



Recommendations:

1. Continue to support conservancies in their efforts to successfully harvest and distribute meat.
2. Improve communication and participation in the process.
3. Improve the efficiency of community hunting and meat distribution processes.
4. MET should produce clear written guidelines identifying key principles to assist conservancies with community hunting and meat distribution processes.
5. With conservancies assess the implications of devolving local hunting to farm, village or household levels.

The distribution of cash dividends to households

The distribution of collective income has taken place in six conservancies since 1998. Three modes of distribution have evolved according to the demographic characteristics of the conservancies and amount of collective revenue available for distribution. These are: individual, equal cash payouts to registered members; the establishment of a conservancy 'social fund' where members can request finances on a needs basis; and payouts to villages.

The amounts paid out vary between the mode of distribution and the revenues available. Payouts to individual members have not been inconsequential, and in one conservancy in Kunene (Torra) these amounted to slightly less than 8% of the average annual household incomes. The most common expenditure for this cash was on school fees, as the payout occurred in January, prior to the start of the new school year. Respondents receiving the cash payout reported that it had made them feel more positive to wildlife and tourism. In the case of payouts to villages in Caprivi, funds have been used for development-related infrastructure projects or for celebrations. There has been one case of conservancy revenues being used to establish a social fund. This only functions where the number of potential beneficiaries is limited and there is an accountable mechanism for verifying needy cases, as it is in Marienfluss Conservancy.

There are a number of positive aspects to the distribution of these revenues. In the case of individual payouts, the cash is always welcome and contributes to income and subsequently food security, allowing for people to reserve whatever resources they would have otherwise used to raise income. That the majority of the people used the income for school costs has an important development impact. The timing of the payouts is also important and has a high impact when distribution coincides with the payment of school expenses.

There remain a number of constraints in respect to the further distribution of these kinds of benefits. In some cases conservancy committees have taken a very conservative

approach to managing revenues, preferring to keep it in the bank. While this earns them interest it also leads to a certain amount of frustration among community members. There also needs to be a strong participatory process associated with the decisions regarding the distribution of collective revenue. In some cases the issue of who is eligible to receive the revenue is deemed problematic by community members. Although conservancy membership ideally defines the beneficiaries, membership lists are not always up to date and there are differences of opinion among community members relating to whether it should only be members or whether the whole community should benefit. Related to the membership and beneficiary issue is the issue of equity in terms of distribution between households. In some cases where the payouts were made to individual members, but there were multiple members in a given household, these households gained a considerable amount of the revenue compared to others. Where village payouts are conducted, those who receive the money are not always easily accountable to the community in terms of the use of the funds. Conservancies need to work through these issues by means of closer consultation with community members.

Recommendations:

1. Ensure that there is wide participation in benefit distribution planning and decision-making.
2. MET should produce guidelines identifying key principles relating to equitable distribution and participation in decision-making processes. These should then be distributed among conservancies; conservancies can then agree their own policies relating to distribution.
3. Conservancies should be encouraged to target benefits to pre-identified groups (poor people) in order to meet legal requirement for equity in distribution.
4. Support conservancies to review where appropriate the applicability of existing membership as the basis for distribution.
5. Where conservancy membership is deemed an appropriate criterion for distribution, registers need to be updated prior to payouts to define who is to receive dividends.
6. Conservancy committees and community representatives should ensure that those who receive money on behalf of villages are accountable for the money.

Addressing livelihood vulnerability and risk: HWC

HWC has a variety of impacts on livelihoods and people incur a number of different costs (direct and indirect). These contribute to household vulnerability. This is particularly the case among poorer households with fewer resources. The impact on livelihoods results from losses in income



from crop or livestock sales due to predation and damage. When wildlife is responsible for losses, this means that households will lose access to valuable food sources, but also that they lose their labour investment and any money invested in production of livestock or crops.

Rural people and MET report an increase in wildlife numbers resulting in increased HWC due to the conservancy and protecting wildlife. This perception affects the extent to which people will continue to support the conservancy initiative. HWC is, however, a complex problem with no single and easy solution.

Effective management solutions require a combination of the following: monitoring and research; deterrents (addressing the causes), for example, the use of fences, scaring and sometimes destroying animals, and decoys (building dams and water points); appropriate policy and legislation (allowing those who suffer the costs and have to deal with practical management the authority to act); and measures that maintain confidence and support of local people (addressing the symptoms). Combining these measures and monitoring and adjusting approaches situationally provides the most effective means to manage HWC. What is important in the context of conservancy objectives (conservation and development) is to ensure that the cost of HWC does not exceed people's minimal tolerance for living with wildlife. Ensuring that any benefits can outweigh the costs is a longer-term objective.

Currently there are a range of activities and initiatives that conservancies and the CBNRM programme are engaged with to address HWC. These include: improving monitoring and reporting systems; protecting water points, and installing them for wildlife use; introducing electric fences to protect gardens; lobbying the Government to simplify procedures to deal directly with problem animal control; and the piloting of the HACCS. This measure is likely to have a high degree of success in terms of offsetting the costs from the perspective of households themselves, but this must be combined with other management approaches. Compensation alone is no panacea. The Government has also established a fund (the GPTF) to enable applications for finance to fund projects that address problem wildlife management.

There are a number of constraints to further improving the conservancies ability to deal with what is a complex problem. There is no MET policy on HWC that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders. Conservancies are increasingly seen as the responsible institution, yet have no authority to deal directly with HWC.

The participation of conservancy members and householders is central to effective management. Agreeing the location

of dams, fences and accepting some responsibility for the maintenance of such installations are important aspects of local participation. Addressing these creates not only a sense of ownership, but also pride and confidence when the management proves effective. In addition offsetting costs (both direct and indirect) in tangible ways is paramount. The GPTF, established by the Government, aims to enable conservancies to access funds from the sales of wildlife products (principally ivory). At present few applications have been funded, and none in the Caprivi Region.

Recommendations:

1. Develop an integrated multi-stakeholder and multi-dimensional strategy to deal with HWC. This should be specific to each region or district, and should involve representatives from the conservancies and traditional authorities and representatives from the broader conservancy membership. Technical staff from MET and conservancy NRM staff, together with technical staff from other line ministries (MAWRD, with veterinary services and DRWS), should also be involved. A forum similar to the CBNRM working group that exists in Caprivi would be ideal. The functions of the group should include establishing an inventory, description and assessment of current deterrent and mitigation practices. From this a suite of measures could be designed appropriate to each conservancy.
2. MET must draft HWC policy document to clarify the roles and responsibilities of government staff. Policy should include devolving responsibility for PAC to regions. In the short term, speed up process for declaring problem animals for control.

Specific recommendations to address livelihood issues (recommendations relating to specific mitigation measures are dealt with in detail in Chapter7):

1. Continue to support conservancies to consider targeting the least secure groups who suffer HWC.
2. Support conservancies to develop their own problem animal strategies to deal with species other than large carnivores and elephants.
3. Support the pilot compensation scheme (HACCS), and encourage adapting it for use in contexts of crop loss for Caprivi as soon as possible.
4. Monitor the effectiveness of HACCS and adapt as necessary.
5. Address the current hurdles to effectively releasing money from the GPTF, and specifically support funding proposals for fencing and water point installations. Support giving priority to proposals from Caprivi with immediate effect.



Existing livelihoods, security and diversification

The foregoing discussion provided a summary of the ways in which CBNRM is currently addressing livelihood security and diversification. It identified a number of constraints to optimising these efforts and made a number of recommendations. The activities discussed do already have positive impacts on livelihoods, particularly the distribution of cash, but the scope of such impacts is limited at present. The discussion here provides a summary of other issues critical to enhancing support for livelihood diversification and security.

WILD research suggests that to improve the effectiveness of positive impacts on livelihoods requires a better understanding of livelihoods themselves. Chapter 5 provided a detailed analysis of the livelihoods of people in Caprivi and Kunene. The material indicates strongly that generally people do not yet include the activities of the conservancies and tourism opportunities as central to their livelihoods. This suggests that while people may be broadly supportive of the conservancies and agree with their objectives they are more concerned with pursuing and adapting their own strategies that from previous experience they know will provide a degree of livelihood security. The strategies they employ differ not only between the regions (as we would expect) but also between households within the regions. The extent to which a particular set of resource or activity combinations contributes to livelihoods varies according to a household's socio-economic status. A key issue to address in order to provide more directed support for livelihoods is this issue of differentiation.

A second key issue, also drawn from detailed research on livelihoods, is the recognition that people employ a wide spectrum of livelihood strategies. To this extent there is no single way in which to provide livelihood support. Rather a suite or range of small-scale interventions would provide the optimum strategy of support. In each conservancy and for different groups within a particular conservancy one set of interventions will be more appropriate than another. This implies that each conservancy needs to develop its own suite of possible support activities based on working through a participatory process with different groups within the conservancy. This would lead to the identification of options that would likely provide the most effective means of supporting particular strategies and particular groups of people. Conservancies would then be in a position to pilot various interventions and to monitor their effectiveness.

Difference and wealth

Not all households utilise resources to the same degree and some are more dependant on specific resources than others. In both Caprivi and Kunene those with the largest number of livestock fall within the category of those who are wealthiest or most secure. Other indicators of difference include the extent of cropping (Caprivi), income levels, and

reliance on natural resources. Other factors that affect an individual households wealth status are the nature and extent of their social networks, including access to a variety of institutions and their geographical location within conservancies. Livestock production and cropping are widely recognised as the cornerstones of people's livelihoods, and although there is a good deal of variation and differentiation between households, there are also patterns to the core strategies and activities within the two regions studied. Key among these is that most households focus on production for consumption. What is significant here is the role of cash incomes in the context of people's consumption strategies and security. Cash becomes an important part of the food security equation, and small regular injections of cash are vital. That pensions were given such prominence in terms of people's livelihood priorities, even though the amounts received were relatively small compared to other sources, lends support to this. People need cash seasonally for school and health costs. A household's ability to raise or access small amounts of cash regularly is important. Within the conservancies the impact of conservancy activities have different effects on different groups. This research identifies that the poorer groups are much more reliant on natural resources to meet their livelihood security needs than the wealthier groups.

With respect to household wildlife use, again it is the poorer groups who are more likely to use wildlife. Conservancy activities that aim to control access to these resources have a potentially negative impact on the poor. In contrast the rich may also use these resources, but they also have other strategies that they can employ to offset any opportunity cost of lost access. In Kunene and in Caprivi, wildlife is an important safety net resource. It provides for both food and to a lesser extent income security. While there are no formal markets for bushmeat, there is some small scale informal trade. Wildlife users tend to be the poorer or less secure households. This was found to be the case for both Kunene and Caprivi. While it is likely that the levels of local off-take have dropped since the introduction of CGGs, people continue to hunt in clandestine ways. This allows them to reserve their other resources for some future purpose. This strategy has the effect of spreading risk. The conservancies aim to protect wildlife and use the resources for the benefit of all their members. Illegal wildlife utilisation may threaten these objectives, but it is important to livelihoods. The extent to which utilisation by households is permissible is dependent on the status of the resource, but also on the priorities as defined by conservancies and the communities. This issue has not been addressed to date, but if the recovery of wildlife species continues, it is an option that conservancies may wish to consider. This is particularly so, since the use of wildlife at household level in contexts of careful management directly links wildlife management with a tangible and meaningful benefit.



In terms of HWC it is also the poorest who experience the greatest negative impacts. If, for example, a household for example only owns five cattle, to lose one is proportionally much more significant than for a household owning 30 cattle. This is not to suggest that the actual value of the cow lost is greater for a poor household, but in terms of impact it is much more severe for a poor household. Careful consideration of the opportunity costs for different groups is important, both in terms of people's continued support to CBNRM and in assessing the impacts of any lost livelihood diversification opportunities for poor groups.

Research on issues of differentiation revealed that the issue of who is and who is not poor is not always clear-cut within conservancies. The issue that requires clarification here is that being poor is not necessarily a constant state: to a degree, at some time or other everyone (except a small minority) is poor. Furthermore, in the context of a positive development or conservancy intervention that may address poverty, everyone will consider themselves poor. Despite this, participatory research revealed that most people could easily identify what criteria make a person poor (lack of stock, income, education, etc). In addition, there was widespread recognition that some people are more vulnerable than others and that, if at all possible, measures should be taken to support these people. Targeting the 'poor and needy' is already an aspect of some conservancies' benefit distribution plans. Therefore at the conservancy level it is clear that addressing poverty is a concern. It is not new to residents of conservancies, nor is it externally driven.

That different groups have different priorities is important, and leads to the need for consideration of providing support for livelihood security as well as exploring options for livelihood diversification. For the poorest groups their concerns are often more about livelihood security in the short term than diversifying their income sources over the longer term – although the latter is also desirable. To this extent the poor and rich have different priorities. For the poor or less secure groups, obviously finding enough food and income is a priority. For the wealthier groups, their concerns relate more to opportunities for improvement and for investment: for example, in buying more cattle or goats and extending their areas of cultivation. Any significant changes for either groups may have implications for conservancies in terms of their conservation objectives.

Addressing support to existing livelihoods

A number of options are available to the conservancies to provide direct support to existing livelihoods. These are presented here to assist CBNRM stakeholders and practitioners to understand better the kind of suite of small-scale interventions that can directly support existing livelihood strategies for different groups of rich or poor. It is imperative to recognise that the identification of

appropriate livelihood support strategies must be done by the conservancies themselves through participatory means with appropriate support. This issue will be addressed below. Caprivi and Kunene are considered here separately since there is enormous variation between the regions.

In Caprivi, a key strategy for most involves crop production. Those that produce the least are those that do not have access to draught power. This group is also highly vulnerable to the loss of crops to wildlife. While this group is also involved in a number of other activities to meet their needs, cropping remains important. Successful crop production will provide at least enough food for part of the year and allow for the possibility that other activities may provide cash for purposes other than food purchases. One option to improve their crop production, and therefore improve their livelihood security, would be to provide support for accessing draught power. The conservancies could use a limited amount of funds to hire cattle and ploughs for cultivation purposes. To ensure there was a degree of equity in this, the animals could be hired from the wealthiest or those who have large cattle holdings. This would provide support for both the poorer groups and the wealthier and serve to provide additional cash in the local economy. There are a number of problems that would be encountered in taking an approach of this nature, not least of which would be the selection of those eligible. However, these could be addressed by the conservancies.

In Caprivi, a range of natural resources (including reeds and thatch grass) are of significance to people. Gaining an income from the harvesting and sale of these products, and also crafts, is important to the majority, but is particularly significant for poorer groups. The latter also harvest and sell wild fruits and water lilies. In addition to these resources there are a range of other natural resources that are of commercial value (particularly in the cosmetics and beverage industries). Improving opportunities in the natural resource product sector requires access to markets, which are currently not secure and limited. There is at present a very limited amount of support to enable people to take advantage of these and other natural resource product opportunities. There are, however, a few organisations from within Namibia and the southern African region that are focusing on providing further opportunities to exploit natural resource products (CRIAA SA-DC and Phytotrade Africa for example). The comparative advantage of natural resource products is important as the cash raised can go directly to the 'producer/harvester' and help with meeting livelihood security needs. There appears to be less reliance on wildlife for food security or incomes, although for some poorer or less secure groups the use of wildlife is considered important (due to the illegal nature of wildlife use there is a tendency for it to be under-reported).