

**PROCEEDINGS OF WILD PROJECT FEEDBACK
WORKSHOPS IN CAPRIVI: 9TH – 10TH APRIL 2003**

October 2003

Wildlife Integration for Livelihood Diversification (WILD) Project
Working Paper 19

C. Murphy



DFID Department for
International
Development

Contact details:

Carol Murphy, Senior Field Researcher, WILD Project, Directorate of Environmental Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Tourism, PO Box 1551 Ngweze, Namibia. Tel: +264 66 252705
email: cmurphy@africaonline.com.na

Edited by Tamsin Savage (tamsin@savagewords.com)

Research for this working paper was conducted under the auspices of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism's WILD Project and funded by the UK Government's Department of International Development (DFID).

Table of contents

Acronyms	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. DAY 1: LIVING WITH WILDLIFE	4
2.1 <i>Main research findings</i>	4
2.2 <i>Group work</i>	6
2.3 <i>Workshop participants' understanding of what CBNRM is</i>	7
3. DAY 2: COMMUNITY-OWNED TOURISM ENTERPRISES	9
3.1 <i>Main research findings</i>	9
3.2 <i>Group work</i>	11
4. REFERENCES	13
APPENDIX 1: LISTS OF PARTICIPANTS.....	14
APPENDIX 2: METHODS USED IN WORKSHOP	16
2.1 <i>Group work</i>	16
2.2 <i>Workshop participants' understanding of CBNRM (Day 1)</i>	16
OTHER WILD PROJECT WORKING PAPERS.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

Acronyms

CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CBT	community-based tourism
CITIES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CSD	CBNRM Sub-Division
HH	household
HWC	human wildlife conflict
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses and Opportunities
WILD	Wildlife Integration for Livelihood Diversification

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The WILD Project is an applied, research initiative of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) whose role is to provide research findings, based on good data, in order to strengthen decision-making about Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) at all levels. The WILD Project is co-ordinated from Windhoek with field staff in the Caprivi and Kunene Regions. The information in this report will be fed into the final research report.

On 9th and 10th April 2003, the WILD Project staff in Caprivi conducted a workshop with invited CBNRM Sub-Division (CSD) staff, conservancy staff and IRDNC staff.¹ During the workshop, WILD Project staff gave feedback on their main research findings regarding 'living with wildlife', i.e. food from the wild and human wildlife conflict (Day 1) and community-owned tourism enterprises and craft (Day 2). Workshop participants were asked to comment on the research findings with regard to accuracy and comprehensiveness, as well as to prioritise the most useful research finding and action point. During Day 1, an exercise was also done to find out participants' perceptions of CBNRM.

The workshops revealed the following:

Living with wildlife (Day 1)

- ***Accuracy and comprehensiveness of research findings and action points***

Most workshop participants agreed with the research findings on this issue and did not find anything wrong. One group felt that they could not agree as they had not been part of the research.

Participants felt that the following have been left out of the research findings and action points: research in areas in Caprivi that are not part of conservancies for the purpose of a comparison; input from Traditional Leaders; change in land use with conservancies, e.g. deciding to plough in other areas; and the advantages of conservancies and community management of wildlife.

- ***Most useful research findings***

These were identified as: information on human wildlife conflict (HWC); the concept that living with wildlife is both good and bad and the method of using a letter from MET promising confidentially of research findings in the context of bushmeat research..

- ***Most useful action points***

These were seen as: the proposed insurance scheme; the proposal for MET to draft a policy on HWC; and the use and potential future use of wild plants.

¹ Staff from the Directorate of Forestry (Ministry of Environment and Tourism), Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services (Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development) and the Caprivi Regional Council were also invited.

- **Participants' perception of CBNRM**

Uniformity and clarity characterised individual participants' perception of CBNRM. The emphasis was on community control over natural resources in order to protect and benefit from them.

Community-owned tourism enterprises and craft (Day 2)

- **Accuracy and comprehensiveness of research findings and action points**

Most workshop participants agreed with the research findings on both issues and did not find anything wrong. One group felt that the predicted values of tourism to conservancies (as reflected in the work by Diggle) in Caprivi were too optimistic.

The following were some of the issues that the workshop participants felt had been left out of the research findings: hunting; joint ventures; management capacity of conservancies; dependency of tourism on external markets; and need to look after the domestic market more (as the "bread and butter").

- **Most useful research findings**

These were: that cooperation between institutions is vital for successful community-owned tourism enterprises; the importance of an enabling environment for local people to earn their own money; the need to strengthen legislation in order to facilitate communities to earn a bigger share of the value of tourism; the need to balance economic, social and environmental components; the need to identify action items to ensure a positive outcome and the 'equity' aspect of benefit distribution.

- **Most useful action points**

These were identified as: the importance of local leadership as a key to successful community tourism; the need to identify the best enterprise management option to lead to the best benefit for communities; and the need to diversification craft products away from palm.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides a description of the workshop held on 9th and 10th April 2003, attended by 14 conservancy staff (nine on Day 2), as well as seven IRDNC staff members (refer to Appendix 1 for the participants' list for both days). This report includes the data generated during the workshop and a record of methods used is given in Appendix 2. Workshop participants own understanding of CBNRM, as discussed on Day 1, is captured in Appendix 3.

The workshop had two aims:

- to feedback WILD Project² research findings; and
- to look for opportunities to act on lessons learnt.

2. DAY 1: LIVING WITH WILDLIFE

2.1 Main research findings

2.1.1 Use of wild plants and animals for food in Caprivi

Objective of research: To look at the wild food resources used in Caprivi and their role in rural livelihoods.

Research started in 2002 and the research methods included the following:

- household (hh) case studies (recording tables for use of wildlife for food by hhs from May 2002);
- a large questionnaire survey of 1000 hhs in seven conservancies in Caprivi, Kunene and Erongo Regions in May 2002;
- a small questionnaire survey of 39 hhs in Caprivi in Nov and Dec 2002;
- a workshop with senior field rangers in Caprivi in Jan 2003; and
- secondary data from various sources.

Results of the study

Bushmeat

- Mostly smaller game species and birds are utilised (duiker, springhares, rabbits, francolin, guinea fowl are the most common).
- Big game such as kudu and buffalo are also utilised but at a smaller scale.
- Methods used to harvest wild animals include traps, snares, spears, guns and dogs.
- Most of the meat harvested is consumed, there is a limited sale of meat.

Wild plants use

- Wild fruits, vegetables and water plants are used (eaten/sold).
- Heavy use of water lilies in Mayuni Conservancy area (near Kwandu River).
- Commonly used species include; Muzinzila (brown ivory), Mukongonga (African Mangosteen), Mutente (blue sourplum).

² The main focus of the WILD Project is to see how the CBNRM/conservancy programme has affected people's livelihoods by answering three questions – "What are people's livelihoods?"; "What change has CBNRM/conservancy programme made?" and "What do these changes tell us about the future?"

- Sale of some of the harvest is crucial to generate a small income to be used to buy food (mealie meal and relish) and pay for school fees.
- Use of wild plants for food is more important than bushmeat because it is widespread and frequent.

Fish use

- Less emphasis placed by research on fish due to limited resources and recent work done in Caprivi on fisheries and livelihoods.
- Few hhs surveyed did fishing.
- However, fish is a big income earner for those hhs that do fishing.
- The fish market in Katima Mulilo is well established with fishmongers travelling to fishing areas to buy fish to resell.

Other research findings

- Wild food plays a significant role in rural people's livelihoods.
- Some areas, previously used by people to harvest wild food, are now being used by conservancies, mostly for conservation and tourism purposes, e.g. Salambala core wildlife area.
- There has been a reduction in harvesting of wild animals and a change in tactics by hunters due to the activities of the community rangers.
- The drought was also mentioned by people as having also contributed to a reduction in wild food harvesting, e.g. the Linyanti River drying up affected local residents.

2.1.2 Human wildlife conflict in Caprivi

Main lessons learnt

- HWC is a very well researched topic in Caprivi.
- HWC in Caprivi is mainly elephant damage to crops and water points, and hyenas and lions killing livestock.
- The wild animals come from protected areas in Caprivi and Botswana.
- There is no acceptable solution to stop the HWC³ in Caprivi.
- The negative impact can be reduced.
- The Namibian Government will not pay compensation.

What impact does HWC have on household livelihoods?

- HWC has a negative impact on hh livelihoods in Caprivi.
- HWC was the main disadvantage of conservancies as perceived by interviewees in the questionnaire survey of 500 hhs in three conservancies.
- But conservancies as institutions require wildlife for tourism and trophy hunting as well as aesthetic reasons.
- This impact is worse for poor hhs.
- The impact is also worse in drought years.

What role do conservancies play in mitigating HWC?

- Community rangers are very active in trying to prevent and reduce HWC (both inside and outside conservancies).

³ Hard boundaries such as electric fences are not desirable from a nature conservation or tourism perspective.

- They have monitored the incidence of ‘problem animals’ in their areas for over a decade and more recently are doing this through the event book system⁴.
- Rangers help farmers and the MET to chase animals out of fields and away from livestock.
- Rangers carry out ‘Problem Animal Awareness’, e.g. advising on building strong kraals and warning farmers of the presence of wild animals in their areas.
- Rangers assist in killing identified ‘problem animals’ that continue to cause damage, especially lions.
- Rangers work with MET where possible, e.g. through the Mashi Districts – Anti-poaching Joint Venture.

Action points - What can be done in the future?

- Fund Caprivi proposals to the Game Product Trust Fund⁵.
- Go ahead with piloting the proposed insurance scheme in Mayuni and Kwandu Conservancies.
- Use trophy hunters to cull identified ‘problem animals’.
- Try new deterrent methods e.g. pepper spray for elephants.
- See if anything can be done at the transboundary level.
- MET to write an HWC Policy to improve and guide practice in the field.

Discussion

Traditional methods of deterring wild animals are perceived not to work anymore.

2.2 Group work

2.2.1 Agreement on research findings

There was no disagreement about the research findings and action points from the groups.

2.2.2 What was left out?

- Large areas of the Eastern Floodplains and West Caprivi had been left out. The findings are not representative of the whole of the Caprivi as research was done mainly in the conservancy areas.
- It would have been useful to have done the same research in an area with no conservancy that has experienced an increase in wildlife, e.g. Malengalenga.
- Conservancy land-use planning and zonation that had not been mentioned – “changing the ploughing areas”.
- The advantages of conservancies were not given, e.g. job creation, reduction of deaths (through preventative HWC work) and the benefit distributions done in Salambala in 2001 and 2002 and West Caprivi in 2003.
- Use of plants for medicines and firewood was not looked at.
- Input from Traditional Leaders.
- A focus on the management of wildlife by communities had been left out.

⁴ This recording has been very useful for decision-making, e.g. at CITIES with the decision to allow Namibia to sell ivory stockpiles and for the proposed insurance scheme.

⁵ So far at least three proposals have been submitted but none funded.

2.2.3 Most useful research findings

The four groups recorded the following as the most useful research findings:

- The process used to get information from the community about living with wildlife (the letter from MET asking for data and promising confidentially). This was seen as a good lesson for community workers to use in the future (yellow group).
- Wildlife damage, e.g. elephants and lions. The research reflects the damages caused by elephants to crops and lions to livestock. This is useful as it can be used to show the Government what is happening (red group).
- Awareness at a household and community level that having wildlife has got advantages and disadvantages (green group).
- HWC – that no solutions have been found. This calls for more research. Although measures to reduce the negative impact have been found and are being used (pink group).

2.2.4 Most useful action items

The four groups recorded the following as the most useful action items:

- The availability of wild plants in Caprivi and their use. Also their future use (to include scarcity and possible commercialisation of processed plant products) (yellow group)
- The proposed insurance scheme for wildlife damage. This is useful as it benefits individual farmers who lose their crops or livestock⁶ (red group).
- Proposed insurance scheme – as people will be paid for their losses (green group).
- Getting MET to write an HWC policy. This should include decentralisation and devolution of decision-making to MET staff in the regions to “help make decisions on the ground”.

2.3 Workshop participants’ understanding of what CBNRM is

2.3.1 Conservancy staff

- The management of wildlife and natural resources with MET and the community (West Caprivi joint submission⁷).
- The objective of CBNRM is to give the rights to the community to look after their natural environment and utilise the resources they have (Geoffrey Divai).
- How the community manages their natural resources and uses them (Lister Maani).
- The protection of natural resources for the community. Ki pabalelo ya limbule za nyambe kwa sicaba (Olga Chala and Patricia Nchindo).
- When the community depends on natural resources, things made by God, protect them and do not destroy them. Sicaba si itingile fa simbule sa nyambe. Imi hape basana ni ku sebelisa umbulel seo kapabalelo asini ku sinye (Othielia Sakachele).
- How community should use their natural resources and benefit from them (Brideness Muatuli).
- Protection of natural resources by the community so that they can get benefits from them (Priscilla Lilata).
- When the community is protecting their natural resources made by God. CBNRM itulusa kuli sicaba si babalela limbule za nyambe (Mary Mukutela).

⁶ Note that the proposed pilot project will only address loss of human life and livestock losses, not crop damage.

⁷ West Caprivi residents are prohibited from forming a conservancy as they reside in a state protected area. They are forming the Kyaramacan Trust as an alternative legal arrangement.

2.3.2 IRDNC

- Community has the full responsibility to run and manage their natural resources and at the end use them sustainably for the benefit of that community (John Kamwi).
- Giving back management rights over natural resources i.e. wildlife to communities (Richard Diggle).
- Is the management and rights of natural resources by organised communities, within a particular area and in return they benefit that community (Janet Matota).
- Rights over wildlife for the community/protecting wildlife. Kamaiso ya sicaba kwa limbule za naheni. Pabalelo ya za limbule za nyambe/sa naheni (James Maiba).
- A defined group of people making decisions over all natural resources in order to use them wisely and benefit (Daisy Nheta).
- Organised communities managing their own natural resources, making decisions on how to do this and utilise them and benefit (Elvis Mwilima).

2.3.3 MET and WILD Project Staff

- When the community has the rights over their natural resources, manage them well and use them in a sustainable way (wise use) (Chrispin Makata).
- CBNRM is when a group of people takes responsibility for managing their natural resources and use these natural resources sustainably in a manner that they get benefits from both consumptive use and non-consumptive use, leading to development (Samson Mulonga).
- People having control over their natural resources to improve their livelihoods (Carol Murphy).
- Communities protecting the natural resources so that wild fruits and other resources should not perish (Moses Kulatau).

2.3.4 Discussion

- The following strong words were used in the context of CBNRM – *“rights, giving back rights, partnership with Government, power, authority, full responsibility, decision-making, control and own”*.
- In the context of communities managing natural resources the following words were used – *“sustainable use, wise use, conserve, benefit, and protect”*.
- The definitions of CBNRM included a reference to defined groups of people or organised communities.
- Is CBNRM about the state giving rights or the communities taking rights or a partnership (giving and taking)?
- Do communities in Namibia have authority over natural resources or not?
- Are conservancies happy that they can manage wildlife?
- Do MET and conservancies share the same understanding of wildlife management by communities?
- What impact have the conservancies had on wildlife?
- CBNRM is not happening in Namibia as communities have very limited rights and responsibilities over natural resources. (The example was given of the MET taking the tusks from dead elephants in conservancies).
- Communities need to look to the Government for different things.

3. DAY 2: COMMUNITY-OWNED TOURISM ENTERPRISES

3.1 Main research findings

3.1.1 Community-owned tourism enterprises

Benefits and costs

The following *benefits* of community-owned tourism enterprises were identified from the research:

Tangible benefits: income, employment, gender equality, training and skills and protection of natural resources

Intangible benefits: pride, empowerment, ownership and heightened awareness of the importance of conservation

The following *costs* of community-owned tourism enterprises were identified from the research:

Tangible costs: exclusion from the tourist area of livelihood activities

Intangible costs: opportunity cost of time needed to plan, implement and operation a collective enterprise; land-use conflicts over the change in land use to tourism

Key success factors

The key success factors for community-owned tourism enterprises were reviewed in the context of economic, environmental and social sustainability (“the triple bottom line”).

Economic – communities need to source funding; financial transparency and quick returns

Business – Planning, training, tourism awareness and ongoing support

Political – Government support, clarity on roles and stability

Social – community consultation and agreement, participation and ownership; trust; solve land-use conflicts and do not rush

Environmental – tourism seen as an incentive to conserve the natural resources

Institutions

The following institutions play a role – Government (MET – CSD, DoT, DEA and MLR); donors (e.g. LIFE); private sector; NGOs (IRDNC, NACOBTA, NNF, Rössing, LAC and NACSO); Traditional Authorities and CBOs.

Actions

- Develop guidelines to help with developing community-owned tourism enterprises.
- Benefit distribution plan in place to decide how collective enterprise revenue will be spent.
- Mechanisms for financial transparency to be in place.
- Diversify enterprises where possible.
- Increase government support.
- Strengthen legislation for conservancy benefit.
- NACOBTA staff to Caprivi.
- Tourism plans to be implemented.

- Best management options to be adopted (whether community or outsourced to private sector).
- Foster strong leadership in communities.

3.1.2 Livelihood impact of craft sales

Lessons learnt

- Practice is old, marketing is new.
- Marketing came as part of the CBNRM programme.
- Mainly plant-based in Caprivi.
- Unique feature – individual cash benefit to a large number of people, mainly women with collective management of marketing.
- Helps alleviate poverty through small amounts of money to poor, rural women.
- Marginal due to time-consuming nature – “the money is small but the job is big”.
- Most crafters (over 80%) earned less than N\$ 500 per year from craft sales.
- Difficulties experienced – getting palm; strenuous nature of weaving and low returns/time consuming nature of craft production.
- Good things – money spent on basic needs; crafters can work from home; raw materials are nearly “free” (only time to collect and process them) and craft industry strengthens the role of women.

Actions

- Support to craft (e.g. more marketing outlets, higher prices for more marketable products, stronger export market).
- Better information flow between producers and market outlets (MCM and RF), e.g. the use of the commission.
- Look for other products to make and sell.

3.1.3 Livelihood impact of community-owned tourism enterprises

Individual impact

- Salaries from jobs and cash from craft sales.
- Training and capacity building.
- Career path development for staff, e.g. from community campsite to lodge and NGOs.
- Negative impact – some people are excluded from using the tourist area for livelihood activities.

Collective impact

Enterprises generate revenue available for benefit distribution (craft market also has the potential to generate revenue to be paid as dividends to member producers).

3.1.4 Community-based tourism – a business perspective

Richard Diggle spoke about his Master’s report, which looked at the financial impact of community-based tourism (CBT) in Caprivi and what needs to be in place for CBT to work.

So far, there is no proof that CBT really works. Some critics say, “people-centred approaches to development (and CBT) are a dream; it is the elite that benefit” and “individual costs exceed individual benefits”, as revenues are small. National Development Plan 2 (NDP2) calls for more employment as a reduction to poverty. Yet the ownership of tourism development is not yet resting with communities. They do not have control over land and planning, to have authority to say what they can do. CBT could be defined as a devolution in

roles and responsibility for developing tourism in communal areas from central Government to community-based structures such as conservancies. Revenues to be managed equitably. A key feature is to provide an enabling environment for individuals to generate cash.

Richard asked whether CBT can earn enough money to cover conservancy costs and thereby make the functioning of conservancy institutions sustainable when the donors go home. Also will there be enough money for revenue generation distribution to people.

In 2001, conservancies in Caprivi earned N\$ 200,000 in revenue (mainly trophy-hunting fees in Salambala) and N\$ 1 million from tourism in term of employment. If more private-sector enterprises are developed according to the tourism plans and conservancies can negotiate better with the private sector, they could increase this figure from N\$ 200,000 to N\$ 3 million. Their operating expenses are about N\$ 1 million, so there would profit for funds to be distributed.

According to this scenario, conservancies in Caprivi are sustainable, but two things are needed. Firstly, there is the need for the Government to strengthen legislation to ensure that more rights go to communities, e.g. the newly registered Mashi Conservancy should be able to negotiate with Namashasha Lodge for a share of revenues (may be in the figure of N\$ 100,000 per year). Secondly is the need for strong leadership to ensure that a multi-million business can be managed successfully, with competent staff, and that there is regular distribution of a significant amount of revenues (e.g. Salambala needs to increase the amount of money distributed).

3.2 Group work

3.2.1 Agreement on research findings

There was little disagreement about the research findings and action points from the groups. One group said that the figures were too optimistic for the value of tourism to conservancies.

3.2.2 What was left out?

- Hunting (this will be picked up by the IIED study at a macro level).
- Capacity to manage by communities, to manage conservancies and enterprises.
- Dependency on external (international) tourism for revenue.
- The need to look after internal (domestic) tourism as the 'bread and butter'.
- Comparing the conservancy to a company/business (do a SWOT comparing the tourism service to a manufacturing enterprise).
- Conservancies providing an enabling environment for local people to benefit (e.g. as in the case of the polers in the Okavango Swamps in Botswana).
- Collective benefit will not impact on poverty.
- Joint-venture relationships.
- Other things you may need to research.
- Input from Traditional Authorities and MET.

3.2.3 Most useful research findings

The four groups recorded the following as the most useful research findings:

- Cooperation is vital between institutions when developing successful community-owned tourism enterprises.
- Strengthen legislation so organised communities get a bigger share of the benefits from tourism.
- Getting a balance⁸ between the ‘triple bottom line’ – social, environmental and economic issues.
- The need to identify action points as a means to ensure a positive outcome (benefits) is implemented.
- Household survey, because other community members thought that conservancies are for those who are employed in the conservancy and the Government.
- Benefit distribution, especially the equitable⁹ aspect of benefit distribution.

3.2.4 Most useful action items

The four groups recorded the following as the most useful action items:

- Get the leadership right as a key to successful community tourism.
- Best management option leads to the best benefits to the communities.
- Craft – look for other products to make and sell, because there is not palm in some areas.
- Procedure taken to undertake the research, i.e. communicating with communities at the grass-root level.

⁸ It was mentioned that the community is the best placed to get the balance – what is good for people, what is good for the resource and what is good for development.

⁹ Equitable means “fair, justice”, not “equal” which means the same.

4. REFERENCES

- Diggle, R. 2003. A business assessment of Community-based Tourism in Caprivi. *MSc Tourism, Conservation and Sustainable Development*. University of Greenwich, UK.
- Halstead, L. 2003. Making community-based tourism work: An assessment of factors contributing to successful community-owned tourism development in Caprivi, Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 60*. Windhoek: MET
- Halstead, L. and Murphy, C. 2003. "The person with the idea for the campsite is a hero." Institutional arrangements and livelihood change regarding community-owned tourism enterprises in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 61*. Windhoek: MET
- Mulonga, S., Suich, H. and Murphy, C. 2003. The conflict continues – Human wildlife conflict and livelihoods in Caprivi. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 59*. Windhoek: MET
- Mulonga, S. 2003. Wild food: Use of natural resources for food in eastern Caprivi. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 62*. Windhoek: MET

APPENDIX 1: LISTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Day 1

Name	Position	Organisation
Geoffry Divai	Senior Field Ranger	Mashi Conservancy
Brideness Muatuli	Community Resource Monitor	Kwandu Conservancy
Mary Mukutela	Community Resource Monitor	Mayuni Conservancy
Olga Chala	Community Resource Monitor	Mayuni Conservancy
Lister Maani	Senior Field Ranger	Mayuni Conservancy
Patricia Nchindo	Community Resource Monitor	Salambala Conservancy
Othielia Sakachele	Community Resource Monitor	Salambala Conservancy
Priscillar Lilata	Community Resource Monitor	Wuparo Conservancy
Vincent Magwalo	Senior Field Ranger	Wuparo Conservancy
Black Mahingi	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Alfred Chaddall	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Divaki Kambonde	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Lieb Kamba	IRDNC	West Caprivi
Daisy Nheta	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
Elvis Mwilima	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
Richard Diggle	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
James Maiba	IRDNC	Eastern Floodplains
John Kamwi	IRDNC	Kongola
Janet Matota	IRDNC	Sauzou
Chrispin Makata	MET	Katima Mulilo
Bernard Munembo	WILD Project	Caprivi
Moses Kulatau	WILD Project	Caprivi
Carol Murphy	WILD Project	Caprivi
Samson Mulonga	WILD Project	Caprivi

Workshop team

Chrispin Makata (MET, CSD, Senior Ranger, Caprivi – Chair)

Samson Mulonga (WILD Project – Research Assistant) – presentation and logistics

Bernard Munembo (WILD Project – Community Liaison Officer) – participant and logistics

Moses Kulatau (WILD Project – Community Liaison Officer) – participant and logistics

Carol Murphy (WILD Project – Senior Field Researcher) – presentation, facilitation and recording

Groups

Yellow – Priscilla Lilata, Janet Matota, Othielia Sakachele, Lister Maani, Divaki Kambonde

Red – John Kamwi, Brideness Muatali, Black Mahingi, Mary Makutela, Lieb Kamba, Olga Chala

Green – Bernard Munembo, Moses Kulatau, Patrica Nchindo, Geoffry Divai, Alfred Chaddall, Divaki Kambonde

Pink – James Maiba, Elvis Mwilima, Daisy Nheta, Carol Murphy, Samson Mulonga

Day 2

Name	Position	Organisation
Brideness Muatali	Community Resource Monitor	Kwandu Conservancy
Mary Mukutela	Community Resource Monitor	Mayuni Conservancy
Olga Chala	Community Resource Monitor	Mayuni Conservancy
Patricia Nchindo	Community Resource Monitor	Salambala Conservancy
Othielia Sakachele	Community Resource Monitor	Salambala Conservancy
Priscilla Lilata	Community Resource Monitor	Wuparo Conservancy
Black Mahingi	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Alfred Chaddall	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Divaki Kambonde	Senior Field Ranger	West Caprivi
Lieb Kamba	IRDNC	West Caprivi
Reuben Mafati	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
Lynn Halstead	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
Nathaniel Nuulimbo	IRNDC	Katima Mulilo
Richard Diggle	IRDNC	Katima Mulilo
Micheal Matongela	IRNDC	Katima Mulilo
Janet Matota	IRNDC	Sauzou
Chrispin Makata	MET	Katima Mulilo
Bernard Munembo	WILD Project	Caprivi
Moses Kulatau	WILD Project	Caprivi
Carol Murphy	WILD Project	Caprivi
Samson Mulonga	WILD Project	Caprivi

Workshop team

Chrispin Makata (MET, CSD, Senior Ranger, Caprivi)

Samson Mulonga (WILD Project – Research Assistant) – presentation and logistics

Bernard Munembo (WILD Project – Community Liaison Officer) – participant and logistics

Moses Kulatau (WILD Project – Community Liaison Officer) – participant and logistics

Carol Murphy (WILD Project – Senior Field Researcher) – presentation, facilitation and recording

APPENDIX 2: METHODS USED IN WORKSHOP

2.1 Group work

Task: To facilitate discussion in groups on workshop findings.

Activity:

- Groups were randomly allocated, except all English-only speakers were in the same group
- Each group had the same five questions to answer, namely:
 1. Do you agree with the research findings and action points?
 2. What is wrong?
 3. What has been left out?
 4. What was the one most useful research findings? (And why?)
 5. What is the one most useful action item? (And why?)

2.2 Workshop participants' understanding of CBNRM (Day 1)

Task: To answer the following:

'Write down in your own language what you think CBNRM is.'

Activity:

- Each participant was given a card and pen to write down their understanding of CBNRM
- West Caprivi provided a team response on one card
- Each participant read out their definition and the cards were placed on the wall
- The key words used (mainly verbs) were captured and discussed
- There was discussion on whether there really was CBNRM in Caprivi or Namibia

WILD PROJECT WORKING PAPERS

1. **Long, S.A., Murphy, C. and Vaughan, K. 2001.** An Overview of Project Approach, Concepts and Methods. Windhoek. November 2001.
2. **Long, S.A. 2002.** An overview of Processes and Methods for Household Level Research. Windhoek. June 2002.
3. **Long, S.A. 2001.** Disentangling Benefits: Livelihoods, Natural Resource Management and Managing Revenue from Tourism: The Experience of Torra Conservancy, Namibia. Windhoek. August 2001.
4. **Vaughan, K., Kuvare, U., Long, S.A. and Murphy, C. 2002.** The Khaibasen Participatory Research Group Livelihoods Workshop Report, 3rd to 8th December 2001. Grootberg multi-purpose training centre ≠Khoadi //Hoas Conservancy. Kunene. January 2002.
5. **Vaughan, K. and Katjiua, J. 2002.** An Overview of Community-based Natural Resource Management and Rural Livelihoods in ≠Khoadi //Hoas Conservancy. Kunene. August 2002.
6. **Arnold, M.B. 2001.** Predators in the Kunene Region: An Overview of Problems and Prospects. Kunene. August 2001.
7. **Murphy, C. and Mulonga, S. 2002.** A Profile of the Livelihoods of People in Two Conservancies in Caprivi. Caprivi. April 2002.
8. **Murphy, C. 2002.** A Summary of Participatory Livelihoods Workshops with Mayuni Conservancy, October, November 2001 and January 2002. With fieldwork assistance from Andrew Long, Helen Suich, Robert Kapala, and Daisy Nheta. Caprivi. March 2002.
9. **Murphy, C. 2002.** A Summary of Participatory Workshops, Salambala Conservancy. With fieldwork assistance from S. Mulonga, E. Mwilima and J. Abbott. Caprivi. February 2002.
10. **Murphy, C. 2002.** Proceedings of Workshops to Evaluate Five Community-based Tourism Enterprises in Caprivi. October 2002.
11. **Murphy, C. and Mulonga, S. 2002.** A Short Survey on the Status of Benefit Distribution at the Salambala Conservancy from July 2001. November 2002.
12. **Suich, H.** Summary of Partial Results from the Socio-economic Household Survey regarding Community-based Natural Resource Management and Livelihoods in Caprivi and Kunene. February 2003.
13. **Murphy, C. and Mulonga, S. 2003.** Senior Community Field Ranger Workshop – Caprivi Region. January 2003.

14. **Fennessy, J. and Schneider, S. 2002.** Natural Resource Management Bibliographic Compilation and Identification of Literature Gaps: Kunene and Caprivi Regions. January 2002.
15. **Vaughan, C., Mulonga, S and Katjiua, J.B.** Cash from Conservation: Torra Community Tastes the Benefits. A Short Survey and Review of the Torra Conservancy Cash Payouts to Individual Registered Members. October 2003.
16. **Vaughan, C., Katjiua, J.B., Mulonga, S., and N. Branston** Living with Wildlife. Proceedings of Workshop to Evaluate Wildlife Utilization and Human Wildlife Conflict with Community Game Guards in Kunene. May 2003.
17. **Vaughan, C., Katjiua, J.B. and Branston, N.** Talking with Torra. Proceedings of a Participatory Livelihoods Workshop with Torra Residents (forthcoming).
18. **Vaughan, C., Katjiua, J.B. and Branston, N. , and K. Bundra May 2003.** CBNRM in the Kunene Region Proceedings of a Workshop Held to Discuss WILD Project Key Findings and Build Stakeholder Consensus. Ombinda Lodge. May 2003.
19. **Murphy, C.** Proceedings of WILD Project Feedback Workshops in Caprivi. April 2003.
20. **Jones, B., Long, S.A., Vaughan, C., Murphy, C., Katjiua, J.B. and Mulonga, S.** Wildlife, Tourism and Livelihoods in Namibia: A Summary of Preliminary Findings of the Project up to end August 2002. August 2002.
21. **Long, S.A., Jones, B., Humphrey, A., and van Wyk, E.** A Report on the WILD Project Engagement Strategy: Outcomes and Stakeholder Consensus. June 2003.
22. **Vaughan, C., Katjiua, J.B. and Branston, N.** Whose Thirst First? A Review of Human Elephant Conflict and Mitigation Measures around Water Points and Gardens in Kunene Region (forthcoming).
23. **Katjiua, J.B., Vaughan, C. and Branston, N.** Wildlife in the Potjie. Significance of Wild Food Resources for Sustaining Livelihoods in Kunene (forthcoming).
24. **Branston, N., Vaughan, C. and Katjiua, J.B.** Meeting Expectations? A Short Review of Community Meat Distribution in Torra and #Khoadi //Hôas Conservancies. August 2003.
25. **Jones, B.T.** Policy, Institutions and Practice: The Impact of Namibian CBNRM Policy and Legislation on Rural Livelihoods. February 2003.
26. **Trench, T., Murphy, C. and Thaniseb, E.** Proceedings of Workshops to Evaluate Five Community-based Tourism Enterprises in Kunene/Erongo. July 2003.
27. **Mulonga, S.** A Short Review of the Socio-Political Contexts of CBNRM in Caprivi. (Forthcoming).

- 28. Vaughan, C. and Katjiua, J.B.** Summary of wild project feedback for Kunene region research findings and recommendations. October 2003.
- 29. Vaughan, C. and Katjiua, J.B.** Report from WILD Project and Khaibasen Research Group Workshop, Grootberg Training Centre, #Khoadi //Hôas. October 2003.
- 30. Vaughan, C. and Katjiua, J.B., and Savage, T.** MET and WILD Project CBNRM Stakeholder 'Policy to Practice' Workshop, Grootberg Training Centre, #Khoadi //Hôas. October 2003.
- 31. Murphy, C., and T. Savage.** Proceedings of WILD/MET Workshop: CBNRM Development and Research Priorities in Caprivi, Katima Mulilo: 23rd October. October 2003.