

**PPT Working Paper No. 4**



**Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism:  
NACOBTA the Namibian case study**

**Nepeti Nicanor**

**April 2001**

## Preface

This case study was written as a contribution to a project on 'pro-poor tourism strategies.' The pro-poor tourism project is collaborative research involving the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Centre for Responsible Tourism at the University of Greenwich (CRT), together with in-country case study collaborators. It is funded by the Economic and Social Research Unit (ESCOR) of the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

The project reviewed the experience of pro-poor tourism strategies based on six commissioned case studies. These studies used a common methodology developed within this project. The case study work was undertaken mainly between September and December 2000. Findings have been synthesised into a research report and a policy briefing, while the 6 case studies are all available as Working Papers. The outputs of the project are:

*Pro-poor tourism strategies: Making tourism work for the poor.* Pro-poor Tourism Report No 1. (60pp) by Caroline Ashley, Dilys Roe and Harold Goodwin, April 2001.

*Pro-poor tourism: Expanding opportunities for the poor.* PPT Policy Briefing No 1. (4pp). By Caroline Ashley, Harold Goodwin and Dilys Roe, April 2001.

*Pro poor Tourism Working Papers:*

- No 1 *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism, Wilderness Safaris South Africa: Rocktail Bay and Ndumu Lodge.* Clive Poultney and Anna Spenceley
- No 2 *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Case studies of Makuleke and Manyeleti tourism initiatives: South Africa.* Karin Mahony and Jurgens Van Zyl
- No 3 *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Case study of pro-poor tourism and SNV in Humla District, West Nepal.* Naomi M. Saville
- No 4. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism: NACOBTA the Namibian case study.* Nepeti Nicanor
- No 5. *UCOTA – The Uganda Community Tourism Association: a comparison with NACOBTA.* Elissa Williams, Alison White and Anna Spenceley
- No 6. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism. Tropic Ecological Adventures – Ecuador.* Scott Braman and Fundación Acción Amazonia
- No 7. *Practical strategies for pro-poor tourism: a case study of the St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme.* Yves Renard
- No 8 *Pro-poor tourism initiatives in developing countries: analysis of secondary case studies.* Xavier Cattarinich.

All of the reports are available on our website at:

**<http://www.propoortourism.org.uk>**.

© CRT, IIED and ODI, 2001

Readers are encouraged to quote or reproduce material from this working paper, but as copyright holders CRT, IIED and ODI request due acknowledgement.

## **Acknowledgements**

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) in funding this work. DFID supports policies, programmes and projects to promote international development. It provided funds for this study as part of that objective, but the views and opinions expressed here are those of the authors alone.

The study was conducted under the auspices of the CRT, IIED and ODI, with editing and advisory inputs from Caroline Ashley (ODI) and Maxi Louis, Executive Director of NACOBTA.

### **The author**

Nepeti Nicanor is an independent consultant. She may be contacted at

P O Box 25601  
Windhoek  
NAMIBIA

Tel + 264 61 2300 303  
Email: [nepetrob@iafrica.com.na](mailto:nepetrob@iafrica.com.na)

NACOBTA's web site address is [www.nacobta.com.na](http://www.nacobta.com.na)

## Acronyms

CAN	Community-based Natural Resource Management Association of Namibia
CBRNM	Community-based natural resource management
CBT	Community-based tourism
CBTE	Community-based Tourism Enterprise
DFID	Department for International Development
EU	European Union
FENATA	Federation of Namibian Tourism Associations
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation
LIFE	Living in a Finite Environment
MC	Management Committee
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
NACOBTA	Namibia Community-based Tourism Association
NANGOF	Namibia NGO Forum
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PPT	Pro poor tourism
PTO	Permission to occupy
RISE	Rural Institute for Social Empowerment
SCL	Standard Consumption Level
SIDA	Swedish Agency for International Development
SME	Small and medium enterprises
SWAPO	South West African People's Organisation
UCOTA	The Uganda Community Tourism Association
USAID	United States Aid
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

# Contents

<b>1. Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Key geographical, cultural and historical characteristics	1
1.2 Tourists and tourism segments	1
1.3 Background on NACOBTA	2
<b>2. Pro Poor Focus</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Pro-poor strategies	5
2.2 Overview of strategies	13
2.3 Specific action to involve poor people in tourism	14
<b>3. Results and Impacts</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Progress and challenges	15
3.2 Relevance to poverty reduction	24
3.3 Case studies	25
3.3a Spitzkoppe CBTE	25
3.3b Penduka	27
3.3c Face to Face	28
3.3d Nyae Nyae Conservancy	30
3.3e Torra Bay CBTE	31
3.4 Impact of CBTEs on the poor	32
3.5 Broader contributions to poverty alleviation	33
3.6 Anticipated impacts	34
<b>4. Review and Lessons</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 Reflections on this PPT initiative	36
4.2 Reflections on the PPT research	39
<b>References</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
1. Methodology	44
2. Actions to address barriers to participation of the poor in tourism	45
3. Impacts on livelihoods of the poor	47
4. Financial data	52
<b>Boxes and tables</b>	
Box 1 NACOBTA membership criteria	5
Box 2 Who are the poor?	8
Table 1 Number of visitors using accommodation and facilities and number of foreign visitors to Namibia	2
Table 2 Registered conservancies	10
Table 3 Emerging conservancies	10
Table 4 NACOBTA operational budget 2000-2005	20
Table 5 Types of poor benefiting from NACOBTA member enterprises	24
Table 6 Financial earnings of the poor, Spitzkoppe	26
Table 7 Financial earnings of the poor, Penduka	28
Table 8 Financial earnings of the poor, Face to Face	30
Table 9 Financial earnings of the poor, Nyae Nyae Conservancy	31
Table 10 Financial earnings of the poor, Torra Bay	31
Table 11 NACOBTA projected indicators	35



# 1. Overview

The focus of this study is the Namibian Community-based Tourism Association (NACOBTA). It is a membership-based association of community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) found in relatively poor communities, which aims to incorporate pro-poor tourism in the mainstream tourist industry. The association provides support to its members by way of grants, loans, marketing, training and organisational development, and also represents its members' interests in policy development at the national level and in negotiations with the mainstream tourist industry.

The case study aims to assess and document NACOBTA's pro-poor tourism strategies, and the challenges and progress it has faced in implementing these strategies.

## 1.1 Key geographical, cultural and historical characteristics

Namibia lies on the west coast of southern Africa, sharing its borders with Angola, Botswana, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Its land area is 824,269km<sup>2</sup>, with a population estimated to be around 1.7 million. It was colonised by Germany in 1884, before passing over to British and South African rule. Namibia gained independence in 1990, following a period of more than thirty years of armed struggle by the black Namibians under the South-West African People's Organisation (SWAPO).

There are thirteen officially recognised languages in Namibia, reflecting the diversity of culture and language in Namibia, although English has been the official language since Independence. The Namibian landscape is home to one of the oldest deserts in the world, the Namib, with its sand dunes, gravel plains, and rocky hills as well as the Kalahari Desert. There are also mountain ranges, fossilised forests, grass and woodland savannah, underground lakes, swamps and extinct volcanoes. There is a vast range of wildlife including black and white rhinos, cheetahs (highest population in Africa), giraffes, oryx, lions, elephants, ostriches, leopards, antelopes, springboks, hippos, crocodiles and the side-winding snakes of the Namib Desert.

During German colonial rule blacks in the central and southern regions were removed from their land and the land was given to the white settlers. This has resulted in 4,200 (mostly white) farmers owning and occupying 44% of the land as commercial farms, which alone consume 36% of the water resources. Communal land makes up 41%, and this is the land which 73% of Namibians live off today through subsistence farming. Around 15% of the country is classified as National Parks.

Namibia has a wealth of cultural and historical features and events such as rock paintings, cultural museums, German architecture, monuments, cultural villages, traditional celebrations and commemorations provide a rich combination of the old and the modern.

## 1.2 Tourists and tourism segments

Namibia is a well-established tourist destination attracting local, regional and international visitors. The majority of regional tourists are South Africans who in 1998 comprised 35.5% of the total number of visitors to Namibia. Other regional tourists come from Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia. German tourists provided the largest number of international visitors (10% of total number

of visitors in 1998), followed by visitors from the UK, North America, France, Italy and Scandinavia.

The tourist sectors that are well-developed are the coastal, wilderness, mass-market, luxury, adventure, back-packers and self-driving segments. The rural and urban tourism sections are still under-developed, but this could change dramatically with the development of conservancies<sup>1</sup> and enterprises like Face to Face.

The use of accommodation facilities has decreased over the past three years, although the number of visitors has risen (mainly due to Angolans, who rarely use the tourist facilities). This is probably due to unrest in the Caprivi region which began in August 1998.

**Table 1 Number of visitors using accommodation facilities and number of foreign visitors to Namibia**

Year	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Accommodation	335,903	476,316	561,592	675,046	629,041	497,945
Arrivals	-	-	-	610,349	614,368	693,777

*Source:* Accommodation and Visitors' Statistics by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) (19??)

### 1.3 Background on NACOBTA

NACOBTA was established in 1995 and operates at both micro and macro levels. At the micro level it works with individual enterprises by providing advice, loans, training and promotional services, and also acts as a network and a 'voice' for CBTE initiatives. At the macro level, NACOBTA has been active in lobbying and assisting the government develop its tourism policy. It has also been working with the State to ensure that communities who apply to be demarcated as conservancies also get permission to own the land and other resources besides wildlife. In addition, NACOBTA liaises with private operators to ensure that CBTEs are integrated into mainstream tourism.

#### 1.3.1 Membership

There were 45 members of NACOBTA at the end of 2000 and membership is open to various kinds of initiatives such as those listed below.

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| \$ Campsites and lodges run by communities | \$ Art and craft centres        |
| \$ Community guides and trackers           | \$ Community tour operators     |
| \$ Traditional villages                    | \$ Cultural groups              |
| \$ Local museums                           | \$ Community car hire operators |
| \$ Community canoe operators               | \$ Conservancies                |
| \$ Wildlife councils                       |                                 |

*Source:* NACOBTA Constitution (19??)

<sup>1</sup> A conservancy is a registered body of local residents to which the Government devolves conditional rights to use wildlife, so long as it is done sustainably



### *1.3.2 Target market*

The enterprises that are members of NACOBTA cater for a wide-range of tourists. A few meet the needs of up-market tourists, while many provide services more appropriate for independent, self-drive tourists. Currently, the biggest market is for the budget backpacker, followed by those in the adventure and wilderness segments of the tourist industry.

### *1.3.3 Key actors*

#### **Management and Staff**

The Association has a secretariat in the capital city, Windhoek, which is staffed by a programme manager, a training coordinator, three business advisors and an administrator/accountant. Currently, there is a management support person seconded by a donor to assist with skills development of the programme manager and the business advisors.

NACOBTA is run by a management committee of ten, consisting of seven elected members and three non-voting Committee members – the programme manager and two additional members from the private sector, one with expertise in tourism and the other in small enterprise development. There are two additional members who are nominated by the programme manager and endorsed by all seven voting members. The elected members serve office for two years, while the additional members serve for one year. The highest decision-making body is the Annual General Meeting where members come together.

#### **Donors**

Donors play a crucial role in the activities of NACOBTA as most of the Association's activities are donor funded. Only a small amount of its income is self-generated through training and consultancy activities. NACOBTA has received N\$4.6 million from donors over the past five years. NACOBTA has received N\$4.6 million from donors over the past five years. The two main sources of funding have been from the Swedish Development Agency (SIDA) and the Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) programme. Additional funding has also been received from the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the European Union (EU).

Many of the non-governmental organisations (NGOs) currently involved in community-based tourism (CBT), have been lobbied by donors to become involved in tourism and community-based natural resource management (CBNRM). USAID, WWF and other donors funding the LIFE initiative have been lobbying for local NGOs to take over when the programme comes to a close, and have also been influential in the establishment of the Community-based Natural Resource Management Association of Namibia (CAN) – the CBNRM NGO Association in Namibia. Many of the tasks that NACOBTA has taken up – such as the tourism development of the Nyae Nyae conservancy – are through involvement with LIFE, which has also funded NACOBTA. LIFE has also been influential in lobbying other donors to commit funds to natural resource management issues, as well as CBTE development.

### Other stakeholders

NACOBTA works in close partnership with other stakeholders involved in tourism, pro-poor tourism (PPT), training, CBNRM, policy formulation and advocacy. Currently the private sector is the most influential in tourism development, followed by NGOs who work mainly in natural resource management and community-based tourism projects, while the government plays a very erratic role.

The private sector is well organised and spearheaded by the Federation of Namibian Tourism Associations (FENATA), an umbrella organisation consisting of private sector organisations, the government and NGOs. Apart from private companies, organisations influential in tourism development in Namibia are:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| \$ Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)     | \$ Air Namibia (the National Airline)                         |
| \$ Association of Namibian Travel Agents (ANTA)  | \$ Car Rental Association of Namibia (CARAN)                  |
| \$ Hospitality Association of Namibia(HAN)       | \$ Namibia Professional Hunters Association (NAPHA)           |
| \$ Tour and Safari Association of Namibia (TASA) | \$ Tourist Related Namibian Businesses Association (TRENABA)  |
| \$ FENATA  | \$ NACOBTA  |
| \$ Life Programme                                | \$ Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF)                            |
| \$ Rural Institute for Social Empowerment (RISE) | \$ Namibia NGO Forum (NANGOF)                                 |
| \$ Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)                 | \$ CAN  |
| \$ Rössing Foundation                            | \$ Namibia Development Trust                                  |
| \$ Nyae Nyae Development Foundation (NNDF)       | \$ Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation (IRDNC) |

## 2. Pro-poor Focus

NACOBTA can be regarded as a ‘trade association’, representing the poorest sections of the tourist industry. Most of its members are based in communal land areas where the majority of people are poor (income of less than U\$1 per day) and rely on subsistence farming. Communal lands also have the highest unemployment rates, lowest income and are the least developed areas in the country.

One of the main objectives of NACOBTA is to raise the income and employment levels of these areas through tourism, in order to improve the living standards of people in communal areas. It tries to achieve this objective through a pro-poor strategy that includes:

- \$ the development of CBT as a niche;
- \$ the integration of CBTEs into the mainstream tourism industry by involving the private sector;
- \$ working towards the development and implementation of policies conducive to pro-poor and environmentally sound CBT, and
- \$ the establishment of NACOBTA as an institution.

Its membership criteria also emphasise support and benefits for the poor, the disadvantaged and the community (Box 1).

### Box 1 NACOBTA membership criteria

- \$ The initiative must significantly benefit disadvantaged communities
- \$ The members or individuals must have limited access to financial resources and skills necessary to develop their enterprises
- \$ The initiative must be owned and operated by a community, community-based organisation or by a resident individual who is a member of the local community; this excludes privately controlled enterprises
- \$ There should be clear evidence of a community benefit fund or other form of community benefit coming from the initiative
- The proposed initiative should be viable

*Source:* Adapted from NACOBTA Constitution (19??)

The tourism focus of NACOBTA is different from conventional tourism because the communities or residents own the enterprises and are directly involved in running them. The benefits from the initiatives go to the community residents as community funds, wages or income to casual labourers and informal sector traders. Unlike conventional tourism, CBT does not aim to expand the size of tourism, but instead aims to carve a niche in the existing tourism market to distribute the benefits more widely.

### 2.1 Pro-poor strategies

As mentioned earlier, NACOBTA takes a multi-faceted approach to PPT because the environment necessary for it to succeed is multi-dimensional and therefore requires a multi-pronged approach. NACOBTA’s approach involves four main strategies:

1. *Micro-level* – assisting individual CBTEs get off the ground and succeed.
2. *Private sector level* – integration of CBT into mainstream tourism industry
3. *Macro-level* – lobbying and advocating for a policy and planning framework that is PPT
4. *Institutional level* – institutional development of NACOBTA as a representative body of CBTEs.

### 2.1.1 Activities of NACOBTA at micro-level

Offering assistance to its members to enable them to get off the ground has been NACOBTA's most successful strategy to date. The activities include training, the provision of grants, product development, marketing and business advice.

- **Training**

NACOBTA offers training to its members and occasionally to its partners on request e.g. Botswana. The courses offered in 1999 and 2000 were: Local Tour Guide Course, Basic Introduction to Tourism and CBT, Tourism Awareness Course, Business Skills Training, and Developing a CBTE. A total of 237 and 182 people were trained in 1999 and 2000 respectively.

- **Small grants**

The Association seeks funding to provide small grants to CBTEs to improve facilities, as most have difficulties accessing loans from financial institutions because they are poor and have nothing to serve as collateral. Grants offered so far have been used to finance the furnishing and fitting of bungalows; upgrading bars, showers and toilets, and the development of campsites and other infrastructure such as reception buildings and entrance gates. Six (total of N\$112,000) and five (total of N\$50,000) grants were granted during 1999 and 2000 respectively. NACOBTA estimates it will give grants to the value of N\$1.5 million by the end of 2005. Of this, N\$1million is expected to be disbursed in the next three years (2001- 2003). These small grants will help raise CBTE facilities to a basic minimum standard and so encourage the private sector to use them.

NACOBTA enters into agreements with the CBTEs they support. These address how they are going to contribute to the community development fund. In addition to small grants, NACOBTA assists CBTEs in raising funds from donors and other organisations.

- **Improvement and development of product**

In addition to grants, NACOBTA staff work directly with CBTEs helping them to improve their products (e.g. accommodation and quality of service). They also advise how CBTEs can add value to their product by, for example, offering other services such as cultural performances, identifying new tour routes etc.

NACOBTA provides CBTEs with basic support packages, consisting of record keeping and financial management stationery, a visitor's book, a date stamp, sign board and a calculator. NACOBTA staff also provide on-site training on how to use and implement this package.

- **On-site business advice**

NACOBTA has three business advisors who provide on-site assistance to member CBTEs. This includes training; developing management and organisational structures and tools; developing mission and vision statements; developing marketing strategies; setting-up financial, monitoring and evaluation systems; setting-up booking systems; drafting constitutions; preparing funding

proposals; assisting in planning; assisting in the application for concessions; overseeing the development of infrastructure; setting-up a performance indicator database system etc.

- **Development of business plans**

The business advisors work together with individual CBTEs to develop and review their comprehensive business plans. This involves consultation with the private sector and research on any proposed new products. These business plans are then used as management tools by the CBTE management.

- **Marketing**

The marketing activities of NACOBTA include the production and distribution of a bi-monthly newsletter, a brochure and a CBTE information booklet highlighting all operating member enterprises and exhibitions at national, regional and international trade fairs and expositions. They occupy a permanent stand at the Namibia Craft Centre, displaying t-shirts advertising particular CBTEs and copies of advertisements and editorials placed in newspapers, travel and airline magazines. NACOBTA also offers advice and information on setting-up web sites, attending meetings with tourism organisations like FENATA, as well as providing sign-boards and guidance on the development of brochures for CBTE members. Other services provided include the marketing of CBTEs for inclusion in tour operators' brochures, and the distribution of brochures and newsletters through Namibian Tourism offices, both nationally and internationally.

### *2.1.2 Integration of CBT into the mainstream tourism industry*

Integrating the CBT into the mainstream tourism industry is one of NACOBTA's main strategies, and has recently met with some success. The Association has been involved in various activities to help combat scepticism in the private sector. These include:

- Inclusion of two private sector members in the management committee of NACOBTA
- Joining the Federation of Namibian Tourism Associations as a member
- Regular attendance of FENATA and TASA meetings by NACOBTA to meet, and be seen by, the private sector
- Organisation and facilitation of a workshop with tour operators in November 1999 to discuss potential partnerships with CBTEs and requirements by private sector
- Distribution of information about CBTEs to private sector
- Training of CBTE staff and members to reach the standard expected by the private sector
- Facilitation and mediation of joint-venture agreements between CBTEs and private businesses
- Development of investment portfolios for CBTEs
- Provision of joint venture training for members
- Doing all the preparatory work with CBTEs such as plans, management structures, negotiation skills, involvement and agreement of all stakeholders in the community before bringing in potential investors/joint venture partners to shorten the procedure for time-pressed private sector
- Initiating investment/joint venture discussion with private sector
- Arrangement of site visits for potential investors
- Participation in trade fairs and expositions
- Promotion and publicity in media about NACOBTA and CBTEs
- Production of up-dates catalogue/brochure of CBTEs
- Setting-up a website

- Setting-up a national booking and information system
- Up-grading CBTE facilities to meet required private sector standards by giving technical support and grants
- Using private sector in product development and tourism planning on consultancy basis

### 2.1.3 Macro level strategy and activities

The Association represents, lobbies and liaises with the government to ensure that the interests and ideas of CBTEs are met and incorporated into the policy-making, planning, implementation, evaluation and monitoring processes of government.

#### (i) Development objectives

The National policy objectives as stated in the First National Development Plan (Volume 1, 199??, pp.) are:

- ‘to diversify, expand and restructure the economy so as to enhance sustainable economic development and growth’;
- ‘to create more employment opportunities so as to alleviate poverty and improve the income distribution and living standards of the people’;
- ‘to reduce existing glaring economic and regional imbalances prevalent in the country’;
- ‘to promote and support the development of small scale enterprises and informal sector economic activities so as to reduce income inequalities and alleviate poverty’;
- ‘to support and encourage the participation of women and youth in the country’s economic activities’

#### **Box 2 Who are the poor?**

*Poor* in the local context means those who spent 80% of their income or more on food. According to the Namibia Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Report of 1995, poor households are those who have an income of between N\$248.34 and N\$496.69 per year and they make up 30% of the total population. The very poor are those with an annual income of less than N\$248.34 per year and make up 25% of the population. The better-off are those with an income of more than N\$496.69 per year and make up 45% of the population. If these figures are converted to US\$ the bottom of the better-off group will have \$0.17 per day

#### (ii) Pro-poor approaches

The government's pro-poor activities, policies and strategies to date include:

- The involvement of the poor in road construction to create employment, for example, in the northern regions
- The SME policy that assists to make credit facilities and loans available to previously disadvantaged groups
- The establishment of the export processing zones at Walvis Bay on the coast and Oshikango in the north which have proven unsuccessful

- The provision of drought resistant seeds and new technology to subsistence farmers in communal areas
- Resettlement programme for the landless poor
- Inclusion of benefits for the poor as a requirement in tender applications for fishing quotas
- The establishment of the Build Together programme which gives subsidised loans to poor people to build houses and has proven to be reasonably successful by providing homes for 3,379 families in all 13 regions over three years. The loan repayment rate by 1994 was 54%.
- The provision of food to the poor during drought periods through the Food Aid and Food For Work programmes
- The implementation of national-wide adult literacy programmes to increase literacy level to 80% by 2000
- The Communal Land Bill which is intended to allow communal farmers to own land on a tenure system
- Provision of incubator units with subsidised rents, joint facilities, business management assistance to small scale enterprises for a limited period
- Provision of work sites and market places for small scale and informal sector traders
- The Affirmative Action Policy that favours the previously disadvantaged in employment
- The progressive extension of health care services to reach all communities, with special attention to the disadvantaged and isolated communities in rural areas

**(iii) Tourism policies**

Tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in Namibia and the government regards it as one of the means of achieving the objectives of the national plan above. There is no national tourism policy as yet, but the government has developed CBT and conservancy policy documents which outline its intention to promote and support CBT and the establishment of conservancies in communal areas. Since Independence, government tourism policy has been used to encourage private sector investment and the international tourism market, but this has been constrained by a lack of capacity in government. Practical change has focused on privatising the resorts inside National Parks and establishing a Namibian Tourism Board.

**(iv) Pro-poor policy issues in tourism**

Policies specific to tourism include the MET Policy Document Circular No. 20 of 1995 on Community-Based Tourism Development and the Nature Conservation Amendment Act, 1996 (Act 5 of 1996) which makes provision for community members to establish conservancies. Commercial farmers have been able to form conservancies since 1975, but not communities in communal land areas. The introduction of this policy has led to the registration of 16 communal conservancies with another 10 in the emerging stages.

The Nature Conservation Amendment Act has a pro-poor component, although its main aim is to realise the government's objective of conserving natural resources and managing them sustainably. It realises that conservation cannot take place without the involvement of the people, and that if communities are to become involved there must be some incentive. Nevertheless, it has been vital in laying the foundations for the development of community tourism. Most conservancies are developing tourism plans as a form of non-consumptive use of wildlife and as a means for income generation. Thus conservancy development is an engine for community tourism.

**Table 2 Registered conservancies**

1. Nyae Nyae	5. Salambala	9. Torra	13. Khoadi Hôas
2. Uibasen	6. Doro!nawas	10. Kwandu	14. Mayuni
3. Wuparo	7. Marienfluss	11. Purros	15. Sesfontein
4. Warmquelle	8. Ehirovipuka	12. Uibasen Twyfelfontein	16. Tsiseb

*Source:* Directorate of Tourism (2000)

**Table 3 Emerging conservancies**

1. Orupembe	6. Omatendeka
2. Uukwaluudhi	7. //Hûab
3. Anichab Braunfels	8. Daures
4. Mutc'ku-Bwabwata	9. Mashi
5. Impalila	10. Otjikavare

*Source:* Directorate of Tourism (2000)

**(v) Community tourism policy**

The MET circular No. 20 of 1995 on Community-Based Tourism Development is pro-poor and states that it is the policy of the MET to:

- actively open up opportunities for rural communities, local people and the informal sector to increase their involvement in the tourism industry, particularly in tourism planning and the running of enterprises;
- ensure that rural communities, local people and the informal sector have greater access to the benefits from tourism on their land by creating appropriate legal mechanisms and establishing appropriate incentives;
- ensure that development of tourism on communal land takes place in areas and in forms acceptable to local people;
- encourage the formal tourism sector to co-operate and work with the informal sector and to recognise that, as well as being in the interest of the tourism industry long-term, this is a social responsibility and contribution to Namibia's national development objectives of improved equity, poverty alleviation, and sustainable growth;
- ensure that tourism development within Namibia is environmentally sustainable.

However, this CBT policy has never been translated into legislation. This raises general concerns for CBT and perpetuates a specific problem concerning communities' lack of rights over tourism concessions. Another problem area with regard to this policy, is the lack of understanding and knowledge about the policy amongst MET staff, resulting in a lack of support or poor/incorrect information to communities and organisations such as NACOBTA. This negates all the promises made by the government as to what they will do to ensure the implementation of this policy.

**(vi) Tourism concession rights**

The pre-Independence approach to tourism development on communal land was for the government to allocate tourism 'concessions' (large areas of land for lodge development and game viewing) to private investors. The post-Independence policies on communal



conservancies and community tourism state that these concessionary rights to tourism should go to conservancies. However, this has not been translated into legislation because it did not fall within the legal scope of the 1996 amendment (which focuses on the consumptive use of wildlife hunting). Meanwhile, the planned Tourism Act to reform policy on concessions and general tourism planning has remained in draft for several years. In some cases such as the Torra Conservancy, conservancies have *de facto* control over tourism as it would be unrealistic to develop in their area without their co-operation. But other conservancies have been established in areas where tourism or hunting concessions have already been granted to other individuals outside the community before the establishment of the conservancy. They have also since been renewed without consulting the conservancy, due to negligence or lack of government commitment to get its house in order. In these cases, private operators continue to control tourism within the area, paying the government and not the community for the right to do so.

**(vii) Lack of tourism and communal land legislation**

Despite the strong pro-poor elements of some specific policies, pro-poor developments are constrained by the general uncertainty over land use and tourism development in communal areas. This is caused by the on-going failure to finalise and pass an umbrella Tourism and Land Act.

The Communal Land Bill which proposes to grant land tenure to conservancies has still not been finalised or passed. In order to integrate CBT into the tourism industry there is a need for an injection of capital by the private sector. However, very few investors want to invest in a community which has no land tenure or rights over resources such as water, fauna and other landscape features.

**(viii) Lack of capacity**

The Directorate of Tourism – responsible for the implementation of most of the policies mentioned above – has only two staff members including the Director to deal with the expanding level of needs created by the implementation of the policy on conservancies and CBTEs. The MET lacks the capacity and skills to deal with many of the promises made in its policy documents and with problems experienced by communities in relation to community-based tourism and tourism in general, such as boundary disputes, capacity building, marketing and speedy and effective policy formulation.

One could say that except for the CBT policy, many of the policies in place are not explicitly pro-poor but may benefit the poor because they open up opportunities for the poor. However, the lack of co-ordination within and between government ministries and the absence of a tourism policy hinders the development of community-based tourism and tourism as a whole.

**(ix) NACOBTA activities at macro level**

As stated in the policy context outlined above, NACOBTA's strategy is to influence, assist, lobby and work with those responsible for legislating and implementing policies and plans at the macro-level. Sometimes NACOBTA has to highlight the difficulties experienced on the ground to the decision-makers at the macro-level. The following are specific activities of NACOBTA at the macro-level.

*a) Development of regional tourism development plans*

NACOBTA and other partners are involved in the development of regional tourism master plans, which look at the tourism potential in particular regions of the country. The master

plans serve as frameworks for tourism development in those regions. The Northwest Region and the North Central Region Tourism Master Plans have been finalised and the Southern Region Tourism Master Plan is under development. The intention is for NACOBTA to use these master plans to develop conservancy tourism option plans, starting with the Northwest Region. These plans will assist conservancies to identify and develop tourism products with the best potential for their particular conservancies. NACOBTA is also responsible for co-ordinating the fundraising for these conservancy plans.

*b) Policy development*

NACOBTA is involved in the drafting of, as well as lobbying and advocating for, the development, improvement and implementation of government policies such as the Communal Land Bill that advocates the granting of land tenure to community members. Other areas of policy which they have been directly involved with include Tourism Policy, PTO procedures, Conservancy application procedures, granting hunting leases to CBTEs and the granting of rights over natural resources to communities. Here are some of the specific interventions which NACOBTA have undertaken at policy level:

- \$ Lobbying for the conservancies to be granted land tenure in the Communal Land Bill
- \$ Drafting and presenting the NANGOF Draft Communal Land Bill to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Natural Resource Management
- \$ Drafting and presenting the NANGOF Draft Communal Land Bill to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Natural Resource Management
- \$ Lobbying for clarity and procedures on how the power of the proposed Land Boards relates to the power of conservancies
- \$ Advocating that the MET stop granting concessions to private sector individuals while conservancies are being established
- \$ Advocating the same trophy hunting quota award system and procedures for both the freehold and conservancies
- \$ Lobbying for the MET to get involved in resolving boundary conflicts between emerging conservancies
- \$ Participating in discussions and drafting of recommendations on the draft Tourism Policy, particularly those affecting CBT and conservancies
- \$ Advocating that tourism concessions be granted automatically to conservancies
- \$ Promoting the CBT policy amongst communities and advocating for its speedy implementation
- \$ Giving input to the review of the Parks and Neighbours Policy
- \$ Being involved in the Forestry Policy and Legislation Review

#### *2.1.4 The institutional strategy*

The first three strategies could not be implemented without the establishment of NACOBTA as an institution. Without NACOBTA, CBTE's would not have a united voice to air their complaints nor access to opportunities for skills development, technical support and funds. It is important to have an authoritative voice to be able to intervene at the macro-level, and the development of NACOBTA and its membership has allowed it to make useful and practical interventions. Donors are also more keen to channel funds through an institution rather than to an individual, and so donor funding to NACOBTA has increased over the years.

The link with the private sector has also been made easier by having NACOBTA as a central point of contact, making negotiations between individual CBTEs and private sector investors smoother and less time-consuming. Through NACOBTA, individual CBTEs have been able to learn from and support each other and their partners. It has also brought together members who would otherwise be isolated and have no bargaining power when dealing with the government, the private sector, NGOs and donors. In its role as a strong united voice and focal point of CBTEs, NACOBTA has:

- \$ Established itself as the only organisation focusing on CBTE development
- \$ Taken up active membership of various bodies involved in CBTE, tourism, CBNRM such as FENATA, Board Member of the Game Trust Fund, Tourism Advisory Committee, Omilunga (North Central) Tourism Forum, LIFE Steering Committee, Game Trust Fund, Northwest Tourism Steering Committee, CAN – the CBRNM Association in Namibia.
- \$ Increased membership to 45
- \$ Raised funds to maintain activities of Association
- \$ Established and maintained an office for the Association
- \$ Established links and partnerships with local and international organisations working on related issues

## 2.2 Overview of strategies

Although the above are the four main strategies used by NACOBTA, the organisation has used additional ones to a lesser extent. These other strategies are described below.

- (i) **Expansion of business opportunities for the poor**  
NACOBTA offers training, marketing, grants and business advice to members to make their enterprises more viable. The Association has also assisted in expanding the CBTE market by encouraging the private sector to use their facilities and services. The setting-up of a website and a booking system is part of NACOBTA's strategy to assist CBTEs and expand the market within the current tourism market. The production of brochures, t-shirts, newsletters and advertisements are also part of the expansion of business opportunities for the poor.
- (ii) **Expansion of employment opportunities for the poor**  
In 2000, NACOBTA members provided full-time employment to 163 and 38 part-time employment to unemployed poor people.
- (iii) **Building a supportive policy and planning framework**  
NACOBTA has been lobbying and advocating for communities to get speedy access to, and use of, land and natural resources through land tenure, conservancies, concessions, PTOs. It has also been working with the State on community-based tourism, Land Tenure, Communal Land Bill, Parks and Neighbours legislation to ensure that the poor benefit and are not negatively affected by these policies. One of the areas that NACOBTA and partners have been lobbying the government for is the training of MET staff to ensure they have a clear understanding of these policies, to enable them to assist the communities appropriately.
- (iv) **Developing pro-poor processes and institutions**  
NACOBTA has been lobbying the government to make the application processes for conservancies, PTOs and concessions more community-friendly by simplifying and shortening them, and also by favouring conservancies above the private sector. NACOBTA and other NGO partners offer training to communities and CBTEs on how to involve all

stakeholders in the decision-making process. Part of the conservancy and PTO application requirements are that communities be involved in, and agreement sought on, boundaries and the use of resources. NACOBTA has worked with communities to explain and assist in involving the community and the poor.

**(v) Institutional Development of NACOBTA**

The development of NACOBTA as an initiator, implementor, communicator, facilitator and matchmaker between the CBTEs, communities, private sector, NGOs and government is one of the Association's key strategies. These roles have enabled it to act as the focal point and strong voice of the otherwise scattered CBTEs, supporting the needs and aspirations of its members and acting as a channel of information both ways.

**(vi) Creating links with the private sector**

Integrating CBTEs into the tourism industry to benefit the poor has also been one of the main strategies of NACOBTA. The focus has been on raising awareness and creating an understanding about CBTEs and the sustainable and equitable use of natural resources within the private sector while lobbying for them to co-operate with CBTEs through support (advice and use of services) and joint ventures.

## **2.3 Specific actions to involve poor people in tourism**

Appendix I shows the vast amount of specific actions being undertaken by NACOBTA and therefore reflects the diversity of strategies being used by NACOBTA.

## 3. Results and Impacts

### 3.1 Progress and challenges

Of the four main strategies of NACOBTA the one that has made the most progress is the institutional strategy, followed by that at the micro-level. Although the strategy of working with the private sector has not seen as much progress as the former two, there has been substantial progress in the last year or two and it looks promising. The macro-level strategy has been hindered by the lack of active government engagement and its failure to fulfil its promises (section 3.1.3).

#### 3.1.1 *At the micro-level*

##### **Progress**

The assistance of NACOBTA and other partners to its members has ensured that many of the CBTEs have grown from strength to strength and are now able to run their enterprises in an acceptable and accountable manner. Some do not need funding anymore, e.g. the Torra Conservancy is self-sufficient and has contributed greatly to the community by supporting the school and clinic and is now looking towards setting up internet facilities at the local school. The Spitzkoppe CBTE is receiving an income of N\$30,000-50,000 per month gross and contributes N\$600 each month into the community fund. The number of visitors to these CBTEs is increasing and the communities are running these enterprises independently with evident pride.

##### **Challenges**

One of the challenges to NACOBTA is to assist its member enterprises to such an extent that they become self-sufficient and independent, while simultaneously contributing to the development of the local community. This can only happen if the staff/management of the enterprise are well-equipped with strategic planning skills as well as financial skills. These are gained by hands-on training and application on site, and not through general courses such as those offered by NACOBTA. The latter may be useful for those entering the CBTE business, but not for those who have to compete or want to work with the private sector. This is obviously a challenge for NACOBTA in terms of the number of staff and skills it has, the distances that need to be covered to reach the enterprises, and the time required to spend at the enterprise with the staff to make an impact. This requires large amounts of money, which may not necessarily be available.

From those enterprises visited, Spitzkoppe had a good bookkeeping system in place but little evaluation of expenditure and application of cost-cutting measures. Although, according to the NACOBTA Six-Monthly Report (01 March-31 August 2000), Spitzkoppe is supposed to have a business development plan, those working on the enterprise did not know why they kept records of visitors. One would expect the enterprise records to have been used in developing the business plan as their records date back to 1994. This suggests that the members were not involved at all in developing the business plan. Members of Face to Face did not seem to understand much of what was in their proposal which was submitted to the Windhoek Municipality by NACOBTA, suggesting there was little involvement of members in developing the proposal. If that is the case, NACOBTA needs to work on strategies focusing on how to transfer skills between members.

One area in which NACOBTA is facing a great challenge is marketing the CBTEs vigorously. Again the staff do not really have skills in marketing commercially and seem to follow an NGO

marketing style, if at all. The focus has been mainly through advertisements in travel magazines and newspapers, t-shirts and the production of sub-standard marketing material. For example, the 2000 CBTE brochure is in too large a format (A4), lacks pictures, is too text-dense, and presented in a font that is too difficult to read and photocopy. The information also fails to raise empathy for the poor or for CBT, or to convince readers that they should support CBT. The first page of the brochure is about NACOBTA and fails to explain why CBTEs are important and need support. There is a need to engage the services of advertising experts because the cost-benefits will be higher when the marketing is done properly.

Members need to be trained in other forms of marketing other than dropping brochures or leaflets at hotels or with tour operators. There needs to be more engagement with potential clients and partners, like phoning or meeting with CBTEs themselves. At the moment CBTEs leave this task entirely to NACOBTA which is over-stretched. The use of radio in advertising for example, could also be engaged more effectively particularly during or before the festive seasons and holidays.

Another challenge to NACOBTA is how to complement its current staff-base with those with business skills and experience and at the same time try to move NACOBTA from an organisation based on a purely development culture to striking a balance between development and corporate culture.

An assessment of the impact of support to CBTEs needs to be integrated into CBTE management systems when its purpose is well understood and internalised by the CBTE members

### *3.1.2 Of integrating CBTES into the mainstream tourism*

#### **Progress**

In the initial years NACOBTA concentrated on institutional development and fundraising. Now it has evolved to focus more on offering services to its members, participating in policy interventions and building links with the private sector to encourage joint ventures and closer co-operation with CBTEs.

The Association has tried to involve the private sector by acting as a mediator, initiator and facilitator between various CBTEs and at least seven investors both locally and internationally. One of the joint ventures – that between the Uibasen Conservancy and Twyfelfontein Country Lodge – has been successfully concluded. In-roads have been made with the private sector, giving advice on product development and providing feedback on CBTE services. NACOBTA is intending to appoint a Joint Venture Co-ordinator in 2001 to liaise with the private sector.

Thus some progress, although slow, has been made but one needs to take into account the systematic divide that existed between the two communities before the opening-up of the tourism industry for the majority of the poor. The involvement of the private sector in advising NACOBTA should be regarded as progress; so too the inclusion of some of the CBTEs in the promotional material of private sector tour operators. A good sign is the fact that private investors have initiated discussions with NACOBTA to facilitate negotiation with CBTEs. Co-operation in training is also taking place with the private sector through institutions like NATH. NACOBTA is no longer sceptical of the private sector and sees them as essential partners in CBT.

## **Challenges**

The challenge to NACOBTA is to meet the standards expected by the private sector, namely the provision of basic facilities and services at all CBTEs, so that tour operators will use their facilities. This in turn involves capital injection, which most CBTEs do not have, and that is why NACOBTA is lobbying the private sector to enter into joint ventures with the CBTEs: a bit of a chicken and egg situation.

Another challenge is negotiating or facilitating business negotiations with shrewd business people and ensuring that the CBTEs get a good deal. This is a major challenge because NACOBTA staff or Rossing, who does the training, do not really have the corporate business skills although they do have the training and communications skills to talk to communities.

NACOBTA is also faced with working between three cultures: the traditional/community culture which is sometimes slow and prolonged; the corporate culture which has little time and wants to strike deals quickly with lowest costs and highest returns; and the NGO/development culture, which focuses on benefits for people. This means that NACOBTA has to do a lot of preliminary work before bringing in the investor or potential joint-venture partner to meet the CBTE/conservancy partners.

The private sector has a low regard for communities as business people and NACOBTA has the task of changing this view. This requires NACOBTA to have staff with excellent business skills and who are able to convince the private sector in their own language, why they should invest in CBTEs and get involved in joint ventures.

It is important that the time invested in lobbying for and facilitating joint venture negotiation, is turned into effective deals which will improve the lot of the poor without the private sector taking over.

The slow progress in involving the private sector can also be attributed to the lack of staff with business and financial skills within NACOBTA as most staff, if not all, come from a development/NGO background. Although CBT in Namibia was initiated by the development sector, one has to acknowledge the fact that CBTEs need to be run as professional businesses with a development perspective if they are to succeed and attract the private sector. To attract the private sector one needs to be able to speak the same business language, if the aim is to convince them to enter into partnerships.

### *3.1.3 Of working at the macro-level*

#### **Progress**

Progress at the macro-level cannot be attributed to NACOBTA alone, as many other stakeholders are involved in policy formulation and advocacy processes. What is significant, is the development of regional tourism plans undertaken in partnership with the MET and other stakeholders including NACOBTA. Another development that can be regarded as progress, is the fact that stakeholders including NACOBTA have succeeded in convincing the MET to halt the process of granting concessions and PTOs to private sector companies until some conservancies in the process of registration have been established. The MET has already started registering conservancies and granting PTOs to communal land communities. By the end of 2000, 17 conservancies will have been registered.

## Challenges

The fact that there is no national tourism policy eleven years after Independence is a major challenge for anyone working in tourism development. Although the government has conservancy and CBT policies in place, it has not followed-up its promises of support to communities in conservancies and CBT. One major challenge for NACOBTA is the huge task of assisting conservancies and CBT, with little or no government support, on a task that is essentially government responsibility. The government has only two people in the Directorate of Tourism in the MET who are supposed to coordinate all CBT activities in a country as vast as Namibia. The procedures for registering conservancies and getting concessions are still not smooth-running, and PTOs and concessions are being granted to private sector individuals without the consideration and consultation of communities. Here are some examples of the government's unfulfilled promises:

- *The MET will actively support those regions that have so far not established regional tourism associations, and will assist them in tourism planning, and provide information, advice, contacts, etc needed for implementation. With only two staff members this is obviously an impossible task for the MET. NGOs like NACOBTA have been fulfilling this promise to date.*
- *All PTO and concession applications for a tourism enterprise must include details of an agreement between the applicant and the local community before it can be approved by MET. The MET has reneged on this promise recently, by granting private individuals concessions and PTOs in a registered conservancy (Khoadi/Hôas Conservancy) without first consulting the local community, and when the conservancy itself needed the concession.*
- *The MET will promote the proactive marketing and promotion of enterprises run by communities or local individuals as a lack of marketing skills is one of their major constraints. MET support in marketing for NACOBTA has not been proactive at all despite regular requests by NACOBTA for MET to include their brochures in their mailings. Requests for sharing stalls with NACOBTA at trade fairs has also not received positive response from MET.*
- *The MET will facilitate contacts between the informal, formal, banking sectors, government, voluntary and donor organisations to ensure the provision of investment incentives, soft loans and technical advice to informal sector tourism. MET will ensure that specific needs of small scale community and informal sector enterprises are taken into account. Coordination in the tourism sector is being spearheaded by NGOs and a substantial part of this promise (incentives) is still waiting to be fulfilled and requires a national tourism policy framework in place in order to be implemented.*
- *The MET will ensure that CBTEs are accommodated in regulations on grading, registration, marketing, etc. (e.g. that accommodation categories include community campsites and guide categories include village guides). The 2000 Tourist Accommodation and Info Guide developed by the MET does not include community campsites, even 5 years after issuing the policy documents.*
- *The MET will promote the proactive marketing and promotion of enterprises run by communities or local individuals (e.g. in material for those seeking socially and environmentally responsible tourism) as a lack of marketing skills is one of their major constraints. To date this remains to be seen. On a recent trip to London, the NACOBTA Programme Manager found none of its CBT promotion materials at the High Commission or Namibia Tourism Office. NACOBTA staff have to contact the Tourism Office each time to find out if they have any of NACOBTA's promotional materials – a proactive approach by the MET in this regard, appears to be lacking.*
- *The MET will facilitate contacts between the informal sector, banking sector, government, formal sector and voluntary and donor organisations to ensure the provision of investment incentives, soft loans, and technical advice to informal sector tourism. Specifically in designing investment incentives and facilitating soft loans for tourism development from banks and donors. MET will ensure the specific needs of small-scale community and informal sector*



*enterprises are taken into account. A long-term goal will be to enable rural residents to move from the informal to formal sector and gain access to loans from the formal banking sector. The facilitation of contact between the informal and formal sector and donors is being spearheaded by NACOBTA and not the MET, despite the fact that NACOBTA is not sufficiently skilled in negotiating business contracts. Although the Ministry of Trade and Industry through NDC has SME loans and other funds for Black Empowerment available, there has been no attempt from the government or NACOBTA to tap into these sources for CBTEs. The challenge for NACOBTA then, is to establish these links and to prove that CBTEs are financially viable to enable them to tap into these sources.*

- *The MET will give incentives for and preference to partnerships and or revenue sharing ventures through designing tax laws and financial regulations so that they do not discourage revenue sharing and wherever possible provide incentives for it. This has yet to take place.*

(Text in italics from MET Circular no. 20 of 1995 Policy Document: Community-Based Tourism Development, 19??)

There is also no consistent pursuance and follow-up from the side of NACOBTA to ensure that the Namibia Tourism Office distributes its information. This probably explains why NACOBTA members do not feature in the Tourist Guide publication produced each year by the MET, which is distributed for free everywhere. This is perhaps due to lack of staff. There is need for a more proactive approach to get what is needed from government, though probably requires a marketing officer.

Although interaction with the government was initially confined to the MET and the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation, the Association is now aiming to focus on a more integrated approach, particularly with the Regional Tourism Development Plans, by involving stakeholders. The challenge to NACOBTA is to consistently and pro-actively lobby and build partnerships with stakeholders such as TELEKOM Namibia, NAMPOWER, the Ministry of Works, Transport and Telecommunication to attend to the needs of the members.

This shows that the success of a macro-level strategy depends a lot on the attitude of government and other stakeholders and their willingness to cooperate. For the Association outside the decision-making spheres of government, tremendous efforts are needed to make even limited in-roads at the macro-level.

### *3.1.4 Of building NACOBTA as an institution*

#### **Progress**

Five years after the establishment of NACOBTA, the organisation has grown in many ways. For example, the size of its membership has increased from 16 to 46 and the number of employees from one to six. The organisation has also made progress in the amount of funding it receives – from N\$4.6 million (1995-2000) to in excess of N\$14.2 million (2000—2005) (see NACOBTA Operational Budget Summary 2000—2005). A total of 415 people have also been trained in CBT related courses in the last five years. NACOBTA has managed to establish itself amongst various stakeholders, as an NGO which focuses primarily on tourism, in comparison with other CBRNM NGOs which specialise in training (Rossing), organisational development (RISE and Rossing), natural resource management (IRDNC) and craft marketing (Rossing).

Some barriers such as funding and under-staffing, have been overcome through additional or future funding. Marketing has been out-sourced and poor financial and management systems have been solved by receiving management support and assistance to put these systems in place.

In the early years NACOBTA concentrated its efforts on institutional development and fundraising. It has now evolved as an organisation with a stronger emphasis on offering services to its members through participating in policy interventions and building links with the private sector, thus encouraging joint ventures and closer cooperation with CBTEs.

NACOBTA has just developed its system to assess impacts in 2000. CBTE income and community income, number of people employed, number of person trained, grants given, CBTE with acceptable financial systems are some of the indicators used to assess impact.

**Table 4 NACOBTA operational budget summary 2000—2005**

<b>Donor</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>Total</b>
LIFE	1,179,911	***				1,179,911
DfID *	2,087,940	1,772,417	1,959,678	1,200,000		7,020,035
Sida *	1,155,427	1,179,983	1,133,974			3,469,384
DfID *	598,398	364,499	162,595			1,125,492
Tour Operators and Booking System	52,290	132,716	345,084	400,000	500,000	1,430,090
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,073,966</b>	<b>3,449,615</b>	<b>3,601,331</b>	<b>1,600,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>14,224,912</b>

Total funding: 1995-2000: N\$4.6 million

\* = to be confirmed

### **Challenges**

The organisation is faced with many challenges such as: sustainability; assessment of impact; the involvement of its members in running the institution; contribution to costs through membership fees; over-reliance on donors; the meeting of increasing demands by its members and a lack of business and financial skills among its staff.

As can be seen from the budget summary above, for the next five years using NACOBTA's indicators, it is estimated that NACOBTA will generate only N\$1.4 million of the N\$14.2 million it is expected to generate through its own sources (the booking system and tour operators). The financial sustainability of NACOBTA at the end of ten years is a challenge the Association will have to deal with, particularly the issue of how to complement donor funding with local financial support or income to ensure that the Association will survive when donors withdraw.

Another challenge for NACOBTA is to put measures in place to assess the impact of CBTEs and NACOBTA's work. A performance indicator system is being put in place, but these indicators need to be broadened to assess the multiplier effect of CBTEs and other intangible benefits, starting with an improved data collection process by NACOBTA. Some CBTEs have excellent data but do not know how to use them to their own advantage and NACOBTA does not collect them.

Many of the members do not pay membership fees and are not directly involved in steering NACOBTA, but instead see NACOBTA as a provider for their needs. The challenge is for NACOBTA to instil a sense of responsibility into its membership base by dedicating time to membership matters.

As new conservancies emerge NACOBTA will be inundated with requests for assistance and its small number of staff will just not be able to meet the demand. The demand for support to members requires it to be member-specific and long-term, as it takes a while to transfer skills to people with little foundation in business. This requires that there be more balance in the development skills on the one hand and financial, business, tourism and marketing skills on the other amongst the NACOBTA staff. It is thus important that an institution is well equipped with enough staff, funds and skills to take on the institutional strategy for pro-poor tourism as it is a very demanding process in terms of time, effort and money.

### *3.1.5 Views of others*

#### **National Tourist Office**

The National Tourist Officer thought that NACOBTA was important, as the demand for pro-poor tourism has been increasing. According to her, one out of seven tourists is interested in pro-poor tourism and makes enquiries through their offices which are then referred to NACOBTA, or their members. She also claimed that the National Tourist Office markets CBTEs both nationally and internationally as part of their pro-poor policy, although no financial assistance is provided. The NACOBTA programme manager however, does not think that special efforts have been made to market CBTEs because in spite of numerous requests from NACOBTA to have their materials displayed and receive requests for more when they run out, they never do. Neither do their international offices display NACOBTA materials.

The Officer also highlighted some complaints they had received concerning NACOBTA CBTEs:

- Some are too noisy
- Some are not clean enough
- They are not up to standard in terms lack of showers, ablution, or filthy bathrooms
- Communication gap with the customers, particularly in German and Dutch

#### **Programme manager**

The project initiator thinks that the work of NACOBTA is important and has made a difference to pro-poor tourism, although the concept of pro-poor tourism was initially difficult to raise as an issue for both the government and communities. This is because the government did not really have any pro-poor policies in place that took an integrated approach to pro-poor tourism.

Trying to get private tour operators to buy into PPT products has been slow, but is now bearing fruits with tour operators advising on product development and including PPT in their brochures. NACOBTA has been assisting pro-poor CBTEs to develop to a standard that will enable them to access the market and meet pre-defined standards.

The biggest challenge of all for NACOBTA has been to prove that pro-poor tourism works when it has failed everywhere else. The success of pro-poor tourism enterprises like Torra and its impact on the poor, shows that part of the answer lies in the involvement of the private sector. Evidence of this impact can be seen where enterprises invest in the education of their communities, create employment and provide much-needed cash. A pro-poor approach has also led to the equitable distribution of resources, particularly rights over wildlife, to communal area populations which previously had no access to them. What NACOBTA has done and is doing, is to assist communities gain access to these resources and provide them with the skills and opportunities to utilise them effectively for alleviating poverty in their communities.

NACOBTA has also realised with time that small grants are not effective in generating the impact necessary to bring pro-poor tourism into the mainstream tourism industry, and is now busy involving the private sector in costing products realistically. These grants never used to include transport and labour costs for example, and has in the past led to the development of substandard facilities, negating the impact NACOBTA has aimed to make.

Unrest in the Caprivi region has impacted negatively on the CBTEs, with no tourism taking place and the withdrawal of NGOs from conflict situations resulting in low moral for communities. NACOBTA had to re-think how to introduce CBT back into the Caprivi region and increase it for the rest of the country. One strategy has been to look at the Southern African region as a whole and create safe routes which pass through the whole region, thus tapping into tourists from other countries and thereby creating regional pro-poor products.

The existence of NACOBTA has helped to focus pro-poor tourism efforts in Namibia in terms of pro-poor tourism enterprise development, product development, private sector involvement, funding, marketing and lobbying for policy reform. This need will continue to exist for some time.

### **Members**

*Spitzkoppe:* “NACOBTA has provided our members with various types of training and with contacts with donors. The organisation has also provided us with funds to furnish the two new bungalows and install showers and toilets. They have also provided us with a sign board and assisted with advertising the bungalows.”

When the researcher remarked that there was no sign on the main road indicating how to get to the CBTE, the members indicated then that they would put up the signboard they received from NACOBTA a while ago.

*Penduka:*” NACOBTA has provided training for our members responsible for accommodation and it has been a great help. We also get a lot of clients who tell us they heard about us through NACOBTA.”

This manager could not recall what or who NACOBTA was at the beginning of the interview.

*Face to Face:* “NACOBTA provided us with training on tourism and tour guiding and have also produced a new promotional leaflet for us. They have also organised for us to attend training on city tours paid for by the Windhoek Municipality.”

These members were not able to say how many leaflets were produced by NACOBTA nor how they were distributed. They also did not know they had a funding proposal which had been submitted to the Municipality.

### **Tour operators**

*Operator 1:* This tour operator thinks that NACOBTA has an important role to play in pro-poor tourism particularly in terms of control, monitoring, advice and as a private sector contact through which they can book sites. He thinks there is a great demand for pro-poor tourism, but that CBTEs must adhere to a minimum standard and should offer what they say they offer in the promotional materials. He also believes that CBTEs can complement tour operators by offering some basic goods, so that tour operators do not have to carry too much such as water, cold drinks, fire wood and canned food. The CBTEs should also offer services such as clean toilets and showers,

information about the roads and animals that they are skilled to do, thereby using and adding value to local skills and knowledge that would not be needed anywhere else.

His experience is that camping sites are usually too near each other with too many visitors booked at once. A lot of the time water is not available, fridges are not working or not stocked with drinks, and more importantly, tour guides are not able to book in advance and make reservations because most CBTEs do not have telephones.

He and his clients do not expect modern showers or toilets, but bucket showers and drop loos that are clean at all times will do. In his opinion, NACOBTA needs to concentrate on ensuring that CBTE facilities meet basic standards as well as offering the above-mentioned goods and services and providing a central booking system.

*Operator 2:* Their clients would like to meet people and experience local culture, but do not want to camp and would prefer to stay in lodges. They therefore cannot use CBTEs at the moment until they offer these facilities.

*Operator 3:* They operate in the mass market and feel that CBTEs are not equipped to deal with such large numbers at once, and recommend that CBTEs try to work with smaller tour operators.

### **Development agency involved**

According to SIDA, the Swedish Development Agency that funds NACOBTA, the initiative is doing a good job in creating revenue and employment for the poor and influencing decision-makers to give rights over natural resources to the poor, so that communities can use tourism as an additional income to using the land.

They are of the opinion that there is a high demand for NACOBTA services because they are good and that demand is greater than current supply. They also think that there are too many donors involved in the field of community-based natural resources management.

The impact of NACOBTA for them, is evidenced by the profit made by CBTEs working with NACOBTA which focuses on the poor.

### **Tourists**

Five tourists (two German, one Australian, one Dutch and one British) were interviewed and only one of them knew of NACOBTA – through their brochure. They have all visited NACOBTA CBTEs and had the following to say:

- The people were friendly and knowledgeable
- Some services were a bit expensive(Katutura tour)
- It was nice to have cold drinks available
- Some CBTE maps were poor and confusing
- The CBTEs were poorly sign posted
- Some campsites were too noisy, there is a need for a tourists code of conduct to be given to tourists
- Some camping sites are too near each other
- Some CBTE employees did not keep time
- CBTEs have something good to offer
- Cultural experience was excellent

### Critics

One critic was a private business person who thought that NACOBTA was not professional enough in its business dealings. This person had originally submitted a tender for one of the joint venture offers and complained that seven weeks after submitting their application they had not heard from NACOBTA, even by way of a letter of acknowledgement.

Another critic was a tour operator who thought that NACOBTA did not have the right people to work with the private sector, as private sector people tend to only listen to people who are confident and have business know-how.

## 3.2 Relevance to poverty reduction

NACOBTA is explicitly pro-poor because it focuses on working with tourism enterprises which aim to significantly benefit disadvantaged communities; individuals or enterprises with limited access to financial resources and skills; enterprises owned by communities, organisations or individuals of local communities, and also with enterprises who offer clear community benefits. Most of the communities where NACOBTA operates have high numbers of unemployed people and the lowest incomes per capita. Most members of these communities do not own the land on which they live and have been disadvantaged in the past, thus constituting part of the poor.

The aim of NACOBTA is to assist communities gain access to, and use natural resources sustainably to create employment, thereby raising income levels and promoting rural development by increasing the viability of CBTEs and integrating CBT into the tourism industry.

According to the 1995 Namibia Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Report, communal areas directly support 95% of the nation's farming population and have the highest degree of poverty, household food insecurity and malnutrition (please see Box 1).

Most of the people involved in managing CBTEs are those who are poor and have some skills, social standing or some basic schooling but are unemployed. These include men, women, youths and the disabled. The very poor tend to do the casual jobs or benefit from informal sector activities.

### Table 5 Types of poor benefiting from NACOBTA member enterprises:

- |                       |                           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| ➤ Seamstresses        | ➤ Drivers,                |
| ➤ Gemstone miners     | ➤ Informal Sector sellers |
| ➤ Craft makers        | ➤ Trackers                |
| ➤ Guides              | ➤ Fishermen and women     |
| ➤ Cultural performers | ➤ Cleaners                |
| ➤ Donkey cart makers  | ➤ Builders                |
| ➤ Grass harvesters    | ➤ Reed harvesters         |
| ➤ Dressmakers         | ➤ Wood collectors         |
| ➤ Canoe operators     |                           |

### 3.3 Case studies

The members of NACOBTA vary greatly in terms of their activities, location, size, period in business, size of community, income, number and type of people employed and whether it is a conservancy or not. The following section tries to give a picture of the different types of members found in NACOBTA. Spitzkoppe is a reasonably well-established CBTE, offering campsites and a couple of bungalows. Face to Face is a tour guide CBTE, which focuses on black suburbs in the capital city and is very new and small. Penduka focuses on craft making for export and provides accommodation for tourists and is almost ten years old. Torra is a conservancy and has a lodge through a joint venture with private sector partners and is one of the most successful CBTEs and does not need any outside funding. Nyae Nyae is a conservancy of the San community and focuses on trophy hunting and craft making. Both the latter two conservancies became conservancies in 1998. The data also give information about other CBTEs and general income from conservancies/CBTEs.

#### 3.3.a Spitzkoppe CBTE

Spitzkoppe was established in 1992 and is owned and run by 19 (8 women and 11 men) members of the community. It is situated in the Namib desert offering a landscape of special shaped boulders and mountains. They offer campsites and a couple of bungalows. Most visitors are tour groups who spend a day or a maximum of two nights camping. The visitors pay an entrance fee and a fee for the camp-site. There is a small shop that sells drinks and basic necessities. The initiative is reasonably profitable and well-established.

The CBTE is run by a management committee (MC), consisting of five women and four men. Some of them are community leaders, representing the community on the MC and other members of the enterprise. Most committee members are able to speak basic English, drive a car, operate a phone, and have some form of schooling (at least attended high school).

Women outnumber men by one on the MC, and they do not just hold the lowest positions. Each member is paid the same (N\$450/month) irrespective of what they do or who they are. This has recently caused problems as men were doing most of the work – building and cleaning the area, etc while women had less to do. This was solved by paying those doing the hard labour an extra N\$50.00 a week each. Skilled community members such as builders have also been contracted to build structures such as the current construction of the bar/restaurant.

The very poor are employed as casual labourers cleaning, collecting wood and water as and when needed at the rate of N\$20/day. The very poor also mine gemstones and sell them to those working at the CBTE who then sell them inside the camp to visitors at a profit.

Each member's income supports 3-10 people. About nine out of ten members do not own their own homes and live with relatives. At least 5 members own goats. A sum of N\$600.00 is donated to the community fund each month.

#### Beneficiaries

- \*Local Gemstone Miners: Able to sell their gemstones to CBTE members and tourists outside the camp for income
- Members of the CBTE: Have regular income, funeral contribution, access to loans, food and clothing donations by tourists, receive training

- Local Shop owner: tourists sometimes buy supplies, CBTE buys fuel,
- Suppliers: CBTE buys building materials, furnishings and shop supplies from nearby town
- \*Casual workers: receive an income although irregular
- \*Family members of the CBTE members: Benefit from the income of members by way of meals, housing, remittance
- \*Neighbouring communities: Receive contributions towards funeral costs from CBTE, access to use of phone, sale of gemstones
- \*Local community: benefits from monthly community fund contributions by the CBTE, access to loans from CBTE, building of community hall, access to telephone, access to transport, sale of gemstones, access to solar electricity, solar street lights, toilet added to church building
- \*Local school: contributions towards repairs and school tours
- Garage owner in nearby town: Income from fuel and car maintenance. CBTE second hand cars cost a lot to repair and maintain,
- Private Doctors: Members' bills and clinic fees paid by CBTE
- Telecommunication Company: Payment of monthly telephone bill
- \*Fire Wood Supplier: Income from selling wood to the CBTE

### Those affected by negative impacts

- \*Local farmers: Lost access to grazing land
  - \*Local and neighbouring communities: No access to the land occupied by CBTE— must make detours around CBTE, have to share scarce water with CBTE, no free movement around the CBTE
  - Environment: Increased waste disposal, quality of roads deteriorate from frequent use
- \* poor

**Table 6 Financial earnings of the poor: Spitzkoppe**

	Approx amount (N\$ range)	Who earns it (type of person)	Earners	Future earners
Wage income	450.00/p/month	Members of CBTE	19	30
Informal sector sales	10—200/p/month	Members of CBTE Gemstone miners	25	100
Casual labour	20—140.00/p/month	Unskilled labourers	20	14
Small enterprise profits(collective income)	3 000/month total	Members as group	19	30
Collective income to the community	450.00/month total	Community	450.00/mnth	500
Overtime	50.00/p/month	Members	19	25
Other cash income	32.00/p/month	Goat farmers	8	12

The total gross revenue for this enterprise for October 2000 was N\$222,818. For a community of about 500 people this CBTE has a total gross local earnings of N\$158,772 per year which would translate into an average per capita income of N\$317.54 per year if the income were to be evenly distributed. Due to this income this community can be classified as better off because of this CBTE only. According to the Namibia Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Report, 1,995 households with a standard consumption level (SCL) of N\$469/year are classified as better-off. The income earnings per person due to this CBTE is more than double the SCL. This community has moved from being a very poor community to one that is 'poor'. What needs to be addressed however, is the distribution of income within the community to ensure that the very poor also benefit.



### 3.3.b Penduka

Penduka is an enterprise that produces bedding, cushions, clothes and other crafts for the export market (Scandinavia and Holland) mainly. It also offers accommodation and limited conference and restaurant facilities for visitors as a sideline to its main business activities. Although it has great potential as a tourism business it does very little to market itself as tourism is not its core business. This enterprise is owned by 23 members, 20 of whom are women who work as full-time staff. Three of the members are deaf and another three have other disabilities. The manager is a disabled female.

They employ a lot of casual workers (all women) to do the labour-intensive sewing work. This includes 95-100 women each month from the adjacent informal settlement who left their rural homes for greener pastures in the city, Windhoek and 500 women per month in the rural areas as casual labourers depending on how many orders they receive. The casual workers in Windhoek can earn about N\$200-700/month and the rural casual workers N\$150/month when it is busy. This is double the normal wage for domestic and farm workers. What they earn also depends on the speed of their work as payment is per finished item. The staff (members) are paid in the range of N\$750-1500 per month, depending on how long they have been members; longer serving members get paid more.

The staff and casual labourers use their income to support themselves and relatives by sending money home to their villages and paying school fees and buying school uniforms for their own children and those of relatives. As they all come from rural areas they support more people with their income: each member of staff or casual worker supports 30-50 people. Casual labourers are trained to sew, make pottery and to make solar stoves. At the time of visit many women were queuing for the opportunity to make solar stoves, which had proven to be very popular as the training and materials were free. The casual workers are paid for each piece of work they do and this sometimes creates cash-flow problems as the selling of products often takes a long time.

Thus the average total staff income/month is about N\$25,875 while the average total income of urban casual workers can be as much as N\$45,000 per month and for rural casual workers as much as N\$75,000. The average total monthly income in wages from this enterprise can even be as high as N\$146,000 each month. This information is depicted more clearly in the table below.

#### Beneficiaries

- Members of the CBTE: Have regular income, accommodation on premises, no need for transport costs
- Suppliers: CBTE buys materials, threads, ink, paint to make products
- \*Casual workers: receive an income although irregular
- \*Family members of the CBTE members: Benefit from the income of members by way of meals, housing, remittance
- \*Local community: benefits from training in sewing and solar stove production, save on energy and time in cooking
- Garage owner: Income from fuel and car maintenance.
- Telecommunication Company: Payment of monthly telephone bill
- Municipality: CBTE pays rates
- Families and organisations using facilities for parties and meetings
- Tourists: Can be accommodated and provided with meals

- \*Members of the nearby recycling project: Recycled products of women and men sold in the shop of CBTE
- \*Women Craft makers in the community: Products sold in CBTE shop
- \*Families of casual workers: Benefit from the income of casual workers by way of meals, housing, remittance
- Shipping Company: income from shipping orders overseas
- Overseas clients: income from selling products locally and benefit of using hand made products

### Negative Impacts

- \*Local residents: Limited access to fishing at the nearby dam
- Environment: Quality of roads deteriorate from frequent use
- \* poor

### Financial benefits to the poor

**Table 7 Financial earnings of the poor: Penduka**

	Amount/p/person (N\$ range)	Who earns it	How many earn it	How many in future?
Wage income	750-1,500/month	Members of CBTE	23	25
*Informal sector sales	50-200/month	Craft makers	20	50
Casual labour	150-700/month	Women embroiders	600 (only about 100 earn regularly)	600
Small enterprise profits	12,000/month	Members	23	25
Collective income to the community	none	None	None	None

A total of 673 poor people derive some sort of financial benefit from this enterprise, some more regularly than others. Income for the 500 rural casual labourers is more sporadic than those in Windhoek. This number is likely to increase in the regions as the CBTE continues to train women to sew and run their own enterprises as they have done already. Each of these people support on average between 30-50 people with their income. This means that about 10,920 are impacted by the financial benefits of this enterprise. Consequently, if this enterprise were to collapse it would mean about 11,000 people would become worse off and more vulnerable.

These are significant figures in terms of looking at employment and the number of people being protected from vulnerability and poverty. Except for those crafts people who sell their crafts through the craft shop at Penduka, the rest are no longer poor but will be as soon as they lose their income at Penduka. As for Spitzkoppe, Penduka makes a difference to poverty in Namibia.

### 3.3.c Face to Face

Face to Face is a new (established July 1999) CBTE that offers tours of black history and Katutura, the Windhoek suburb reserved for blacks before Independence and which is still primarily black. The four members of the enterprise are recent school graduates who are unemployed and have come to the city to look for work. One of them was a taxi driver and came up with the idea. Two of the

members are female, and one of them has a young child living with her grandmother. They live with relatives and operate from one of their residences in Windhoek.

Three of them do the tour guiding while one of the females takes the bookings and does the bookkeeping. They do not have a vehicle but hire a taxi from friends. The tour takes three hours and they require a minimum of two people.

NACOBTA has produced brochures for this enterprise which are distributed to guesthouses and tour companies. The perception of all the CBTEs visited, has been that the distribution of brochures is their main marketing strategy. At the time of visiting FACE to FACE all the staff members were in the office, despite the fact that they have not had many bookings in the past month. The responsibility for marketing themselves is left to NACOBTA, which again consists mainly of brochures and articles in papers and magazines – direct marketing to tourists and tour operators is rare or non-existent.

### **Beneficiaries**

- \*Members of the CBTE: Have regular income, gaining multiple skills, meet people
- \*Taxi Owner: CBTE hires car from taxi driver
- \*Members of the Greenwell Matongo Recycling Centre: Visitors buy their products
- \*Family members of the CBTE members: Benefit from the income of members by way of contribution to electricity/water costs and food
- Local community: meeting and interacting with people from other countries they would otherwise never meet
- Garage owner: Income from fuel and car maintenance
- Telecommunication Company: Payment of monthly telephone bill
- Municipality: CBTE members contribute to paying rates where they stay
- \*Informal Sector: Tourist buy their food and drinks at the market and talk to them
- \*Families in Katutura Meet and interact with tourists
- Tourists: Find out about how the majority of people in Windhoek live and about Black Namibian History
- \*Members and of Penduka: Clients go and eat at the Penduka Restaurant and buy crafts
- \*Women Craft makers in the community: Whose crafts are sold at the Penduka shop

### **Those affected by negative impacts**

- \*Local community: Tourist may take pictures of them, invasion of their privacy
- \*Families in Katutura: Tourist may take pictures of them, invasion of their privacy

\* =Poor

### **Financial benefits to the poor: Face to Face**

**Table 8 Financial earnings of the poor: Face to Face**

	<b>Amount/person (N\$ range)</b>	<b>Who earns it (type of person)</b>	<b>How many earn it</b>	<b>How many in future?</b>
Wage income	100-300/month	Members of CBTE	4	10
Informal sector sales	30-150/month	Informal traders at market	6	50
Recycling centre(SME)	10-60/person/month	Members of recycling Centre	10	20
Informal sector, transport	360/month	Taxi owner	01	5
Informal sector sales: Crafts	14- 100/person/month	Women selling through Penduka shop	5	20
Small enterprise profits	130/person/month	Members	4	40
Collective income to the community	none	None	None	none

This new enterprise already brings financial benefits to 48 people in terms of a monthly income that amounts to about N\$5,000 each month and translates into a total annual income of N\$60,000. These financial benefits have a more far-reaching impact than for just the direct income earners, as each earner supports on average 15 people. Thus the total financial benefits can be felt by as many as 720 people. Once it is fully established the potential outreach of this enterprise could be very high, and there is no doubt that with the necessary support and skills this enterprise could have a dramatic impact on poverty in Namibia.

### **3.3.d Nyae Nyae Conservancy**

The Nyae Nyae CBTE is a conservancy of the San community, which focuses on trophy hunting and craft making. The conservancy was established in 1998 and generates funds from bed levies for guests using the local lodge.

#### **Beneficiaries**

- Community: benefit from community fund
- Wage earners: Have income that improves their vulnerability status
- Families of wage earners: benefit from income
- Environment: Donation of wildlife as non-financial benefit to the community by the state, donors and private sector
- Craft makers: Are able to produce and sell their products to tourist for income
- Cultural Performers: Can make income from performances
- Guides: Generate income form their tracking and hunting skills through wages
- Community: Gets meat from hunting

#### **Negative impacts**

Negative impacts could arise from the mismanagement of wildlife through trophy hunting, but this has not been the case so far as conservation is part of the conservancy's management strategy.

**Table 9 Financial earnings of the poor: Nyae Nyae conservancy (1998)**

	<b>Amount/ year (N\$ approx)</b>	<b>Who earns it (type of person)</b>	<b>How many earn it</b>	<b>How many in future?</b>
Wage income	9500/person	Full-time workers	6	12
Trophy hunting (a)	115 000	Community		
Bed levy (b)	3000	Community		
Casual labour	1406/person	Casual workers	32	50
Other	4 000	Community		
Crafts	57 835	Informal sector craft makers		
Cultural tourism	1750/person	Cultural performers	16	100
Collective income to the community (a+b+ other)	(122 000)	Community	(2631)	
<b>Total income</b>	<b>227 835</b>			

Source: Adapted from LIFE Report: Oct- Mar 1999

As one of the more marginalised communities in Namibia, and in a region faced with changing lifestyles, from nomadic to more settled, it is heartening to notice that this community is making use of its natural resources and traditional skills to raise its standard of living. Looking at the table showing CBTE income over the past four years, the Nyae Nyae community has grown from strength to strength making a gross income of nearly N\$1million in 2000 alone. This translates into N\$373.70 per person in the community per year, and means that the community as a whole is no longer classified as very poor but poor (SCL for very poor = less than N\$ 248.34). Again, this is due solely to the income from the CBTE and if this trend were to continue, the community would become better-off. It is also worth noting that some of the income from the CBTE goes directly into the community fund.

### 3.3e Torra Bay CBTE

Torra is a conservancy on the coast in the Namib Desert and one of the most successful CBTEs to date, because it no longer needs funds from outside. The community entered into a joint venture with private partners and established a lodge which generates funds for the community as well as providing employment to community members.

**Table 10 Financial earnings of the poor: Torra (1998)**

	<b>Amount/year (N\$ approx)</b>	<b>Who earns it</b>	<b>How many earn it</b>	<b>How many in future?</b>
Wage income	15994.90/person	Fulltime lodge workers	10	
Trophy hunting (a)	50 000	Community		
Tourist lodge (b)	120 000	Community		
Collective income to the community (a+b)	(170 000)	Community	(600)	
<b>Total income</b>	<b>329 949</b>			

Source: Adapted from LIFE Report: Oct- Mar 1999

The total local earnings averaged-out for the population in 1998 amounted to N\$550 per person per year. This again moves the community from being defined as poor and very poor to one that is better-off. The people of this community have already started reaping the benefits from the CBTE. The school is about to become connected to the internet, with many basic needs already being met from this enterprise. If the community did not take up this CBTE opportunity, they would have to wait for decades for many of these benefits to come to them via the State, as in other Namibian communities.

### **3.4. Impact of CBTEs on the poor**

The data on the financial earnings of the poor presented in the tables for Penduka, Spitzkoppe and Face-to-Face were collected from interviews with staff from these specific CBTEs. They are rough estimates and not precise data. Data for all other CBTEs has been extracted from the semi-annual reports of LIFE. The data covers only 9 out of 45 members of NACOBTA, and not all CBTEs either. The data from LIFE focuses mainly on tangible benefits such as financial income to the community, wages and game donation rather than intangible benefits, as has been done for the case studies.

What has transpired from interviews with members of the case study CBTEs, is that the income they receive has made them less vulnerable to hunger. Many were pleased that they had acquired new skills which could be used locally without them having to leave their communities. Others found the opportunity to be their own bosses very rewarding. The fact that they were able to assist their community was also highlighted as an important factor by the interviewees. The chance to manage and control resources that were previously not accessible to the poor was also welcomed by the members interviewed.

The case studies show that CBTEs impact on many people directly and indirectly, particularly the poor, and this impact is growing significantly year on year (see Appendix on Impacts on Livelihoods of the Poor).

Of the three CBTEs visited, women formed about fifty percent of the membership – a good sign that women are also benefiting from CBTEs, though this did vary across regions. All three case studies showed that CBTEs reduced the vulnerability of households in the CBTE communities involved, and that the impact was wider than for just the immediate employees and members of CBTEs, as their income made it possible to pay for school fees, food and other needs that required cash. The case studies also show that CBTEs generate spin-offs for the poor in the informal sector, through craft-making, cultural performance and trading. It also offers casual labour opportunities for people who would otherwise not have any other means of income.

The case studies also show that those who benefit most are those with some kind of basic skills or education, and are either able to drive, read and communicate in English, hunt, make crafts or have the educational background to be trained. The very poor usually do not have many of these and tend to be used as casual labour.

Data available also shows that more established CBTEs tend to have a higher income than newly-formed CBTEs, but the type of activities an CBTE is engaged with also determines their levels of income. Some CBTEs are involved in activities other than tourism such as thatchgrass harvesting, and this brings in substantial additional revenue to the community. Those engaged in joint ventures with the private sector (Nyae Nyae and Torra) seem to do better than those on their own.

Income from most of the Caprivi CBTEs has dropped significantly since the unrest began, as tourism came to a halt.

The total collective income due to CBTEs over the past six years amounts to almost N\$2 million over the same period comes to just over N\$5 million.

Income generated from CBTEs in the five years since 1995 amounts to more than N\$7 million, most of which goes on wages. With the exception of CBTEs in the Caprivi area, the data shows an increase in income from CBTEs. This means that CBTEs are bringing desperately needed cash to the poor in rural communities. The very poor also benefit from CBTEs through the community fund income which is different from that earned in wages, because it is earned by the community as a whole and may be used for a range of collective expenditures. The communities in which CBTEs operate have moved from being very poor to better-off or poor in terms of the income level of their community. Twenty five percent of those in management committees of conservancies are women and in many of the CBTEs women make up a substantial number, if not the majority, of those earning wages.

Many of the CBTEs have not reached their potential yet due to lack of skills and investment, while others are still being set up as many communities apply for conservancies, concessions and PTO. One can thus assume that the income generated to date is only a fraction of what could be earned once the CBTEs have been up-graded and their capacity improved. This increase could be boosted over the next five years by a strong local, regional and international marketing drive if political stability is restored in Caprivi and Kavango.

According to the proposed budget, by 2005 NACOBTA expenditure over 10 years will have totalled N\$19 million, an amount which is projected to help create 320 jobs within member CBTEs who are expected to have a gross income of N\$3.7 million each year by 2005. The estimated total gross income of member CBTEs from now until 2005, amounts to nearly N\$15,000,000 or probably around N\$22 million, including income already earned. If NACOBTA's \$19 million investment over 10 years has generated the N\$22 million earned by BTEs, this would suggest a good return given that CBTEs would continue to earn around N\$3.7 per year on an on-going basis. However, there are many caveats to this simple comparison. NACOBTA's future budget is likely to be much larger, as only promised funding is included. Such income estimates are merely approximate; this makes it difficult to predict what the gross income (total revenue) is likely to be in reality. So even after allowing for costs, actual profits could be much lower (however many of the 'costs' are payments to local poor workers, so are off-set by benefits). Also, income estimates are only a partial indicator of the livelihood benefits of CBTEs to the poor, and, more importantly, NACOBTA's expenditure is only one contributor to the development of the CBTEs – investments from many other organisations and individuals are involved as well. On the other hand, the income of other CBTEs that are not currently NACOBTA members is not included (see tables below), and could in part be attributed to NACOBTA's general promotion of CBT. Nevertheless, the ball park figures indicate that investment is reasonable and in line with returns, taking into the account the non-financial benefits and the likelihood that much of the CBTEs annual earnings would be sustained beyond the period of NACOBTA's input.

### **3.5 Broader contributions to poverty alleviation**

NACOBTA and its partners have made a formidable contribution towards reaching the national objectives of sustaining economic growth, creating employment, reducing inequalities and eradicating poverty. This is evidenced by the fact that rural communities are making an income never heard of before in communal areas and that jobs are being created within communal areas instead of people migrating to the urban areas. The study shows that most CBTEs are making an income that has changed their communities from being poor or very poor to being better off. This has contributed significantly towards the equitable distribution of resources between urban and rural communities.

The income from conservancies over the past three years has grown by 42%. The total income from eight conservancies with a total population of 15,675 for 1999 and 2000 alone amounts to N\$4.3 million. With the number of conservancies increasing and the Northwest region being developed into a tourism area, and the increasing demand for CBT in the tourism market, CBTE income over the next ten years is bound to grow and consequently have a positive impact for poverty alleviation.

The community structures being developed through CBT are also proving to bring cohesion to communities, even though this was difficult at first. Outsiders are using them to reach communities, though most importantly, is the democratic style of communication and consultation being adopted that will have a long-term effect on leadership and accountability in Namibia. Leaders at the national, regional and local level will be held more accountable by their communities in the future

Natural resource management by communities with power over resources is already starting to bear fruit, as communities start to enjoy the benefits from managing their resources and the State realises that it cannot do it alone. The return of wildlife to communities is only the beginning of the process of the conservation of nature and the preservation of culture by the nation, as hopefully the government seeks to restore rights over resources to other communities. From this, people will have a more responsible attitude towards their natural resources as they realise their true value.

In the long-term, CBT will definitely become part of the tourism industry as NACOBTA continues to strengthen its ties with the private sector, and rural communities become stronger and more organised.

Provided that the government and the private sector play their role in mainstreaming pro-poor tourism and there is political stability, CBT is going to be one of the more significant and sustainable sources of income in communal areas, keeping many households from being vulnerable and providing cash. One aspect that needs to be avoided is donor over-dependency. In this regard the involvement of the State and private sector should be nurtured, as the success of pro-poor tourism relies heavily on the commitment and ownership of this idea by the State, private sector and the communities themselves. This requires the State to put essential policies in place and to back them up while ensuring that political decisions do not harm the most vulnerable by affecting the industry.

### **3.6 Anticipated impacts**

NACOBTA anticipates pro-poor CBTEs to improve living standards in communal areas by increasing the income and employment from tourism. It is also anticipated that the number of



people employed in CBTEs will increase to 320 in the next five years, while the viability of CBTEs will be increased. More communities are expected to benefit from CBTEs as other regions develop and implement their tourism development plans. More people are expected to be trained and the number of visitors to CBTEs is expected to increase to 100,000 over the next five years.

Lack of infrastructure development (telephone lines, provision of clean water, poor roads etc.) and the absence of a tourism coordinating policy are likely to result in problems. Another potential problem is responding to members' demands for support and training while staffing is limited in numbers.

The Association is not very financially sustainable and is mostly dependent on donor funding, although there are plans to generate more income from introducing a marketing and booking system. Institutionally it is very sustainable, and one could argue that as long as the government does not become more actively involved in pro-poor tourism, the greater the need for an organisation like NACOBTA and its related activities.

Judging from the income generated for the communities, one could conclude that if more joint ventures could be established between the private sector and the communities the more sustainable the outputs of NACOBTA would be.

The strategy of having an institution like NACOBTA to promote PPT is replicable, although it does require a lot of financial investment and effort to take off.

**Table 11 NACOBTA projected indicators**

<b>Year</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Indicator</b>						
NACOBTA members	45	55	65	75	80	85
CBTE employees	163	200	230	260	290	320
CBTEs gross income	1.472.500	1.800.000	2.160.000	2.592.000	3.110.400	3.732.480
NACOBTA trainees	182	220	260	280	200	150
Number of visitors at CBTEs	58 900	68 000	75 000	85 000	95 000	100 000
CBTEs with good finance systems	8	20	30	40	50	60
CBTEs with support package	10	20	28	34	38	38
CBTEs with business plans	9	20	30	40	50	60
Number of grants to CBTEs	5	16	11	11	5	2
Joint ventures agreements	1	6	11	15	18	20

## 4. Review and Lessons

### 4.1 Reflections on this pro-poor tourism initiative

#### 4.1.1 *Strengths*

NACOBTA's main strengths lie in its capacity to network with and influence various stakeholders, together with the fact that it has no self-serving aim other than to help the poor benefit from natural resources to alleviate poverty. NACOBTA, as an institution that coordinates, facilitates and mediates on behalf of CBTEs, is regarded as being singularly placed to promote pro-poor tourism. Although there are many other stakeholders involved in CBNRM issues, they all have their own specific focus, such as training or community development. The focus of NACOBTA has always been PPT, which has helped to keep PPT at the centre of all discussions and activities in the CBNRM movement.

The importance of being a membership organisation cannot be over-emphasised, as this allows the organisation to focus more on issues raised by its members rather than on ideas developed by NGO workers. In addition, it gives the organisation more credibility and authority in promoting and lobbying for member interests with the private sector, government and donors. This makes negotiation easier with the private sector, because they are able to deal with the members directly. Also, donors feel more comfortable giving money to a membership organisation because they believe that it is likely to be more sustainable when beneficiaries are directly involved. The government is also more likely to listen and come to an agreement with a membership organisation, rather than an ordinary tourism NGO.

Focusing on the poor and community development are great strengths of NACOBTA, and draws empathy and understanding from both donors and the private sector because they are issues that everyone is concerned about. This has been backed-up by committed and enthusiastic development staff, another key advantage of NACOBTA.

Another strength has been NACOBTA's ability to focus on those CBTEs which are viable. This is also linked to it being a membership organisation with clear membership criteria. This practice would have been more difficult to implement for an ordinary NGO.

#### 4.1.2 *Weaknesses*

The main weakness of NACOBTA is its lack of business, tourism and financial expertise. Although the institution has excellent development know-how, it is important to achieve the right balance of business and development skills in order to make in-roads into the private sector and to ensure that CBTEs are viable.

Over-reliance on donor funding is another weakness, as this might create a dependency for the institution as well as for its individual members on external financing. Currently very few of its members are paying their membership fees, but the association is not pursuing them it is not reliant on these fees. The over-involvement of donors in the activities of NACOBTA may be another weakness. This creates the impression that NACOBTA is donor-driven and is pursuing an agenda for the donors rather than for the communities, leading to the disengagement of some important stakeholders.

Another weakness of NACOBTA is its failure to develop an effective system for distributing community funds to benefit the very poor as well as other people within communities. Most of these communities have neither the experience nor the skills to work with large sums of money, and need assistance. The suggestion is not to tell communities what to do with their money, but to offer them various options of what can be done to benefit the community best. NACOBTA could perhaps employ the services of a financial consultant to develop guidelines as some of the CBTEs generate a substantial amount of money which could be used more efficiently to benefit even the very poor in these communities

#### *4.1.3 Constraining factors*

The absence of a national tourism policy, together with a lack of government pro-activeness and commitment to implement community-based tourism and conservancy policies, is a major constraint to incorporating PPT into mainstream tourism. This is illustrated by government decisions in granting PTOs and concessions which greatly disadvantages the poor. Other concerns include:

- the slow processing of conservancy, PTO and concession applications;
- uninformed MET personnel;
- the lack of government involvement in border disputes between communities;
- lack of incentives for private sector and community involvement in CBTE (farmers are offered incentives);
- lack of financial support for CBTEs;
- the lack of staff in the Directorate of Tourism.

Another constraint to PPT development is the lack of funds and capital to develop the enterprises to an acceptable standard. Most communities cannot get financial assistance from financial institutions because they do not have land tenure or other collateral.

The slow progress on the Communal Land Bill calling for communal land tenure to be given to communities, thus granting them rights to manage all natural resources including land in their community, is an additional constraint.

#### *4.1.4 Facilitating factors*

Factors facilitating the progress of PPT include:

- the commitment of development workers and NACOBTA;
- the demand and enthusiasm of communities for initiating CBT activities;
- the growing global CBT market;
- donor assistance;
- the existence of the Conservancy Act and CBT policy.

#### *4.1.5 Main lessons*

The main lessons learnt are:

The poor need to be organised into credible structures at both the local and national level to empower them and facilitate communication with others.

Working with the poor requires patience, time and effort, and progress is sometimes slow. PPT requires skills to work with very different groups of people – the poor, the private sector and the decision-makers

PPT requires multi-level strategies. At the macro-level, policies need to be in place for pro-poor tourism to start; at the micro-level, the poor need to have access to skills, resources, markets and training to manage the enterprises effectively and maintain standards. The private sector must be involved as they have the skills, experience, established clientele/contacts, know the industry and have the money to invest. Those involved in PPT must be organised and have a clear vision of pro-poor tourism and what is efficient. The poor must have access to natural resources that tourists are looking for or need, such as land, wildlife, water etc.

Assessing PPT impacts on the poor can be difficult, but is important particularly when some are still sceptical about PPT.

- The establishment of PPT in the mainstream industry requires a lot of investment to make the initiatives viable. The operations of a supportive organisation like NACOBTA are also costly as there is a lot that needs to be done. It is therefore important to ensure that the outputs of these are in proportion with the inputs.
- A membership organisation of CBTEs promoting PPT is more effective and credible than an NGO or donor as the poor themselves are involved.
- An association like NACOBTA is more effective at developing and supporting PPT enterprises and working with the private sector to integrate PPT into the mainstream industry than influencing issues at the macro-level.
- Promoting PPT requires the development of partnerships between the private sector and the PPT initiatives as well as partnerships with those with skills and funds.
- An association like NACOBTA needs to balance development skills and with business and tourism skills.
- An association such as NACOBTA needs to have a system of assessing and monitoring the benefits of PPT in place.
- The gender aspect should be promoted in PPT activities
- PPT has a positive impact on the living standards of the poor
- PPT needs strong promotion
- PPT should also be targeted at the local market
- Political instability impacts negatively on PPT
- Very successful PPT can benefit both the fairly poor and the very poor if efficient ways of distributing the benefits are put in place
- Promoting PPT needs to be supported by some kind of government policy which could be used to solicit support or action from government by those promoting PPT such as NACOBTA.
- The development of PPT requires basic infrastructure in the communities such as telephones
- The development and promotion of PPT should be spearheaded by indigenous people to foster ownership of the idea within the government, communities and private sector and thus make it sustainable.
- It is important to ensure that in joint ventures with the private sector, the poor do not just become ‘spectators’ of the process and recipients of community funds. It must be involved in running the enterprises with the aim of acquiring skills and eventually assuming full ownership and responsibility.

In summary, PPT requires a driving force through a form of institution that is multi-skilled, bend on developing essential partnerships and skills while focussed on pro-poor tourism, particularly when poverty alleviation efforts are many and varied and some very closely linked to pro-poor tourism e.g. natural resource management.

## 4.2 Reflections on the pro-poor tourism research

The study shows that tourism can be adapted to meet pro-poor objectives by providing the poor with access to natural resources, which can be used to establish tourism enterprises and integrated within the mainstream tourism industry. A substantial amount of financial and technical support is required however, to make these enterprises viable. It also requires a substantial effort to build relations with key players in the tourism sector to ensure that the industry understands the concept of PPT, and is receptive to the idea of integrating these new entrants into the industry.

The study shows that income from PPT over the past five years amounts to over N\$7 million. This income has remained within the participating communities making them less vulnerable to poverty, and changing their status from being very poor to poor or better-off. The involvement of the poor in PPT ensures that all the income generated goes back into the community, unlike much income generated from tourism by the state or the private sector..

PPT should equally target the poor and the poorest sectors of the community. In many instances, the poorest do not have the basic skills required for running an enterprise, but do have other traditional skills, including performance, hunting, riding, craft-making, gemstone mining etc., which can be harnessed for their benefit. Consequently, the poorest are able to benefit from PPT when community funds are well managed and when the distributive mechanisms focus on the needs of the very poor rather than those of the poor or better-off only.

PPT can be applied to any type of tourism including mass tourism. Mass tourism should be limited to guided tours, craft selling and cultural performances in order to limit environmental damage and negative impacts on the poor. Great care should be taken to ensure that negative impacts on the livelihoods of the poor (e.g. cultural and sexual exploitation, environmental damage) are minimal, and the cost benefits of tourism in general should be taken into account at all times.

The inclusion of the private sector in PPT increases the commercial feasibility of CBTEs: the poor have the resources and the private sector the skills and experience needed to ensure success of the initiatives. These partnerships must provide a win-win situation for both sides to make it worthwhile. Benefits to the poor can be ensured through establishing community funds and bed levies, which has worked with the Torra and Nyae Nyae conservancies in Namibia.

The integration of PPT into the mainstream industry requires a mutually respectful relationship between those promoting PPT and those working in the private sector. People in the private sector respect partners who demonstrate an understanding of the way business operates. This means that those involved with the development and promotion of PPT need to acquire excellent business skills in addition to their community development skills.

Practical action at the destination level cannot be effective unless some critical policies are in place. NACOBTA would not have been able to approach the private sector and enter into joint ventures with poor communities, if tourism rights had not been granted to communal areas. The conservancy policy gives communities rights over wildlife in their respective areas; hence the Nyae Nyae

conservancy was able to make an income of as much as N\$125,000 from trophy hunting alone in 1998. This is significant in a community where there was no cash income at all prior to this date. Policy development without sufficient action would not be of use to the poor either. Without poor people's involvement they would have no knowledge of policies directly affecting them. In the current political climate, the government has not begun to implement PPT policies and is unlikely to do so in the near future because of a lack of capacity and poor coordination. An organisation like NACOBTA is able to fill this gap by concentrating its activities at the destination level within the current policy framework for the benefit of the poor. With some policies in place, efforts should perhaps be more focussed at the destination level rather than at the policy level. However, efforts at the policy level are perhaps best shared with other stakeholders rather than being spearheaded by a single organisation – donors, communities and other NGOs are working with NACOBTA at the macro-level.

PPT in Namibia is proving to be an effective poverty alleviation strategy judging by the income it creates for the poor and its livelihood impacts. It also has a positive impact for the nation as a whole, in terms of economic growth, the equitable distribution of income, employment creation and poverty alleviation. The good news is that income from PPT has grown at an average rate of 43% over the past three years. While PPT brings other livelihood benefits to the poor for now, many regard income as the most important.

PPT requires that there is a product to offer tourists, but the poor do not always have something, such as landscape or local products. PPT should thus be regarded as a complementary strategy to combating poverty. Like any other business it is also contingent on externalities such as political stability and the purchasing power of tourists.

The long-term impacts and sustainability of PPT cannot, as yet, be fully verified from this case study. Much still needs to be done to integrate PPT initiatives within the main tourism industry and many CBTEs still need a lot of support and development. Nevertheless when looking at income alone, the short-term impacts from these initiatives are evident. On the other hand, livelihood impacts are extremely difficult to measure and monitor as many people including the poor, donors and NGOs do not pay much attention to them and they are best measured a long period after implementation (10+ years).

## References

1. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1994
2. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1995
3. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1996
4. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1997
5. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1998
6. *Accommodation Statistics*, MET, 1999
7. *Activity Management Profile*, by Nghishoongele Immanuel and Barnes Jon, 1997
8. Wabahe, M.S (2000) *An Evaluation of SIDA support to Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*
9. *Annual Visitor Statistics*, Policy Planning and Management Information Unit, MET, 1996
10. *Annual Visitor Statistics*, Policy Planning and Management Information Unit, MET, 1997
11. *Annual Visitor Statistics*, Policy Planning and Management Information Unit, MET, 1998
12. *Bi-Annual Report for the Namibian Community-Based Tourism Association*, March- August 1997
13. *Bi-Annual Report of the Namibia community Based Tourism Association*, September 1997 - February 1998
14. *Bi-Annual Report: The Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*, September 1999 - February 2000
15. *Bi-Annual Report: The Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*, by Louis Maxi and Davidson Andee, 1999
16. *Bi-Annual Report: The Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*, March to August 1998
17. *Bi-Annual Report: The Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)*, by Louis Maxi, August 1998 to March 1999
18. *Community-Based Natural Resource Management Programme*, by Ministry of Environment and Tourism
19. *Conservation of Biotic Diversity and Habitat Protection*, by Ministry of Environment and Tourism, 1994
20. *Consultant's Report on A Workshop on Developing M and E Systems for the INRM Programme*, by Baird James H, 1995
21. *Country Review Report*, by UNDP, 1999
22. *Current and Potential Use values for Natural Resources in Some Namibian Communal Areas: A Planning Tool*, by Barnes J. I. , 1995
23. *Desertification News*, by Namibia's Programme to Combat Desertification, 1994
24. *Ecotourism in Namibia: Considerations for Environmentally and Socially Responsible Travel*, by Christ Costas, 1995
25. *Final Report: Namibia's National Programme to Combat Desertification*
26. *First National Development Plan (NDPI) Volume I*, by The National Planning Commission, 1995/1996 - 1999 -/2000
27. *First National Development Plan (NDPI) Volume II*, by National Planning Commission, 1995/1996 - 1999/2000
28. *Flamingo*, by Air Namibia, November 2000
29. *Gender as a Factor in Community Based Natural Resource Management: A case Study of Nongozi, Lianshulu, Lizauli and Sachona Villages in East Caprivi - Namibia*, by Nabane Nontokozi, 1995
30. *Incentives Affecting Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable use: the case of Land use options in Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline, 1996
31. *Institutional Relationships, Capacity and Sustainability*, by Jones Brian, T.B., 1996
32. *Intangibles Matter: Non-financial Dividends of Community Based Natural Resource Management in Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline, 1998
33. *Knowledge, Opinions and Attitudes Regarding Environmental Assessment in Namibia: Results of a National Survey Conducted in 1997*, by Tarr Peter, 2000
34. *Land-use Planning: Towards Sustainable Development*, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, 1994
35. *Life (Living in a Finite Environment) Programme*, by World Wildlife Fund, 1995

36. *Livelihood Strategies of Rural Households in Caprivi: Implications for Conservancies and Natural Resource Management*, by Ashley Caroline and LaFranchi Christopher, 1997
37. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme ( Project No. 690-0251)*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and management Systems International, April 1999
38. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme (Cooperative Agreement No. 690-A-00-99-00227-00)*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, October 2000
39. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme (Project No. 690-0251)*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, April 1998
40. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme (Project No. 690-0251)*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management System International, October 1999
41. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme(Cooperative Agreement No. 690-A-00-99-00227-00)* by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, April 2000
42. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, 1997
43. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme: Project No. 690-0251*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, 1996
44. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme: Project No. 690-0251*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management Systems International, 1997
45. *Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme: Report No. 690-0251*, by World Wildlife Fund, Rossing Foundation, World Learning and Management System International, 1998
46. *Mission Statement and Mandate of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism*, by Ministry of Environment and Tourism, 1994
47. *NACOBTA Six-Monthly Report( March-Aug 2000)t and Annual Performance Indicators Sept 99- Aug 2000*, M. Louis and A . Davidson
48. *NACOBTA Strategic Plan(1998-2001)*Undated
49. *Namibia Country Position Paper*, 1996
50. *Namibia Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Report*, by The Republic of Namibia, August 1995
51. *Namibia Human Development Report*, by UNDP with UN Country Team, 1998
52. *Namibia Human Development Report*, by UNDP with UNAIDS-sponsors, 1997
53. *Namibia Human Development Report*, by UNDP, 1996
54. *Namibia: North-West Region Tourism Master Plan Volume II*, by Urban Dynamics Africa, March 2000
55. *Namibia: Raising to the Challenge of Poverty Reduction: Technical Paper for Preparation of Poverty Reduction Strategy for Namibia*, by The Republic of Namibia and the World Bank, 1997
56. *Namibia-Community Based Tourism Association*, by Louis Maxi, 1996
57. *Parks and Resident Peoples Linking Namibian Protected Areas with local Communities*, by Jones Brian T. B., 1997.
58. *Parks and Resident Peoples Linking Namibian Protected Areas with local communities*, by Jones Brian T.B., 1997
59. *Population Dynamics, the Environment, and Demand for Water and Energy in Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline, 1995
60. *Population Growth and Renewable Resource Management . The Challenge of Sustaining People and the Environment*, by Ashley Caroline, 1994
61. *Position Paper on The Outline of a National Land Policy*, by NANGOF, December 1996
62. *Profits, Equity, Growth and Sustainability. The Potential of Wildlife Enterprises in Caprivi and Other Communal Areas of Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline, Barnes Jon, Healy Tim, 1994
63. *Promoting Community-Based Tourism Development*, by Ashley Caroline and Garland Elizabeth, 1994
64. *Promotion of Community Based Tourism*, by Ministry of Environment and Tourism, 1995
65. *Pro-poor Tourism: Putting Poverty At the Heart of the Tourism Agenda*, Ashley, C. Boyd, H. Goodwin, 2000
66. *Proposal to Amend and Extend the Living in a Finite Environment (Life) Programme*, 1999-2002
67. *Quarterly Report for the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (Combined)*, by Louis Maxi, 1996



68. *Quarterly Report for the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association*, by Louis Maxi, 1 December - 28 February 1997
69. *Report of the Community- Based Tourism Enterprise Workshop*, Costas Christ, World Learning, 1995
70. *Research on Problems Encountered by Women in Cross Border Trade*, by Development Support Services
71. *Socio-Economic Status and the Use of Natural Resources in the Proposed Salambala Conservancy*, by Mosimane Alfons Wabahe, 1996
72. *Submission of Final Technical Report for the Enterprise Development Unit of the IRDNC for the period October 1995 to May 1997*
73. *The Environmental Investment Fund*, by McGann Joseph A, 1999
74. *The Status of Freshwater resources in Namibia*, by Day J.A., 1997
75. *The Value of Non-Agricultural and Land use in Some Namibian Communal Areas: A Data Base for Planning*, by Barnes J.I., 1995
76. *Tourism Accommodation and Info Guide*, 2000
77. *Tourism and Poverty Development: Untapped Potential*, DIFD, 1999
78. *Tourism in the Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana and Oshikoto Regions*
79. *Tourism, communities, and the potential impacts on local incomes and conservation*, by Ashley Caroline, 1995
80. *Tourism, Communities, and the Potential Impacts on Local Incomes and Conservation*, by Ashley Caroline, 1995
81. *Tourists' Willingness to Pay for Wildlife Viewing and Wildlife Conservation in Namibia*, Barnes J.I., Schier C, van Rooy G, 1997
82. *Towards the Establishment of the Environmental Investment Fund*, by McGann Joseph A, 1999
83. *Travel News : Namibia*, Oct 1999
84. *Travel News: Namibia*, April 1999
85. *Travel News: Namibia*, August 2000
86. *Travel News: Namibia*, Feb/March 1999
87. *Travel News: Namibia*, May 2000
88. *Travel News: Namibia*, Nov/Dec 2000
89. *Travel News: Namibia*, Sept/Oct 2000
90. *Using Resource Economics for Natural Resource Management: Namibia's experience*, by Ashley Caroline, Barnes Jon, Brown Chris and Jones Brian, 1997
91. *Using Tourism as a Means to Sustain Community-Based Conservation: Experience from Namibia*, by Callihan David, 1999.
92. *Wildlife Conservation and Utilisation as Complements to Agriculture in Southern African Development*, by Barnes Jonathan I, 1998
93. *Wildlife Management, Utilisation and Tourism in Communal Areas*, by Ministry of Environment and Tourism, 1995
94. *Wildlife Tourism, Communities and Resource Economics: Experience in Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline, 1996
95. *Wildlife Use for Economic Gain the Potential for Wildlife to Contribute to Development in Namibia*, by Ashley Caroline and Barnes Jon, 1996

## **Appendix 1: Methodology**

The methodology included in-depth interviews with: members of initiatives, NACOBTA staff, NGO staff, government officials, members of the private sector involved in tourism, donors, tourists, beneficiaries of initiatives; secondary research using various sources listed in the reference list and visits to three of NACOBTA's member initiatives.

The NACOBTA data are based on estimates. Data from LIFE documents do not focus on CBTE activities alone but rather on all conservancy activities. Thus they do not reflect those NACOBTA members which are not yet conservancies. Data from interviews are also rough estimates except for those of the Spitzkoppe CBTE.

## Appendix 2 Actions to address barriers to participation of the poor in tourism

Issue	Barrier?	Means of overcoming it
Lack of human capital of the poor – e.g., skills	Yes	Training in tourism, SME management, tour guide, language skills provided. On-site business advise offered
Lack of financial capital of the poor – e.g., micro credit, revolving loans	Yes	Grants provided
Lack of social capital/organisational strength	No	
Gender norms & constraints	Yes	Gender sensitive approaches included in training. Constitution requires gender representation in management
Incompatibility with existing livelihood strategies	Yes	Avoid mass market tourism to avoid competition for resources such as water. Ensure that waste disposal is safe and done regularly. Provide tangible benefits to community
Location	Yes	Develop area tourism plans to guide the poor. Lobby for development of infrastructure in tourist potential areas
Lack of land ownership/tenure	Yes	Lobby for legislation to give land tenure to the poor in their communities. Offer training to communities on lease agreements, joint-ventures, levies, understanding contracts and negotiation skills
Lack of product	Yes	Develop tourism development plans and investment portfolios. Consult private sector.
Planning process favours others – lack of planning gain	Yes	Lobby government to give concessions to the poor instead of private sector, and power to communities over all natural resources in their area. Advocate for communities benefit funds with all applications for conservancies, PTOs and concessions
Regulations & red tape	Yes	Lobby for hunting quota systems to be the same for both conservancies and freehold owners
Inadequate access to the tourism market	Yes	Centralise the marketing and promotion of CBTEs through the association. Link up with private sector and government tourism promotion bodies
Low capacity to meet tourist expectations	Yes	Upgrade facilities to basic expected standard, train staff and encourage joint ventures with private sector
Lack of linkages between formal and informal sectors/local suppliers	Yes	Distribute information about the informal sector. Create links with the formal sector through the CBTE Association
Tourist market (segment) inappropriate	No	
Lack of pro-active government support for involvement by the poor.	Yes	Constant lobbying and involvement of the government in the CBTE Association's activities
Mistrust between the poor and the private sector	Yes	Create awareness about mutual benefits and social responsibilities
Lack of banking facilities near the poor	Yes	Lobby financial institutions to offer mobile services for long-term gain and as a contribution to development
Lack of benefits to the poor	Yes	Ensure that there are tangible benefit for the poor in each product and that the communities understand short-term and long term gains

Lack of technical support	Yes	Provide on-site business advice and assistance with plans, budgets, proposals, monitoring and evaluation systems, marketing tools etc.
Lack of CBT booking system	Yes	Set up a centralised booking system for all members. Lobby for infrastructure development e.g. telephone, roads. Ensure service provided is what is advertised
Lack of infrastructure	Yes	Lobby and work in partnership with key stakeholders involved in infrastructure development
Lack of national tourism policy	Yes	Lobby for legislation of tourism policy so as to ensure that the necessary infrastructure and support for tourism can be budgeted for
Political unrest and war	Yes	Working in partnership on a regional strategy to re-introduce regional tours involving other countries to the country and the Caprivi and Kavango regions in particular.
Lack of information	Yes	Provide information to the poor about the opportunities in tourism through conservancies, concessions, PTOs and land tenure

### Appendix 3 Impacts on livelihoods of the poor

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Losses, problems</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skills, access to education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities and members have acquired skills such as book keeping, planning, management, leadership, negotiation, working with contracts.</li> <li>Working with, tourists, record keeping, natural resource management, game guarding, tracking, budgeting, developing business plans, running CBTEs, decorating CBTEs, dealing with bookings.,</li> <li>415 trained under NACOBTA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tied up with the activities of the CBTE</li> <li>Use free time to study</li> <li>Have to leave family behind when attending training in other places</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural resources (access to, use/productivity)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>17 Communities now registered as conservancies to access rights over wildlife</li> <li>Many communities have PTO s and can exploit natural resources such as Spitzkoppe</li> <li>Wildlife donated and introduced into communities to boost tourism by MET and private sector—50 hartebeest, 53 oryx, 89 springbok, 8 zebra, 33 blue wilde beest, 25 impala worth N\$400 000 donated to Nyae Nyae and Salambala in 1999</li> <li>Trophy hunting used to bring income</li> <li>Trophy hunting provides meat to community</li> <li>Children and adults pleased to see wild life again</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife can destroy crops and property</li> <li>Some communities forced out of new conservancy areas</li> <li>Lack of land tenure</li> <li>No right over other resources such as water, plants and landscape</li> <li>Competition for resources such as water and land</li> <li>Take farming land away from people</li> <li>Conflicts arise over boundaries</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community organisation, cohesion, pride</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All conservancies now organised into committees which makes communication and decision making participatory</li> <li>Power no longer centralised in traditional authorities and the state</li> <li>Women now part of decision making—25%</li> <li>The rich and the poor now have power in the community</li> <li>Communities now have power to negotiate with outsiders through the community committees</li> <li>People have pride in their CBTE success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some people do not understand that even if they signed documents on behalf of the community it does not give them the right to claim community property for themselves</li> <li>conflicts arise due to power struggle</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure:</li> <li>• Water</li> <li>• roads, transport</li> <li>• telephone, communication</li> <li>• other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads to CBTEs are better maintained than before</li> <li>• Some CBTEs now have access to phones</li> <li>• Bore holes give access to water for the community too</li> <li>• Locals can have access to transport by lifts from visitors</li> <li>• Some CBTEs have transport which can assist communities</li> <li>• School built using CBTE community funds</li> <li>• Lodges build to increase tourists</li> <li>• Toilets and showers introduced into community</li> <li>• Solar Electricity introduced in CBTEs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much traffic disturb people and animals</li> <li>• Some roads interfere with people's properties</li> <li>• Increased noise</li> <li>• Increased traffic</li> <li>• Banks are too far from CBTEs</li> <li>• Post Offices too far</li> <li>• Ablution systems may pollute drinking water</li> <li>• Farm lines not efficient</li> <li>• Solar power cannot operate freezers, faxes, other gadgets required by tourists</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Health Care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• members can afford clinic fees</li> <li>• First Aid facilities available at CBTEs even for communities</li> <li>• Some CBTEs pay for medical costs of workers</li> <li>• Access to telephone makes access to medical help e.g. ambulance quicker during accidents</li> <li>• Some CBTE built clinics in community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• risk of incapacitation due to car accidents</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Access to information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members seek out information about the history of Katutura and Namibia</li> <li>• Visitors get access to information they normally do not get which improves the perception of the poor by the tourists</li> <li>• Interaction with tourists increases information from outside</li> <li>• Communities have access to information through CBTE newsletter and NGO/NACOBTA staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities may be introduced to information that conflict with their beliefs</li> <li>• Information from outside may influence community members negatively e.g. unhealthy diet, rude music etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funds for the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community benefit indirectly from community funds contributed by CBTEs</li> <li>• Funds raised through levies, leases, fees etc.</li> <li>• Community spend funds on what they regard as their needs collectively. Spitzkoppe is building a toilet for the church hall and contributing to funeral expenses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities do not have rights over all resources to start charging others</li> <li>• No efficient system of distributing and using community funds within the community</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other livelihood activities: farming, employment, migration etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular income for those employed</li> <li>• Employment created locally, particularly rural areas</li> <li>• Income even during drought for farming communities</li> <li>• Families united as work is in community</li> <li>• Access to cash</li> <li>• Offers employment to who are semi-skilled— school leavers</li> <li>• People near their farms and can do both— 6/19 members of Spitzkoppe CBTE are subsistence farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members not with their immediate family(Penduka, Face to Face)</li> <li>• Members are far from their relatives(Penduka, Face to Face)</li> <li>• War in Caprivi has set CBTEs and communities back in many ways</li> <li>• Over-reliance on overseas tourists</li> <li>• Members can no longer assist with farming in the village</li> <li>• Too much pressure on individuals to farm and run CBTE s</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Markets, market opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBTE is becoming increasingly popular with tourists i.e. market expanding—58 900 tourists visited NACOBTA in 2000</li> <li>• Creating a product in the market that was not there before</li> <li>• Taking a share of the existing tourist market</li> <li>• Private sector getting involved in CBTE in support or as partners</li> <li>• The poor are seizing market opportunities previously only accessible to the poor</li> <li>• Market has potential to grow for CBTE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in market putting pressure on resources</li> <li>• The poor with poor negotiations skills loose out on deals with the private sector</li> <li>• Mass market cab over-stretch communities in energy and resources</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MET CBT and Conservancy policies have made communities seize the chance</li> <li>• Government’s goal to alleviate poverty and bring equity has led to donors assisting NACOBTA and CBTEs</li> <li>• The Namibian constitution calls for sustainable resources management. This has led to the development of CBTEs and Conservancies as a means of CBNRM</li> <li>• Policy that Municipalities will be responsible for training and managing tour guides have led to FACE to FACE getting training and possible support</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence over policy makers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many CBTEs now have a voice at policy and planning level in the form of NACOBTA</li> <li>• Communities who were applied for conservancies demanded that MET not put concessions for their areas on tender and</li> </ul>	

	<p>this was obliged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MET has put all PTO applications on hold for now on request from CBTEs and CBRNM NGOs</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created 163 fulltime jobs</li> <li>CBTE employ over 800 casual labourers as cultural performers, builders, cleaners, hunting assistants &amp; craft makers</li> <li>Create jobs for the poor with skills as guides drivers, trackers</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities for informal sector &amp; small businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the informal sector and open opportunities for them by taking tourists to the informal sector(Face to Face)</li> <li>Selling of rafts produced an income of N\$195 917.00 in 1999</li> <li>Creates a market for small scale mining</li> <li>Use of grass and reeds use for building by CBTE which boost these sectors</li> <li>Face to Face takes clients to the informal sector market to try Namibian food</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Casual labour opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBTE s use casual labour during busy periods and for hunting and building</li> <li>Penduka relies heavily on casual labour(more than 600)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases household incomes for CBTE members, informal sector, other CBTEs, SMEs and casual workers directly or indirectly</li> <li>Regular household income for the members</li> <li>Food security raised</li> <li>Many CBTE communities changed from very poor to poor or better off categories</li> <li>Household income from CBTEs in 2000 was N\$1,94 million</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People may become dependent on income</li> <li>May neglect other income sources</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local culture and history is preserved by the young CBTE members</li> <li>Local culture and history promoted</li> <li>Local culture and history instil pride in community and CBTE members</li> <li>Positive perception of the local culture and history developed in tourists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Privacy of people could be invaded</li> <li>Potential to exploit people by tourist e.g. photography etc.</li> <li>Wrong impression or perception of Namibians may be taken by tourists</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture and history re-introduced</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall vulnerability of households</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decreased as there is regular income and some members move from being very poor to poor or poor to being better off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerability to changes in the tourism market</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Become economic entities</li> <li>• Rural skills and knowledge are finding use in CBTE</li> <li>• No longer as marginalised</li> <li>• Speeding the Development process</li> <li>• Solving their own problems and needs</li> </ul>	

## Appendix 4 Financial data

### A. Financial benefits, community income and wage income for some CBTEs in 1999

CBTE	Total financial benefit (N\$)	Total income earned by conservancies (communities)	Total household /wage income	Population size
Khoadi//hoas	45000	45000	0	2823
Kwandu	5760	0	5760	5982
Mashi	3616	0	3616	
Mayuni	132631	23019	9612	1462
Nyae Nyae	518687	122000	45587	2631
Salambala	263149	168986	31663	7066
Torra	507761	276614	207335	1426
West Caprivi	38435	17243	21192	
Wuparo	3097	0	3097	4278
Caprivi Arts and Crafts	65562			
Lizauli Traditional Village	58402			
Caprivi Crafts	2 333			
CBTEs not in Conservancies	580 000	252540	327 600	
Total	2 224 573	905 402	655 462	

Source: Adapted from: LIFE Report April –September 99/2000

**B. CBTE total financial benefits and community income over four years**

	1997		1998		1999		2000	
	TFB	TCI	TFB	TCI	TFB	TCI	TFB	TCI
Khoadi//hoas					45 000	45 000	97 000	90 000
Kwandu					5 760	0	800	0
Mashi					3616		21 500	
Mayuni					132 631	23 019	51 000	16 000
Nyae Nyae	182 000	182 000	227 835	146 000	518 687	122 000	983 200	129 000
Purros							100 440	0
Salambala			10 378	10 378	263 149	168 986	114 660	36 411
Torra			329 949	170 000	507 761	276 614	411 000	188 000
West Caprivi	9760	9760	24 305	14 305	38 435	17 243	25 735	3685
Wuparo					3 097	3 097	2 200	0
Caprivi Arts & crafts	128 850		72 847		65 562			
Lizauli Traditional Village	63583		64 891		58 402			
Caprivi crafts	10 951		31 071		2 333			
Other CBTEs					580 140			
<b>Total</b>	<b>668350</b>	<b>191 760</b>	<b>1 151 776</b>	<b>340 683</b>	<b>2 439 823</b>	<b>655 959</b>	<b>1 807 535</b>	<b>463 096</b>

Source: Adapted from: LIFE Report April –September 99/2000

TFB= Total Financial Benefit , TCI=Total Community Income i.e. collective income

TFB = TCI plus total household income

**C. Income from CBTEs over six years**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	6 year total
Household/wage income	160000	568850	668350	559309	1 249 549	1 944 251	5 150 309
Conservancy Committee income			191760	592 467	652 862	484 886	1 921 975
<b>Total N\$</b>	<b>160 000</b>	<b>568850</b>	<b>860 110</b>	<b>1 151 776</b>	<b>1 902 411</b>	<b>2 429 137</b>	<b>7 072 284</b>

Source: Life Report April-Sept 2000

Income from CBTEs not in conservancies included in household/wage income