



Lodge in Outjo, which involved approximately 70 people, and a similar number at feedback workshops in Grootberg. Two similar workshops were held at the Chesire Homes in Caprivi. Many of the workshops were recorded, the proceedings for which are available as WILD Working Papers (see Annex 5 for a list of project outputs).

In addition to these workshops researchers participated in the conservancies quarterly planning sessions in both regions, provided feedback on research findings through meetings with the conservancy committees and other groups and were observers and participants at conservancy planning sessions and annual general meetings (AGMs). At Windhoek-level project staff participated actively in the quarterly members meetings of NACSO and were actively involved in a number of NACSO working groups, most notably the Research Working Group and to a lesser extent the Institutional Development Working Group. WILD staff also took part in workshops (NACSO visioning, HWC, National Planning Commission EDF 9 support to rural development, LIFE II Evaluation workshop) and conferences (Southern African Regional CBNRM Conference) and contributed to the inception and development of the CSD within MET. What is perhaps significant about these sessions is the extent to which WILD staff were participants. The net result of this is that WILD staff became actors themselves involved in the processes of the development of CBNRM over the project's duration. This level of participation and engagement in some cases led to some dynamic and constructive debate between project staff and CBNRM stakeholders⁵, but in other cases differences of opinion were less easily reconciled⁶. To an extent WILD staff were never merely observers. Engagement and participation by WILD were anticipated in the design of WILD and during the course of the project this participation became one means by which WILD disseminated the findings of the project in a dynamic and iterative manner.⁷

Qualitative research

There were a number of fundamental approaches that informed the conduct of WILD research. The first of which was the recognition that to bring a fresh view to understanding the relationship between CBNRM and livelihoods it was imperative not to be perceived as working directly through one particular service provider or another⁸. Retaining independence was important. It was imperative to work with people who were both a part of the conservancy mainstream and those who were not. The second

fundamental approach involved engaging with people in their own contexts at household level. This meant spending periods of time with people at their own villages and farms and sitting together in their domestic contexts discussing local social and political issues. Qualitative research also involved active engagement with people and creating opportunities to talk with people about research findings in informal settings. Simply put, spending time with people, eating together and engaging in their lives, showing respect and commitment to them and building trust are essential aspects of qualitative research. Among community development professionals and social scientists this approach when combined with robust quantitative research and analysis is an accepted and important feature of the work since it contributes to building respect, trust and demonstrates a level of commitment by the researchers to the issues concerning local people. For this reason having teams permanently based in the field was an advantage. Through these processes of social engagement it became possible to gain an understanding of the social and political complexities of rural livelihoods. In addition the approach offered a unique opportunity to discuss often difficult findings with key conservancy individuals in an informal, honest and non-confrontational way. The recruitment of Namibian field researchers educated to graduate level, who were quite familiar with the communities that became the focus of this study gave the project an advantage over researchers who might come for short periods and conduct household interviews or surveys. It gave the researchers a depth of understanding not easily achieved by outsiders. Information gathered with the assistance and support of Namibian staff in these informal contexts provided an important way of contextualising findings and sometimes led to issues that would not otherwise have been researched.

The qualitative research that was formally implemented focused on the development of household case studies, working with key informants and workshops using participatory methods (for example, 10 workshops held at 10 community-based tourism enterprises). Households for case studies were selected to establish a representative group of households who were not only willing to be the subject of in-depth research focusing on livelihoods, resource use and management issues, but were differentially affected by CBNRM activities. In total this work involved 16 households in the two study regions. Research was structured according to a series of activities and methods that focused on the livelihood strategies, outcomes and resource endowments of individual households (see Annex 3, Table 1). Other

⁵ The debate that WILD staff in Kunene entered into with the #Khoadi //Hôas committee, for example, ultimately led to positive outcomes for the conservancy as they emerged from a period of crisis in addressing issues of representation and equity in the distribution of benefits – particularly meat.

⁶ Some NGO steering committee members, for example, constantly questioned the approach and methodology of WILD due to their discomfort with negative project findings and their presentation.

⁷ In Kunene, one senior MET staff member commented that "since WILD has been here we now have a language to describe many of the issues and challenges we have been working on for years" (Nahor Howaseb pers. comm.)

⁸ The senior researchers were outsiders and it was difficult to throw off the label of belonging to an NGO. In contrast it was almost impossible for people to accept that we were working under the umbrella of the MET. WILD staff did not wear uniforms and, in Kunene, had no office space at MET.



qualitative research involved formal and informal interviews with key household informants, and informal discussion with a range of local-level stakeholders. In these contexts the development of rapport and trust between WILD staff and informants was an important feature of the research. Of particular note here is the material that was collected concerning local subsistence hunting (see Mulonga 2003 and Katjiua *et al.* forthcoming). Without the level of trust and commitment established between WILD staff and local informants it would have been impossible to collect material of this nature and sensitivity. Research also involved semi-structured interviews with CBNRM stakeholders based regionally and in Windhoek and recording the outcomes of various meetings attended. The various aspects of this qualitative research provided a degree of triangulation, when combined with more rigorous and accepted quantitative methods.

Quantitative research

To compliment the participatory and qualitative research, quantitative research focused on the use of survey techniques. An extensive household socio-economic survey was carried out across conservancies in three regions. This covered a total of 1,192 households: in Caprivi, 206 in Salambala, 183 in Mayuni, and 184 in Kwandu; in Kunene and Erongo, 84 in Torra, 210 in ≠Khoadi //Hôas, 175 in Sorris Sorris, and 150 in Ehirovipuka. It was designed in collaboration with the EEU within the DEA, and was supported by a design consultant recruited by the World Bank. The survey was implemented by a team of enumerators recruited by the Social Impact and Policy Assessment Centre (SIAPAC) Windhoek. The enumerators worked in close collaboration with WILD Project staff and locally recruited survey guides who were brought on board by WILD staff to ensure that local capacity and knowledge would guide the implementation of the survey. The survey data was cleaned and entered into an SPSS data package by staff at the Multi-disciplinary Research and Consultancy Centre (MRCC) at the University of Namibia (UNAM). Preliminary analysis of the survey was conducted by consultants recruited by the project (these included staff from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), DEA staff and consultants identified by the World Bank – Satisfaction Sweden).⁹

Other surveys were also conducted by WILD Project. These combined small purposive and random samples involving data collection among smaller groups of informants. While less statistically relevant, these surveys do provide a good understanding of key issues and cover topics that had

previously received little attention. The surveys included for Kunene study sites:¹⁰

- Work on the distribution of cash benefits in Torra. Here interviews were held with heads of 67 individual households that were selected as representative of the different geographic areas within the conservancy and combined isolated settlements with the population centres at Bergsig and other larger posts.
- The use of bushmeat and other wild foods in Torra and ≠Khoadi //Hôas Conservancies. A total of 37 people from different household were interviewed (Torra n=13, ≠Khoadi //Hôas n=24). These individuals were purposively selected due to their proximity to core wildlife areas and due to the fact that they were known to be active hunters.
- Meat distribution in Torra and ≠Khoadi //Hôas Conservancies. A total of 49 interviews were conducted across the two conservancies. Again selection of interviewees was based on geographic representation within the two areas (Torra n=24, ≠Khoadi //Hôas n=25).
- Research on the impact of elephants on water points and initiatives to mitigate their effects was conducted at 18 different sites in the following conservancies and emerging conservancy: Torra, ≠Khoadi //Hôas, Ehirovipuka, Omatendeka and Okongundumba. The sites were identified by IRDNC and MET staff on the basis of the number of problem incidents reported and the location or presence of protected water points. The interviews were conducted in collaboration with the conservancy staff.

For Caprivi, small sample surveys included:

- Questionnaires on craft production and sales. Forty interviews were conducted with crafters in 12 villages. This work also involved the analysis of existing sales data held by Rössing Foundation and Mashi Craft Cooperative.
- A benefit distribution survey was also conducted in Salambala Conservancy. Interviews were held with 34 households in 18 of the 19 villages who received payouts. Initially the *nduna* of each village was approached and interviews conducted with them. Further interviews were carried out with householders who were available and willing to be interviewed.
- A survey on wild food utilisation was also conducted in Caprivi. This involved interviews with 39 different households from Mayuni and Salambala Conservancies and from an area near Linyanti (outside of any conservancy or emerging conservancy). Tables recording wild food use were given to field assistants who visited

⁹ See Suich 2003 for the analysis of partial results from this survey.

¹⁰ The following surveys for Kunene and Caprivi were not based on random samples, but rather informants were selected purposively by WILD, MET and in some cases IRDNC staff due to their direct experience or involvement with the issue under investigation.



the households on a weekly basis to record the use of wild food (including bushmeat). Existing data from MET on incidents of poaching were also analysed.

- A questionnaire focused on the impacts of HWC was used to interview 21 households in three conservancies (Mayuni, Salambala and Kwandu). These interviewees were selected by conservancy staff who drew up a list of those who had experienced incidents of HWC.¹¹ This work also involved the analysis of existing MET data on HWC.

Commissioned studies

WILD commissioned a number of pieces of specific research and analysis. These included the compilation and summary review of literature available in Namibia relating to NRM and livelihoods; background reports relating to the study conservancies; the analysis of policies and legislation relating to CBNRM and issues of sectoral integration; an economic study of the values of tourism to communal areas (Caprivi, Erongo and Kunene); and support in the analysis of a range of survey data. In addition to these a number of consultants were contracted to support the implementation of specific field-level research, and a full-time editor was contracted to assist in the production of final reports. The results of these commissions are included in the analysis provided in the various chapters of this report.

Bibliographic database and reference collection

This work was a desk-based study, but also involved the physical collection of over 250 reports and other documents. This was compiled into a small reference collection, and a database (using Endnote) was developed to search the collection. In addition to this, a further 350 documents were located in various libraries and collections in Windhoek and Okaukuejo. These were included in the searchable database. A report identifying key research gaps and the focus of the available literature was written (see Fennessy and Schnieder 2002)¹².

Background conservancy profiles

This commission focused on gathering together various existing information relating to the conservancies. It included material on geographical and topographic contexts; wildlife, birds and vegetation; social and political contexts; incomes and conservancy employment; and the collection of new data on the demographic profiles of the conservancies. The work was compiled and produced as a report (see Humphrey and Humphrey 2003).

Work on policies, institutions and practice

The aim of this desk review was two-fold. Firstly, to examine the impact of Namibian community-based wildlife and tourism policies and legislation on rural livelihoods. The policies and legislation were examined in terms of their provisions concerning rights, institutions, responsibilities and conditions. They were then considered in terms of the extent to which they devolve rights to local communities and their fit with common property management theory and practice. The commissioned paper analyses the extent to which differences in interpretation of policy and legislation at different levels and among different stakeholders affect practice and implementation. Finally the fit between policy outcomes and livelihood priorities and strategies is explored. The second aim concerned the extent to which policies, legislation, and institutional arrangements in different natural resources sectors are synergistic and provide opportunities for communities to practice an integrated resource management approach. Issues considered include the importance of factors such as scale and the role of existing authorities (see Jones 2002).

Tourism values study

The core objectives of this study were to conduct an economic analysis of the present contribution of tourism in communal areas to the local, regional and national economy and to provide an understanding of trends in terms of its growth and rates of decline over time. A secondary objective was to support the development of capacity within the Directorate of Tourism (DoT). This focused on making available the methodological tools used for the study for future data gathering purposes useful for policy, planning, management and decision-making within the DoT. The aim of this work was to provide information on the current economic value of tourism in the study areas and to provide a macro-level analysis to complement the household-level work that WILD was doing on the distribution of incomes (see Roe *et al.* 2003).

Analysis and Dissemination

The analysis of data was informed by the conceptual foundations that a livelihoods perspective provides. The identification of discrete field-level research activities and the focus of broader participatory work addressed issues relating to peoples livelihood strategies, their access to resources and various activities associated with meeting livelihood outcomes. Broader work on livelihoods was complemented with targeted research on issues relating to

¹¹ The data sets relating to these studies are available through the MET library housed with the DEA. The analysis of the data by WILD can be found in many of the WILD Working Papers (see Annex 3).

¹² The collection is housed in the CSD within MET.



the distribution of financial benefits and meat from community harvests; on the role and significance of craft production and marketing for livelihoods; on issues of livelihood vulnerability and insecurity (for example work on HWC); on gaining a better understanding of the role and value of wild food and wildlife resources; on issues relating to the organisation of resource use and distribution at household level (with a particular focus on local subsistence hunting); and on the contribution that community-owned tourism (for example, campsites) can make to communities and individual household livelihoods. Commissioned work aimed specifically to address broader livelihood issues relating to institutional, policy and legal contexts and to broader economic analysis.

Analysis itself was carried out by the field teams in conjunction with the Windhoek-based team leader. This was an ongoing and iterative process: moving between findings and analysis and back again until clarity and a consensus was reached among all staff. Key issues were also discussed formally and informally with a variety of stakeholders:

central among whom were the DEA-EEU staff and others in the MET CSD, and members of the steering committee¹³. Much of the quantitative data was analysed with the support of IIED economists and many of the findings were subsequently discussed at length with other stakeholders (for example, staff at UNAM and NGOs) to ensure that issues were contextualised according to a variety of perspectives and other available data (see Long *et al.* 2003). The project steering committee, that provided strategic guidance to the project, has also been involved in discussing data and providing support in the development of appropriate engagement and dissemination strategies. Finally, the findings of WILD were also discussed extensively with conservancy committees, members and households in the study sites (see Annex 3 for reference to the various feedback meetings and project engagement strategy).

The following chapters address understanding and contextualising CBNRM in Namibia.

¹³ For a full list of those who made contributions please see the acknowledgements and Annex 6.