# Table of Contents

A Introduction ................................................. 3  
B San Legal Status ........................................... 5  
C Base Line Data  
  Demographics .............................................. 7  
  Location of San ........................................... 8  
  Land Tenure ............................................... 16  
D CBNRM Status/Pressures in Namibia ...................... 18  
E Conservancy map and ICEMA intervention sites  
  Situation analysis and Lessons learned from Conservancy with San ........................................ 26  
F Strategy for Local Participation by the San  
  San Participation Issues in Conservancy Development .................................................. 31  
  ICEMA Indigenous People Development Action Plan .................................................. 32  
G Institutionnel Arrangement ................................ 35  
H Capacity Building for San Issues ......................... 35  
I Annual Review  
  Monitoring and Evaluation ................................ 36  
J Cost Estimates and Financing ............................. 38  
K San Annual Review Executing Agency ..................... 39  
L Implementations of Recommendations .................... 39  
M Selected References ........................................ 40  
N San Websites ............................................... 44  

## List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Map of administrative divisions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Location of San in Namibia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3a/b</td>
<td>Map of registered/emerging conservancies</td>
<td>21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>San language distribution in relation to conservancies</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5/6</td>
<td>Consultation Management Process</td>
<td>55/56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Table 1 San per region
Table 2 Status of San in conservancies
Table 3 ICEMA conservancy sites
Table 4 Consultation Methods
Table 5 Monitoring Framework

List of Annexes

Annex 1 Impact Analysis with regard to San
Annex 2 San Participation Procedures
Annex 3 Internal Monitoring Framework
Annex 4 External Monitoring Framework
A Introduction

The Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) provides an independent assessment of the project entitled “Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management”, funded by the World Bank/Global Environment Facility (hereinafter WB/GEF Project). This project is being administered by the World Bank and implemented by the Namibian Government through the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). The ESA was requested by the World Bank to ensure that the proposed project is carried out in line with Namibia’s Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) policy, the emerging Environmental Management Bill, and the applicable World Bank Safeguard Policies. An initial internal review by the World Bank classified the project as a category B project according to the World Bank standards. Impacts of category B projects are likely to be site-specific, relatively easy to mitigate and reversible within reason.

The project’s global objective is to “restore, secure and enhance key ecosystem processes in conservancies that increases the prospects to improve significantly the conservation of globally important biodiversity and to reduce land degradation in the country as a whole”.

The development objective of the project is to “promote community-based integrated ecosystem management that accrues socio-economic benefits, and prospects for benefits, to conservancies”.

The overall conclusion of the consultant team for the ESA is that the WB/GEF Project “Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management” is unlikely to have major negative biophysical and social environmental impacts. Mitigation measures can be put in place relatively easily to manage potential negative impacts. In many cases the mitigation measures recommended are already in place and/or can be built into the way in which implementing agencies carry out their work with local communities.

The World Bank has developed a number of Safeguard Operational Policies to ensure that all possible negative impacts are considered and mitigation measures are spelled out prior to the implementation of any proposed project. These policies ensure that the quality of operations is uniform across different settings worldwide. If the decision is taken that a Safeguard Policy should be applied, mitigation measures and plans need to be developed and in place before the implementation of a proposed project.

This document, the Indigenous People Development Plan (IPDP) is based on the Indigenous People’s Safeguard Policy (OD 4.20) as the World Bank has applied this policy, and is thus an issue, which has to be addressed by the proposed project.

The term “indigenous peoples” describes groups with a social and cultural identity distinct from the dominant society that makes them vulnerable to being disadvantaged in the development process. The IPDP for the above project will address the San of Namibia.
This decision was taken to trigger the Safeguard Policy for Indigenous Peoples prior to a determination by the implementing agency (Ministry of Environment and Tourism) that ICEMA will be mainly restricted to provide support to the 29 conservancies that have been registered before 2004. In two of these 29 conservancies, namely Nyae-Nyae and N#a-Jaqna in the Tsumkwe district, San form the dominant or exclusive residents or membership. In at least seven other conservancies in the Kunene, Erongo, Omusati and Caprivi regions, San minorities are present. For information on the initial project target sites and location of San community members see section C "Location of San" and section E "Conservancy maps and ICEMA intervention sites".

According to the Indigenous People's Safeguard Policy, the Namibia Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project requires the development of an IPDP because Indigenous peoples could be affected by the project. An IPDP is applicable regardless whether Indigenous Peoples might be affected positively or negatively by the project. The project is expected to incorporate and monitor activities that are identified by the IPDP. The IPDP has been developed in the event the project causes direct or indirect negative effects on the Indigenous Peoples of the project area. The IPDP needs to ensure that i) indigenous peoples benefit from the project, and, ii) that potentially adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples are avoided or mitigated. The IPDP should also endeavor to maximize positive effects of the project for Indigenous Peoples.

This IPDP is to be used in conjunction with the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that have all been prepared for this project as separate stand alone documents, also disclosed at the Bank info shop and in Namibia.
**B San Legal Status** (after Geingos, V, 2002)

The San people, the country's earliest known inhabitants, historically have been exploited by other ethnic groups. The Government has taken a number of measures to end this societal discrimination against the San, including seeking their advice about proposed legislation on communally held lands and increasing their access to primary education. By law all indigenous groups are able to participate equally in decisions affecting their lands, cultures, traditions, and allocations of natural resources. Nevertheless, the San and other indigenous Namibians have been unable to exercise fully these rights as a result of historically minimal access to education and economic opportunities under colonial rule, coupled with their relative isolation in remote areas of the country.

Immediately following Namibian independence in 1990, land redistribution and tenure reform became one of the government's focuses. At the same time a frantic land-grab erupted in some communal areas: communal farmers owning large cattle herds fenced off large plots for private use. This often happened at the expense of San, of whom a small minority owned a few head of cattle, and they did not have the financial means to erect fences. Meanwhile the fencing of land in communal areas has been declared illegal in Namibia, but this has led to further conflict between and within many communities.

Measures thus far taken by the Namibian Government to facilitate land redistribution and reform include the establishment of the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR), the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act of 1995, the National Resettlement Policy of 1997 and the National Land Policy of 1998 and the recent Communal Land Reform Act (Act No. 5 of 2002).

The purpose of this latter piece of legislation, according to Tjombe (2002:1), is "to provide for the allocation of land rights in communal areas, establish communal land boards and describe the powers of Chiefs and Traditional Authorities and boards with regard to communal land". And, as Werner explains (2001:11), "Communal land vests in the State in trust for the benefit of 'traditional' communities. The State is thus the ultimate owner of such land, with certain powers of alienation and allocation".

The Communal Land Reform Act seeks to regulate the land tenure relationship between the State and those occupying communal land owned by the State. It recognizes the existence of communal area conservancies and by extension the role they play in conservation. The Act makes provision for the conversion of traditional rights to leasehold rights for periods of up to 99 years. The members of the conservancies as well as the conservancy itself are able to apply for leases on existing conservancy land but the leases will not be granted if it changes significantly the agreed management plans and resource use of the conservancy. The makeup of the Communal Land Boards makes provision for membership for one representative from MET and for one representative from the conservancies within the relevant traditional area.

Therefore, the Communal Land Reform Act is the principal mechanism for allocating land rights and managing land use decisions, and contains the principles of decentralized decision-making, representation and consultation. However, the hopes of
the families residing at Namibia's 97 resettlement projects for land tenure have not yet been satisfied. The estimated 7 000 San supported by 11 resettlement projects (see Suzman, 2001:92) are constantly reporting on their dependency, frustration and lack of trust in the projects.

Though land is being acquired for resettlement under Namibia's Land Reform Act, the primary objectives of the national resettlement policy have thus far been achieved only in part, and in some cases not at all. Recent research has revealed that since the inception of the resettlement programme, the objective of attaining self-sufficiency within five years by means of "creating] employment through full-time farming and bringing] smallholder farmers into the mainstream of the Namibian economy by producing for the market" (Werner 2001: 6) have not been accomplished.

The Traditional Authorities Act, which came into effect in December 1995, defines the role, duties, and powers of traditional leaders. The act provides that customary law that is inconsistent with provisions of the Constitution is invalid and delineates which types of crimes may be dealt with in traditional courts. The act assigns to traditional leaders the role of guardians of culture and tradition, and also mandates that traditional leaders elected to Parliament must choose between their traditional and elected offices before the end of 1996. Some traditional leaders and human rights organizations have maintained that this provision is unconstitutional and court challenges are pursued.

To counteract the difficulties facing their many dispersed and remote communities across the southern African region regarding land rights, human rights, capacity-building and development, the San decided to establish a regional organization that could represent them at all levels, hence the establishment of the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) in 1996. WIMSA's core activities since its inception have included assisting San communities in dealing with land issues and human rights violations, planning and securing funds for development projects, and in Namibia, seeking official recognition of their traditional authorities.

Regarding land tenure, of the six broader Namibian San communities, only two, the Kung and Jul’hoansi of Tsumkwe District, today control their ancestral land (now state-owned communal land) and thus have access to natural resources. These two communities will be covered in the ICEMA project.

The Hai||om in north-western Namibia still live on their ancestral land, but lost control over it when it was absorbed into the Etosha National Park and commercial farms in the Outjo and Tsumeb districts.

The ancestral lands of the !Xóõ and Jul’hoansi in the Omaheke Region in south-eastern Namibia and the Khwe in West Caprivi in the far north-east have all been turned into communal or commercial farms that employ some San as farm laborers, historically paying them either a meager wage or in kind. Minimum wages for farm workers have subsequently been established by the Namibian Government (which excludes payment in kind) and other aspects of the Labour Act concerning services that employees have to be provided with are being enforced.

The answer to the question of whether or not San, i.e. particularly the communities other than the Kung and Jul’hoansi of Tsumkwe District can survive without land is clearly no, they cannot, unless they are able to gain entry into the formal economy and follow-
lifestyles not dependent on land or natural-resource based economies. Through land dispossession these San communities have lost their food security; they have become economically dependent on other ethnic groups and government food aid; they have experienced a loss of dignity, disruption of their social fabric, and degradation of their environment by intruders with large cattle herds; and in sum, they remain a marginalized population in Namibia and every other southern African country in which they live.

The San are aware that Namibia’s national land policy does not provide for the restitution of ancestral land, but they are adamant about making their voices heard on the matters of land to secure their future and recognition of their traditional authorities to ensure their representation on land boards and other bodies advising the Namibian President on land matters.

San in Namibia also hope that the process of granting conservancies that they regard as very positive developments for communal lands will be sped up so the conservancy-owning communities can soon start running income-generating projects on their lands. The Nyae Nyae Conservancy of the Jul'hoansi in the Tsumkwe district, the oldest registered conservancy in Namibia, has already established a variety of natural resource-based income generating activities, and has been assisted in the process to manage the recovery of key but formerly depleted natural resources.

C Baseline Data – Demographics and Land Tenure
(after Overseas Development Institute, 1999)

Demographics

The term San is used to refer to a diverse group of indigenous peoples living in southern Africa who share historical and linguistic connections. The term “Bushmen” is no longer used. Unfortunately, the San have historically been regarded as second-class citizens in Namibia by Europeans and Bantu-speaking peoples of north-east Africa. Figure 2 identifies where the San live in Namibia.

Namibia has a population of approximately 33,000 San – less than 2% of the total population (about 1.8 million). Their Human Development Index is less than half the national average, while their Human Poverty Index is more than double the national average. Per capita income of the San is the lowest among all language groups in Namibia, and the majority of the population lacks access to means of earning cash income. Food security is a major problem – with up to 70% of Namibian San dependent on food-aid programmes. Other problems facing the population include landlessness, lack of education, extreme poverty and dependency, as well as vulnerability to poverty-related diseases (e.g. tuberculosis) (Suzman 2001).

The San live in isolated groups in widespread regions of the Kalahari and traditionally used to be hunter-gatherers who migrated in small family bands. The San did not keep domestic livestock and they moved with everything they possessed to follow the availability of water, game and edible plants. Ownership of possessions or livestock is not typical in San society. Traditionally, women tend to look after the children as well as collecting plants and the men are involved in hunting.
Today, San communities are settled permanently in villages. Nores were they are diversifying their sources of livelihood like other indigenous communities in Namibia. Some San members are engaged in livestock and crop farming although at a very small scale, are employed to earn income, selling crafts, benefit from the social welfare grants provided by the government, participate in national programmes and have access to social services such as education, water, health, transport and communication etc.

The San can be divided into 6 groups, Jul’hoansi, !Kunq, !Xu, Kxow or Mbarakwenqo, Hei-||om, and |Nu||en. The last 3 groups had little to no contact with one another but this is changing though as San interests are forming into units of solidarity.

The San have a relative lack of collective political leadership. Individual decision-making and leadership is part of the culture.

**Location of San**

The San communities like other indigenous communities are settled in all parts of Namibia. The San community is widespread in the Otjozondjupa, Caprivi, Ohangwena and Oshikoto regions of the country. In most cases the San communities are settled along tribal lines in the different regions of the country and has embraced the socio-economic lifestyle of the region in which the live. In some regions some indigenous tribe members are very few and does not constitute a community but rather a few households that constitutes several family members.

The San communities living in the Otjozondjupa region and the Caprivi region are still deriving their livelihood from hunter gathering, therefore depends on the natural resources within their environment. The Otjozondjupa region and the Tsumkwe area in particular have the highest concentration of the San community.

Of the approximately 50% of the Namibian San population that live on communal lands, only 10% live in the Tsumkwe District (the only district where San has customary land rights), a further 25% live in Kavango, the north-central, Otjozondjupa and Omaheke (former Hereroland) regions combined, and just over 10% in West Caprivi. Only the San in Tsumkwe District have retained access to sufficient land and whose traditional authorities the Government officially recognizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rural / Urban San</th>
<th>Total San</th>
<th>% of San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otjozondjupa¹</td>
<td>8092 / 376</td>
<td>8468</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>6297 / 259</td>
<td>6556</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>5098 / 56</td>
<td>5154</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshikoto</td>
<td>4234 / 137</td>
<td>4371</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohangwena</td>
<td>1149 / 0</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>731 / 20</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>498 / 12</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khomas</td>
<td>79 / 33</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>38 / 11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>40 / 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>28 / 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Nyae Nyae Conservancy and N#a-Jaqa Conservancy – Tsumkwe District
Table 1 showing distribution of San per region (based on 1991 census, Atlas of Namibia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Karas</th>
<th>Oshana</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>20 / 8</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
<td>26308 / 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0 (99.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Namibia**

**Figure 1 Map of Administrative Divisions**

**Figure 1 Map of administrative divisions**
Map: Distribution of San in Namibia (Source: Suzman, James, ed. (2001b) An Assessment of the Status of the San Namibia. Windhoek, Namibia: Legal Assistance Center.)

Figure 2 Locations of San in Namibia
**Tsumkwe** was known as a San village and has developed over the years, and today is an administrative town of the Tsumkwe constituency. Most social services are such as school; clinic, police station, shops etc are available in Tsumkwe. The San community members are the majority in most of the registered and proposed conservancy areas within the Tsumkwe constituency.

In addition those in Nyae Nyae (East Tsumkwe) have a well established CBO (the Nyae Nyae conservancy and the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDFN) and are the beneficiaries of a number of NGO initiatives (co-ordinated predominantly by the NNDFN) (Suzman 2001). The Ju/'hoansi of Nyae Nyae are relatively culturally homogenous, with a relatively stable social structure, a strong sense of tradition and identity.

In contrast, the West Tsumkwe population is a mixture of predominantly San people from different areas (mainly !Kung). They have until recently been unable to access services provided by NGOs to Nyae Nyae, community institutions are weaker (though they operate under a single traditional authority) and institutional capacity is limited (Suzman 2001). They have, however, in 2003 succeeded in registering a conservancy, the **N#a-Jaqna Conservancy**, which has become the largest conservancy in Namibia.

The San of **West Caprivi** – the Kxoe speaking “Barakwena” – are supported in CBNRM activities by IRDNC, but are not expected to be affected by ICEMA. Conflicts have occurred with the Government over both land rights and the mandate of the traditional authority in West Caprivi, resulting in high levels of insecurity, worsened by military activity in 1999 and 2000, resulting a number or refugees fleeing to Botswana (though they are now slowly returning) (Suzman 2001). The San in the West Caprivi occur in the Caprivi Game Reserve, and although a parallel approach is being developed to grant them formal rights and opportunities concerning the use of the natural resources of this park, a conservancy cannot be established in this park in terms of current legislation. This situation will be reviewed in 2004, and the Caprivi Game Reserve (and adjacent Mahango Game Park) is in the process of being re-proclaimed as the Bwabwata National Park. The new national park will exclude, however, San settlements and land used by San for agriculture at present.

Other San groups include the Hei-||om who used to live in the area of the **Etosha National Park, Ovamboland and Tsumeb districts**. They were dispossessed of their land with the proclamation of the park and the creation of commercial farms in the Outjo and Tsumeb districts, although some inhabitants were given jobs and housing inside Etosha. In recent years they have tried to claim some land back, or at least, gain some compensation, but so far without success. The majority of the Hei-||om San are resident on farms and towns in the Outjo and Tsumeb districts.

There are also San living in other communal areas and among other ethnic groups, and some are present as small minorities in at least seven other conservancies (see Table 2). In **Omaheke, Otjozondjupa and Kavango regions**, most San are unpaid labourers for local Herero and Kavango farmers. They might be given some maize meal and milk for carrying out various types of work. This labour practice is illegal and has recently received considerable publicity and the attention of the Labour Commissioner. They are rarely incorporated into local decision-making fora, and are among the most destitute people in Namibia.
The San groups that are living in the below-mentioned conservancies are often not part of the conservancies' membership. Since no survey has been carried out yet regarding the San population living in the below-mentioned conservancies, population numbers are based on an estimation.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Size (km²)</th>
<th>Population (registered membership)</th>
<th>Presence of San group within the area of the conservancy</th>
<th>Status of San within the conservancy</th>
<th>Main source of income of San in the conservancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyae-ye-keu</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>San represent majority of conservancy members</td>
<td>San represent majority of conservancy members</td>
<td>Main income through conservancy benefits (trophy-hunting, tourism, sustainable game harvesting, etc) as well as full-time employment in conservancy management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kya-kehna</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>San are represented in the conservancy management committee</td>
<td>San represent majority of conservancy members</td>
<td>Additional income from selling crafts, supplemented by limited livestock and crop production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayuni</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>San represent majority of conservancy members</td>
<td>San represent majority of conservancy members</td>
<td>Nima income from employment or conservancy activities. Community remains dependent on social security programmes as well as remittances from out-of-conservancy employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the IPDP Action Plan includes a social assessment in each ICEMA target site prior any intervention.

Information provided by WIMSA and by M. Mosimane, CBNRM Programme Leader, University of Namibia.

An average family consists of 5 members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>San Presence</th>
<th>San Employment</th>
<th>San Farming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mashi</td>
<td>Represented</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwanzu</td>
<td>Represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunda</td>
<td>Represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 families in Kwidu and Wuparo Conservancies altogether.

- San represent minority of conservancy members.
- Estimated 5 - 20 families outside the area (Grootfontein and Sumkwe).
- Lives at San en Rus and Kafir Pies.
- San represented minority of conservancy members (estimated 5 - 20 families).
- San are represented on the management committee.
- Office in village.
- Aman of Okakke village is a San community member and is appointed as a Conservancy Management Committee member.
- San represent minority of conservancy members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soms Sores</td>
<td>K. Pare</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Estimated 5 and 10 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San represent minority of conservancy members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated 10 - 15 families in Soms, Sores, S. Kab and Khoas Conservancies together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San represent minority of conservancy members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-ua 4</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Estimated 8 - 12 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No information available, probably through livestock farming or as farm labourers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ehviropuka</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Estimated 8 - 12 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated 5 and 10 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San represent minority of conservancy members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated 10 - 15 families in Soms, S. Kab and Khoas Conservancies together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San represent minority of conservancy members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated 8 - 12 families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Tenure

A major dividing issue has been the relative merit of indigenous customary tenure systems and those based on western concepts involving the registration of individual ownership. In the 1980s, the policy debate on the individualization of tenure focused on economic development. In the 1990s, the focus has turned to the sustainable use of land resources.

Both of these arguments tend to underestimate the importance of customary land tenure systems, which are an integral part of the social, political and economic framework. Above all, they overlook the unintended effects of undermining land tenure systems, which protect poor and vulnerable members. They also tend to disregard the empirical evidence that traditional tenure systems can be flexible and responsive to changing economic circumstances. With population pressure and commercialization, individualization has occurred autonomously (Migot-Adholla et al., 1994).

The case for government intervention undoubtedly varies greatly throughout southern Africa. The extent to which rural people are able informally to adjust tenure to suit their livelihood purposes is likely to depend on the extent to which land rights have been disrupted by past interventions and by enforced overcrowding under colonial and apartheid regimes.

There are undoubtedly 'tenure hot spots' where, if the rights of the more vulnerable members of society are to be protected, change must not be allowed to take place in a legal and administrative vacuum. People are often uncertain about the nature of their rights and confused about the extent to which institutions and laws affect them. Matters are further clouded by local and national political conflicts over land management roles in the communal areas (CAs).

The need to resolve tenure problems in the CAs, particularly in informal settlements of Namibia, has been overshadowed by a debate about the restitution of ancestral lands and the redistribution of white-owned ranches. Namibia is a sparsely populated arid country, about 44% of which is made over to freehold, fenced ranches, mainly white-owned in central and southern Namibia. Another 43% of Namibia is communal land, most of it unsurveyed and unfenced. White settlers did not occupy the more fertile land to the north, where at least half of the population lives. Pastoral and mixed farming systems remained more or less intact, but the CAs in the north were seriously disrupted by the war preceding independence.

On coming to power in 1990, the SWAPO government announced its intention of transferring land to the landless majority but agreed to a constitution in which the property of citizens could not be taken without 'just compensation'. With the support of the opposition, it conducted a national consultation on the land question, culminating in a National Conference in Windhoek in June 1991. Broad agreement was reached that the restitution of particular areas of land to specific tribal groups was not feasible because the land used by the various pastoral groups had overlapped for centuries and could not be identified with accuracy. With regard to the inequity of freehold land ownership, the meeting recommended that foreigners should not be allowed to own farms, absentee landlords should be expropriated and that ownership of very large farms and/or several farms by one person should not be allowed.
Almost half the meeting’s recommendations relate to the resolution of land-related issues in CAs: inter alia the need to guarantee land to local people; to abolish land allocation fees demanded by chiefs; to grant land to women in their own right; to establish a system of land administration; to control ‘illegal fencing’ of grazing areas; and to move the herds of wealthy farmers to commercial farms. Neither the national conference nor the briefing papers by NEPRU (1991) gave guidance on the options for a future land tenure system.

In the years following the conference, land reform received little attention. The Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation (MLRR) remained weak. Contrary to the recommendations of the conference regarding the fencing of grazing in the CAs, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (MAWRD)) went ahead with a credit scheme to help farmers subdivide the communal land.

In 1995, shortly before the general election, the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act was passed. It provided for the acquisition of excessively large, under-utilized and foreign-owned freehold farms for redistribution, but with inadequate attention to how the new tenants should be identified or settled.

Unlike this Act, the National Land Policy and the proposed legislation for the CAs have been through a process of public consultation. As Werner (1997) observes, the Communal Land Act touches on issues that are sensitive among a large and powerful rural constituency, including traditional leaders and the Ovambo people who have their roots in the relatively densely populated CAs in the north and provide the bulk of SWAPO support.

In 2002, subsequent to the enactment of the Communal Land Reform Act, Land Boards have been established in all 13 regions. Land Boards have representation from regional councils, traditional authorities, conservancies and a range of other Government agencies. In 2002 and 2003, land reform on freehold land has accelerated through the increase of Government expenditure on land purchases and resettlement, accelerating an affirmative action loan scheme through the Agricultural Bank for farm purchases, and securing external funding support for the establishment of a multi-disciplinary Permanent Technical Team in the MLRR, tasked with the review of current land reform policies and programmes, again involving extensive national consultation.

Namibian San populations have benefited from the CBNRM programme, as well as from associated programmes of sustainable use of natural resources. However, given the lack of land rights of most San communities, it is only a minority that is likely to directly benefit from such a programme.

One of the key responsibilities of the conservancies is to try to ensure that the interests of the San are protected. There is risk for the further marginalization of the San where they are a local minority, if their participation in the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project is not sought and encouraged.

The land is owned by the state. Although traditional authorities should be consulted before outsiders gain access to a specific community’s land, this often does not happen. Grazing lands in most of the communal areas are open access and a common property management regime needs to be established in order to provide for proper land and
resource management. Most San people, except those in west Caprivi and the Nyae Nyae (former Bushmanland) have been disposed of their land.

D CBNRM Status / Pressures in Namibia (after Brian Jones, 1999)

In the 8 years since the passing of Namibia’s Communal Area Conservancy legislation, a total of 29 conservancies, incorporating more than 72,000 residents managing an area of some 7,072,300 hectares, have been registered and gazetted. In addition to the 22% of communal lands encompassed by the 29 gazetted conservancies, a further 35 conservancies (incorporating estimated 50,000 to 60,000 more people) across the country are preparing for registration. Support for CBNRM comes mainly from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, and the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO), a collaboration of 11 NGOs and the University of Namibia.

There are non-financial CBNRM benefits; most notable is the development of empowerment and respect for the San communities involved in conservancy development. This empowerment is due to:

- adaptable institutions
- defined and committed membership
- accountable leaders and participatory processes for making decisions, sharing information, and including women
- cohesive social units with a common purpose
- new skills
- mechanisms for managing and recovery of natural resources
- experience and confidence in dealing with outsiders
- recognition from neighbors and outside authorities
- pride and sense of control

The success of CBNRM is tangible. During June 2003, the fourth annual game census of more than 5,000,000 hectares of existing and emerging communal conservancies in northwest Namibia was conducted. The results of the census found significant increases for most wildlife populations. Translocation of wildlife is occurring in areas where wildlife populations are low, or slow to recover.

However, as wildlife numbers increase, human/wildlife contacts also increasing resulting in loss of human life, crop losses and livestock predation. In the Caprivi and Kunene regions, a Human Animal Conflict Compensation Scheme (HACCS) is underway. Under this scheme, over the long term, individual conservancies will compensate for stock losses caused by certain species of wildlife, provided that certain and clear conditions are met.

Although the conservancy approach is relatively new, communal area residents feel they will benefit and are willing to try to invest time and effort in establishing these agreements. In the past, income generation opportunities open to communities have
depended on the goodwill of the government and the private sector. Now, the acquisition of conservancy status gives communities trophy hunting, camping and photographic tours concession rights, providing greater opportunities to generate income and a position of strength from which to negotiate with the private sector.

The San Nyae Nyae conservancy in northeastern Namibia was able to conclude a trophy hunting agreement with N$175,000 over two years soon after its registration as a conservancy in late 1997. The value of this hunting operation has expanded considerably, and the last agreement brought over N$1 million to the conservancy.

CBNRM is increasing revenue generation for participating communities. Total CBNRM income in Namibia in 2001 was N$6,000,000 and in 2002 it was N$11,000,000. Despite this success and growth, considerable challenges for the CBNRM movement remain, which are:

- Management of benefits (financial and non-financial)
- Building and maintaining good communications and relations with a variety of diverse stakeholders
- Managing impacts of human/wildlife contacts
- Upholding conservancies beyond the wildlife focus; and
- Reaching social, economic and environmental sustainability.

To meet the above challenges, focus must be placed on local skill development. Such skills encompass: planning, reporting, communication, land-use planning, management, participatory decision-making, negotiation, HIV/AIDS awareness, monitoring, and evaluation and conflict resolution.

To date, 4 conservancies have reached financial independence. These are Tora, Uibasen, Nyae Nyae (San) and Salambala.

**Negative**

Despite wildlife controls, wildlife numbers have generally fallen in most communal areas except where successful community based conservation projects exist. In northern communal areas, uncontrolled cutting of trees for various needs is present, while in the northeast woodlands are being cleared for shifting cultivation.

In many cases traditional mechanisms for land and resource allocation and management have broken down. Under South African colonial rule, land allocation was the function of government officials, but in practice, traditional leaders believed the land was owned by chief or king and allocated land according to customary law. However, a number of factors, including post independence government policy’ have eroded this de facto allocation of land by traditional leaders. The erosion of the power and status of traditional leaders has contributed to the development of “open access” situations in much of Namibia's communal land, such that residents are unable to prevent others from settling on the land and using its resources, to the detriment of existing residents. In this situation, people have little incentive to invest time and effort in managing the land for the future, but tend to use what they can before someone else does. As a !Kung resident of Omatako says: “Our land is small. What will become of our conservancy if such a
small place is full of cattle? This place is our future. Please help us so that we can close the gate and know where we will live together."

However, conservancy creation brings costs as well. To meet conservancy conditions, communities need to spend a large amount of time in meetings, which have significant opportunity costs in terms of other activities individuals might deem important. The degree of organization involved in arranging meetings, particularly in the northwest where settlements are scattered, can take up a large amount of time for core leaders, and in some cases at their own expense. The length of time it has taken government to effect policy and legislative reform from the time when this was first discussed with pilot communities has lead to individual losing faith that any change would really occur. However, most communities believe that the benefits will outweigh the costs.

The policy that communities must define themselves, and agree boundaries with neighbours often exacerbates existing conflict over resources and causes delays in conservancy formation. There is also a risk that households and individuals will not perceive a direct link between income and their input into managing the resource, if the income is put into community projects or a bank account. There is also a risk that income will be used for infrastructure, which is really the domain of the government, letting government shirk its responsibilities.

Conservancy institutions are beginning to provide the building blocks for local development that go well beyond the initial scope of the CBNRM. Again, the legal rights acquired by conservancies will further increase community's sense of empowerment. There is a need to focus on the establishment of community resource management institutions with secure and exclusive group rights over all natural resources on their land, including formal tenure over the land itself, and the opportunity to carry out integrated land use planning and management.
E Conservancy map and ICEMA intervention sites

The following maps and tables aim to demonstrate the location of registered and emerging communal conservancies in Namibia as well as to present an initial overview of the situation of San in the registered conservancies selected as initial ICEMA target sites.

Figure 3a Registered and Emerging Communal Conservancies in 2001

Registered and Emerging Communal Conservancies
Figure 3b Registered Communal Conservancies as of December 31, 2003
### Table 3 Initial ICEMA Project intervention sites (registered conservancies) and CBNRM issues (Conservancies with San majority highlighted – see also table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Size (km²)</th>
<th>Population (registered membership)</th>
<th>Key CBNRM issues</th>
<th>Priority CBNRM action/s</th>
<th>Status of Conservancy Management Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyae</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grown up, Talo caup;</td>
<td>- Develop integrated management plan;</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Current core population</td>
<td>- Diversification of revenue generating activities needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorris Sorris</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>- High potential but no integrated management plan or business / development plan;</td>
<td>- Develop integrated management plan;</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>- CBO under-resourced;</td>
<td>- Diversify revenue generating activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huab</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>- Not yet developed or benefiting from natural resources</td>
<td>- Develop integrated management plan;</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuparo</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>- No income;</td>
<td>- Potential site for community tourist lodge</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>- No management plan</td>
<td>- Improve management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwandu</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>- Low income through CBNRM;</td>
<td>- High potential site for community tourist lodge</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>- Elephant-human conflicts;</td>
<td>- Diversify revenue generating activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehiviropuka</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>- Next to ENP – wildlife conflicts;</td>
<td>- Address human-elephant conflict;</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>- Not yet developed or benefiting from natural resources</td>
<td>- Improve management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omatendeka</td>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>- Human-elephant conflicts;</td>
<td>- Diversify revenue generating activities</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>- Not yet developed or benefiting from natural resources</td>
<td>- Address human-elephant conflict;</td>
<td>Rudimentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Khoadi Høas</td>
<td>Kuene</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>- Unprotected forests, vulnerable riverine forests;</td>
<td>- Improve management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>- Diversification of revenue generating activities needed</td>
<td>- Diversification of revenue generating activities needed</td>
<td>Advanced, zonation in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uukwahaudhi</td>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>- Limited financial benefits;</td>
<td>- Integrate forest management to other activities;</td>
<td>Basic, primary zonation in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>- Diversification of revenue generating activities needed</td>
<td>- Improve management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4  San language distribution in relation to Conservancies (language data from Mendelsohn et al. 2002)
Situation analysis and Lessons learned from Conservancy with San – Nyae Nyae Conservancy

Although the San community are concentrated in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy and the N#A Jaqna Conservancy, few are settled in other conservancies (see table 2).

The N#A Jaqna Conservancy is at the initial stages of conservancy formation and support to develop decision-making structures and natural resource management skills (only registered recently in July 2003). It can therefore not offer any lessons to others yet. The conservancy covers 9,120 sq. km, and consist of 782 members, with a total number of residents of ca. 8,000. Relatively little is known about this conservancy and the resident community, and it has not yet launched any income-generating activities. This large spatially settled area has abundant plant resources (especially hardwood timber) but very limited surface water sources and low game populations. Agricultural potential is low due to deep unconsolidated sandy substrates and the presence of plants poisonous to livestock, except in seasonal riverbeds where limited cultivation is possible sporadically. The people are much more socially and culturally heterogeneous than the Nyae Nyae residents, and include San resettled there from other areas. Social cohesion is relatively low, but the community managed to complete the process regarding the registration of a conservancy, and the designation of a representative body.

The Nyae Nyae Conservancy is the second largest conservancy in Namibia and encompasses approximately 9,030 km² of Kalahari woodlands. The Nyae Nyae Conservancy was founded by one of Namibia's most marginalized ethnic groups, the Ju/'hoansi San. The conservancy (excluding the district settlement of Tsumkwe) has 770 adult members, which represent a total population of approximately 1,800-2,000 San people (Berger, #Oma, #Honeb, and Viall, 2003).

The Ju/'hoansi San are a society in transition. Historically, the Ju/'hoansi were a skilled, hunter-gather society that moved seasonally over vast distances between Botswana and Namibia. However, the area now inhabited by the Ju/'hoansi is roughly one-tenth of the 35,000 square miles (90,688 km²) that an estimated 1,200 Ju/'hoansi occupied as recently as 1950 (Nyae Nyae Development Foundation, 2002). This reduction in landbase, combined with the loss of traditional hunter/gatherer skills in the younger generation of Ju/'hoansi, is increasingly forcing the Ju/'hoansi to adapt to western societal norms. However, the remoteness of the area and the challenges of developing an effective, culturally-adaptive educational system for the San have yet to counter the Ju/'Hoansi's extremely low levels of literacy and employment. Furthermore, efforts to introduce the traditional hunter/gatherer Ju/'hoansi to sedentary agricultural activities (i.e., livestock and crop production) have had limited success (Berger, et.al., 2003), and

such activities are further constrained by the conflicts these activities face with local predator and expanding elephant populations.

(i) Support received to date:

Since 1993, the Living In A Finite Environment (LIFE)\textsuperscript{6} Project has assisted the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation to support the Ju/'Hoansi San through a grant to bolster the Nyae Nyae Conservancy's ability to sustainably manage and benefit from its natural resources. A key aspect of this grant has been to assist the Ju/'Hoansi to rebuild their wildlife populations from historical low levels in the early to mid-1990s back to numbers that can contribute to the Ju/'hoansi’s welfare through benefits generated from trophy hunting, tourism, sustainable game meat harvesting, and potentially, game farming of high-value species such as roan antelope or buffalo. The support to the Ju/'Hoansi has come in a number of forms, including: assistance in mobilizing the Ju/'Hoansi into a conservancy; conservancy land-use zoning around different land-uses (i.e., wildlife, integrated livestock, village areas, etc.); development and maintenance of game watering points; re-introduction of game to bolster the recovery rate and financial viability of the conservancy; support to the valuable disease-free buffalo herd; marketing and negotiation of trophy hunting concessions; and capacity-building of the Nyae Nyae Conservancy committee to manage the above activities.

(ii) Nyae Nyae Conservancy benefits:

The formation of conservancies has generated financial and non-financial benefits to indigenous communities that participated in the formation of conservancies. The most notable non-financial benefits are the development of democratic institutions within these communities. The San community of Nyae Nyae conservancy has made significant progress in terms of community organisation and participation and the conservancy becoming a sustainable self-sufficient organisation. This is an opportunity, which other San communities in the Tsumkwe constituency can utilize to diversify their livelihood.

The Ju/'Hoansi San are one of Namibia's most poverty-stricken and marginalized communities. The analysis of the combined Wiessner/Conservancy employment and income data showed that the Nyae Nyae Conservancy directly provides 28% of the full-time jobs in the conservancy and approximately 35% of the cash income of conservancy members in 2003. Financial benefits have been derived from trophy hunting, camping and photographic tours concession rights. The economic opportunities created through the formation of the conservancy generate income for the indigenous communities and the rights acquired enable them to negotiate with the private sector. Additional livelihood benefits derived from game meat consumed by conservancy members, and from the support the conservancy provides towards maintenance of village and wildlife water points.

The heterogeneous nature of indigenous communities, including the San influences the benefits derived by individuals and households. This is a day-to-day scenario where individuals or households benefits differently due to their ability and skills they possess.

\textsuperscript{6} The LIFE Project is jointly funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Ministry of Environment & Tourism, and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and administered by the WWF on behalf of the Namibia National CBNRM Programme.
The management and control of benefit distribution from the conservancy is a complex issue in all conservancies. The San community will therefore also experience benefit distribution challenges and they will have to devise culturally and locally acceptable solutions to the challenges.

The San community possesses valuable knowledge of natural resource management and utilisation, which they can harness through conservancy management. They can utilize the support they receive from government and non-governmental organisations through the national CBNRM programme to implement the knowledge they possess to their benefit and the benefit of the future San generations.

(ii) Challenges and Lessons Learned:

It should be noted that the described challenges for the San below are of general nature (occurring in communal rural areas) and are not specific to the CBNRM Programme and the creation of conservancies. As a matter of fact, the lessons from the CBNRM Programme and the Nyae Nyae conservancy have shown that it tends to improve the situation of rural communities (including San) through prevention and conflict solving mechanisms such as consultation, participation and joint land use planning efforts, use of community game guards or environmental shepherds.

- **Open access:** The conflict between the San communities in the Tsumkwe constituency and the non-San communities has been around access to land and natural resources, and grazing in particular. The sparsely populated Tsumkwe constituency has experienced the arrival of cattle farmers to the area searching for grazing for their livestock (neighboring Herero herdsmen). The arrival of cattle farmers threatens the livelihood of the San community because of the additional pressure cattle put on the natural resources, especially edible plants the San community collects for a living and pristine wildlife habitats.

- **Integrated resource management:** There is also a need to better integrate and harmonize wildlife and agricultural activities at village community levels. There is scope for introducing small horticultural production activities, but this will require the introduction of measures to mitigate the conflict being created by expanding Nyae Nyae and elephant populations. Though arable agricultural production has limited potential in Nyae Nyae, there is a need for the Ju/'Hoansi to introduce appropriate technology (i.e., drip irrigation systems) to allow small-scale gardens to be developed at the village level to supplement their nutritional needs;

- **Long-term perspective:** The transitional nature of Ju/'Hoansi society and culture places the Ju/'Hoansi people at competitive disadvantage to other ethnic groups in Namibia. Given current low literacy levels and the disadvantaged position of the Ju/'Hoansi people, there is a need for long-term donor commitment and effective coordination of donor inputs if the capacity of the Ju/'Hoansi people is to be appropriately developed in the coming years.

- **Insufficient capacity:** Lack of education and understanding of new concepts compromise the ability of San to take full advantage of the opportunities available to them. Although San have the potential to form conservancies, manage natural resources and derive financial and non-financial benefits from the conservancy, they need more support from government and non-governmental organisation to maximize their benefits from the conservancy.
(iv) Participation:

Active participation of the San community as members of the conservancy is hampered by lack of education. On the other hand the experience of Nyae Nyae demonstrates that with the necessary support from government and non governmental organization the formation of conservancy can benefits the San community and empowers them to exercise their rights to manage, utilize and take decision over their natural resources.

While recognizing the lack of traditional leadership in some indigenous communities and the San in particular, the formation of conservancies creates an opportunity for the San community to organize themselves into representative institutions than can represents the rights and interests of the community. The communities inter and intra social dynamics of power that influence participation and access to benefits should however be mitigated through the implementation of the project, although they are part of community development.

Conservancies are community institutions unique to each indigenous community that decide to exercise the right to form a conservancy. These institutions are likely to experience community dynamics within and from outside the conservancy. It is the local management of the dynamics that determines the ability of the community to develop the conservancy to improve their livelihoods. The San as a unique indigenous community with the support of the government and the non governmental organization will have to respond to the challenges to create a conducive environment for the conservancy to improve and diversify their livelihoods.

F Strategy for Local Participation by the San (after Australian Heritage Commission, 2002)

Participation by the San at the local level is crucial to ensure their needs are taken into consideration and sustainable solutions are achieved. Failure to respect San interests in respective conservancy areas can result in less overall success of the conservancy activities and the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project, whether the conservancy is being developed by the San, or, the San are indirectly involved in other conservancy projects.

Consultation with San assumes added importance in formulation of the conservancy and planning for activities proposed to be undertaken to enhance their participation in the project. When preparing the conservancy plans consultations must be held with the local San communities and other stakeholders including village elders, village level government officials, NGOs and civil society. Table 3 identifies methods to be used for consultation.
Table 4- Consultation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Communities</td>
<td>Individual discussions, field observations and study, transect walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local CBOs and neighboring communities</td>
<td>Focused discussions, village meetings, regional and state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected representatives to local governments</td>
<td>Individual interviews, consultations on conservancy maps, regional and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local conservancy officials</td>
<td>Joint meetings and individual consultations on conservancy maps, regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project officials and line departments and</td>
<td>Joint meetings, individual interviews and consultations, regional and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/civil society</td>
<td>level stakeholders workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the important issues raised and addressed already by the San with respect to conservancy participation include:

- Inadequate participation in the projects
- Inadequate representation in the decision making process under the project
- Lack of capacity to manage the project at the community level
- Dependence on farm/wage labour for their livelihood
- Tribal customary rights and restriction
- Encroachment including shifting cultivation/cattle grazing in communal San areas
- Conflicts with neighbouring communities on usufruct and customary rights
- Lack of employment opportunities
- General poor socio-economic conditions in San villages
- Specific efforts required to dovetail government schemes for the socio-economic development of San groups

During implementation of the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project and this IPDP, the field level functionaries of the Ministry of Environment, responsible for implementing the project supported by CBOs, NGOs and the private sector must involve San communities to plan and implement activities under the project. In respect of IPDP, some of the activities, which will require concerted efforts on the part of project implementing agencies, include the following:

- Undertaking social impact assessment at the San community level
- Identifying issues related to San at the village level
- Identifying gaps in the infrastructure in the San community
- Assessing the implementation of on-going government schemes and families benefited so far
- Identifying strategies to be adopted to enhance the participation of and project benefits to San communities
- Identifying specific activities to be included under IPDP
Identifying government and other development schemes that could be dovetailed for the socio-economic development of the San
Developing activities that could be taken up with government support and other components of the project
Coordinating with concerned agencies to dovetail government schemes
Monitoring the implementation

Given the poor socio-economic status of the San, they continue to lag behind the general population. The approach so far adopted in the past was top down planning and implementation. As a result San communities could not benefit from the various constitutional safeguards, policy regulations and government development programs. This clearly demonstrates the need for focused attention on San issues and involving them in the planning of activities based on their felt needs. Local San groups need to be supported in implementing all the IPDP and conservancy activities. This approach is the heart of the over all project approach of community driven development.

The first step under this approach is the identification of issues confronted by San groups so that strategies could be formulated. Keeping in view these problems and issues, which have evolved overtime, and to remove the socio-economic constraints faced by them, there is a need to plan and implement deliberate interventions under the conservancy project. At the same time, there is a need to dovetail the on-going government development schemes to ensure the continuity of sustained efforts of the Namibian Government. The underlying objective of the San conservancy project is to reduce the dependence of San on the farm wage labour for their economic subsistence, to narrow the gap in the levels of development of San and non-San through socio-economic development and mainstreaming activities.

San Participation Issues in Conservancy Development

In the northern and northeastern parts of Namibia where most of Namibia’s San reside, empowerment and participation issues remain.

At the moment, only 2 conservancies with a San majority have been registered and gazetted; the Nyae Nyae and NÃ­A Jaqna. Of these 2, only the Nyae Nyae has it own recognized system of self-determination. Other registered conservancies include San minorities (see table 2 for San in conservancies including ICEMA's initial target sites).

All other San have not been recognized by the government as having special rights to self-determination. Consequently, non-San pastoralists continue to dispossess the San to access of traditional lands. The result of this is that many San become farm labour for the pastoralists or other agricultural operations.

Even within the Nyae Nyae conservancy, the government has not granted the San complete control over natural resources, or gives recognition to the San's traditional knowledge and traditional land management practices. The government model of conservancy structures tends to be hierarchical, and overpowers the San traditional governance structures. The government has not provided particular assistance to the
Nyae Nyae to help them try to achieve a balanced system of game management that is based on traditional values.

To have a more balanced approach to land and natural resource management, the San must be assisted by highly qualified land management practitioners who can blend the hierarchical and traditional land management systems. The San do want to be part of the modern world, but want to be able to maintain their traditional systems and practices.

Conservancy activities and the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project can assist the San in ensuring their traditional knowledge and practices are applied as long as the Conservancy Committees develop land use plans that are more holistic in perspective. To the San, conservancy agreements are not just about land and game management issues, but also rather about the whole aspect of San society.

San Village Development committees can be a useful tool to ensure that their interests are properly reflected in the conservancy structures. This will require careful facilitation of village meetings by the Village Development Committees to determine how San interests and values are reflected in conservancies planned on or near San population concentrations. A useful output from such deliberations would be a comprehensive San land use plan. Such an exercise should also be integrated with similar discussions with neighbouring Village Development Committees so that the interest of the San in a particular region is properly respected. Such collaboration will ensure capacity is built within the San communities from the ground up. At all points, established Conservancy Committees where San are not the majority of managers, should be the first point of contact where the San can have their issues heard and addressed.

Conservancy discussions to date have articulated that conservancies can be the panacea for empowerment and development of the San. This is true if the activities within in a San conservancy respect the capacities of the San themselves. To this end, the niche that the San have is their rich traditional knowledge and practices, which can be amplified in a conservancy through campsite development, traditional crafts, guiding and cultural education. Although San capacity at the moment is now low with respect to higher levels of conservancy activities, such as lodge management and operation, they still need information now on what skills are needed to move into higher levels of conservancy work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICEMA Indigenous Peoples Development Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following actions have been identified to ensure that the ICEMA Project maximize positive effects of the project for the San, that San benefit from the Project and that potentially adverse effects on San are avoided or mitigated:

(i) Project sites selection and social assessment at San community level (part of annual work plan development – ICEMA component 4)

The precise nature of interventions and the additional activities needed to address any specific problems of the San would be determined when strategic social assessments are carried out at individual San community level for preparing conservancy plans.
As part of ICEMA project implementation, a work plan will be developed under coordination of the Project Office on an annual basis to detail activities for the following year of project implementation and to identify and select intervention sites (as per project component 4). Upon annual site selection, all conservancies that will receive support from the project in the following year will be scanned for San membership, the latter that would imply carrying-out of a strategic social assessment for the area prior to project intervention. For the first year of project intervention, a list of 10 potential sites has already been identified, of which two conservancies have San as the majority of conservancy members and others as a minority (see table 2). Accordingly, social assessments for the respective conservancies will be undertaken before effectiveness of the project. The social assessment will:

- Participatively identify San people in the area covered under the conservancy project. This is particularly important in San areas with mixed population.
- Determine the economic status of San, in terms of their landholding, poverty level, livelihood strategies and dependence on communal land. This will help in planning activities focused on their economic development.

(ii) Implement San participation plan (under ICEMA component 1 and 2 activities)

All specific measures proposed to develop San under a conservancy project area will form part of the participation plan. The first and foremost in the process of participation is that when the field level officials and the other stakeholders involved in conservancy activities and the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project start working with the San communities. During this process, these functionaries should ensure the involvement of the San at all stages of planning and implementing project interventions at the community level. In San areas where San are mixed with general population, there is likelihood that the San do not have adequate representation in conservancy management committees and conservancy planning. The project will support concerted efforts to ensure that San are not under represented in the decision-making bodies at the local level. NGO will help to ensure that representation on conservancies committees will reflect the diversity of community members, and in particular in conservancies with San. In order to ensure a fair representation of the San groups, members from San communities could be chosen in proportion to their population in the conservancy area. The role of NGO/CBOs assures importance here when they take up awareness campaigns to explain the need for the active involvement of the San in the decision making process at the community level. For this purpose, NGO/CBO and field level conservancy personnel will undertake awareness and communication programs to explain about the participatory nature of project activities and the need to involve all sections of the society in planning and implementing project interventions at the San community level. In areas inhabited by San, information, education and communication campaigns will be designed and tailored to meet San socio-cultural situations and will be taken up more intensively to ensure their participation and a fair and adequate representation in conservancy development processes. Annex 2 provides a more detailed account of how the San can ensure their active participation and how ICEMA will support the process.

(iii) Provide for capacity building and training for facilitators to work with San groups (under ICEMA components 1, 2 and 3)
For this purpose, capacity building activities will be provided to encourage and equip governmental field staff, NGO/CBO and conservancy staff to work with the San groups and provide adequate resources for their field operations in San areas with large San populations.

At the San community level, the following actions are envisaged throughout the process of preparing, implementing and monitoring activities proposed under the IPDP.

(iv) Enable San participation in project planning, implementation and monitoring (under ICEMA components 1 and 2)

- Ensure that each San household actively participates in the San decisions making process. In San areas with a mixed population, ensure that all San within a project area have adequate representation.
- Encourage self-help groups (SHG) among San to take up economic activities.
- Organize separate SHG for women among San so as to benefit from their social and cultural capital.
- Identify gaps in the infrastructure in San areas, discuss with relevant government agencies on exploring the possibilities of funding.
- San Village Development committees should be encouraged to act as a pressure group or lobby in procuring support and benefits for the San through NGO/CBOs, the Conservancy Committee and other state bodies.

As stated earlier, the overall approach in planning and implementing San participation and representation is to extend programs already inbuilt in the project design on a priority basis to San communities under the respective Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project.

(v) Develop benefit distribution plans (under ICEMA component 1)

Further, all efforts should be made to dovetail government development programs for the socio-economic welfare of San groups. In this regard, conservancy and government personnel at different levels have major responsibilities to ensure that San benefit from conservancy activities. The ICEMA project supports the development and improvement of conservancy benefit distribution plans at conservancy level. Specifically, conservancy and government staff at the divisional/district level together with NGO/CBOs, should ensure the following:

- San issues should be an integral component of the conservancy plan, and accordingly ensure that the financial allocation for activities under the San community level is inclusive of the proposed activities.
- Identify and amalgamate Namibian government programs/schemes meant for San areas and communities and examine the means of augmenting the delivery system in their favor of San villages.
- Ensure that wage employment opportunities under the proposed activities under the Conservancy Plan are offered to San on a priority basis.
- Similarly, the income generation activities planned under the project will be extended to San families a preferential basis.
- Design group and household targeted development plans at the San community level.
(vi) External monitoring of San participation (under ICEMA component 4)
- As a part of the overall ICEMA monitoring and evaluation process, a periodic (half yearly) assessment to review the progress of San participation activities under the ICEMA project will be carried out. WIMSA is a potential candidate to be contracted for this task.

(vii) Support to Project Office (under ICEMA components 3 and 4)
- One Social Specialist as part of the Technical and Scientific Advisory Roster (TSAR) at the project level responsible for San issues levels will coordinate and monitor the activities of the conservancy at the community level.

G Institutional Arrangement in ICEMA Project

Existing San development initiatives through San Village Development Committees, NACSO, the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) and Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC) need to liaise closely with the government of Namibia (MET) and UNAM to ensure overall development of the San communities is respected during conservancy formulation. In order to have focused attention on San development under the conservancy project the conservancy committee, with the support of the MET and UNAM should coordinate with relevant San Communities to oversee and monitor the implementation of San requirements at the community level. The overall responsibility for respecting San issues should be the responsibility of the Conservancy Committee.

H Capacity Building for San Issues in ICEMA Project

Some Conservancy committee personnel and civil society functionaries may have little exposure to San issues, and should be trained in skills to manage and respect them. As well, conservancy and related personnel need to be trained on different aspects of San development, and to address San issues. The training could be focused around:

- Namibian government policy relating to San and CBNRM
- Strategies and procedures for San empowerment
- Social impact assessment related to San issues
- Consulting techniques with respect to the San
- Ensuring support for socio-economic development of the San
- Dovetailing government schemes for socio-economic development of the San
- Database management for monitoring and evaluation of the conservancy project.

Training should be organized at the district and community level and should be repeated to cover a large number of those associated with San issues. In addition exposure visits should be organized for all those personnel involved in conservancy development to areas where conservancy activities are being handled successfully. In particular, the
Nyae Nyae Conservancy should be used as template from which other San conservancies could be modeled and adapted. Good practices will be identified during conservancy development and these will be documented and disseminated widely among key conservancy personnel and respective San communities.

I Annual Review of the Project on the San in ICema Project

Monitoring and Evaluation (after Asian Development Bank, 2003)

The project management team is responsible for organizing and resourcing monitoring and evaluation efforts. The conservancy plan will specify the details of the arrangements for M&E, including:

- Allocation of responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation within the conservancy unit or agency;
- Responsibilities for specific tasks, including data collection, data analysis, verification, quality control, coordination with related agencies, preparation of reports, submission of reports to decision makers, responsibility to review and act on reports;
- Method to be used to collect and analyze data;
- Resources required for field survey work and for record keeping, including the provision of specialists in sociology, social anthropology and environment;
- Any requirements to build the capacity and skills in monitoring and evaluation, including a training plan and budget;
- Time frame for data collection efforts, report preparation, and submission; and
- Budget for monitoring and evaluation.

An external Agency, such as WIMSA, should be responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of respect for San issues. This agency can also assist MET, UNAM and the Conservancy Committee in developing the appropriate database, train personnel, and assist in preparing data formats and monitoring reports.

In order to address any grievances the San may have, the ICema Steering Committee should be the first point of contact the San can use, through a spokesperson of the respective San Village Development Committee. In case of grievance, the ICema Steering Committee would call on relevant members from the Technical and Scientific Advisory Roster (TSAR), as well as representation from the Conservancy and San community, including WIMSA for recommendations for conflict resolution. Based on the input received from the various partners, the committee will decide how to address the grievance. Monitoring of the actions taken following the committee's decisions will be responsibility of the project's M&E Coordinator.
Internal Monitoring

Monitoring and evaluation of conservancy San issues is necessary to determine progress, identify bottlenecks, take up corrective measures and thus ensure adequate and timely implementation of the conservancy, with respect to San issues, at the community and district level. The conservancy should have full responsibility for internal monitoring. Monitoring takes place against the activities, entitlements, time frame and budget set out in the conservancy plan.

A record system should be supplemented by periodic survey designed to measure change against the baseline established during the initial census and survey work. The periodic survey focuses upon people affected and on the benefits indicators.

The authors of the conservancy plan will develop a method for the monitoring work, including periodic surveys and achievement of progress against activities and entitlements that comprise the plan. The method will specify the survey plan, sampling framework, frequency, resources, and responsibilities. Monitoring will normally continue throughout the life of the project, even after the period of intensive conservancy activity.

Detailed monitoring indicators will be selected to address the specific contents of the composite summary of monitoring and evaluation requirements set out in Annex 2.

Table 5 identifies a framework for developing the Monitoring Indicators.

Table 5 – Monitoring Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Method to Follow</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Numbers and health of game, quality of natural habitats, grazing effects</td>
<td>Reports from MET, San Communities, Conservancy Committees, IRDNC</td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>WIMSA/MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>San participation and representation in conservancy development/management, San health and social cohesion, San participation in meetings, school enrolment, quality of infrastructure,</td>
<td>Reports from San Village Development Committees, MET, Conservancy committees, IRDNC</td>
<td>4 times per year for first 2 years, then twice per year when conditions improve</td>
<td>WIMSA/MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>San income from conservancy involvement, changes in occupations, skill improvements, economic activities established.</td>
<td>Reports from San villages, MET, IRDNC</td>
<td>4 times per year for first 2 years, then twice per year when</td>
<td>WIMSA/MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the moment, it is not possible to identify the San communities that will be directly or indirectly affected by the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project over its 5-year lifetime. Initial 10 target sites (registered conservancies only) have been identified, including 2 conservancies with a majority of San, and the other with a minority of San (see table 2). Therefore, articulating a detailed cost estimate and financing plan for the annual San “effects and mitigation review” is not at this time included in the Indigenous Peoples Development Plan. Regardless, once it is firmly known which San communities will be directly or indirectly affected by the project, the Annual San review should identify a budget to cover these generic review items:

- Data collection and analysis
- Capacity building (e.g. San training)
- Internal monitoring
- External monitoring
- San monitoring
- Implementation and Follow-up for Mitigation Development Plan

Regardless, discussion with WIMSA indicate that participation of San communities in Conservancy planning can cost up to US $15,000 per village over several years. On average, further conservancy project costs (camps etc) can run to US$10,000 per project, and that up to US$5,000 per village will need to be devoted to capacity building, such as training and skill development.

Support will be provided to WIMSA to review San issues under the ICEMA project.

### J Cost Estimates and Financing Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Followed</th>
<th>Social impact Assessments and integration of San issues into conservancy plans</th>
<th>Reports from WIMSA/MET conservancy and San Village Development committees</th>
<th>Conditions improve Twice per year WIMSA/MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other sectors</td>
<td>Schemes dovetailed, San families and villages benefited</td>
<td>Reports from San, WIMSA, IRDNC</td>
<td>Four times per year WIMSA/MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support will be provided to WIMSA to review San issues under the ICEMA project.
K San Annual Review Executing Agency

The organization which should be engaged to undertake the annual San review would be the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), in collaboration with the South Africa San Institute (SASI) and the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordination (IPACC) and the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC). Consultations with WIMSA indicate that WIMSA is willing to be a key player in the ensuring San issues are respected in all phases of conservancy related activities and the Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management Project if applicable. However, WIMSA stresses the need to have core program support to undertake this task, and that a suitable amount of time be afforded to WIMSA and the San to ensure a full and collaborative dialogue with affected San can be established.

L Implementation of Recommendations from San Annual Review

The identified possible negative impacts can be easily mitigated if the proposed mitigation measures are incorporated into the overall project management plans. The monitoring and evaluation indicators should be respected to ensure the San are not excluded from the CBNRM programme and project benefits. While ensuring that the San are included in the conservancy project, special care must be taken to ensure they are included in a way that respects all potential indigenous minorities in the area. An Annual Review Action Group is recommended to be created that would oversee how the findings of the Annual Review are implemented when San interests are at stake. Such a group would consist of representatives of the project stakeholders and should be chaired by WIMSA. The Action Group would only focus on project areas where San are resident and have identified interests of concern.
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The implementing agency, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism has subsequently determined that ICEMA will focus mainly on conservancies already registered before 2004 (see table 2). Among the 10 ICEMA targeted conservancies with San population, Nyae-Nyae and N#a-Jaqna conservancies, both with a majority of San community members have been identified by MET as candidates for programmes to restore their natural resource base, particularly through the reintroduction or recovery management of absent or rare, yet economically valuable species of wildlife such as buffalo, roan and sable antelopes, as well as other more common yet locally depleted species such as eland, giraffe, impala, oryx and hartebeest. Such restoration programmes will only be conducted based on a demand expressed by these conservancies (already done to MET) and with the consent of the conservancy, also concerning the modalities of such programmes. Obtaining such consent has been built into the work plan as the first prerequisite step concerning such programmes.

Previous reintroduction and restoration programmes in Nyae Nyae Conservancy have been highly successful, and will be used as a model for future programmes in both conservancies.

N#a-Jaqna conservancy has substantial resources of valuable hard wood tree species, which were formerly subject to exploitation by commercial operators without benefiting this community. ICEMA makes provision for inventorying valuable resources and developing options for their use and management by conservancies, in a highly consultative way. It is likely that N#a-Jaqna conservancy will benefit substantially through this ICEMA intervention.

Both conservancies may also apply to make use of support from the Community Funding Facility (CFF) in ICEMA to develop income-generating enterprises. Technical support has been included in this component concerning the feasibility of such initiatives, and their economic and social costs and benefits to the relevant communities. Both conservancies also qualify for institutional support aimed at strengthening conservancy governance. Non-site based aspects of ICEMA, particularly the review of the CBNRM policy, provide opportunities to give special attention to the San issues outlined in this report.

A number of key issues emerged out of the impact analysis undertaken during development of the ESA package that need to be taken into account when implementing the project, within the confines of the resources available to it and noting that ICEMA will apply only to two registered conservancies on San communal lands:

- Some Namibian San populations have benefited from the CBNRM programme, as well as from associated programmes of sustainable use of natural resources. However, given the lack of land rights of most (San) communities, it is only a minority that is likely to benefit from such a programme. In addition, the amount of household income generated by the programme is minimal in terms of poverty alleviation, and

---

7 As part of the ESA development process, an impact analysis with regard to San was undertaken (after Speiser et al., 2003). The here presented results and initial mitigation actions identified led to the development of the ICEMA IPDP Action plan as described in the main section.
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food security remains a serious problem even in conservancy areas (this issue is therefore not directly relevant to ICEMA but component 1 will support the development of benefit distribution schemes, provide for ecosystem-based income-generating activities).

- Further options of developing sustainable harvesting for wild natural resources should be developed in order to provide alternative income generating opportunities, reduce dependence on food aid and increase food security (this issue is relevant to ICEMA, through the intended recovery of the natural resource base of the two conservancies through component 2).

- Strategies to ensure that development of cultural tourism is a viable means of generating community income, ensuring that any such development is non-intrusive and is not culturally degrading should be considered (this issue is relevant to ICEMA, should the two conservancies wish to develop cultural tourism through the CFF, component 1).

- The role of conservancies in protecting the interests of indigenous peoples within their boundaries could be strengthened (this issue is supported through CBNRM policy reviews under ICEMA component 3 and seen as an opportunity to strengthen San interests).

- There is potential for the continued marginalization of San people, if the project does not ensure participation, in areas where these groups are a local ethnic minority (ICEMA will undertake a social assessment in every conservancy with San population prior any intervention and implement the IPDP action plan as described in this document).

In order to deal with these issues, specific recommendations for ensuring that issues concerning indigenous peoples are given appropriate attention within the Project are presented in below:

**Issue 1:**

Where San are a local minority, there is potential for further marginalization.

**Biophysical impacts**

No negative biophysical impacts are identified.

**Social impacts**

**Degree of impact: MEDIUM**

There is a danger that, where San groups are a local minority, they may be left out of the conservancy formation process and out of conservancy decision making if there are not specific interventions to guarantee their participation. This may also manifest itself in lack of access to land and resources and/or exclusion from benefit sharing within the conservancy, further marginalizing an already impoverished group.

**Overall project objective:** To ensure the participation of all natural resource users on an equal and equitable basis, in the process of conservancy formation and operation, as well as with regard to decisions over natural resource use and management.
Mitigation measures
Particularly where San people form a local minority:

- Local-level surveys should be undertaken during emerging conservancy discussions, in order to determine the number of San peoples in the area, degree of their integration into the local society and economy, and any special development needs
- Monitoring and evaluation against this baseline should occur in the short-, medium- and long-term to ensure an improvement in social and economic integration, that development needs are met and participation in decision making takes place
- Specific measures to ensure participation by San peoples in conservancy formation and operation should be built into the activities of agencies supporting these emerging conservancies. Such measures should include specifically targeted awareness raising and capacity building
- Government policy, since the 1991 Land Conference, has been that the San are a special case in terms of land and development policy. This policy should be followed applied where San peoples are involved in the CBNRM programme
- By ensuring that project implementation covers management of all natural resources – both plant and animal – the inclusion of all resource users, including San peoples, should be guaranteed.

Issue 2:
While not an issue exclusive to the San, there is potential for cultural tourism developments to be degrading and or invade the privacy of the San communities

Biophysical impacts
No negative biophysical impacts are identified.

Social impacts
Degree of impact: MEDIUM
Cultural disruption is one disadvantage often cited as being the result of tourism development in areas where people tend to live in "traditional" ways. Exposure to "Western" behavior, increased materialism, etc., are said to contribute to traditional and cultural practices breaking down. On the other hand, San people in Namibia are involved in the cash economy and cultural impacts are unavoidable. Measures do need to be taken though, that enable the people themselves to manage these impacts.
Conflict with tourists can result from tourism developments – cultural tourism or otherwise – if the privacy of residents, or their ability to conduct their affairs without interruption is compromised.

Overall objective: To ensure that cultural tourism is sensitive to the needs of local residents and participants in the development.
Mitigation measures

- Tourism awareness training should include a component that covers the potential costs associated with tourism developments, enabling informed decisions by participants regarding whether a tourism development is desirable.
- Feasibility studies should holistically assess the costs and benefits of proposed tourism developments, and their impacts on residents' livelihoods. This information should be fed back to the San community to ensure informed decisions can be made.
- Cultural tourism enterprises should only be developed when they have the consent and participation of all locally-affected parties and participants.
- Development of tourism zones and tourism plans should be designed to reduce any possible negative affects of developments, such as invasion of privacy, etc.

Issue 3:
Each impact (positive and negative) of the project relating to a component or its subcomponent will affect San peoples equally to other participants in the project, provided that the issue has been addressed, and suggested mitigation measures implemented.

Biophysical impacts
Degree of impact: LOW to MEDIUM

Social impacts
Degree of impact: LOW to MEDIUM

*Overall objective:* To ensure that indigenous peoples have the opportunity to participate in the CBNRM programme based on informed choices. To prevent further marginalization or exclusion from decision-making processes of indigenous peoples.

Mitigation measures

- An intervention targeted at CBNRM service providers (both Government and non-government) that raises awareness of issues relating the San their special needs to be designed and implemented by a sufficiently qualified individual/organisation.
- Site-specific interventions may be required, particularly where the San are a local minority, and should be developed to suit local circumstances of social and economic organisation, resource use, etc.
- Monitoring and evaluation at programme and project level should include indicators specifically relating to the San, with special emphasis by projects in areas where the San are a local minority.

Other socio-cultural CBNRM issues which could have negative effects on the San, together with recommendations as to how to mitigate these issues are described below:
Issue 4:
Unregulated grazing of cattle by non-san on communal lands

Recommendation:
The conservancy plan needs to incorporate a grazing policy. Along with grazing management, the policy should specify the scope for augmenting fodder resources in and around san areas and possibly steps to upgrade cattle breeds for maximizing production from these cattle.

Issue 5:
Village Development Committees should function as independent bodies to maintain their autonomy, while at the same time maintain links with other Village Development Committees.

Recommendation:
To establish linkages, spokespersons from San communities should be invited to other village meetings. Unwarranted intervention by CBOs or NGOs may undermine the capacity of a San village, and contribute to a dependency syndrome. Local skills and initiatives should be developed to deal with conflicts as and when they arise, rather than institutionalise such management.

Issue 6:
In San society there are both passive and active members. Any benefits of the conservancy accruing to the San must be shared in a respectful and responsible way.

Recommendation:
Mode of benefit distribution among the San should be left to internal San protocols. However, in cases of large San populations with a relatively small conservancy area protected, care needs to be taken so that the active members get more concerted efforts to persuade the passive members to play an active role in conservancy management.

Issue 7:
Empowering women and increasing their participation in conservancy management.

Recommendation:
Pursuant to San cultural norms, women need to be encouraged and allowed to be part of Village Development committees. Vocal and influential women in San society need to have the opportunity to mentor other women to become more involved in community decision-making. Conservancy personnel and NGOs need to be sensitised about women’s involvement.

Issue 8:
In some cases there may be conflict over boundary demarcation between San and non-San land use areas.
Recommendation:
San and non-San land use areas needs to be clearly demarcated on a map, as well as identified on the ground.

Issue 9:
Danger of politicisation of San conservancy can occur with the greater flow of benefits to the San.

Recommendation:
Share of benefits from conservancy activities must be done on an equitable basis to protect the San from the intrusion of politics, but also to ensure that the focus on benefits to the marginalized and women is not diluted.

Issue 10:
It is possible that the San are not aware of aspects like equity, transparency, sharing and reinvestment mechanisms, financial management etc.

Recommendation:
Simple guidelines for the San in vernacular language need to be prepared and disseminated. Meetings and sharing of information and appraisal by the San Village Development Committees need to be held.
Annex 2 – San Participation Procedures

These procedures are divided into 3 sections. The first section describes the background to the process and provides definitions for some of the terms used. The next section describes the purpose of Indigenous participation and provides a few key principles on Indigenous participation. The main part of the document is the consultation and negotiation process, which is set out in the third section.

The consultation and negotiation process is divided into three major stages: Initial Consultation; Identifying Indigenous Issues and Values; and Managing Indigenous Concerns. Each stage is divided into smaller actions with the issues that need to be considered. In addition there are some hints to help people address issues and examples of Indigenous participation practices.

One of the difficulties associated with a proposed project or activity that involves Indigenous people’s values may be disagreement between Indigenous peoples. A set of simple hints is provided on dealing with such disputes.

Background

The project will make every effort to prevent the CBNRM activities from having a negative impact on the populations of San minorities and to ensure that the latter benefit fully from the project. The Indigenous Peoples Development Plan is an integral part of the project, and this document extracts and summarizes the mechanisms in the project design that will ensure the above. It is realized that the introduction of new conservancies may pose specific problems for the San, which in general are very poor, and therefore may not be inclined to take on, what could be perceived as a risk, a long-term investment and benefit. Generally, the strategy developed for the project aims at ensuring that the San minorities are not economically or culturally marginalized in the development process, while at the same time are not culturally assimilated into the dominant cultures, but can maintain and revitalize their own institutions, traditions and culture, if they so wish.

Definitions

Indigenous heritage is dynamic. It includes tangible and intangible expressions of culture that link generations of Indigenous people over time. Indigenous people express their cultural heritage through ‘the person’, their relationships with country, people, beliefs, knowledge, law, language, symbols, ways of living, sea, land and objects all of which arise from Indigenous spirituality.

Indigenous heritage places are landscapes, sites and areas that are particularly important to Indigenous people as part of their customary law, developing traditions, history and current practices. All Indigenous heritage places have associated Indigenous heritage values.
Indigenous heritage values include spirituality, law, knowledge, practices, traditional resources or other beliefs and attachments.

The precautionary approach is taken where an activity involves a risk of significant irreversible damage to a place. Uncertainty about heritage values at the place should not be used as justification for proceeding with that activity. This approach should be used when there is uncertainty or debate over the significance of a place to ensure that heritage values are not damaged.

Traditional Owners are those people who, through membership in a descent group or clan, have responsibility for caring for particular country. Traditional Owners are authorized to speak for country and a heritage. Authorization to speak for country and heritage may be as a senior traditional owner, an elder, or in more recent times, as a registered Native Title claimant.

Other Indigenous people with interests are those people who through their personal or family history of involvement with a particular place have an interest in its heritage values. Such places could include, but are not limited to, mission stations, places of Indigenous protest, and areas of land where people worked. In some areas custodians are responsible for looking after places and sometimes the stories and ceremonies linked to these places. In other areas custodians are Indigenous people who look after a place on behalf of others.

The relevant Indigenous people are the Traditional Owners and other Indigenous people with interests in a place.

Principles

In recognizing the rights and interests of Indigenous peoples in their heritage, all parties concerned with identifying, conserving and managing this heritage should acknowledge, accept and act on the principles that Indigenous people:

- are the primary source of information on the value of their heritage and how this is best conserved;
- must have an active role in any Indigenous heritage planning process;
- must have input into primary decision-making in relation to Indigenous heritage so they can continue to fulfill their obligations towards this heritage; and
- must control intellectual property and other information relating specifically to their heritage, as this may be an integral aspect of its heritage value.

In identifying and managing this heritage:

- uncertainty about Indigenous heritage values at a place should not be used to justify activities that might damage or desecrate this heritage;
- all parties having relevant interests should be consulted on Indigenous heritage matters; and
- the process and outcomes of Indigenous heritage planning must abide by customary law, relevant State laws, relevant International treaties and covenants and any other legally binding agreements.
Adhering to cultural restrictions on information about an Indigenous heritage place is essential to maintaining its heritage value.

Involving Indigenous People

Consultation and negotiation are central to the Indigenous heritage management process outlined in this document. It is important to recognize that Indigenous people often have a broad range of issues that they need to address and your project or activity may not be an immediate priority. Negotiating the level of involvement of the relevant Indigenous people is an important part of the early negotiation process. Figure 5 outlines the consultation process where the San are in the minority and are not developing their own Conservancy. Conversely, should the San be developing their own conservancy, as did the Nyae Nyae, the required consultation process is identified in Figure 6.

In some cases Indigenous people may be happy to be kept informed about the project or activity, while in other cases they may want more active involvement. The process outlined in this document covers instances where the relevant Indigenous people wish to be actively involved and it will need to be modified where Indigenous people are comfortable with simply being informed about progress on a project. However, it is recommended that the relevant Indigenous people formally agree when a different process is negotiated.

It is also very important to decide at what level the San will be participating in the conservancy development process and in the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project. Terms such as “partnership” and “consultation” can be used freely in meetings and discussions, but in reality, their applications can be quite different.

The following are the types of participation that are in practice today:

Co-option Indigenous and local people are persuaded to join the project but they and their representatives have no real input, respect or power

Co-operation Local and Indigenous people have assigned tasks but outsiders decide the agenda and direct the process

Consultation Outsiders seek local opinions and then analyze and decide on a course of action

Collaboration Local people work with outsiders to determine priorities. Outsiders are responsible for directing the process

Co-learning Local indigenous peoples and outsiders share their knowledge to create new understanding. They work together with outside facilitation to create action plans

Collective Action Local and indigenous peoples set their own agenda and mobilize to carry it out in the absence of outside initiators and facilitators.
Using a participation technique which affords the San the highest degree of involvement and input will ensure a greater degree of success in resolving the following issues which are likely to arise out of the conservancy development projects:

- Land settlement
- Cultural properties and sites
- Distribution of income and wealth
- Employment rights
- Gender equity
- Human rights
- Induced development effects (e.g. HIV/AIDS)
- Involuntary resettlement
- Legal and customary land and resource use
- Long term income opportunities
- Education and training opportunities
- Maintaining local San culture
- Quality of life
- Tenure and land use rights
THE INDIGENOUS CONSULTATION MANAGEMENT PROCESS

MET receives a conservancy sub-project draft proposal (non San led)

→ Check point
Meet with San to describe project

→ Agree on a process for addressing San issues and values

→ Arrange a meeting of all stakeholders to discuss the project and to agree who will do work.

→ Undertake background research

If yes

Revise proposed project or activity or decide not to proceed with project or activity

If not revised, abandon proposal

Ensure that the affected San are involved and that their interests are respected. If Yes, proceed

Identify any special management requirements with the San

→ Checkpoint
Meet with all stakeholders to identify constraints on managing San interests and values

→ Implement and review outcomes with relevant San and other stakeholders

Figure 5
THE INDIGENOUS CONSULTATION MANAGEMENT PROCESS

MET receives a conservancy sub-project draft proposal from San

Check point
Meet with San to discuss project

Agree on a process for addressing San issues and values, as well as other interests of non-San

Arrange a meeting of all stakeholders to discuss the project and to agree who will do work.

Undertake background research

If yes

Revise proposed project or activity or decide not to proceed with project or activity

If not revised, abandon proposal

If no

Ensure that the affected San are involved and that their interests are respected. If Yes, proceed

Identify any special management requirements with the San, and ensure non San issues respected

Checkpoint
Meet with all stakeholders to identify constraints on managing San interests and values

Implement and review outcomes with relevant San and other stakeholders

Figure 6
The Strategy presented in this IPDP to ensure that the San participate in the conservancy network and in the Integrated Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project is generic in nature. Each conservancy area will have its own specific issues to resolve. Therefore, this strategy should be regarded as a template from which more locally appropriate San participation frameworks can be developed. Prior to deciding that there are no San issues or populations, every effort must first be made to establish this.

Initial Consultation

Identify traditional owners and other indigenous peoples with rights and interests in the area

Actions:

- Identify the San with rights and interests in a place, especially the San authorized to speak for a place, taking into account that the San will have differing degrees of knowledge about conservancy areas and their importance
- Ensure both men and women with rights and interests in an area are identified since men and women may be responsible for different places and values
- Identify indigenous peoples who may not be traditional owners but who have interests in an area so that any effects of the project or activity on the San values of places will be identified
- Investigate whether the interest of the San from surrounding areas may also be affected by the project. E.g. will changes to water flows or access affect neighboring San or indigenous communities?
- Identify and adhere to any process or protocols that the San have already established for consultation
- Undertake consultation for each new conservancy unless Traditional Owners and other interested indigenous peoples agree that this is not necessary

Hints

- The Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC) or the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), as well as Namibian government departments or the University of Namibia can provide advice on how to identify the relevant authorized and other Indigenous peoples with interests in an area
- It may be appropriate for separate male and female teams to undertake consultation
- It is advisable for the project team to develop a relationship with the San themselves and not leave this solely to paid consultants

Identify Non-Indigenous Peoples with Rights and Interests in a Conservancy Area

Action

- Identify other landowners and users as well as tourist and recreational groups who have rights and interests in the area.
Meet with Relevant San to Describe the Conservancy Project

Actions

Make the description of the conservancy factual and clear. Remember to:

- Outline any potential implications of the conservancy (financial, cultural, environmental, educational etc)
- Any prior discussions and agreement with 3rd parties and other stakeholders need to be made clear
- Provide San with any relevant documentation, including maps of the area being discussed
- Allow time for the San to decide whether they wish to become involved in the conservancy
- Check to see if the project needs to be described to other Indigenous groups. Ensure that all Indigenous groups receive the same information and that this is sufficient for them to provide informed consent
- Respect the San's right to chose the time and location of the meetings

Hints

- Offer assistance with mediation where more than one group has an interest in traditional lands in a proposed conservancy area. This may assist in obtaining agreement as to who needs to be involved in the project
- Where groups are in dispute, focus on developing ways of protecting San interests that can be agreed to by all parties
- It may be appropriate for this consultation to occur in smaller groups rather than in large meetings.

Agree on a process for Addressing San Matters

Actions

- Agree on the manner, timing, and level of consultation and involvement for the conservancy area
- Decide who will hold copyright over any work undertaken with the San to identify or establish management regimes for San heritage places
- Decide whether separate reports should be produced for male and female Traditional Owners and another that is open access (sacred San information removed)
- Determine whether there is a need to help resource the dissemination of the results of the work, the process for obtaining comment from the San on the reports and how many copies of the reports are required.
- Agree on processes for obtaining informed consent from the San to display any information gathered, including publishing on the Internet.
- Formalize any protocols and agreements
- Involve San in developing Terms of Reference for any consultancies
- Include San in selection process for any consultants and seek their agreement to the appointment of specialists employed on the project
- Identify resources required to maintain community involvement (meetings, surveys)
Hints

* Involving San from the initial stages of the project will allow mutually agreed processes and time lines to be developed that take into account the priorities of the San. This may also assist in developing mutual trust and positive working relationship.
* Arrange a meeting of all stakeholders to discuss the conservancy and agree who will undertake work

Arrange a Meeting of all Stakeholders to Discuss the project and Agree Who will Undertake Work

Actions

* Arrange an early meeting of all identified stakeholders to provide a form where the San can explain issues pertinent to them. Such a meeting also helps to ensure that San issues are made visible to the wider community and recognizes the need to negotiate with the San.
* Agree upon processes form mediating and resolving disputes among parties that may arise during the course of the conservancy
* Consider adopting a precautionary approach in cases where the San refuse to be involved. Reasons for this need to be identified and resolved.

Hints

* State environmental and cultural agencies can help identify any reporting or legislative requirements. Representatives from these agencies should also be involved in meetings.

Dealing with Disputes

Two forms of dispute may be encountered when consulting and negotiating with the San: disputes among indigenous groups, and disputes between Indigenous stakeholders and the people proposing the conservancy. To deal with disputes within the community:

* Consider taking the precautionary approach. Protection of San culture and interests is important no matter what competing claims are being made
* Do not become involved in disputes between Indigenous groups because indigenous disputes need to be resolved at the community level
* Be prepared to assist and possibly resource an appropriate independent person or body to help solve the dispute.
* Do not try to impose unrealistic timeframes for resolving community disputes.

To deal with disputes between the community and other stakeholders:

* Identify formal and informal dispute resolution processes
* Identify and consider using culturally appropriate forms of dispute resolution
* Encourage everyone to use informal processes
* Do not try to impose unrealistic timeframes for resolving disputes.
Identifying San Issues and Values

Undertake background research

**Actions**

- Include previous San cultural heritage and resource surveys in any background research.

**Hints**

- Do not rely solely on information about the San that is from government sources only. Seek knowledge and information from the San themselves and NGO/CBOs that work with the San
- A conservancy should not rely solely on previous work to establish San issues, as the San may not disclose the existence of issues unless a threat is immediate.

Ensure that the San are actively Involved and Identify their Interests

San involvement in identification process may be the only way to establish what is important to them, as there may be no obvious evidence for past or present San use in the conservancy area. It is also the only way in which the value of a place for the San can be established.

**Actions**

- Ensure compliance with state laws by obtaining necessary surveys for permits and other activities required to identify San interests
- Ensure that any sensitive area disclosed in the course of identifying San interests is protected from unnecessary further disclosure
- Record the names of custodians of information where they have specific information about places and values

**Hints**

- San are likely to describe the importance of a place in general terms. They may also avoid discussing places and values because of cultural sensitivities; and this may be particularly true for very important spiritual places
- Advice on permits can be obtained by contacting relevant government ministries
- It may be appropriate for San males and females to separately undertake the identification of special interests and values
Managing San Interests and Values

Identify Special Management Requirements with Relevant San

Actions

- Respect that San may need time to reach consensus on appropriate management/involvement in the conservancy
- Understand that San management of Traditional Lands may maintain or rehabilitate any or all of the following: San customary law, relationships with land and water, animal plant diversity, traditional use of land
- Establish any values and issues that cannot be discussed in an open meeting of all stakeholders

Hints

San management/involvement issues could cover issues like:

- Protecting culturally restricted information
- Removing and or storing cultural material
- Reparation of material removed from an area for analysis or alternative use

Meet with all Stakeholders to Identify Constraints on Managing San Places and Values

Actions

- Ensure consultation with other property owners, residents and in some cases tourist and recreational groups, as well as Traditional Owners and other indigenous peoples with an interest in the area
- Inform all groups of the heritage, social and economic values and needs so they can be taken into account when discussing management requirements
- Provide ongoing access to and management of Traditional Lands by Traditional Owners which may be necessary for maintaining the San heritage and cultural value of the conservancy
- Apply the precautionary approach when there are differing opinions among the San or other parties about the importance of a place.
- Do not allow use of a place that is incompatible with one group’s understanding of the values of the area in question.
- Comply with all state laws and identify the full range of legal obligations that may relate to San heritage and culture and other legal rights.

Hints

Management issues that may need to be discussed or resolved by all stakeholders include:

- Employment and or training of San to be involved in the conservancy project
- Implementation of cultural awareness training for non-San people employed or working in the conservancy area
- Resolve health, safety economic, cultural and San community development issues
- Access for San (getting people back in the bush, providing for ceremonies and educating the young)
- Use of San resources
- Access rules for non-San people including what activities a developer, researcher or other non San land user can undertake at a place
- Procedures for mediation and dispute resolution

Management arrangements are not completed until some form of agreement has been reached among all parties

Implement and Review Outcomes with Relevant San and other Stakeholders

Actions

- Ensure all parties agree to monitoring mechanisms and apply them to management arrangements
- Provide for management arrangements to be reviewed and if necessary amended in light of changing circumstances

Hints

- San may want to monitor cultural impacts, ground works or disturbances and undertake any other measures for conserving the heritage and values of a place
- Understand that San may also seek advice from other agencies, NGO/CBO’s, specialists to address specific management issues.

Examples of San Cultural Management Cultural Practices

Maintenance

Examples of Maintenance

- Restricting access by people to certain sacred San areas
- Allowing San access to places so ceremonies and other cultural practices can take place
- Allowing San access to traditional sources of food
- Monitoring sensitive San places to ensure they are protected
- Recording and passing on stories about a place so that the next generation learns of its value
- Keeping natural processes that are significant to the cultural and ecological function of a place (water)
- Monitoring earth disturbance to ensure San sacred sites are not disturbed

Restoration – Actions that conserve or add to the heritage value of a place

Examples of restoration

- Reintroducing ceremonies to places
- Using traditional knowledge in the management of the conservancy
Removing material to a place where it was found to conserve the heritage value of the San

Removal – Actions to conserve heritage values by removing items from a place (action of last resort)

Examples

- Excavating a San site that will be destroyed by development so that material will not be lost
- Relocating or storing cultural material to ensure its protection

Interpretation – Actions that may help change people’s behavior

Examples

- Interpreting the significance of San culture to ensure culturally appropriate behavior of visitors
- Recording oral history about a site of significance to the San

SAN Participation Strategy

The preceding information is presented from the non-San point of view with respect to participation. The following is an outline of what the San need to consider ensuring their participation is sought and respected.

Communication:

- The community should name a spokesperson or committee to liaise with the conservancy team and the authority of this person or group should be clear
- The San community needs to develop a method whereby the community is well informed of the events taking place with respect to the conservancy
- Language and literacy issues need to be addressed

Responsibilities

- Ensure that the conservancy development schedule respects the communities’ schedule for hunting, harvests, events
- The community needs to determine how much time might be needed to prepare questions and get necessary information
- The community needs to fully understand its land tenure status and rights
- The community should consider how it will liaise with regulatory agencies so that San interests and values are clearly articulated
- How many San and who will be involved in direct negotiations and what will be their authority?
- What resources are available from the government or outside agencies to participate
- What techniques would the San community like to see to ensure that its knowledge and expertise is used most effectively during the decision-making part of the project?
Technical Summary of the Conservancy Project

- What is the project all about, and is this clear to the San?
- What is the schedule of the project and dates for major events?
- What buildings will be built, clearing of forest areas, use of water etc?
- What is the total area of land to be affected?
- Were other locations considered?
- How will land be used once conservancy in operation?
- How many San can participate directly in management and operation of conservancy?
- What changes might the San community see and feel?
- How will waste be treated?
- What are transportation routes?
- What are plans for post construction clean-up?
- How will the conservancy be financed, and will the San be able to invest?
- What is the long term outlook from the proponents perspective
- Will the San community and the proponent both feel at ease with local men and women involved in the project?

Benefit-Sharing

- Does the San community understand how the project will make money, and how much it will earn? How much of the profits will flow to the San?
- Who from the San will be employed and what kind of jobs. Can the San be a permanent part of the project
- What spin-off or support services can be started?
- If the San become dependant on the project, what would happen if the project did not live up to its expectations
- How will the traditional values and activities of the San be protected and enhanced by the project
- If the community receives compensation to offset the loss of other opportunities, will it be enough to make up for other changes to San culture and traditions?
- What education, health and capacity building efforts will be offered to the San to meet their present and future community needs?
### Annex 3 – Internal Monitoring Framework

**Potential Monitoring Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Monitoring</th>
<th>Basis for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>- Have all land tenure issues been identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have capacity building and training activities been completed on schedule?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are conservancy activities being achieved against agreed implementation plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are funds for the conservancy being allocated on time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have conservancy offices received the scheduled funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have funds been disbursed according to the conservancy plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has the social preparation phase taken place as scheduled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have all land issues been settled in time for project implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have all San received compensation if necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have all San received the agreed transport costs, relocation costs, income substitution support and any resettlement allowances, if necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have all replacement land plots or contracts been provided? Was the land developed as specified? Are measures in place to provide land titles to San?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How many San households are involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How many San have received housing as per relocation options in the conservancy plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does house quality meet the standards agreed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have relocation sites been selected and developed as per agreed standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery of San Entitlements</strong></td>
<td>- Are the San occupying the new houses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are assistance measures being implemented as planned for host communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is restoration proceeding for social infrastructure and services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are San able to access schools, health services, cultural sites and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are income and livelihood restoration activities being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have San received received entitlements including payments/compensation for net losses resulting from lost activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td>- Have consultations taken place as scheduled including...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grievance and Special Issues

- Have conservancy leaflets been prepared and distributed (assuming literacy)?
- How many San know their rights?
- Have any San used the grievance redress procedures? What were the outcomes? Have conflicts been resolved?
- Was a social preparation phase developed?

Benefit Monitoring

- What changes have occurred in patterns of occupation, production and resource use compared to the pre-project situation?
- What changes have occurred in income and expenditure patterns compared to pre-project situation? What have been the changes in cost of living compared to pre-project situation? Have San incomes kept pace with these changes?
- What changes have taken place in key social and cultural parameters relating to living standards?
- What changes have occurred for more vulnerable San?
Annex 4 – External Monitoring Framework

External Monitoring and Evaluation

The conservancy should appoint an independent agency for external M&E, such as WIMSA, to ensure complete and objective information. Post-evaluation of conservancy establishment is an integral part of the project cycle. Independent evaluation can be done by an outside research or consulting agency, university department or development NGO. The tasks of the external agency are to:

- verify results of internal monitoring;
- assess whether conservancy objectives have been met; specifically, whether San livelihoods and living standards have been restored or enhanced;
- assess conservancy efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, drawing lessons as a guide to future conservancy policy making and planning; and
- ascertain whether the San entitlements were appropriate to meeting the objectives, and whether the objectives were suited to San conditions and needs.

The conservancy will set out the requirements for external M&E, usually in the form of a TORs for the external agency. The external team will usually be asked to provide an annual survey update of the original baseline, focusing on benefit monitoring and evaluation of conservancy objectives. The external team will set up a data base for monitoring and evaluation, building upon the project's own record keeping system. It may also include maps, charts, photographs of affected properties, copies of contracts and land titles, payments, and valuation documents relating to the conservancy.

The questionnaire design and sample framework will be designed to develop a comparable data base of before and after conservancy establishment conditions. The survey will generally incorporate a San household questionnaire, which obtains information on the key indicators of conservancy progress, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. This may be supplemented by periodic participatory rapid appraisals (which will allow the evaluators to consult with a range of San stakeholders, local government, field staff, NGOs, community leaders). The monitoring and evaluation team will also usually conduct at least one ex-post evaluation survey to assess the achievement of conservancy objectives, the changes in San living standards and livelihoods and the restoration of the economic and social base of the San. Composite External Monitoring requirements are set out in Annex 3.

Summary Terms of Reference for External Monitoring and Evaluation

- Aims and objectives of external M&E in relation to objectives of the conservancy and San interests
- Information needed to meet these objectives, with reference to the conservancy
- Method and approach to provide the information
- Detailed methodology, use of the existing baseline census and survey, periodic updates, sampling frame, arrangements for data collection, collation and analysis, quality control, and development of a recording and reporting system
- Participation of key San stakeholders, in monitoring and evaluation
- Resources required, including expertise in sociology, social anthropology and environment
- Time frame for M&E
- Reporting requirements

### Indicators for External Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Indicators</th>
<th>Basis for Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and structure, ages, educational and skill levels</td>
<td>Composition and structure, ages, educational and skill levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of household head</td>
<td>Gender of household head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health, education, utilities and other social services</td>
<td>Access to health, education, utilities and other social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing type</td>
<td>Housing type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and other resource owning and using patterns</td>
<td>Land and other resource owning and using patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations and employment patterns</td>
<td>Occupations and employment patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income sources and levels</td>
<td>Income sources and levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and hunting production data</td>
<td>Agricultural and hunting production data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in neighborhood or community groups</td>
<td>Participation in neighborhood or community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to traditional lands</td>
<td>Access to traditional lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to cultural sites and events</td>
<td>Access to cultural sites and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of all assets</td>
<td>Value of all assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basic information on SAN**

- Were compensation payments made free of depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the San?
- Have San adopted the housing/land access options developed?
- Have perceptions of community been restored?
- Have San achieved replacement of key social and cultural elements?

**Restoration of living standards**

- Were compensation payments free of deductions for depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the San?
- Were compensation payments sufficient to replace lost assets?
- Was sufficient replacement land available of suitable standard?
- Did transfer and relocation payments cover these costs?
- Did income substitution allow for re-establishment of enterprises and production?
- Have enterprises affected received sufficient
assistance to re-establish themselves?
- Have San been provided income-earning opportunities? Are these effective and sustainable?
- Do jobs provided restore pre-project income levels and living standards?
- How much do San know about conservancy procedures and entitlements?
- Do San know their entitlements and rights? Do they know if these have been met?
- How do San assess the extent to which their own living standards and livelihoods have been restored?
- How much do San know about grievance procedures and conflict resolution procedures?
- Were the San and their assets/issues correctly enumerated?
- Were any land speculators assisted?
- Was the time frame and budget sufficient to meet objectives?
- Were entitlements too generous?
- Were vulnerable San groups identified and assisted?
- How did conservancy implementers deal with unforeseen problems?
- Were there unintended environmental impacts?
- Were there unintended impacts on employment or incomes?

Levels of San Satisfaction

Effectiveness of Conservancy Planning

Other Impacts

Participation of San and NGOs in Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Involvement of people affected and hosts in the M&E process may solve many day-to-day problems arising in the implementation of conservancy operations. San, local CBOs, and/or NGOs should be involved. Participatory evaluation helps improve program performance by involving key players in evaluation design and implementation. Participatory Rapid Appraisal techniques foster the involvement of San and other key stakeholders in conservancy implementation.
### Comparison of Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More controlled, positivist approach</th>
<th>More subjective, participatory approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quick; easy to quantify</td>
<td>- Views and perspectives of all stakeholders inform the result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Straight-forward methodology</td>
<td>- Provides an opportunity for other realities to impinge (i.e. matters beyond the Project Framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Likely to be directly relevant to the manner in which the project was designed</td>
<td>- Should lead to a closer mutual understanding and sense of shared purpose (the human foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seen to be more accountable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easier to deal with and does not raise complex issues related to control of the activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Arrogant and insensitive</td>
<td>- May not fit the project format or framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results likely to reflect the values of the evaluator</td>
<td>- Can substitute for a rigorous examination of the achievements of the activity against its objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flawed assumptions about independent observation and capacity to capture reality</td>
<td>- Few evaluators really know how to use participatory techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ignores human reality - change, political dynamics</td>
<td>- Can raise expectations that won't/can't be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assumes simplistic cause and effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Steps in Conducting Participatory Evaluation

- Decide on the degree and nature of participation.
- Prepare the evaluation scope of the work.
- Conduct the team planning meetings through mini-workshops.
- Conduct the evaluation.
- Analyze the data and build consensus on results.
- Prepare further mitigation plans, if required.

Source: *Conducting a Participatory Evaluation*, USAID, Center for Development Information and Evaluation, 1996.
**Participatory Rapid Appraisal**

- Key informant interviews: select local leaders, village workers or persons with special knowledge or experience about resettlement activities and implementation.
- Focus group discussion: specific topics (e.g., land compensation payments, services at resettlement sites, income restoration, gender issues) discussed in open-ended group sessions.
- Community public meetings: open public meetings at resettlement sites to elicit information about performance of various resettlement activities.
- Structured direct observations: field observations on status of resettlement implementation, plus individual or group interviews for cross-checking purposes.
- Informal surveys/interviews: informal surveys of San, hosts, village workers, resettlement staff, and implementing agency personnel using non-sampled methods.
- In-depth case studies of San and host populations from various social classes to assess impact of conservancy.


---

**Monitoring and Evaluation in the Project Cycle: Key Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cycle</th>
<th>Key Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identification/social assessment</td>
<td>- Conduct social surveys as a basis for conservancy planning, monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>- Consult with all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct baseline with census and survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish an M&amp;E plan as an integral part of the Conservancy Plan, involving internal and external resources, building on the established baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Review Meeting</td>
<td>- Review M&amp;E plans for inter-agency coordination of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review Budget and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>- Verify M&amp;E plan will provide information on progress and achievement of conservancy objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loan Negotiations

- Include M&E
- Establish field level monitoring capability.
- Involve San and NGO in monitoring.
- Monitor internally progress in meeting targets for budget and time frame, delivery of San entitlements, consultation, grievance and special issues and benefits.

Implementation

- Involve San and NGO in monitoring.
- Monitor internally progress in meeting targets for budget and time frame, delivery of San entitlements, consultation, grievance and special issues and benefits.
- Engage external, independent specialists to monitor and evaluate progress and achievement of conservancy objectives.
- Prepare regular reports on all aspects of M&E.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Conduct ex-post evaluation of conservancy to assess the effectiveness, impact, impact and sustainability of conservancy entitlements; and to learn strategic lessons for future policy formulation and planning.

Checklist: Monitoring and Evaluation

- Establish system of internal monitoring to assess progress in meeting key targets in the Conservancy Plan: budget and time frame, delivery of San entitlements, consultation, grievance and special issues and benefits.
- Provide sufficient time, resources and funds for internal monitoring.
- Conduct regular reviews, based on monitoring and evaluation reports, involving key stakeholders including San representatives. Reach consensus on actions required to improve conservancy performance and implement them.
- Establish a system for external monitoring and evaluation to assess achievement and suitability of conservancy objectives.
- Establish monitoring and evaluation reporting methods and reporting requirements.
- Involve San, hosts, NGOs, and community in project monitoring and evaluation, using participatory methods.
- Include an ex-post evaluation of conservancy conducted by the independent external agency after completion of the project.
- Review lessons learned for conservancy policy making and planning.
San Monitoring and Evaluation

The affected San and San communities may wish to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for their own respective needs. Such a framework can be adapted from the following community based monitoring and evaluation template:

**Self Determination Issues:**

- Have the San’s rights and interests been protected and respected?
- How will the San’s access to and effective use of legal structures be assessed?
- What provisions have been made to enhance recognition of legal rights?
- What provisions have been made to recognize customary and traditional land and resource tenure?
- What are the assurances that the conservancy will be sensitive to local San cultural and social systems?
- How have local language, culture, social structure and production systems been strengthened?

**Potential Negative Impacts**

- How have potential negative impacts been assessed?
- How have negative impacts been avoided or mitigated?
- What forms of restitution have been developed for negative effects?
- How has the conservancy attempted to minimize disruption or damage to land, resources and San Culture?

**Informed Participation**

- How were San preferences and priorities assessed?
- How were the San involved in the preliminary stages of the conservancy proposal?
- What procedures were used to ensure full-disclosure of intentions and prior informed consent from appropriate institutions?
- How were the appropriate institutions and their representatives identified?
- How was the San knowledge and culture used in the project?
- How were local criteria, indicators and priorities assessed and integrated into the project?
- What mechanisms were used to ensure San decision-making through-out planning, implementation, and evaluation?
- How have the San been guaranteed the right to veto the project or any of its components, phases or outputs?

**Traditional Resource Rights**

- What “products” have been generated that are subject to intellectual property rights (IPR) concerns (photos, art work, plants)
- What arrangements have been made to protect the IPR of the San?
- What equitable benefit sharing mechanisms have been established?
- What were the potential for misuse of data and information, and how was this avoided?
- What forms of compensation were developed?
- What mechanisms were generated to ensure confidentiality of information?

**Sustainability**

- Were clear benchmarks developed that could be applied during all phases of the project?
- What mechanisms were in place to ensure financial viability of the conservancies once external funding ended?
- What were the guarantees that the San participated meaningfully in the project?

What were the long-term benefits to San communities and their organizations and national status?