

RESEARCH DISCUSSION PAPER

Number 32

March 1999

A preliminary environmental
assessment of Namibia's
resettlement programme

by

Environmental and Geographical Science Masters Students
University of Cape Town (ed. Rob Blackie)

Directorate of Environmental Affairs

Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Private Bag 13306, Windhoek, Namibia

This series of Research Discussion Papers is intended to present new, preliminary, or topical information and ideas for discussion and debate. The contents are not necessarily final views or firm positions of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Comments and feedback are welcomed.

Abstract

This paper is adapted from a study done on resettlement schemes in Namibia by the Masters students at the Department of Environmental and Geographical Science at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in 1998. The full report is available under the title “A retrospective assessment of the environmental implications of resettlement in the Oshikoto and Omaheke regions of Namibia”, published by the Directorate of Environmental Affairs’ Namibian Programme to Combat Desertification (NAPCOD). The full report gives more details on the methodology of the study, the particular characteristics of the schemes visited and the reasons for selecting these schemes.

The main findings of the report are on the general process of resettlement, illuminated by five case studies in the Oshikoto and Omaheke regions. The process of resettlement of purchased land has speeded-up significantly in recent years, allowing the comparison of older *ad-hoc* schemes and newer better-planned schemes. All schemes are found to have fulfilled a social role by providing land to landless individuals, who are often displaced farm labourers. The purchasing of land adjacent to communal lands and in blocks, an official government policy since April 1998, is likely to lower the support costs of resettlement schemes and reduce pressure on communal land. Negative aspects of resettlement that were studied were focused on weak participation by resettlement beneficiaries and lack of coordination by different institutions involved in resettlement. More recent schemes such as the Vasdraai and Excelsior farms appear to be performing better than older schemes in this respect. A preliminary costing of some different resettlement schemes is shown, with a brief discussion of why costs vary so much between schemes.

Recommendations are made on how to improve participation further, how to improve coordination between institutions, and further research to improve the process of resettlement.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The report was done as part of the NAPCOD coordinated programme of research in support of its work to combat desertification, funded by the German Ministry of Economic Co-operation (BMZ) through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). It is part of a larger series of pieces of research that aim to provide policy orientated research on the costs and benefits of different land use options, systems and tenure arrangements.

The UCT team and Rob Blackie acknowledge the assistance of the following individuals who went out of their way to ensure the successful completion of the study:

- *Sunny Shuuya for providing botanical expertise*
- *Mr Kanyemba, Mr Vergotine, Mr Shuumba and all others at Ministry of Lands Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR) offices in Windhoek for providing valuable information and contacts and assisting with the logistics of the research*
- *MLRR staff and settlers interviewed on the schemes visited for giving patiently and generously of their time and sharing their experiences with us*
- *Dr. Chris Brown (previous Head of the DEA and currently Director of the Namibian Nature Foundation), Peter Tarr and all the staff at the DEA who provided much needed support, information and encouragement during the study*
- *Dr. Helmut Woehl of GTZ for his capable support and organisation of the project's contractual and financial arrangements*
- *DRFN for the loan of their trailer and further logistical support*
- *Mr Mark Dummett for providing valuable anthropological insights during the field research*
- *Alice Jarvis for reviewing the draft discussion paper and providing many valuable comments*

The UCT team extend their sincerest appreciation to those in Tsumeb for their generous support and care following their car accident. Special thanks go to the Beyer and Friedrich families.

We wish to acknowledge the Department of Environmental and Geographical Science, UCT, especially Professor Richard Fuggle, Mr Richard Hill, and Ms. J.Barker for their valuable support and supervision of the study and Ms. Sharon Adams, Ms Sue Sayers and Mr Kevin Winter for their indispensable assistance.

Finally a special vote of thanks goes to Mr Darryll Killian of the EEU for his guidance and encouragement throughout the study.

Table of Contents

1. The context of resettlement and land reform	1
2. Findings	1
3. Discussion of Findings	8
4. Recommendations	14
5. Research related recommendations	22
References	24
Appendix 1	25
Appendix 2	29

1. The context of resettlement and land reform

Land and its control are major political and economic issues across the developing world. Distribution of land is strongly influenced by history and economics. In many parts of the world current land distribution is the result of historical processes by which ruling elites have seized large areas of land from small-scale farmers. In Namibia this was initiated under German colonial rule and continued under South African rule until approximately 43% of Namibia's land area was controlled by white settlers. A long-running economic debate has raged over whether this is efficient and what action governments should take, if any. Governments in several African countries, most notably Kenya, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa have decided that redistributing land (commonly known as land reform) to poorer members of society will be a way to both reduce rural poverty and reverse historical injustices. Redistribution of land has been a common government policy across Asia, Latin America and to a lesser extent Africa during the past 50 years.

Two broad models of land reform exist. The most common, as implemented in Namibia and Zimbabwe, is to resettle people on land bought by the government. Less common, but gaining acceptability internationally, is the market-based model by which the government provides finances and services (such as agricultural extension) to allow people to buy land themselves and establish small farms. This is being piloted at present in Brazil, Colombia and South Africa. Since market-based approaches to land reform in South Africa have only recently been initiated, there is little evidence from the region to compare this new approach with the more traditional resettlement schemes.

The Namibian government instituted a land reform programme in 1990. This aims to resettle people on both communal land and on commercial farms bought by the government and hence improve the quality of life of the resettled communities by provision of land for settlement and agricultural practices. The main target groups so far have been ex-combatants, the San community, landless people, the disabled and retrenched farmworkers.

2. Findings

The aim of this section is to draw out the main issues pertaining to resettlement in Namibia as

identified in the case studies of the resettlement projects.

Specific criteria were used to characterise the case studies in order to achieve clarity and ease of assessment (Appendix 1). However, during this process it was observed that descriptive characteristics were intricately linked and could be narrowed down to a number of common issues. This discussion collates the descriptive characteristics from the case studies and concludes with the issues which are fundamental to the successful implementation of resettlement at the case study projects. Implications of these findings are discussed in section 3. This discussion leads to recommendations (presented in section 4), which are intended to enhance the strengths and mitigate weaknesses of the resettlement programme as identified by the study.

2.1 Progress since 1990

In the immediate post 1990 period, which saw the establishment of the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, the resettlement of people on farms and communal land occurred without any supporting legislative or policy framework. Milestones in public debate have been the 1991 National Land Conference and the 1994 People's Land Conference. The Resettlement Policy was approved in 1996, and the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act in 1995. Increased funding was announced for land purchase in 1995, with the commitment of N\$20 million a year (Werner, 1997). Progress in acquiring land for resettlement has increased since then (Table 1).

Table 1 – Farms purchased for resettlement

Period	No. of commercial farms purchased	Percentage
1990–5	17	43%
1996–7	22	57%
Total	39	100%

The primary objective of the redistribution of land to the landless has been relatively successful so far with the resettlement of about 16,000 people, of whom about 2,000 have been resettled on former commercial farms (Shanyengana, 1998).

The Land Policy which was passed by the National Assembly in April 1998 confirmed government's commitment to land redistribution. It emphasises that future purchases of commercial farmland will focus on buying blocks of land, or land adjacent to communal areas.

The land tax, which was provided for in the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, will be introduced and is likely to make land much cheaper by inducing sales by many farmers who are not farming profitably. Lastly, the provision for community tenure, amongst other types, will provide a legal framework within which to transfer land to settlers.

The final legislative components, namely the Agricultural Communal Land Reform Act, the Amendment Agricultural Commercial Land Reform Act (which aims to simplify the process of allocating land for resettlement) and the Resettlement Act are expected in the near future.

2.2 Dependency on government provision

The success thus far of Namibia's Resettlement Policy to “*uplift the living standard of all Namibians*” is questionable on the basis of the evidence presented in this report. Contrary to the policy's aim of creating self sufficiency among the settlers within a 5 year period, continued dependency of the majority of registered people on government provisions, such as food and clothing, was apparent.

Many of the problems raised by both settlers and administrators of the projects pertain to difficulties encountered by them in attempting to comply with the objectives of the resettlement policy, while satisfying individual needs. The majority of poorer settlers continue to rely on provisions from the government.

However, many settlers are unable to improve their standard of living, due to circumstances beyond their control. This, however, does not mean that settlers are unable to provide for themselves. Many strategies are employed on the schemes to suit local changing requirements and individual aspirations. Problems arise when these strategies conflict with the objectives of the schemes. The following discussion presents examples of the complex and interconnected nature of such strategies and conflicts. It should be emphasised that the issues and linkages among them are by no means mutually exclusive but have, for purposes of clarity, been presented as separate discussions.

2.3 Alternative income generating strategies

Apart from government run income generating activities such as the sale of produce from communal gardens and small scale knitting and sewing projects, no formal strategies for the

generation of income for individual gain are evident on the schemes. Limitations associated with a lack of access to income are expressed by settlers as an overriding constraint to self-sufficiency. Major social implications are evident in the lack of money necessary for such requirements as school fees, medical emergencies, transport, supplementary food, house furnishings and financial security for the future, to mention but a few.

One of the consequences is the domination and exploitation by “those who have” over “those who need”. This is evident in cases both within the settler community, and between settlers and entrepreneurs not registered with the projects. Situations occur where goods and services which are difficult for poorer settlers to access are provided at unrealistic prices by the more affluent.

The below-average financial situation of many of the settlers is exacerbated by institutionally imposed regulations. Food for Work, the system on which most schemes are based, serves to preclude the potential for gainful employment of the settlers. Requiring that the settlers spend a substantial amount of time on the scheme for communal activities with minimal financial reward (the system observed on the majority of schemes visited during the study) prevents individuals from becoming economically independent. The applicability of the Food for Work scheme to the specific resettlement projects is complex and involves a number of other dimensions. Thus, it cannot be categorically stated that the system itself is inappropriate. The manner in which it presently operates on many of the projects, does, however, appear to be detrimental to the improvement of general living standards of the settlers.

Another factor contributing to the lack of interest in government projects is the control of the process by those in positions of power. Marketing of the products of most government projects is typically controlled by project administrators. Apparent confusion by many settlers over allocation of profits from the sales, instils mistrust, anger and ultimately disinterest in continuing with the project. This socio-economic environment has led to the resettlement schemes becoming an accessible source of cheap labour for surrounding farmers. Settlers resort to employment which provides below average salaries and benefits in order to supplement their income.

The sustainability of the resettlement process relies to a large extent on the ability of settlers to

become financially independent. As discussed above, some factors inherent in the implementation of the resettlement process on certain schemes may prevent, rather than encourage, sustainability.

2.4 Government services

It should be emphasised that these are not unanimous feelings expressed by settlers about provisions on all projects. Complaints often referred only to certain aspects of provisions. Some examples of general dissatisfaction include complaints that:

- the food is not nice/sufficient
- no furniture is provided for the houses
- houses are too hot or do not have enough rooms
- water, diesel and/or transport provisions are insufficient
- food rather than money is received for working.

Examples of disuse and abuse of services and provisions include the fact that:

- many of the partially-constructed houses remain incomplete
- theft or damage of materials and equipment or infrastructure occurs.

It is not possible to determine from such a restricted research period the reasons for the above circumstances or even whether the explanations given by either the authorities or the settlers are valid. What is clear, though, is the exacerbation of the problems by the lack of tenure security or rights of ownership. This contributes to low motivation levels to contribute to communal activities such as working in communal vegetable gardens or, in some cases, the completion of houses.

Uncertainty over specific rights of the settlers was observed. Both settlers and administrators were often unclear as to specific allocation of plots, lease and activity requirements and project objectives. The unwillingness to invest time and effort in activities on many of the schemes is closely associated with insecurity of ownership rights. Personal benefit from such communal activities is limited, particularly when there is a lack of a sense of community on the projects. Often the manner in which these activities are managed (settlers are supervised rather than

encouraged to take initiative) further serves to decrease incentives. Such uncertainty frustrates attempts at self-improvement and runs counter to the stated objectives of the resettlement policies.

The settlers do not possess formal documentation which specifies the rights they have over their land. It is not necessary that the settlers be given full private ownership, but rather that they are certain of their rights and have a written document which can be used as security. Agribank will consider lending to people with long term leasehold agreements.

2.5 Use of natural resources

The primary natural resources relied upon by the resettlement schemes visited are wood, water and pasture. There are many facets to this issue. From a purely technocratic view, there is a general absence of monitoring, evaluation and control of the use of natural resources, particularly on the more established schemes visited. Access to these resources also involve complex socio-political issues such as:

- The lack of community-based maintenance of facilities on most schemes
- Limited ownership of certain resources by those who most use them limits responsibility for misuse or overuse.

Some strategies associated with the use of specific natural resources may be linked to further issues on the resettlement schemes and are discussed below.

2.5.1 Water

Although it was not possible to determine the extent of water usage on the projects many complaints emerged citing the lack of availability of water as a major limitation to self-sufficiency and the failure of crops. As an arid country, such climatic constraints to activities are to be expected. Issues surrounding access to water on many schemes reflect social circumstances such as the theft of equipment and lack of community-based water management systems.

2.5.2 Pasture

Exceeding the carrying capacity of the land in terms of overgrazing does not appear to be a

constraining factor on the resettlement projects. This could be attributed to the relatively low numbers of livestock owned by the majority of settlers as well as the relatively recent establishment of some of the schemes visited. Further, the fact that the schemes are developed on previously established farmland makes it difficult to determine how much of the environmental impact is due to resettlement. The lack of clarity and control over rights of the “grazers” is an important issue on the schemes. Grazers include residents who are not registered with the projects but who have generally obtained permission to graze livestock on this land.

3. Discussion of findings

Most problems are related in some way to the lack of empowerment of the settlers due to the top-down approach of the majority of schemes visited.

The failure of most of the settlers thus far to achieve self sufficiency is aggravated by the imposition of an inappropriate “development” system on them which completely disregards not only their wants and needs, but also existing skills and abilities to provide for themselves.

Inherent in any development process is the underlying assumption that the existing situation is inadequate. Blaming this situation on social and cultural deficiencies of those constrained by it, serves only to lower confidence levels and further alienate the poor from the rest of society. This is particularly pertinent to the dominating approach of government employees, adopted in aspects of the resettlement process evident on most of the schemes visited. A number of underlying institutional trends were observed during the research. These common issues are relevant to the approach or manner in which the resettlement process is implemented, and may, if amended, contribute to the greater possibility of a sustainable resettlement process. These are discussed below.

Many of these institutional shortcomings of the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR) are already recognised by the ministry itself. Steps have recently been taken to train staff, further involve settlers in decision making and improve transparency.

In many cases, it is not possible to determine single underlying causes of the problem issues due to the complex and interconnected nature of the issues. However, the discussion below attempts to link the issues of resettlement and to provide possible solutions to problems encountered. The amalgamation of information used for this section was gathered from the case studies, observations, interviews and literature review.

3.1 Co-operation and co-ordination of institutions

Co-operation between, and co-ordination within, the various sectoral line ministries at all levels greatly increases the chances of a successful implementation process for resettlement.

The same is true of co-operation between governmental organisations and non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations.

The degree of fulfilment of formal activities outlined in the Resettlement Policy, with respect to the various roles required by different ministries is unclear. A certain amount of co-operation between these various sectors appears to exist (both formally and informally) on a regional and local level.

Where clear co-operation does exist, the results have generally been extremely positive. A good example is the Excelsior resettlement scheme which operates on the basis of co-operation between an international donor agent, EPTISA and the MLRR. Further examples include the provision of education, health and agricultural services on or near some resettlement schemes. Problems encountered with provision of services generally relate to the manner and regularity with which they are provided or the costs of using them. For example the lack of income presents an obstacle to school children who are denied access as fees charged by the individual schools cannot be paid or school uniforms cannot be bought.

Vasdraai is also an example of co-ordination between government and NGO's, in that NANGOF has been involved in consultation with settlers and the government prior to the settlement of people on the farm.

Resettlement shares some common goals with areas of interest such as rural development, education, agriculture, environment, water and health. Since the ministries involved have agreed to the Resettlement Policy they should make clear budgetary provisions to support resettlement schemes, and enhance co-operation. Similarly duplication of effort could be avoided if organisations in resettlement projects communicate and share information and experiences. For example, although veterinary services provided to livestock owners on the schemes record the number of livestock present, no attempt is made to adhere to the carrying capacity on the farms.

A lack of co-operation and integration is evident between ministries at national level. Further, repercussions of the control of the resettlement process primarily from the level of central government are most felt at the specific programme and project implementation of schemes.

Repercussions from this approach include lack of maintenance and repair of boreholes, inappropriate agricultural training, and increased marginalisation of settlers due to insufficient and irregular goods and service provision. The lack of support for resettlement from partner ministries also contributes to this.

Opportunities to improve the situation exist in the forthcoming decentralisation of the government as well as increased encouragement of community-based management projects so that those most affected have the power to improve their situation. This would go a long way to promoting self-sufficiency as well as considerably reducing the overwhelming workload of the MLRR.

3.2 Communication links

Communication is integral to all aspects of resettlement. In order for planning, co-operation and co-ordination, participation and capacity-building to be effective, communication between all parties involved is essential. Communication problems are evident at the various levels between:

- settlers themselves
- settlers and local, regional and national authorities
- different levels of the MLRR
- other involved ministries.

Communication problems between the settler communities on the schemes are compounded by linguistic social, cultural, and economic differences. Increased awareness of these differences would improve the situation somewhat, as would a representative community committee to which settlers could go to settle disputes or problems. This is however, a complex topic involving a range of socio-political factors not exclusive to problems of resettlement.

Channels of communication on the schemes, especially for complaints are often not clear or are perceived as not working. This limits interaction between settlers and authorities. Language is often an additional obstacle to clear communication between the settlers and authority figures. The situation is often worsened by both cultural and gender insensitivity on the part of both authorities and settlers. Whether or not they are justified, preconceptions and

judgements based on differences preclude understanding and co-operation.

Reflections of this lack of communication are evident in the over-simplified justifications often given by authorities for failures of government activities on the schemes. This regularly manifests itself as a perception of the culture or attitude of the settlers as being lazy and ungrateful or that they are simple, unadaptable or traditional. This derogatory view limits the likelihood of settlers expressing their concerns and resignation over problems and contributes to the lack of motivation.

Relatively effective verbal communication seems to exist at various levels within the MLRR in day to day activities. Dissemination of information followed by appropriate actions does not however, appear to function optimally. Instances of this include the lack of implementation of recommendations made in reports on some of the schemes written by employees of the MLRR itself. In addition lack of information may prevent employees of other ministries from being aware of their intended role in resettlement programmes.

3.3 Consultation and participation

Improvements to the resettlement process, with respect to prior consultation with settlers, are evident on the more recently established schemes visited, especially the Excelsior and Vasdraai case studies. Certain aspects of participation, particularly on Excelsior and Vasdraai are also improving.

Given the country's climatic, social and economic constraints, there are limitations to the range of activities that can be undertaken. Activities of the settlers on most of the schemes are still prescribed by the ministry and strict control over certain activities is maintained. Examples of this include control over:

- agricultural methods such as what crops to plant and when to plant them
- income generating activities such as knitting, sewing, brick-making and agricultural schemes, marketing of the products and in many instances control of the proceeds
- distribution of goods and services such as the Food for Work scheme
- type and amount of training or capacity enhancement of the settlers, such as agricultural training

- housing design and sometimes housing location.

Settler participation in the decision making processes is rare. Instances in which participation does occur have the potential for a far greater increase in the standard of living of the settlers. Previously mentioned issues such as dissatisfaction with government provisions and a lack of motivation, have the potential to be mitigated through increased consultation and participation. However, a major limitation in the approach to resettlement on the schemes visited remains. This is the lack of choice available to the settlers in terms of alternatives or complements to the agriculturally based resettlement programme. These include access to alternatives such as jobs in urban areas. There is awareness of the limitations to the MLRR's present approach to resettlement and the situation is apparently under review (Kandjii, pers. comm.)

Most problems are related to the immediate meeting of basic needs and therefore the opportunity to develop an ability to meet future needs is neglected. Clerks see themselves as supervisors who have to control the schemes and do not seem to encourage the settlers as decision-makers or right-holders.

3.4 Planning

Due to the political and social urgency of land reform, the planning of the resettlement schemes in some places has been on an ad hoc basis. The chances for the successful implementation of a policy increase when strategic policy goals are converted to measurable objectives with allocated responsible functions within realistic time frames. At present, much confusion exists on implementation issues resulting in *ad hoc* management and decreased efficiency. Of all the resettlement schemes visited, only Excelsior, a project with strong MLRR support as a pilot, has a management plan and is operated according to longer-term, yet relatively flexible objectives. Monitoring and evaluation of the success of the resettlement schemes forms an essential part of planning future schemes. An agreement presently exists between the MLRR and NANGOF to evaluate some of the schemes, which presents a useful opportunity for an independent assessment of the resettlement programme.

3.5 Capacity enhancement

The MLRR recognises the lack of capacity within their institution and is, with assistance from

foreign aid organisations such as IBIS and ITC, in the process of addressing such weakness. At a project level, capacity enhancement of both the MLRR administrators and the settlers through participation and effective communication rather than imposed training methods promise to increase the likelihood of achieving the goals of the resettlement policy. Capacity enhancement with respect to human resource skills and technical skills is required at all institutional levels. This would go a long way to reducing conflicts arising from social and cultural differences and may improve the co-operation and communication on the projects.

3.6 Conclusion

Given the legacy of inequitable land distribution in Namibia, the government has instituted a resettlement programme to rectify this imbalance and thereby alleviate poverty. Because of the political urgency of the land issue, an *ad hoc* approach to resettlement has been followed in the schemes which were undertaken in the years immediately following Independence. As a result, implementation has not always been carried out with adequate planning or capacity.

Although the objective of land redistribution has been addressed to some extent, the manner in which it has been implemented, and the long term nature of resettlement programmes means that success in addressing aims such as poverty alleviation is difficult to assess. To an extent this depends on how poverty is defined. Most residents of resettlement schemes expressed gratitude for being resettled, hence poverty has been alleviated in the sense that their livelihoods have been improved. However whether long term objectives of development are met will require more analysis over a longer period of time.

4. Recommendations

The recommendations in this section are based on the conclusions of the research undertaken as described in sections two and three and the main report. The limitations of extrapolating the results of five specific case studies (as described in the main report) to the policy level are acknowledged and taken into account.

In order to achieve the long term success of resettlement in Namibia it is necessary that the priorities, goals and government policies be reviewed in terms of the aims they wish to achieve. The government currently does not have a consistent method of comparing policies across the sectors, partly as a consequence of having limited information on the value of different approaches to development in Namibia.

In reviewing government policy, it is imperative that the realities and challenges which face resettlement in Namibia be acknowledged. Namibia has an arid and harsh climate which makes crop farming a difficult and risky (if not impossible) occupation in most areas. The increasing price of water for irrigation means that in many areas only livestock production will be feasible.

4.1 Strategic environmental assessment

All developments need to be assessed at a strategic level in order to consider alternatives to, and the mitigation of, impacts on the environment and the people that are potentially involved. The most strategic level at which to make decisions is that of policy and legislative development. This is because strategic decisions provide the opportunity for the consideration of the widest range of alternatives (Hansen, *et al.*, 1997).

The consideration of alternatives can be done by means of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). In Namibia such strategic issues are usually dealt with at project level by feasibility studies. Strictly speaking, an SEA should consider the 'no go' alternative. Similarly feasibility studies, such as those undertaken recently for the Epupa and Möwe Bay projects, must establish whether the project satisfies a minimum economic rate of return, usually set at 8% or 10% in Namibia. Resettlement projects by their very nature are long term and, due to the lack of information on pre 1990 schemes in Namibia, assessing the long term benefits is

not yet possible. One appropriate approach is to quantify the costs per household for different schemes to facilitate easier comparison of the benefits produced. This is done below, showing the gross costs to the government (e.g. what must be paid now to establish resettlement schemes) and the net costs (taking into account planned cost recovery).

Table 2: Costs of resettlement

Scheme	Gross cost per household (N\$)	Net cost per household (N\$)
Namatanga/ Elandsput	122,667	34,945
Klein Huis	212,000	44,468
Stilte	148,500	45,869
Vasdraai	10,000	10,000
Excelsior	187,673	187,673
Gam	79,670	79,670

See Appendix 2 for derivation of these estimates. Note that all of these are on commercial farms except Gam.

These projects compare favourably to many large capital intensive projects undertaken by the government. Further analysis would be needed to assess how they compare to other livelihood generation strategies. What stands out though is the much lower costs of the schemes such as Vasdraai and Namatanga, due to their limited costs beyond land acquisition, and the degree of cost recovery they are attempting. In addition it appears that they are cheaper than a project on communal land such as Gam.

Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy (1995) states that all listed policies, programmes and projects, whether initiated by government or the private sector, should be subject to the established Environmental Assessment procedures. "Human resettlement" is defined as a listed activity in terms of the policy. The Environmental Management Act which is intended to give legal effect to this policy, is currently in the draft stage (For more details see Research Discussion Paper 28). Strategic environmental assessments under the Act will not be done as stand alone studies, but rather involve broad stakeholder participation in the policy and legislation formulation process, as has already occurred to some extent for the Resettlement Policy and the Land Policy.

4.2 Assessment of the resettlement programme

Resettlement in Namibia has political, economic and social benefits in terms of returning land to the landless in order to alleviate poverty. However, the success of resettlement is constrained by a number of limitations inherent in the policy. These limitations pertain to:

- **what** resettlement is trying to achieve
- **who** resettlement is intended to benefit
- **where** resettlement is to take place.

4.2.1 Aims of the Resettlement Policy

The policy needs to specifically state its aims and the manner in which it intends to achieve them. This means setting measurable objectives and targets, the time frame in which these objectives and targets should be achieved and the accompanying responsibilities of departments and divisions. It is important that targets be process oriented rather than product oriented. Settlers should be involved in the setting of targets such as the rate at which houses should be built.

4.2.2 Target groups

The policy needs to be more specific about target groups to be resettled. Currently there is a wide range of target groups each with a diversity of needs. The policy identifies the San as the group most in need of help, and yet the case studies have shown that their needs are not being adequately addressed and in some cases they are being further marginalised.

4.2.3 Selection of Areas for Resettlement

The “Agricultural Potential Assessments” carried out by the Land Use Planning Unit of the MLRR for some of the resettlement projects are useful and appropriate.

It is recommended that these assessments take place before, and not after, a farm has been bought. The recommendations of these assessments should be taken into account and in areas unsuitable for crop farming resettlement in its current form is not recommended.

4.2.4 Tenure arrangements

The policy is not clear on the forms of tenure that are expected to be established, however it

seems that individual tenure arrangements are to be promoted. There are however certain natural resources which should not or cannot be subdivided such as water and grazing land. Studies across southern Africa that have compared the efficiency of “ranch” systems and “communal” systems have consistently found “communal” systems to be more productive (Scoones ed. 1995: 12). Hence tenure should support the key characteristics of these systems which are flexibility and mobility.

The new land tenure system for Namibia, currently being developed by the MLRR will contain new legal options for rural areas, including forms of tenure that may be appropriate for resettlement schemes. It is recommended that these options be considered.

4.2.5 Framework Approach

The policy is very general and while this allows for a broad and flexible approach to resettlement, it does not give much guidance in terms of practical implementation of the resettlement programme. The flexible nature of the policy is important in terms of responding to the variety of conditions within Namibia and a rigid policy would not be practical.

It is recommended that a framework approach in terms of provision of guidelines for resettlement be adopted.

This framework would not dictate the exact manner in which resettlement should be implemented, but could include options on tenure, services and infrastructure, appropriate technology, housing and sanitation, land use and agricultural practices. The options could be made available in the form of guidelines.

The framework approach would necessarily promote a ‘bottom up’ approach as decisions would be taken at a local level rather than imposed from ‘above’. One option could be, that when a resettlement scheme is started, the community could be given a 'shopping list' and a finite 'budget' to which they could assign their highest priorities and in so doing participate in decisions which affect them.

4.3. Institutional issues

4.3.1 Capacity

The MLRR acknowledges its limitation in terms of capacity and has implemented a number of

capacity building programmes to improve technical and planning skills.

It is recommended that these programmes be continued and in expanded to include a more holistic approach to human resource development. Management, interpersonal and conflict resolution skills should be included in the programmes.

4.3.2 Communication and co-ordination

Inter-ministerial communication was identified as a major weakness in the successful implementation of resettlement.

In order to facilitate better communication it is recommended that:

- **Clear channels of communication and procedures for communication be established**
- **Regular meetings between ministries should be arranged**
- **Reports should be regularly produced and distributed to the relevant ministries to indicate progress and share information**
- **Reports should be available to the public in order to improve the transparency and accountability of ministerial actions**
- **Reports by partner ministries should also be produced to show how they are assisting the resettlement process.**

4.4.1 Project level-Environmental Impacts

Both policies and programmes, as well as projects with regard to human resettlement are subject to an Environmental Assessment according to the National Environmental Assessment Policy.

With this in mind it is recommended that the Environmental Assessment Procedure as stipulated in Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy (1995) be carried out on all government farms prior to the resettlement of people. Farms which are being considered for purchase should also be subject to such scrutiny. Where resettlement schemes are already in existence it is suggested that an evaluation be conducted to identify current problems.

It is recognised that conducting a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for each farm would greatly increase the costs of resettlement and would require an increased capacity in terms of manpower. For this reason it is suggested that a 'pre-feasibility' study or Initial

Assessment be undertaken. This Initial Assessment would indicate whether significant impacts were expected or if the environment is unsuitable for the anticipated development. If significant impacts are identified during the Initial Assessment, a full Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out.

In terms of an Initial Assessment (or evaluation where a resettlement scheme already exists) it is recommended that the following issues be addressed:

The biophysical environment

- wood and water usage
- bush encroachment
- biodiversity loss
- desertification.

The socio-economic environment

- types of people to be resettled
- ethnic relations
- specific needs of the settlers
- opportunities for settler participation in the resettlement process
- access to services and infrastructure
- types of training required by settlers
- skills of settlers which could be utilised on the project
- ability to enhance nearby resettlement schemes.

Alternatives and appropriate technology

- Appropriate technology and alternatives in terms of housing, pumps for boreholes, agricultural equipment and crops, and waste management.

Mitigation measures

- The Initial Assessment or Evaluation should provide mitigation measures to minimise any negative environmental impacts of the resettlement project.

Monitoring and evaluation

- The Initial Assessment should set up a baseline of information for the purpose of monitoring and evaluation. Information should include data on rainfall, carrying capacity, vegetation cover, borehole water levels, water quality and erosion.
- Where resettlement projects are already in existence, it is recommended that studies be done to monitor and evaluate the project so that, where necessary, mitigation measures can be implemented to minimise environmental impacts and maximise the chances of success.

Carrying Capacity

- It is recommended that carrying capacity of farms be established and reviewed on a regular basis. This will facilitate effective management of natural resources on these farms. Livestock control would be much easier and self enforcing if the carrying capacity is determined.

Management plans

- The Initial Assessment or Evaluation must lead to the development of a management plan. It is necessary that this management plan be flexible enough to allow for changes at later stages as well as include participation by settlers.
- The management plan should contain an agricultural plan for the farm with measurable objectives and targets and the means to achieve them. Participation of settlers should be encouraged in the setting of targets and objectives.
- The manager/caretaker of the farm must have the necessary skills/training to be able to implement the management plan. This does not require that they are agricultural experts, but rather that they can communicate with and motivate the settlers.

4.4.2 Role of Managers/Clerks/Caretakers

It is recommended that at each individual resettlement project the role of managers and clerks be tailored to suit the needs of that particular project.

As a general recommendation, the role of these officials should be that of facilitation (in a similar way to an extension officer) rather than management or supervision so as to encourage a “bottom up” approach to decision making as well as to encourage settlers to take charge of their situation.

It is further recommended that official supervision and management be eventually phased out so that settlers can be increasingly empowered to take charge.

4.4.3 Participation and Empowerment

Empowerment of settlers through participation in decision making needs to be encouraged.

It is recommended that participation be improved via:

- **regular meetings initiated by both settlers and officials**
- **consultation before decisions are taken, for instance in layout of the houses, house design, types of crops to be grown**
- **promoting flexibility in terms of the options available to settlers**
- **where applicable, skills other than agricultural skills should be recognised and utilised. For example, some settlers have mechanical skills which could be used for maintenance and repair of equipment.**

Settlers' committees at resettlement schemes should be fully representative of the community in terms of ethnic groups, sex and age groups, since these committees are intended to represent the community as well as facilitate participation in decision making processes. There is potential to co-ordinate committee training with the Community Based Management of Rural Water Supply training of waterpoint committees.

It is recommended that:

- **committees should have voting powers in terms of decisions and should not be purely advisory**
- **the clerk (or any other government official) can not be a member of the settler's committee.**

4.4.4 Education and Training

Participation and empowerment can be achieved or enhanced by prioritising education, adult literacy and skills training. In addition to this settlers need the opportunity to use their initiative and to take control of, and responsibility for, the resettlement projects.

It is recommended that considerable focus be placed on developing the management, financial and marketing skills of the settlers if the projects are to develop into commercially successful ventures which are sustainable in the long term. It is recommended that training be in the form of 'hands on' practical training and not just by demonstration.

5. Related research recommendations

5.1 Rights of farm labourers

A substantial number of settlers on the resettlement projects seem to be displaced farm labourers (i.e. who have lost their jobs and hence their homes), thus increasing the numbers of people who apply to be resettled. This was especially evident at the case study farms in the Gobabis region.

It is thus recommended that further research be undertaken into securing the rights of farm labourers.

5.2 Food for work programme

The manner in which the Food for Work Programme is currently operating on many of the case study schemes appears to be detrimental to the improvement of general living standards of the settlers. The Programme was initially intended as a drought relief mechanism with a finite time span, and was adopted by the National Resettlement Policy with the stipulation that food for work be terminated after five years of each resettlement projects' initiation. At Tsintsabis the programme is still running and there is evidence that it has created a degree of settler dependence on the government, constrained settlers in the choices that they could make and to some extent, reduced the incentive to become self sufficient.

It is recommended that research be conducted into the necessity of this programme and mechanisms for implementing it more efficiently.

5.3 Tenure options

It is suggested that further research be conducted into other tenure options, including communal tenure and group tenure options, individual tenure, and a combination of individual and communal tenure - for instance, individual plots for crop gardens and communal tenure for grazing land.

5.4 Target Groups

Further research into the specific needs and behaviour of target groups is needed to alleviate poverty on an equal basis.

5.5 Credit for settlers

Settlers have difficulty obtaining credit because of their high risk of default.

- Research needs to be undertaken into the possibilities of developing joint ventures between credit organisations and the Namibian government in order to provide financial assistance to settlers. An example already exists in the Ministry of Agriculture's Northern Livestock Development Programme's arranging for small numbers of goats to be handed over to the poorer members of communities to allow them to become self reliant.
- The options of NGO assistance be considered (e.g. the Namibian NGO RISE).
- Close attention should also be paid to the South African Land Bank's scheme of making very small amounts of money available to settlers and allowing them to build up a positive credit rating. If this is successful a similar model could be applied in the Namibian context.

5.6 Economic costs of resettlement

A prerequisite to research into the economic costs of resettlement is that increased transparency, monitoring and record keeping is required in order to make the necessary information available.

It is essential that a more accurate figure of the cost per person can be obtained for resettlement projects. This should include land purchase costs, capital and running costs of the resettlement projects and the operational costs of the resettlement division of the MLRR. This will allow more accuracy in assessment of the different types of schemes that are being undertaken.

REFERENCES

- Hansen, G et al. 1997
Early Strategic EAs: Three case studies. Proceedings of the IAIAsa conference on Integrated Environmental Management in southern Africa: The state of the art and lessons learnt. September 1997.
- NAPCOD, 1996
Policy factors and desertification - analysis and proposals. Namibian Programme to Combat Desertification, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia, Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Windhoek. 127pp.
- Republic of Namibia, 1995
Namibia's environmental assessment policy. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek. 17pp.
- Republic of Namibia, 1996
The National Resettlement Policy. Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, Windhoek. 18pp.
- Scoones, I 1995
Living with uncertainty: New directions in pastoral development in Africa. Intermediate Technology Publications, London, UK. 207pp.
- Shanyengana, M 1998
An overview of resettlement in Namibia. Paper for a workshop on resettlement, Windhoek 6-7th July 1998. 30pp.
- Werner, W 1997
Land reform in Namibia: The first seven years. Namibia Economic Policy Research Unit, Windhoek. 17pp.

Appendix 1: Assessment Criteria: Example of the main study findings from Drimiopsis

Assessment of Drimiopsis in terms of the Criteria

1. Assessment of Policy-related Criteria at Drimiopsis

Policy-related Criteria	Discussion
<p>Achievement of policy's aims and objectives in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poverty alleviation • self sufficiency within five years • achievement of the political goal of access to land • employment through full-time farming • integration of settlers into the market economy • access to credit via documentation of secure tenure 	<p>The lack of formal, regular access to income is the main factor limiting the achievement of poverty alleviation at Drimiopsis and one of the main roles served by the camp is that of a transitory location for settlers between part-time jobs. Poverty alleviation with regard to the satisfaction of basic needs is achieved on Drimiopsis to the extent that settlers are regularly provided with food parcels, shelter, water, basic health and education facilities. There is no regular access to clothing. Many settlers however, remain on or just above the poverty line.</p> <p>Initially as a temporary resettlement camp, and more recently a transitory camp, the main purpose of Drimiopsis was not to assist settlers to achieve self-sufficiency. However, some settlers are now permanent residents on the camp and have not achieved self sufficiency in the six years on the camp as they still rely on the government for the goods and services presented above.</p> <p>Some of the previous settlers of Drimiopsis have been relocated to farms such as Skoonheid, and have therefore achieved access to land. However, some settlers have been waiting for six years to be relocated from Drimiopsis.</p> <p>Employment through full-time farming has not been achieved at Drimiopsis. Many of the residents are relatives of farm-workers who work part-time on farms in the region.</p> <p>Settlers are integrated into the market economy only through assistance of the clerk who is responsible for the marketing and sale of produce from the communal garden. Projects attempting to achieve this aim, such as sewing and knitting projects for women have been discontinued at Drimiopsis.</p> <p>Access to credit via documentation of secure tenure has not been achieved as none of the settlers have received written contracts with regard to their tenure at Drimiopsis.</p>

2. Assessment of Socio-economic Criteria at Drimiopsis

Socio-Economic Criteria	Discussion
Written advertisement and application procedure	Advertisement of the application procedure was not a topic broached with the settlers interviewed, however, settlers waiting to be relocated from Drimiopsis had completed MLRR application forms.
Security of tenure in terms of unchallenged access to and use of land	Due to the size of the camp, settlers at Drimiopsis had restricted access to land for purposes of agriculture. Individual properties seemed to be limited to small plots with housing. Use of these plots is unrestricted in terms of allowing the settler to choose whether and what crop they want to plant.
Use of settlers' skills for their benefit as well as for the benefit of the project	Settlers were required to work in the communal garden, however, maintenance of services and infrastructure is done primarily by government employees. Awareness of illnesses such as TB and Malaria is taught by the mobile clinic as are basic methods of treatment. In all other respects activities of settlers in terms of requirements on the camp are supervised by the clerk. Education is encouraged on the project which teaches pupils certain skills such as literacy.
Access to services and infrastructure	Access to School is provided for some of the younger settlers. Access to water is limited due to the general lack of water in the region. Permanent toilet facilities are under construction at the camp. Access to permanent electricity, transport, security and health facilities is problematic for the settlers at Drimiopsis. A shop is located near the camp.
Settler expectations which match the government's ability/willingness to provide	Evidence that the expectations of settlers exceeded government provisions included general discontent of the settlers with provisions such as food, housing, and water provision amongst others.
Access to supplementary forms of income and employment opportunities	Access to supplementary forms of income and employment opportunities was problematic to determine at Drimiopsis due to the transitory situation of many of the settlers at the camp. Self-help projects on the camp are irregular in nature and fail to provide any income. Proceeds from the communal garden are not distributed directly to the settlers. Further income is provided by part-time work on neighbouring farms.
Strong community links	There is a community committee at Drimiopsis but its representation can be questioned by the negative views expressed by some settlers. The fluctuating numbers of people at the camp reduces community cohesion and violent crime is common at the camp.

3. Assessment of Institutional Criteria at Drimiopsis

Institutional Criteria	Discussion
Communication and co-ordination between institutions	Communication between institutions at a regional and local level appeared ineffective in that one borehole pump had been broken for a long time. Security at the camp was low and crime was a problem.
Participatory decision making	A small amount of participatory decision-making was evident at Drimiopsis in that the community committee was consulted in deciding what to do with proceeds from the communal garden. However, as the chairperson of the committee was the MLRR clerk, the degree of this participation is questionable.
Transparency and accountability	The MLRR representative at Drimiopsis appeared open and willing to provide information where possible. Constraints of the inability to provide certain of information were admitted, and was attributed more to a lack of coordination than lack of transparency. Most questions posed by the research team were answered. The same was true of teachers at the two schools at Drimiopsis.

4. Assessment of Biophysical Criteria at Drimiopsis

Biophysical Criteria	Discussion
Location of resettlement project on land suitable for crop farming	The area surrounding Drimiopsis has little to no suitability for crop farming, and livestock is suggested as the land which is suitable for crop farming, and livestock is the preferred alternative.
Biophysical assessment prior to land acquisition	No known biophysical assessment was undertaken prior to the purchase of Drimiopsis
Agricultural background of settlers	Most of the male settlers at Drimiopsis were previously displaced farm workers. The extent of their agricultural knowledge or experience is undetermined by the research team.
Monitoring of resettlement project	No monitoring is done of the Drimiopsis resettlement project
Carrying capacity	The carrying capacity of Drimiopsis is undetermined as no agro-ecological study has been done specifically for Drimiopsis
Clerk's agricultural experience	The clerk at Drimiopsis had attended agricultural training, but the extent of his experience was unknown.
Suitability of farming activities for the land	Large scale farming activities were not present at Drimiopsis. Seeds and an agricultural plan were provided by the MLRR at a national level, therefore the suitability of farming activities can be questioned.
Utilisation of appropriate technology	An effective irrigation system was in place in the communal garden at Drimiopsis. No tractor was used for the garden due to its size and layout.
Functional design of houses and other structures such as boreholes and pumps	Housing designs were based on standard prefabricated and brick houses provided by the MLRR. No attempt was made to enhance the design according to settler needs. Water points from which settlers obtained water was inappropriate and contributed to water loss due to the lack of a tap. Limited technology was available for the irrigation of individual gardens.

5. Assessment of Sustainability Criteria at Drimiopsis

Sustainability Criteria	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of the quality of settlers' lives 	<p>In terms of access to basic facilities, land and education, settlers believed that their lives had been improved. Problems cited, however remained at the level of the satisfaction of immediate needs. With regard to self-determination and ability to exercise choice over their future, settlers appeared restricted and their ability to maintain the quality of life imposed by the project is questionable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of social self determination 	<p>The promotion of social self determination has not been fulfilled at Drimiopsis as the settlers are still “administered” by a government official and are limited in terms of being able to exercise freedom of choice over most aspects of their lives.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation skills training and capacity enhancement 	<p>The schools at Drimiopsis theoretically provide access to capacity enhancement project. However problems discussed in the description of the case study reveal that full advantage of these capacity enhancement facilities is not being taken by the settlers for various reasons, most of which are beyond their control. Further skills training is provided for the promotion of health, however, in terms of improving the settlers chances of obtaining income from skills, training is limited.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate design of buildings and infrastructure 	<p>Building and infrastructure could be improved at Drimiopsis in terms of consultation with the settlers to determine what their needs are, or encouraging the settlers to take responsibility for providing their own facilities with assistance in the form of training and materials. Much of the infrastructure does not make use of the most environmentally appropriate technological option, for instance, water points lack a sealing facility, and water is lost.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of earth's vitality and ecological diversity 	<p>This criterion is not being achieved at Drimiopsis in that no monitoring and evaluation of any kind is done at the camp. Further, no baseline data exists for Drimiopsis for analysis of the current environmental condition of the camp. The presence of large numbers of people on the limited space available at Drimiopsis does not fulfil this criterion, particularly as the population relies primarily on natural resources for the provision of basic needs such as wood for fuel.</p>

Appendix 2: Derivation of cost estimates for Table 2

The figures in Table 2 have been derived in the following way:

Namatanga, Elansput, Klein Huis and Stilte future revenues to the government from rent have been discounted over a 50 year period to a present benefit. This has then been subtracted from the gross costs to give a net cost, which is then divided by the number of households. Gross costs are derived by adding the value of the land for each plot.

Vasdraai: A cost to the government of N\$810 000 of purchasing Vasdraai has been assumed, split between 81 families equals N\$10 000 each. However the land probably cost more than this, and is probably insufficient at present. Hence a more realistic estimate might be substantially higher, possibly giving a gross value of N\$50 000 per household. Deeds Office data could not be used due to absence of cross referencing of the farm records to the transactions data.

Excelsior: Farm purchase costs from the Deeds records have been inflated to January 1998 prices using the GDP deflator index and then added to the cost of the project itself. The total has been divided by the 14 families on the project. The purchase of more land as planned by the project would probably lower these costs substantially.

Gam: The N\$39 million quoted in NDP1 has been divided by 2986 people quoted resettled in page 35 of the main report. This has then been multiplied by the average of 6.1 people per household for rural Namibia (National Household Income and Expenditure Survey 1993/4).