



“It (the traditional village) also helped the community accepting awareness of conserving. They learnt about not burning, about harvesting grass and reeds... If a child brought eggs from birds’ nests in the bush, I would now tell him to return the eggs to the bush. I can pass on what I have learnt to my kids.” (Lizauli Traditional Village 16/09/03)

Livelihood Costs

There are some negative consequences associated with increasing community participation in tourism. These costs are difficult to quantify and include: reduction of livelihood activities at tourism sites, conflict over enterprise ownership and the distribution of benefits, frustration at slow flow of benefits and the opportunity costs of time.

Reduction of livelihood activities at the tourism site

One of the costs of tourism in communal areas is the land-use change at the tourist site which reduces access to resources and excludes some livelihood activities (grazing, cropping, fishing, use of water and veld foods). This exclusion in turn can lead to improved NRM as wildlife returns to the tourist site, but the cost of losing access to the site is felt at the individual level and often individuals lose out in favour of the collective gains from tourism revenue generation. However, there are examples where compensation through tourist jobs has been provided to individuals who can no longer use the tourist site to meet livelihood needs.²⁷

Giving up access to resources from the site used by the conservancy campsites was a trade off made by local people at all the case study campsites. One participant at N//goabaca Campsite workshop reported, “Before the campsite we used to eat the fruit of this big tree.” The local *induna* gave up the field he ploughs for the site of the traditional village at Lizauli. The Kubunyana Campsite area had abundant natural resources used by local people – the workshop role play to illustrate what people had to give up or put in for the development of the enterprise showed its use for: harbour facilities for *makoros*, hunting, fishing, eating and harvesting wild fruits, for resting under a big tree and digging roots. Likewise the Salambala Campsite role plays showed people complaining that the site they have given up was fertile compared to other land they had been allocated and they had lost their “beautiful” homes. Their trade off was giving up rich land for poor land to have the campsite. The Salambala Campsite is located within the core wildlife area where grazing has been prohibited in order to allow for the restocking of game and tourism activities. This area has a long history of conservation and has only recently been used for residence.

Three tourism enterprises in Kunene reported giving up rights to land and resources as a cost of the establishment of the enterprise. Prior to the establishment of the Okarohombo Campsite, in Marienflüss in 1991, the Ana trees that provide shade for the tourists provided pods for use as cattle fodder. Some people also kept field/gardens along the Kunene River where some of the campsites are located. At the Ugab Wilderness Camp, local farmers gave up grazing land for their goats and cattle, as was the case for the Anmire Traditional Village.

Conflict over enterprise ownership and benefits

A comparison between the historical development of community-owned enterprises in the Kunene and Caprivi Regions revealed that the Kunene community-owned enterprises are older than those in Caprivi and, importantly, pre-date conservancy formation. When established, these enterprises lacked an institutional framework within which to clarify communal ownership and benefit distribution. In some cases the community-owned campsites in Kunene have contested ownership (e.g. Khowarib Campsite, Purros Campsite, and Ongongo Campsite). This is not the case in Caprivi, where conflicts have been resolved more successfully.

Box 7: Conflict over ownership of the Khowarib Restcamp

Elau Ganuseb, the individual who initiated the Khowarib Restcamp, said, “The campsite of Khowarib has a long-running conflict. Because of this long-running conflict, the development is not so good... the workshop [research workshop] won’t resolve the conflict but we can name the conflict which might help in the future” (Khowarib Restcamp workshop, 3 March 2003). The time-line exercise in the workshop yielded a long description of the turbulent history of the campsite from 1990 to December 2002, and the dysfunctional structures – “People are hired and dismissed, the committee is elected and dismissed. There are no structures in place at the moment.” A member of the traditional authorities concluded the historical narrative by saying, “We [the traditional authorities] were brought in to clean up the mess. All what was given we cleaned up – the campsite was very dirty. We also noticed that the level of visitors was very low.”

Many outside organisations were involved in the development of the Khowarib Restcamp. Its ownership and status have been hotly contested, and the management has changed several times. At the time of this research, the campsite was just functioning. The half-completed and poorly-designed infrastructure reflects the shifts in its management and different external interventions²⁸. The LAC has taken on the case in order to provide a legal solution. A workshop held by WILD revealed a remarkable and open

²⁷ Examples were found in Caprivi (at the Salambala and Kubunyana Campsites) and Erongo (Ugab Wilderness Campsite).

²⁸ Lack of sensitivity by support NGOs to local politics has also been named as a contributing factor in the conflict (see Trench 2003).



participation of the two contesting parties. This bodes extremely well for the future resolution of conflicts over this enterprise which is located in the newly-established Anabeb Conservancy (see Box 7).

Frustration at slow flow of benefits

The virtual absence of tourists in Caprivi between 2000 and 2001 due to the lack of security has caused some conservancy members to be disillusioned and angry at the slow flow of benefits. Examples of the statements and perspectives of a number of conservancy members illustrate this. A conservancy committee member at the N//goabaca Campsite workshop, on 13 September 2002, reported:

“We as the committee find it shameful to give no feedback – people say to us, ‘You just go (to the meetings) to get a piece of bread’.”

Another said:

“I started coming to the meetings (showed size her child was when she started) he is growing and he sees nothing. That is why my heart is burning. We become tired. People ask, ‘Is it a committee to bring development or only to have meetings?’”

A Salambala Conservancy Committee member reported that, even though the Salambala Campsite exists, some people say,

“There is nothing in Salambala. The people sitting there are just getting money for themselves to live.”

This slow flow of benefits has the potential to erode the link between benefits from tourism activities and improved NRM. Fortunately, tourists are now returning to the region.

An enterprise cannot be sustainable unless it is financially viable²⁹. Through identifying benefits, workshop participants perceived a need for the enterprises to have financial returns. All enterprises that were part of this study needed to source external funding to fund the capital cost of the enterprise and start-up salaries for staff until the enterprise could be self-funding. This task was completed with the support of NGOs. Most funding took the form of a non-repayable grant. This is advantageous as capital costs do not need to be repaid and enterprises short-cut the time needed to cover operating costs to make the campsite staff members’ jobs sustainable or generate profit for benefit distribution. Both of which are positive livelihood outcomes for local people.

Workshop participants did not display a strong understanding of the importance of business planning, training and marketing as a factor leading to successful enterprise development. This may be attributed to the inexperience,

limited exposure and lack of understanding of tourism and business management that many conservancy committee members experience. There is a need for improved business training with communities and individual entrepreneurs and business plans need to be conducted in the early stage of enterprise establishment, to incorporate issues of financial viability, marketing and benefit distribution. Financial transparency must be maintained and benefits seen quickly to enhance the trust and ‘buy in’ by community members.

For lodges and upmarket camps, education levels are a significant factor affecting successful employment. The availability of training also influences job and promotion prospects. Conflicts are common with joint ownership, as communities are not homogenous bodies but consist of different factions. In Kunene, there are a significant number of contested campsites which were established before the conservancies were introduced and without clear leadership and ownership/benefit agreements. In Caprivi, the community-owned campsites were all developed after the introduction of conservancies and there was no confusion over ownership.

Conflicts are especially evident with regard to land issues that require parties to give up or change land usage. Strong local governance can ensure effective community consultation and agreement over the enterprise as well as solving any land-use conflicts over the tourist site. All the campsite case studies had to negotiate with community members to give up land to make it accessible for the tourist development. The initial resistance by affected parties was dealt with through broad consultation, strong traditional leadership, and at a later stage through benefits such as employment, alternative land and assistance to move.

Diggle (2003: 74) predicts that all emerging and registered conservancies in Caprivi can achieve financial independence within five years. However, he cautions that appropriate institutional mechanisms need to be in place, and there remain “considerable challenges concerning the establishment of strong and effective institutional mechanisms that are able to promote and control ‘multi-million dollar’ ventures and... [that] without strong leadership and economic stability, conservation will loose out to development and corruption”. In this context, he points out that conservancies are not helped by the legacy of apartheid and the lack of clarity from the Government in respect devolution to the level required for successful CBT (c.f. Diggle 2003).

A key success factor for privately-owned and managed enterprises with some contractual arrangements to benefit local communities (i.e. joint venture agreements) is the presence of an ‘honest broker’ service to negotiate the deal

²⁹ Covering costs and making a profit.



between the two parties. Joint venture agreements have the potential to generate more and quicker benefits than community-owned and managed enterprises.³⁰ Ashley and Jones (2001) emphasise the motives of the private sector with regard to joint ventures as a key success factor.

Cost of time

CBT is time consuming for the community members involved, especially the development and operation of community-owned tourism enterprises. This is especially significant to people who have few resources, have cropping as the mainstay of their livelihoods and are contributing their time on a non-remunerated basis³¹. Broad consultation within communities was identified as important in the early stages of the development of community-owned tourism enterprise. It aids conflict resolution, creates awareness, builds trust, and determines the amount of ‘buy in’ the community has for the enterprise.

“There was not full cooperation in the community. We had to negotiate – it slowed things. We could not go ahead without the support of the majority of people.” (Charles Mashabati, campsite staff member at Salambala Campsite workshop, 20 September 2002)

The main thing that women have given up for the development of Mashi Craft Market has been the time taken away from their household tasks to go to meetings and workshops. These women are already very constrained in use of time:

“Being women, we are subject to our husband. We have only a little time to spend making baskets – we have to fetch water, collect reeds for the courtyard... Instead of making many baskets in a month, we make one.” (Agnes, Mashi Craft Market workshop, 24 September 2002)

Factors that Affect Successful Community Participation in Tourism in Communal Areas

Successful community participation in tourism in communal areas can deliver positive contributions to people’s livelihoods. Analysis of the 10 community tourism enterprise workshops held in Caprivi and Kunene, with over 150 local people who were responsible for establishment of the enterprises, identified the main internal and external factors that helped or hindered the successful participation of communities in tourism in communal areas.³²

Table 33 summarises these factors. They are categorised according to their economic, social or environmental nature. A cross-cutting factor is the need for community participation in tourism in communal areas to ‘fit’ with other livelihood strategies. Community participation in tourism in communal areas is a good ‘fit’ with existing livelihoods because people can live in proximity to their homes and continue with their agricultural activities and social life.

Social and institutional factors

Institutional conflict has begun to emerge between individuals wishing to establish tourism enterprises in communities and conservancies acting on behalf of the collective. This conflict has been recognised within the CBNRM programme for some time. Individuals in both Kunene and Caprivi Regions are beginning to recognise the possibilities for income generation through tourism and a number of small campsites and traditional villages are being developed; some with NGO support, others with little outside assistance. This has led to some conflict where individual entrepreneurs see conservancies as seeking to prevent development and have resisted working through the conservancies (Davis and Jacobsohn 1999). According to Jones and Mosimane (2000), NGOs argue that a reason for working through conservancies is that all tourism enterprises

Table 33: Local factors affecting successful community participation in tourism in communal areas

Economic	Social	Environmental
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit with other livelihood activities • Collectively-owned • Financial viability (sourcing external funding and start-up staff salaries) • Business planning and training • Financial transparency • Distribution of profit • Marketing – linking local marketing to other levels • Honest broker service for joint venture contracts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit with other livelihood activities • Collectively-owned or joint ventures • Strong local governance • Broad consultation and agreement • Strong traditional leadership in support • Availability of training to improve skill needed for tourism, e.g. literacy or guiding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit with other livelihood activities • Tourism seen as an incentive to conserve

³⁰ A related cost here may be a reduced sense of ownership by the community – one of the key factors for successful NRM.

³¹ Rewards for this investment in time can be altruistic, greater status in the community and increasing the opportunity to secure a job.

³² Refer to Halstead 2003 for an assessment of success factors based on participatory research in Caprivi.



are taking place on communal land and if parcels of land (even though small) are taken up by lodges, campsites and traditional villages there is an opportunity cost to other land users. There should thus be some form of fee or levy paid to the community in compensation for the loss of the use of this land. Another reason is that conservancies are trying to coordinate tourism development and ensure the sustainable use of the tourism resource. The issue is therefore one of crafting appropriate institutional arrangements between individuals and conservancies in a way that the rights of individuals to start businesses are protected at the same time as the rights of other to access common property resources are respected.

Some conservancies are trying to resolve this tension between collective rights and interests and individual rights and interest by establishing tourism development plans (Jones and Mosimane 2000). These plans will encourage the establishment of enterprises in a way that would aim to be ecologically and socially sustainable, as well as ensuring that development is appropriate to the regional product being offered and supply does not outstrip demand. Conservancies in Kunene and Caprivi agreed some time ago that they themselves should apply for all PTO rights within their boundaries, and that individual entrepreneurs should enter into mutually acceptable contracts with the conservancies (Davis and Jacobsohn 1999). This is not only an issue of individual entrepreneurs contributing to the collective for the use of a common pool resource, but one that relates to the collective (i.e. the conservancy) addressing the needs of individuals when they make the trade off and suffer the loss of access to land and resources for a 'community' enterprise. In Caprivi this has been addressed by a number of conservancies (for example, Salambala and Mayuni) by providing work for those who lost access to land when campsites were established on behalf of the community. In contrast, the dispute over the right for one family to remain settled in the core wildlife area in Salambala Conservancy persists.

However, the tension between individual and collective rights remains strong. The issue emerged as a focal point for discussion during a WILD feedback meeting held in Kunene during May 2003 (Vaughan *et al.* 2003a.):

"It seems that individual businessmen are totally excluded by this focus on community. We should make provision for individual business people, they should be accommodated somehow." (Jacobus Basson, headman, Torra Conservancy)

"People talk in terms of community business, but when it comes to one individual, it goes out rather than benefiting the entire community. For example, one man has 95% and the community has 5%, it becomes a private entity; if someone comes in, make sure it is the kind of business that gets a certain per cent, otherwise they become individually-owned." (Torra Community member)

"Collective versus individual: will the community allow individuals run their own businesses, or will they be forced to make an agreement?" (MET official, Kunene Region)

In Caprivi, Jones and Butterfield (2001) reported how the Salambala Conservancy Committee felt that a small roadside craft outlet run by a local woman should be managed by the conservancy and the profits distributed among the conservancy members. It was argued that the woman was occupying a prime spot on a tourist route on communal land and therefore some form of collective management was justified. A MET official at a conservancy quarterly planning meeting in Caprivi questioned whether individuals should benefit from craft sales and suggested that this should be a collective benefit because craft sellers were using common property natural resources. Responses were as follows (Murphy undated):

"If the conservancies decide to 'tax' the crafters, that is their decision. They have the right and responsibility to make their own decisions with regard to resource use in the conservancies and whether there is individual or collective benefit." (Female craft maker, Caprivi)

"If the conservancy ask me for money, I must be getting something back from the conservancy (e.g. protection of the palm source, Community Resource Monitor help or help with transport." (Female craft maker, Caprivi)

It would appear as if this issue still needs attention within the CBNRM programme. The need for individuals or companies to have an agreement with the conservancy as a representative of the community is not disputed. But it is dangerous if the conservancy is to gain all PTO rights for tourism enterprises and then allocates or sublets these to individuals within the community. There is a strong likelihood that decisions would be taken based on factors such as kinship, feuds between clans, ethnic differences etc. Would a local entrepreneur have the confidence to apply for a tourism site for his or her enterprise knowing that there was an ongoing feud between the entrepreneur's family and the family of the conservancy chair?

External (regional, national and international) success factors affecting the adoption of CBT

The key regional, national and international factors determining the successful adoption and management of CBT include:

Strong government leadership and supportive policy and legislative framework

As well as appropriate institutional mechanisms, Diggle mentions a second condition that needs to be in place for successful CBT in Caprivi, which is an enabling legislative framework (Diggle 2003). He points out that rural conservancies do not have exclusive control over tourism in communal areas. Instead they have limited rights over