trophy animals being shot, more animals being shot than were sold, animals being wounded and not retrieved, and meat being wasted due to messy shots. Reasons cited included less than adequate supervision by inexperienced and newly elected conservancy management; insufficient support or enforcement (e.g. roadblocks) by limited MET

staff; and in some cases, allocation of shoot and sell quota to somewhat less than scrupulous operators. (NB conservancy hunting guides have received training, 6 qualifying, and better rifles for cleaner shooting have been supplied to some conservancies in an attempt to deal with this issue). It was suggested that over and above the rapid introduction of a tagging system as a way of managing operations and minimising losses, the whole notion of 'shoot and sell' should be revised. As discussed elsewhere in the report, value adding activities such as the production of smoked beef and biltong using prime cuts (with the rest being available for own consumption without having to buy it back), production of hides, etc., should be further explored and promoted; and that in the long term greater business acumen be developed within communities as awareness around hygiene standards and needs is also fostered. This also touches on the suggested need for taking the time before quota setting meetings to build a deeper understanding of the science AND business/financial considerations that need to be taken into account when setting quotas. It is felt that people need assistance in order to develop a longer term view of the potential, gain a deeper understanding of the markets and what might be possible in terms of partnerships with the private sector.

The ongoing and adequate involvement of suitably informed and sensitised MET officials at the quota setting meetings is critical, and seems that MET Scientific Services are keen to play a more active role in this regard and need to be supported in such. Current restructuring provides for increased CBNRM capacity within MET Scientific Services. It is also understood that further checks and balances are being considered by Scientific Services in order to ensure that the most suitable quotas are signed off by the Minister.

With respect to managing trophy hunting, further to the possible knock trophy animals have taken from badly managed 'shoot and sell' operations, there are a number of contractual issues that need to be addressed. The Project is in the process of standardising contracts and removing loopholes, but the contracts remain long and possibly unintelligible to many if not most conservancy committee members. It seems that conservancies have not always called for technical support from MET or the Project, and have signed contracts that are beset by various problems, including guaranteeing quotas that cannot be sustainably provided. On the other hand it has also been reported that trophy hunters themselves have complained of having to provide unrealistic guarantees when the animals can sometimes simply not be located. In this regard it was suggested that the guarantee should possibly be for a minimum overall value, rather than a minimum number of a certain species. This would however require a degree of flexibility in the quota numbers and would likely require the rapidly responsive involvement of MET. It was also suggested that contract prices should not be set in US dollars as this caused confusion with fluctuating currency exchange rates. Greater understanding and deeper insight into trophy hunting as a business also needs to be fostered so that conservancies understand what goes into it, both before and after – and what makes and breaks it.

### **3.5.2 Replicability**

Clearly the in-country replicability is high, given the number of conservancies that have been formed since the start of the Project and that are benefitting from the "roll-out" system of support tools and the technical backup provided.

Namibia largely differs from countries such as South Africa, in that its communal areas have increasing numbers of wildlife and progressive legislation has devolved use rights to registered conservancies. As well as this, human population levels are low and land areas vast, which is not always the case on the sub-continent. The situation in most South African communal areas is that wildlife is mainly restricted to formal conservation areas, but where wildlife is available in numbers on communal land, Namibian experience will be useful in guiding sustainable use.

In countries with similar populations of wildlife on communal land, programmes such as the Zimbabwean CAMPFIRE programme exist, but could well benefit from the support materials used in the Namibian conservancies. Botswana has recently changed policies on hunting, to the detriment of some rural communities now deprived of sources of income, but again the Namibian model would be useful in future. It is understood that Namibian expertise is already assisting in Zambia, and as Angolan policy and legislation develop, further opportunities for exchange of ideas and concepts will become available. A sister country relationship with Mongolia has also operated for the past two years, with Mongolia being particularly interested in the Namibia CBNRM rights devolution model and return of benefits from sustainable use of wildlife. Inputs by project personnel have also been made in Cambodia.

### 3.5.3 Risks

The WWF Technical Report 7 considers a major threat to the Project and CBNRM Programme to be the ‘ultra-green’ movement that appears to be gaining in popularity in wealthy societies overseas – where the trophy hunting market lies. The report notes: *“This stakeholder group does simply not understand the daily survival pressures experienced by rural people in Africa (and the developing world). They also, despite their better education, do not understand that it is possible to utilize a wildlife resource yet not deplete it. The emotion that drives this irrationality means that most of these people are not even prepared to try and understand the cause-effect relationships driving conservation in the developing world. The most recent example is the drive in the USA to list Lion on CITIES which will effectively stop utilization of this species. The outcome of this initiative, should it be successful, will almost certainly have the opposite effect of that intended – as soon as communities no longer get benefits from lion they will simply eliminate them from their lands (as farmers throughout the developed world have already done with large predators). This is an issue that WWF as an international network needs to understand, and find the courage to actively address. Educating the general public and endorsing best practice sustainable use, instead of trying to ‘hide it’ is the science-based course of action WWF needs to follow internationally. It’s acknowledged that this is a difficult cause of action due to the need to attract donors. But being expedient and ignoring science-based evidence for the sake of short-term donor support, is greatly increasing the risk that problem-causing species world-wide will continue to drift towards extinction.”*

The other risks noted in the WWF Technical Report 7 include that the very small pool of technical people (a number being on part-time contracts) available to support the conservancies presents a high risk to the programme. If one person should leave the team and not be instantly replaced with an equally competent, devoted and experienced person a massive hole appears. This presents a major threat in both the short and the long-term, and as already expounded on

elsewhere in this TR, the longer term risk of not finding the funds to continue to provide this essential 'extension' service to Conservancies into the future, which are being solidly tackled by the Project team.

The drop in global tourism and drop in wildlife tourists visiting Namibia rather than other African destinations where wildlife sightings are of a different magnitude might also be considered a medium to long term threat to the viability of conservancies.

Increasing human-wildlife conflict were reported by a number of people as a risk, particularly in relation to the Caprivi region where elephant numbers are growing and multiple competing land uses exist within a relatively small area. There are limited dispersal areas, as the elephants become increasingly boxed in between fences and settlements on all sides. A lack of coordination between government departments in respect of land use planning is evident and needs to be urgently addressed. With increasing predator populations in some conservancies in the north west, the potential for human-wildlife conflict there is also growing and it was reported by community members that MET officials are often slow to respond or in some instances do not respond at all until something has gone wrong.

Finally, the lack of land rights (as opposed to rights to use wildlife) is a threat generally, but particularly to conservancies such as Nyae Nyae, which have been hard pressed to prevent invasions by neighbouring cattle farmers. Whilst various policies are under discussion, further clarification is required about what existing legislation if any might be used to protect the rights of communities in this regard, or whether new legal instruments are required and if there is the political will to advance such.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

It would be useful for the Project staff to prepare a synthesis of the process and products developed (management plans, event books, census, quota setting using hard data etc) for publication in an appropriate journal and as a semi-popular booklet. The use of an external expert (such as assisted with the paper on buffalo in Caprivi) would alleviate pressure on the overstretched team.

Steps can be taken to optimize income from consumptive use, including facilitating co-operation between tourism and hunting operators and ensuring that trophy quality animals are not under-used by 'shoot and sell' or own use; ensuring that proficiency and professionalism of 'shoot and sell' operators is increased to minimize negative disturbance impacts of cropping on animal populations, and training of community shooters in identification of trophy quality animals, shot placement, minimum disturbance shooting, etc.

The use of a tagging system to reduce paperwork and aid in minimizing opportunities for irregularities in the shooting and transport of quota allocations should be explored. The tag serves both as "licence" and means of identifying "legal" carcasses.

Conservancies should be encouraged to offer contracts for longer than one year, this will attract more professional operators in both the trophy hunting and shoot and sell sectors, as, for example, PH's need to attract clients in advance, and shoot and sell operators are likely to be more diligent and willing to invest in necessary equipment etc with longer term contracts.

The issue of increasing human-wildlife conflict also requires further attention – how conflict might be reduced (e.g. through land use planning and zonation), the proper identification of offending animals, their timely destruction, appropriate policy measures and agreement on the most suitable means for compensation/insurance for loss of livestock (that are effective and at the same time support the notion of community ownership of wildlife).

The possibility of managing at the landscape level (clustering conservancies) has received attention since the MTR and should be expanded where appropriate..

The emerging model of conservancy-owned hunting and tourism operations has not enjoyed the success envisaged, partly due to the drop-off in tourism experienced post 2010. This does not necessarily indicate a flawed concept, and can still be further explored.

One aspect of the project that requires more attention is around data analysis. Project staff report having amassed a wealth of data that they have not yet had the opportunity to interrogate. This may yield further insights and lessons for the project and for the sustainable utilization of wildlife in Namibia and attention should be giving to finding a way of tackling it, for example, enlisting the assistance of students.

Technical support to conservancies will be needed for years to come, given the responsibility assumed by conservancy management structures for ensuring sustainable resource use, equitable use of income, managing wildlife populations in arid communal areas etc. It is strongly recommended that programme partners crystallize these options, sooner rather than later, into a cohesive, defensible Sustainable Finance Plan to ensure continuity of support. This will, of necessity also include longer term actions aimed at increasing the attractiveness of a conservation career to younger Namibians and assisting in the required formal and experiential training process.

## **4.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION**

Means of alleviating the increasing pressure and demands on most project personnel need further investigation. Particularly so as new conservancies are registered and existing conservancies begin implementation. It would seem that additional funds will need to be secured in order to expand the project team.

Career development of interns and conservation leadership participants requires funding, continued mentorship with a view to longer term career development and placement.

## **4.3 ENSURING SUSTAINABILITY OF RELEVANT PROJECT COMPONENTS**

The broader CBNRM Programme, is widely acknowledged as a world leader in initiatives of this kind (as evidenced by the numerous awards, including the prestigious Markhor Award most recently).

However, the rapid growth of the CBNRM Programme is not without challenges. The increasing number of conservancies (many of which are marginally, or not at all financially viable) is stressing the ability of service agencies, (NGOs and government alike) to provide support services at the levels required.

The question arises as to when is enough is enough, in terms of technical support to ensure that the broader CBNRM programme is sustainable.

Whilst many conservancies have efficient management structures in place, there will, as in any 'business' of a similar nature, be occasions when technical backup of various forms will inevitably be required. This will vary, with some conservancies requiring regular high-level input in key areas (e.g. quota setting, interpreting trends in animal population numbers, censussing, partnership and/or concession agreements with hunters and tourism operators etc).

The obvious question arises as to how to provide and ensure sustainable support to all conservancies on a needs basis. Further, given the historical support for these initiatives from external donor funding, it is becoming increasingly urgent to plan for the long-term sustainable finance of CBNRM support services, bearing in mind that donor support has already decreased in the case of the NRM project.

Steps are in place to address this. In July 2007, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) organized a national stakeholder workshop entitled the *“Namibia CBNRM Sustainability and Sector Vision Workshop”*. This workshop identified and analysed a range of sustainability challenges facing the CBNRM Programme and recommended the formation of a CBNRM Sustainability Task Force (STF)<sup>2</sup> to develop a CBNRM Sustainability Strategy, based upon attainment of the below vision statement:

*“A Namibian CBNRM Programme which empowers present and future generations to manage wildlife and other natural resources in an integrated manner as a recognized and valued rural development option”*

The STF has since collaborated on the production of a report entitled *“The Namibia National CBNRM Programme Sustainability Strategy”*, which provides a number of recommended actions and approaches to assist the broader CBNRM Programme to attain long-term viability and financial sustainability. The report expands upon the workshop findings and recommendations, but also incorporates new ideas and concepts in relation to sustainable conservation finance that are based upon global best practices and lessons learned.

In essence, it was agreed that in addition to financial sustainability, the long-term viability of conservancies is contingent upon the establishment of permanent CBNRM support systems. Such systems will be necessary to meet the challenges of meeting the recurrent training and technical support needs of conservancies and community forests.

The STF has identified a number of potential recommendations that are deemed wholly appropriate and worth reproducing here (information provided by C Weaver WWF):

**Secure long term sustainable financing for the CBNRM Programme** – Three broad funding areas have been targeted for further exploration and development, including:

- **External Funding:** Although donor funding for direct support to CBNRM is declining there are still opportunities to pursue a coherent and effective fundraising strategy, particularly if more innovative mechanisms for funding are developed. For example, the exploration of a range of innovative cooperative partnerships, including development banks that would consider the provision of competitive finance or security for investment into community venture partnerships. Another option could entail the attraction of philanthropic donations or contributions from other interested parties (individuals and corporations) if an independent CBNRM trust fund is established.
- **Income Generation:** Increased revenues, if translated into increased benefits for members, will strengthen member support, which should in turn, will contribute to institutional

---

<sup>2</sup> The STF membership included at various stages of operation: Colgar Sikopo (MET), Maxi Louis (NACSO), Jo Tagg (ICEMA), Karine Nuulimba (IRDNC), John Hazam (LAC), Joseph Hailwa (DOF-MAWF), Sem Shikongo (MET), and Chris Weaver (WWF)

sustainability and resilience. It is therefore a high priority for the programme to further explore and promote increased income streams to cover conservation and service costs, while concomitantly contributing towards their members' development goals. For example, a review of the legal and tax framework could greatly enhance investment and returns in communal areas.

- **Government Funding:** Continued support by Government to the CBNRM Programme is critical. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) is crucial for the sustainability of conservancies (from C Weaver).

In addition to the above initiative of the STF, which relates to the broader CBNRM Programme, a long term funding strategy and mechanisms to provide the required ongoing support to the Project should be work-shopped by NRWG, and the "Business Plan" should then be rolled out without delay. This will, of necessity also include longer term actions aimed at increasing the attractiveness of a conservation career to younger Namibians and assisting in the required formal and experiential training process. The need for trained and able Namibians has been expressed, and the intern and conservation leader programmes are addressing this.

## APPENDIX 1

### Review programme and list of individuals interviewed PROGRAMME

Pre 29 <sup>th</sup> September	Review and collate information
29 Sept	Travel to Windhoek
30 Sep	Interview Dr Stuart-Hill, document update
1 October	Windhoek Interviews,,
2 Oct	Interviews in windhoek contd (see list below)
3 Oct	Travel to conservancies in Damaraland area
4 Oct	Observe game quota setting ,Torra Conservancy; meat processing facilities at Dora !nawas
5 Oct	Field debriefing session, assessment of documents for gaps etc
6 Oct	Analysis of data, gap identification
7 Oct	Return Windhoek
8 Oct	Interview and debriefing, Colgar Sikopo, Director Parks and Wildlife MET, G Stuart Hill
9 Oct	Wrap, return, drafting process commences

### PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED IN NAMIBIA, 30 SEPTEMBER TO 8 OCTOBER 2012

Greg Stuart-Hill	WWF
Chris Weaver.	WWF
Richard Diggle ,	WWF
Maxi Lewis	NACSO
Joe Tagg	MCA
Chris Thouless	MCA
Georgina van Wyk	NRWG
Colgar Sikopo	Director Parks and Wildlife, MET
Greenwell Matongo	WWF
Dave Ward,	WWF
Raymond Peters	WWF
Sylvia Thompson	WWF
Russel Vinjevoid	IRDNC
Richard Fryer	IRDNC

Karine Nwuulimba	IRDNC
Danica Shaw	IRDNC
Francesca Woellert	IRDNC
Maxi Lewis	NACSO
Jon Barnes	Consultant
Kenneth !Uiseb	MET Deputy Director DSS
Mr Roman	Torra Conservancy Manager
Tony Robertson	CONINFO