COMMUNITY FOREST ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT IN NAMIBIA

A BRIEF ASSESSMENT AND A WAY FORWARD

Stig Johansson
Team Leader
Namibia-Finland Forestry Programme

BACKGROUND

Achievements in CBNRM

Community Forestry (CF) activities have been started from the beginning of the establishment of the Directorate of Forestry. At present the DoF is engaged in developing community forestry activities and in the process of declaring community forests at 29 sites in seven regions covering a total of 1.39 mill. ha. (Table 1).

Table. 1. Number and size of community forest activities by region.

DOF Admin. Region	Political Region	CF sites (no.)	Beneficiaries (no.)	Size (ha)	Mean area (ha)
NORTH-EAST	Caprivi	9	20,000	90 075	10 008
	Kavango	9	6,950	224 500	24 944
	Otjozondjupa	2	6,856	221 161	110 581
Sub-total		*20*	*33,810*	*535 736*	*26 787*
NORTH-WEST	Oshikoto	2	2,816	5 879	2 940
	Ohangwena	2	12,800	76 096	38 048
	Omusati	2	183,050	280 800	140 400
	Kunene	3	6,000	492 448	164 149
Sub-total		*9*	*204,666*	*855 223*	*95 025*
GRAND TOTAL		29	238,476	1 390 959	
Mean			8,223	47 964	

Some of the sites are purely community forestry without any other community based natural resource management (CBNRM) activities, such as existing or emerging conservancies, overlapping. Others are sites, either complete or partly over lapping, where conservancies are established and community based forest management is developed.

Although an impressive effort, the most striking feature is that despite a very long time of development activities **no community forest has yet been officially declared** in Namibia. While at the same time, starting from February 1998, a total of 29 conservancies covering an area of 7.4 mill.ha have been registered (Table 2) and a considerable number are emerging.

Table 2. Total number of sites, members and size of registered conservancies.

Region	No. of sites	Size km²	Size ha	Registered members
Caprivi	5	1 716	171 600	8 618
Erongo	2	8 828	882 800	1 098
Hardap	1	95	9 500	20
Karas	2	4 495	449 500	924
Kunene	16	39 358	3 935 800	5 969
Omusati	1	1 437	143 700	25 000
Otjozondjupa	2	18 123	1 812 300	1 534
TOTAL	**29**	**74 052**	**7 405 200**	**43 163**

While there are many similarities between the two CBNRM activities there are also distinct differences in approach.

Legal rights

One major difference in approach between the two CBNRM activities is regarding the legal declaration. In a simplified way one could say, that in conservancies the focus has been on registering them quickly before detailed development planning takes place. While in the community forests the approach has focused on extensive consultation and planning before application for declaration.

The former approach has lead to a great number of registered and emerging conservancies in a reasonably short time with wide public support and media coverage. The major advantage is that the communities have been given with legal rights, with all the incentive this provides, before they get involved in, sometimes time and resource consuming, development work.

In the community forests, the communities have been involved in developing the process over sometimes an almost unbelievably long time frame. It has taken on average about 33 months but frequently between 40 and 60 months. The longest time taken so far is in Okongo, where 107 months – almost nine years have been spent without completing the declaration.

It is very difficult to estimate how much time and money has been spent by government and donors but it certainly is substantial amount. What is much more alarming is the amount of time and money spent by the communities, without a single sign of benefit from this activity so far. Many of these communities are probably very poor and could perhaps have used their time much more productively in agricultural or other income generating activities. – An example of these futile and confusing efforts is the woodlots and the women groups at Uukwaludhi, where the prospects for recovering any of the efforts and costs, especially the inputs from the community members and the women, are very bleak or highly un-likely.

Beneficiaries

A second major, probably the most important difference between the two approaches relate to the beneficiaries and the benefits.

The conservancies are managed by a registered association consisting of registered members. These members may, and in many cases are, only representing a fraction of the communities with traditional rights to the conservancy area. Neither the Amendment of the Nature Conservation Ordinance nor the regulations make any specific mentioning of requirements of representation of the overall community interests. Neither is there an explicit requirement for members to be residents with rights to the communal land in question. Furthermore, there is an age limitation to the membership. In theory this means that the beneficiaries of the conservancies no not necessarily represent the entire population within the conservancy area who have traditional rights to that land. – However, in many of the conservancy constitutions the requirement for members to be residents with rights to the land has been included. Nevertheless, this does not change the situation regarding beneficiaries.

The amendment of the Ordinance provides the rights to wildlife and has pawed the way for community based tourism development, primarily based on the wildlife. Both of these are "new" development opportunities with limited linkages to traditional subsistence resources and entitlements. Hence, the restriction of benefits to the registered members can be justified by the interest of those who wish to engage in new development opportunities.

In conservancies the rights and benefits are transferred to members of the conservancy. This, and the management interventions the conservancy members adopt, may lead to exclusion of people who have the traditional rights to the resources and land. Care must be taken to ensure, that if rights to "development opportunities", such as wildlife and tourism, is extended to cover a broader range of resource rights of primarily subsistence nature, such as forestry, NFFPs, and grazing, and possibly *ex-post* as suggested in the draft Parks and Wildlife Bill, the larger community is not excluded from their traditional entitlements and benefits.

By contrast the Forest Act requires that the body, with which the Minister signs the agreement on management rights and provides for the creation of a community forest, must represent the interests of the persons who have rights over that communal land.

This paper provides an analysis of where CF has gone wrong and why has the performance been so meagre? Below some of the issues and possible improvements are discussed below.

LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

One reason for the delay of the declaration may be that the legal provisions for the establishment of community forests made in the Forest Act (No. 12) were provided as recently as 2001. Furthermore, the drafting of regulations for the Forest Act, including those concerning declaration of community forests, were delayed and started only in 2004. However, the policy and strategic plan, including the draft of the act, were already available in the mid-late 1990's and hence all but the legal declaration could have been in place at the time of the promulgation of the Forest Act.

Moreover, the Forest Act is quite specific about forest management and the classified forests, such as the community forests and, although the regulations could have added more clarity, the lack of these should by no means have been a major obstacle to declaration. The political support to CBNRM and the process developed by the conservancy registration and management should have provided a sufficient model to use or adapt to community forests.

Presently a joint consultancy by NFFP and CFNEN has been commissioned to draft a set of priority regulations, including those dealing with community forestry. The consultants are supported a drafting team consisting of the Director, Deputy Director, two Chief Foresters, the NFFP CTL and the CFNEN Co-ordinator. The most urgent regulations regarding community forestry cover the following areas:

1. The application process and forms required to make application to be declared as a community forest;
2. The approval process for the Minister to declare an area to be a community forest together with a model approval certificate;
3. Guidelines as to what must be included in the constitution of a community forest management authority;
4. A model constitution (to be annexed to the regulations);
5. Guidelines as to what must be included in a management plan for a community forest;
6. A model form to be completed in furnishing a management plan (to be annexed to the regulations);
7. A reporting/monitoring system for community forests;
8. A model form to be completed in respect of reporting/ monitoring (to be annexed to the regulations); and
9. The powers and functions of honorary forest officers; and a model accreditation form for honorary forest officers.

However, DoF must still decide what should be included in the regulations, and hence become legally binding, and which aspects should be left for guidelines on community forestry. The latter allow for more adaptive flexibility based on the experience from implementing community forestry, while the former are more rigid and difficult to change. A guiding principle in this decision should be not to over-regulate.

ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The Forest Act requires the DoF to maintain a national forest inventory which, among other things, should contain the total number of community forests, the area covered by the CF's, as well as a record of the management plans.

Presently the process of establishing community forests lacks clear leadership at DoF. There is no clear decision on the administrative responsibilities within DoF. There is no clear established procedure and hence information is scattered and handled by various DoF sections and stakeholders of the process both at the DoF-HQ as well as in the regions. This needs urgent attention for a number of reasons. – The declaration of a community forest contains a legal decision regarding the access and the modalities of use of resources within a community forest. As several of the proposed sites are at the stage when an application will be submitted to the minister, there is urgent need to ensure that all the documents which will be part of that legal decision will be found and are filed and readily available. Secondly, it is urgent to ensure that all such steps, which are required by legislation and regulations, are fulfilled. Such issues may be to explicitly clarify the role of the communal land boards, the regional councils, the traditional authority, the role and rights of non-resident users or of neighbouring communities or holders of titles to free-hold land neighbouring the community forest.

Since a number of sites are about to be submitted for declaration it is utmost urgent that a check-list of the documents and steps required is drawn up to avoid confusion at the stage when the minister will have to make his decision.

The declaration is a legal process and will contain decisions on rights and obligation regarding the resources and their management. It will influence anyone with intention or aspiration to use the resources within the CF. Hence a clear procedure of handling of information and documents must be established in order to avoid possible legal conflicts at a later stage.

Presently (mid-February), after almost 10 years of work, there is no single file opened for the community forests at DoF-HQ. The only file existing is on Okongo Forest, and not because it is a community forest but because it is a separate project funded through GTZ. Hence, if there is any documentation on community forestry it may appear under the specific projects, NFFP, CFNEN, DANCED etc. There is an urgent need to develop a system for filing documentation on the establishment of community forestry at the DoF HQ.

Further, instructions on filing procedures with regard to community forestry must me drafted. All original documentation required or generated in the process, especially with regard to the legal as well as to the management and monitoring requirements, must be submitted and filed at the DoF HQ. Copies of this must also be established at the Regional HQ for those community forests established in the specific region and a similar filing system for the districts.

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY BASED FOREST MANAGEMENT

There is a relatively long period of work with communities and community forestry in Namibia and an even longer perspective on CBNRM and conservancies. Experiences from work with community forestry have been presented in a range of issues papers, reports (e.g. Salinas & Helenius 2001), tool boxes (CFNEN, in prep.) etc. However, none has lead to guidelines for the community forestry process, which would have been approved by the DoF. Consequently, the process, procedure, methods etc. look different from site to site and actor to actor. The result is also that neither the professional staff nor the communities have a clear idea what should and could be done and what the implications are for different stakeholders.

This becomes increasingly problematic as the process comes closer to the application for declaration. This decision will have obvious legal implications regarding management of forests or woodlands and the forest based resources found within the boundaries of the community forests.

The long delays in the progress and the uncertainties regarding responsibilities, even within DoF, are in fact a reflection of the lack of clarity of the process and the lack of clear leadership and assigning of responsibilities. – It is clear that unless DoF makes community forestry one of it's core areas and gives this programme the required attention the way forward will be as winding and slow as in the past.

A good model which could be used is Tanzania, which was visited by a group of DoF staff and advisors in December 2003. Tanzania experimented with community based forest management over a long period in the 1980' and 1990's. In 1998, the new forest policy was adopted, the Forest Act was promulgated in the early 2000 and the regulations of the act are

now in the final draft form. – The whole process involves a very strong devolution of powers of forest management to the communities. Based on the past experiences and the new framework two guiding documents have been prepared, which may serve as an example for Namibia.

"The framework for participatory forest management" (FBD 2003) is a 45 p. document presenting the policy, legal, and institutional framework including the roles of the central government, regional and district authorities, as well as the role of village institutions. It presents the different approaches to participatory forest management, including the management of private and state forests. It also presents some lessons and finally outlines key implementation principles, modalities and activities.

The second document "Community-Based Forest Management Guidelines" is an 86 p. document giving the background to CBFM, outlining the process in bringing forests under community management, and finally provides a tool box on with examples of simple appraisal tools, useful records for forest managers as well as the planning and legal frameworks for community forest management.

A similar set of guidelines is urgently required in Namibia, both to assist professional staff working with community forestry, as well as the communities and other stakeholder involved in these processes.

This could be done e.g. by commissioning a consultancy to prepare the guidelines. The consultant should work with a group of professional staff from DoF, NFFP, CFNEN, and the CBNRM Unit. The aim should be to have the guidelines by end of 2004. This would set the stage for the coming years of work in the community forestry programme. Since the CFNEN-project will continue for another 8 years it could undertake to review and update these during the latter part of the programme period.

MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND RESOURCE INVENTORIES

The interpretation of the Forest Act, especially those regarding the requirements for a management plan and the information on the forest produce found within the proposed community forest, has been very rigid. Thus a full scale forest inventory and management plan has been seen as a pre-requisite for the application. Both are very expensive and time consuming to produce and presently the resource inventories and management planning has become a stumbling block for the whole declaration process.

Resource inventories

Especially the high cost of the inventories is a problem. These cannot be done without external assistance, since the GRN budget for SNT's are sufficient only for about three months of the year. Also the fact that they do not necessarily address the actual resource management needs of the communities is a problem. The use of the woody resource inventory (Laamanen & Verlinden 2002, Laamanen 2003) approach speeds up the work but still costs are too high for the government to sustain the activity. The slow process of preparing consultative management plans also increases the time spent in establishment and declaration.

The forest inventories have been based on sound inventory methodology, which produces sufficient information and an accurate picture of the growing stock. The focus has been on a very detailed stock-taking. However, there are serious doubts that this information will ever be sufficiently used to guide management or to monitor the changes of the resource over time. The costs-effectiveness of generating this information is probably also highly un-satisfactory.

Management means controlled use or action. With regard to the community forests it should mean sustainable and controlled use of the woody and non-wood forest resources by the communities. Sustainable means that the resource will be providing at least an equal amount of required and preferred benefits over time. Controlled use means that the managers, in the case of community forestry - the communities, will be able to detect trends in the provision of benefits. In a simple and pragmatic way this means that they will be able to say if the supply of e.g. preferred forest foods or fuelwood, is diminishing, remains the same as in the past or is increasing or improving.

Thus the **focus on the whole concept of management of community forests must shift from stock-taking to monitoring of use.** The main aim is to develop simple, locally used monitoring tools which help the communities to detect the trends in resource availability. However, the necessary compliance reporting to government must also be included.

The process should have three main thrusts:

1. A general resource assessment should be done, which preferably provides an opportunity for long-term monitoring of the vegetation. This can e.g. be done by the use of remote sensing or adaptation of the woody resource monitoring, since the management units are relatively large (at present about 47,000 ha). The results should be both the boundary map and the vegetation map of the community forest. The information provided is the forest cover and the volume and biomass of the woody component (both among the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management). This will also provide a basis for cheap long-term (5 – 10 years) monitoring.

2. A set of simple monitoring modules should be developed, which will enable the communities to monitor the resources or management activities. Some resources are high priority and appear in almost any community forest, while others are varying either depending on the environment or because of specific preferences by different communities. Regarding the first category, standardised monitoring methods can probably be developed, such as those developed as part of the conservancy "Event Book" (Stuart-Hill *et al.* 2004) (Appendix 1). The Desert Research Foundation has developed similar monitoring modules for the purpose of desertification monitoring (NAPCOD, undated). The other "non-standardised" set of modules, depending of the site specific needs, will have to be custom made during and as part of the management planning process.

3. Finally a method of dealing with commercial forest harvesting and use has to be devised. Commercially interesting species are found in many community forests. There should no reason why they or the possibility to use them would differ from the hunting of game (such as elephants) by the conservancies. However, the method of establishing the level of the resource, the sustainable use and the setting of harvesting quota needs to be developed. Where stands appear in concentrated habitats this is not difficult. In more uniform habitats, where commercially interesting species may be

evenly distributed, the difficulties in conducting cost-effective resource inventories are apparent. The way to deal with this requires careful consideration. One main line to consider would be to rely even here on less exact stock-taking and local monitoring. The other would be to develop an inventory method, where the main discussion should be on the requirements for accuracy and the method for monitoring.

Management planning

There are a number of draft guidelines and models for management planning of which presently the draft prepared by Laamanen and Otsub (2002) is used to guide the process. There are also a number of draft plans at various stages of development, however, again none has been approved by DoF or reached an official status.

There is also great variation in structure, contents and quality of the plans, some of which are of very poor quality. Generally, there is also too much focus on the descriptive elements of the plans or the forest inventory chapters (generally taken directly from the inventory reports) at the cost of the parts dealing with management. Especially crucial issues, such as management objectives, the community level institutional arrangements for forest management and benefit sharing, the management interventions or actions, and particularly the monitoring must be developed.

Furthermore, the development of the comprehensive plan takes too long and delays the declaration process. – It will be necessary to develop a shorter (max 2-4 pages) "Provisional Management"-plan, which provides and specifies the area, the management objectives, the institutional arrangements and benefit sharing, a resource description, outlines general management interventions or actions and a one-year work plan, which could include the preparation of a comprehensive management plan. The application for declaration should also specify that a comprehensive management plan should be prepared within one year of declaration. This should either be included in the Forest Act Regulations or the CBFM Guidelines. Furthermore, management plan models have been developed for conservancy use, which could serve as models to adapt for use in community forests.

Monitoring management

The main focus of the management planning should shift to developing and determining monitoring methods. These should be defined by and for the users/managers but also keeping in mind the required compliance reporting to government or development partners.

The "Event Book"-model, developed for and used by the conservancies, could be used and adapted when developing a model for community forest management. Alternatively the forest management issues could be incorporated in the "Event Book"-model, so that it would provide a basis for comprehensive natural resource monitoring within lands under registered or declared community management.

MONITORING THE COMMUNITY FOREST ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS

Until recently there has been a rather poor understanding of where we are in the process of the establishment of community forests. No proper national monitoring system has been in place, nor is anybody clearly tasked with the responsibility to monitor and pursue the process despite

the fact that CBNRM or CBFM is of very high political priority in the MET. Moreover, although the management planning is part of the establishment process, the sheer number of plans being simultaneously developed calls for a system to monitor the planning process as well. This would become particularly important if the regulations would include a one-year condition as part of the declaration.

A simple, Excel-based monitoring and reporting framework, which allows a general overview of the situation and progress has been developed (Appendix 2). This also allows an analysis of possible bottlenecks in the procedure. This framework should still go through a final review of the structure and of the data in the table. Also a definition of the data criteria needs to be done to ensure consistency of reporting. This should come in use from the 2004/2005 financial year onwards.

A similar, simple Excel-based monitoring table has been drafted to monitor the management planning processes. However, this requires further work. Since it will mainly serve internal DoF use, the FMPU should finalise it, so that also this will be in use from the next financial year.

CONCLUSION AND ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

General

There is an urgent need for change. The focus must be on getting the community forests declared as soon as possible. The whole process must be quickly developed towards simplicity and clarity. Focus must be on local empowerment by providing legal rights, institutional arrangements, procedures, and management and monitoring tools which are robust and easy to use at the community level. Finally, the ultimate objective must be to support local economic development, income generating activities and employment creation. ⟵ key question: what do forests offer the objects?

Legal and regulatory framework

The regulations must be quickly put in place. During the process of the drafting of the regulations decisions have to be made on which elements should be included in the regulations and which should be included in the guidelines. The responsibility to address this issue should be with the drafting team and be made and completed by end of March when the draft regulations should be finalised.

A checklist of the documents, which will be attached to the application and processes, such as the registration of boundaries, which must be completed for declaration of community forests should be completed by mid-March, and possibly included in the regulations.

The role of the Communal Land Boards and any other possible legal obstacles and issues, which may influence the declaration, should be determined and identified. This could be e.g. the role and rights of neighbours, or the situation with overlapping conservancy and community forestry boundaries which could lead to legal complications during or after declaration.

Issues that should be resolved are for example what will be done in situations where the boundaries of conservancies and community forests are 1:1 or where there is partial overlap?

What will be done with the difference of rights between the community forests (those who reside are beneficiaries) and the conservancies (those who are members are beneficiaries)? What will happen if the aspiration to expand the mandate and rights to resources in the new Parks and Wildlife Act is included in the act.

Administrative and institutional framework

A clear decision on who is responsible for the Community Forestry Programme at DoF with concrete "terms of reference" must be made urgently. This should be followed by a clear definition of the responsibilities of those within DoF, whether at HQ or in the regions, who deal with or contribute to the process of the establishment and management of community forests.

Guidelines on Community Forestry in Namibia, using existing models from Namibia and elsewhere e.g. Tanzania, should be prepared.

DoF must decide on a clear administrative procedure and a "filing system", including administrative instructions of what should be filed, where and by whom during the establishment process.

The simple process monitoring system should be finalised. The structure should be agreed, the data criteria defined and the data should be checked. Data on beneficiaries must also be incorporated.

Resource inventories and monitoring

Change focus from stock-taking to monitoring management. Someone should be contracted to develop a set of standardised, simple resource monitoring modules to enable the managers and users to detect trends (decreasing, no change, increasing) in resource availability.

Device a method to prepare a coarse inventory based e.g. on remote sensing or a combination of RS and field inventory work, such as the Woody Resource Inventory. The purpose is to generate a general baseline against which to monitor ling-term change in a cost-effective manner. Secondly, to produce a general forest cover map with cover and biomass information for the brief management plan attached to the application.

A procedure for carrying out resource inventories and assessments has to be drafted. A consultant could be hired to present a proposal for a cost-effective system, particularly for establishing quota for commercial use of forest resources (timber).

Management plans and planning

There must be a shift from academic, descriptive plans to simple, easy to understand and use community focused management plans. Such models are found both in Namibia and elsewhere. The plans must be focused on concrete objectives, institutional arrangements, rules and regulations and on management and resource monitoring.

Someone should be contracted to develop a local administrative, management and monitoring system, including the necessary tools based on existing models such as the e.g. the Event Book-system.

The structure, format and standards for content of the brief management plan to be attached to the application must be developed by the end of March 2004. The present guidelines for forest management planning must be revised soonest.

The monitoring system for the management planning process must be finalised and taken in use.

Other issues of importance

There are many other important and difficult issues that should be addressed. Such issues are e.g. benefit sharing arrangements within community forests, the local community based and managed permit arrangements and how these are enforced and monitored. How to initiate and stimulate local economic development activities geared at income generation and employment creation. The local community based and managed permit system is urgently required, since along with the declaration, the permit system will empower the communities to manage and use their resources.

How will an integrated CBNRM approach look like in the present central government set-up? What about in a possible Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife? How will it look like in a decentralised set-up?

Nevertheless, unless some (hopefully most) of the 29 emerging community forests are legally declared soonest the credibility of the Directorate of Forestry and the MET, including the efforts made in the Community Forestry Programme will be at stake. What is more worrying is that this endless process may soon politically backfire because of the unrealised expectations of the communities and efforts made by them so far. This could, in the worst case scenario, also have implications for the whole CBNRM process in Namibia.

References

Laamanen, R. and M. Otsub. 2002. Guidelines for preparing a forest management plan in Namibia. — *Namibia-Finland Forestry Programme, Directorate of Forestry and Indufor Oy, Windhoek and Helsinki.*

Laamanen, R. and A. Verlinden. 2002. Manual for Woody Resource Monitoring System. — *Namibia-Finland Forestry Programme, Directorate of Forestry and Indufor Oy, Windhoek and Helsinki.*

Laamanen, R. 2003. Supplement to the manual of woody resource inventories: considerations for community forest inventories. — *Namibia-Finland Forestry Programme, Directorate of Forestry and Indufor Oy, Windhoek and Helsinki.*

NAPCOD. undated.

Salinas, C. and E. Helenius. 2001. Guidelines on integrated forest management planning for communal lands in Omusati Region. — *Namibia-Finland Forestry Programme, Directorate of Forestry and Indufor Oy, Windhoek and Helsinki*

Stuart-Hill, G., D. Ward, B. Munali and J. Tagg. 2004. The Event Book System: a Community Based Natural Resource Monitoring System from Namibia (draft).

Appendix 1.

Monitoring Modules
that have been developed for the Event Book system

The following modules (containing data collection and reporting tools) have been developed for the event book system. Not all of these have been implemented in the field and some have not yet been pilot tested. They are all, however, ready to be implemented should any conservancy wish to do so.

More modules have been developed than have currently been implemented in the field, one for every topic that has been identified by various communities across the country. The modules that currently have been developed are as follows:

Problem animal incidents
Poaching
Predator encounters
Rare and endangered animals
Fence monitoring
Water point monitoring
Flooding and river levels (for flood plains conservancies)
Rainfall
Wildlife sighting during fixed foot patrols
Wildlife mortalities

Trophy hunting
Wildlife harvesting
Livestock mortality
Livestock theft
Livestock condition
Fishing effort
Fish catch trend
Long-term vegetation change
Seasonal grass grazing assessment
Wildlife re-introduction

Appendix 2. Status of establishment of community forests in Namibia by February 2004.

No	Areas	Size (ha)	Letter of consent	Signing Agreem. of FMCs	Establ. of FMCs	Approval of FMC Constit.	CF border Demark.	CF border approval	Forest invent.	Soc.-econ. survey	CF mgmt plan Comm.	CF mgmt plan DoF	Approval of CF by-laws	Submis. to MET	Declar.	Total time** months	Not
Responsibility:			C	C & DoF	C	C		DoF	DoF	DoF	C	DoF	C	DoF	MET		
NORTH-EAST																	
Caprivi Region																	
1	Salambala conservancy	14,000	09/2000	11/2001	01/2000	04/2000	10/1999	12/1999	05/1997, 04/2000	12/2000			02/2002			82	Do
2	Kwando conservancy	19,888	12/2001	02/2002	09/2002	11/2002			06/2003	12/2003			12/2001			27	NFF
3	Sikanjabuka CF	4,927	06/2001	08/2001	10/2001	04/2001			10/2002	02/2003	05/2003		04/2003			33	NFF
4	Zilitene CF	10,000	07/2003	05/2001	05/2001											34	NFF
5	Bukalo (pilot area)	770	03/2001	11/2000	06/2001	03/2001			11/2001	06/2001			08/2002			40	CFNE
6	Lusese (pilot area)	260	06/2002	11/2000	06/2002	06/2001			11/2001	11/2003			08/2002			40	CFNE
7	Kabbe (pilot area)	230	08/2001	08/2001	08/2001	09/2001			11/2001	10/2001			08/2002			31	CFNE
8	Masida CF	20,000	11/2003	05/2003	08/2001	08/2001			12/2003	12/2003			08/2002			10	CFNE
9	Lubuta CF	20,000	12/2003	12/2003	05/2003	08/2002										3	CFNE
	Sub-total	*90,075*														*33*	*Mea*
	Mean	*10,008*															
Kavango Region																	
10	Hans Kanyinga CF	27,000	04/2003	11/2002		01/2003	01/2003		03/2003	10/2003			04/2003			16	NFF
11	Ncaute CF	11,500	11/2003	08/2003			12/2003		06/2003	10/2003	12/2003					9	CFNE
12	Gcwatjinga CF	20,000	11/2003	01/2004				05/2003								4	CFNE
13	Ncumcara(Mile20)CF	10,000	11/2003	06/2003	09/2003	06/2003										9	CFNE
14	Ncamagoro(Mile30)CF	25,000	11/2003	09/2002	10/2002	08/2003			09/2003							18	CFNE
15	Mbeyo CF	50,000	11/2003	10/2003	10/2003	06/2003										9	CFNE
16	Cuma CF	12,000		01/2004	01/2004											2	CFNE
17	Likwaterera CF	10,000	02/2002	01/2004	01/2004											13	CFNE
18	Katope CF	59,000		12/2003	12/2003					01/2003						3	CFNE
	Sub-total	*224,500*														*9*	*Mea*
	Mean	*24,944*															

No.	Name	Area										No.	Code
19	**Otjozondjupa Region**												
20	M'Kata CF	80,000	12/2003								01/2003	61	CFNE
	Nyae Nyae Conservancy	141,161	10/2003	04/1994	02/1999	12/2003	06/2003	08/1995	04/2003			61	Do
	Sub-total	*221,161*											
2	*Mean*	*110,581*										*61*	*Mea*
	NORTH-WEST												
	Oshikoto Region												
21	Oshaampula CF	719	08/2002	11/2000	06/2002	04/2001	10/2002	06/2002				66	DO
22	Ohepi CF	5160	08/2002	11/2000	06/2002	02/2001	08/2002	10/2002	07/1999	12/2002	06/2002	66	DANCE DO
2	*Sub-total*	*5,879*											DANCE
2	*Mean*	*2,940*										*66*	*DANCE*
	Ohangwena Region												
23	Ekolola CF	578	10/2002	11/2000	05/2001	10/2002	10/2002	07/1999	03/2003	06/2002		66	DO
24	Okongo CF	75,518	04/1996	12/1999	12/2000	04/1996	10/2000	03/1997; 12/2000	04/2003	12/2000		107	DANCE DOF,GT
2	*Sub-total*	*76,096*											
2	*Mean*	*38,048*										*87*	*Mea*
	Omusati Region												
25	Uukolonkadhi CF	133,000	01/2002	03/2003	03/2002	05/2002	06/2002				09/2003	26	NFF
26	Uukwaludhi CF	147,800	08/1996	08/1999*	11/2003	08/1999	09/1999*					91	NFF
2	*Sub-total*	*280,800*											
	Mean	*140,400*										*59*	*Mea*
	Kunene Region												
27	Ehirovipuka Conservancy	197,843	N/A	07/2002	01/2000		12/2003				01/2001	50	NFF
28	Omatendeka Conservancy	181,505	N/A	07/2002	11/2000		12/2003				04/2003	40	NFF
29	Okangudumba Conservancy	113,100	N/A	03/2003	03/2001						07/2003	36	NFF
3	*Sub-total*	*492,448*											
	Mean	*164,149*										*42*	*Mea*
29	**GRAND TOTAL** **MEAN AREA**	1,390,959 46,980										33	Mea

* Honorary Foresters
** By February 2004