

RESEARCH DISCUSSION PAPER

Number 24

October 1997

Parks and Resident Peoples
Linking Namibian Protected Areas with local communities

by

Brian T. B. Jones



Directorate of Environmental Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Private Bag 13306
Windhoek, Namibia

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Aim of this paper	1
1.2 A new paradigm for protected area management	1
1.3 Parks and Resident Peoples in Namibia.	2
1.4 The need for a Namibian policy	4
2. New approaches, new names	6
2.1. ICDPs, CBC, CBNRM, co-management, partnerships and People and Parks, Parks and Resident People	6
2.2. What's in a name?	10
3. Rationale for involving resident peoples in the establishment and mangement of protected areas	11
3.1. Practical concerns	11
3.2. Ethical concerns	12
4. Approaches to Parks and Resident People Programmes	13
4.1. The beneficiary approach	14
4.2. Compensation and substitution	17
4.3. Buffer zones	18
4.4. Support zones and the 'engine of growth' approach	20
4.5. Participatory approaches	21
5. Towards a Resident Peoples and Parks Policy and Strategy for Namibia	22
5.1 Developing tools for a Parks and Resident Peoples approach	22
5.2 Conclusion	29
6. Proposals for a "Parks and Resident Peoples" Policy for Namibia.	30
6.1. General policy	30
6.2. Proposals for "People living in Parks" policy for Namibia.	32
7. Implementation.	34
References	35



Parks and Resident Peoples

Linking Namibian protected areas with local communities

1. Introduction

1.1 Aim of this paper

The aim of this paper is to document and analyse international approaches to protected area management which involve resident peoples¹, and to use this analysis to propose practical approaches which the Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) can include in the development of its own 'parks and resident peoples' policy and strategy.

1.2 A new paradigm for protected area management

The IVth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas held in Venezuela during 1992 concluded that "human communities, especially those living in and around protected areas, often have important and long-standing relationships with these areas. Local and indigenous communities may depend on the resources of these areas for their livelihood and cultural survival." Further, protected areas "cannot co-exist with communities which are hostile to them. But they can achieve significant social and economic objectives when placed in a proper context. The establishment and management of protected areas and the use of resources in and around them must be socially responsive and just." (IUCN 1993: 35).

These statements are an indication of the shift in international approaches to protected area management which has taken place over the past 15 years. This shift has been well documented (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992, Hales 1989, IIED 1994, Wells and Brandon 1992, Western and Wright 1994,). In summary, the new approach recognises that in the past the creation of protected areas to save wildlife and conserve biodiversity, usually ignored the legitimate needs and interests of people. The creation of protected areas has often led to the removal from the land of resident human populations. These dispossessed peoples were then denied access to resources within the protected areas which they needed for their own

¹ A number of different terms have been used to refer to people living in and around protected areas, including 'local communities', 'neighbours', and 'traditional societies'. I follow Brechin et al (1991: 6) who use the term 'resident peoples' to refer to "those individuals, families, and communities - 'traditional' or 'modern' - that occupy, reside in, or otherwise use, on a regular or repeated basis, a specific territory within or adjacent to an established or proposed protected area." This definition has the value of not making judgements about what is 'traditional', of being more specific than the broad term 'local' and of including people who live within protected areas. The term 'neighbours' emphasises the separation between parks and people with its connotations of 'outside' and 'next to'. Terminology that includes the possibility of people living within parks is more appropriate for the analysis and policy proposals which follow.

livelihoods. This 'alienation' of local people from their land and resources has in many cases led to hostility against protected areas by neighbouring communities. The negative attitude of local people has been exacerbated in situations where animals which consume crops, kill and eat livestock or threaten human lives cannot be contained within protected areas. In many cases the protected area philosophies which have been introduced to developing countries reflect 'eurocentric' notions of conservation and are not rooted in indigenous cultures. Protected area conservation is therefore linked to colonialism and imposed foreign cultural norms. Past protected area management strategies have relied heavily on para military anti-poaching measures to keep out people who were seen solely in terms of a threat to wildlife and wild habitats. The new approach to protected area management recognises that in order to legitimise the setting aside of land for wildlife and biodiversity conservation, local people need to benefit from parks and game reserves. Protected areas should not be run as islands isolated from what goes on around them, but should be integrated with local economies and land uses, helping to promote local economic development. Some conservationists believe that local people neighbouring parks and game reserves should be involved in key decisions concerning the establishment and even management of protected areas.

1.3 Parks and Resident Peoples in Namibia

Over the past 15 years, conservation authorities in Namibia have taken a mixed approach to the issue of people living in or near protected areas. Some attempts were made to modify the old 'island' approaches to protected areas, while in other cases the presence of people within particular protected areas was largely ignored.

Two game reserves, Khaudom and Mahango in the Okavango Region were given to the pre-independence Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreation Resorts by tribal authorities on the understanding that a percentage of park entry fees would be returned to the community. At first this revenue was paid to the former ethnic Administration for the Kavango people, which was based some 200 km from the two reserves. There was no obligation by the Kavango ethnic authority to spend the money in the communities where the parks had been proclaimed and with the Independence of Namibia in 1990 and the abolition of the ethnic administrations, the system fell away. Prior to Independence, the conservation authorities in some areas allowed certain species from game reserves to be killed occasionally to provide meat for traditional feasts.

At least two attempts have been made in Namibia to establish new protected areas in which the resident people would not be removed, but would live within the park. During the early 1980s the Directorate of Nature Conservation and Recreation Resorts proposed the establishment of a national park in the eastern Bushmanland area, now eastern Tsumkwe District, in north eastern Namibia. The local San people would have been able to remain within the reserve carrying out small-scale subsistence cattle farming and dryland cropping. The proposals were turned down by the pre-independence administration following pressure from a development NGO and foreign politicians who argued that the San would lose their land rights if the proposal went ahead (Jones 1996).

A more participatory approach to including resident people within a protected area was demonstrated during the late 1980s in the proposals for the proclamation of a new game reserve

in the former Kaokoland in what is now Kunene Region. The proposed park management plan made provision for Himba pastoralists to remain within the proclaimed area, continuing with their normal economic activities. The resident people would sit with conservation officials on a joint management body for the park, and be in the majority. Tourism fees and income from consumptive use of wildlife would be channelled to park residents and the park would be zoned to provide for different forms of recreational activity and to keep tourists away from areas sacred to the Himba (Eyre et al 1989).

The proclamation of the proposed Kaokoland Game Reserve was turned down by the post-independence government because Cabinet members did not fully realise the differences between the new proposals and an old style game reserve. Cabinet sources also indicated that the uncertainty over land reform had made Ministers reluctant to turn over large pieces of land to conservation when their constituents were crying out for more land. The park was intended to be a 'contractual' park with a contract signed between the Government and the residents, although the nature of the contract was never fully spelt out and no draft contract was developed.

The proposals for a national park in the former Bushmanland and a contractual park in the former Kaokoland represented a significant departure from the traditional approach to protected area management in Namibia. The proclamation of these areas would have represented important additions to the existing protected area network. However, it is not so clear that proclamation would have been in the interests of the resident peoples. Neither then nor now does existing legislation provide for categories of protected area within which people remain resident or for which a contract can be signed with resident peoples. The rights and involvement of local people would have been included in park regulations, which can be easily changed by government, and the people would have been left subject to the whim of government officials. It is not at all clear whether, under either set of proposals, the people would have retained their land rights.

During 1991 a number of concerned conservation officials from the Etosha National Park began contacts with neighbouring communities who had lost land due to the proclamation of Etosha or who were suffering from problems caused by animals which left the park and moved through neighbouring communal land. These contacts resulted in a report to MET head office recommending that a workshop be held to develop a strategy for improving relations with park neighbours (Vinjevoold 1991). Head office response was that such a workshop should wait for the results of the pending National Land Reform Conference and the workshop was subsequently never held.

The theme of improving relations with the communal neighbours of Etosha was also developed in proposals made to USAID for a large and ambitious project to investigate the decline of ungulate species in the park. The study was linked to the possibility of enabling game numbers to increase so that a surplus would be available to spill into neighbouring communal areas as a source of meat, to increase tourism potential and so that game ranching and wildlife-based cottage industries could develop (Venzke and Lindeque 1994).

Since independence, personnel of the Wildlife Protection Service in Etosha have been encouraged to develop good relations with neighbouring communities and carry out extension work in addition to their anti-poaching activities. The park veterinarian has provided ad hoc services to neighbouring communal area livestock farmers as part of a good neighbourliness approach.

During 1996, President Sam Nujoma showed interest in the return of species such as wildebeest to the communal areas to the north of Etosha and requested the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to develop a project to investigate the return of wildlife to these areas (Berry 1996). Some initial activities have begun and the return of a small number of animals to specific areas north of the park is expected to take place in 1997.

Also during 1996, a precedent was set when the MET's Directorate of Resource Management offered a tourism concession within the Mudumu National Park in Caprivi Region to a neighbouring community which had been removed from the park prior to proclamation. This represents an important new step in the Ministry's approach to dealing with park and neighbour issues as it is the first time that there has been public recognition that the Ministry should compensate people who have been removed from a protected area.

Despite exploring different approaches to resident peoples in establishing new protected areas, the MET has largely ignored the presence of two communities already living within its game reserves. The Namib-Naukluft Park was proclaimed in 1907 with a community of Topnaar people living within the park boundaries. These people, living in the lower Kuiseb Valley, have never been officially integrated into the park and are still not recognised in the park regulations. Virtually their every movement and activity is illegal and subject to the goodwill or otherwise of park staff. They live in perpetual uncertainty and a land tenure and human rights limbo.

The people living within the current boundaries of the Caprivi Game Reserve are in a similar situation. They are not recognised by park regulations and are in the same limbo as the Topnaars of the Namib-Naukluft Park. Even though in recent years a child has been mauled by a hyena, and people have been killed by elephants, the official policy is that there are no 'problem animals' because it is a game reserve. Resident peoples are discouraged from themselves killing predators which threaten them or their livestock, a right given to all other citizens outside protected areas. Positive gestures by the MET to people living within the Caprivi Game Reserve have included: the acceptance of the establishment of a community game guard system; attempts to establish a liaison committee and in 1996 the offer of a tourism concession to a San community who live within the Caprivi Game Park at Bagani/Mutjiku.

1.4 The need for a Namibian policy

The attempts by the MET in the past to develop new approaches to protected area management which include resident peoples have been ad hoc, and as demonstrated by the Namib-Naukluft and Caprivi Game Reserve cases, inconsistent. This is partly because there has never been a clear policy direction within the MET which sets out its thinking on relations between parks and resident peoples and which provides protected area managers with some agreed approaches and guidelines. The MET policy document "Land use Planning for Sustainable Development" (MET 1994) sets out a broad and cautious approach to dealing with resident peoples as part of a set of broader policies. Although adopted as official MET policy there is little indication that the approaches outlined in the document are actively promoted and implemented within the Ministry. However, the document provides a foundation upon which to build a specific parks and resident peoples approach.

The absence of such a specific parks and resident peoples policy and strategy has meant that developing good relations with resident peoples and reducing conflicts between parks and their neighbours has been left to the interest and motivation of individual park managers. Protected area managers do not see it as part of a well-defined Ministry approach to proactively develop good relations with park neighbours and they receive no guidance on what methods to employ. The Ministry has not decided on which policy options it prefers amongst a range of different possibilities. There has been no concerted attempt to develop among park managers the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for dealing with resident peoples.

On the other hand, the MET has vigorously adopted a policy of decentralising ownership and use rights over wildlife to rural communities, so that they can derive income from consumptive and non consumptive use of wildlife and participate directly in decisions concerning wildlife management outside protected areas (MET 1995a). This policy, backed by legislative change, places a high premium on direct community involvement in wildlife management and decision making. Ownership over huntable game and use rights over other species will be devolved to communal area residents who form a management unit called a conservancy. In several communal areas, these conservancies are likely to be formed adjacent to protected areas where there is currently a high degree of conflict between the park and the neighbouring people, yet where the parks have considerable potential for providing economic development opportunities for neighbours.

In another progressive move, the MET has developed a Community-based Tourism Policy which sets out how it will promote the development of community-based tourism enterprises (MET 1995b). The policy links community-based tourism to the conservancy approach by making provision for conservancies to be given tourism concessions.

The MET is currently developing a series of park management plans for six protected areas on communal land in north eastern Namibia. A team of consultants has been engaged to develop these management plans and their terms of reference include addressing park/neighbour relations and community involvement. The management plans will set out for park staff a number of tasks and responsibilities concerning liaison with neighbours and sharing of park resources. Yet there is no existing Ministry framework within which these tasks and responsibilities fit. Without such a framework being developed, the risk remains that the community involvement component of the management plans will not be implemented. The MET staff and consultants working on the management plan project also require an indication of the MET's preferred options and 'bottom line' regarding issues such as sharing of resources and revenue and the level of community involvement desired in park management. Commitment to community involvement as an output of park management plans implies that communities should also be involved in the development of those plans. This implies a degree of negotiation and consensus building between the MET and community at an early stage. While this process needs to be open and flexible, MET staff and the consultants again need to have a framework within which to operate. If the Ministry is not prepared to allow joint management of a park for example, then this should be made clear to all concerned from the outset.

It is clear from the above that there are several reasons why it is important for Namibia to develop a policy and strategy for linking its protected areas with neighbouring communities. In summary:

- ◆ Park managers have in the past expressed the need for outreach to neighbours to deal with existing or potential threats to individual parks.
- ◆ A framework is required which sets out the Ministry's position on key issues concerning park and neighbour relations as well as preferred options.
- ◆ A framework is required which ensures that tasks and responsibilities concerning community involvement become part of park operation and management.
- ◆ A framework is required within which training for dealing with park/neighbour relations can take place.
- ◆ Protected area policy towards community involvement needs to be consistent with other Ministry policies such as the communal area conservancy policy.
- ◆ MET staff and consultants need guidance on what is negotiable and non-negotiable in the development of park management plans for the north eastern protected areas.
- ◆ A policy framework is required for dealing with people living within a protected area, whether for existing situations or for future proclaimed areas.

2. New approaches, new names

Attempts to move away from traditional protected area concepts and involve resident peoples in conservation have spawned a number of new approaches, which in turn have spawned a number of acronyms. It is useful to examine some of these approaches, not only to clear up confusion caused by the array of different acronyms, but also to clarify differences between approaches and their relevance to protected area management.

2.1. ICDPs, CBC, CBNRM, co-management, partnerships and People and Parks, Parks and Resident People

Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs)

The term Integrated Conservation and Development Projects was coined by Michael Wells and Katrina Brandon working with Lee Hannah, when they carried out a study of 23 projects in Africa, Asia and Latin America which aimed at integrating the needs of local people with protected area management. They used the term to embrace "new approaches to protected area management that are attempting to address the needs of nearby communities by emphasising local participation and by combining conservation with development." (Wells and Brandon 1992: 1).

They note that ICDPs vary in scale and scope, from activities in biosphere reserves, and on the boundaries of national parks to regional land use plans with protected area components and large-scale development projects linked to protected areas. "Most ICDPs aim to stabilise land use outside protected area boundaries and to increase local incomes, in order to reduce the pressure

for further exploitation of natural resources in the protected area. Many ICDPs also emphasise conservation education" (Wells and Brandon 1992: 3). In their survey of ICDPs, Wells and Brandon focus exclusively on projects linked directly to protected areas. The only possible exception to this is their study of the Lupande Development Project in Zambia and the Zambian ADMADE project. These projects focus on communal areas designated as Game Management Areas, not all of which are directly adjacent to protected areas.

The ICDP concept was developed further by Michael Brown and Barbara Wyckoff-Baird in a report titled: "Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects" for the USAID-funded Biodiversity Support Programme (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992). Although much of their focus remained on new approaches to protected area management, Brown and Wyckoff-Baird broadened the scope of ICDPS to include community-based conservation activities outside and not necessarily related to protected areas. They emphasise sound resource management as well as biodiversity conservation in protected areas: "Based on the belief that rural poverty is one of the primary factors contributing to over-exploitation of natural resources and to encroachment of protected areas, integrated conservation and development projects seek to: (1) improve the quality of life of people living in areas rich in biodiversity and (2) promote the conservation and management of these areas. The underlying assumption is that by increasing the options for local residents to manage their resources for the benefit of current and future generations, better conservation will result." (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992: 1). They also refer to attempts in southern Africa to return wildlife management and benefits resulting from it to local communities - approaches which are not specifically linked to protected area management. They also give attention to common property resource management and tenure issues, which are usually associated with community resource management outside protected areas. Brown and Wyckoff-Baird note that ICDPs provide local communities with "economically and ecologically sound alternatives, the establishment and strengthening of institutional capacities, improved information, and an enabling policy environment" (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992: 1).

World Wildlife Fund US (WWF US) is one of the international conservation organisations which has embraced the ICDP approach as well as the use of Wells and Brandon's terminology (WWF 1995). WWF US view ICDPs as having the dual goals of conserving biological diversity and improving the quality of life for area residents. WWF recognises three types of ICDP. It refers to the majority, which are located in government-operated protected areas and surrounding buffer zones, projects being developed by government and conservation organisations to assist and support conservation in areas "under the guardianship of indigenous peoples" and a third type being initiated on communal and private lands and involving joint management arrangements between the government and local communities. WWF view most ICDPs as having the following components (WWF 1995: 1-4):

- i) Resource protection and management, including sustainable resource use, as appropriate
- ii) Socio-economic development, including the development of viable alternatives for meeting economic and resource needs (such as improved productivity of lands outside protected areas through agro forestry)
- iii) Strengthening of community institutions for local stewardship of resources

iv) Policy research and dialogue at the national level in order to create a suitable environment for the implementation of ICDPs and to enable sustainable resource use

WWF's own hypothesis regarding ICDPs is that: "If communities and individuals are organised to take action, have control over or access to the natural resource base, have the necessary information and knowledge, and believe that their social and economic well-being is dependent on sound resource management, then they will act to conserve resources." (WWF 1995: 3).

From the initial analysis of ICDPs reported by Wells, Brandon and Hannah in 1992 there has clearly been an expansion of the concept to include community-based activities not necessarily linked to protected areas. There has also been the development of some underlying assumptions or hypotheses which underpin the rationale behind ICDPs. The WWF hypothesis implies four important components that the organisation believes will lead to conservation: the existence of institutions which organise communities and individuals for action, tenure over land and/or resources, information and knowledge, and the ability to benefit from sustainable resource management.

Community-based conservation (CBC)

Like ICDPs, community-based conservation has been used to refer both to projects which link protected areas with human needs and community-based resource management activities not linked specifically to protected area management. A workshop on Community-based Conservation held by WWF US in Hwange, Zimbabwe in 1991, brought together a number of people implementing projects which ranged from communal management of large mammals including elephants (Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Project) to protected area neighbours deriving income from operating bee hives within the protected area (Malawi beekeeping project) (WWF 1991).

According to Western and Wright (1994: 7): "Community-based conservation includes, at one extreme, buffer zone protection of parks and reserves, and at the other, natural resources use and biodiversity conservation in rural areas. The term covers both new and traditional conservation methods, as well as conservation efforts that originate within or outside a community, so long as the outcome benefits the community."

Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)

Another term in common currency is 'Community-based Natural Resource Management' (CBNRM). This term is used for example within the SADC region by countries being supported by the SADC/USAID Regional Natural Resources Management Project. Under this project, Botswana, Zambia, Namibia and Zimbabwe have developed programmes which aim to enable rural communities to manage their resource base sustainably (Rihoy 1995). A key feature of CBNRM programmes is their emphasis on common property resource management regimes as the vehicle for community resource management. Such regimes imply that communities have secure use rights or tenure over land and resources, can decide how resources will be managed

and can capture the benefits from good management. According to Steiner and Rihoy (1995: 15) the underlying hypothesis of the southern African CBNRM programmes is that:

"For a community to manage its resource base sustainably it must receive direct benefits arising from its use. These benefits must exceed the perceived costs of managing the resource and must be secure over time."

Another important feature of these programmes is that although their initial focus has been on wildlife, they are diversifying to include other natural resources. For example, communities in Botswana are involved in enterprises based on the exploitation of cochineal and marula fruit (Jones 1997), some communities in Namibia are selling thatching grass and others are involved in the management and use of bushfood (Ashley and LaFranchi 1997).

The southern African CBNRM projects are not specifically linked to protected area management and the focus is on communities managing their own natural resources outside of protected areas.

Co-management and partnerships

The terms 'co-management' and 'partnerships' are frequently used in relation to resource management inside and outside protected areas.

IUCN (1993: 83) refers to the need for co-management of protected areas and calls for a "shared 'co-management' responsibility between governments, non-governmental organisations, and concerned communities."

Brechin et al (1991: 25) define co-management as "substantial power sharing of protected area management responsibilities and authority among government officials and local people." Davey (1993: 201) refers to co-management as varying "from day-to-day management of the park (with local people being employed as park rangers) to formal or informal representation in park policy and planning matters (via a board of management), or it may be a combination of both."

Barrow (1995) writes of the need to develop 'partnerships' and the need to examine issues of rights and privileges within these partnerships: "True partnership relates to negotiated rights. All partners are recipients of benefits and each holds responsibility for the management of resources that create the benefits."

People and Parks, Parks and Resident People

With specific regard to protected area management, a number of terms are used to refer to approaches that aim at involving local communities. These include 'People and Parks' (Wells and Brandon 1992, GEM 1995), and 'Parks and Resident People' (West and Brechin 1991).

Both refer to approaches which involve park neighbours or people living within the protected areas in the sharing of benefits from the park and/or in the sharing of decision-making.

2.2. What's in a name?

The above section provides a brief explanation of the different terms which have been applied to projects and activities which involve rural African communities in conservation in one form or another. It is important to identify what these terms and approaches really mean. Not only to clear up confusion over the proliferation of names and acronyms, but because there are also significant conceptual differences in these approaches which have important implications for policy formulation as well as management activities.

A clear distinction needs to be made between projects which are linked to protected area management and those which focus on the management of natural resources by rural people living outside of protected areas.

The most important attribute of a protected area is that it has been designated formally or legally by the State for a specific conservation purpose or purposes. Even where multiple use of the area or zones for different uses within the area are allowed, the State ultimately sets the parameters for this use. And where the State allows co-management of the protected area with resident peoples, it is the State which has ultimate control by virtue of the legal proclamation of the area (the few exceptions are contractual parks where the State contracts to operate a park on behalf of the residents who retain legal title to the land). The primary goal of the vast majority of protected areas is conservation through protection. Rural development and recreational objectives will be secondary objectives, if objectives at all. An exception to this is Pilanesburg National Park in South Africa, established by the former Bophuthatswana Parks Board, where part of the aim of establishing the park was that it should be used as far as possible for the benefit of neighbouring communities (Keenan 1984).

By contrast, on land outside of protected areas, the primary objective for the use of the land and its resources is to sustain the livelihoods of rural people. Conservation is an important, but secondary objective, which is linked to sustaining production rather than as a goal in itself. While the State might in some cases own communal land, as in Namibia, its controlling function is much more limited than in a protected area. Rural people have much more freedom to make choices about how to use the land, based on a variety of legally recognised rights and tenure forms.

There are clearly some significant differences between approaches which focus on community-based natural resource management activities outside protected areas and those which focus on community involvement with protected areas. The general concepts of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) and community-based conservation as used by Western and Wright (1994: 7), do not make a distinction between protected area and non-protected area activities, and need to be discarded because of the significant differences in these approaches.

In order to make this distinction clear and provide some clarity of terminology I will use the following in this paper:

'Community-based Natural Resource Management' (CBNRM) to refer to approaches and projects which focus on giving secure use rights and/or ownership over natural resources to rural communities, which focus on enabling these communities to capture the benefits

from sustainable resource management and on creating or strengthening community level resource management institutions.

'Parks and Resident People' to refer to approaches that involve people living in or adjacent to protected areas in sharing benefits generated by the park, either directly or indirectly, and/or in sharing in park management.

'Co-management' to refer to significant power sharing between government and resident people in the development of policy and planning and the taking of decisions concerning park management. (CBNRM approaches also involve some degree of co-management with government, but for the purposes of this paper, references to co-management will be within the context of protected area management.)

3. Rationale for involving resident peoples in the establishment and management of protected areas

This section examines in more detail why internationally, conservationists have adopted approaches to protected area management which aim at involving resident peoples. The reasons for involving people are categorised under practical, or management issues, and ethical issues.

3.1. Practical concerns

In many cases the implementation of protected areas has had a number of negative impacts on resident peoples which have led to resentment against the parks and conservation agencies. This resentment has in turn led to hostile actions against park staff, illegal use of resources within parks and damage to park property (Hough 1988). In Namibia local people in Caprivi have fired shots at a Post Office official mistaking him for a Nature Conservator, conservators have been threatened, fencing has been removed from the Etosha National Park northern boundary, and claims are made for the restoration of land now under proclamation as game reserves. One local chief has deliberately ordered his people to graze their livestock and settle within the Caprivi Game Reserve.

Negative impacts of protected areas on communities include the following:

- Resident people evicted from their land, often without adequate compensation
- Loss of access to natural resources within the protected area
- Loss of access to cultural resources (ancestral graves, rock art etc.) within the protected area
- Loss of crops and livestock to problem animals which leave the protected area
- Loss of human life to problem animals which leave the protected area
- Disruption of local culture and economies by tourism

The resulting resentment and hostility often leads to actions including:

- Deliberate setting of fires
- Damage to or theft of park property such as fencing
- Settlement in parks

Grazing livestock in protected areas
Illegal cutting of wood, grass, reeds etc
Poaching
Threats to park staff
Demands for restoration of land

The hostile actions of park neighbours pose significant threats to the success and even the existence of protected areas. We need to understand the causes of hostility towards protected areas and not simply focus on the symptoms such as poaching and setting of illegal fires. Protected area managers need to understand why people take these actions. Other important causes of apparently hostile actions are poverty and human population increase which lead to greater competition and demand for land and resources. If resources needed for survival are scarce outside protected areas, people will turn to the resources within these areas either legally or illegally.

Hostile actions by neighbours have important management implications for protected area managers. If parks have to be run as besieged islands, they have to be policed and patrolled and much time and money has to be diverted away from management activities. Illegal grazing and settlement within a park can severely compromise its conservation objectives, destroying habitat for wildlife and interfering with essential ecological processes.

At the same time as protected areas have been facing increasing threats, so particularly in developing countries have budgets for protected area and biodiversity conservation been shrinking. Many countries have established protected areas without having the resources to manage them. The model of paramilitary game guards and anti-poaching units is costly and demands large numbers of personnel to adequately patrol sometimes huge reserves. Cumming (1993) cited figures of US\$200 per square kilometer and one park official per 50 square kilometers as being necessary to implement a successful protection programme.

As a result of the pressures described above, there is a need for protected area managers to change the attitudes and behaviour of resident peoples towards parks and game reserves so that management activities can focus on achievement of park objectives without having to spend ever increasing resources on para military protection against increasingly hostile people.

3.2. Ethical concerns

Apart from the practical concerns surrounding traditional protected area management, there are a number of ethical concerns which have been identified.

Several commentators have shown how traditional protected area models, particularly in Africa have been based on foreign conservation ideologies which were imposed on Africa by European colonists (Anderson and Grove 1987, Lewis and Carter 1993, West and Brechin 1991). These ideologies were based on notions of a wild African Eden in which herds of wild animals roamed free from interference by humans, and on North American concepts of national parks (Anderson and Grove 1987, Brechin et al 1991).

Protected areas were proclaimed in Africa to protect wild animals from the deprivations of humans, ignoring the true relationships which had existed between wildlife and people, in which wildlife was part of the means of production and had socio-cultural significance. Anderson and Grove (1987: 4) categorise this approach as follows: "Much of the emotional as distinct from the economic investment which Europe made in Africa has manifested itself in a wish to protect the natural environment as a special kind of 'Eden', for the purposes of the European psyche, rather than as a complex and changing environment in which people have actually had to live. The desire to maintain and preserve 'Eden' has been particularly pronounced in eastern and southern Africa... Here, at its crudest, Africa has been portrayed as offering the opportunity to experience a wild and natural environment which was no longer available in the domesticated landscapes of Europe."

Driven by the imperative to protect 'Eden', Europeans in Africa built upon the concepts of national parks that they were familiar with. This meant separating people from wildlife and wild habitats, creating large national parks and game reserves, and where necessary removing people from the land to be proclaimed. In many instances the removal from the land took place without compensation, or where compensation was promised it never materialised.

There is a moral obligation on governments and conservationists who have removed people from their land to fairly compensate them. Where people are currently living within protected areas, or new protected areas are planned, careful consideration should be given to whether it is necessary to remove people and if so, how they can be compensated.

For many rural people land is not simply a utilitarian commodity, but there is a strong link between land and culture. The presence of ancestral graves helps define the ownership of land in terms of a people's history particularly if there is no written history and written title deed to the land.

4. Approaches to Parks and Resident People Programmes

As conservationists have recognised the need to gain the support of resident people for protected areas, they have developed a number of different methods and techniques. The nature of these methods has depended upon a variety of factors including the legal and policy framework of a particular country, the aims and objectives of the conservationists themselves, whether government or NGO, the level of the existing and potential threats, the available human resources and capacity and the available financial resources.

Broadly speaking these methods can be categorised in the following way:

The beneficiary approach in which benefits from the protected area are expected to generate support for the area and its conservation objectives.

The compensation and substitution approach which aims to compensate resident people for the loss of land and resources and tries to provide them with alternative economic activities or access to alternative resources/and or improved local resource management.

The buffer zone approach in which zones of compatible land use are developed around a park or as part of the park, in order to reduce conflicts with neighbours and remove the 'hard edge' boundary between land used for wildlife protection and land used for crops or livestock.

The participatory approach, in which communities are involved to some extent in park policy, planning and decision-making.

4.1. The beneficiary approach

It has been recognised that protected areas can provide local communities with a number of different benefits, some of which are direct and/or tangible and others which are indirect or intangible:

A. Direct/tangible

- ◆ Revenue sharing (e.g. from entry fees, accommodation fees, trophy hunting and other park activities)
- ◆ Environmental education and park interpretation (e.g. guided visits for neighbouring schools, community members and leaders)
- ◆ Extension (on resource management outside the protected area, on problem animal control etc.)
- ◆ Access to resources (e.g. reeds, fish, game, thatching grass, fuelwood, palm leaves, grazing, etc.)
- ◆ Access to meat from culling/trophy hunting
- ◆ Provision of game meat for traditional feasts
- ◆ 'Export' of surplus game across park boundaries for consumptive or other use in neighbouring areas (including fish)
- ◆ Employment
- ◆ Tourism enterprise opportunities in or outside park (campsites, lodges, joint ventures with state or private sector, traditional village, craft sales, firewood sales, provision of vegetables and other foodstuffs, etc.)

- ◆ Other enterprise opportunities (various park activities or the supply of materials for these activities can be contracted out to local entrepreneurs e.g. fence construction, road construction, building construction etc.)
- ◆ Social services (e.g. roads, clinics, water provision etc. - free or at a nominal charge for use)
- ◆ Compensation for damage or injury caused by problem animals
- ◆ Assistance in problem animal control

B. Indirect/less tangible

- ◆ Watershed protection (erosion control, local flood protection, regulation of stream flow etc.)
- ◆ Maintenance of ecological processes
- ◆ Biodiversity conservation
- ◆ Non-consumptive use benefits (aesthetic, spiritual, cultural/historical, existence value)

These lists are not exhaustive and no doubt a number of other benefits from protected areas can be identified. It is clear that there is a wide range of possible benefits. Not every protected area will be able to provide all these benefits and policy decisions are required on whether, even if there is the potential, it is desirable to provide the benefit.

The 'beneficiary' approach as it has been called (Wells and Brandon 1992), rests on the assumption that if the protected area benefits its resident peoples, especially by increasing their standard of living, they will a) develop positive attitudes towards the park and b) desist from activities which threaten the park. This approach is often accompanied by attempts at educating resident peoples about the benefits and importance of the park.

This approach has a number of advantages that have made it attractive to protected area managers:

- ◆ Many of the benefits that protected areas can provide as listed above, are direct and tangible such as cash from employment and local tourism-based enterprises or meat from culling. These benefits are relatively easily measurable and it is gratifying to show that the protected area has contributed to an increased standard of living of its neighbours.
- ◆ The provision of benefits can promote dialogue and liaison between the protected area authorities and resident peoples.

- ◆ The provision of certain benefits is less time consuming relative to more participatory activities and can potentially generate much good will for a small amount of effort.
- ◆ In the right circumstances, and if benefits are substantial enough, some beneficiaries will link their own future well-being with that of the park.

However, a number of problems have also been identified with this approach:

- ◆ There is little point in a protected area sharing benefits if there is no clear link between the benefits and improved conservation of the park and its resources. Wells and Brandon (1992: 31) point out that "very careful thought must be given to the anticipated linkages between the social and economic benefits for people living *outside* protected area boundaries and the needed behavioural responses to reduce pressure on resources *inside* the boundaries". Often it is difficult to make these linkages. It can be argued, for example that the provision of social services by the park authorities for resident peoples is in any case a government function and therefore unlikely to be an incentive for changed behaviour.
- ◆ Access to park-generated benefits might not be sufficient to reduce demand for resources within the park. According to Hannah (1992: 55) "Project development benefits may help compensate individuals and communities for lost access to reserve resources, but do not remove the motive for exploitation. There is no absolute level of development beyond which desire for further wealth or well-being disappears".
- ◆ Some protected areas share revenue with neighbours, but income generated by many protected areas is insufficient to make an impact on the livelihoods of resident people. Furthermore, the income is likely to be required for park management activities and the protected area will be unable to afford to share the income it generates.
- ◆ The beneficiary approach has been criticised for involving resident peoples in what has been called 'passive participation' (IIED 1995, Wells and Brandon 1992). In this scenario, resident peoples have very little input into decision-making and control and are more-or-less passive recipients of benefits from the protected area, perhaps providing information to outside experts and 'rubber stamping' decisions made by protected area authorities. Critics argue that 'passive participation' is insufficient to generate adequate support for protected areas as these approaches usually seek the support of local communities for ideas and activities which have been initiated by outsiders and do not adequately take into account the needs, aspirations and perceptions of the recipient communities (IIED 1994, Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992, West and Brechin 1991).
- ◆ It is often not clear whether resident people are receiving *net* benefits from schemes to provide benefits from protected areas. Economic analysis is required to establish whether the benefits outweigh the costs, and whether this is perceived as such by the local people (IIED, 1994).
- ◆ The one-way, message-oriented education campaigns which often accompany the

beneficiary approach are rarely successful in changing people's attitudes and behaviour (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992).

4.2. Compensation and substitution

This approach goes beyond the beneficiary approach by recognising that where resident peoples have been removed from their land or denied access to resources, they should be compensated. A flow of benefits from the protected area to resident peoples is seen as part of the compensation due to them, and not simply part of attempts to get people to like the Government's game reserve. The compensation and substitution approach combines a number of objectives, including compensating resident peoples for the economic losses caused by the establishment of a protected area, providing substitutes for resources to which access has been denied or improving production of resources outside protected areas. Compensation and substitution are also used to try and remove the economic incentive for people to illegally exploit a protected area's resources (Wells and Brandon 1992). Compensation is usually provided in the form of cash or services. Another dimension to the compensation approach is the hiring of local people to work in protected areas as a form of compensation for loss of traditional access to natural resources (West and Brechin 1991).

Under substitution schemes various alternative resource management methods have been introduced to areas outside protected areas. These include promotion of new crop varieties and cultivation methods, erosion control and soil conservation measures, energy-saving devices, irrigation farming, etc. (IIED 1994).

Although compensation and substitution approaches appear to be relatively simple, there are a number of problems associated with their implementation. Wells and Brandon (1992: 30) suggest that difficult questions that require answers are "*who* should benefit, by *how much*, and for *how long*". There are problems with the sustainability of compensation approaches that are built on the provision of donor funding. When the funding runs out the compensation stops and "Communities are left confused and embittered and, having no alternative sources of livelihood, revert to illegal utilisation of the wildlife resource." (IIED 1994: 21).

Often compensation is provided without a good understanding of whether it will fully cover the opportunity cost to the community of foregoing access to or use of a resource, and without a good understanding of whether the compensation serves a purpose in a community's livelihood which is similar to the activity foregone. For compensation to act as an incentive for communities to change their behaviour towards a protected area, it "must at least be equal to what communities are willing to accept in exchange for foregoing the use of a resource" (IIED 1994: 22-23).

A new approach to dealing with the issue of compensation has emerged in South Africa as the new Government tries to deal with land claims of people removed from their land under the former Apartheid policy. Some of these claims are being made in regard to land from which people were removed to make way for the establishment of protected areas. The approach which seems to be emerging is that if the community is awarded the land by the claims tribunal, the land will remain as an integral part of the protected area. The community will, however be able to benefit directly from all wildlife-based commercial activities taking place on that land and enter

into joint venture partnerships with the private sector (Hanekom 1996).

4.3. Buffer zones

The use of buffer zones as part of protected area management became popular following the development of the Man and Biosphere Programme by UNESCO in 1979. The concept of a biosphere reserve was developed to incorporate the needs of local people in the management of these reserves, and a typical biosphere reserve consisted of a core area of protection surrounded by a 'buffer' zone in which certain activities such as research, education, training and tourism could take place. An outer buffer zone would be developed which would be used for development activities which would involve local communities (Wells and Brandon 1993).

Since the development of the buffer zone concept as part of biosphere reserves, a number of different definitions of and approaches to buffer zones have been developed

Wells and Brandon (1993: 159) describe buffer zones as:

"Strips of land on park boundaries within which the sustainable use of natural resources will be permitted. The activities envisioned for buffer zones usually include hunting or fishing using traditional methods, collecting fallen timber, harvesting fruit, seasonal grazing of domestic stock, and cutting bamboo, rattan, or grasses. Activities forbidden in buffer zones generally include burning vegetation, cutting live trees, constructing buildings, and establishing plantations."

They also cite the following definitions:

"Areas adjacent to protected areas, on which land use is partially restricted to give an added layer of protection to the protected area itself while providing valued benefits to neighbouring rural communities." (Mackinnon et al 1986)

"Areas outside of parks that are designed to protect parks". (Wind and Prins 1989)

"A zone, peripheral to a national park or equivalent reserve, where restrictions placed upon resource use or special development measures are undertaken to enhance the conservation value of the area." (Sayer 1991)

Brown and Wyckoff-Baird (1992: 28) cite the following definition and objectives developed at a workshop on buffer zone management in Africa (PVO-NGO/NRMS 1991):

"A buffer zone is an area inside or adjacent to a protected area where the harmonious relationship between the natural environment and people is promoted."

"The objective of buffer zone management is to optimise the political, economic, social, cultural, ecological, and intrinsic worth of resources, through adaptive management, with fairness to all groups, and allowing for changing values over time."

Generally the main motivation for buffer zone creation has been the protection of a protected area by hoping to change the attitudes and behaviour of resident peoples through using the buffer zone as a means of generating benefits. Buffer zones are also aimed at protecting protected areas by removing the 'hard edge' boundary between the protected area and incompatible land uses on its border, thus reducing conflicts with resident peoples.

Despite the popularity of the buffer zone concept, there is consensus in the literature that in practice, the approach is difficult to implement and has not been very successful (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992, Hales 1989, IIED 1994, Wells and Brandon 1993).

A number of reasons are given by the same authors for the lack of success in implementing buffer zones and these are summarised below:

- ◆ Several authors point to the fact that buffer zones are often created outside the existing boundaries of protected areas. This means that resident peoples are expected to give up some degree of access to land and resources to which previously they had unrestricted access. This begs the question: Why should local people be willing to do this?
- ◆ There is little evidence to support the supposition that limited benefits available from a buffer zone will change the behaviour of resident peoples so that pressure on the park is reduced.
- ◆ Some authors question whether it is possible to monitor and measure 'sustainable use' within a buffer zone and if possible, is it practical, given the scarcity of human and financial resources in most protected area authorities?
- ◆ A common constraint identified is that most protected area agencies lack the authority and jurisdiction to establish and enforce a buffer zone, particularly outside the boundaries of the protected area. Even where buffer zones have been proposed inside parks, the conservation authority has often lacked the legal mechanisms for establishing such zones. Most proposals for buffer zones have therefore remained on paper and have not been implemented.
- ◆ Another problem is that little attention has been paid to the promotion of development activities within buffer zones, and benefits to resident peoples have often never materialised.
- ◆ Some authors believe that buffer zones have not succeeded in their objectives often because they have been imposed from above and resident peoples have not participated in the planning of the buffer zone.

Another problem in buffer zone management is that despite various attempts to define buffer zones and clarify their objectives, the concept still remains vague and unclear to many practitioners. For example, Wells and Brandon (1992) state that among a number of case studies carried out as part of a survey of integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs), the

only operating buffer zones were the game management areas around South Luangwa National Park in Zambia. Yet elsewhere in the same publication, the authors categorise the same game management areas under the concept of "multiple use areas". Indeed, their definition of a multiple use area includes the following:

"Protected areas that permit human settlement and natural resource use in specific zones inside a larger multiple use area that also includes fully protected zones." (Wells and Brandon 1992: 10)

It appears from this that one person's buffer zone is another person's multiple use zone.

Also, further examination of the game management areas adjacent to South Luangwa National Park reveals that they are in essence communal lands inhabited by resident people who carry out a number of economic activities based on crops and livestock farming with no additional restrictions imposed on their activities by nature of the area being a game management area. The authors do not make it clear whether the various projects around the park, (Luangwa Integrated Rural Development Project, the Lupande Development Project, the Administrative Design Project) were designed specifically to 'protect' the park.

Whatever the objectives of these projects, the game management areas surrounding South Luangwa are clearly not typical of the buffer zone concept as understood by most practitioners. Their inclusion as buffer zones by Wells and Brandon only helps to increase the confusion about what buffer zones really are and whether they can be really useful.

4.4. Support zones and the 'engine of growth' approach

As a result of the growing recognition of the limitations of buffer zones, conservationists have begun to rethink and revise the buffer zone approach. New ideas include the establishment of 'Support Zones' around protected areas instead of buffer zones.

The support zone concept takes a much more positive approach to protecting the protected area than the conventional buffer zone approach. Support zones are not intended to restrict protected area neighbours from certain activities outside the protected area as with many buffer zones. The support zone is an area adjacent to the protected area in which the protected area authorities try to create a set of circumstances which are favourable to the continued existence of the protected area. Within support zones, the protected area authority tries to promote compatible forms of land use, assists local people with problem animal control, looks for ways to promote enterprise opportunities linked to the protected area, assists local people in the management of land and natural resources, and provides environmental education as a service to the community. The protected area authority also liaises closely with community leaders and institutions to develop good communications and a spirit of partnership (Schuerholz 1996).

Within support zones, protected area authorities can pay particular attention to using parks and game reserves as nodes of local economic growth and development. Support can be given to the establishment of wildlife and tourism based industries outside the protected area and local businesses can be given contracts to carry out construction work inside the park. Management

plans need to give consideration to how tourism developments inside the protected area might preclude opportunities that could be made available to communities outside the area.

4.5. Participatory approaches

For more than a decade changes have been taking place in approaches to rural development which emphasise the need for the participation of rural people in the planning, design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of projects designed to benefit them. Analysis of many of the past failures in rural development led to the conclusion that projects had been imposed on rural people from above - the 'top down' approach - and as a result the supposed beneficiaries of the projects had no commitment to many of its activities and no 'ownership' over the project. Projects which worked were those which had involved local people in project planning from the start (West and Brechin 1991).

Rural development theory and practice therefore moved away from top down approaches towards 'bottom up' ways of designing development projects. Instead of planners and outside experts deciding what should happen and then informing local people, villagers should be asked to define their needs and bring their own knowledge of local conditions to the planning table. Projects should be planned and implemented jointly by outsiders and the intended beneficiaries of the project.

Following the emergence of new ideas in rural development, conservationists keen to link conservation and development have also embraced the bottom up approach and recognised the need for resident peoples to be involved in the development and implementation of projects which affect them. Discussions of protected area management are now littered with calls for resident peoples to be involved in decision-making about the establishment of new parks and the management of existing ones.

The need to involve local people or promote 'people's participation' has become as much part of the conservation rhetoric as it has become part of the development rhetoric. Many commentators conclude that peoples participation often remains at the level of rhetoric and is very seldom really achieved in the implementation of either conservation or development projects or activities which link the two (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992, IIED 1994, Wells and Brandon 1992, West and Brechin 1991).

This is often because there is not a common understanding amongst either development workers or conservationists of the concept 'participation.' There are many different interpretations of the concept which range from situations where outsiders consult local people but make all the decisions (passive participation) to situations where local people have a large degree of control and involvement in decision-making (active participation).

The beneficiary approach described above, when put into practice, is often an example of passive participation. Typically a conservation agency will decide that a number of potential benefits from its protected areas could be made available to resident peoples in order to improve their attitude and behaviour towards the park. The benefits will be provided without any real involvement of the intended beneficiaries in deciding whether they want the benefits, in what way should the

benefits be provided, who should benefit, and how should benefits such as resource harvesting in the park be monitored and regulated.

Co-management approaches where resident peoples have a significant level of involvement in protected area policy, planning, and decision-making, are examples of active participation.

According to Brown and Wyckoff-Baird (1992: 15): "Perhaps the most important lesson learned in development over the last 20 years is that the failure to equitably involve projected beneficiaries as partners of all phases of project implementation from design through evaluation has consistently led to disappointing results... Token participation cannot suffice in the design process. Instead, participation includes all relevant stakeholder groups in a way that enables each to perceive a stake in, and the ability to impact, the process. In addition, the process needs to enable target beneficiaries to themselves initiate the flow of information and the decision-making"

The main advantage of approaches which include active participation of resident peoples is that they are the most likely to succeed in bringing about a change in attitudes and behaviour towards the protected area. The main disadvantages are that these approaches are time consuming and require personnel with skills in communication, facilitation and conflict resolution. In order to implement an active participation approach protected area authorities usually need to hire new staff or retrain existing personnel.

5. Towards a Resident People and Parks Policy and Strategy for Namibia

The preceding section described a number of approaches that have been used to change resident peoples attitudes and behaviour towards protected areas. It described a number of advantages and disadvantages of each approach. This section analyses these approaches in relation to their usefulness for developing a coherent policy for Namibia on resident peoples and protected areas and provides a synthesis which leads to recommendations on specific policy elements.

Most protected area management programmes which involve resident peoples tend to include elements of each of the approaches described above: the beneficiary approach, the compensation and substitution approach, buffer zones, and some degree of community participation. In some cases, law enforcement capacity is also strengthened.

Each approach clearly has limitations, particularly when applied in isolation, but these limitations need not be insurmountable obstacles. In order for these various approaches to work, a number of factors need to be taken into account. The following section suggests ways in which the different approaches can be positively employed and combined to provide a suite of tools suitable for protected area managers to use in developing relationships with resident peoples.

5.1 Developing tools for a Parks and Resident Peoples approach

Benefits

The sharing of benefits from a protected area with resident peoples will not on its own lead to changes of attitude and behaviour. Much depends on the extent to which benefit-sharing fits into a broader participatory approach in which resident peoples are involved in key decisions taken about who should benefit and how. Much will also depend on whether there is a clear link to the benefits and improved conservation of the protected area.

The following needs to be taken into account when developing a benefit sharing programme:

- ◆ There needs to be a clear link between the benefit and improved conservation of the protected area. The benefit should depend for example on the continued existence of the protected area and should be a net benefit to the beneficiary. The provision of social services outside the protected area might be good public relations but does not provide a link to conservation of the protected area.
- ◆ The links need to be emphasised to the beneficiaries through extension and communication activities which can inform the community about the economic benefits of the protected area. Extension and communication are not sufficient on their own and need to be part of a broader participatory framework.
- ◆ The more direct the benefit, the more powerful the benefit is likely to be as an incentive. Benefits need to reach the people most directly affected by the protected area and should not be channelled through remote regional governments or other institutions which can hold on to or divert the flow of benefits, particularly if it is in cash. The inhabitants of the park or most immediate neighbours will usually be the people who have the most impact on the park and who bear the costs of living in or near the park. They are therefore the group whose behaviour needs to be influenced.
- ◆ Small units of beneficiaries mean that the impact of the benefit is greater. Smaller units are also better for negotiation and decision making.
- ◆ Benefit distribution (particularly in terms of cash, but also access to resources) needs to be as transparent as possible so that a) benefits are not captured by an elite, and b) so there is accountability within the community for how cash is spent or access to resources allocated.
- ◆ The benefit must be perceived by the community to be a benefit. This implies that there must be participatory mechanisms for resident peoples to identify their needs and inform the park authorities of what they think are benefits the park can provide, and which are the most important to them. How a benefit is perceived will depend on its relevance to peoples' livelihoods. The timing of cash benefits (e.g. coming when families need to pay school fees, or towards the end of the dry season) can also help to maximise the impact.

- ◆ Mechanisms for allowing access to resources within parks need to be practical for both the park authority and the neighbours, and need to be mutually agreed. Sanctions for non-compliance with agreed procedure should also be agreed in advance and made clear to both park managers and the community.
- ◆ Sanctions for non-compliance with agreed procedure are best applied through a community institution such as a tribal authority or a user/producer organisation (e.g. conservancy, basket making club), to which the rights of use are given. These organisations provide a point of contact for park managers who do not need to interact with every individual involved in the activity. These organisations can enforce the agreed upon rules and if they cannot, then the park authorities can withdraw access to the resource.
- ◆ The sharing of resources should only take place where the sustainable use of that resource can be easily measured and monitored, using indicators and methods acceptable to and understood by both scientists and local people.

Compensation and substitution

Careful consideration needs to be given to the introduction of compensation and substitution schemes. Particular attention is required to ensure that the right people benefit.

- ◆ The provision of compensation should be an obligation of protected area authorities where resident peoples are removed from their land in order to establish a protected area or where they are denied access to resources they once had access to.
- ◆ Compensation should be provided where there are clearly identifiable individuals or groups of people who have a verifiable claim to the land or resources denied to them by the establishment of the protected area.
- ◆ The level of compensation should be determined by the extent of the loss to the community balanced by the available resources of the protected area or its controlling authority. Where compensation is for loss of access to resources it should be at least equal to what communities are willing to accept in exchange for not being able to use the resource
- ◆ The length of time over which compensation should be paid will depend upon the nature of the compensation. A community might accept a once-off payment or be more interested in receiving a tourism concession which provides a smaller income over an indefinite period.
- ◆ Compensation should be sustainable and not dependent upon outside (e.g. donor) funding.
- ◆ Substitution of resources required by resident peoples from protected areas needs careful research before being embarked upon. The social impacts of proposed alternatives need to be investigated. Negative impacts can result on the very poor who might not be able

to afford alternatives or whose survival depends upon the sale or barter of the original resource. There are sometimes cultural reasons why people do not adopt an alternative.

- ◆ Rural people are notoriously conservative about the introduction of new techniques and technology. Often this is because these have been imposed from outside and developed in conditions not appropriate to where they are being introduced. Again there might be cultural reasons for resistance, or the success of the innovations have not been demonstrated. Often, there is no cost/benefit analysis to indicate whether there is a real incentive for the innovation to be adopted. Innovations are best introduced following research on the potential impacts of the innovation and within a participatory framework which involves local communities in testing the techniques and technology themselves.

Buffer and Support zones

Despite the problems facing the implementation of the buffer zone concept, this approach still has potential to be a useful tool in protected area management. The conventional approaches to buffer zone management need revising, however, and more attention needs to be given to the notion of a 'support zone' outside the protected area.

Most buffer zones as noted above, tend to be extensions of protected areas and lead to resident people having restrictions imposed on them over land and resources to which access and use was previously unrestricted.

- ◆ Buffer zones which restrict the use of resources on land to which rural people previously had unrestricted access should be avoided. Such zones are perceived simply as an extension of the protected area with the resulting losses and costs to the community.
- ◆ Outside of existing protected area boundaries, attention should focus on the development of support zones in which the protected area authority should promote compatible forms of land use through a number of incentives. Where possible, the protected area should be a net exporter of wildlife resources which can be used both consumptively and non-consumptively outside the reserve. The protected area should provide economic opportunities for people in the support zone and where possible should not compete with services which could be provided by the community. Park managers or NGO partners could facilitate the provision of training and capacity building for communities and individuals in enterprise development and business management. These businesses should focus not only on wildlife and tourism, but provision of services to the protected area such as construction work. As far as possible, contracts for construction work within the protected area should be awarded to local businesses. The protected area authority should develop regular liaison with appropriate institutions in the support zone and promote a park/community liaison committee. Where appropriate, joint management committees should be established with representatives of the people living within the support zone. The protected area authority could work with local people within the support zone to improve their own resource management, reducing dependency on resources within the park. The authority should also help local people deal effectively with problem animals. Commercial area and communal area conservancies are useful institutions for the

development of protected area support zones.

- ◆ Inside protected areas consideration should be given to the development of multiple use zones around or adjacent to a core area of protection. These multiple use areas should allow regulated use of certain resources such as thatching grass, reeds, palm leaves, etc. The emphasis should be upon providing people with access to resources currently unavailable to them, rather than trying to impose new restrictions on an area outside the protected area in exchange for some possible benefits. This approach is more likely to provide an incentive for people to develop a positive attitude towards the protected area as it provides tangible benefits, which if appropriate, might also serve as compensation for loss of land or access to resources.
- ◆ Namibian legislation which makes provision for the proclamation of protected areas needs to be amended to make provision for zoning of parks, including the establishment of multiple use zones.
- ◆ The development of support zones outside protected areas and multiple use zones inside these areas, should take place within a broader participatory framework which involves resident people in planning and decision-making.

The adoption of the above approach to buffer zone management shifts the emphasis away from the buffer zone as a protective layer around the park and more towards the sharing of resources within the park in a controlled manner and the provision of economic and other incentives for park neighbours to develop compatible forms of land use outside the protected area.

Participatory approaches

Much of the material for this paper has come from four surveys of projects which seek to link protected area management and resident peoples or which involve rural people in conservation in other ways (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992, IIED 1994, Wells and Brandon 1992, and West and Brechin 1991). Each of these surveys concludes from the wide range of cases studies examined that passive or 'token' participation of resident peoples is not sufficient to change peoples attitudes or behaviour towards protected areas that impact them negatively. They conclude that bottom up approaches which involve people in decision-making are crucial for winning commitment and support.

In this regard there are two levels at which community participation needs to be considered.

At one level, a broad participatory framework needs to be put in place which emphasises the *process* by which decisions are taken, whether about what benefits should be provided, what resources should be shared, who should benefit, or about the creation of support and multiple use zones or the provision of compensation. The process of decision-making should ensure that resident peoples have the right and the opportunity to be involved in decisions. As far as possible and as far as is culturally acceptable, as many different individuals and groups within a community should be part of the decision-making process, and participation should not be left to leaders and

elites alone. In some cases this might require the building of community capacity to participate and/or the establishment or adaptation of appropriate institutions which can represent the community once broad-based participation has been achieved. Community capacity and institution building are key activities which can take place within support zones.

At another level, the type of community participation desired in direct park management needs to be carefully considered. A number of possibilities exist. These include: no involvement at all; involvement through a liaison committee at which park staff consult local people but where local people have no decision-making power; co-management where the community has a significant say in park planning, policy and decision making; contractual management where the community retains title to the land and the conservation authority contracts to manage the park on behalf of the community, or where the state guarantees community rights and joint management through a contractual agreement.

The arguments for moving towards the most participatory end of the scale and approaches such as co-management are strong. As noted above, experience from rural development shows that active participation leads to community ownership and commitment to a project or set of activities and processes. Experience of the management of natural resources outside protected areas rests on the hypothesis that if communities have access to benefits which exceed the cost of resource management, have appropriate institutions, have control over or access to the resource, and have the necessary information and knowledge, then they will conserve the resource and use it sustainably. If this hypothesis is also applied to protected area management it suggests that there will be greater support for the protected area by resident peoples in proportion to the degree of ownership over and access to the reserve that they have.

When compensation is being considered for people removed from their land or denied access to resources through the establishment of a protected area, active participation in protected area management is an important form of compensation. As noted above, this is an approach being implemented in South Africa.

Active participation is also an important consideration for those parks in Namibia such as the Kaudom and Mahango Game Reserves where the community gave up the land to the State for conservation purposes on the understanding that they would share in park revenue. Co-management of these protected areas linked to benefit sharing would be an important form of compensation for the giving up of this land and would provide a powerful incentive for the community to give strong support to the parks. Co-management is not a new concept in Namibia. It was proposed by Eyre et al (1989) in their draft management plan for the proposed Kaokoland Game Reserve. This was based mainly on the provision for people to remain within the reserve, but the principle can also be applied to existing parks where people were removed and/or the land voluntarily given up for conservation.

- ◆ Co-management is therefore strongly recommended for protected areas which have been, or will be, created on communal land in Namibia. This would be an appropriate form of management for the following existing areas: Mangetti Game Reserve, Kaudom Game Reserve, Mahango Game Reserve, Caprivi Game Reserve, Mudumu National Park and Mamili National Park.

- ◆ Co-management is also strongly recommended for existing protected areas in which people live and for new parks in which residents remain on the land. These are the Namib-Naukluft Park and the Caprivi Game Reserve, and the proposed Kaokoland Contractual Park.
- ◆ In the case of protected areas in which people live, a legally binding agreement or contract should be entered into between the MET and the residents. This agreement would guarantee the land and basic human rights of the residents and define decision-making jurisdictions and relationships.

Co-management and contractual arrangements are not necessarily appropriate in all circumstances, and the need to obtain as much commitment and support of the local community as possible needs to be balanced against a number of other factors.

Foremost amongst these are the wider obligations that governments and protected area authorities have beyond local and regional interests. These include the maintenance of habitats for regional and international migratory species (e.g. palearctic migrant birds, elephants), the maintenance of habitats for species with highly specific breeding requirements (e.g. flamingoes), the maintenance of habitats for and protection of national and internationally endangered species and the obligation to maintain and preserve the nation's natural heritage for future generations. There are also obligations to maintain the health of wetland systems shared with other countries and the associated ecological processes.

Co-management arrangements are much more difficult to implement where protected areas are large and surrounded by a number of different groups of resident peoples. There are likely to be a wide variety of different claims to benefits and compensation and the difficulties of identifying who should benefit or receive compensation are compounded. Logistically it is much more difficult to bring people together for liaison and decision-making purposes, and the resources required for community capacity and institution building are very much greater.

- ◆ For these reasons, co-management is not recommended for the Etosha National Park. Strategies which should be used for this park include support zone and 'engine of growth' approaches based on liaison, economic opportunities and incentives to commercial as well as communal neighbours, problem animal control, extension and environmental education as services to the communities, and the formation of commercial as well as communal area conservancies.

Law enforcement

The preceding sections of this paper focus heavily on the need to recognise the human and social dimensions of protected area management. They consider ways in which protected area managers can build good relations with resident peoples and promote cooperation in the management and protection of the protected area.

However, it is clear that while protected area authorities are adopting approaches which are more

'people friendly' they should not be abandoning strong law enforcement. However well 'support zones' are operating, however much the protected area is acting as an engine of local economic growth, and however much resources are shared between the protected area and resident peoples, there will always be the need for law enforcement.

According to Hannah (1992: 55): "A common fallacy regarding conservation/development projects is that development will make reserves self-enforcing. Few, if any, projects have actually been operated on such a premise. The evidence of this study is that all projects maintained some element of enforcement, and the stronger the enforcement component, the more effective has the project been in meeting conservation objectives".

One level of enforcement is through community institutions and leadership where the protected area is seen to be a net benefit to the community. But enforcement by the protected area authority itself needs to be a sufficient deterrent for people not to undertake activities which will undermine the integrity of the protected area.

5.2 Conclusion

The above analysis has focused on a number of different approaches to integrating human and social needs and perspectives with protected area management. These approaches are tools which protected area managers can use in a strategy putting into effect a "Parks and Resident Peoples" policy.

Each of the approaches has a number of strengths, weaknesses and opportunities. The above analysis points to a number of areas of overlap between approaches and areas in which one approach can support another. Rarely will one approach be successful on its own. A policy and strategy on Resident Peoples and Parks need to build on the strengths and opportunities of each approach, while recognising the weaknesses. The policy and strategy need to build upon the areas of overlap and mutual support, providing for an appropriate and flexible mix of approaches which can be tailored for the individual circumstances of each protected area and group of resident peoples. The approaches and guidelines developed above, should in most cases, be applicable to both commercial and communal land neighbours to protected areas.

From the analysis earlier in this paper of why human and social perspectives need to be included in protected area management and the discussion of different approaches to achieve this, three key principles can be extracted which need to be at the heart of a 'Parks and Resident Peoples' policy for Namibia:

- ◆ Full and active participation of all stakeholders should be promoted in all interactions between protected area authorities and resident peoples, particularly in protected area planning and management.
- ◆ Resident people who have lost land or have been denied access to key resources through the establishment of a protected area should be adequately compensated.

- ◆ Protected areas should operate as engines of local economic growth, through the provision of incentives for the development of local enterprises, and the provision of technical support in the establishment and operation of such enterprises.
- ◆ People living within protected areas should not suffer net costs compared to people living outside.

The detail of how the four principles are applied will vary according to the neighbours themselves and the needs and objectives of the individual protected area.

6. Proposals for a "Parks and Resident Peoples" Policy for Namibia

This section uses the above analysis to develop a number of proposals for a Namibian policy on protected areas and resident peoples. The first set of proposals deals with a general policy which applies to both people who live inside protected areas and the people who live nearby. The second set of proposals provides more detailed focus on the specific situation concerning people who live inside parks. This is felt necessary because of the more complex issues that this situation raises. These issues relate to the need to guarantee peoples' land rights and basic human rights, the need to clearly define the rights, roles, responsibilities of both resident peoples and the protected area authority, and to the reconciling of peoples' development objectives and the conservation objectives of the protected area.

6.1. General policy

A PARKS AND RESIDENT PEOPLES POLICY FOR NAMIBIA

1. PREAMBLE

- 1.1 The Ministry of Environment and Tourism recognises the key role that protected areas play in the conservation of ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity. The Ministry also recognises that these are the primary objectives for the establishment and management of protected areas.
- 1.2 The Ministry also recognises that human communities living in or adjacent to protected areas often have long-standing relationships with these areas. In some instances in Namibia, people have been removed from their land in order to establish protected areas and in other instances, people have been denied access to resources they were once able to use as part of their livelihoods.
- 1.3 The Ministry recognises that protected areas or parts thereof may have important

cultural significance for people living in or adjacent to these areas, and in particular for people who have been removed from these areas.

- 1.4. The Ministry recognises that wild animals often leave protected areas and cause damage to crops, kill livestock or kill or injure people.
- 1.5. The Ministry recognises that protected areas have the potential to become motors of economic development for people living in marginalised rural areas.
- 1.6. The Ministry recognises that protected areas cannot co-exist with neighbouring communities which are hostile to them.

2. POLICY

In view of the above, it is the policy of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to:

Manage protected areas in ways which are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of people living in or adjacent to these areas, giving particular attention to promoting their economic development, promoting their full participation in all interactions with protected area managers, and providing adequate forms of compensation to people removed from their land or denied access to key resources through the establishment of a protected area.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- 3.1. Protected areas will be managed so that they provide the maximum possible benefit for people living in or adjacent to these areas, provided that a) these benefits are ecologically and economically sustainable and b) these benefits are in accordance with the objectives of a particular protected area as defined in the management plan.
- 3.2. Appropriate compensation will be provided where people have been removed from their land or denied access to resources through the establishment of a protected area, or where a community has voluntarily given up land to the State for the establishment of a protected area. This compensation shall be in the form of sharing benefits from the protected area, the preferential awarding of tourism concessions within the protected area to the community concerned, and the inclusion of these people in the joint management of the protected area.
- 3.3. The basic human rights, including land rights, of people resident within a protected area will be recognised and acknowledgement of these rights incorporated in the proclamation and regulations of that area.

- 3.4 Liaison with communities living in or adjacent to protected areas will take place on a regular basis and will be formalised through the creation of appropriate liaison bodies in order to address problems and conflicts.
- 3.5 Support and incentives will be provided to people living in or adjacent to protected areas (on both privately owned and communally held land) to practice land-use options compatible to those in parks, e.g. tourism and use of wildlife. Incentives could include, for example, removal of sections of park fence, access to the park from neighbouring property, preferential translocation of game, and a commitment not to develop competing forms of tourism accommodation or services within the protected area.
- 3.6 Protected areas will be integrated into local and regional economies through:
- a) being exporters of wildlife for use by neighbours
 - b) providing preferential employment opportunities for people living in or adjacent to the protected area
 - c) encouraging and supporting the development of local tourism-based enterprises
 - d) encouraging and supporting the development of other local industries and services by contracting out to local entrepreneurs various park activities or the supply of materials for these activities such as fence construction, road construction and building construction.
- 3.7 Where appropriate, protected areas will be zoned for different levels of use, including multiple use areas on the periphery, which can be used to reduce conflict with neighbours and to allow resources in the park to be used in a negotiated and regulated manner.
- 3.8 The development of a 'support zone' adjacent to a protected area should be promoted where appropriate. In these support zones, the activities of people will not be restricted, but the Ministry will be proactive in developing wildlife-based economic opportunities for neighbouring people and assisting them in their natural resource management.

6.2. Proposals for "People living in Parks" policy for Namibia

A PEOPLE IN PARKS POLICY FOR NAMIBIA

1. PREAMBLE

- 1.1 The Ministry of Environment and Tourism recognises the key role that protected areas play in the conservation of ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity. The Ministry also recognises that these are the primary objectives for the establishment and management of protected areas.
- 1.2 The Ministry recognises that it might be necessary, and in some cases beneficial, for people (other than park staff) to live permanently within protected areas.
- 1.3 The Ministry recognises that protected areas cannot co-exist with resident people who are hostile to them.
- 1.4 The Ministry recognises that where people live inside protected areas, special provision must be made for such people to enjoy similar land and basic human rights as people living outside protected areas. These rights or the right to carry out certain activities will only be restricted by a mutual and legally binding agreement between the community and the MET.
- 1.5 The Ministry recognises that people living within protected areas should receive preferential treatment in the sharing of benefits from the sustainable use of wildlife and from tourism activities within the protected area.
- 1.6 The Ministry recognises that people living within protected areas should be fully involved in all decision-making that affects their lives and livelihoods and should be treated as co-managers of the protected area.

2. POLICY

In view of the above, it is the policy of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to:

Manage protected areas in ways which are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of people living inside these areas, giving particular attention to recognising their rights, promoting their economic development, promoting communication and participation in decision-making as co-managers and providing preferential opportunities to residents to benefit from the sustainable use of wildlife and from tourism activities within the protected area.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- 3.1 The basic human rights, including land rights, of people resident within a protected area will be recognised in a legally binding agreement between the residents and the government and this agreement will be incorporated in the proclamation and regulations of that area.
- 3.2 The Ministry will enter into joint management of the protected area with the residents who will have full participation in all decisions which affect their lives or livelihoods.
- 3.3 The Ministry will ensure that residents are fully involved in the development of protected area management plans.
- 3.4 Protected areas will be managed so that they provide the maximum possible benefit for residents provided that a) these benefits are ecologically and economically sustainable and b) these benefits are in accordance with the objectives of a particular protected area as defined in the management plan.
- 3.5 Appropriate preferential income-generating and benefit-sharing opportunities will be provided to residents. These opportunities shall be in the form of sharing income and other benefits from the protected area and the preferential awarding of tourism concessions within the protected area.
- 3.6 As far as possible, residents within protected areas should be afforded the same rights to use wildlife as those who form conservancies on communal land.
- 3.7 Within areas zoned for use by residents, they should have the same rights to destroy problem animals as people living outside protected areas. The Ministry should take a proactive approach in this regard encouraging the use of community game guards for problem animal control in these areas.

7. Implementation

A number of issues regarding implementation of the above policy proposals require consideration.

A shift in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism approach to adopt policies which link protected areas and resident peoples in a positive way requires a shift in the commitment of resources. The implementation of the two policies outlined above will be time consuming. Staff time will be required for negotiations with communities and a host of other new activities. If present staffing levels are not sufficient to carry out these new activities, new staff will need to be appointed. Consideration could be given to appointing personnel whose specialist task is to work with resident peoples. Existing staff will need some training in working with local communities. Law enforcement in some parks needs to be improved through the provision of adequate staff and equipment.

Once a new "Parks and Resident Peoples" policy has been adopted by the government, the MET should draft an implementation strategy which ensures that adequate human and financial resources are made available, and that the Ministry's capacity to work with resident communities is developed. The new policy should guide the development of community involvement components of park management plans. Specific parks should be targeted to begin implementing the new policy.

The implementation of the policies on parks and resident peoples should not be undertaken lightly. If sufficient resources are not made available to do the job properly, it would be better not to embark on such a project in the first place, as expectations will be falsely raised within the communities as well as within the MET.

However, full commitment by the MET of human and financial resources to implementing the proposed policies should prove to be an important and worthwhile long term investment in the conservation of Namibia's natural resources and biodiversity. It should also provide an important and worthwhile investment in rural development in some of our most impoverished areas.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, D. and R. Grove. (1987). Introduction: the Scramble for Eden: past, present and future in African conservation. In: Anderson, D. and R. Grove. (eds.). (1987). *Conservation in Africa: people, policies and practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ashley, C. and C. LaFranchi. (1997). Livelihood strategies of rural households in Caprivi: Implications for conservancies and natural resource management. Research Discussion Paper No. 20. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Windhoek.
- Barrow, E. (1995). Community Conservation Approaches to Conservation in East Africa. Some Experiences to Date. Paper presented to the *Workshop on Participatory Wildlife Management: Concepts and Opportunities*. Ethiopia, May 1995.
- Berry, H. (1996). Proposed programme for the repatriation of wildlife to the Omusati - Oshana - Oshikoto Regions. Internal Report. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek. (R)
- Brechin, S. R., P. C. West, D. Harmon and K. Kutay. (1991). Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: A Framework for Inquiry. In: West, P. C. and S. R. Brechin. (1991). *Resident Peoples and National Parks: Social dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Brown, M. and B. Wyckoff-Baird. (1992). Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects. Biodiversity Support Program, Washington D. C.
- Cumming, D. H. M. 1993. Conservation Issues and Problems in Africa. In: Lewis, D. and N. Carter (eds). *Voices From Africa. Local Perspectives on Conservation*. World Wildlife Fund. Washington D. C.
- Davey, S. (1993). Creative Communities: Planning and Comanaging Protected Areas. In: Kemf, E. (ed). (1993). *The Law of the Mother: Protecting Indigenous Peoples in Protected Areas*. Sierra Club books, San Francisco.
- Eyre, C., R. Loutit and L. Scheepers. (1989). Concept Master Plan for Kaokoland Nature Reserve. Internal report. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek.
- GEM (1995). People & Parks. National Conference Proceedings. 15 September - 17 September 1995. Group for Environmental Monitoring, Johannesburg.
- Hales, D. (1989). Changing Concepts of National Parks. In: Western D. and M. Pearl. *Conservation for the Twenty-first Century*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Hanekom, D. (1996). Community Approaches to Wildlife Management. In: ODA. (1996). *African Wildlife Policy Consultation. Final Report of the Consultation*. Overseas Development Administration, London.

- Hannah, L. (1992). African People, African Parks. An Evaluation of Development Initiatives as a Means of Improving Protected Area Conservation in Africa. Conservation International, Washington D. C.
- Hough, J. L. (1988) Obstacles to Effective Management of Conflicts Between National Parks and Surrounding Human Communities in Developing Countries. In: *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 15. No. 2. Summer 1988. Foundation for Environmental Conservation.
- IIED. (1994). Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
- IUCN. (1993). Parks for Life. Report of the *IVth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- Jones, B. T. B. (1996). Institutional Relationships, capacity and sustainability. Lessons learned from a community-based conservation project, eastern Tsumkwe District, Namibia, 1991-1996. Research Discussion Paper No. 11. Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Windhoek.
- Jones, B. T. B. (1997). Community-based Natural Resource Management in Botswana and Namibia - an inventory and preliminary analysis of progress. IUCN, Harare.
- Keenan, J. (1984). The Pilanesberg Game Reserve. Report on the Socio-Economic Effects of the Pilanesberg Game Reserve on the surrounding population, and the attitudes of the surrounding population on the Game Reserve. Pilanesberg Game Reserve, South Africa.
- Lewis, D. and N. Carter. (eds.). (1993). Voices from Africa: Local Perspectives on Conservation. World Wildlife Fund, Washington D. C.
- Mackinnon, J., K. Mackinnon., G. Child and J. Thorsell. (1986). Managing Protected Areas in the Tropics. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. Quoted in Wells. M and K. Brandon. The Principles and Practice of Buffer Zones and Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation. In: *Ambio vol. 22 No. 2-3, May 1993*. 1993.
- MET. (1994). Land-use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development. Policy document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek.
- MET. (1995 a). Promotion of Community Based Tourism. Policy document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek.
- MET. (1995 b). Wildlife Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas. Policy document. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek.

- PVO-NGO/NRMS Project. (1991). Buffer Zone Management in Africa: Report from a Workshop. October 1990. Experiment in International Living, Washington D.C. Quoted in Brown, M. and B. Wyckoff-Baird. *Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects*. Biodiversity Support Programme, Washington D. C. 1992.
- Rihoy, E. (1995). The Commons Without the Tragedy? Strategies for Community Based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa. *Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference*. SADC Wildlife Technical Coordination Unit, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- Sayer, J. (1991). Rainforest Buffer Zones: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. Quoted in Wells, M. and K. Brandon. *The Principles and Practice of Buffer Zones and Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation*. In: *Ambio vol. 22 No. 2-3, May 1993*. 1993.
- Schuerholz, G. (1996). Namibia: Management Plan for Okavango National Park, Caprivi. Kreditanstalt fur Wiederaufbau, Frankfurt.
- Steiner, A. and E. Rihoy (1995). Strategies for Community Based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa. A Review of Lessons and Experiences from Natural Resources Management Programmes in Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In: Rihoy, E. (1995). *The Commons Without the Tragedy? Strategies for Community Based Natural Resources Management in Southern Africa. Proceedings of the Regional Natural Resources Management Programme Annual Conference*. SADC Wildlife Technical Coordination Unit, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- Venzke, K. A. E. and M. Lindeque. (1994). Management, monitoring and sustainable use of the ungulate-predator system of Etosha National Park: research on factors limiting ungulate populations in Etosha N.P., and wildlife management actions to promote population recoveries. Project proposal. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek.
- Vinjevold, R. (1991). Introduction of buffer zones adjacent to Etosha. Internal report. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Windhoek. (2)
- Wells, M. and K. Brandon. (1992). *People and Parks: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities*. World Bank, Washington D.C.
- _____. (1993). *The Principles and Practice of Buffer Zones and Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation*. In: *Ambio vol. 22 No. 2-3, May 1993*.
- West, P. C. and S. R. Brechin (eds). (1991). *Resident Peoples and National Parks: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

- Western, D. and R. M. Wright. (1994). The Background to Community-based Conservation. In: Western D. and R. M. Wright (eds). *Natural Connections. Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*. Island Press, Washington D.C.
- Wind, J. and H. H. T. Prins. (1989). Buffer Zone and Research Management for Indonesian National Parks: Inception Report. World Bank National Park Development Project. DHV/RIN Consultancies, Bogor, Indonesia. Quoted in Wells, M. and K. Brandon. The Principles and Practice of Buffer Zones and Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation. In: *Ambio vol. 22 No. 2-3, May 1993*. 1993.
- WWF. (1991). Community-based Conservation in Southern Africa. Workshop proceedings. Hwange National Park, Zimbabwe. September 17-21, 1991. World Wildlife Fund, Washington D. C.
- WWF. (1995). Background Documentation. Workshop 1 of the ICDP Review: "Linking Conservation and Human Needs: Creating Economic Incentives". April 30 - May 6, 1995. Bacalar, Mexico. World Wildlife Fund, Washington, D. C.

DIRECTORATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

Other Research Discussion Papers available in this series

1. **Ashley, C. 1994.** Population growth and renewable resource management: the challenge of sustaining people and the environment. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 1.* 40 pp.
2. **Ashley, C, Barnes, J and Healy, T. 1994.** Profits, equity, growth and sustainability: the potential role of wildlife enterprises in Caprivi and other communal areas of Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 2.* 25 pp.
3. **Quan, J, Barton, D and Conroy, C (Ashley, C ed). 1994.** A preliminary assessment of the economic impact of desertification in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 3.* 150 pp.
Northern commercial areas: Okahandja, Otjiwarongo and Grootfontein. 33 pp.
Communal and commercial areas of southern Namibia. 42 pp.
Northern communal areas: Uukwaluudhi. 35 pp.
4. **Ashley, C and Garland, E. 1994.** Promoting community-based tourism development: why, what and how? *DEA Research Discussion Paper 4.* 37 pp.
5. **Jones, BTB. 1995.** Wildlife management, utilisation and tourism in communal areas: benefits to communities and improved resource management. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 5.* 37 pp.
6. **Barnes, JI. 1995.** The value of non-agricultural land use in some Namibian communal areas: a data base for planning. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 6.* 21 pp.
7. **Ashley, C, Müller, H and Harris, M. 1995.** Population dynamics, the environment and demand for water and energy in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 7.* 37 pp.
8. **Barnes, JI and de Jager, JLV. 1995.** Economic and financial incentives for wildlife use on private land in Namibia and the implications for policy. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 8.* 21 pp.
9. **Rodwell, TC, Tagg, J and Grobler, M. 1995.** Wildlife resources in Caprivi, Namibia: The results of an aerial census in 1994 and comparisons with past surveys. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 9.* 29 pp.
10. **Ashley, C. 1995.** Tourism, communities and the potential impacts on local incomes and conservation. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 10.* 51 pp.
11. **Jones, BTB. 1996.** Institutional relationships, capacity and sustainability: lessons learned from a community-based conservation project, eastern Tsumkwe District, Namibia, 1991 - 96. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 11.* 43 pp.
12. **Ashley, C and Barnes, JI. 1996.** Wildlife use for economic gain: the potential for wildlife to contribute to development in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 12.* 23 pp.
13. **Ashley, C. 1996.** Incentives affecting biodiversity conservation and sustainable use: the case of land use options in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 13.* 21 pp.
14. **Jarvis, AM and Robertson, A. 1997.** Endemic birds of Namibia: evaluating their status and mapping biodiversity hotspots. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 14.* 103 pp.

continued overleaf.....

Other Research Discussion Papers in this series (continued).....

- 15 Barnes, JI, Schier, C. and van Rooy, G. 1997. Tourists' willingness to pay for wildlife viewing and wildlife conservation in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 15*. 24 pp.
- 16 Ashley, C, Barnes, JI, Brown, CJ and Jones, BTB. 1997. Using resource economics for natural resource management: Namibia's experience. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 16*. 23 pp.
- 17 Lange, GM, Barnes, JI and Motinga, DJ. 1997. Cattle numbers, biomass, productivity and land degradation in the commercial farming sector of Namibia, 1915 to 1995. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 17*. 28 pp.
- 18 Lange, GM. 1997. An approach to sustainable water management using natural resource accounts: the use of water, the economic value of water and implications for policy. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 18*. 39 pp.
- 19 Lange, GM and Motinga, DJ. 1997. The contribution of resource rents from minerals and fisheries to sustainable economic development in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 19*. 32 pp.
- 20 Ashley, C and LaFranchi, C. 1997. Livelihood strategies of rural households in Caprivi: implications for conservancies and natural resource management. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 20*. 96 pp.
- 21 Byers, BA. 1997. Environmental threats and opportunities in Namibia: a comprehensive assessment. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 21*. 65 pp.
- 22 Day, JA. 1997. The status of freshwater resources in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 22*. 46 pp.
- 23 O'Toole, MJ. 1997. Marine environmental threats in Namibia. *DEA Research Discussion Paper 23*. 48 pp.

For further information, contact:

**DEA Publications Department
Directorate of Environmental Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Private Bag 13306
Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: + 264 61 249015
Fax: + 264 61 240339
e-mail: jb@dea1.dea.met.gov.na**

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