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<td>NGO</td>
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<tr>
<td>ONP</td>
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<tr>
<td>pers.comm.</td>
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Terms of Reference (ToR)

The consultant was commissioned by KfW to provide technical assistance to Namibia’s Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MoET) for the further development of a practical management plan for the proposed Okavango National Park (ONP). As an additional outcome, the consultant was requested to identify possible areas of intervention where future assistance may be given through German financial cooperation.

The consultant’s ToR may be summarized as follows:

- Contact the MoET’s multidisciplinary planning team and -with this group- conduct a workshop on protected area planning (consultant was advised by KfW prior to his departure to cancel the workshop on request of the MoET).

- Conduct field visits with planning team and identify conflict areas.

- Assist with the implementation of participatory workshops for the benefit of local stakeholders in the support zone (consultant was advised by KfW prior to his departure to cancel the workshops on request by the MoET).

- Assist the planning team in the revision of the draft plan for the ONP, with special consideration to following issues:
  - (a) adequate depth of all subject areas; (b) zoning; (c) balancing the interests of all parties concerned; (d) optimal administrative structure; (e) budgets (investment and operating costs); (f) implementation schedule of management plan.

- Assist planning team in the preparation of specific operational plans, a personnel planning schedule and corresponding budgets.

- Assist MoET to outline a project concept that makes a meaningful contribution to the implementation of the management plan’s most urgent interventions and objectives.

- Assist with the development of ToR, as the departure point for the elaboration of a fully fledged feasibility study that may serve as a basis for project appraisal by KfW.

- Assist MoET in specifying additional support requirements regarding the elaboration of management plans for the four remaining parks.

1.2 Study Approach
The principle working relationship of the consultant was with the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) as project coordinator, and the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM) with management responsibility for protected areas. Instead of the originally proposed formalized log frame workshop, several brainstorm meetings were conducted with members of the MoET and the Steering Committee for the management plan. The meetings served as a forum for discussions with respect to: (a) KfW’s concerns regarding the management plan; (b) additional work required to produce an integrated development plan; (c) enhancement of the policy guidelines for management plans; and (d) a priority needs assessment in preparation of an assistance package for potential KfW interventions.

This was followed by a reconnaissance of the Caprivi under professional guidance of the author of the management plan. The field trip focused on areas and issues of contention; special attention was given to the proposed zoning for the Okavango proposed National Park, proposed visitor facilities, tourism and other infrastructure, support zone boundaries and issues, meetings with local NGOs involved in community relation work and meetings with MoET staff currently working in the to be consolidated Wildlife Reserves.

Based on the brainstorm sessions and the field visit a series of intensive workshops with individuals from the planning team and the Steering Committee were conducted in order to (a) produce the concept and outline for the integrated development plan; (b) to produce a strategy which allows for better stakeholder participation and community involvement; (c) to produce the conceptual framework and study design for the establishment of support groups for the selected six protected areas of interest; (d) to produce guidelines in preparation of a project proposal for the production of a regional tourism development plan; and (e) to develop the strategy for the production of the four remaining management plans in the light of lessons learned from the Okavango experience.

In a final meeting with key persons from the MoET consensus was reached on all salient issues as documented in the Letter of Understanding (see Appendix 1 -a). The consultant’s itinerary and a list of persons met are summarized in Appendix 2.

2 BACKGROUND

KfW currently provides financial support to Namibia’s Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MoET) for the development of management plans for six protected areas in the north eastern part of Namibia (see Map 2 -a). The financial support is based on the agreement between KfW and the MoET from April 11, 1994 which identifies a total amount of N$ 720,000 for the production of the management plans. The consultant was informed by the MoET that the production of the management plans will be the first step of a large scale financial assistance portfolio by KfW for the development of the same six protection units. This is based on a financing agreement between KfW and the Republic of Namibia for DM 5 million (i.e. “Study and Expert Fund I) from September 12, 1991.
The Okawango management plan is the first in the series of five plans to be produced in the framework of the agreement (i.e. two protected areas will be consolidated to form the proposed Okawango National Park). According to the MoET this management plan has now been finalized and approved by the Ministry.

The plan was submitted to KfW for review. The first assessment of the plan indicated some shortcomings in the planning process. Of special concern was the lack of operational plans which should translate the guidelines provided in Volume 2 of the plan into practical activities. The concerns expressed in the assessment of the plan prompted the current consultancy. The principle aim of this consulting assignment is to clarify the contentious issues and to design a strategic conceptual framework for a smooth continuation of the program.

3 ISSUES OF CONCERN

3.1 Protection Categories and Legal Aspects

Namibia’s Protected Area System includes following categories: (a) National Park, (b) Game Park, (c) Game Reserve, (d) Park, (e) Wildlife Reserve, (f) Recreation Resort, and (g) Recreation Area (see Table 3.1-a). Some of the protected areas carry several category names (i.e. Etosha National Park is officially registered as “Game Park”) of which only two enjoy legal backing according to Namibia’s Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975: (a) Nature Reserves and (b) Game Parks. Both have to be proclaimed and to be made known by notice in the Official Gazette.
Table 3.1 -a Sizes and proclamation dates of Namibia’s state owned Parks and recreation Areas (Source: Linda Baker, from Namibia Environment, Vol.1, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK</th>
<th>SIZE IN SQ. KM</th>
<th>PROCLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etosha National Park</td>
<td>93 240,00</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>89 834,00</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>99 526,00</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>27 554,00</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>22 270,00</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namib-Naukluft Park</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>49 768,00</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Barmen Hot Springs</td>
<td>0,10</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi Game Park</td>
<td>5 715,00</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardap Recreation Resort</td>
<td>251,77</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daan Viljoen Game Park</td>
<td>39,53</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cross Seal Reserve</td>
<td>60,00</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs Ai - Ais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>461,17</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South West Nature Park</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton Coast Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterberg Plateau Park</td>
<td>405,49</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Bach Recreation Resort</td>
<td>42,85</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National West Coast Recreation Area</td>
<td>7 800,00</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Diamond Coast Recreation Area</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huns Mountains</td>
<td>3 000,00</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naute Recreation Area</td>
<td>224,62</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popa Game Park</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahango Game Reserve</td>
<td>244,62</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaudum Game Park</td>
<td>3 841,62</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudumu National Park</td>
<td>1 009,59</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamili National Park</td>
<td>319,92</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 111 844,57 square km or 13,6 % of Namibia

The location of the Conservation Areas is shown on Figure 3.1-a. Protection areas 16 to 21 on Figure 3.1-a are subject to the current KfW intervention in support of the elaboration of management plans. The proposed modifications of the Caprivi areas are based on recommendations made following an inter-sectoral socio-economic study of the Caprivi Region from 1991.
The current system of protected areas in Namibia and corresponding legislation is confusing, ambiguous and outdated. There is consensus on the need for a critical review. The network of protected areas needs to be expanded to equally represent the country’s ecosystems and to provide the basis for sustainable biodiversity conservation (Namibia is in the process to ratify the International Biodiversity Convention).

There is an urgent need for an updated legislation to provide clarity regarding categories for conservation areas and to set the legal framework for their sustainable protection and management. This will be addressed by the new environmental legislation which is currently drafted under the auspices of the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA). According to Jan Glazewski, the legal advisor to the DEA, the new legislation will follow IUCN’s guidelines for protected area categories, adapted to Namibia’s needs (pers. communication). Conservancies will be added as an additional category. The need for Management Plans for protected areas will be covered in the framew, whereas the critical elements of management plans will be included in subsidiary legislation attached to the Proclamation Act of an area.

If the new legislation will adopt the IUCN categories, existing categories may have to be changed. IUCN categories are defined by permissible use. The right choice for a category should be based on the vision statement for each area.

At this point the potentially most suitable protection categories for the protection units in the Caprivi is unknown. It has been suggested, to provide National Park status to the newly proposed western Caprivi protection area, i.e. Okavango National Park; according to the management plan it is composed of the existing Mahango Game Park and the western most section of the proclaimed Western Caprivi Game Park. The latter will have to be de-proclaimed first to enable the creation of Okavango NP. The implications are unknown since National Parks are currently not included in the Ordinance as a recognized category. This issue has to be resolved before implementation of the evolving integrated development plan for the proposed Okavango National Park.

Consensus Agreement:

- The new legislation will provide the basis for the right choice of protection categories which influence the management.

- The principle elements of a management plan will be incorporated into the subsidiary legislation of the Proclamation Act of the corresponding protection unit.
3.2 Teamwork in the Planning Process

The elaboration of management plans for protected areas is a team effort. Ideally, the teamleader should be a park’s planner. The teamleader would work throughout the planning process in close cooperation with existing park staff, the wildlife research division of the DRM, the economic section of the DEA, the proposed support group(s) for the respective areas and representatives of local communities and other stakeholders. It is understood that community representatives should be trusted members of the support zone population. The planning team should access special expertise on a consultative, as-needed basis.

Consensus Agreement:

- The need for teamwork in the planning process is recognized. To best achieve this goal, support teams will be established for areas for which management plans will be elaborated.

3.3 Participation of Stakeholders and Support Zone Communities

i) Communities and Stakeholders

Active participation of support zone communities and stakeholders in the planning and decision-making process is an essential prerequisite to achieve sustainable protection goals. Little needs to be added to the much discussed issue. Suffice it to say that communities should be given a chance to have a say in what happens in their backyard, especially when dealing with lands which traditionally have substantially contributed to their livelihood. This applies in particular to the Caprivi region where communities concentrate in the periphery of areas demarcated for protection (see Figure 3.3-a).

Figure 3.3 -a map with distribution of communities

The elaboration of a management plan is regional business. Decisions on land and resource use should therefore be made on a local level with guidance of the teamleader. The teamleader has to make sure that decisions comply with pertinent Government policies and legislation.

With proper regional teamwork in place there would be no need for a “Technical Steering Committee” in Windhoek which currently dominates the KfW sponsored planning process. It is self-evident that vital land and resource use decisions should be made by the people
mostly affected by such decisions. Communities should have a say in what happens in their backyard. There is a lot at stake.

It is critical to make the planning process transparent and to develop ownership within the communities. This is achieved through periodic participatory workshops to which communities are invited for an interactive exchange.

For each protected area with a management plan an advisory council should be established; it should be composed of representatives from support zone communities, stakeholders, local NGOs and the corresponding Park Warden. The functions and responsibilities of the Council should be spelled out in the management plan.

ii) Support Groups

The rationale for the proposed support groups is to foster community and stakeholder involvement in the planning and management of protected areas and respective support zones. One of the key functions of the support groups is to compile pertinent baseline data (non-academic) from the support zone in preparation of management plans. Other functions include environmental awareness campaigning and extension activities. The support groups should be composed of representatives from local level GOs, community representatives, NGOs and other stakeholders from the planning region. The support groups will play a crucial role during all phases of park planning. The earlier the groups are established the more valuable will be their contribution. The support groups will be an integral part of the planning team and, by representing local community interests, they will be a critical link between the planning team, the park administrators and the support zone communities. On completion of the management plans the support groups will continue their activities. They may get involved in conservancy work, implementation of pilot projects, community wildlife conservation, informal education, tourism infrastructure enhancement, and many other things.

Consensus Agreement:

- Community and stakeholder participation in the planning and decision-making process will be achieved through, (a) the establishment of support groups as integral parts of the planning teams; (b) periodic participatory workshops; and (c), the establishment of a technical advisory council for each protection unit.

- The MoET’s parks/neighbour and conservancy program should serve as the principle tool for active community participation in the land and resource use planning and decision making process. The program should be fully integrated into the process of management planning.

- An advisory Council should be established for each protected area with a completed management plan. The Council should be composed of the Park
Director, representatives local communities, Gos, NGOs and other stakeholders. Their principle function would be to (a) make important land and resource use decisions with respect to the protection unit and support zone, (b) supervise the implementation of the management plan, and (c) approve the annual work plans and budgets for the key management programs.

- Support Groups should be established and enhanced for the Okavango, Kwando, Mudumu, Mamili, Kaudon and Mengeti protected areas.

3.4 Policy Guidelines for Management Plans

Namibia’s policy guidelines for the elaboration of management plans are very complex. The guidelines place great emphasis on the compilation of biophysical baseline data, which are not necessarily needed in such detail for practical management purposes. The guidelines provide insufficient detail on the zoning concept as a management tool. They do not address the need for a vision statement as basis for strategies to be adopted. The management guidelines do not request a development plan and provide little guidance for the establishment of practical administrative structures. The guidelines do not identify key management programs, applicable to any protected area.

The management plan for the proposed Okavango National Park fully complies with the current policy guidelines for management plans. Volume 1 of the plan provides an overview of available biophysical data; Volume 2 provides general guidelines and recommendations regarding the management of the proposed NP; and Volume 3 depicts some priority issues translated into activities to be implemented. The integrated development plan which actually constitutes the major part of a management plan, is missing. It will be elaborated expediently.

Consensus Agreement:

- The guidelines for management plans will be enhanced in order to incorporate a (a) vision statement; (b) an expanded zoning concept; (c) key management programs as specified in Appendix 3 and an Integrated Development Plan as outlined in the same Appendix.

4 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT OF THE MoET

The management of the country’s protected area network is part of the responsibility of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MoET). The Ministry is composed of the Directorates of (a) Resource Management, (b) Forestry, (c) Environmental Affairs and (d)
Tourism, supported by Divisions and Sub-Divisions which provide services to the different Directorates. All four Directorates are involved to different degrees in protected area management, although the Directorate of Resource Management is trusted with the overall responsibilities.

4.1 Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA)

The DEA develops the policies and guidelines which apply to protected areas. The Directorate also assumes responsibility for the design and implementation of environmental projects addressing cross-cutting issues (i.e. biodiversity conservation, desertification, EIAs, Park/Neighbour and Conservancies etc.).

The elaboration of management plans for protected areas is a new exercise in Namibia. None of the existing protected areas has a proper management plan. Recognizing the need for a more systematic approach to long-term planning and management the DEA recently developed the “Guidelines for Management Plans” which provide the format and policies for the elaboration of management plans. The guidelines are a modified version of a model used in Natal.

Although the DEA has no direct mandate for the management of protected areas, it provides advise and other support to the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM), especially with reference to the use of protected area resources by support zone communities (i.e. park/neighbor program) and the establishment of conservancies within support zones of parks. The DEA has developed the policy concept and the legal framework for both programs which are currently being implemented under the auspices of the DEA in close cooperation with the USAID sponsored “Living in a Finite Environment” (LIFE) project. Unfortunately, there is little cooperation between the DRM and the project executants.

4.2 Directorate of Resource Management (DRM)

i) Staff Structure and Staff Capacity

The DRM has jurisdiction over the management of the country’s protected areas and wildlife resources. The DRM is represented in all six administrative regions in the country, of which two constitute the area of interest: the Caprivi and Okavango. The two regions are consolidated into the “Division North East, Area 3” with an organizational structure and staff positions, shown in Figure 4.2 -a (i.e. proposed rationalisation currently being implemented). The regional office is located in Rundu.

insert figure
The current staff of the proposed Okavango National Park (combined staff of the Mahango and Buffalo section) is composed of 4 rangers, 1 watchman, 2 leader labourers and 8 labourers. It is apparent that the current staff is inadequate to manage the proposed Park in accordance with the recommendations of the management plan. The management plan (see Appendix 1 for proposed organizational structure of the Okavango NP) recommends a staff total of approximately 45 persons for the NP.

At present, the DRM is mostly concerned with law enforcement, game counts, game capture and transplants, problem animals and the issue and enforcement of hunting concessions. There is little interaction and/or cooperation with support zone communities of protected areas. This is partly due to the lopsided educational background of senior and junior personnel and due to the lack of a progressive in-service training program. There is a definite need for an in-service training program which addresses the multifold demands of modern society and the pressing demands of the economically deprived rural populations characterizing the support zones of protected areas. A change in attitude by the DRM’s field staff is an essential prerequisite for a successful implementation of management plans and the sustainable protection of protected areas.

To date, neither the DRM or any other GO employs park planners with formal training; neither has the DRM in-house capability to produce practical management plans. For this reason, the elaboration of the KfW sponsored management plans was contracted out to a consultant. The production of management plans by outside consultants is of little benefit to the MoET. It does not provide much needed on-the-job training of MoET staff. Furthermore, the expertise and experience gathered in the planning process is lost. Also lost is the unique opportunity for the much needed trust building/bonding process with support zone communities which could be achieved within the participatory planning process. Without direct and intimate involvement in the planning process, the DRM field staff will continue to work in isolation, mostly concerned with their day-to-day enforcement problems.

The engagement of consultants for the elaboration of management plan cannot be a desirable long-term solution. For this reason, it is critical that the DRM develops in-house capability. As the GO responsible for implementation of management plans it is crucial that the DRM develops ownership which may best be achieved through forming in-house capability. This has been substantiated through an USAID sponsored complex training need assessment which identified the DRM’s shortfalls in training and skill requirements.

It is doubtful that the DRM will be able to develop in-house capability for protected area and support zone management on its own. Outside assistance is needed to develop and implement in-service and on-the-job training modules in order to develop the much needed in-house expertise. The training should go beyond capacity building for the elaboration of management plans; it should equip the field staff with the capability to productively interact with visitors to protected areas, local communities and stakeholders in general. Field staff should learn how to deal and cooperate with NGOs and how to accommodate
community needs. An expatriate Technical Advisor should be attached to the DRM to provide assistance to the DRM in the capacity building process, guidance during the planning and implementation stages of the management plans.

As a first step, a workshop should be conducted on management planning for protected areas with participation of RPM field staff currently involved in management of protected areas and teaching staff of Technokon which currently provides most of the ranger training in Namibia. The workshop should provide management personnel with background on the principles of management plans and will enhance their understanding for the need of management plans.

Consensus Agreement

- The need for capacity building within the DRM for the elaboration of management plans is recognized. It is recommended to establish a permanent staff position within the DRM for a qualified physical planner with experience in parks planning. The planner should be the counterpart to the consultant currently engaged in the elaboration of the KfW sponsored management plans and should assume ultimate responsibility for management planning in the DRM.

- There is a need for an expatriate Technical Advisor to the DRM in order to assist in the development of (a) in-house management planning capability, (b) training modules for all staff levels, (c) their implementation and (d) to advise the DRM on all matters regarding the management of protected areas and support zones.

- The need for a workshop on protected area planning for the benefit of key management personnel is recognized and should be implemented as soon as possible.

ii) RPM Budgets for the Caprivi and Kavango Regions

The 1996/97 operational budget for the Caprivi Region is approximately 2 Million Namibian Dollar; for the Kavango Region it is 1.2 Million Namibian Dollars. The operational budgets are expected to increase substantially on completion of the KfW supported project with the expansion in staff and infrastructure for the areas with evolving management plans. Detailed budget figures are provided in Appendix 4.

4.3 Directorate of Tourism (DT)
The Directorate of Tourism is responsible for the Government owned tourism infrastructure inside protected areas. Management of tourism related facilities is currently not an integral part of park management as proposed by the evolving management plans. The DT is a very weak link in the chain which needs strengthening. Attached to the DT is the Policy Planning, Management and Information Unit (PPMIU), which is not incorporated into the Government core structure. The PPMIU is equally weak and very poorly funded.

Ideally, the PPMIU should provide the required tourism related input into the management planning process; however, it lacks the manpower, technical know-how and the budget to fulfill this function. The PPMIU, in theory, would also be responsible to produce a much needed regional tourism development plan for the Caprivi/Kavango Region. Such plan would provide the basis for the planning of tourism infrastructure related to the protected area system, proposed conservancies and support zones. The tourism program for the Okavango NP has been prepared in isolation from the rest of the region. It is self-evident that tourism development has to be addressed in a regional context.

Consensus Agreement:

- The need for the elaboration of a regional tourism development plan for the Caprivi/Kavango Region has been recognized. The plan should be produced expediently and should serve as planning basis for the visitor programs affiliated with the protected areas with evolving management plans.

5 SUSTAINABILITY OF KfW’s CAPITAL INVESTMENT

5.1 Personnel capability of the MoET

From the capability assessment of the MoET it becomes apparent that the current capacity of the DRM’s personnel will be unable to implement the Okavango management plan as proposed. It will be difficult to locate properly trained and experienced staff which would qualify for the key positions as described in the management plan. Without outside assistance for capacity building in the DRM and outside assistance for the implementation of the management plan(s), the plans will not be implemented. The DRM and the DRA have already difficulties in accepting the staffing structure as proposed in the organizational chart for the ONP; the DRM rather fancies an interim solution as shown on the proposed organizational chart prepared by the DRM for the Caprivi Region (see Figure 4.2 -a). If the DRM’s interim version will be adopted, the integrity of the management plans is at stake. If the proposed staffing structure for the ONP is not adopted in principle, what are the chances to obtain the personnel required for 5 additional
areas? Without proper staffing of the proposed protected areas and without proper training and skill development the evolving management plans cannot be implemented.

Except for specialized short-term training courses abroad (i.e. CNPPA and US Park Service sponsored annual training course for park managers), capacity building should be achieved through on-the-job training. There will be a need for an expatriate project manager to implement the integrated development plan for the ONP. He will train his counterpart and key management personnel from the management programs. He should be assisted regarding special training needs through short-term consultant expertise. In conjunction with the proposed Technical Advisor for protected areas management, to be attached to the DRM, he would design and implement training workshops for all staff levels with emphasis on personnel to be employed in the KfW sponsored project. Needless to say, that the training has to focus on skill development for ranger work related to support zone communities and support zone issues. Skill development with respect to problem resolutions in connection with land- and resource use conflicts will be critical for the sustainable management of protected areas.

5.2 Financial Capability of the DRM

The DRM feels confident that it can cover the operational budgets for the five KfW sponsored protected areas in accordance with the projected management plans.

The DRM currently generates approximately N $ 700 000 from the Western Caprivi (Mahango and Buffalo Sections from 117 000 has of land) and N $ 172 000 from the eastern section through trophy hunting of elephants alone. The eastern section covers lands outside of Mamili and Mudumi Nps which are not hunted (Ben Beytel, pers.comm.). This revenue from trophy hunting compares favourably with the current operational budget for the areas of interest. There is little doubt, that revenues can be increased dramatically based on proper management and infrastructure development in the parks and support zones as stipulated by the management plans. Additional revenue can be generated through:

- the sale of higher quotas for trophy hunting (one trophy elephant generates N $ 70 000 in revenue), once animal populations have been increased and stabilized through proper habitat and people management;
- gate and facility user fees from park visitors;
- fees to be paid by lease and licenc holders to the parks administration;
- the sale of surplus big game animals for re-stocking purposes and private game farms.
The north eastern region of Namibia with Caprivi as a focus has great tourism potential when seen in a regional context. With the completion of the Caprivi Highway, a project co-financed by KfW and the EEC, tourists can take the “big” National Park circuit, including Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, South Africa and Namibia. This will be a great attraction and will stimulate regional and international tourism. The KfW sponsored parks will be the engine driving the tourism based local economy.

In this light, the confidence of the DRM in being able to meet the expected financial challenge posed through dramatically increasing operational budgets can be shared. In other words, it is possible that the MoET can develop the financial capability to implement the management plans and to meet the operational costs on completion of the development phase. With proper management the proposed parks can be self-financing.

Consensus Agreement:

- Capacity building in the DRM is an essential prerequisite for the implementation of the management plan and park’s administration. This may best be achieved through an expatriate project manager with overall responsibility for the implementation of the management plan for the ONP. The project manager would assist in the design and implementation of training modules in close cooperation of the to be employed Technical Advisor to the DRM.

- In-service and on-the-job training of staff to be employed in the KfW sponsored parks are critical for proper implementation of management plans.

- The services of a resource economist are required to design fee structures for park users and consumptive resource use (i.e. the expertise can be provided by the DEA).

6 DONOR FUNDING FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

The most pertinent biodiversity conservation related donor activity in the Caprivi region is the USAID funded LIFE project. The project is implemented by WWF US in close cooperation with the IRDNC (Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation), a local NGO with extensive experience in community based conservation.

The US $ 15 Million LIFE project is part of the US $ 55 Million Regional Program, which promote community based tourism, skill development in rural communities, establishment and operating nature conservancies, recruitment and training of community game guards,
infrastructure development for biodiversity conservation and many other nature conservation and community development related activities. Although the budget of US $15 Million covers all of Namibia; the Caprivi Region is a focal area where the major part of the money is being spend. The LIFE projects aims at strengthening conservation oriented local NGOs, Gos and Universities. The project duration is from July 1993 to August 1999.

- The principle goals of this community-based natural resource funding program may be summarized as follows:

  - initiate involvement of local communities in sustainable resource management in partnership with the Government;

  - direct involvement of the local communities in decision-making over wildlife utilization options such as trophy hunting and cropping (based on proper legislation which currently is being approved); and

  - extension of project to include fisheries, forestry and improved range management systems.

In the framework of the LIFE project the IRDNC has quite successfully established a community based game guard system in the eastern Caprivi and has developed a good working relationship with local communities which is build on mutual trust.

In general, the LIFE project is a program which is well designed, well implemented and well received locally. It is practical and works at grassroots instead of the common “from the top down” approach.

The LIFE program in the Caprivi and the IRDNC in particular would be the ideal partners to succesfully establish the proposed Support Groups for the KfW sponsored protected areas. IRDNC should become the driving force for the implementation of the management plans, in particular with respect to the support zone programs. Furthermore, the IRDNC could be the idseal partner for on-the-job ranger training with respect to community interaction and cooperative programs with community game guards. Every efoort should be made tp capitalize on the IRDNC’s experience and skills for the benefit of the KfW sponsored project and the Caprivi at large.

**Recommendation:**

- to establish a close working relationship with the LIFE program and the IRDNC in the Caprivi;
• to consider co-funding with LIFE of activities identified in the management plan for ONP projects in the support zone and within the parks/neighbor program.

7 PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP

7.1 Finalization of the Management Plan for the ONP

The Directorate of Environmental Affairs have approved the current version of the management plan as the final product. The DEA strongly defended the plan which was produced according to the guidelines for management plans which had been submitted to KfW prior to the initiation of the project. However, Consensus agreement by the Steering Committee and the DEA was reached on the format and structure for the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) for the ONP (see Appendix 1-b). There was consensus agreement that the proposed IDP will be a critical part of the management plan.

It was agreed that the consultant responsible for the elaboration of the management plan be given the task to expediently produce the IDP. On completion, the IDP will be submitted to KfW for funding. Provided KfW’s approval of the attached cost proposal for the production of the plan, the first draft could be ready for comments by April 10.

It is recommended that KfW provides the Project Coordinator with a confirmation of funding approval by fax as soon as possible.

The costs for the elaboration of the IDP are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional time senior consultant @ N $ 800/day (= DM 300/day):</td>
<td>DM 3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 days preparation of draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 day workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 day post-workshop discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 days final draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total of 10 days for senior consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional time of quantity surveyor/architect for 1 day</td>
<td>DM 300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional time of loss adjuster for 1 day</td>
<td>DM 300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshop related expenses (meals, fares etc.)</td>
<td>DM 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report production</td>
<td>DM 400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contingency</td>
<td>DM 400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IDP will be discussed with support zone communities of the proposed ONP and other stakeholders from the area in form of participatory workshops.

There was consensus agreement that work in preparation of the second management plan will commence as soon as KfW releases the funds. Simultaneously, steps will be taken to assemble the proposed support groups for the five protection units of concern. There was agreement that community and stakeholder participation in the planning and decision making process will be an important part of future work.

7.2 Training Workshop

i) Background

The rationale for the workshop has been discussed before. The workshop will be an important part of the proposed capacity building program for DRM management personnel. Provided approval by KfW as part of the current project, the workshop should be implemented later this year at a mutually agreed upon time.

The workshop will be for 6 days to be held at the Lianshulu Lodge, in the heart of the Mudumu National Park. This provides the opportunity to management personnel and trainers to obtain first-hand experience in planning of an area as part of the current project. It provides local stakeholders with the opportunity to express their concerns and fears and to contribute through their local knowledge. This will be an important step for the development of ownership. The work produced by the workshop participants will be used in the elaboration of the management plan for Mudumu NP.

The number of participants for the technical planning part should be restricted to 15 persons and for the log frame section to 25 persons. Invited are senior park managers and wardens from the Caprivi and Kavango Regions, representatives from the DRM, DEA and DR, and teaching staff from Technokon. For the 3 days log frame part of the workshop representatives of support zone communities, NGOs and other local stakeholders will be invited.

The workshop would be facilitated by an expatriate professional park planner with sound experience in people and subject matter management. He would assume full responsibility for the design and implementation of the workshop. He would be assisted by the current project co-ordinator and other DRM staff as required. The 6 days training workshop will be composed of following sessions:
• 1 day introduction to familiarize the participants with the principles of management planning for protected areas (core group only).

• 2 days log frame workshop in preparation of the management plan for Mudumu NP (large group).

• 1 day field reconnaissance with focus on proposed development areas and contentious sites (large group).

• 1 day continuation and conclusion of log-frame workshop (large group).

• 1 day meeting at a to be selected support zone community (large group).

ii) Tentative Budget

Time requirements for expatriate consultant:

4 days preparation in Windhoek and on site
6 days implementation of the workshop
3 days follow-up work
2 days travel

ii) estimated workshop costs except for expatriate fees and expenses:

Daily allowance for 25 workshop participants (room and board at the lodge) for 6 days approximately DM 18 000.00

travel expenses for participants DM 4 000.00

miscellaneous DM 1 000.00

Total workshop expenses DM 23 000.00

7.3 Technical Advisor to the DRM

It is realized that this component falls outside FZ contributions, unless it could be accommodated as integral part of the on-going project. As described earlier, a Technical Advisor to the DRM is urgently needed in support of the KfW sponsored program, to assist in the design and implementation of training programs and to assist in the capacity building process within the DRM in general.

7.4 Elaboration of Regional Tourism Development Plan
It is realized that this exercise falls outside conventional FZ contributions. However, since it would provide a sound basis for the KfW sponsored park program, financing the plan within the framework of the current commitment should be considered.

7.5 Support Group and Park / Neighbour Program
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APPENDIX 2  ITINERARY AND PERSONS MET

March 23  travel to Windhoek
March 24  literature review
March 25  meet H. Gebauer, German Embassy
          meet Peter Tarr, Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA)
          meet Brian Jones, Conservancy and praks neighbours program of
          the DEA
March 26  meet planning group from DEA:
          Chris J. Brown, Peter Tarr and Brian Jones from the DEA, Chris
          Hines, Consultant, author of the management plan, and Helmut
          Woehl, GTZ advisor to the DEA on the desertification program;
          meet Joe Tagg, parks and neighbour program of the DEA
March 27  meet Chris Hines
March 28  meet Steering Committee for Caprivi Management Plan:
          Erik Holm-Petersen, Project Manager of Namibia Tourism
          (PPMIU), Danie Grobler, Deputy Director of Directorate of
          Resource Management (DRM) of the MoET, Ben Beytell,
          Senior officer of the DRM, Peter Tarr and Chris Hines
March 29  meet Helmut Woehl, GTZ advisor
          meet Jon Mendelson, GIS mapping section of the DEA
          meet Peter Tarr and Brian Jones
March 30-31 literature review and preparation of documents
April 01  meet Chris Weaver, WWF activities in Caprivi
          meet Jan Glazewski, legal section of DEA
          meet Ben Beytell, DRM
          meet Jon Barnes, WWF-US operated LIFE project and economic
          advisor to DEA
April 02-09 Field trip Caprivi
April 03  meet Roy Vincent, Lodge owner Mahango Section
April 04  meet Patrick Lane, Chief Warden Western Caprivi, Rundu, DRM
April 04  visit Mahango area
April 05  visit Buffalo Section
April 06  meet Grant Burton and Marie Holstensen, owners Lianshulu Lodge
          visit Mudumu proposed National Park
          meet Ben Vermaark, Namushasha Lodge
April 07  visit Eastern Caprivi wildlife reserve Susuwi Section
          visit Eastern Caprivi wildlife reserve southern section
April 08  meet Simon Mayes and Matthew Rice, IRDNC and LIFE program
          meet Evan Thomas, Ministry of Education
April 09  meet Manie LeRoux, Chief Control Warden, Eastern Caprivi
April 10  return to Windhoek with M. LeRoux
April 11  meet Jan Glazewski, legal advisor to DRA
          meet Bernadette Arpivor, National Planning Commission
April 12  group meeting with Chris Brown, Peter Tarr and Brian Jones, DRA
meet Paul Klotzsch, Director of Buffalo Trails Safaris, Caprivi

April 15

group meeting with Technical Steering Committee
debriefing German Embassy
meet Erik Holm-Peterson, PPMIU

April 16

final meeting with DRA staff

DEPARTURE FOR GERMANY